

evaluation department

ANALYSIS  
evaluation

# ASIA EARTHQUAKES AND TSUNAMIS

REAL TIME EVALUATION,  
FIRST ROUND  
SYNTHESIS REPORT  
MARCH 2005

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies promotes the humanitarian activities of National Societies among vulnerable people. By coordinating international disaster relief and encouraging development support it seeks to prevent and alleviate human suffering. The International Federation, the National Societies and the International Committee of the Red Cross together comprise the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

## *A fine balance*

# **Asia earthquake and tsunamis :** Real Time Evaluation report *for the* Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

*March 2005*

*Maurice Herson*

## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Acronyms and glossary	4
Executive summary	5
1. Background	8
2. Methodology	8
3. Appeals, planning and objectives	10
4. Assessments	11
5. Quality, flexibility and context	12
6. Initial responses	12
7. Local National Society capacity and the behaviour of other NSs	13
8. DREF and FACTs	14
9. Operational response	15
10. Quality of humanitarian response	15
11. Operating at a new level	16
12. Operational management	17
13. Disaster response 'tools'	17
14. Secretariat management of the disaster response 'tools'	19
15. Recovery Assessment Teams (RATs)	19
16. ICRC	20
17. Logistics	21
18. The Task Force in Geneva	21
19. Decision-making	22
20. Taking responsibility for operational capacity management	22
21. Effectiveness of existing systems	24
22. Interaction with the UN and others	25
23. Staff stress	25
24. HR management	25
25. Relationships and coordination	25
26. Relationships and coordination: the relief phase	26
27. Relationships and coordination: the recovery phase	26
28. Leadership, coordination and control	27
29. Participating National Societies (PNSs) action in the field	29
30. Accountability	29
31. Communications	30
Recommendations of the synthesis report	32
Key recommendations of the Indonesia RTE report	36
Annexes	38
Performance Indicators	
Other key documents	
People interviewed or consulted	
Terms of Reference of the Real-Time Evaluation	
Asia earthquake and tsunamis operations Evaluation Framework	

---

## Acronyms and glossary

CHF	Swiss Francs
DMC	former Disaster Management and Coordination (Division, in Geneva)
DMIS	Disaster Management Information System
DREF	Disaster Relief Emergency Fund
ERU	Emergency Response Unit
FACT	Field Assessment and Coordination Team
Federation	The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
Geneva	The headquarters of the Federation Secretariat
HoD	Head of Delegation
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee of the UN
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
Movement	The Red Cross Red Crescent Movement
NS	National (Red Cross or Red Crescent) Society
ONS	Operating National (Red Cross or Red Crescent) Society
OSD	Operations Support Department (in Geneva)
PMI	Palang Merah Indonesia, the Indonesian Red Cross
PMN	Pledge Management Note
PNS	Participating National (Red Cross or Red Crescent) Society
RAT	Recovery Assessment Team
RCRC	Red Cross / Red Crescent
RD	Regional Delegation (of the Federation Secretariat)
Secretariat	The RCRC Federation Secretariat
RSOF	Regional Strategy and Operational Framework
SLRCS	Sri Lanka Red Cross Society
UN	United Nations

## Acknowledgements

The evaluator wishes to acknowledge the enormous good will and openness with which Federation staff, ICRC staff, and staff and others from National Societies have treated him. This is an indicator of their principled engagement with the fundamental values of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, and I hope that this report will serve all of them well in their obvious desire to achieve the Movement's aims and objectives as well as possible.

I would also like to thank Abhijit Bhattacharjee and Björn Ternström who carried out the Indonesia and Sri Lanka country evaluations respectively. Our collaboration was a pleasure and a learning experience for me. This report would be much weaker without their efforts, although its faults are of course no-one's but my own.

Finally Anne-Marie Cruz gave invaluable support logistically, in setting up interviews, and in making my life generally easier while I carried out this task.

*Maurice Herson, Real Time Evaluation Team Leader, March 2005*

## Executive Summary

The undersea earthquake in the Bay of Bengal on December 26<sup>th</sup> 2004 caused damage in the nearest country, Indonesia, and also generated tsunamis that devastated coastal regions of 12 countries, including as far away as East Africa. The nature of this disaster itself is unusual, although not beyond anything that has been experienced before. It is unusual mostly for the simultaneous effect on several countries across such a wide geographic range, and what really is exceptional is the level of international interest. In the affected countries the National Red Cross Society actively and immediately responded to the effects of the tsunami in its own country. Federation and ICRC delegations in the region also reacted. National Societies of countries whose citizens were caught up in the disaster as tourists supported their own national efforts to identify losses, and aid and repatriate people.

In addition an unprecedented number of other National Societies around the world have contributed materially, financially and with staff. The Federation as a whole is likely to have at its disposal over 2 billion Swiss Francs; this comes to an unprecedented degree from public donations, showing the enormous regard in which the RCRC Movement is held. However this also imposes obligations not only (as ever) to use the money well in support of "the mission to improve the lives of vulnerable people by mobilising the power of humanity" that is claimed at the head of the publicly available Operations Updates, but also to be seen to be using it well, in ways beyond or different than what is normally demanded.

These basic facts underlie tensions within and between parts of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement. Many of these are endemic in this Federation as in any federation, and are brought into sharp focus by these operations. Unsurprisingly the result is a mixed picture: in parts, excellent Red Cross action, committed coordination and cooperation, effective management; and in parts bad humanitarian practice, disregard of all agreements, and ineffective leadership.

Some general points that arise from the two country studies are that the local National Societies acted swiftly and correctly, based upon the training and capacity of staff and especially of volunteers. The ICRC also, being active in both Aceh and Sri Lanka, mobilised an effective and limited relief response. The international RCRC response was both slower and messier; while some of it made effective use of global resources, there was not a systematic outcome that reflected the high level of activity. There was never a sufficiently clear set of data and analysis to constitute clear objectives for the RCRC to shape the overall relief response and to enable the performance to be monitored. However, the cooperation between elements of the Movement on the ground has been generally good.

Three major findings that come out of the Sri Lanka RTE report are :

- In the initial two-week emergency phase, the international disaster response tools mobilised were not as effective as they should have been. This was caused by a combination of lack of management capacity, technical mis-match between some ERUs and the needs of affected populations and, for some teams, a lack of will to be coordinated.
- The major achievement of the following month was the establishment of, and RCRC stakeholder buy-in into, the Movement Organisational Framework. This lays the organisational foundation for a coordinated RCRC long-term response, a foundation that will be essential to wise spending of the vast resources available for rehabilitation and reconstruction.
- The main current RCRC challenge in Sri Lanka is to ensure quality and economy in the long term activities planned. These are not traditional RCRC activities either in content, or scale. It is evident that the Movement will need to find ways to complement internal competence with external capacities.

Three major findings that come out of the Indonesia RTE report are:

- The initial response included the RCRC Movement being the first to arrive on the scene, rescuing the injured and recovering the dead; some of the affected people in remote areas got access to first aid and basic healthcare within the first two weeks of the disaster through the work of RCRC members; at least thirty two thousand people received immediate food supplies through the work of Pelang Merah Indonesia (PMI, Indonesia Red Cross) and ICRC in the first few days when the need was greatest, and over 50,000 people were depending on RCRC for their water supply every day, at least 140,000 people have received non-food relief items from the RCRC for their basic survival.
- International aid agencies, including the Movement, have made much of conventional relief distributions, guided more by their own domestic needs and their perception of what the people need rather than by the expressed needs of the affected community. Right now, however, conventional relief is not considered the first priority by the affected population. The Federation and the international humanitarian community have made much of the immediate relief and have been slow in responding to the affected community's needs for recovery especially in the area of livelihoods.
- The response so far has been influenced more by the media needs and the perception of donors in the home countries of the PNSs, rather than by the *expressed* needs of the affected community. Involvement of the affected community in planning and design of the response or integrating a 'beneficiary-perspective' into the humanitarian response of the RCRC (this applies to other humanitarian organisations as well) has been conspicuously lacking throughout the operation so far.

A concerted effort to make an assessment of recovery needs in Sri Lanka and Indonesia was initiated quite early, which was correct. While this has yielded plans of action and coordination mechanisms, the assessments have also thrown up the dilemmas inherent in the amount of resources available to the Movement and the number of RCRC actors.

The global tools at the disposal of the Federation for emergency response have been developed over several years and have served well to a large degree. However the experience of this disaster has also shown some of their limitations and suggests ways in which they might be developed. This disaster also shows up possibilities for including the capacities of a wider range of National Societies in international humanitarian responses.

National Societies that have the inclination to undertake operations, or even merely to provide materials, in this case, have been under great pressure to meet the perceived or assumed expectations of their public donors and supporters. This has not always coincided with best practice in assessing and meeting needs. The inability within the current expectations of the Secretariat for it to manage the various practices of the National Societies puts on the latter an obligation to know (where they do not already), and in all cases to use, good practice, to live up to principles and standards, and to ensure that their priority remains the welfare of their targeted beneficiaries.

At this time, the Federation has begun to create structures that have a chance of drawing in and retaining the commitment of most of its members to plans that will allow for a reasonable and coordinated use of extensive resources. However the challenge remains of how to match the assumed expectations of those who gave money for an immediate emergency response which is generally no longer necessary; the existing and traditional competences of the Movement; and the actual needs on the ground for financial and technical resources. At least in theory there is the possibility of being able to do the follow-through to a disaster – recovery and rehabilitation, linked to disaster preparedness – in a way that the humanitarian community often advocates for but rarely if ever is able to achieve.

There is currently insufficient clarity over the proper role of the Secretariat within the Federation. Interlocking processes of change over recent years have reduced the role of Geneva as well as shifting the emphasis of the Secretariat as a whole to support for National Societies, and with a reduced acceptance by National Societies of its being operational. This has left a partial vacuum, with a strong demand for the Secretariat to act to coordinate National Societies' actions in an emergency, while it has neither the strength nor the clarity of mandate to enable it to do so. It has failed in this case to show the leadership that would enable it to fulfil the coordination mandate. This emergency highlights the proper role for the Secretariat and for Geneva in the case of a large emergency.

The Secretariat reacted fast to this emergency, but showed failings in increasing its capacity both in Geneva and in the affected countries appropriately and fast enough, and in creating a management structure that left staff and partners clear about lines of responsibility and decision-making.

To be accountable in these circumstances is no easier and in some ways harder than usual in emergency response. It is more than providing an account of what is being done, or financial accounts. Communications that can explain and educate, advocate and demonstrate impact will be necessary to mitigate the risk of public cynicism, and can act as a catalyst of actually being accountable, that is, doing well what is necessary and desirable. The accountability strategy and the communications strategy of the Movement require active buy-in from all elements of the Federation.

Most disasters handled by the Movement are of a very different scale and complexity and observations from this response should not become an automatic benchmark for more 'ordinary' disasters, which history has shown can be handled with far less organisational difficulty.

Thus the disaster itself is less than its profile, and this causes an overall distorting effect on action and on attention.

---

Note : during the course of the text of this report, *conclusions of the evaluator are italicised*, and *recommendations are in bold italics*. Key recommendations are collected together at the end of the report together with those of the separate Indonesia RTE report.

---

## 1. Background

The undersea earthquake in the Bay of Bengal on December 26<sup>th</sup> 2004 caused extensive damage in the nearest country, Indonesia, and also generated tsunamis that devastated coastal regions of 12 countries, including as far away as East Africa. There was no early warning system in place as there is in the Pacific Ocean, and as many as 250 000 people died, and many listed as missing.

In all of the affected countries<sup>1</sup> the RC NS actively and immediately responded to the effects of the tsunami in its own country. Federation and ICRC Delegations in the region also responded. NSs of countries whose citizens were caught up in the disaster as tourists supported their own national efforts to identify losses, and aid and repatriate people.

In some of the affected countries the emergency is all but over, with a recovery or maintenance effort only now required. Even in Indonesia and Sri Lanka there is not the conventional pattern of relief needs after a disaster. Broadly the emergency phase is over, and the repair, recovery, reconstruction, rehabilitation phase already begun<sup>2</sup>.

An unprecedented number of other NSs around the world have contributed materially, financially, and with staff. The tally is not yet complete, but the Federation as a whole appears likely at the time of writing to have at its disposal over 2 billion Swiss Francs<sup>3</sup>. This comes to an unprecedented degree from public donations, showing the enormous regard in which the RCRC Movement is held, and also imposing obligations not only (as ever) to use the money well in support of the "mission to improve the lives of vulnerable people by mobilising the power of humanity" claimed at the top of the publicly available Operations Updates, but also to be seen, in a way beyond what is normally demanded, to be using it well.

The Federation decided to carry out a process of monitoring and evaluation of the RCRC response to the Asia earthquake and tsunamis, of which this Real-Time Evaluation (RTE) is the first round<sup>4</sup>.

Most disasters handled by the Movement are of a very different scale and complexity and observations from this response should not become an automatic benchmark for more 'ordinary' disasters, which history has shown can be handled with far less organisational difficulty.

## 2. Methodology

This Real-Time Evaluation was designed and managed by the Monitoring and Evaluation Department of the Federation Secretariat. It covers approximately the first 10 weeks of the response to the earthquake and tsunamis, and is designed to be set within a longer-term and

---

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the Maldives, where no Society existed at that time.

<sup>2</sup> This imprecise terminology refers to the humanitarian response, as, unfortunately, does most of this report. As is normal in such situations, the efforts of affected people to return to normality began at once.

<sup>3</sup> Other humanitarian and governmental organisations have analogously large financial resources to be used in the same areas, for similar purposes, and over the same time period.

<sup>4</sup> See Terms of Reference for this RTE in Annex 4. The overall Evaluation Framework is attached as Annex 5, but is currently under revision.



broader Framework. Three independent consultants were employed to undertake two field-based elements (in Sri Lanka and Indonesia) and a desk-based element in the Federation headquarters in Geneva. Other affected countries within the region, and actions of NSs of countries with nationals caught up in the disaster as tourists, are not fully covered here.

The individual Sri Lanka and Indonesia real time evaluation reports were produced separately and independently by evaluators working to the Secretariat Monitoring and Evaluation Department. This report is the synthesis report, and also contains reflections on RCRC responses to the tsunamis in countries that have not been visited, on the basis of interviews and written sources only. It is clear to the evaluator that this initial synthesis report is weaker for not having the benefit of visits to and country reports on more countries as originally proposed in the Evaluation Framework. However the conclusions and recommendations of this report are felt to stand on the sound basis of the investigations and facts available.

In all cases the original intention was that there should be teams undertaking each of these elements, but only in Indonesia was there more than one person working alone. Single evaluators can not only achieve less work than a team, but they miss the benefit of cross-fertilisation and cross-checking of ideas and analysis.

The methods used to gather and assess information and opinions for this Synthesis Report were:

- multiple semi-structured interviews with Federation staff, both those involved with the response to the tsunamis and others able to give background information;
- semi-structured interviews, mostly by telephone, with representatives of National Societies that have made contributions to the response;
- reading of key documents, both those that serve as background and those that are of current relevance.
- incorporation of the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluators and their individual country RTE reports for Sri Lanka and Indonesia.

No attempt was made to read all the records of the response to the tsunamis, nor to keep up with all documentation appearing during the course of the evaluation; it is not the intention of the RTE to give a comprehensive account of the response, but to give a commentary on a descriptive account only. Annex 2 lists several key documents that will supplement what is possible to put in this report.

In addition the evaluator attended a meeting in early March in Hong Kong of senior representatives of all parts of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement held to agree on the strategy for the coming years. Some preliminary findings of this evaluation were presented there.

This report does not attempt to evaluate the activities of the ICRC nor to cover them except in terms of that organisation's interaction with its RCRC Movement partners.

At various points in the report, mention is made of recommendations or observations from evaluations or reviews of previous emergency responses. As there is no record of whether those recommendations have been accepted, or whether action on them has been agreed, it is not clear to this evaluator whether they should count as lessons that should have been learned or not, but in any case they are opportunities to learn lessons that may not have been taken. I recommend that *in future there should be a formal follow-up process to all evaluations, recording whether recommendations are accepted or not, what action should be taken with regard to them, and where responsibility for that action lies. This should start with the present real-time evaluation (Recommendation 8).*

### 3. Appeals, planning and objectives

The nature of this disaster itself is unusual, although not beyond anything that has been experienced before<sup>5</sup>. It is unusual mostly for the simultaneous effect on several countries across such a wide geographic range, and what really is exceptional is the level of international interest<sup>6</sup>. Much of this interest probably springs from the cinematic horror of a wall of water caused by a geological event deep under the sea and profound shock at the numbers who died or disappeared so instantly. However those who survived do so within the context of largely intact physical and administrative infrastructure – with the partial exceptions of Indonesia, which also bore the brunt of the earthquake, and Somalia which generally lacks such infrastructure anyway. Thus the disaster itself is significant but less, proportionally to other disasters, than its profile, and this causes an overall distorting effect on action and on attention.

With the benefit of hindsight the initial Preliminary Appeal on December 26<sup>th</sup> 2004 for 7.5 million CHF now appears absurdly little. However at that time there were only known to be deaths “reportedly exceeding 3800” as a result of the tsunamis, with “thousands” of people evacuated. In fact this was a large initial amount to appeal for, and it was always likely that there would be a revised Appeal as there usually is with large or long-lasting responses<sup>7</sup>. Over the next day or two the guess in Geneva was that it would end up as a 50 million CHF operation. The revised Appeal on December 29<sup>th</sup> was for some 67 million CHF, in recognition not only of the fact that the first Appeal was fulfilled within an unprecedented 4 hours, but also with figures for deaths, injuries, displacement and homelessness rising dramatically, as was the public profile. By this time there was much more information included in the Appeal document on the extent of the effects and the considerable amount of RCRC action in response.

The Federation’s initial Appeal within hours of notice being received of a disaster signals its awareness of the event, its ability and willingness to act in response to it, and its need for funds to do so. *This is an effective system that relies on an institutional depth of experience that generally enables the Secretariat to make good informed guesses at what the effects and therefore the needs would be.*

The first Appeal stated “the Federation anticipates massive relief needs for approximately two-three weeks, with considerable longer-term rehabilitation needs thereafter”. The latter part of this was a useful signal given early on. By the time of the revised Appeal it stated that “the Federation anticipates the need to immediately respond to massive relief requirements for approximately 3 months, with considerable longer-term rehabilitation needs thereafter”. The first part of this turned out to be wrong

*Had the initial estimation been retained and highlighted, it might have been possible to shape the RCRC response better<sup>8</sup>.* It would also have enabled the Federation to present a realistic picture of needs. That would have informed the public appeals for funds, and thus what the

---

<sup>5</sup> The last natural disaster that touched a whole region was Hurricane Mitch in 1999, and of course the Balkans went through regional conflict-generated crises several times in the 1990s.

<sup>6</sup> Although arguably Afghanistan in 2001 is a comparator here.

<sup>7</sup> By the standards of Federation Appeals, this amount is not exceptional, although it is the highest amount requested in a preliminary Appeal in 2004. About half of Appeals made are for less than 1 million CHF.

<sup>8</sup> The most relevant recent experience, that is the tsunami in Papua New Guinea two years previously, where the pattern of severe destruction along a narrow strip of the coast, high death rates but few risks to the survivors, is exactly what has been seen for most of the places affected by these tsunamis, but was not reflected in the Appeal as it developed.

Federation and its members are now to be held to account for, that is, delivering programmes with the enormously larger resources than are actually needed to meet the needs as expressed in that first revised Appeal, except in the most general sense that it foresees longer term rehabilitation needs.

On January 12<sup>th</sup> 2005 the Appeal was again revised, this time for 183.5 million CHF, and with a clearer picture of the extent of the effects of the disaster and of the order of magnitude of the funding that would be available. This Appeal document contains country-by-country objectives for the worst affected countries for the first time<sup>9</sup>. These stretch the time-frame to 6 months. The document makes some fuller reference to needs beyond the relief phase, and there is evidence of longer-term planning, much along the lines of what has actually happened.

*What was being appealed for the relief phase has proved to be unrealistic, as that phase ended faster than is implicit in this Appeal's plans and budgets<sup>10</sup>. Interestingly at this stage the Appeal was framed very much from a programme point of view, although it was already known that the amount of funds was far exceeding what was being requested. This might have been a warning to everyone of the issues that now exist about the responsible use of those funds, and even at that time of whether to stop fund-raising, as the more specialised MSF very publicly did. It is here that lie the origins of the balance or tension between being driven by needs in situ and using money according to donor wishes.*

#### **4. Assessments**

While the above account has focussed on what is in the Appeals, this is not entirely within the control of the Secretariat where these Appeals are put together. They depend for their quality crucially on getting good assessments from the NSs, delegations in-country and from the FACTs. These were not forthcoming everywhere, and the whole Federation system is let down by the reality that *actual needs assessments were not made adequately and fast enough and therefore there was not a sound basis for matching emergency needs to funding*. It is in those countries worst affected where the FACTs should have been able to make up the inevitable deficit. The data from the FACTs remained 'soft'. The FACTs reported too little as they went along, and by the time their final reports arrived they were too late. Federation sources of information appeared to be no fuller or better than was available in the media. On the other hand, the excellent disaster preparedness system in Bangladesh allowed a full and accurate assessment of damages and risks in that country to be available within some 6 hours.

Although the emphasis has been on the countries with the greatest destruction, at an early stage a right decision was made to include Africa in the overall Appeal. The East Africa Delegation insisted on having one of the weekly Operations Updates focussing on East Africa, although the effects and the responses in East Africa would probably not have been noteworthy had they not been linked to the tsunamis in Asia.

A review of the documentation shows that there was a lot of information, although not enough explicit analysis. At least one NS says that they sent their own assessment team as they need their own specific information and have difficulty accessing the information that they felt they needed. This may be disingenuous, but it may also reflect the fact that *the FACTs did not enable the Federation to make available enough good quality information and thus draw in all the actors*.

---

<sup>9</sup> There was also recognition of the limits to needed emergency response in most of the other countries.

<sup>10</sup> I believe that the financial systems exist that will allow for tracking of what was actually spent but do not recommend that a technical exercise of matching that spending against the proposed budgets be carried out as part of this evaluative process (as opposed to audit), as I do not believe that this would yield any insights of value.

Nor did the Federation produce a plan of action, effectively until the time of the final revision of the Appeal. This response would certainly have benefited from setting out an early plan of action<sup>11</sup> and using it to get buy-in. It appears that there was a lack of clarity as to the purpose of RCRC activities. This allowed the needs perceived by the donors to be defined by the reports of the media and to take precedence over the professionally assessed needs of the people affected.

## 5. Quality, flexibility and context

Possibly a casualty of the lack of analysis is that there is little on the aspects of the quality of programming in the documentation. At an early stage a short document was made available on DMIS reminding all members of the Federation to address some issues of quality and standards, but no feedback was received nor obvious take-up, including by the Task Force in Geneva.

From the beginning it was requested that funds should as far as possible not be earmarked. This was a good call, made early on, and will reduce over the long term what would otherwise have been extra difficulties in the allocation of funds.

It is natural that the Appeals should focus on RCRC activities and intentions, however there is a more general tendency to talk as if the RCRC and UN are the only actors apart from governments. While the RCRC is unique in its reach and in its role as auxiliary to governments, it does have to operate in the same arena as other actors. This was something that was missing from early planning assumptions, as far as can be seen from the documentation, and is still missing from the RAT reports, and largely from the Regional Strategy and Operating Framework. *The Federation needs to lift its eyes above the wall surrounding itself and its members and be engaged with the many others in the same field of activity in the longer-term interventions after the tsunamis (Recommendation 22).*

## 6. Initial responses

The RCRC Movement is uniquely placed to take up the responsibilities of its mandate in times of disaster, with local NSs and their trained staff and volunteers. Although the numbers of these vary, as does the quality of their training, *in all the countries where there was an NS, it responded promptly and effectively. Especially in those countries where the response was smaller, limited and now over, there should be a review of their preparedness, in order to affirm its effectiveness and/or to look for how it can be improved in the light of this experience (Recommendation 9).*

Local NSs mobilised early and achieved a great deal. In Sri Lanka there was an immediate local response, in RCRC terms most obviously by the SLRCS Branches and the ICRC. The SLRCS sent volunteers also from parts of the country that were unaffected. SLRCS branches responded immediately and quite effectively. 3000 volunteers were mobilised, where possible supported by people with experience from past operations and/or who had had RDRT, NDRT or basic relief and logistics training. Search and rescue, first aid, distribution of water, cooked food and non-food items took place along with removal of human remains and debris. Branches supported the ERUs with everything from contacts with coordinating local authorities, NGOs, visitors, volunteers and labourers, gradual refinement of government supplied beneficiary lists, etc.

In Indonesia the Movement was the first to arrive on the scene, rescuing the injured and recovering the dead. Some of the affected people in remote areas got access to first aid and basic health-care within the first two weeks of the disaster through the work of RCRC members; at least 32,000 people received immediate food supplies through the work of PMI

---

<sup>11</sup> The Goma evaluation recommended that an initial plan of action should be produced within one week. This recommendation was repeated in the evaluation of Iraq disaster preparedness.

and ICRC in the first few days when the need was greatest; over 50,000 people are depending on RCRC for their water supply every day; at least 140,000 people have received non-food relief items from the RCRC for their basic survival. The PMI organised thousands of the volunteers from its strong network around the country to rotate in and out of Aceh.

A few regional PNSs were able to move in quite fast in Aceh, and some relief distributions were carried out by them with the help of PMI volunteers as well as the PNS's own volunteers. *On the other hand distribution of internationally procured relief materials was slow and often too late.*

The Sri Lanka RTE report says, distributions of internationally supplied relief goods began late (at least two weeks post-disaster). By this time, given the nature of the disaster, the emergency was already largely over. Items that were not requested or required were shipped in, sometimes without notice to the in-country team, and delegates and others able to handle relief item distribution were generally absent. There was no relief focal point in Geneva. This was not a success. *Geneva should in future ensure that there is someone available as a relief focal point (Recommendation 15, and, there should maybe be more Relief ERUs. (See recommendations on page 17.)*

ICRC, which had delegates in Aceh, Sri Lanka, Myanmar and Somalia, took a very pragmatic attitude and found uses for the ERUs as they arrived, and distributed goods from their existing in-country stocks for immediate use, either directly or through the ONSs, who were also distributing locally acquired materials. *Given that distribution of other RC materials acquired internationally was very slow, this was an important achievement for the Movement.* It is unclear to the evaluator why the Federation should seem to have defaulted to procurement overseas. The Federation should note that it is generally considered good practice to do local purchase<sup>12</sup>. *It is recommended that the Secretariat engage the membership in a strengthening of local purchase capacity, with all that this implies in terms of reviewing contract protocols, setting of standards, etc (Recommendation 16).*

## **7. Local National Society capacity and the behaviour of other NSs**

The Malaysian RC with their military had access to affected areas before others. There are similar stories to be told from India to the Seychelles and Somalia. Local NSs used existing stocks, or did new procurements, and made relief distributions rapidly.

In Thailand the RC had the skills, capacity, staff and volunteers, funds and supplies to enable it to take up the challenge of what needed to be done immediately. Taking advice from the RD, they increased their capacity to provide information to the Federation that would demonstrate their ability to cope. The Thai RC accepted support to make the recovery assessment through the RD. It should be noted that the Thai RC and the Thai government both took the same approach in insisting on their right to decide what outside help they needed and were willing to accept.

The same is also true of India, where the government took a strongly self-sufficient stand, and the Indian RC came under pressure from parts of the Federation to accept a FACT, ERUs, and other support, including funds. They decided to go it alone, for a variety of reasons<sup>13</sup>. At first they refused help even from the Delegation in country, although over time they used the capacities of some Delegates. They did make use of some materials warehoused since the response to the Gujarat earthquake. *Unfortunately there was a need externally for more communications and information from the Indian RC about what they were doing.*

---

<sup>12</sup> Despite the relative lack of photo opportunities for PNSs that this implies.

<sup>13</sup> The recommendation in the Gujarat earthquake evaluation that "the Federation should pursue a judicious and mission-sensitive policy in deployment of expatriate delegates to India" reveals some of the background to this.

Within the Federation there is still a range of views about the credibility in the Thai and Indian refusal to accept help and the balance between that and meeting the needs of the victims when there are huge needs. While there is a principled respect for the NS taking the lead, there should also be an insistence on being able to fulfil the RC mandate. On the other hand it would be naïve to deny that *the attitude of some of the PNSs was not only shaped by concern for the benefit of victims but also under big domestic pressure to mobilise in the face of this disaster, just as the NS's attitude was also shaped partly by that of the government.*

On the other hand in Sri Lanka and Indonesia many PNSs felt themselves free to rush in and launch their own operations seemingly without thought for or sometimes communication with the ONS, nor coordination with the Secretariat. This may have been rapid but the RTEs in Sri Lanka and Indonesia throw severe doubt on the effectiveness or appropriateness of some of what was done. The Sri Lanka RTE report claims that "in Sri Lanka the Federation response was resource driven, *ad hoc* and reactive as shown by the uncoordinated response from many of the members, the focus on "securing humanitarian space"<sup>14</sup> rather than finding out actual needs and the lack of proactive coordination".

## 8. DREF and FACTs

On the first day 1 million CHF was allocated from the DREF to enable Delegations to get on with spending. This was promptly done and sufficient. On the other hand this was not backed up with the necessary reinforcement of the Delegations, particularly in Sri Lanka, and possibly in Myanmar. The evaluator has been unable to pin down with certainty why this did not happen, although PNSs offered staff to both the Secretariat and the Delegations, and *it is clear in retrospect that these offers should have been taken up.*

The alert to potential FACT members was launched on the first evening. The Head of OSD pushed for ERUs to be deployed at the same time, even though procedures would have it that they should be deployed later on the basis of the output of a FACT request. This showed good situational leadership, which was needed to try to forestall PNSs which would have gone unilaterally. Nevertheless the actual deployments once they were in-country were slow and in Indonesia the FACT worked on assessments in which PMI had very little participation.

The change of mind-set, for example over ways of working, took a while in the field. ONSs and Delegations were slow in deciding to accept FACTs, and were certainly behind in the time-scale of the PNSs who felt an aggressive need to respond and a corresponding frustration at being, as they felt, held back. Geneva was caught in the middle here, having delegated decision over such matters to the field, and was at first unwilling to exert its authority to insist both on what it felt was right as well as what it was being pressurised to do. From outside the affected countries it appeared that owning the ONS response was not good enough, and that they and the Delegation needed externally provided extra resources.

As stated above, there was a large amount of information but comparative lack of analysis. This was paralleled by a great deal of activity but insufficient direction to that activity. Superficially this is surprising for an organisation with the experience and capacity of the Federation. The main explanations are explored below; they are to do with the structure and recent structural changes in the Secretariat and the Federation itself, and with the distorting effect of the world-wide public attention and fundraising.

---

<sup>14</sup> The phrase 'humanitarian space' has in the view of the evaluator started to be unhelpfully mis-used in the post-tsunami context. It is starting to be used to mean space within which organisations that call themselves humanitarian actors can find opportunities to carry out programmes; crudely, there are not enough needs to allow all such actors to work. Thus the use of this term betrays a worrying emphasis on organisational need rather than response to humanitarian needs and rights.

## 9. Operational response

Despite what might appear to be obvious, this should not be seen as overall an extraordinary - that is, out of the ordinary - disaster response. The reality of this disaster is that it is indeed a major disaster in 2 countries, Sri Lanka and Indonesia (in Aceh), and to some extent in the Maldives and part of India. The loss of life was great but the needs of the survivors for immediate relief were in most cases far less so. By the nature of a tsunami there is a clear divide between those who are affected and those who are not, people live side by side, dependent on the same infrastructure and support mechanisms, and thus it is hard to focus assistance. However this was not "the big one" that has been talked about. It should not overstretch the capacities of a major humanitarian movement like the RCRC, and indeed *the Indonesia RTE report rates the overall performance of the Federation's operations reasonably well against those of other organisations*<sup>15</sup>. *The Sri Lanka RTE report on the other hand concludes that affected people did not benefit much from the enormous resources that were made available in the first two weeks*<sup>16</sup>.

To date a total of 125 relief flights have gone to 4 of the affected countries; 3 FACTs were deployed (to the Maldives, Sri Lanka and Indonesia); 13 ERUs provided by 9 NSs have been deployed, as well as several technical teams from within the Asia region that do not meet full ERU specifications; several other NSs have provided direct assistance to the in-country Societies.

*The ability of the Indian, Malaysian and Thai NSs to cope with the initial response in their own countries was sufficient*, although no doubt there are arguments for the potential of other RC action or inputs. Were it not for the distorting effect of the publicity and the funds that became available, there might have been much smaller, targeted, and entirely sufficient responses launched and managed in-country, with suitable help from the 'tools' available to the Federation for disaster response.

## 10. Quality of humanitarian response

There is a set of specific issues to do with the quality of humanitarian response, that have not taken the prominence that they should have done. These issues are the application of the Code of Conduct, standards and principles, protection in the technical sense (although this is core business for the ICRC)<sup>17</sup>, gender analysis, and attention to accountability to those affected by the disaster. Each of these is a major topic beyond the scope of this report. These things tend at present to be left to the knowledge and proclivity of individuals, while they are actually things that need systematic application, both because they make a significant difference to the outcomes for affected people<sup>18</sup>, and because *if the RCRC wants to be able to claim its status as the premier emergency response actor, it must be able to demonstrate quality as well as quantity. Indeed it should be a significant voice lobbying across the humanitarian system for high quality responses, which it can only do if it can demonstrate its own significant commitment to that quality.*

Despite the fact they take little space in this report, they are significant issues that require long-term effort and attention. Humanitarian action requires more than good-will or technical know-how, although both of these are also important. *Especially those NSs with less*

---

<sup>15</sup> See performance indicators in Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> The next section looks at how the systems and tools that the Movement has at its disposal for disaster response functioned in this case.

<sup>17</sup> Only one of the two RAT reports mentions protection, and that only in the context of ICRC's mandate.

<sup>18</sup> Two very specific examples of concern have come to the attention of the evaluator. One is the apparent reluctance of the Thai RC to address the issue of illegal immigrants affected by the tsunami. The other is the Indian RC's accepting and distributing a donation of milk powder.

*experience of international operations, but even those with a great deal of experience, should invest in ensuring that their staff and volunteers know something about these issues of quality in humanitarian response activity and have a commitment to seeking expert support if necessary (Recommendation 17).* Primary responsibility lies with decision-makers in the response to make deliberate decisions about the use of quality standards, to document them and then monitor them. Geneva is where there should be the repository of expertise and advice and where these issues can be strategically followed through.

## **11. Operating at a new level**

In the immediate and foreseeable future the main issue arising as regards ability to deliver good programmes in the medium-term is that of the Federation stepping into a new league, as one consequence of having many times the financial resources that it is accustomed to. This presents two sorts of challenge. *The Federation has been too concerned so far with sorting itself out to have grasped that a challenge has presented itself to do something bigger and different from more of what it always does, good though that may be.*

The other kind of challenge is that of taking on for example construction programmes of a scale that is, I believe, unprecedented and for which there may not be expertise systematically available within the Federation. There is also time needed to set up and to consult with a different set of interlocutors in order to do the job well<sup>19</sup>. *This requires a change of mind-set, which is not easy to accomplish, and possibly an up-grading of competence and capacity.*

What is being talked about in the world at large is that the funds available will be useful for the recovery of those individuals and communities struck by the earthquake and the tsunamis, but that it is in large measure in the wrong hands. The so-called humanitarian community that takes on emergency response now holds a huge amount of the available funds while the emergency phase is largely over. These funds are now available for the medium and longer term. *The RCRC, as the recipient of a very large amount of these funds, needs to enable itself to do a good enough job that it will not be tarred with the brush that will inevitably find many organisations using up their funds rather than using them well<sup>20</sup>.*

The RCRC too needs to beware not to become cavalier with resources just because there are a lot. On the other hand if it sticks to its traditional scale and roles it will not be able to spend the money within a reasonable time, as the RAT reports indicate. *There is a need to be innovative, and to extend geographical and sectoral spread.* The Indonesia RTE report suggests that the Federation needs to be realistic about the capacity and limits of PMI, and needs to explore the feasibility of working with other players like the National Disaster Management Agency, government authorities or other regional institutions, with active participation of PMI. As it points out, the planned cost of PMI's activities for the recovery phase of the operation exceeds \$410 million. This would stretch the PMI beyond its capacity or anything the organisation has been familiar with. Undoubtedly similar arguments apply in Sri Lanka.

This carries dangers for the quality of the work. *Programme managers and staff in the technical cells in Sri Lanka and Indonesia will need to be of the right calibre to work in a highly complex and*

---

<sup>19</sup> The Indonesia RTE report says "reconstruction is always a highly sensitive and political issue. Some RC/RC members the evaluators spoke to mentioned that they might get into reconstruction work later. The evaluators think that organisations may like to carry out research into the resettlement issues before they get into it, and an appropriate response would be to help people with tools, materials (and cash) as the ICRC is doing, allowing people to build themselves, and let the communities negotiate all issues related to land title, house design etc., with the authorities. Such an approach would however need an in-depth interaction with and understanding of the communities and advocacy with the government authorities and World Bank (if the latter does get involved, which is likely)".

<sup>20</sup> See Footnote 13 above, which draws attention to the mind-set of finding space for organisations to use up available funds.



*sensitive environment. What is being proposed will require the Federation to look for expertise that it probably does not have internally in order to be able to step into the new leagues in which it now finds itself committed to operate (Recommendation 23).*

The very positive side of all of this is that for once the funds are there to do the job properly, when so often the humanitarian community finds itself only able to complain and advocate about the fact that there is not continuing support to those who suffer disasters to enable full recovery and rehabilitation, let alone improved and less vulnerable circumstances.

## **12. Operational management**

It is said that humanitarian response is the management of dilemmas, and although this was coined to refer to humanitarian work in conflict, there are senses in which it is equally true of the response to natural disasters; organisational dilemmas and tensions have to be managed and judgements made. This is not an excuse for unnecessary compromise or bad performance, but it is the necessary context of operational management.

In calm retrospect the response of the Secretariat was proportionate and reasonable. In equally calm retrospect there was a form of panic by some, although not all, NSs, which did not act responsibly and with discipline, according to the agreements, standards and principles of the Red Cross. The image of the 'wall of water', the timing at Christmas, the public interest, and other specific internal factors all acted in concert to put pressures on NSs to act fast when they should have held back. This thrust the Secretariat into the role of 'spoilsport', trying to control the uncontrollable. This is neither its proper role, not one for which it is equipped, nor one that the members want it to play. This effectively stopped it being able to do what it could do best; the same was true in the field in Indonesia, where FACT members were preoccupied with receiving ERUs rather than fulfilling their proper tasks. It is equally the case that with a display of greater leadership the Secretariat might have been able to manage this better; as an indication of this, bringing in an experienced emergencies manager to run the Task Force in Geneva has been widely praised by NSs and clearly served to strengthen the Secretariat's performance and profile, but rather too late.

## **13. Disaster response 'tools'**

The development of a range of tools to aid Federation disaster response over the years has given it the ability to deploy resources available globally in particular instances. In this case, the deployment of funds from the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund, Field Assessment and Coordination Teams, Emergency Response Units, information-sharing through the Disaster Management Information System, and the more recently developed Regional Disaster Response Teams and National Disaster Response Teams. Of these the DREF and DMIS require little comment except to note their usefulness and correct deployment; many other humanitarian organisations would envy them.

The FACT and ERU concept have been developed over several years to bring the resources of the NSs into the response to disasters. Yet all this has also been shown in this case to be out of date, with an élite group that excludes those who can bring smaller but significant resources to bear. In this case the FACTs have come in for a great deal of criticism. Partly over their slow deployment, partly over their composition - membership of the FACTs was to some extent driven by the strength (and willingness to be difficult) of the NSs offering members rather than the individuals' optimal suitability for the task - as well as over the quality of the data and assessments they produced. There is much here that needs to be looked at and faced.

There has been some detailed criticism of the roles, composition and performance of both FACTs and ERUs in this case:

FACTs should have been larger, or, to fit this very scattered emergency, more numerous, and with a greater set of skills, among which is an Information delegate.

The objections of NSs and delegations to sufficient FACT resources should have been more robustly challenged.

FACT reporting lines are unclear.

The FACTs that were deployed should also have been both more focussed and more flexible, and either contained their own logistical capacity or else have been deployed together with a Logistics ERU.

In the case of Indonesia they needed to interact more with the PMI, other agencies and local communities.

In the case of Sri Lanka it was the under-strength of the delegation that left them unable to fulfil the tasks that they had. In Sri Lanka they also had to spend too much of their time managing the ERUs.

It makes sense in the context of the effort that has been put into building the capacity of the Federation's regions and the NSs to ensure that trained individuals in-country and in-region are able to be part of the current FACT system. This would also help to deal with the issue strongly brought out in the Indonesia RTE report that there was insufficient local knowledge included in the FACT deployed in that country. It is of course by the same token generally helpful to have members of the team who understand the nature of global resources that can be brought to bear. It is to be hoped that all of this will help NSs and country Delegations to find the deployment of FACTs more acceptable, with better outcomes based on the needs of affected people rather than intra-organisational positions<sup>21</sup>. *FACTs need to be formally and functionally articulated with the more recent RDRTs and NDRTs (Recommendation 10).*

Current protocols need to specify, as they do not yet, how staff with competences in the region should interact with FACTs and ERUs, but need to do so as to encourage the development and use of in-region and in-country staff with competencies. Complementarity of curriculum in training of FACT, RDRT and NDRT personnel should be checked<sup>22</sup>, and the value of each of these parts of the Federation's assessment and coordination resources stressed. *RDs need a system analogous to the FACT alert and deployment system for RDRTs and NDRTs, although the responsibility for deploying a suitable team should stay with Geneva (Recommendation 10).* Strong links between OSD and regional DM staff will need to be invested in.

ERUs in general were working well, were self-contained, making a difference; the Indonesia RTE report believes the quality of their work to have been excellent. On the other hand some ERUs are also shown to have been rather too rigidly designed, and some of them not up to standard either; this latter is an issue that Geneva needs to take a firm line on. There is too much detail on the potential modifications to particular types of ERUs for this report to deal with, and *Geneva should take the lead, with strong membership involvement, on a review of current NS investments in ERUs and whether and how they should be adapted to ensure adequate capacity (Recommendation 11).* This should include whether the suggestion that has been made in reflecting on the tsunami response that there should be more Relief ERUs is a good one, as well as the idea that has come up before of Administration/Finance ERUs. Consideration should be given to their being more modular, for example; the suggestion that they might profitably have been 'cannibalised' by the under-strength FACT and delegation in Sri Lanka should be retained as part of a deep re-think.

ERUs are a very good idea and a very valuable resource, and should not be thrown away because of criticisms in this case. They would benefit greatly in utility, and politically within

---

<sup>21</sup> See below also on the 'advocacy' around these global tools.

<sup>22</sup> The Goma evaluation makes a similar point about an integrated system for training and deployment of personnel in disaster, and even suggests the phasing out of the separate terms FACT and RDRT.

the Federation, through a re-think. Into this process should also be thrown the experience of the deployment of technical resources by some regional NSs<sup>23</sup>. These were not up to full ERU specification, but *it is that specification that should be loosened up to allow for the use of such resources available to more NSs than those which have up until now made the larger commitment and investment to ERUs (Recommendation 11)*. The Indonesia RTE report notes that there is a great deal of anger and frustration among these PNSs who felt that the Federation system only promotes the interests of 'traditional' PNSs. Regional PNSs have certain advantages in terms of cultural and linguistic familiarity with the affected areas. *Rather than blocking their entry, the Federation needs to proactively engage with them right from the start to make the best use of them for collective response (Recommendation 12)*.

#### **14. Secretariat management of the disaster response 'tools'**

The role of Geneva in coordinating and managing the deployment of FACTs – and the individuals within them – was not respected in all cases. The issue of the proper role of the Secretariat is dealt with more generally below. However *if the Federation is to be able to make use of its enormous, but scattered, resources to meet the needs of people affected by disasters that outstrip the capacity of the local NS, then those resources must be seen as belonging to the Federation and not to NSs and the procedures associated with them must be adhered to*<sup>24</sup>.

It is of course a reality that NSs have their own strategies and political pressures in their own countries, but these and questions of national profile should be robustly challenged by other members of the Federation, and the responsibility of the Secretariat to give priority to disaster response must be allowed to be fulfilled. It is of course also necessary that the Secretariat fulfils that responsibility effectively and efficiently, and it should be criticised where it fails to do that. In this case the ability of Geneva to match the competing demands of PNSs with disaster response resources they felt would be useful or that they felt the need to deploy, the attitudes of its own delegations, and the primacy of the ONSs was sorely tested. Finally *the net result was a far from satisfactory outcome for those affected by this disaster in relation to the resources available and actually used in the relief phase*. It is the evaluator's view that the measures proposed above regarding the FACTs, RDRTs, NDRTs and ERUs, if undertaken holistically rather than as technical exercises, will go a long way towards strengthening effective and systematic Federation-wide disaster response, without re-centralising operational responsibility in Geneva.

#### **15. Recovery Assessment Teams (RATs)**

It was a good move to form and send in RATs earlier than the ONSs or the local Delegations would have wanted, although some people would say that they still went in too late. The inclination to think and act linearly was correctly resisted, giving time to do a proper job on the recovery assessments even while relief activities were still needed.

The RATs had the correct composition, and have on the whole been seen as positive, and their achievements, somewhat against the odds, are notable. The reports the RATs produced are proving helpful in shaping the response from here on, in satisfying many PNSs' needs to have something to buy into, and in affirming a proper role for the ONSs. As a result of this, and to their credit, many people are proposing that the RAT be institutionalised along the same lines as the FACT. Since RATs are very expensive in time and money, *I recommend that this not be done immediately, but that a detailed review for how this might be done, and what its value would be, be undertaken (Recommendation 13)*. This should be done under the

---

<sup>23</sup> The experience of Hurricane Mitch and now this disaster show that non-ERU-holding neighbouring NSs are of course likely to come along outside any existing agreements.

<sup>24</sup> The Indonesia RTE report makes the very strong statement that "it is becoming increasingly evident that the tools are being used as a way of hoisting individual country flags rather than as a coordinated, cohesive response".

auspices of Geneva, although it might usefully be sub-contracted to a regional DM staff person even from a region not affected by the tsunamis. It should take into account the regional and global dimensions of capacity referred to above in relation to a review of the FACT.

In addition there are many details from this experience that should be looked at so that if there is a proposal that the RAT concept be formalised, it can be done in some detail. Their methodology was not and is not clear. Once it is made clear it will probably require a training curriculum at least for RAT leaders, and a roster. RAT was not a means to an end in itself but part of the process to get a consensus for planning, and while it is sensible to have this dual purpose, it does however also need to create a planning document. RAT teams could have given more information as they went along and the RAT reporting format needs to be clear. Finally they need to have a finance person, a dedicated writer-cum-editor, and generally a communications/media member, although these last two roles might be combined.

FACTs and ERUs, and maybe in the future RATs, have an image problem. NSs from which they or their members come cannot always separate their NS's interest in them from the global value they are designed for. It appears that in the field some ERUs were taking instructions from their home Society rather than from the Delegation or the FACT; this is generally unacceptable. In addition some NSs where these tools may be deployed do not understand what FACTs and ERUs are, and therefore are not in a position to judge their potential value<sup>25</sup>. This is in tension with recognising the primacy of the ONS and thus their strong say in whether any of these tools of the Federation's emergency response capacity is deployed. *OSD in Geneva and regional DM staff need to work closely together to ensure that effective information on and lobbying about these tools is an essential part of disaster preparedness for all NSs and delegations (Recommendation 14)*. Regional desks in Geneva, if they are to have the responsibility for managing the Secretariat's emergency responses, also need to understand the tools. The aim should be comprehensive buy-in to their value. Reciprocally, these tools have to live up to all aspects of their supposed value by being of high standard, disciplined and sensitive to the environment within which they operate.

## 16. ICRC

The ICRC is widely praised for its open-ness and helpfulness, and its commitment to Movement coordination. The role played by the ICRC is in all respects significant and helpful. *It scaled up its activities but less so proportionally, carrying out comparatively small but appropriate interventions*. A particular area in which the ICRC has the 'lead role'<sup>26</sup> is in family tracing and linking. It has supported ONSs in these activities<sup>27</sup>. For the ICRC this was not an extraordinary operation; it had infrastructure, staff, contacts, and stocks in-country, and had some funds and raised a limited further amount. It should also be noted that ICRC pragmatically needs to do this to maintain its proper humanitarian space<sup>28</sup>, as the places most affected by this disaster were by chance also places where the ICRC operates, not just as Movement lead, but with its particular mandate. The ICRC is a sophisticated organisation that has managed to achieve this aim, to carry out appropriate interventions, and to play a positive role within the Movement. The ICRC will no doubt continue to do this, and *it is up*

---

<sup>25</sup> The Bam earthquake evaluation too included a recommendation on communication with NSs on ERUs.

<sup>26</sup> According to the 1997 Seville Agreement

<sup>27</sup> The Bam earthquake evaluation recommended clarifying with ICRC responsibility for providing support in tracing in the case of mass-casualty natural disasters. Maybe aided by ICRC's presence in several of the affected countries, this has gone very smoothly in this case.

*to the other actors in the Movement to respect what it is doing and behave so as to ensure that it continues to have access and proximity to those in need (Recommendation 24).*

## 17. Logistics

Views about the effectiveness of logistics systems and performance are generally good. In Indonesia the Federation appears to have done a good job, a fact which PNSs generally acknowledge there. The logistics ERU in Sri Lanka also is praised. A robust local and regional logistics system will now be critical during the recovery and reconstruction stage.

## 18. The Task Force in Geneva

A Task Force (TF) was set up in Geneva, as is the habit in the Federation at the time of major disasters. This happened very quickly on the first day, although, largely due to the holiday period, it did not have a full complement of necessary staff for some time; however staff took on necessary roles. At first there was shared leadership of the TF, which is not an effective system. A TF needs to have someone in charge. Only when a dedicated TF leader was brought in to run it was there a feeling amongst some staff that the TF was at times functioning in a way that supported decision-making rather than letting it be fudged. This is significant also for the field; it is not wrong in principle for *Geneva to take responsibility to tell the delegation what needs to be done, but this needs to be done with one voice (Recommendation 19)*, even by one person, not lots of people all taking it on themselves to do so.

The Task Force is a good set-up to serve operations management, to bring together all of the interested parties within the Secretariat and to create a coordinating core that can mediate with the field and all the NSs. There are checklists both for the establishment and the running of an operational Task Force, which are quite recent and clearly not yet good enough, judging by the performance of this one<sup>29</sup>. They need to include the important function of raising of issues<sup>30</sup>, as well as information-sharing. The checklists also currently place decision-making within the TF, whereas it actually needs to be located with individuals (see below), and the TF to limit itself to action points. After the first couple of days it appears that the TF did not minute its discussions or action points again until mid-February when the responsibility for this task was given to an individual. Not to have agendas, notes and follow-up from the forum that is crucial in supporting the coordination function is bad practice in operational management. It also makes it much harder to review and audit management practices; this evaluation would have valued the records contained in notes from the TF. *It is recommended that in future TFs should at a minimum always have agendas and keep notes of action points which are then communicated to all stakeholders*<sup>31</sup> (Recommendation 4).

In addition the SOPs<sup>32</sup> that support the TF guidelines remain in a draft that is stuck institutionally. These SOPs are known to be needed. The problem appears to be that the draft runs to over 300 pages and is widely considered too mechanistic and too long to be useful or usable. This experience should serve as the impetus to move past this impasse, and to *put the*

---

<sup>28</sup> This is a correct use of this phrase, to mean space within which humanitarian protection and assistance can be delivered, especially in a conflict situation.

<sup>29</sup> The evaluation of the Iraq operations pointed out the lack of clear membership or mandate of the TF, with a tendency to focus on details and not enough on scenario planning.

<sup>30</sup> Such as issues of quality, standards and principles, but also those of policy, advocacy, and communications.

<sup>31</sup> The German RC opens a 'disaster log-book' in the first hour of a new disaster response in which all important decisions are recorded.

<sup>32</sup> Standard Operating Procedures.

*resources into finalising a set of SOPs that will be acceptable and therefore useful*<sup>33</sup> (Recommendation 3). SOPs are needed to specify necessary and non-necessary procedures for particularly heavy operational circumstances, although the default should of course be normal procedures. SOPs can also be also a valuable tool for incorporating learning.

## 19. Decision-making

As pointed out above, a weakness of the TF was that it allowed confusion over decision-making responsibilities, especially within the context of a matrix system such as the Secretariat has where it can be harder to pin down where decisions need to be made. It remains the case till today that a range of staff active in the response are not clear who is responsible for what decisions<sup>34</sup> nor how to get decisions made, and they observe delays in making decisions that they attribute to this lack of clarity. Senior managers, those actually responsible for making decisions, are less aware of this as a problem, and it may be that the issue is that *decision-making responsibilities are not well communicated among all staff. This should be resolved, and will no doubt need reinforcement and repetition. Part of this reinforcement needs to be through repeating the message, and part of it needs to be done by managers ensuring that their practice demonstrates the message (Recommendation 1).* 'Walking the talk' is a leadership issue.

## 20. Taking responsibility for operational capacity management

In recent years there has been a push for the Federation to have a small Secretariat, linked to the emphasis on the strength and strengthening of NSs and a decreased acceptance for the Secretariat to be operational. There have in addition been budget-driven cut-backs in the Secretariat. The consequent changes within the Secretariat have not yet been completed, and this has contributed to failings in its performance; *unclarity of roles and responsibilities both of and within the Secretariat has served the Federation badly.*

Some PNSs have found the Secretariat frustrating regarding information and decisions. They recognise that its capacity and expertise have dwindled in recent years. However these changes have allowed a previous structure to be dismantled without a satisfactory replacement, and have placed responsibilities in parts of the Secretariat that have not yet been given or developed the capacities to fulfil them at times of major emergency such as this. Specifically, the *Strategy for change* in 2003 gave control to regional and country Delegations for both programming decisions and relations between the Secretariat and the NS. This 'norm', as laid out in *Strategy for change*, explicitly excluded disaster response, which, at the time of that document, was still carried out by the now defunct DMC. When DMC was dismantled and the Operations Support Department formed in early 2004, there remained a formal procedural gap, into which the assumption flowed that the regional Desks and the Delegations would be in control for disaster response, including this one. However this is not widely understood in the Secretariat.

The functional and pragmatic collaboration that took place between the regional Desks and the OSD in Geneva acted well, but it neither had the full control that it probably needed, and that frustrated PNSs wanted it to have in order to unblock activity, nor did it have delegations with the knowledge, training and capacity to really take charge. Therefore the first points to be made are about completing these changes. *While recognising that the new*

---

<sup>33</sup> The Iraq evaluation recommended that these should be "completed as rapidly as possible", as did the Chad real-time management review. This evaluation can only repeat, endorse and reinforce that recommendation.

<sup>34</sup> An unnecessary and damaging side-effect of this reality is that compliance with basic business procedures such as authority to sign PMNs is lacking. If it is an organisational cultural issue that such compliance is under-valued, then it is all the more important to have clear decision-making practices at times of abnormal activity when risks are also increased.

*ways of working are not fully bedded in yet, the evaluator recommends that they should not necessarily be pushed through to the ultimate logical conclusion. This emergency must cause the Secretariat and the Federation as a whole to reflect on whether and how far to pursue this course, if it is to retain the ability to live up to the reputation that it has earned as a premier emergency response agency over many years (Recommendation 18).* The Sri Lanka RTE takes the bleak view that it is questionable whether the Federation is currently capable of being a leader in humanitarian response given the membership's inability to give a clear mandate to its Secretariat and to discipline those members who choose to flout agreements made.

The RCRC's reputation as a premier emergency response organisation is built on the reach and strength of all the NSs but also on an operational capacity that has historically been deployed under central Secretariat control. This should not be lost in the wider institutional changes. PNSs want the Federation to provide a clear sense of direction for a response and faster decision-making, although some of them also want it to be non-operational. This evaluation tends to the view that major emergency responses require a robust capacity under unified command and control, and with the requisite competencies in order to achieve this.

In addition, for major emergencies Geneva has an advantage in advising and managing international assets. However experienced disaster managers find themselves in conflict with HoDs and other regional staff who do not necessarily have disaster response expertise and experience. *Delegations and others need to be told, not advised on, what they need to do on important matters of capacity and accountability.* The Sri Lanka RTE report is of the opinion that the delegation was overwhelmed and underestimated the level of support it should have requested from the Federation system. The Indonesia RTE report argues that management at a higher level ought to have decided to send more administration and coordination delegates to the field – that the field had not asked for this can be no excuse for management failure in critical situations like this. As also pointed out in that report, country delegations, being too closely involved in a disaster of this magnitude and looking at things from a country perspective may fail to see the global ramifications and complexity of an event like this which unfolded to the world quite slowly over a 24-48 hour period. *Higher level managers ought to take responsibility for decisions as to when to deploy, how many and what competence and brief is appropriate for a particular situation (Recommendation 19).*

Delegated power to country and regional level does not excuse management from the need to take control at critical times. Equally those to whom power has been delegated must enable senior managers to do this by making adequate analysis and information available to them. Although the evaluation of the southern Africa drought response concluded that by-passing the RD was not useful, it seems to the evaluator a good thing to have taken the decision quite early on in this case that the scale and immediacy required the Sri Lanka and Indonesia disaster programmes to report directly to Geneva. With a very large disaster, and especially one that crosses regional boundaries, it makes sense to formally cut out the RD, since this is what actually happens.

Looked at from another point of view, those to whom such power has been delegated need to have the right skill-set and competencies; what is appropriate for normal times and preparedness programming is unlikely to serve equally well for times of major emergency response. *The Secretariat needs to be more rigorous about HR practices with regard to post-holder competencies. Those who do not have the correct skill-sets for the work that needs to be done should have a system to support them or possibly replace them at particular times (Recommendation 7).* At core this is an issue of accountability and effective programme delivery.

These comments are made because it does not appear that any potential competency gaps were taken into account in this case. In the longer run *attention needs to be paid to*

*managerial competence, leadership qualities and working culture rather than to structural permutation and combination (Recommendation 7).*

Meanwhile the roles of the regional and country delegations in Sri Lanka and Indonesia need to be clarified for the recovery stage, with a clear organogram incorporating all roles (Recommendation 21). This will demonstrate a sense of leadership that has been missed during much of the history of this disaster response to this point.

## **21. Effectiveness of existing systems**

It should be noted that *there were existing systems that worked well*. It should also be noted that they were supported by unstinting dedication of time by staff of the Secretariat (and NSs), provision of generally timely and useful information, and more, all while under a rain of demands and often complaints from its stakeholders. While all of this is normal business and their job, it should not be invisible or unrecognised for that reason. Broadly, getting people into the offices at the time of a major holiday, getting an initial handle on the size of the disaster, getting information on to DMIS, putting together Appeal within hours and later its early revision, setting up a Task Force, making an allocation of sufficient size from the DREF, holding a teleconference with PNSs and the field within hours, good daily reporting, having contact lists up to date, etc. These are all important good basic procedures, and if they are taken for granted in the Federation, many other organisations would be pleased to have them work so normally, and, it was apparent to the evaluator, with great collective purpose.

It should also be admitted that the contingency plan for the holiday period could have been better. In due course it is probably *OSD that should recommend a revised one, that would list functions that need to be resourced immediately, and that would also allow for secondments in from NSs to the Secretariat in order to meet those needs (Recommendation 6).*

DMIS serves important purposes in getting information to all who need it. DMIS functioned well to do that<sup>35</sup>, and now its functions have been taken over by the Operational Updates. *These serve probably too many different audiences, and with such a high profile disaster it is worth resourcing a differentiated service (Recommendation 30).*

From the first day the Federation had good public visibility through its website, and this has been maintained so far. Early press releases however concentrated on the RCRC Appeals and appear inward-looking. The unusual donor base, with some 85-90% of funds coming directly from the public, makes it imperative to maintain the ability to service the website, in conjunction with the websites of NSs. The evaluation did not look in detail at information, reporting and communicating capacities. It appears however that they are fragmented both inside Geneva and across the world, which puts up a flag that such an important tool of service to PNSs, to managers, and to service the public's desire to know progress is potentially fragile. Programme managers and decision-makers also need this information. *The evaluator wishes to emphasise the importance of good quality information, which can only be provided by allocating resources and priority to its management and proposes that this issue be specifically reviewed (Recommendation 27).*

## **22. Interaction with the UN and others**

At the beginning a person was put full-time on to coordination with the IASC and UN agencies and structures in Geneva. This was a good thing, and resulted in very positive positioning of the Federation in the UN context. *It remains necessary that the Movement coordinates effectively with the UN centrally and in the field, as well as with other actors in the coming response phases (Recommendation 22).* The RCRC has an enormous profile, great resources, and should be capable of having a bigger presence than it currently appears to

---

<sup>35</sup> A bad moment when the IT infrastructure could not take the burden of hits it was receiving was quickly sorted out.



have in the wider humanitarian coordination. In Aceh the Federation appears to shun UN coordination. The fact that the RAT reports do not appear to deal with this issue explicitly is an example of *the energy that the Movement has put into its own internal coordination at the expense of other activities*. This requires both a more outward-looking attitude than is now the case, and capable staff to do it. The Special Representative has an important role in this respect, of course.

### 23. Staff stress

Times of emergency response are inevitably stressful, physically, emotionally and psychologically. This cannot be changed, although there are many things that can, directly or indirectly, mitigate these effects. It appears to the evaluator that the Secretariat is not taking enough care of this issue directly, and in this context *I recommend that the Secretariat undertakes to bring staff who played major roles in the response together for a few hours for an internal lessons-learning session in Geneva, irrespective of this real-time evaluation (Recommendation 2)*, and as psychological support too to staff who have been under great stress. This would be good normal practice in a major situation like this.

### 24. HR management

There are a few observations regarding HR. There appears to have been a bottleneck in the HR Department, that may have been partially responsible for the fact that extra staff were needed, were on offer from PNSs but couldn't be dealt with. It was also unable to control the recruitments that were being undertaken by lots of people, often without, it appears, proper job descriptions, despite the fact that there exist generic job descriptions that have only to be made specific to a context, but these were bypassed in what has been described as 'panic'. The Sri Lanka evaluator believes that the HR functions throughout the Federation system are still under-resourced and should be rapidly strengthened. *The HR Department should make recommendations as to how it can in future support the Secretariat to manage the issue of rapid recruitment, and ensure the agreement of other parts of the Secretariat to what it proposes (Recommendation 5)*.

On the other hand *the rapid deployment of an HR Assistant from the RD to Sri Lanka after 4 days, and one to Indonesia after 8 days was excellent*, both in terms of recognising that it was necessary and also that it could be achieved by secondments within the regions.

### 25. Relationships and coordination

This report has nothing to say about relationships between PNSs. It does have much to say about the relationships between PNSs and the Federation and about relationships between the Secretariat and the NSs. *Those NSs that have demonstrated their commitment to working within the agreements of the Federation have felt that this has been too little recognised because there has been so much emphasis on dealing with those NSs which have acted outside them and which have achieved their unilateral aims to the detriment of the interests of others*. This report wishes by this statement to make its own contribution to recognising that commitment.

*Relations between the ICRC and other parts of the Movement have been very good*<sup>36</sup>. The Secretariat invested time in ensuring that this was so. There is clearly great good will on all sides., and for this reason these relations will go on needing attention in order to ensure that this state of affairs continues. ICRC has been very flexible and cooperative in terms of concrete actions. For example it did briefings to 'new' PNSs who arrived in Aceh. It was very open and quick to let Movement partners come in and exhibited willingness to negotiate 'coordinated activities'.

---

<sup>36</sup> The Goma evaluation proposed a standing agreement with the ICRC so that respective roles in future cross-mandate disasters, such as this one, are clear and delays are avoided. This is presumably in addition to the Seville Agreement, which appears still to be effective.

## 26. Relationships and coordination: the relief phase

The effort to coordinate internally rather than to focus on activity externally has been a feature across the board in this response. The Sri Lanka RTE report states that the process of getting coordination right initially absorbed key managers at all levels. However early on there was an inability, on the part of the Secretariat structures, to present a 'coordination package' sufficiently appealing for the members to buy into, and with it a lack of discipline among the membership of the Federation causing them to disregard agreements in favour of their own short-term organisational gain. This contributed to the consequence that too little international relief assistance was delivered. This state of affairs went on for far too long. Some PNSs say they are frustrated by the imbalance between reflection and necessary action. The evaluator feels that this balance is shifting now, although too late for the relief phase.

In the field *in Indonesia there is poor coordination by PNSs with the PMI*. The FACT may have set the tone for this by carrying out assessments in which PMI had very little participation, the PMI often not being consulted or asked to attend meetings. In any case, this not only goes against the spirit of the Federation and of current strategies, it is also likely to be operationally inefficient and ineffective.

## 27. Relationships and coordination: the recovery phase

It is to be hoped that the Movement Coordination Framework will provide an incentive to alter this behaviour, a forum to do better, and the kind of leadership that will make it less likely to continue. Certainly the proposal for the Framework is felt to be well thought through and has been generally greeted with enthusiasm<sup>37</sup>, and relief that the consuming process of designing this and negotiating buy-in is drawing to a close. What the Sri Lanka RTE report says about this process is the following: "*The Federation's ... efforts to lay the groundwork for coordinated RCRC Movement rehabilitation and reconstruction programming were outstanding*. The report concludes that the organisation took the lead and managed to align a very broad spectrum of organisational agendas, lay down some ground rules, start building capacities and create the basic conditions for coordinated long-term RCRC rehabilitation and reconstruction work in Sri Lanka. This would not have been possible without active assistance from other Movement partners as well as external pressures from for example the Government of Sri Lanka. However, the people involved have reason to be proud of an impressive organisational feat implemented under very difficult circumstances."

The Indonesia RTE report is very concrete and states that "PNSs now need clarity on four things from the Federation: (i) who can work where in the recovery stage; (ii) what protocols and modus operandi for setting up offices and for deployment of delegates, visa issues, etc.; (iii) what salary, procedures for recruiting local staff and how to go about identifying local staff; and (iv) what coordination support is available from the Federation; these are not yet coming from the Federation". They are decisions that need to be made transparently and fairly, and not in a way that effectively pushes NSs into exhibiting bad behaviour, nor a way that favours those NSs with the largest financial resources. This will take care and wisdom.

This evaluator shares the opinion of the country-RTE evaluators that *it is vital for the Service Centres to be set up and functioning rapidly (Recommendation 20)*. This will act as a glue to hold the field-level coordination together, which is where the real commitment to intra-Federation coordination needs to be. The Technical Task Forces will also act as attractors, for which they need to have the right set of skills, and leverage good quality programming. The Sri Lanka RTE report agrees, stating that "a number of practical issues need the immediate attention of the Technical Committees. The setting of standards is perhaps the highest priority

---

<sup>37</sup> The East Africa region is impressed and talking about adopting the 3-tier cooperation model. The Asian regions might then in turn learn from the way that East Africa develops it under rather less pressure of the immediate.

and needs to be addressed. Internationally recognised standards such as the Code of Conduct, Sphere, the BPI, professional technical standards etc need to be translated into the Sri Lanka RC Movement context". *The Secretariat and the PNSs must allow these functional levels to become active even while higher level strategic issues may be unresolved. And the Movement Partnership Task forces should avoid involvement in the details of this process but needs to monitor that international standards are adhered to (Recommendation 20).*

## 28. Leadership, coordination and control

Lest it be thought that there are easy solutions, or that this disaster has thrown up a major new set of issues, it is worth quoting a paragraph from the evaluation of the 1986 Africa Drought Relief Operations<sup>38</sup> : "The League (*as it was then*) of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies is unique. There is no comparable federation of national voluntary agencies in both rich countries and the Third World which is devoted to humanitarian aims. The large number of National Societies and the scale and spread of the Movement do, however, pose difficult managerial problems. The Secretariat has to serve and sustain the League and reconcile the interests of diverse National Societies. These demands present the Secretariat with two options: a passive service role; or an active coordinating role. Currently the Secretariat appears uneasily balanced between the two." Indeed this disaster has thrown into high relief some endemic tensions.

Everyone approves of coordination, but may not agree on what it is. There are strong versions and weak versions, versions that aim through information exchange to satisfy the minimum requirement not to leave gaps or allow overlaps, and versions that seek to create the conditions for strategic cohesion. Coordination is certainly different from control, although those who resist it often claim they are resisting control where there is not a mandate for control, as there is not for the Secretariat in the Federation.

A study done for UNOCHA<sup>39</sup> highlighted important coordination functions that are often missing in the UN, and the same ones appear to be relevant to the RCRC :

the importance of using policy instruments in systematic ways – that is, in an organised way, according to established procedures rather than in an *ad hoc* manner;

the emphasis on cohesion, bringing elements of a response together;

the focus on planning, managing information, accountability, functional divisions of labour and sustaining frameworks with political authorities.

The Federation should consider whether this represents the coordination that they say they want from their Secretariat, and if so, accept that it describes compliance of the coordinated as well as performance by the coordinator. It would allow to, and demand of, the Secretariat a role as facilitator not just logistically but of modalities, pitfalls, and as the driver of programme quality. Of course in order to work well it also implies a strength in the coordinator that is otherwise called leadership.

Leadership is not easy to define in words with clear everyday meanings, although it is relatively easy to observe, and the evaluators have been repeatedly told that it is its absence that has been observed. It requires practical demonstrations of willingness to be in the lead and to exercise the authority of leadership, not of control. And it requires these demonstrations early on as early losses are not easily won back. For example, there should have been an ambitious plan of action developed by the Secretariat that would have provided space for the aspirations of most if not all PNSs, including the so-called 'non-traditional' ones.

---

<sup>38</sup> *An independent Review and Evaluation of the Africa drought relief operations 1984-1986 of the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies*, Institute of Development Studies, September 1986

<sup>39</sup> *Humanitarian Coordination : lessons from recent field experience*, Nicola Reindorp and Peter Wiles, June 2001

In the field, there should from the first day have been a Federation liaison person to welcome PNSs to the field and encourage them thereby to join in a coordinated effort, meetings should have been held and information rigorously and actively shared, rather than the impression being given of struggling to keep up.

This would have supported, and should have been supported by, a more proactive and robust engagement with PNSs at headquarters level, both (re-)assuring them of an active and effective coordinating effort that would serve the needs of beneficiaries as well as NSs, and tying them into that coordination. Complaints that they were not feeling coordinated should have been responded to in this manner, rather than by either allowing Secretariat staff to blame PNSs or by allowing normal management and coordination arrangements to hold when they were not working, and required a change of *modus operandi*. In Geneva there should have been a far quicker process of appointing a Special Representative, and especially of deciding on the management structure within which he is to operate. There should have been more rapid recognition of the need to and decision to scale up Secretariat staffing and to settle on organograms; in fact a good example of this was in transferring the management lines of the Sri Lanka and Indonesia delegations straight to Geneva, by-passing the RDs. The Secretariat's acts of leadership were too sporadic and reactive to events however to win 'followership'.

*Management and decision-making responsibilities have not been clear to Secretariat staff, nor to some PNSs.* The non-operational, participative, coordinating and facilitative role desired of the Secretariat by the majority of the membership for normal circumstances, has led to a gap where firm, active decision-making responsibility needs to be exercised in times of emergency, and this too has been – maybe ironically - missed by the membership. It is perhaps not impossible for the Secretariat to be a coordinating body showing inspiring leadership, as PNSs have wanted it to be and complain that it has not been; however it has not achieved this (yet)<sup>40</sup>. While some of its efforts in this direction have also been undermined by PNS actions anyway, the fact that this has not been sorted out after two months has left many staff as well as PNSs confused and unclear of who is responsible for what and how to get decisions made. From this point on at least the role of the Secretariat needs to be respected by Federation members, as much as it needs to be fulfilled by the Secretariat<sup>41</sup>.

---

<sup>40</sup> Having been very critical of the lack of leadership in the initial phases, the Sri Lanka RTE feels that the Federation is now taking the lead, and cites a series of parallel developments that appear key to the successful re-orientation, as that report calls it.

<sup>41</sup> It was the evaluation of UNHCR's unsatisfactory performance during the Balkans crisis in 1999-2000 that pointed out that UNHCR could only coordinate those who wanted to be coordinated.

---

## 29. Participating National Societies (PNSs) action in the field

*Undisciplined' activities<sup>42</sup> by some PNSs in Sri Lanka and Indonesia started early<sup>43</sup>.* By December 29<sup>th</sup> a letter had to be sent out about the difficulties being caused by unsolicited and un-notified goods arriving in Sri Lanka. Logisticians in Indonesia found a considerable proportion of their time taken in dealing with unsolicited, unwanted and inappropriate materials in the warehouses. There is no excuse for RCRC members to have allowed this to happen. At one stage it became necessary for the Secretary General of the PMI to send out a letter to all Secretaries General reminding them that "failure to adhere to ... guidelines places the humanitarian activities of the entire Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in Indonesia at risk". This was followed by the Secretary General of the IFRC and the Director General of the ICRC issuing a joint letter to all PNSs to remind them of the necessity that "all actors of the Movement will work within the framework of the agreed plans". Whatever the faults and deficiencies in operating relationships, and whatever the scope for PNSs to work unilaterally or bilaterally, it is to be hoped that all PNSs have taken to heart the importance of avoiding such actions as made these letters necessary. The risks were to the parties involved, but also to the confidence and trust in the SLRCS, the PMI and the ICRC of the authorities and the other parties to the conflicts there, and if these were damaged, to the ability of the various parts of the Movement to operate effectively in these areas.

Some NSs have taken the opportunity, either planned or spontaneous, to launch themselves into international operations. For some this introduction to the international stage has shown they did not have expertise how to operate. PNSs with less experience do not know about the protocols for coordination and expected to be told: hopefully they have learnt the value of Secretariat functions. The Movement Platforms will help.

## 30. Accountability

Responsibility for the resources that have been committed for the responses to the effects of this disaster is being taken seriously, and there is a great deal of awareness of and discussion about accountability within the Federation, the Secretariat and the member NSs at the moment, and rightly so. This is because of an awareness of the need to use the funds well, as well as to report on the way the funds are being and have been used. This is all normal, or should be, but clearly the risks are heightened by what I have elsewhere in this report called the distorting effect of the profile of this disaster imposing obligations not only (as ever) to use the money well but also to be seen to be using it well in a way beyond what is normally demanded.

However it is also necessary to use the funds for the explicit or implicit purposes for which they were given<sup>44</sup>, while everyone inside the humanitarian community knows that the need for huge funds is for recovery and reconstruction and not for relief. These are the two aspects of accountability – using the funds well and using them for their intended purpose - that must be kept in balance, with no compromise over the quality of the work done for the sake of making concessions to the assumed expectations of the watching public. *This must be*

---

<sup>42</sup> For example, "...lack of respect among some members for the agreed procedures, and roles and responsibilities within our Movement. ...*ad hoc* behaviour, the lack of coordinated relief shipments and the arrival of delegates and visitors with no advance notice to the NS", letter from Susan Johnson, 24/01/05

<sup>43</sup> This report will make no comment on why some PNSs felt able to go into Sri Lanka and Indonesia unilaterally, but restrained themselves (although often reluctantly) in the cases of India and Thailand.

<sup>44</sup> The Federation's revised Appeal dated 29 December gave as background that, "...many who escaped death in the worst tsunami ever recorded battle against hunger and risk of diseases. Fresh water, food and fuel are running short". This basic message was never changed even once the Federation got a better assessment of the situation.

*honestly and openly explained to the public (Recommendation 28).* The actions and communications of the humanitarian community at large, including and maybe particularly of the RCRC, are otherwise liable to be judged in the long term as cynical and self-seeking.

Availability of large amounts of money could be an opportunity to improve ONSs' capacity as auxiliaries to government and their preparedness. However *there is a need to justify openly big effort and spending on NS capacity building (Recommendation 29)*, depending to some degree on their immediate performance in responding to this disaster.

It might be worth testing the expectations and desires of the public over what they would find acceptable ways to spend their money that has been entrusted to the RCRC. This would then give a clear mandate to the Federation, and incidentally also provide a baseline on which to base efforts to educate the public.

Both the duty to give an account and the management of some of the risks requires a strong performance in communications too. However the reporting must not take precedence over the actions. An Accountability Framework is being debated. It can be a strong tool if it is well understood and well used, and owned by all parts of the Movement.

Another fundamental aspect of accountability that clearly needs attention is in efforts to be accountable to those who are intended to benefit from these operations. The Indonesia RTE report states that the Federation delegates appear to spend lot of their time in office-related work, and not enough in the field talking to people in the community or working alongside PMI volunteers, in fact they hardly visit and interact with the communities. ICRC, on the other hand, has developed a systematic way of interacting with displaced and affected community in all locations through which they gather the community's perception of the needs and carry out rapid assessments on an on-going basis which informs relief distribution.

*Financial accounting is in part in hand.* The Indonesia RTE report makes the important point that the Principles and Rules for RCRC Disaster Relief outline certain good practices for accounting. However, these are mostly with reference to ONSs. *Where PNSs are also almost operational in the stricken country, similar procedures ought to also apply to PNSs (Recommendation 25).* The ONS, and even the local public, have a right to know the actual disbursements and expenses charged by the PNSs to the operation from the funds raised by them. The PMI said that to date they have no information from any of the PNSs as to how much funds have been allocated for the country and how the money is being spent. The RSOF sets out measures which will be taken by the Federation and the ICRC in order to fulfil and enhance its accountability obligations to all stakeholders. The measures outlined are mostly limited to the Secretariat and ICRC delegations, and do not indicate how the PNSs operations are going to be monitored or what principles/minimum standards the PNSs will be required to follow. *All Federation actors should implement similar high standards of financial accounting and transparency (Recommendation 25).*

### **31. Communications**

As mentioned elsewhere, the RCRC's reputation with the UN and amongst the public is very high. With this goes a prominent profile and a platform to speak to the public. Communications with the public have never been more important, or more of an opportunity. An indispensable part of this programming needs to be a wise and sophisticated communications strategy, that goes beyond what has been operating so far. The RCRC has been given a platform to speak to the public on subjects wider than the tsunami.

On the other hand the Secretariat is not very used to speaking to the public as its major donor base and will need to find a different voice, but one that still incorporates the sort of content that is habitually reported in the ways that institutional donors expect it to be reported. *The Federation needs key messages and facts that all its members can use, especially on numbers of those benefitting and how, when, how directly, out of how many in need, who else is*

*servicing them, etc. The reporting must be balanced and reflect the true nature of what the Movement is doing (Recommendation 28).* It must thus include Thailand, Malaysia, India, Myanmar, Somalia, and all of the regional disaster preparedness work, and report what the RCRC does holistically.

It is a good thing that the RAT reports and the Regional Strategy and Operating Framework go some way towards proposing a plan of action; public donors need the reassurance that this exists and the Federation needs urgent messages for all PNSs to use.

There are also some risks to be managed. We can make intelligent forecasts but cannot know how the media will actually take up the tsunami story (which it is for them) in the future. The 'Phuket factor' and the foreigners caught up in the disaster is part of what brought the attention and the money<sup>45</sup>, and it will be important to include this in a principled way into communications back to the public.

There is existing excellent collaboration between Federation and ICRC staff on communications, however the communications needs of these two parts of the Movement are rather different<sup>46</sup>. For the Federation it will be necessary both to be able to have good, intelligent and intelligible answers to FAQs<sup>47</sup>, but also to take the opportunity to have proactive communications that serve as public education and advocacy. It is unlikely that it will be possible to foresee all the communications needs, either reactive or proactive. ***A strong communications unit centrally, but servicing all of the NSs, is recommended. It should bring together existing communications functions (Recommendation 26),*** and also be able to work with and influence the leadership

---

<sup>45</sup> For example, in Sri Lanka the effects were probably worst in the north and east, but attention was on tourist areas in the south.

<sup>46</sup> Public messages need to be balanced by risks to security, protection and acceptability.

<sup>47</sup> Frequently Asked Questions, or those that are expected to be asked. Much of this is either reactive or even defensive against potential criticism.

---

## Recommendations of the synthesis report

Geneva internal :

- 1) The continuing lack of clarity experienced by staff of the Secretariat regarding decision-making should be resolved, and will no doubt need reinforcement and repetition. Part of this reinforcement needs to be by managers repeating the message about where decision-making responsibilities lie, and part of it needs to be done by managers ensuring that their practice demonstrates the message.
- 2) The Secretariat should undertake to bring staff who played major roles in the response together for a few hours for an internal lessons-learning session in Geneva, irrespective of the Real-Time Evaluation. This is best initiated by managers rather than Human Resources staff.
- 3) The Operations Support Department should make the commitment and soon put the resources into finalising a set of SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures) that will be acceptable within the Secretariat and therefore useful.
- 4) In future disasters, Task Forces should at a minimum always have agendas and keep notes of Action Points which are then communicated to all stakeholders. This should be in the revised SOPs (see above).
- 5) The Human Resources Department should make recommendations as to how it can in future support the Secretariat to manage the issue of rapid recruitment. It should then ensure the agreement of other parts of the Secretariat to what it proposes.
- 6) The Operations Support Department should recommend a revised Geneva-level contingency plan, that would list functions that need to be resourced immediately, and that would also allow for secondments in from National Societies to the Secretariat in order to meet those needs.
- 7) The Secretariat needs to be more rigorous about human resources practices with regard to post-holder competencies. Those who do not have the correct skill-sets for the work that needs to be done should have a system that will provide support to them or possibly replace them at particular times. Attention needs to be paid to managerial competence, leadership qualities and working culture rather than to structural permutation and combination.
- 8) In future there should be a formal follow-up process to all evaluations, recording whether recommendations are accepted or not, what action should be taken with regard to them, and where responsibility for that action lies. This should start with the present Real-Time Evaluation

### Disaster response

- 9) Especially in those countries where the response was smaller, limited and now over, there should be a review of their preparedness, in order to affirm its effectiveness and/or to look for how it can be improved in the light of this experience.
- 10) The Operations Support Department should undertake to revise its emergency deployment systems, so as to ensure that Field Assessment and Coordination Teams (FACTs) are formally and functionally articulated with the more recent Regional and National Disaster Response Teams (RDRTs and NDRTs). Regional Delegations need a system analogous to the Field Assessment and Coordination Team (FACT) alert and deployment system for Regional and National Disaster Response Teams (RDRTs and NDRTs). This system should be integrated with the FACT system, and the responsibility for deploying a suitable team should stay with Geneva.



- 11) Geneva should take the lead, with strong membership involvement, on a review of current National Society investments in Emergency Response Units (ERUs) and whether and how they should be adapted to ensure adequate capacity for response, including for relief. The specification of ERUs should be loosened up to allow for the use of resources available to more National Societies than those which have up until now made the larger commitment and investment to ERUs.
- 12) National Societies within a region where a disaster occurs should be encouraged by the Secretariat to contribute to the response. The Federation needs to proactively engage with them right from the start of a major emergency to make the best use for the collective response of their willingness to engage and their specific advantages.
- 13) The Secretariat, with strong membership engagement, should undertake a detailed review for how Recovery Assessment Teams (RATs) might be institutionalised. This should not only look at modalities but at what the value of their being institutionalised would be.
- 14) The Operations Support Department in Geneva and regional disaster management (DM) staff should actively work closely together to ensure that effective information on and lobbying about the value of the global 'tools' for disaster response are an essential part of disaster preparedness for all National Societies and delegations.
- 15) The Operations Support Department should in the case of future major disasters strengthen its coordination capacity by ensuring that there is someone designated as a relief focal point.
- 16) The Federation should take note that it is generally considered good practice to do local purchase. It is recommended that the Secretariat engage the membership in a strengthening of local purchase capacity, with all that this implies in terms of reviewing contract protocols, setting of standards, maintaining procurement capacity, etc.
- 17) Especially those National Societies with less experience of international operations, but even those already with a great deal of experience, should invest in ensuring that their staff and volunteers know enough about issues of quality in humanitarian response and have a commitment to seeking expert support if necessary.

#### **Roles of the Secretariat and NSs :**

- 18) If the Federation is to retain the ability to live up to its reputation as a premier emergency response agency achieved over many years, this emergency must cause the Secretariat and the Federation as a whole to reflect on whether and how far to pursue the course of delegation of management responsibilities to the Secretariat's regions. In addition the formal procedural gap, into which the assumption flowed that the regional Desks and the Delegations would be in control of all matters for disaster response, should be closed. The Secretariat should not necessarily push this new division of roles through to its logical conclusion, but should take account of the essential roles of other parts of the Secretariat in ensuring professional and effective management of large responses.
- 19) At the time of a major emergency and when there is a Task Force in Geneva, Geneva should have the responsibility to tell the delegation what needs to be done in terms of staffing capacity, communications and policy. Senior managers must take responsibility for decisions as to when to deploy additional capacity to delegations in countries affected by major disasters, how many and what competence and brief is appropriate for a particular situation. All of this needs to be done with one coordinated voice.

#### **In the field :**

- 20) In Sri Lanka and Indonesia the Service Centres must be set up and functioning rapidly. The Secretariat and the Participating National Societies must allow these functional levels

to become active even while higher level strategic issues may be partially unresolved or subject to continuing negotiation. The in-country Movement Partnership Task Forces should avoid involvement in the details of this process although they need to take responsibility for monitoring that international standards are adhered to.

- 21) The roles of the regional and country delegations in Sri Lanka and Indonesia need to be clarified for the recovery stage, with a clear organogram incorporating all roles.
- 22) The Federation needs to be engaged in each location with the many others in the same fields of activity in the longer-term interventions after the tsunamis. Coordination with other members of the Movement is not sufficient; there should also be willing and active engagement with the UN specifically in its legitimate coordination role, with other multilateral organisations, with international NGOs, as well as with governments.
- 23) Current programming proposals will require the Federation to look for expertise that it probably does not have internally in order to be able to step into the new leagues in which it now finds itself committed to operate. Capacity and expertise gaps should be identified and filled as soon as is feasible. This may be done by acquiring expert staff, by forming functional working partnerships, or by other means. Programming proposals may need to be adapted accordingly.
- 24) The ICRC needs to continue to have access and proximity to those in need. Other actors in the Movement need to ensure that their actions in practice respect what the ICRC is doing and its requirements to be able to work effectively.

#### **Accountability and communications**

- 25) All Federation actors should implement similar high standards of financial accounting and transparency. The Operating National Societies (ONSs), and even the local public, have a right to know the actual disbursements and expenses charged by the Participating National Societies (PNSs) to the operation from the funds raised by them. The Principles and Rules for RCRC Disaster Relief outline certain good practices for financial accounting. However, these are mostly with reference to ONSs. Where PNSs are also almost operational in the stricken country, similar procedures ought to also apply to those PNSs.
- 26) The Secretariat currently has uncoordinated communications functions. Geneva should institute a strong communications unit centrally, bringing together existing communications functions and able to serve all of the National Societies.
- 27) The evaluator notes with the Federation the importance of good quality information, which can only be provided by allocating resources and priority to its management. The issue of whether the Federation has the ability and capacity to create, manage and make available good quality information should be specifically reviewed.
- 28) The Federation needs key messages and facts that all its members can use, especially on numbers of those benefiting and how, when, how directly, out of how many in need, who else is serving them, etc. The reporting must be balanced and reflect the true nature of what the Movement has done and is doing. The fact that funds must be used where they are needed as much as for the intentions of their donors, that is for recovery and reconstruction now as well as for emergency relief, must be honestly and openly explained to the public.
- 29) Since it is proposed that funds donated for the tsunami will also be spent on large efforts towards the capacity building of National Societies, the justification for this must be openly made and included in communications about Federation activities in response to the tsunami.

- 30) The Operational Updates which are produced showing Movement activities in the tsunami-affected regions and are posted on the internet serve too many different audiences. With such a high profile disaster a differentiated service should be resourced in order to ensure that the needs for information and analysis of donors, National Societies, media, communicators, managers and others are met.

## Key recommendations of the Indonesia RTE report

The key recommendations which the evaluators consider essential to significantly enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the operations and the organisation's humanitarian response capacity.

### **7.1 Operational Level (Immediate):**

- a) Strengthen management capacity at field level by recruiting managers with experience of complex operations management.
- b) A senior level operations manager to be posted in Banda Aceh (not Jakarta).
- c) Clarify role of the regional delegation who ought to play a leadership role in the reconstruction phase. If required, bolster its capacity.
- d) Ensure adequate *local* procurement capacity and systems are in place.
- e) Ensure greater interaction with PMI and local community at sub-delegation/ field office level and beneficiary involvement in planning and design of the recovery and reconstruction programme.
- f) Undertake quick inventory of staff/delegates capacity available now and what is needed for recovery stage.
- g) Prepare and share with all stakeholders an organogram for the entire operation in Indonesia and update it periodically.
- h) Decide how best to utilise/redeploy the equipments to be left behind by ERUs.
- i) Greater interaction with OCHA and wider humanitarian community needed at field level.
- j) Clarify who is the overall manager for the entire operation in Geneva, and ensure that all reporting and critical communication (as opposed to information) flow through that channel.
- k) Ensure that there is adequate research and advocacy capacity in-country during the recovery/reconstruction phase.
- l) Explore possibility of setting up a joint project with PMI through which professional staff can be recruited<sup>48</sup>.

### **7.2 Strategic Level (Medium-Long term):**

- a) Identify critical elements of effective leadership, especially in emergency operations and develop strategy to strengthen these capacities at all levels.

---

<sup>48</sup> Currently all staff are recruited as Federation employee, as PMI, being a predominantly volunteer-based organisation, is averse to recruiting staff on its rolls.

---

- b) Clarify role, responsibility and authority of different parts of the organisation during disasters of various scales depending on whether a national, regional or international response is warranted.
- b) Undertake orientation of delegates and all field-based managers on corporate perspective, rather than territorial view of the organisation: this will involve significant changes in the organisation's working culture.
- c) Carry out comprehensive review of all tools (FACT, ERUs, RDRT, etc) and address the question how these tools can be made more effective, flexible and responsive to local expertise, capacities and needs.
- d) Address the issues around code of conduct with PNSs.
- e) Put in place a director-level mechanism to ensure that lessons from reviews and RTEs are *learned* and *acted upon*.
- f) Enhance the capacity for research and advocacy on issues of accountability of humanitarian actions to local communities and adherence to code of conduct.

# **Annexes to**

## **Asia earthquake and tsunamis :**

### **Real Time Evaluation report**

*for the*

### **Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies**

**March 2005**

Annex 1a	<b>Performance indicators, from the Indonesia RTE report</b>
Annex 1b	<b>Performance indicators, from the Sri Lanka RTE report</b>
Annex 2	<b>Other key documents</b>
Annex 3	<b>List of people interviewed or consulted</b>
Annex 4	<b>Terms of Reference of the Real Time Evaluation</b>
Annex 5	<b>Asia Earthquake and Tsunami Operations, Evaluation Framework (Draft)</b>

## Annex 1a : Performance indicators, from the Indonesia RTE report

<i>Performance indicator</i>	<i>Where the Federation stands</i>
<b>1. Fundamental principles and humanitarian values/advocacy:</b> RCRC distinguished from other organisations by its values and principles, and known to stand on the side of vulnerable.	RCRC highly respected by local organisations and government for its values, although it has not yet engaged in advocacy on the values/FPs.
<b>2. Disaster Preparedness:</b> trained volunteers and community-based preparedness plans.	PMI known for the best-organised volunteers in the country, and in high demand from various organisations.
<b>3. Disaster response:</b> meeting basic needs of the affected people; beneficiaries satisfied with services received, no food crisis.	International relief, including those of the Federation, were delayed although PMI and ICRC provided critical food supply with GOI/local organisations in early stage. Beneficiaries' needs not fully appreciated by humanitarian interventions generally. <i>Federation response distinctive in water area.</i>
<b>4. Health:</b> no disease outbreak, known for substantial work in healthcare.	Basic health care and referral hospitals by RCRC are providing critical services of extremely good quality. Closely working with health authorities – that makes Federation's work highly visible.
<b>5. National society:</b> meets performance indicators as above; is credible and effective	PMI is highly credible and efficient organisation, with a strong volunteer-base which can be envy of any organisation.
<b>6. Working together effectively:</b> acting as one organisation; all PNSs feel equally valued and RCRC seen as a welcoming space for all people who want to help without discrimination.	Federation has not demonstrated a coordinated response and has been seen to be working like other disparate organisations. However, in recent weeks as the operation enters recovery stage, coordination within the Federation is improving. Needs to do more to achieve greatest impact, commensurate with the resources commanded by the RCRC Movement.

**Annex 1b : Performance indicators, from the Sri Lanka RTE report**

Performance Indicator	Where the Federation stands
<p><b>1. Fundamental principles and humanitarian values/advocacy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC/RC distinguished from other organizations by its values and principles</li> <li>• known to stand on the side of vulnerable people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Government of Sri Lanka regards RC/RC as a category of its own, subdividing partners into Development Banks, UN, Red Cross, INGOs and NGOs.</li> <li>○ The Movement has a good image in Sri Lanka. Political realities complicate the picture as does the history of the SLRCS.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Disaster preparedness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• did we have trained local volunteers and community based preparedness mechanism in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SLRCS had approx 60 people trained in NDRT, VCA or basic DM and Logistics. There were Branch Executive Officers in each district as well as elected Branch committees. Many volunteers were mobilised. More training would have been beneficial as well as better communications, equipment, systems and monitoring.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Disaster response</b> did the response results in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meeting basic needs of affected people (food/water/shelter)</li> <li>• beneficiaries satisfied with service received</li> <li>• no food riots or long lines for relief material in any of the affected areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Immediate basic needs of affected people were rapidly met. SLRCS efforts contributed to the community based mechanisms that achieved that. International response was quite late and not always well adapted to the needs.</li> <li>○ Contact persons quote beneficiaries as mostly satisfied while even though support was clearly inappropriate (e.g. blankets) and some lacking (e.g. mosquito nets, kerosene stoves).</li> <li>○ No food riots known. Lines at times long.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no disease outbreak</li> <li>• other organisations know with clarity: what we do, and how we operate in an emergency situation</li> <li>• known for substantial work in health and care</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No post disaster epidemics reported. Government of Sri Lanka MoH played key role in this. MoH, and its partners, should be praised for the multi-year work that made this possible! RC is one of MoH partners and the work with e.g. removing human remains and WATSAN contributed to the successful result.</li> <li>○ Government of Sri Lanka and UN system: overall yes. Other stakeholders: No data.</li> <li>○ I have no data.</li> </ul>



<p><b>5. National Society</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meets performance indicators in the areas listed above.</li> <li>• is known as credible and effective</li> <li>• partner of choice of governments/ intern. organizations/ civil society/private sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mixed picture.</li> <li>○ Mixed picture.</li> <li>○ Yes, especially in collaboration with other RC Movement entities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Working together effectively</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• acting as one organization determined to maximize the full potential of our global reach and resources in order to achieve greatest impact for our beneficiaries and greatest influence on other actors</li> <li>• all participating and host NSs feel equally valued and respected contributors</li> <li>• Red Cross Red Crescent seen as the 'Heart Beat of Humanity' and is a welcoming space for all people who want to help or be helped, regardless of nationality, race, religion, political affiliation or any such consideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mixed picture. Donor driven, lots of Movement-internal politicking, beneficiaries conspicuously absent from most discussions at country and Geneva level. Never-the-less, the unusually concerted attempt to get Movement coordination working is starting to pay off. Stakeholders at all levels have been compromising and leaning backwards to make coordination work. Furthermore, field level coordination efforts appear to have been generous and practical.</li> <li>○ No, but moving in the right direction.</li> <li>○ No field data.</li> </ul>

## Annex 2 : Other key documents

The following documents supplement what is contained in the main text of the RTE report. Not all of them are public documents :

Operations Updates, available at <http://www.ifrc.org/>

Recovery Assessment Team Report Indonesia, 7<sup>th</sup> February 2005

Recovery Assessment Team Report Sri Lanka, 7<sup>th</sup> February 2005

Asia Earthquake and tsunamis Regional Strategy and Operational Framework for Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, Draft proposal, 24<sup>th</sup> February 2005

<i>Draft plans of action for :</i>	South Asia region
	South East Asia region
	Sri Lanka
	Indonesia
	Myanmar
	Thailand
	Bangladesh
	India
	Malaysia
	Maldives
	East Africa region

## Annex 3 : list of people interviewed or consulted

**IFRC Secretariat,  
Geneva**

### **Asia & Pacific Department**

Ewa Ericsson, Senior Officer  
Jagan Chapagain, Regional Officer, Asia & Pacific Department  
Jasna Djordjevic, Planning Officer  
Simon Missiri, Head of Asia Pacific Department  
Suzana Harfield, Regional Officer (Sri Lanka, Maldives)

### **Disaster Preparedness and Response Department**

Antony Spalton (DfID Programmes)  
Eva Von Oelreich, Head  
Helene Lackenbauer  
Yvonne Klymann

### **External Relations**

Marcel Fortier

### **Monitoring & Evaluation Department**

Matthew Varghese, Head

### **Field HR / Security Unit**

Louise Hamberg-Dardel, Health Officer  
Tor Planting, Acting HR Manager

**Finance**

Angela Eaton, Tsunami Operation Finances

**Health and Water and Sanitation**

Bruce Eshaya-Chauvin, Head Health Department

**Logistics**

Birgitte Stalder-Olsen, Head of Mobilisation

Erling Brandtzaeg, Field Logistics (Indonesia & Myanmar)

**Media**

Marie Françoise Borel, Information Officer

**National Society and Field Support Division**

Martin Faller, Team Leader

**Operations Support Dept**

Elizabeth Soulié, Operations Support

Flemming Nielsen, Operations Coordinator

François Courtade, ECHO and Grants

Frédéric Zanetta, DMIS

Jane Marin, Reporting Coordinator

Mostafa Mohaghegh, Operations Coordinator

Peter Rees, Head, OSD

Pieter de Rijke, ERU

Stephen McAndrew, FACT deployment manager

**Organisational Development Dept**

Bayarmaa Luntan, Senior Officer

**Risk Management & Audit Department**

Rafael Bravo, Head

**Telecommunications**

Pierre Haessig, Head Field Telecommunications

**Tsunami Operations**

Iain Logan, Operations Coordinator

Johan Schaar, Special Representative for the Tsunami Operation

Wilson Wong, Regional Officer, Asia Earthquake & Tsunamis

**Directors**

Ibrahim Osman, Director, Policy & Relations Division

Richard Blewitt, Director Movement Cooperation

Susan Johnson, Director National Society and Field Supp

**IFRC Secretariat,  
Field delegations**

Anitta Underlin, Head of East Africa Delegation

Bob McKerrow, Head of South Asia Delegation

Bekele Geleta, Head of South East Asia Delegation

Ian Wilderspin, Disaster Preparedness, South East Asia Delegation

---

John Gwynn, Organisational Development Delegate, Asia Service Center

**National Societies**

American RC, Luc Greeves  
Australian RC, Nathan Rabe, Tsunami Appeal Manager  
Australian RC, Pascal Rigaldies, Project Leader, Tsunami Response  
British RC, Matthias Schmale, Director of International  
British RC, Sir Nicholas Young, Chief Executive  
Canadian RC, Wayne MacDonald, National Director, International Programs and Humanitarian Issues  
Danish RC, Anders Ladekarl, Head of International  
Danish RC, Lasse Melgaard, Desk Officer Sri Lanka,  
Danish RC, Pia Lorentzen, Desk Officer Indonesia  
Finnish Red Cross, Kalle Löövi, Head of International Aid  
Finnish RC, Kristiina Kumpula, Secretary General  
French RC, Antoine Peigney, Director of International Operations  
Hong Kong RC, Bonnie So, Head of International & Relief Service  
Iceland RC, David Lynch, Director International Department  
Indian RC, Dr Vimula Ramalingam, Secretary General  
Indonesia Red Cross, Muhammad Mar'ie, Chairman  
Japanese RC, Naoki Kokawa, Director, International Relief Division  
Korean RC, Eunhee Cho, Information Officer, International Relations Department  
Korean RC, Il-Hoon Kwak, Chairman, Volunteers  
New Zealand RC, Lady Jocelyn Keith, National President  
Saudi RC, Dr Khalid al-Hebshi, Director General of Mekkah Region  
Singapore RC, Geri Lau, Secretary General  
Sri Lanka Red Cross, Nimal Kumar, Hon. Secretary  
Swedish RC, Bjorn Eder, Head of International Relations  
Swedish RC, Nina Paulsen, Regional Co-ordinator, Int'I Program's, SA  
Swiss Red Cross, Martin Fuhrer, Director International Cooperation  
Thai RC, Sawanit Kongsiri, Assistant Secretary General for External Relations  
Turkish RC, Kaan Saner, Head of Section, OD Department

**ICRC**

Christoph Luedi, Head of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit  
Florence Sechaud, Deputy Head of operations for South East Asia and the Pacific  
Francois Bugnion, Director for International Law and Cooperation within the Movement  
François Wuarin, Adviser for the Tsunami Operation  
James Reynolds, Deputy Head of Operations for Central and South Asia  
Mary Perkins, Deputy Head of Region (Indian Subcontinent) for the Tsunami Operation  
Roger Ruffy, Head of unit, External Resources Division  
Sandra Moretti Carr, Head of Sector Asia and the Pacific Cooperation within the Movement  
Vincent Lusser, Press Department (Asia)  
Yves Etienne, Head, Assistance Division

**Miscellaneous**

Fernando Soares, Red Cross EU Office, Consultant for Tsunami response mapping

## Annex 4 : Terms of Reference for the Real Time Evaluation

### **Asia: Earthquake and Tsunami** Terms of Reference

*International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies*  
Monitoring and Evaluation Department

#### 1. Background

The magnitude 9.0 earthquake that struck the area off the western coast of northern Sumatra on Sunday morning, 26 December 2004, at 7:59 am local time (00:59 GMT) triggered tsunamis, that inundated coastal areas in countries all around the Indian Ocean rim – from Indonesia to Somalia. Sri Lanka, the Indonesian province of Aceh, four states of southern India, the Maldives, coastal areas of Thailand, Malaysia, and Myanmar were the most severely affected. The area is historically prone to seismic upheaval due to its location on the margins of tectonic plates. However, tidal waves of this magnitude are rare and therefore, the level of preparedness was very low. As of January 21, over 210,000 people lost their lives and more than 20,700 are still missing; nearly 2,300,000 are displaced.

Thousands of staff, relief and medical personnel, and volunteers of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies of the tsunami-affected countries have provided a vital initial response, in search and rescue, clean-up, temporary shelter and immediate relief assistance, emergency medical services, psychological first aid and tracing. It is estimated that over 5,000 Red Cross and Red Crescent volunteers and 76 relief and medical teams have been mobilized in the disaster-affected areas. Approximately 33 national societies are actively involved in supporting the tsunami operations, and it was estimated that during the first three weeks of the operations, a total of 250,000 people affected by the disaster have received assistance through the International Federation.

The International Federation immediately launched a Preliminary Emergency Appeal on the day of the disaster with a focus on Sri Lanka, Indonesia and the Maldives. On 3 January 2005, the ICRC launched budget extensions additional to its 2005 Emergency Appeal for Indonesia and Sri Lanka. Along with initial support from the country and regional delegations, the International Federation deployed within 24-72 hours three Field Assessment and Coordination Teams (FACT) and 18 Emergency Response Units (ERU) in the sectors of water and sanitation, health care, aid distribution, telecommunications, and logistics/transportation to Sri Lanka, Indonesia and the Maldives. A total of 77 relief flights have now arrived in the various affected countries and a further 31 flights are in the International Federation relief pipeline, making a total of 108 relief flights coordinated through the International Federation. The International Federation and the ICRC in Geneva are currently working on an organizational framework for Movement coordination.

Details of the appeal, updates of activities and budget are in the International Federation website [www.ifrc.org](http://www.ifrc.org).

#### 2. Reasons for the Evaluation

This real time evaluation is to be the first one of the system of reviews of the Asia: Earthquake and Tsunami operation, described in the Evaluation Framework. As such, it will:

- take stock of progress, be an objective basis for review of the emergency operations effectiveness, identify solutions to problems, and provide an input to future direction of the system of evaluation of Asia: Earthquake and Tsunami operation.

*Author : Maurice Herson*

- provide recommendations to the participating and host National Societies, Federation Secretariat and the donors for any necessary changes in management and coordination, the overall implementation of the operation, and the future work-programme of the operation.

### 3. Focus

The first real time evaluation will:

1. focus on three key issues, namely:
  - operation management (both field and Secretariat);
  - Movement cooperation and coordination; and
  - relief.
2. further develop the real time evaluation framework for the Tsunami operation through consultation with Federation members, making recommendations regarding issues such as the design of the accountability system, focus, periodicity, and resource needs.
3. take into account participating and host national societies praises and concerns about management of the operation and accountability.

### 4. Scope

More specifically, within the areas of operation management (field and Secretariat), Movement cooperation and coordination, and relief, this real time evaluation will assess and provide expert opinion on:

- 1) Adequacy of the planning and appeal objectives: Are they being realised? In retrospect, were the appeal objectives clear and realistic?
- 2) Speed of response: by documenting the evolution of the operation response and commenting on decisions being made. Could this operation be implemented more quickly without undue risks? (benchmark speed of response to other major humanitarian organisations: first to have relief personal/volunteers on the scene, when did the first relief package get distributed)
- 3) Opportunities for improving the operation response, especially in terms of management effectiveness, coordination, and relationships, as per the following definitions:
  - *effectiveness*: assessment of the operations management from Geneva and field including decision making process (Were the organisational structures and staff appropriate and flexible for effective disaster operation?);
  - *relationships, coordination and management*: the nature and extent of functional relationships, cooperation and exchange of information among the Movement, with the external actors and within the Secretariat;
- 4) The responsiveness and efficiency of the disaster operation, including the:
  - extent to which Federation Secretariat is able to draw on the areas of particular competence of its members (What is the perception of members?);
  - cost-efficiency in providing relief – benchmark if possible;
- 5) The quality of disaster operation (benchmark to other major humanitarian organisations if possible), including the:
  - participation of the beneficiaries and volunteers in programme implementation at local level;
  - satisfaction of beneficiary needs in terms of such factors as adequacy and appropriateness of relief items,

- comprehensive - in particular, the extent to which concerns including children, gender and vulnerability and poverty implications have been adequately included.
- 6) Coverage: does the relief meet the needs in various geographical areas and sectors.
  - 7) Identification of strengths and weaknesses in the International Federation operation and resource utilisation.
  - 8) Validity of assumptions made: Were important assumptions been left out or ignored? Did the operation have any unintended side effects, social or economic?
  - 9) Compliance: did all partners comply with Sphere standards.
  - 10) The performance of the International Federation must be measured against the following indicators and, whenever possible, benchmarked to other major humanitarian actors:

Performance Indicator	Where we stand
<b>1. Fundamental principles and humanitarian values/advocacy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC/RC distinguished from other organizations by its values and principles</li> <li>• known to stand on the side of vulnerable people</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Disaster preparedness</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• did we have trained local volunteers and community based preparedness mechanism in place</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Disaster response</b> did the response results in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meeting basic needs of affected people (food/water/shelter)</li> <li>• beneficiaries satisfied with service received</li> <li>• no food riots or long lines for relief material in any of the affected areas.</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no disease outbreak</li> <li>• other organisations know with clarity: what we do, and how we operate in an emergency situation</li> <li>• known for substantial work in health and care</li> </ul>	
<b>5. National Society</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meets performance indicators in the areas listed above.</li> <li>• is know as credible and effective</li> <li>• partner of choice of governments / intern. organizations/ civil society/private sector</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Working together effectively</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• acting as one organization determined to maximize the full potential of our global reach and resources in order to achieve greatest impact for our beneficiaries and greatest influence on other actors</li> <li>• all participating and host NSs feel equally valued and respected contributors</li> <li>• Red Cross Red Crescent seen as the 'Heart Beat of</li> </ul>	

<p>Humanity' and is a welcoming space for all people who wants to help or be helped, regardless of nationality, race, religion, political affiliation or any such consideration.</p>	
--	--

The focus and scope specified in these Terms of Reference for the first phase of the Real Time Evaluation include all that might be covered. However it is understood that logistical and time constraints will limit what is in fact achievable. The evaluators are given freedom to be selective as long as they ensure that the outputs are relevant, timely and address the issues that emerge as of critical importance and value to the Federation and the Movement, and agree the revision with the Evaluation Department.

## 5. Evaluation Audience

The primary audience is internal: the International Federation members, participating and host National Societies, the Federation Secretariat, and the ICRC.

The secondary, external, audiences include donors, who have an interest from the viewpoint of assessing the accomplishment and the use of funds entrusted. The partners of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, such as national authorities and other institutions and International Organisations involved in humanitarian action may be interested too.

The review has the potential to be circulated more widely and hence may afford a learning opportunity for the humanitarian community in general.

## 6. Methodology

The real time evaluation will cover all affected countries either through field visits or by interviews. The evaluation design calls for field study by country teams in two of the major affected areas i.e. Indonesia and Sri Lanka, where major operations are currently ongoing. A third team will be based in Geneva to look at Secretariat operations management, cooperation and coordination within the Movement, conduct interviews with National Societies not covered by field visits, listen to praises and concerns of donor National Societies and put together an agreed evaluation framework and work plan for future real time reviews. The Geneva team also has the responsibility for preparing a final report from the country reports and global issues.

The purpose of establishing three teams and running the review concurrently is to have the review results available in real time, so that the corrective actions can be taken early.

The review teams will consist of independent consultants as well as National Society representatives; the team leaders will always be independent consultants. To ensure the independence of the evaluation, the final decision on the team composition will be made by the Monitoring and Evaluation Department.

1. Review of key documented materials, these include but not limited to:

- Appeals
- Letters to Permanent Missions and National Societies
- Briefing notes
- MoU or Agreements between Federation and ICRC/National Societies
- Minutes of the Task Force meetings in Geneva and field



- Framework agreement Federation and external organizations
  - Minutes of major meetings such as the Stockholm Meeting
  - Operations Updates
  - Disaster Management Information System
  - Assessment documents.
2. Consultation and interviews with beneficiaries of the emergency phase (to get an idea of beneficiary perception covering issues like relief supplies, medical treatment, water and sanitation, tracing, psychosocial support etc.);
  3. Interviews with participating and host National Society Secretary Generals and their managers;
  4. Interviews with key internal stakeholder within the Secretariat, Delegations, and the ICRC;
  5. Interviews with other key stakeholders, such as relevant Ministries, International Organizations, NGOs, United Nations, media etc.

The review team will maintain close liaison with the delegations and the concerned National Societies. Although the team should feel free to discuss with the agencies and people concerned anything relevant to this assignment, it is not however, authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the National Society or the International Federation.

## 7. Composition of the Evaluation Teams

The review team will comprise:

Overall Team leader based in Geneva, with experience of both the disaster operations and of evaluations. He/she is responsible for the quality of the final product and has the responsibility to liaise with the country teams for a coherent approach to the evaluation.

Country team leader for Sri Lanka will have responsibility to lead the team in Sri Lanka and produce a quality stand alone report.

Country team leader for Indonesia will have the responsibility to lead the team in Indonesia and produce a quality stand alone report.

The country team leaders must ensure coherence with global objectives and balance it with national realities. The country team leaders must have experience in management at the senior level, as well as experience in disaster operations and evaluations. The knowledge and experience of the team leaders should encourage field operation managers to seek their advice.

To increase the learning element of the evaluation, the participating and host National Societies may provide a staff to be a member of the evaluation team. Each team will consist of maximum three persons. Team members will be selected based on:

- expertise in operation management or technical sector expertise;
- knowledge of the systems of RC/RC Movement;
- capacity to articulate lessons learnt in the context of complex network of organizations;
- experience in evaluation and preparing analytical reports; and
- good interview and interpersonal skills.

## 8. Time Schedule

The exercise will be implemented from February to mid-March 2005. The composition of the teams will be finalized by 7 February.

The team will spend the initial three days studying the reports and planning the evaluation.

The country teams will spend three to four days in Geneva to be briefed and prepare for field visits.

The country teams will spend about fifteen days in the field. Itineraries need not attempt to cover every operation site but rather to get a view of a sample of locations.

The country teams will ensure an in-country discussion of the report and incorporate comments arising from these meetings (2 days).

The country teams will be briefed and debriefed in Geneva and their report discussed by relevant department and Federation Members. (5 days)

The Geneva team will spend 5 to 6 days in the field the rest of the time will be spend on preparation, interviews, report writing, debriefing and discussion of the findings with Secretariat and Federation members.

### **9. Reporting and Feedback:**

The teams are fully responsible for their independent report, which may not necessarily reflect the views of the International Federation.

The country reports will be completed, to the extent possible, in the country and the findings and recommendations fully discussed with all concerned parties and wherever possible through consensus.

The Geneva based team leader bears responsibility for finalization of the overall report, which will be submitted to Federation's *Evaluation Department*. He/she also has an oversight responsibility for coherence and quality for the work being done by country teams.

### **10. Key Deliverables and Deadlines:**

1. Two page approach paper to this Terms of Reference after desk review and interviews in Geneva and before the start of field visits (responsibility all team leaders).
2. A preliminary country report submitted to the Geneva team leader by 25<sup>th</sup> February – not more than four pages (responsibility of country team leaders).
3. A preliminary report of key findings and conclusions which bring together country and global issues by 27<sup>th</sup> February for the 'Global Conference on RC-RC Tsunami Recovery Action'. Five page report (responsibility of Geneva-based team leader).
4. Country reports by 5<sup>th</sup> March – not more than 15 pages (responsibility of country team leaders).
5. Final report by 10<sup>th</sup> March – not more than 20 pages (responsibility of Geneva-based team leader). Letter to Federation Management from Team Leaders 10<sup>th</sup> March (all members). No restriction on contents or length.
6. Lessons learnt on methodology adaptation or methodological innovations to manage such a complex real time evaluation (one or two pages). Delivery optional for all team members.
7. Preparing a consulted real time evaluation framework for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies for this Tsunami operation (responsibility Geneva based team leader) by 15<sup>th</sup> March.

**11. Management:**

The Monitoring and Evaluation Department, International Federation Secretariat will manage the quality of reports, coordinate the circulation of draft and final reports, and preparation/ transmission of the management memo to all stakeholders; it will also ensure that comments are addressed through a consultative process.

## Annex 5 : Evaluation Framework (Draft)

### Asia: Earthquake and Tsunami Operation Evaluation Framework Monitoring and Evaluation Department

This document provides a frame to manage credible evaluations in which progress is measured, standards are verified, root causes of problems are identified, plans are checked for their relevance and implementation, and systemic problems are given recommendations for improvement.

#### Introduction<sup>49</sup>

Through the “Asia: Earthquake and Tsunami” operation, the International Federation is involved in one of the largest disaster relief, recovery and rehabilitation operation ever undertaken. The management of such substantial resources requires us to:

- a) continuously generate lessons to improve our operation,
- b) demonstrate accountability to our beneficiaries, public, partners and donors in the use of resources trusted with us.

To be effective the evaluation framework is based on the following two critical elements:

- 1) Independence: evaluations to be impartial and credible, its findings, conclusions and recommendations must be free from bias. This means that evaluations carried out by the Monitoring and Evaluation department has the independence from line management at all stages of the process including resource allocation for evaluation, formulation of terms of reference, staffing of evaluation teams, and clearance of reports. This requires a careful balance between consultation, discussion, consensus building and independence as currently being practised by the Federation Secretariat.
- 2) Transparency: all evaluation reports to be issued by the Monitoring and Evaluation Department are accessible to donors and partners and to the humanitarian community.

#### Objectives

This evaluation framework is being developed to take stock of progress in implementation of activities, identify solutions to problems and delays which arise and highlight systemic issues. It is purposively designed to:

- a) be an independent and objective basis to review performance of all operations and its process and systems;
- b) ensure active accountability in the achievement of the objectives and utilisation of resources;
- c) continuously improve operation by providing lessons from experience;
- d) satisfy donor, media and public interest that the money given is efficiently used for the purpose it is given.

---

<sup>49</sup> Information on International Federation Appeal and Programme Updates are available at [www.ifrc.org](http://www.ifrc.org)

## Evaluation Values and Guiding Principles

Evaluation and related analytical functions will make a significant contribution to the achievement of the operations goals and objectives by ensuring that evaluation and related analytical functions are:

- a) appropriate and relevant to the needs of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent and key stakeholders;
- b) implemented objectively, rigorously, independently and benchmarked to the highest professional and international standards;
- c) implemented in a collaborative and non-confrontational manner consistent with winning acceptance to the findings and recommendations by all interested parties, the host country National Society, the International Federation and donors;
- d) balanced between utilisation focus and accountability;
- e) reflective of the special position of the most vulnerable, marginalised groups; gender, and children;
- f) coherent, cooperative and complimentary in the implementation of evaluation exercises with outside agencies;
- g) quality driven.

## Scope

All objectives, sectors, activities, systems and process related to the "Asia: Earthquake and Tsunami" operation are to be covered by this evaluation system.

## Issues to be covered

- 4) Adequacy of the planning and goal setting: Where goals clearly defined? Where they realised? In retrospect, where the goals appropriate?
- 5) Speed of response: by documenting the evolution of the operation response and commenting on decisions being made. Could this operation be implemented more quickly without undue risks?
- 6) Opportunities for improving the operation response, especially in terms of management effectiveness, coordination, and relationships as per the following definitions:
  - *effectiveness*: assessment of the operations management from Geneva and field including decision making process;
  - *relationships, coordination and management*: the nature and extent of functional relationships, cooperation and exchange of information among the movement, external actors and within the Secretariat;
  - *financial management processes*: cost effectiveness of the operations, efficiency of financial processes (transfer, disbursement etc).
- 4) Relevance of resource application/utilisation and operation response, including the:
  - degree to which operation is focused on topics and problems, assigned priority by National Society and needs of most vulnerable in the affected countries;
  - relevance of the operation to individual country's demands and needs, including supplementary/complementarity to support provided by other sources;
  - extent to which the operation represents the most appropriate response from International Federation and takes advantage of RC/RC comparative advantages and strategic priorities.
- 5) The responsiveness and efficiency of the disaster operation, including the:

- extent to which Federation is able to draw on the areas of particular competence of its members;
  - cost-efficiency in producing the outputs;
  - balance of staff and non-staff resources.
- 6) The quality of disaster operation and resource utilisation (benchmarked to other major active humanitarian organisations), including the:
- participation of the beneficiaries and volunteers in programme implementation at local level;
  - satisfaction of beneficiary needs in terms of such factors as appropriateness, relevance and implementation;
  - comprehensive - in particular, the extent to which concerns including children, gender and vulnerability and poverty implications have been adequately included.
- 7) Effectiveness and impact, including the:
- extent to which operation and resource utilisation has led to improved institutional capacity of National Society;
  - degree to which assistance led to sustainable capacity and livelihood's of the affected population.
- 8) Coverage: The degree of the adequacy of planning to meet the needs in various geographical areas and sectors.
- 9) Identification of strengths and weaknesses in the International Federation operation and resource utilisation.
- 10) Compliance: did all partners comply with related agreements policy and standards such as Sphere. Aspects related to adequacy of the agreements and relevance of the policy and standards should be commented upon.
- 11) Validity of assumptions made about inputs and outcome of the operation. More specifically, were important assumptions been left out or ignored? Did the operation have any unintended side effects, social or economic effects including increase in costs?
- 12) Red Cross/Red Crescent value added in terms of principles and values, focus on most vulnerable, utilisation of local volunteers etc.

#### Performance Indicators:

The performance of the International Federation must be measured and benchmarked to other major humanitarian actors against the following indicators:

Performance Indicator	Where we stand
<b>1. Responsive and focused (vulnerability)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerability and resilience defined at all levels</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Fundamental principles and humanitarian values/Advocacy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC/RC distinguished from other organizations by its high values and principles</li> <li>• known to stand on the side of vulnerable people</li> </ul> influence other actors to change their behaviour	
<b>3. Disaster Preparedness</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recognized as leading authority and benchmarked</li> <li>• adequate resources (human and material) to respond locally</li> <li>• local volunteers and community based preparedness mechanism in place.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4. Disaster response</b></p> <p>response results in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• basic needs of affected people (food/water/shelter) met until normalcy restored</li> <li>• beneficiaries satisfied with service received</li> <li>• no food riots or long lines for relief material</li> <li>• no disease outbreak</li> <li>• normality and community life restored quickly</li> <li>• NS capacity developed</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• health in emergency -- no disease outbreak</li> <li>• other organisations know with clarity: what we do, and how we operate in an emergency situation</li> <li>• known for substantial work in health and care</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. National Society</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meets performance indicators in the areas listed above.</li> <li>• is credible, transparent, accountable</li> <li>• is known as effective</li> <li>• partner of choice of governments/intl. organizations/civil society/private sector</li> <li>• meets expectations of the public</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7. Working together effectively</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• acting as one organization determined to maximize the full potential of our global reach and resources in order to achieve greatest impact for our beneficiaries and greatest influence on other actors</li> <li>• all NSs feel equally valued and respected contributors</li> <li>• Red Cross seen as the 'Heart Beat of Humanity' and is a welcoming space for all people who wants to help or be helped, regardless of nationality, race, religion, political affiliation or any such consideration.</li> </ul>	

## Periodicity

- 1) A comprehensive real time evaluation will be conducted quarterly. It should cover all activities, sectors and countries. The teams should have sector specialists with preferably RC/RC experience and humanitarian background. The turn around period from start of the evaluation to final report including feed back on evaluation findings and conclusion should not be more than three weeks.
- 2) An annual in-depth evaluation would be conducted in the fourth quarter and serve as the mid-term evaluation.
- 3) The cycle would continue with increasing vigour and taper off towards the completion of the operation – with a final evaluation.

The real time evaluation which is to cover six countries would require four independent teams with country team leaders (this is to make sure that the results are available for action immediately). In short, the design calls for good and credible evaluations to be done simultaneously in four countries -- so that the results are available quickly to take timely management decisions/actions.

The periodic real time evaluation will have the following elements:

- 1) identify issues which operational aspects require improvements and ensure timely management feedback through a management note;
- 2) listing all the action points suggested in the previous evaluation, one by one, and seeing if suggested changes have been made;
- 3) looking if anything new, good or bad, has been uncovered by the current evaluation;
- 4) finding good things and saying WOW!

## Management

The real time evaluation will be managed independently by the Monitoring and Evaluation department. Sector departments, donors and the National Societies in the operational countries will be asked to nominate team members. A good balance of team members weighted in favour of independent external evaluators will be made, with the team leader always being an external independent consultant.

The terms of reference and team members for the evaluation would be discussed and agreed with key stakeholders.

## Reporting and dissemination of results

- a) Communication: The monitoring and evaluation department will coordinate the circulation, responses, transmission and preparation of the management memo for all evaluation exercises to all stakeholders and ensure that each comment is seriously addressed through consultation.
- b) Reporting responsibility and action for change: A key concern, which is not unique to the Federation, relates to the follow through on matters raised in evaluation exercises. It is widely recognised as a significant challenge among all actors in the humanitarian and development arena. In the case of each evaluation exercise conducted, a completion memorandum will be prepared, summarising all the recommendations made and including the proposed management response to each one. This memorandum will be discussed with the operations management and stakeholders. Follow up on the implementation of the agreed responses will be reviewed every quarter.

## Identification and selection of Consultants

Consultants, either individual or companies will be selected from the register of Consultants maintained in the Evaluation Department and open advertisement. The register is used to highlight and capture all the



potential expertise available in different sectors reflecting the breadth of International Federation operation. When an evaluation or a related analytical function is scheduled, staff will refer to the register and where possible a minimum of three consultants will be pre-selected for each sector. Consultants will be selected based on their relevant expertise and according to the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference. An invitation to tender will be sent to the three pre-selected consultants and they will be invited to submit a bid for the work giving details of their suggested approach (in less than 500 words), their time schedule, their availability and their fee expectations. The approach submitted will be considered by Federation in consultation with key stakeholders. The successful Consultant will be contacted by the Secretariat HR department and offered the contract.