

# **TEC (Tsunami Evaluation Coalition) Evaluation of Links between Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD), Phase Two**

*DRAFT Approach Paper (short version), March 18, 2007*

## **Introduction**

This paper suggests tentative approaches for the Phase Two of the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC) evaluation of linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD) in the tsunami response. It is a summarised version of a longer draft Approach Paper, which contains slightly longer lists of questions and a summary of the first LRRD support, as well as implications and arguments for a second study.

The proposal is to undertake the Phase Two evaluation in Sri Lanka, Indonesia and the Maldives. Four themes and related sets of overall questions are proposed for structuring the evaluation. In addition, questions of specific relevance to the three countries are presented. Suggestions are also presented of how the evaluation can complement other analytical efforts that have developed since the Phase One study. This involves learning from the emerging findings from national reports and international initiatives, and paying particular attention to how to ensure synergy with the Tsunami Recovery Impact Assessment and Monitoring System (TRIAMS).

The evaluation carried out by the TEC was the largest humanitarian evaluation ever undertaken. The conclusions of various reports from the TEC evaluation, and particularly the LRRD part, showed serious concerns that the developmental aims of the response were not likely to be achieved. However, the timeframe for the TEC studies, conducted less than one year after the tsunami, made it impossible to verify if this was indeed the case. This suggests a responsibility to return with further analysis in order to ask whether these concerns reflected a valid critique of the ultimate results of the response. Especially since one of the objectives of TEC evaluation was learning, it is essential that additional analysis be undertaken to see if such learning has occurred.

## **Proposed structure for LRRD Phase Two**

The efforts of the international aid community are currently shifting away from leading the response to the tsunami to that of supporting national and local recovery efforts. This shift of roles shall be clearly reflected in the LRRD Phase Two evaluation. Although it is the aid effort that shall be evaluated, the evaluation should consider the aid response in the perspective of the wider trends that have driven recovery, including household, community and government initiatives and the wider economic and market related context. The evaluation should clearly reflect the combined efforts by local, national and international actors and acknowledge that external aid can only provide a supporting function to the recovery efforts of disaster affected people and countries themselves.

The four proposed themes are:

- A. The return of the state and civil society
- B. Poverty, livelihoods and economic recovery
- C. Rebuilding the social fabric and community development
- D. Reduction of risks from natural hazards and conflict

## **Tentative lists of questions**

The following sets of questions that are proposed in order to capture the relevance and effectiveness of aid within the context of national and local response.

## Suggested thematic questions

### A. *The return of the state and civil society:*

- a) To what extent have state and civil society institutions regained their capacity to lead recovery, development and risk reduction?
- b) Have aid agencies transformed their roles from that of implementer to one of support and facilitation? What can be learned from this experience?
- c) To what extent has accurate information on reconstruction plans reached affected communities and has this provided the basis for genuine decision-making at local level? Have effective mechanisms been put into place through which households can present concerns and complaints about aid programmes?
- d) What lessons can be drawn from comparison of the three very different experiences of Indonesia, Sri Lanka and the Maldives with regard to decentralisation and subsidiarity?
- e) To what extent have aid interventions effectively supported the restoration of public service institutions (including their human resource capacity where this was depleted). Has assistance recognised limitations on sustainable public expenditure?
- f) To what extent has support to the reconstruction of infrastructure such as schools and health facilities been matched by appropriate attention to human resource and institutional constraints?
- g) How has the reconstruction effort addressed pre-tsunami deficiencies in basic services, including water and sanitation and solid waste management in particular?
- h) How do national and local state and civil society actors perceive the relevance and impact of the 'capacity building' efforts so far of the aid community? What say have they had in how this has been planned and implemented?
- i) Has the tsunami response become more related to the 'harmonisation and alignment' agenda agreed upon by donors in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness? How has the nature of the relationships between aid agencies and state and civil society institutions changed over time?

### B. *Poverty, livelihoods and economic recovery:*

- a) How have economic actors, from farming households to international enterprises, revived and reassessed their activities after the tsunami, and what has been the role of aid in contributing to this process?
- b) What is the relative importance of external aid in livelihood support and economic development, as compared to locally generated investment resources and remittances?
- c) To what extent have livelihood efforts recognised the differing livelihood circumstances and opportunities of men and women and of groups with different needs and capabilities?
- d) To what extent has the disaster created chronic poverty. Has recovery programming recognised such risks and attempted to address them??
- e) To what extent has recovery programming been realistic and aware of the different approaches needed to address short term transient poverty versus more chronic poverty?
- f) To what extent has there been an integration of recovery efforts with national policies to promote pro-poor growth and consolidate social protection?

### C. *Rebuilding the social fabric and community development:*

- a) How have communities which have been shattered by the tsunami rebuilt their internal relations, and what role has community development assistance played in this process?
- b) To what extent have housing and reconstruction programmes resulted in functional communities with access to basic infrastructure, services and livelihood?
- c) How have the micro-politics of local social relations encouraged or hindered recovery, and to what extent have aid efforts taken such factors into account?
- d) To what extent has reconstruction taken into account the varied structural nature of social and economic exclusion in the affected areas, and attempted to reverse patterns of social exclusion?

- e) Has information flow improved since the early phases of the tsunami response and to what extent has this generated better ways of engaging disaster affected people and communities in the reconstruction process?
- f) How have the relationships between aid agencies and local communities evolved since the initial response?

D. *Reduction of risks from natural hazards and conflict:*

- a) How have the preceding three sets of factors increased or reduced the risks of future natural disasters or conflicts?
- b) Did the tsunami create a ‘window-of-opportunity’ for increased attention to risk reduction?
- c) Has attention to risk reduction been sustained or has the memory of the disaster risks faded from the agenda in the face of other, competing priorities?
- d) Did pressures for rapid reconstruction and disagreements over land use planning discourage attention to underlying risks of negative environmental impacts, conflict and natural hazards?
- e) Which actors have ‘championed’ risk reduction issues over time? What lessons can be drawn regarding how to sustain risk reduction efforts?
- f) How have regional and international initiatives to promote disaster risk reduction impacted on national policies and local institutions?
- g) What shows experience so far about the objectives to ‘build back better’?

Suggested country-specific questions

In addition to these four sets of overall questions, there are specific issues that should be addressed in the analysis of the three countries that should be part of the evaluation.

*Particular issues to be reviewed in Sri Lanka*

- Has the renewed conflict resulted in a more consolidated approach to reconstruction and risk reduction or are the conflict and natural disaster issues being treated separately?
- How have agencies addressed the needs of the chronically poor living in close proximity to tsunami and conflict affected populations?
- In retrospect, how did initial confusion and disagreements over buffer zones and related land issues impact on the reconstruction process?
- To what extent have newly strengthened national disaster risk reduction institutions been effectively supported and engaged in the tsunami recovery process?
- Have other emerging issues and priorities overshadowed the tsunami response, and what have been the implications of the wider socio-economic and political processes on tsunami reconstruction (especially changes and set-backs in the creation of coordination structures)?
- How have earlier concerns about politically related inequity in reconstruction priorities and a preference for easily accessible areas been addressed by the government and by the aid community?
- 

*Particular issues to be reviewed in Indonesia*

- How has the decentralisation process in Indonesia affected the reconstruction effort and has reconstruction supported the consolidation of effective decentralised governmental structures?
- How have aid agencies worked to ensure synergy with emerging political change and the peace and reconciliation process in Aceh?
- To what extent have aid agencies shown evidence of a process of learning about the unique socio-cultural values in Indonesia?

- How have aid agencies encouraged and supported the increasing ownership of the reconstruction process by the Aceh and Nias Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency (BRR) and can this be attributed to the Multi Donor Fund for Aceh and Nias?
- How have efforts reconciled demands for reconstruction of coastal communities and livelihoods with disaster risk reduction objectives that would seem to discourage activities such as fish farming?
- What lessons can be drawn from the 2006 floods in Aceh regarding the quality and appropriateness of the tsunami reconstruction and risk reduction process?
- How have aid agencies worked with the government to address challenges of land titling, support to local contractors and minimising negative environmental impacts while also responding to concerns about the slow pace of reconstruction?
- 

#### *Particular issues to be reviewed in the Maldives*

- How have aid efforts reflected attention to the issues raised by the precipitous drop in public revenues after the tsunami?
- How have aid efforts addressed the lack of human and institutional resources on isolated individual islands in reconstruction efforts (e.g., for managing new solid waste and desalination infrastructure)?
- How have land issues been addressed during reconstruction in a country with such restricted land area and where government policy aims to concentrate the population on a limited number of islands?
- Given a context with a very rapid economic growth rate but also very high risks due to climate change, demands by the youth and other factors, have the Maldives found ways to learn from the tsunami response in design of future social protection systems?
- How have agencies developed local partnerships in light of the limited civil society present and concerns about the democratic process?
- To what extent have livelihood programmes taken into account the highly specialised nature of an economy dependent on tourism and commercial fisheries?
- To what extent have aid priorities reflected the most pressing needs of economic reconstruction (e.g., of small island port facilities)?
- 

### **Complementary tsunami-related reviews and monitoring efforts**

In December 2006 a number of reports were issued by national agencies as well as a range of individual aid agencies and networks. The UN Office of the Special Envoy for Tsunami Recovery and the Global Consortium for Tsunami-Affected Countries (OSE) presented the report “Lessons Learned from Tsunami Recovery: Key Propositions for Building Back Better”<sup>1</sup> which summarises well the overall direction and experience of the response. These reports and recommendation contain a wealth of information and analysis that was unavailable during TEC/LRRD Phase One. These reports are useful, but the emphasis on the activities of the specific actors and the relationships with chosen beneficiaries means that they inevitably lack the wide overview that the TEC has striven to present. It is therefore likely that synergies can be found between LRRD Phase Two and agency reporting.

The largest initiative planned for *ongoing* monitoring and analysis of the tsunami recovery process in the coming years is TRIAMS. At this point the tsunami affected countries have committed themselves to collecting and analysing data on the tsunami response based on a flexible set of basic indicators. Productive discussions have been held regarding how to best mobilise and coordinate TRIAMS efforts and the concerned countries are collating initial reports. TRIAMS will provide important data and analyses, but it will require time, and the challenges of achieving regional inter-governmental consensus may in some way limit the depth of cross-country analysis. TRIAMS will generate important information in the long-term, but will be primarily focused on quantitative data collection and will probably not be fully operational for some time. Also, TRIAMS will focus on national outputs and impacts, but will not highlight the quality of aid response. A proactive dialogue between

TRIAMS and the Phase Two evaluators can provide valuable insights into strategic issues and ensure that additional data collection efforts may contribute to the relevance and usefulness of TRIAMS' findings.

Despite what might seem like a plethora of reports and initiatives, there is a notable lack of independent and empirically based evaluation of LRRD in the tsunami response. Phase One of the TEC/LRRD was acknowledged as having been conducted too early to draw firm conclusions regarding the ultimate results of the aid response. The findings provide a solid baseline for the Phase Two evaluation.

A number of second year reports are available, and will provide very useful material for the evaluators, but these do not provide cross-country overviews and for the most part do not constitute independent assessment. The OSE's ten key propositions for building back better constitute an important guide for future analysis, but verification is needed as to whether or not these lessons have indeed been learnt.

All of these conclusions highlight how important it is for the LRRD Phase Two to clearly identify and concentrate on where it can provide added value to other evaluations, studies and reports. There is a distinct need to undertake a second LRRD evaluation in order to:

- Follow-up on the preliminary findings of Phase One;
- Present a timely and independent overview of LRRD in the tsunami response;
- Draw cross-country comparisons;
- Document whether the 'lessons' of the tsunami response have indeed been learnt;
- Summarise the experience of the most intensive period of post-tsunami reconstruction; and
- Provide a milestone study by which to help guide the focus of TRIAMS in the coming years.

---

<sup>i</sup> [www.tsunamispecialenvoy.org/pdf/SELLR\\_122506.pdf](http://www.tsunamispecialenvoy.org/pdf/SELLR_122506.pdf)