



**United Nations
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)**

**Multi-donor Voluntary Trust Fund on
Tsunami Early Warning Arrangements in the
Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia**

**Evaluative Review 2008
Final Report**

Prepared by Mr. Philip Hall
Consultant

31 October 2008

Commissioned by
ESCAP Programme Management Division

This report can be found on the Trust Fund web site at:
www.unescap.org/pmd/tsunami_index.asp

ESCAP INDIAN OCEAN AND SOUTH-EAST ASIAN COUNTRIES



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ESCAP INDIAN OCEAN AND SOUTH-EAST ASIAN COUNTRIES	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	3
LIST OF ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS & GLOSSARY	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE.....	8
1. INTRODUCTION	16
1.1 Background.....	16
1.2 Purpose.....	17
1.3 Objective.....	17
1.4 Outputs.....	17
1.5 Scope.....	17
1.6 Target Audience.....	18
1.7 Governance	18
2. METHODOLOGY	19
2.1 Component 1 – Development of a Review Work Plan and Indicators	19
2.1.1 Focus	19
2.1.2 Approach.....	20
2.2 Component 2 – Stakeholder Questionnaire	21
2.2.1 Focus	21
2.2.2 Approach.....	21
2.3 Component 3 – Consultation with Key Stakeholders	22
2.3.1 Focus	22
2.3.2 Approach.....	22
2.4 Component 4 – Independent Evaluative Review	22
2.4.1 Focus	23
2.4.2 Approach.....	23
2.5 Component 5 – Review 2009.....	24
2.5.1 Focus	24
2.5.2 Approach.....	24
3. RESULTS, ANALYSIS & FINDINGS.....	25
3.1 Component 1 – Development of a Review Work Plan and Indicators	25
3.2 Component 2 – Stakeholder Questionnaire	25
3.3 Component 3 – Consultation with Key Stakeholders	26
3.4 Component 4 – Independent Evaluative Review	27
3.4.1 Governance Structure	27
3.4.2 Review and Appraisal Process.....	29
3.4.3 Administration and Management.....	31
3.4.4 Stakeholder Perceptions.....	32
3.4.5 Usability of Guidelines and Templates.....	34
3.4.6 Fundraising Efforts	37
3.4.7 Quality of Reports.....	38
3.4.8 Partnership Arrangements.....	40
3.4.9 Sustainability Measures	40
3.4.10 Adequacy to Address Adverse Impacts	42
3.5 Component 5 – Review 2009.....	43
4. CONCLUSIONS.....	44

5. RECOMMENDATIONS	46
ANNEXES	48
Annex A – Terms of Reference	48
Annex B – Performance Targets and Indicators	48
Annex C – Programme of Interviews (Bangkok, 5-9 May 2008).....	48
Annex D – Stakeholder Questionnaire	48
Annex E – List of Questionnaire Recipients	48
Annex F – Guidelines for Completing the Grant Application Form (Markup).....	48
Annex G – List of Documents Reviewed	48

LIST OF ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS & GLOSSARY

ADPC	Asian Disaster Preparedness Center
ADRC	Asian Disaster Reduction Center
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
EWS	Early Warning Systems
ICG	Intergovernmental Coordination Group
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission
IOTWS	Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning and Mitigation System
ISDR	International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non Government Organization
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OECD DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development / Development Assistance Committee
PMD	Programme Management Division, ESCAP
PTWS	Pacific Tsunami Warning System
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
TEWS	Tsunami Early Warning System
ToR	Review Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USD	United States Dollar
WMO	World Meteorological Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *Multi-donor Voluntary Trust Fund on Tsunami Early Warning Arrangements in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia* was established by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) in 2005, following the destructive Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in December 2004. The Fund is administered by ESCAP and covers ESCAP member countries of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia. As of December 2007 the Fund had received contributions of approximately USD12.5 million and has provided USD5.5 million in programme funding for activities carried out by five organizations.

In December 2007, the Fund's Advisory Council adopted a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework that provides for an annual evaluation of the Fund as well as monitoring and evaluation of the specific projects it supports. This Evaluative Review, commissioned by ESCAP in March 2008, is the first annual evaluation of the Fund. Its primary focus is to examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the Fund, with the aim of improving the quality of the Fund's future work.

The Review was conducted in accordance with the Review Terms of Reference (ToR) by a consultant¹ engaged by ESCAP. It consisted predominantly of an independent desk review and a questionnaire survey, together with interviews in Bangkok with selected stakeholders in the Fund (in particular, donors and national governments). The questionnaire was sent to ESCAP members and OECD DAC members with representation in Bangkok and was used as the general structure for the stakeholder interviews. The findings of the Review, documented in this Evaluative Review 2008 Report, will be used by ESCAP to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund.

The scope of the Review, as specified in the ToR, consisted of five main components; (1) development of a review work plan and indicators; (2) development and dissemination of a stakeholder questionnaire; (3) consultation with stakeholders; (4) an independent evaluative review; and (5) development of targets and indicators for a comprehensive review of the Fund to be carried out in 2009. The methodology adopted for the Review, therefore, was to address each component independently and simultaneously, and to draw the findings of the components together in the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Review Report. This strategy also recognised that each component might require a different approach to achieve its contribution to the overarching objective of the Review.

Conclusions

The Stakeholder Questionnaire, while poorly subscribed, provided a logical framework for the consultations with stakeholders. As a result, the consultant received valuable input from the in-person interviews.

The stakeholder consultations and independent desk review determined that the Fund is being well governed and managed by ESCAP, and is successfully working with partners through established relationships. The general consensus among stakeholders is that the reports produced by the Fund are useful resources, and that the Mapping Study report in particular makes a useful contribution to the discussion on tsunami warning capabilities in the region.

¹ Mr. Philip Hall, who is a Visiting Professor at The University of the South Pacific, and has experience working with the Australian Tsunami Warning System Project.

The Review, however, identified two central issues that require early attention if the Fund is to achieve its program objectives and meet the expectations of its partners and key stakeholders. These are:

- (1) The Fund suffers from the lack of a strategic direction. The perception among stakeholders is that the Fund is outdated and suffers from the lack of a strategic direction. This is considered to be the primary reason why the Fund has not attracted new major donors.
- (2) The Fund suffers from the absence of a stakeholder engagement strategy. The root cause of most, if not all, of the secondary issues identified by the Review is the absence of an effective stakeholder engagement and communication strategy.

The lack of a strategic direction and the absence of an effective stakeholder engagement strategy indicate that ESCAP has adopted an *administration focus* rather than a *business focus* in its management of the Fund. This explains, in part, current perceptions in the region that the Fund is outdated, is too narrow in scope, difficult to access, and has a finite life of only a few more years.

Recommendations

The Evaluative Review 2008 has produced a set of 16 recommendations. The five primary recommendations are:

- (1) The Fund develops a strategic vision and plan as soon as possible. Interviewees were almost unanimous that this was needed to attract new funding – donors will need more clarity on what their funds will be used for. There was also a perception from some donors that the Fund was planned as a short-term mechanism, which a strategic vision and plan would help to address.
- (2) The Fund’s scope is broadened to focus on overall disaster risk reduction. As a technical matter, it is most effective to address the tsunami threat in a multi-hazard context and, similarly, early warning systems have to be developed in an overall disaster management and development context. As a practical matter, stakeholders noted that donor funding specifically for tsunami work is drying up and a “Tsunami Trust Fund” will face a challenge attracting fresh contributions at this stage.
- (3) The Fund focuses more on downstream work like “community resilience”. There are greater needs in these areas, the cost of projects is lower and there is a greater chance of sustainability.
- (4) Further streamlining of the appraisal process continues to be actively considered. Many stakeholders, especially those representing smaller countries, felt the process was too difficult although few specific suggestions were made on how to improve it. Two ideas aimed at lower-capacity countries, however, are to consider a “fast track” process for small grants, or to provide assistance to NGOs that can assist low-capacity countries in proposal development.
- (5) The Fund needs to be more proactive and consistent in engaging with stakeholders and managing their expectations. A stakeholder engagement and communications strategy needs to be developed. That way, key stakeholders would be kept informed about the Fund and how it works, how to apply or partner, and what the Fund’s strategic vision is.

<p>2. It is recommended that the long-term strategy of the Fund be focused on overall disaster risk reduction. The tsunami threat must be considered in a multi-hazard context, and similarly, EWS must be developed in an overall disaster management/development context. In the preliminary stage, however, it is more realistic and practical for the Fund to promote an overall multi-hazard approach by focusing on a few natural hazards common to and more prevalent in the region, i.e., tropical cyclones and floods as well as tsunami.</p>	<p>We agree. At the recent meeting of the Advisory Council, ESCAP and the key donors agreed to consider a proposal to broaden the scope of the Fund for a focus on overall disaster risk reduction. Even at present, the agreed Fund Policy states that “As the principles of disaster preparedness and prevention can be applied to relatively low frequency events such as tsunamis but also to other natural disasters, a multi-hazard scope of projects will be considered”, and most of the approved projects are not tsunami-specific.</p>	<p>Submit a formal proposal to the key donors to broaden the scope of the Fund for a focus on overall disaster risk reduction and rename the Fund as an “ESCAP Multi-Donor Trust Fund on Tsunami, Disaster and Climate Preparedness” (through revised Terms and Conditions of the Fund).</p>	<p>PMD</p>	<p>Done (October 2008).</p>
<p>3. It is recommended that the Fund Advisory Council determine a Strategic Vision and commission the development of a Strategic Plan for the Fund as soon as possible. The Strategic Vision should be reviewed biennially and updated as required to ensure it remains relevant to the evolving needs of the Region. The Strategic Plan should be completed by mid-2009, and then reviewed and updated biennially to</p>	<p>We agree the Fund’s vision should be reviewed, updated, and possibly refined. The Fund’s strategic vision is currently reflected in the Fund Objectives and Policy. At present, the vision provides for support to a broad range of activities in support of end-to-end tsunami warning arrangements without limiting proposals to a narrow area of priority that the Fund has selected. Developing a Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Propose the Advisory Council review the strategic vision of the Fund and consider development of a Strategic Plan.</p>	<p>PMD</p>	<p>January 2009</p>

<p>ensure it remains relevant to and addresses changes in regional priorities that are consistent with achieving the Strategic Vision.</p>	<p>may have a number of advantages, as described in the report, but may also have implications on Fund management costs and may limit the range of activities the Fund can support. This should be carefully considered. Whatever approach the Fund adopts for its strategic vision, we agree it should be communicated consistently to stakeholders (see recommendation 7).</p>			
<p>4. It is recommended that the review and appraisal process be extended to provide a 'fast-track' process to cater for small grant proposals by individual countries and NGOs, and that ESCAP actively promote this modality to eligible countries and agencies. Clear guidelines, including a clear definition of "small grant proposal", are needed to ensure that this facility is provided and administered on a fair and equitable basis.</p>	<p>This proposal should be considered carefully by the Fund's Advisory Council, based on its strategic vision for the Fund. At present, the Fund has not been set up primarily with small grants in mind. A reduction in the average proposal size would almost certainly have cost implications. As an extreme example, an average proposal size of US\$ 10,000 would result in a portfolio of 1,300 projects, whereas the Fund provides only for a single Programme Officer to provide monitoring and evaluation oversight of the portfolio. Funding decisions are currently made at biannual Advisory Council meetings with ESCAP and the key donors, so a fast track process would also require a greater frequency of meetings, a "remote" decision-making process, and/or a delegation of authority to the Fund Secretariat for certain proposals.</p>	<p>Raise this issue with the Fund's Advisory Council, as part of discussions on the Fund's strategic vision.</p>	<p>PMD</p>	<p>January 2009</p>
<p>5. It is recommended that ESCAP</p>	<p>We agree. In the past, ESCAP has</p>	<p>Raise this issue</p>	<p>PMD</p>	<p>January</p>

<p>explore ways in which it can assist low capacity countries to develop quality proposals consistent with the aims and objectives of the Strategic Plan.</p>	<p>organized technical assistance (in partnership with UNDP) to countries that have submitted proposals that the Advisory Council has expressed interest to fund, subject to revisions. Capacity development in project design and implementation for priority groups of stakeholders could be considered. Since this may be needed on a relatively large scale to have an impact on national capacities, this should be considered carefully as part of development of an overall Strategic Plan for the Fund. Another alternative may be to promote further synergies with other organizations that are providing capacity building in project implementation and proposal development. Yet another alternative, which is already being adopted by certain projects supported by the Fund, is joint submission of proposals by national governments and international organizations; this approach could be further encouraged.</p>	<p>with the Fund's Advisory Council, as part of discussions on the Fund's Strategic Plan.</p>		<p>2009</p>
<p>6. It is recommended that the composition of the Inter-Divisional Task Force have a broader representation of UN agencies. Instead of solely consisting of ESCAP representatives, a more appropriate model would be one representative each from ESCAP (Chair), UNDP and ISDR, with</p>	<p>We agree that other UN agencies should be represented in the Task Force. To continue to take advantage of ESCAP's multi-disciplinary expertise in relevant areas such as social affairs and environment, we feel the Task Force should continue to include several representatives from ESCAP.</p>	<p>Seek agreement by the Fund's Advisory Council on a new composition for the Task Force</p>	<p>PMD</p>	<p>January 2009</p>

secretariat support provided by ESCAP PMD.				
7. It is recommended that ESCAP commission development and implementation of a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan to ensure that it is more proactive and consistent in how it engages with stakeholders and manages their expectations, particularly local communities in disaster-prone areas. The Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan should clearly define who the Fund stakeholders are, how ESCAP engages with them, and what information ESCAP should be communicating to them and when. The Plan should be reviewed and updated annually.	We agree. A draft Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan is currently under preparation and will be submitted to the Advisory Council for consideration. It should be continuously reviewed and updated as required (e.g., in response to a change in the Fund name/Terms and Conditions, and other changes in communications priorities).	Develop Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan	PMD	January 2009
8. It is recommended that ESCAP consider convening a summit of key stakeholders of the Fund (current and potential partners and beneficiaries) to address their perceptions and to establish a mandate for action and change.	We agree that ESCAP should address stakeholder perceptions through development and implementation of a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan (see recommendation 7 above), including reporting on the Fund to annual sessions of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, and presentations on the Fund in other high-level bodies. Through taking advantage of the above opportunities, we feel that a dedicated summit on the Fund may not be necessary.	In addition to the ongoing reporting to annual ESCAP sessions, present the Fund at a high-level meeting of key stakeholders in 2009, if consistent with the Fund's Communication Plan.	PMD	December 2009

<p>9. It is recommended that ESCAP consult with low capacity countries and obtain their input into how the guidelines and templates could be improved. ESCAP may wish to consider the suggestions provided by the Consultant in section 3.4.5 and Annex F of this Report as a starting point.</p>	<p>ESCAP agrees that regular feedback from stakeholders, including low capacity countries, should be sought on the Fund documents and how they can be improved. The guidelines will be revised in line with suggestions provided in section 3.4.5, although the revision will need to be consistent with documents such as the Fund Policy and Eligibility Criteria that have been approved by the Advisory Council.</p> <p>In addition to review of guidelines and templates, we note that further assistance to governments and other implementing partners in the substance of designing and developing projects should be considered (see recommendations 5 and 6 above).</p>	<p>Seek feedback from low capacity countries on how Fund documents can be improved on an ongoing basis, and within the framework of the next Fund evaluation.</p>	<p>PMD</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>10. It is strongly recommended that, in initiating any new fundraising activities, ESCAP give urgent consideration to the feedback obtained from consultations with stakeholders during the Review process.</p>	<p>We agree. The feedback should be addressed in the Fund's Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan and taken into account in new fundraising activities.</p>	<p>Incorporate feedback from stakeholders in the Fund Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan.</p>	<p>PMD</p>	<p>January 2009</p>
<p>11. It is recommended that the Mapping Study be updated annually and that its scope be widened to provide visibility of what other work is being done internationally on tsunami early</p>	<p>We agree. Periodic updating of the Mapping Study, taking into account new developments, was always envisaged by ESCAP. Updates will provide visibility of work that is being</p>	<p>Update the Mapping Study periodically. Increase the multi-hazard</p>	<p>PMD</p>	<p>June 2009</p>

warning systems and their integration into an all-hazards approach.	done by a range of actors on early warning systems (e.g., Standard Operating Procedures). The first update will also increase the focus of the mapping study on “multi-hazard” issues like institutional arrangements for disaster risk reduction, as well as the “last mile” (community preparedness and response).	focus of the Study and provide visibility of work being done by a range of actors.		
12. It is recommended that the Mapping Study address the need for a global network design of seismic and sea level gauges to support a regional TEWS in the Indian Ocean.	We feel this is within the purview of UNESCO’s Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), which coordinates the establishment of tsunami early warning systems in the respective ocean basins.	ESCAP will take up the matter with IOC-UNESCO in the context of the Mapping Study update.	PMD	November 2008
13. It is recommended that the approved set performance indicators for Sustainability be made available on the Fund’s website as part of the Guideline information for completing the Grant Application Form.	ESCAP agrees that the guidelines on completing the grant application form should be updated based on input provided in the evaluative review (e.g., suggestions in section 3.4.5, and the set performance indicators developed in Annex F of this review). The update will include additional guidance on sustainability.	Incorporate additional guidance on sustainability in the guidelines for completing the grants application form.	PMD	February 2009
14. It is recommended that the approved set performance indicators for Measures to Address Adverse Impacts be made available on the Fund’s website as part of the Guideline information for completing the Grant Application Form	ESCAP agrees that the guidelines on completing the grant application form should be updated based on input provided in the evaluative review (e.g., suggestions in section 3.4.5, and the set performance indicators developed in Annex F of this review). The update will include additional guidance on how	Incorporate additional guidance on addressing adverse impacts in the guidelines for completing the grants	PMD	February 2009

	projects can plan for and address environmental, social and other potential impacts of their projects.	application form.		
15. It is recommended that Annex B (unpopulated) form the basis of a template for future Fund and project evaluations and that it be incorporated within the Fund M&E Framework.	We agree.	Incorporate Annex B (unpopulated) within the Fund Monitoring and Evaluation Framework	PMD	January 2009
16. It is recommended that Annex B (populated) from the 2008 Evaluative Review form a performance baseline against which the 2009 triennial evaluation is conducted.	We agree, although given the scope of the present evaluative review, we feel it may not be necessary to conduct another comprehensive Fund evaluation until 2010. Subsequent evaluations will also assess the continued relevance of the recommendations from this 2008 evaluation.	Use Annex B (populated) as a baseline for the next Fund evaluation.	PMD	2010

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) established the *Multi-donor Voluntary Trust Fund on Tsunami Early Warning Arrangements in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia* (hereinafter referred to as “the Fund”), in 2005, following the destructive Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred on 26 December 2004. To date the Fund has received contributions of approximately USD12.5 million, including USD10 million from the Government of Thailand and USD2.5 million from the Government of Sweden as well as contributions from the Governments of Nepal and Turkey. The Fund is administered by ESCAP and covers ESCAP member countries of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia, from Iran to Indonesia.

The Fund contributes to the overall United Nations response to the development of a regional tsunami early warning system (TEWS) and disaster preparedness capabilities by narrowing the capacity gaps in the region and ensuring development of an integrated regional early warning capability based on adequate resources. The Fund is demand-driven and works on the basis of competitive rounds of funding in which proposals are received and reviewed by a technical appraisal Task Force.

The main decision making body of the Fund is an Advisory Council, consisting of representatives from ESCAP and the Fund’s key donors. The Fund is also managed in close partnership with other United Nations organizations, which appraise new proposals, attend Advisory Council meetings as observers, and participated in developing a Mapping Study on Gaps and Unmet Needs in Tsunami Early Warning Systems². As of 31 December 2007, approximately USD5.5 million of the Fund’s resources had been programmed for activities carried out by five organizations.

Through these projects, the Fund is supporting key areas such as development of tsunami advisory services, warning dissemination at the regional and national levels, and capacity building in Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and related tools. Activities implemented by grants recipients in 2007 included installation and upgrading of sea level stations in South-East Asia, preparations for a regional tsunami warning centre, and training-of-trainers activities on community based hazard mapping.

Commission resolution 62/7 of 12 April 2006 requested the Executive Secretary to ensure that the Fund was administered efficiently, effectively and transparently, in accordance with the Fund's terms and conditions and objectives. In December 2007, the Fund's Advisory Council adopted a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework³ that builds upon the principles and follows the guidance available in existing M&E frameworks within the United Nations. Among other things, the M&E Framework provides for an annual evaluation of the Fund.

ESCAP has retained a consultant, Mr Philip Hall⁴, to conduct an evaluative review of the Fund in 2008 (hereinafter referred to as “the Review”).

² This report is available on the Trust Fund’s Web site at www.unescap.org/pmd/tsunami_index.asp

³ UNESCAP Monitoring & Evaluation Framework for the *Multi-Donor Voluntary Trust Fund on Tsunami Early Warning Arrangements in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia*, 17 December 2007.

⁴ Mr. Hall is a Visiting Professor at the Pacific Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development (PACE-SD), Faculty of Islands and Oceans, at The University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji Islands, and has experience working with the Australian Tsunami Warning System Project.

1.2 Purpose

Regular evaluative reviews of the Fund are essential in order to measure and assess the performance of the Fund overall as well as individual projects supported by the Fund, to learn from findings and experiences, and to decide on what actions to take to achieve better results.

The findings of the Review will be used by ESCAP to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund.

1.3 Objective

The objective is for the consultant, in consultation with ESCAP, to carry out a three-week desk evaluation of the Fund to identify recommendations for improvement in the Fund in the areas identified in the Review Terms of Reference (ToR), a copy of which is provided at Annex A.

1.4 Outputs

The outputs of the Review, as required by the ToR, are:

1. Refined Terms of Reference and methodology for the evaluation, draft survey questionnaire(s) submitted to ESCAP by 31 March 2008 for approval.
2. Draft Review report submitted to ESCAP by 14 May 2008 for review and comment.
3. Final Review report (addressing comments received from ESCAP), submitted to ESCAP by 20 June 2008 for acceptance.

1.5 Scope

The scope of the Review consists predominantly of a questionnaire survey and desk review, together with bilateral meetings with selected stakeholders in the Fund (in particular, donors and national governments). These activities fall into five main components as specified in the ToR:

1. Development of a work plan for the Review, including further development of the M&E methodology as well as specific qualitative and quantitative indicators against which the substantive and administrative performance of the Fund could be monitored and evaluated.
2. Design of a questionnaire, which could be transmitted to partners and stakeholders of the Fund to seek their comments on the performance of the Fund and their views on how this could be improved.
3. Consultation with key stakeholders.
4. Conduct an independent evaluative review of the Fund, addressing the following areas and providing recommendations for improvement;
 - a. Efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund's governance structure;
 - b. Efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund's process for review and appraisal of proposals;
 - c. Efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund's administration and management;
 - d. Stakeholder perceptions on the performance of the Fund;
 - e. Usability and completeness of the Fund's guidelines and templates;
 - f. Effectiveness of fundraising efforts conducted;

- g. Quality of Fund reports produced, in particular the Mapping Study on Gaps and Unmet Needs in Regional Tsunami Early Warning Systems;
 - h. Effectiveness of the Fund's Partnership arrangements;
 - i. Effectiveness of the Fund's sustainability measures; and
 - j. Adequacy of measures to address potentially adverse impacts (e.g., social and environmental impacts), as well as gender mainstreaming.
5. Development of qualitative and quantitative targets and indicators for a comprehensive the review of the Fund to be carried out in 2009.

The strategy adopted to address these components and the evaluation questions are presented in Section 2, Methodology.

1.6 Target Audience

The findings of the Review will be shared with Advisory Council members, and may be disseminated to other stakeholders.

1.7 Governance

The Review was conducted in accordance with the ToR by the consultant under the supervision of the Chief, Technical Cooperation Section, Programme Management Division (PMD), ESCAP, and under the direct supervision of the Programme Officer for the Tsunami Regional Trust Fund.

2. METHODOLOGY

The following factors were considered in determining an appropriate methodology for undertaking the Review:

1. The scope of the Review (as mentioned in Section 1) consists predominantly of a questionnaire survey and desk review, together with bilateral meetings with selected stakeholders in the Fund;
2. The scope activities fall into five main components as specified in the ToR;
3. The timeframe allowed for the consultant to conduct the Review, also as specified in the ToR, was three weeks work over a period of three months (i.e. 25 March to 30 June 2008);
4. The first deliverables (a refined ToR and methodology for the evaluation, and a draft survey questionnaire) was due to be submitted to ESCAP one week after commencement of the Review (i.e. by 31 March 2008);
5. Recipients of the questionnaire would be asked to provide responses by 9 May 2008;
6. Consultations with key stakeholders were scheduled to be held in Bangkok, Thailand, in the week 5 – 9 May 2008; and
7. The second deliverable (a Draft Review Report) was due to be submitted to ESCAP by 14 May 2008.

The methodology adopted for the Review was, therefore, to address each component independently and simultaneously, and to draw the findings of the components together in the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Draft Review Report. This strategy also recognised that each component might require a different approach to achieve its contribution to the overarching objective of the Review. The approach taken for each component is explained in following sub-sections.

2.1 Component 1 – Development of a Review Work Plan and Indicators

“Development of a work plan for the Review, including further development of the M&E methodology as well as specific qualitative and quantitative indicators against which the substantive and administrative performance of the Fund could be monitored and evaluated.”

2.1.1 Focus

The Review must focus on the overall Fund and how its activities and the project initiatives it sponsors contribute to the development and implementation of end-to-end tsunami early warning capabilities in the ESCAP member countries, and how these capabilities contribute to the development and operation of an overall Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning and Mitigation System (IOTWS). While it is vitally important that these capabilities are sustainable in the medium to long term, it is equally important that the performance indicators against which these capabilities are measured are realistic and practical for the current time.

While there is considerable emphasis being placed on the scientific and technical (*upstream*) capabilities of tsunami early warning systems to detect and monitor an event, and issue the warning as quickly as possible after confirming an event, it is also important to develop the non-scientific and non-technical (*downstream*) capabilities required to deal with the event. Community awareness, preparedness and the ability for disaster and emergency managers to

manage the response to an event (whether a warning has been issued or not) are as equally important in an effective end-to-end early warning capability as the ability of scientists to detect and monitor an event.

2.1.2 Approach

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Review were refined through consultation between the Consultant and the ESCAP Programme Officer for the Fund. The ToR, a copy of which is provided at Annex A, specified the work plan for the Review in terms of scope, methodology, deliverables and milestones.

The scope of the work plan was designed to cover all the facets of the Fund while contributing to the further development of the M&E methodology. The work plan, therefore, would address:

1. Development of specific qualitative and quantitative targets and indicators against which the substantive and administrative performance of the Fund could be monitored and evaluated, both for this Review and for a comprehensive review of the Fund to be conducted in 2009.
2. Views of stakeholders on the performance of the Fund and their views on how this could be improved.
3. Assessment of the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund in key areas (including governance, administration and management, access, processing of proposals, stakeholder engagement, promotion and fund raising, and reporting) with recommendations on how these could be improved.

In defining the scope of the work plan, ESCAP took into account the limited time available for the Review to be conducted, and that ESCAP intended that a comprehensive review of the Fund be carried out in 2009. The methodology adopted, therefore, was to survey target recipients by email in parallel with developing the qualitative and quantitative targets and indicators, then conduct the desk review and bilateral meetings in Bangkok with selected stakeholders (in particular, donors and national governments).

The work plan was implemented to achieve the following deliverables and milestones:

1. Refined ToR and draft survey questionnaire submitted to ESCAP by 31 March 2008.
2. Questionnaire transmitted by ESCAP to target recipients by 9 April 2008.
3. Qualitative and quantitative targets and indicators developed by 5 May 2008.
4. Bilateral meetings held in Bangkok from 5–9 May 2008.
5. Questionnaire responses due 9 May 2008.
6. Draft Review report submitted to ESCAP by 14 May 2008.
7. Final Review report submitted to ESCAP by 20 June 2008.

To monitor and evaluate the substantive and administrative performance of the Fund, targets and indicators needed to be developed for each activity of the five components of the Review and each activity of the 10 areas of the Independent Review (component 4). Each component and area must be considered in the extent to which that activity (and its parts) contributes to the performance of the Fund in achieving its objective, and whether that contribution can be measured (i.e. *quantitative*) or not (i.e. *qualitative*).

If the activity (or parts of the activity) can be measured, then tangible metrics and performance targets can be defined. If the activity (or parts of the activity) cannot be measured, then a primary objective outcome must be defined for that part against which performance indicators can then be determined to define the levels of “success” toward achievement of the desired outcome. To effectively monitor and evaluate performance of an activity, it is important to break the activity down into as many logical parts as possible, whether the parts are qualitative or quantitative.

This approach has been used to develop the performance targets and indicators against the requirements of Components 1 and 5. The targets and indicators developed are presented in Annex B and their use is discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.5.

2.2 Component 2 – Stakeholder Questionnaire

“Design of a questionnaire, which could be transmitted to partners and stakeholders of the Fund to seek their comments on the performance of the Fund and their views on how this could be improved.”

2.2.1 Focus

The questionnaire focussed on the three fundamental questions of the M&E process:

1. Are we doing the right thing?
2. Are we doing it right? and
3. Are there better ways of achieving the expected results?

2.2.2 Approach

A questionnaire was developed and transmitted to Government stakeholders of the Fund, including ESCAP member States and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development / Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) members with representation in Bangkok, to seek their comments on the performance of the Fund and their views on how this could be improved. The questionnaire consisted of nine questions (six general and three optional) designed to obtain constructive comment and feedback so that the information provided in response could be used, in the context of the Fund’s M&E Framework, in determining ways to improve management of the Fund.

In commissioning the questionnaire and determining its target audience, ESCAP took into account that many of the countries and international agencies to whom the questionnaire would be sent may not have detailed operational knowledge of the Fund or activities it supports. The majority of questions, therefore, address areas that any country or agency receiving the questionnaire should be qualified to offer a constructive response; these questions form the “General” section of the questionnaire. Those questions addressing areas that require a more detailed knowledge of the Fund form the “Optional” section of the questionnaire. While all recipients of the questionnaire were invited to offer responses to the Optional questions, it was expected that only the Fund partners and primary stakeholders would do so.

Responses to the questionnaire were requested by 9 May 2008, by email sent directly to the consultant (Mr Hall at philip@faerberhall.com) and the Programme Officer, ESCAP (Mr Charles Davies at daviesc@un.org).

A copy of the questionnaire is included at Annex D and a listing of the stakeholders to whom the questionnaire was sent is included at Annex E. The results of the questionnaire are presented and discussed in Section 3.2.

2.3 Component 3 – Consultation with Key Stakeholders

“Consultation with key stakeholders.”

2.3.1 Focus

The methodology adopted for arranging and conducting consultations with key stakeholders was to first recognise that the Fund has received contributions of approximately USD12.5 million through the Government of Thailand, through the Government of Sweden, and other donors (Nepal and Turkey). Secondly, it was important that the Review recognised that the other key stakeholders of the Fund include ESCAP member states (see Table 1) and IOTWS partners. Thirdly, the Review approach must recognise that ESCAP is the United Nations’ regional development arm in Asia and the Pacific, and in the context of its work programme, ESCAP promotes regional coordination and cooperation in areas such as natural disaster management. Therefore, other key stakeholders that needed to be consulted include those United Nations agencies, international aid donors and non government organizations (NGOs) actively involved in disaster risk reduction and response in Asia and the Pacific.

Australia	Islamic Republic of Iran	Singapore
Bangladesh	Lao People’s Democratic Republic	Sri Lanka
Brunei Darussalam	Malaysia	Thailand
Cambodia	Maldives	Timor-Leste
China	Myanmar	Viet Nam
India	Pakistan	
Indonesia	Philippines	

Table 1: ESCAP Indian Ocean and South East Asian Countries

2.3.2 Approach

The Consultant visited Bangkok in the week 5–9 May 2008 and, with ESCAP assistance, conducted a series of bilateral meetings with selected stakeholders in the Fund, including partners, donors, international aid and disaster management agencies, national governments and select UN agencies. A list of interviewees and the interview schedule is provided at Annex C. The findings arising out of the consultations with key stakeholders are presented and discussed in Section 3, Findings and Annex B.

2.4 Component 4 – Independent Evaluative Review

“Conduct an independent evaluative review of the Fund, addressing the following areas and providing recommendations for improvement;

- a. Efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund’s governance structure;*
- b. Efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund’s process for review and appraisal of proposals;*
- c. Efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund’s administration and management;*
- d. Stakeholder perceptions on the performance of the Fund;*

- e. *Usability and completeness of the Fund's guidelines and templates;*
- f. *Effectiveness of fundraising efforts conducted;*
- g. *Quality of Fund reports produced, in particular the Mapping Study on Gaps and Unmet Needs in Regional Tsunami Early Warning Systems;*
- h. *Effectiveness of the Fund's Partnership arrangements;*
- i. *Effectiveness of the Fund's sustainability measures; and*
- j. *Adequacy of measures to address potentially adverse impacts (e.g., social and environmental impacts), as well as gender mainstreaming."*

2.4.1 Focus

The Fund was established in 2005 after the Phuket Ministerial Conference on Tsunami Early Warning Arrangements. The Fund received the contributions from Thailand and Sweden in November and December 2005 respectively, and the first project funds were advanced to implementing organizations in August 2006.

At its fifth meeting in December 2007, the Fund's Advisory Council adopted an M&E Framework that aims to provide a consistent approach to monitoring and evaluation of individual projects, as well as Fund-level evaluation. The first Fund-level evaluation is an independent desk evaluative review to be carried out in 2008. The findings of the evaluative review will be used by ESCAP to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund. The findings of the Evaluative Review will be shared with Advisory Council members, and may be disseminated to other stakeholders.

Evaluation is defined in the M&E Framework as "*a selective exercise to determine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, (impact) and sustainability of either the Tsunami Trust Fund as a whole (programme evaluation) or particular projects (project evaluation). Evaluation is used to improve the quality of the fund's future work.*"

Therefore, as in the Stakeholder Questionnaire, the Independent Evaluation Review also focussed on the three fundamental questions of the M&E process:

1. Are we doing the right thing?
2. Are we doing it right? and
3. Are there better ways of achieving the expected results?

2.4.2 Approach

The primary objective of the Independent Evaluation Review was to assess the performance of the Fund by conducting a desk review of the established policies, processes and practices and the results achieved by the Fund thus far. The Consultant conducted an audit of the Funds activities against its governance and management framework. To achieve this, the Consultant reviewed key Fund documents (see Annex G), interviewed ESCAP program management personnel and took into consideration the comments of stakeholders from the interviews held in Bangkok during the week 5-9 May 2008.

The following criteria were adopted from the M&E framework and applied in conducting the Independent Evaluative Review of the Fund in the 10 areas specified above.

1. **Relevance:** The consistency of the Fund's impact and outcome in relation to the unmet needs of the IOTWS⁵ system at both regional and national levels at the Fund level, as well as outputs and results in comparison to what was expected from the Fund by its key stakeholders;
2. **Efficiency:** The use of human and financial resources in the best possible way to achieve results, and measures taken to improve implementation and maximize impact with limited resources;
3. **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the expected objective/outcome have been achieved as listed in the policy criteria at the Fund level;
4. **Impact:** Changes and effects, positive and negative, planned and unforeseen, that have resulted from the Fund with respect to the target groups and other affected stakeholders; and
5. **Sustainability:** Likelihood that the positive effects of the Fund or project will continue after their implementation has been completed.

Performance targets and indicators developed under Component 1 (see Section 2.1) were applied against their respective area. The findings and recommendations against these targets and indicators are presented in Annex B and discussed in Section 3.4.

2.5 Component 5 – Review 2009

“Development of qualitative and quantitative targets and indicators for a comprehensive the review of the Fund to be carried out in 2009.”

2.5.1 Focus

The M&E Framework adopted by the Fund's Advisory Council provides for a comprehensive evaluation of the Fund to be carried out every three years. As considerable resources, planning and consultations are needed, once every three years was envisioned as a reasonable periodicity. The “Triennial Evaluations” are to be independent evaluations conducted by external consultants managed by ESCAP. The first triennial evaluation is to be carried out in 2009.

2.5.2 Approach

The set of qualitative and quantitative targets and indicators developed for Component 1 (see Section 2.1 and Annex B) are considered to be an appropriate benchmark on which to conduct the triennial evaluation in 2009. The findings and recommendations from the 2008 Evaluative Review will set a performance baseline for the Fund, and the triennial evaluation will then be able to determine the Fund's performance in addressing the recommendations, progress in implementing agreed recommendations, and assessing the impact of implemented recommendations against the 2008 Evaluation baseline.

The set of targets and indicators in Annex B are by no means definitive. As a template, Annex B should be managed as a living document and form part of the M&E Framework; it should be reviewed and maintained on a regular basis to ensure that it remains current and consistent with the Fund ToR and other policy and strategic documents.

⁵ In this case, relevant documents such as ESCAP's *Mapping Study on Regional Unmet Needs and Gaps on TEWS* as well as IOC's Implementation Plan for the IOTWS provide useful benchmarks of relevance and overall progress, in relation to the existing baselines on current status and areas that need to be addressed to fill gaps.

3. RESULTS, ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

This section presents the results, analysis and findings of the Review in the areas defined within the strategic objective. Each area is addressed in terms of: the focus for improvement; the primary M&E key performance indicators (KPIs); and the findings of the Review, drawing on the interviews with stakeholders (which were based on the stakeholder questionnaire) and the independent evaluative review conducted by the consultant. For each area, recommendations are offered as to how the Fund may be improved.

3.1 Component 1 – Development of a Review Work Plan and Indicators

“Development of a work plan for the Review, including further development of the M&E methodology as well as specific qualitative and quantitative indicators against which the substantive and administrative performance of the Fund could be monitored and evaluated.”

KPI: Targets and indicators enable the substantive and administrative performance of the Fund to be effectively monitored and evaluated.

Results: A comprehensive set of qualitative and quantitative performance targets and indicators are presented in Annex B.

Analysis: The results, analysis, findings and recommendations for all areas of this Review are presented against the full set of qualitative and quantitative performance targets and indicators in Annex B.

3.2 Component 2 – Stakeholder Questionnaire

“Design of a questionnaire, which could be transmitted to partners and stakeholders of the Fund to seek their comments on the performance of the Fund and their views on how this could be improved.”

KPI: At least 25% of the countries approached provide a response.

Results: As at midnight 9 May 2008 no responses had been received by ESCAP or the Consultant. A detailed response from Bangladesh addressing questions 1 to 6 was received by ESCAP PMD on 15 May 2008.

Analysis: ESCAP PMD communicated the questionnaire by email on 10 April 2008 to 140 recipients representing 45 countries as summarised in Table 2 below. A copy of the questionnaire is included at Annex D and a listing of the stakeholders to whom the questionnaire was sent is included at Annex E.

GROUP	No. of Countries	No. of Recipients
ESCAP Member Countries with Embassies based in Bangkok	34	128 (inc. Thailand 44)
OECD DAC Countries based in Bangkok [UN Member Countries (non-ESCAP Members) and Non-UN Member Countries]	11	12
TOTAL	45	140

Table 2: Stakeholder Questionnaire – Country Groups and Recipients.

Responses to the questionnaire were requested by 9 May 2008, by email sent directly to the consultant (Mr Hall at philip@faerberhall.com) and the Programme Officer, ESCAP (Mr Charles Davies at daviesc@un.org).

That no responses were received by the requested date, and only one response has been received since⁶, indicates that the mechanism of using questionnaires communicated by email to solicit stakeholder comment may require follow-up action to increase the response rate. Stakeholder feedback is a critical element in the M&E process and the benefits far out-weigh the management and administrative effort required to obtain it.

The quality of the response received from Bangladesh reinforces the premise that the current Stakeholder Questionnaire activity will provide valuable feedback that will help ESCAP improve the way it governs and manages the Fund.

Recommendation(s):

1. It is recommended that the Stakeholder Questionnaire activity for this Review be progressed through to its intended completion. Since responses were received only from one country (Bangladesh) out of 45 countries, ESCAP PMD should contact the target recipients again in an attempt to increase the response rate. The results and analysis of the Stakeholder Questionnaire responses should then be documented as an addendum to the Evaluative Review 2008 Report.

3.3 Component 3 – Consultation with Key Stakeholders

“Consultation with key stakeholders.”

KPI: Stakeholders willingly engage and provide open and constructive feedback.

Results: The Consultant conducted interviews in Bangkok during the week 5-9 May 2008 with stakeholders representing nine countries, four UN agencies and one NGO. The Programme of Interviews arranged by ESCAP PMD is provided at Annex C. The Programme Officer, ESCAP (Mr Charles Davies) accompanied the Consultant for the country interviews with Cambodia and Turkey.

The interviews were generally conducted in semi-structured format, using the nine questions in the Stakeholder Questionnaire as the main guide for discussion. All stakeholders interviewed willingly engaged in open and often spirited discussion, thus providing valuable input into the Evaluative Review process.

Analysis: While there was widespread acknowledgement by stakeholders that the Fund is being well governed and managed by ESCAP, the interviews highlighted several areas of common concern among stakeholders:

- (1) Most interviewees felt the general perception within the region is that the Fund is a short term funding mechanism focussed primarily on supporting development of the upstream capabilities of a regional tsunami EWS rather than development of national downstream capabilities that integrate tsunami early warning into a multi-hazard approach. Interviewees believe this is one of the main reasons why the Fund has not attracted many project proposals or new donors.
- (2) A strategic vision and plan for the Fund is urgently needed. Interviewees were unanimous in their view that a long term strategy needs to be developed and

⁶ Response provided by Bangladesh following the interview held with the Ambassador on 7 May 2008.

actively promoted if the Fund is to attract new donors, or additional funding from existing donors.

- (3) More emphasis needs to be placed on developing the downstream capabilities that are fundamental to achieving community resilience. Interviewees recognise this means that the Fund ToR may need changing to allow countries to put forward project proposals that have a national rather than regional focus. This would also allow lower capacity countries to access the Fund, even if only to obtain funding that enables them to develop project proposals for submission to other donors.
- (4) The scope of the Fund is too narrow and needs to be broadened. All interviewees believe the Fund should place more emphasis on developing capabilities that underpin an all-hazards approach to Early Warning Systems (EWS) rather than focusing on tsunami. Many interviewees felt that the tsunami tag was outdated and possibly a deterrent to attracting project proposals as well as new funding.
- (5) Access to the Fund is too limited and needs to be expanded. Many interviewees expressed concern that restricting access to the Fund to ESCAP member countries is not in the spirit of the Phuket Ministerial Declaration and the Paris Declaration, and that the Fund should be opened to all UN member countries in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia, including African countries. Many interviewees felt that opening the Fund up to the African countries would also attract new donors.

These concerns and other outputs from the consultations with stakeholders are covered in the Independent Evaluative Review section.

Recommendation(s):

2. It is recommended that the long term strategy of the Fund be focussed on overall disaster risk reduction. The tsunami threat must be considered in a multi-hazard context, and similarly, EWS must be developed in an overall disaster management/development context. In the preliminary stage, however, it is more realistic and practical for the Fund to promote an overall multi-hazard approach by focussing on a few natural hazards common to and more prevalent in the region, i.e., tropical cyclones and floods as well as tsunami.

3.4 Component 4 – Independent Evaluative Review

“Conduct an independent evaluative review of the Fund, addressing the following areas and providing recommendations for improvement.

The primary purpose of the Independent Evaluative Review was to determine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the Fund. The findings from the Independent Evaluative Review, together with the findings from the consultations with stakeholders, will provide valuable input into the Fund’s strategic planning and decision-making process. ESCAP, informed by these findings, will be well positioned to improve future programmes, and accountability to Advisory Council, ESCAP member states especially in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia, and UN Secretariat at large.

3.4.1 Governance Structure

Currently, there are three representatives on the Fund’s Advisory Council: one from ESCAP, one from the Government of Thailand and one from the Government of Sweden. Five UN organizations participate as observers: the International Strategy for Disaster reduction (ISDR), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Intergovernmental

Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (IOC-UNESCO), the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

Focus: The efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund’s governance structure.

KPI: Key stakeholders are confident that the Fund is being governed in accordance with UN standards and guidelines, and as such, the integrity of the Fund stands up against international scrutiny.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: Three of the 14 interviewees said that they were not in a position to comment, or declined to offer a comment. It is apparent from the countries that did comment that there is general confusion among stakeholders between the meaning of ‘governance’ and ‘administration’. Comments that relate to the management of the Fund are covered in Section 3.4.3.

While some stakeholders questioned whether ESCAP was the right vehicle for managing the Fund, based on varying degrees of uncertainty as to how the Fund fits within ESCAPs’ Terms of Reference, it is widely recognised and accepted among stakeholders that ESCAP – as a UN agency – is a very good mechanism for facilitating governance of the Fund. Overall, stakeholders expressed the view that they were “comfortable with UN governance of the Fund”, and that “ESCAP is doing a good job at governing the Fund”.

The common concern among stakeholders, however, that there needs to be a clear strategic vision for the Fund, highlights an area where the governance structure of the Fund needs to be reconsidered. While the Fund is governed within a policy framework, the policy needs to be translated into a strategic vision that recognises and addresses current perceptions in the region that the Fund is outdated (i.e. tsunami not a current priority for regional countries), too narrow in scope (i.e. tsunami focus and restricted to ESCAP member countries), difficult to access (i.e. project proposal process too complicated for smaller less capable countries), and has a finite life of possibly two or three more years.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: The lack of strategic vision raises a fundamental question on what is the expectation of the Fund partners in regard to governance of the Fund; is governance about accountability to stakeholders?; or does governance also extend to determining the strategic direction? It is a defining point that, without exception, all stakeholders interviewed were clear that they expected the Fund’s governing body to be proactive in defining and guiding the strategic direction for the Fund.

The Fund Advisory Council, therefore, needs to define the strategic vision for the Fund that addresses the issues and perceptions mentioned above, and commission the development of a strategic plan that lays out the roadmap on how the vision is to be achieved.

In order to successfully define a strategic vision that inspires commitment, and to develop and implement a strategic plan for the Fund that supports that vision, the Fund Advisory Council needs to invite participation of key stakeholders whose collaborative expertise covers the end-to-end multi-hazard environment. The strategic vision and plan also needs to be developed in consultation with the broader stakeholder community so that it receives the support critical to its implementation and success.

While a strategic vision enables stakeholders to stay focussed on the long term objective, a strategic plan that is updated and published biennially with a projection of targets to be achieved in, say the next five years (e.g. a rolling Five Year Strategic Plan), will provide stakeholders with a facility to deal with immediate issues while being able to target medium and long range problems with a high degree of certainty. This approach, together with other

initiatives that the Fund Advisory Council can implement, should attract greater donor participation and encourage countries and agencies to submit proposals.

From a governance perspective, the strategic plan is the mechanism that integrates the Fund Policy with the Eligibility Criteria, Terms and Conditions and other documents – it is the mechanism through which the Fund Policy is ‘operationalised’. It is the Consultant’s view that the administrative investment to the Fund to put this mechanism in place will be marginal compared to the benefits gained by the people of the region, both in terms of increased stakeholder participation and the quantity and quality of projects funded.

Recommendation(s):

3. It is recommended that the Fund Advisory Council determine a Strategic Vision and commission the development of a Strategic Plan for the Fund as soon as possible. The Strategic Vision should be reviewed biennially and updated as required to ensure it remains relevant to the evolving needs of the Region. The Strategic Plan should be completed by mid-2009, and then reviewed and updated biennially to ensure it remains relevant to and addresses changes in regional priorities that are consistent with achieving the Strategic Vision.

3.4.2 Review and Appraisal Process

Focus: The efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund’s process for review and appraisal of proposals.

KPI: Stakeholders consider the proposal process to be easy to access, expedient and fair in its outcomes.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: While there is general agreement at the technical level that the process of filtering proposals is efficient, stakeholders are unanimous in their view that the existing qualification criteria and proposal format does not cater for low capacity countries. A number of low capacity countries (e.g. Maldives, Laos, Cambodia, Viet Nam, Myanmar etc.) have received assistance from agencies such as the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC), UNDP and OCHA to develop and put forward proposals, but even these have had limited success. While some proposals may not have been accepted by ESCAP on the grounds that they were not technically sound, the prevailing perception among stakeholders is that proposals have not been accepted because the proposals were nationally focussed rather than regionally focussed. Hence, there is strong support among stakeholders that this limitation be removed, especially when more focus needs to be placed on developing national downstream capabilities.

Stakeholders also suggest that the current review and appraisal process is not flexible or dynamic; the two common concerns expressed were:

- (1) The process is too long, has a high overhead, and is too onerous for most countries. There has to be a simpler way with clearer guidelines (without being too generic) so that it is easier for low capacity countries to access the Fund. While stakeholders highlighted this as an issue, they did not offer suggestions as to how the process could be improved.
- (2) The complexity of the application and appraisal process needs to be reviewed in the way funds can be made available to smaller cross-culture groups. Again, while stakeholders highlighted this as an issue, they did not offer suggestions as to how the process could be improved.

Overall, stakeholder comments in this area were negative but not substantiated. They do, however, highlight a number of questions that need to be addressed as part of enhancing the Fund's M&E Framework; questions that ESCAP are already wrestling with. For instance: How long is too long? What is the overhead at present for countries submitting proposals? What should it be? Are there any specific suggestions for improving it?

In addition, one interviewee expressed the need for a broader representation of stakeholders on the Review and Appraisal Task Force. Instead of only consisting of representatives from ESCAP, the interviewee suggests a more appropriate model would be one representative each from ESCAP (Chair), UNDP and ISDR, with secretariat support provided by ESCAP PMD.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: To be effective, the appraisal process must not only be impartial and fair, but it must also be flexible and dynamic to ensure that the Fund remains as relevant to the need as possible. There are several modalities available to countries to mobilise project proposals, and ESCAP provides countries with guidance and advice on those modalities. However, ESCAP could still assist in a number of ways without weakening the Fund's review and appraisal process to accommodate "thin" proposals. For example, the Fund could encourage submissions from low capacity countries for seed funding to assist them develop project proposals for submission to other donors. ESCAP could consider making available small grants for NGO's to assist low capacity countries develop and submit project proposals, and promote opportunities for local NGO's to translate proposals into English.

Small grant proposals can already be considered by the process, although ESCAP concedes that the Fund was not really set up with these in mind. While it can be argued that encouraging more small grant proposals may increase transaction and Fund management costs, such proposals are – by definition – low value proposals and generally not technically complex; they should incur less review and appraisal overhead compared to larger projects.

Small grant proposals, therefore, warrant design and implementation of a 'fast-track' path through the review and appraisal process; a fast-track path that should be complemented with an appropriate level of financial delegation. For example, a low capacity country submits to the Fund a small grant proposal for USD15,000 to engage an NGO to prepare a proposal for a USD1 million project that will design and install a network of warning sirens in a heavily populated coastal province. The main proposal is targeted at an international aid donor that has expressed interest in funding the project, providing the country with a window of opportunity that requires a one-two month turnaround from submission to funds being made available. The Fund review and appraisal process, in its current form, does not provide this level of flexibility or dynamics.

In addition, a common view expressed by stakeholders was that ESCAP could work more proactively with member countries, particularly the less capable countries, to enhance their ability to develop and submit sound proposals. While this view could be more a symptom of inadequate stakeholder engagement, it could also be a sign of widespread ignorance of the application, review and appraisal process.

Irrespective, there are many ways in which ESCAP could facilitate such assistance without compromising its role as independent appraiser and funding provider. For example, ESCAP could seek approval from the Fund Advisory Council for an 'investment' allocation from the Fund to run a training workshop for country and NGO representatives on how to develop and submit a quality proposal, in much the same way the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) did in 2007 for South Pacific countries and NGOs looking to secure

funding for climate change vulnerability and adaptation projects. Such initiatives will foster better stakeholder engagement and act to better educate stakeholders on the process.

If a fast-track process is to be implemented, or if assistance is to be provided to certain organizations in developing proposals, clear guidelines (including a clear definition of what constitutes a "small grant proposal") will be needed to ensure that these facilities and services are provided and administered on a fair and equitable basis.

Finally, the composition of the Inter-Divisional Task Force could be strengthened significantly by having a broader representation of UN agencies whose combined expertise covers the end-to-end multi-hazard environment. The suggestion by one stakeholder that, instead of three ESCAP representatives on the Task Force, there be one representative each from ESCAP (Chair), UNDP and ISDR, with secretariat support provided by ESCAP PMD, is fully supported.

Recommendation(s):

4. It is recommended that the review and appraisal process be extended to provide a 'fast-track' process to cater for small grant proposals by individual countries and NGOs, and that ESCAP actively promote this modality to eligible countries and agencies. Clear guidelines, including a clear definition of "small grant proposal", are needed to ensure that this facility is provided and administered on a fair and equitable basis.
5. It is recommended that ESCAP explore ways in which it can assist low capacity countries to develop quality proposals consistent with the aims and objectives of the Strategic Plan.
6. It is recommended that composition of the Inter-Divisional Task Force have a broader representation of UN agencies. Instead of solely consisting of ESCAP representatives, a more appropriate model would be one representative each from ESCAP (Chair), UNDP, ISDR with secretariat support provided by ESCAP PMD.

3.4.3 Administration and Management

Focus: The efficiency and effectiveness of the Fund's administration and management.

KPI: Key stakeholders are confident that the Fund is being managed professionally and in accordance with UN standards and guidelines.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: Ten of the 14 interviewees said that they were not in a position to comment, or declined to offer a comment. Those that did offer a comment felt that ESCAP is "doing a good job at managing the Fund". Sweden in particular commented that it is "pleasantly surprised at how well ESCAP is managing the Fund", and indicated that while it will be providing additional funding, it is willing to consider making further contributions once a strategic plan for the Fund has been developed and agreed. Turkey said that it "sees UN management of the Fund like a letter of reference", referring to their high level of confidence in terms of transparency, accountability and credibility that comes with the thoroughness of UN administration and management.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: ESCAP convenes the ESCAP/WMO Typhoon Committee, the ESCAP/WMO Panel on Tropical Cyclones, and operates in a multi-hazard framework. Therefore, ESCAP is placed well to promote and leverage a multi-hazard approach. However, ESCAP gives the impression that it is managing the Fund from an administrative perspective rather than a business perspective. A primary reason for this impression, is that ESCAP does not have a formal strategy or plan in place that defines who

the Fund stakeholders are, how ESCAP engages with them (proactively and consistently) and what information ESCAP should be communicating to them and when. A Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan will enable ESCAP to ensure that it is more proactive in how it engages with stakeholders and manages their expectations, particularly local communities in disaster-prone areas.

The absence of a stakeholder management strategy explains in part the clear message received in interviews with stakeholders that ESCAP could be more proactive in engaging with the Funds partners and broader stakeholder community (particularly low capacity) countries on a more regular basis. Aggressively promoting the Fund in a multi-hazard framework within the context of an engagement and communication strategy would also address perceptions among stakeholders that ESCAP is managing the Fund for regional tsunami EWS initiatives only.

Recommendation(s):

7. It is recommended that ESCAP commission development and implementation of a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan to ensure that it is more proactive and consistent in how it engages with stakeholders and manages their expectations, particularly local communities in disaster-prone areas. The Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan should clearly define who the Fund stakeholders are, how ESCAP engages with them, and what information ESCAP should be communicating to them and when. The Plan should be reviewed and updated annually.

3.4.4 Stakeholder Perceptions

Focus: The perception of stakeholders on the performance of the Fund.

KPI: Stakeholders consider that the Fund is of value and is meeting its intended objectives.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: The primary expectation of stakeholders is that the Fund makes a real contribution to mitigating the risk of regional communities to natural hazard events, including tsunami. There is, however, mixed perceptions among stakeholders on how well the Fund is performing against that expectation.

Stakeholders are generally in agreement on their major concerns with the Fund:

- (1) The limitations of the Fund are considered to be inhibiting its ability to attract new donors or donor funding. New donors might be attracted if the Fund was expanded to include all countries in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia, including African countries, and promoted an all-hazards approach to EWS.
- (2) More emphasis needs to be placed on development of regional and national disaster management capabilities that support an integrated all-hazards approach to early warning, including the tsunami threat, rather than development of tsunami early capabilities as the primary focus.
- (3) The Fund should be regarded within the context of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and focus on the merits of multilateral (in addition to bilateral) funding channels for development assistance.
- (4) The Fund should focus more on supporting downstream initiatives rather than upstream initiatives. Greater priority needs to be given to developing downstream capabilities, particularly in getting the warning messages, for all hazards, to the

household. This means talking a bottom-up approach to improving national disaster management capabilities. These are considered more important in the present and also not as big a problem in terms of achieving sustainability as with upstream capabilities (i.e. scientific and technology systems).

- (5) The Fund is not the only source of possible funding countries and agencies should consider. It may be useful for the Fund to raise awareness of other funding mechanisms, and provide seed funding to countries and agencies for less costly investment activities such as project definition, concept development and pilot implementation. This information could be included in the application guidelines and the general information section on the Fund website.
- (6) The focus needs to move away from supporting the establishment of regional upstream (i.e. technical) capabilities to addressing the development of strategic national downstream capabilities (i.e. community resilience). Projects are not expensive at the downstream/community level.
- (7) The Fund needs to place more emphasis on a multi-hazard approach to developing EWS and less emphasis on EWS for tsunamis.
- (8) There needs to be better distribution of funds to a broader range of organizations applying for projects designed to retain more historical knowledge, integrating indigenous/traditional knowledge with modern knowledge, etc.

One stakeholder sees a need to revisit the Phuket Declaration because member countries and implementing partners have lost visibility of its purpose. The stakeholder argues that this is evidenced by the Fund being restricted to ESCAP member countries only.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: As at the end of 2007, the Fund had conducted three rounds of funding and received 36 proposals from various regional, sub-regional and national organizations. The first round of funding was conducted in August 2006, attracting 24 proposals at a total value of USD29.62m. However, the number and total value of proposals has declined sharply in subsequent rounds⁷. The fourth round of funding closed on 15 February 2008. Five proposals were received of which three have been approved at a total value of USD2.98m⁸.

Table 3 presents a summary of the total number and value of proposals submitted against the total number of proposals and value approved. Table 4 presents a summary of approved project proposals across Funding Rounds.

Funding Round	Proposals Submitted	Total Value Requested (USDm)	Proposals Approved	Total Value Approved (USDm)	Proposal Approval Rate
17 August 2006	24	29.62	6	4.26	25.00%
15 April 2007	9	8.03	1	1.21	11.11%
31 August 2007	4	6.16	1	0.80	25.00%
15 February 2008	5	9.62	3	2.98	60.00%
TOTAL	42	USD53.43m	11	USD9.25m	26.19%

⁷ 2007 Annual Report of the Multi-donor Voluntary Trust Fund on Tsunami Early Warning Arrangements in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia (January – December 2007), dated 25 March 2008.

⁸ Email: Mr. Charles Davies (ESCAP) to Mr. Hall on 6 June 2008.

Table 3: Fund Proposal Summary – Requested versus Approved.

Table 3 shows that while the number of proposals submitted to the Fund declined sharply after the first funding round and appear to be stabilising at around five proposals per round, there is evidence that proposals are becoming more aligned and to the quality required by the application criteria.

Project	Value (USD)	Funding Round Approvals (USD)			
		Aug 2006	Apr 2007	Aug 2007	Feb 2008
TTF01	323,902	323,902			
TTF02	2,899,943	2,899,943			
TTF03	84,000	84,000			
TTF04	444,730	444,730			
TTF05	246,549	246,549			
TTF06	260,000	260,000			
TTF07	1,211,766		1,211,766		
TTF08	800,000			800,000	
TTF09/10/11	2,980,000				2,980,000
TOTAL	\$9,250,890	\$4,259,124	\$1,211,766	\$800,000	\$2,980,000

Table 4: Fund Proposal Summary - Approved Projects.

It is noted from the Fund's 2007 Annual Report that projects TTF05 (UNDP-Maldives) and TTF06 (DMC-Sri Lanka) are focussed on building national capacity for warning dissemination (i.e. downstream capabilities). That these projects have successfully traversed through the Fund's application, review and appraisal process is in stark contrast to the current overall perception of stakeholders (as recorded above) that the process does not adequately cater for these types of proposals. This indicates that ESCAP has not been successful in communicating to the wider stakeholder community the outcomes of the Funding Round process, particularly in promoting the virtues of proposals that have been approved by the Fund as examples of the Fund's agenda.

The current perceptions of stakeholders regarding the Fund, therefore, reinforces the earlier recommendation at Section 3.4.3 that ESCAP commission development and implementation of a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan. As an initial step, ESCAP should consider convening a summit of key stakeholders of the Fund (current and potential partners and beneficiaries) as early as possible to address their perceptions and to establish a mandate for action and change.

Recommendation(s):

8. It is recommended that ESCAP consider convening a summit of key stakeholders of the Fund (current and potential partners and beneficiaries) to address their perceptions and to establish a mandate for action and change.

3.4.5 Usability of Guidelines and Templates

Focus: The usability and completeness of the Fund's guidelines and templates.

KPI: Countries and agencies seeking to submit project proposals consider the Fund's guidelines and templates easy to understand and use.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: A number of country stakeholders expressed the general view that the current guidelines and templates need to be clearer so that it is easier for low capacity countries to access the Fund. This issue is closely linked with the review and appraisal process and the common view expressed by stakeholders that ESCAP should consider assisting member countries, particularly the less capable countries, to enhance their ability to develop and submit sound proposals. As with stakeholder comments on the review and appraisal process, stakeholders did not highlight specific areas or provide examples of where the guidelines and templates were not clear, or suggest how they could be improved.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: The benchmark for the usability of guidelines and templates must be set at the least capable country eligible to access the Fund.

A review of the Eligibility Criteria, Guidelines for Completing the Grants Application Form and the Grant Application Form template⁹ revealed a number of inconsistencies and highlighted a number of areas where these documents could be improved.

- (1) Eligibility Criteria. The link on the website, labelled “Eligibility Criteria”, takes viewers to the document titled “Eligibility criteria for organizations to apply for Trust Fund resources.” These criteria are repeated in the guidelines document, which also contains (but are not highlighted) eligibility criteria for applications (i.e. *Only projects covering ESCAP Indian Ocean and South-East Asian countries (from Iran to Indonesia) are eligible to receive support from the Trust Fund, and the stipulation that project implementation timeframes are limited to a maximum of two years*). This information should be included in the Eligibility Criteria document.
- (2) Guidelines for Completing the Grants Application Form. This document needs to be updated to remove inconsistencies between it and the Grant Application Form and to make it more “user friendly”. The Guidelines document should include in each section the exact wording used in the Application Form followed by the guidance relevant to that section. Low capacity countries find it easier to understand concepts and requirements when they are explained with descriptors and analogues they can relate to and identify with. The guidance, therefore, should be supported by one or two simple examples wherever possible. This will make the document longer but will greatly enhance its value to the user.

An edited copy of the Guidelines document containing a number of suggested changes is provided at Annex F. For example:

- a. Part A (Overview) can be improved as shown in Annex F to provide clearer direction.
- b. Part B (Capacity building needs) is a rewording of the question in the Application Form and does not provide any guidance to the applicant. It also does not mention the Mapping Study, which is specifically referenced on the Application Form.
- c. Part C (Problem identification and project design) provides basic guidance.
- d. Part D (Target group) is a rewording of the question in the Application Form and does not provide any guidance to the applicant. It is also a repeat of the information requested in Part A, point 5.
- e. Part E (Overall strategy) provides basic guidance.

⁹ Available on the Fund website at http://www.unescap.org/pmd/tsunami_index_02.asp#apply

- f. Part F (Results framework) is a complex topic which most low capacity countries will find arduous and have difficulty in providing a quality response. The wording needs to be simplified and examples should be provided.
- g. Part G (Internal Capacity of Submitting Organization) provides basic guidance but could be worded better.
- h. Part H (Contribution to regional coordination and cooperation) should be supported by one or two examples.
- i. Part I (Knowledge Management Strategy); the guidance provided adds unnecessary complexity to a simple question.
- j. Part J (Sustainability) should be supported by a definition of “sustainability” and one or two simple examples.
- k. Part K (Gender); the question is too broad in its wording and too narrow and negative in its guidance. Natural hazards impact men and women differently for a wide range of reasons, and some influential people in these countries may not see these differences as “inequalities” but cultural and social realities; this is the challenge. While it is important that the proposal address how the planned outcomes may impact the traditional roles of men and women in the community, it is also important that the proposal show how gender has been addressed in the project design and implementation. For example, does the submitting organization have a gender policy, and is that policy consistent with the UN’s guiding principles on gender? What efforts has the submitting organization taken to ensure the appropriate level of gender representation and participation on the project team and in capacity building activities?
- l. Part L (Partnership Approach) should be supported by one or two examples.
- m. Part M (Counterpart Contributions) provides basic guidance but could be worded better. Some clearer guidance on expectations needs to be given, even if these may be waived by the Fund under certain circumstances. What if the submitting organization is an NGO acting on behalf of several countries? How significant is “significant counterpart resources”? At what level does “favourably considered” become “acceptable”? What qualifies as an acceptable “in kind” contribution? etc.
- n. Part N (Activity Work Plan). The only reference to Part N on the Application Form is in the remark at the very end of the form after the Annexes. The note needs to be in its logical place immediately following Part M. It also provides more budgetary information against major milestones rather than being an Activity Work plan per se.
- o. Part O (Proposed Financial Needs Schedule). The only reference to Part O on the Application Form is in the remark at the very end of the form after the Annexes. The note needs to be in its logical place immediately following Part M (and N). The format of the schedule is so simple that it should be included as a table in the Guideline document and on the Application Form rather than as separate worksheet in the excel workbook where it could easily be missed.
- p. Part P: Annexes: The Guideline document does not mention the requirement (per the comment box on the Application Form) to “Please annex a copy of your organizational charter/statutes and the most recent annual report, unless ESCAP already has these on file.”

- (3) Grant Application Form. The comment boxes should be removed and a note included above Part A to advise prospective applicants to refer to the Guidelines document for assistance in filling out the form.
- (4) Address details for enquiries and where completed application forms are to be forwarded should be provided on the Eligibility Criteria, Guidelines for Completing the Grants Application Form and the Grant Application Form template.

Recommendation(s):

9. It is recommended that ESCAP consult with low capacity countries and obtain their input into how the guidelines and templates could be improved. ESCAP may wish to consider the suggestions provided by the Consultant in section 3.4.5 and Annex F of this Report as a starting point.

3.4.6 Fundraising Efforts

Focus: The effectiveness of fundraising efforts conducted.

KPI: Fund raising efforts meet agreed targets in attracting new donors and/or new funding from existing donors.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: ESCAP advised that a number of potential donors have expressed some initial interest in the Fund, but their contributions never materialized. In contrast, Nepal decided to become involved in the Fund as a show of international “solidarity”. Turkey is also now a funding partner, having contributed USD100k to the Fund in April. Turkey is not affected by tsunami but other natural hazards, primarily earthquakes, and wants to be involved in the international development of disaster risk management and EWS initiatives, including the Fund.

The Governments of Thailand and Sweden expressed their disappointment that other donors have not come forward, are looking to ESCAP to use its convening powers to actively promote the Fund internationally. Sweden indicated that, while it will be providing some additional funding, it is willing to consider making a larger contribution once a strategic plan for the Fund has been developed and agreed.

Many stakeholders indicated their willingness to champion their country’s participation in the Fund, both as a potential partner and a potential beneficiary, but listed a number of constraints to participating that included the following:

- (1) Stakeholders were focusing their efforts on tsunami early warning through other channels, and are more inclined to contribute through agency representation on existing bodies such as IOC/ICG and participation in that fora.
- (2) Stakeholders are inclined to contribute through bilateral rather than multilateral initiatives where the demand comes direct to the donor from the beneficiary country (or through an NGO acting on behalf of the beneficiary country) rather than through a UN secretariat or agency such as ESCAP.
- (3) Scope needs to be broadened to address EWS in an all-hazards context and particular emphasis was placed on developing disaster management downstream capabilities.
- (4) More focus needs to be placed on disaster management cooperation in the region rather than scientific cooperation.

- (5) Need answers from ESCAP to some of the broader questions, such as Vision, Strategy, Mandate, Benefit, etc. Expanding the Fund into other Indian Ocean countries (including the African states) and the Pacific would be well received.
- (6) Need to see what steps ESCAP takes to address current perceptions in the region that the Fund is outdated (the name “Tsunami Trust Fund” is a turn-off), difficult to access, has a finite life of only a few years, and that the focus on tsunami is too narrow (the scope of the Fund needs to be broader).
- (7) Currently preoccupied with other disasters, such as the food crisis, cyclones and flooding and therefore were not in a position to contribute to the Fund at this stage.
- (8) Some other stakeholders have adopted a “watch and see” position, looking at what other countries are contributing.

Overall, stakeholders did not rule out the possibility of contributing to the Fund in the future, but ESCAP would need to demonstrate that the Fund is working and is of value before asking for contributions, especially tied contributions.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: Following the initial contributions to the Fund from the Governments of Thailand and Sweden in 2005, only two additional contributions has been received (USD2,000 from the Government of Nepal and USD100,000 from the Government of Turkey). The 2007 Annual Report mentions in section 6 (Lessons learned) that “many additional potential donors are aware of the Fund but have not been willing to commit funding to it”. The Report proposes that ESCAP should address this by “obtaining further information to ascertain the interest of potential donors and better understand their constraints and concerns, if any, e.g., through a Fund evaluation.”

Recommendation 2 of the 2007 Annual Report is that ESCAP organize a donor roundtable or pledging meeting in the second half of 2008. ESCAP and its donor partners have only a limited window of opportunity to attract new donors to the Fund; therefore, any future fundraising initiative, especially the proposed donor roundtable, must be well-informed and address the key issues and perceptions identified by stakeholders.

The Consultant strongly recommends that, in embarking on new fundraising activities, ESCAP must give urgent and serious consideration to the feedback obtained from consultations with stakeholders during the course of this Evaluative Review.

Recommendation(s):

10. It is strongly recommended that, in initiating any new fundraising activities, ESCAP give urgent consideration to the feedback obtained from consultations with stakeholders during the Review process.

3.4.7 Quality of Reports

Focus: The quality of Fund reports produced, in particular the Mapping Study on Gaps and Unmet Needs in Regional Tsunami Early Warning Systems.

KPI: Reports make a useful contribution to the development of stakeholder knowledge and understanding of the topic. In regard to the Mapping Study report, the report addresses the development status of integrating tsunami early warning into an all hazards emergency management framework and identifies the benchmark and targets against which gaps and unmet needs are determined.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: The overall stakeholder consensus was that the reports produced by the Fund are useful resources. The Mapping Study report in particular makes a useful contribution to the discussion on tsunami warning capabilities in the region. It is generally regarded as a useful “snap shot” that needs to be updated annually. Stakeholders who were more familiar with the Mapping Study also agreed with the identified need to incorporate TEWS into an all-hazards approach.

Turkey was confident that the Mapping Study report and other documents available on the Fund website were considered in deciding to become a donor to the Fund.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: A stakeholder (Mapping Study) workshop was held on 4 April 2007 in Bangkok in which approximately 40 participants representing 17 organizations were consulted for their views on where the gaps are for a minimum EWS. A range of valuable technical and process-related comments were obtained (refer to the August 2007 Mapping Study report¹⁰).

The Consultant agrees with stakeholders that the Mapping Study makes a useful contribution to the discussion on tsunami warning capabilities in the region. However, it is noted that the most important Gap and Unmet Need, which is not reported in the Mapping Study, is that – in reality – there is no global TEWS “plan” and, therefore, no global network design of seismic and sea level gauges to support development of a regional TEWS in the Indian Ocean. Coordinated and effective tsunami early warning must be an international objective, and therefore seismic and sea level gauge network designs need a global approach supported by regional implementation; otherwise the uncoordinated development of detection and monitoring networks leads to “imbalanced” capacity geographically and less than optimum use of resources. IOC-UNESCO has the responsibility to facilitate this work.

The report also does not cover work done (or being done) by some of the major players, suggesting that the Mapping Study process lacked the capacity to generate updated or new information. For example:

- (1) How are other countries funding TEWS projects and operations?
- (2) Humanitarian funds v commercial investment through loans (e.g. the Government of Maldives and France) for the funding of sirens.
- (3) Donor collaboration on TEWS project design definition and funding priorities.
- (4) Coastal mapping is a desired end state, but not necessary to do early assessments. Better use could be made of local knowledge for initial assessments and estimates for basic design.
- (5) Is the urgency for the development of SOPs really appreciated? SOPs are crucial to success as they define roles and responsibilities as well as processes. It has been demonstrated that better internal / external cooperation comes from the development of SOPs.
- (6) The need to place a greater focus on incorporating local and traditional knowledge in the evaluation of risk and development of appropriate early warning strategies and capabilities at the local community level.

In summary, the Mapping Study report reflects that the development of EWS capacities is still heavily focused on science and technology, internationally each country is progressing

¹⁰ The report is available on the Trust Fund’s Web site at www.unescap.org/pmd/tsunami_index.asp

(or not) to their own agenda, and in most countries the integration of TEWS into an all-hazards / multi-hazard framework is not occurring quick enough (or not at all).

Recommendation(s):

11. It is recommended that the Mapping Study be updated annually and that its scope be widened to provide visibility of what other work is being done internationally on tsunami EWS and their integration into an all-hazards approach.
12. It is recommended that the Mapping Study address the need for a global network design of seismic and sea level gauges to support a regional TEWS in the Indian Ocean.

3.4.8 Partnership Arrangements

Focus: The effectiveness of the Fund's Partnership arrangements.

KPI: The Fund's partners actively participate in and contribute to the Fund operations and promote overall coordination of effort through the diversity of partner expertise.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: Stakeholders did not offer specific comments regarding the Fund's partnership arrangements.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: The Fund is a resource mechanism that works within the international framework of the IOTWS, coordinated by the IOC, to narrow the capacity gaps in the region through the building and enhancing of tsunami early warning capacities in accordance with the needs of Indian Ocean and South-East Asian countries. The Fund, therefore, builds on partnerships with many stakeholders, including regional countries and agencies within and outside the United Nations.

Partnerships, with both public and private entities, are critical to ensuring sustainability and ownership of the project, avoiding duplication of similar efforts, fostering synergies with other relevant projects, mobilizing resources, and promoting overall coordination of efforts.

The Fund is successfully working with partners through established relationships and processes to carry out multidimensional technical appraisal of proposals and coordinate with the international tsunami early warning and disaster management community. However, as evidenced in other sections of this Review, the Fund has not been as successful in working with partners to raise awareness of the Fund, encourage submission of relevant proposals or attract new donors. As evidenced in other sections of the Report, this is primarily due to the Fund partners looking to ESCAP to take the lead in these areas, while ESCAP has expected its partners would be more proactive in promoting the Fund.

The partnership arrangements will benefit from defining the strategic direction of the Fund and development and implementation of a stakeholder engagement and communications plan.

Recommendation(s): Covered by recommendations dealing with governance, administration and management, stakeholder perceptions and fundraising.

3.4.9 Sustainability Measures

Focus: The effectiveness of the Fund's sustainability measures.

KPI: The positive effects of projects funded by the Fund continue after their implementation has been completed.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: Stakeholders look to the Task Force and the Advisory Council, as the two entities charged with assessing and approving project

proposals, to be mindful in their deliberations of the long term sustainability of projects and to ensure linkages with other funding sources are fully explored.

Stakeholders also share a common view that sustainability is achieved through focusing on the downstream issues and promote capacity building initiatives that contribute to the development of community resilience to hazard events.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: The Guidelines for Completing the Grant Application Form is the primary mechanism for communicating sustainability requirements and expectations to organizations seeking to submit project proposals. The proposal eligibility criteria and application requirements ensure that projects financed through the Fund have a strong component of sustainability built into their design. Building linkages with existing institutions, developing local skills and resource bases, and having a demand-driven approach to meeting regional needs all contribute to project sustainability.

As mentioned in section 3.4 5 (Usability of Guidelines and Templates), Part J (Sustainability) could be improved by including a definition of “sustainability” and one or two simple examples to help submitting organizations better understand the Fund’s objectives and expectations in this area. It would also be beneficial for submitting organizations – and Fund stakeholders – if the set of M&E performance indicators for sustainability were also made available on the Fund’s website as part of the guidance material.

<p>TTF01: ADPC (USD323,902) Installation/upgrading of four sea level stations in Myanmar, Philippines and Viet Nam (2) and associated training and technical support.</p>
<p>TTF02: ADPC (USD2,899,943) Development of a regional tsunami early warning centre, installation of broadband seismic stations, and capacity building in tools such as Concept of Operations (CONOPS), Tsunami Alert Rapid Notification System (TARNS), Incident Command System (ICS) and Coastal Community Resilience (CCR).</p>
<p>TTF03: ADRC (USD84,000) Training of trainers in community-based hazard mapping in India and Bangladesh.</p>
<p>TTF04: IOC-UNESCO (USD444,730) Capacity building in SOPs in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia, with specific focus on Myanmar, Pakistan, Philippines and Viet Nam.</p>
<p>TTF05: UNDP-Maldives (USD246,549) Measures to strengthen national and local capacities for early warning, including dissemination, preparedness and response, focusing on Gaafu Dhaalu and Dhaalu atolls.</p>
<p>TTF06: DMC Sri Lanka (USD260,000) Strengthening disaster communications, focusing on Galle and Hambantota districts.</p>
<p>TTF07: ADPC (USD1,211,766) Development of a database of pre-computed tsunami simulations that is integrated into the warning system developed under project TTF-02. Work with recipient organizations on procedures for tsunami forecasting and graphical presentation for tsunami watches.</p>

Table 5: Approved Projects as of 31 December 2007.

Table 5 lists the seven projects that have been accepted and approved for funding from the Fund as of 31 December 2007¹¹; one project (TTF03) has been completed. The other six projects are in various stages of implementation. It is therefore too early to determine if the sustainability measures designed into these projects have been successfully implemented and are having the desired impact.

Recommendation(s):

13. It is recommended that the approved set of performance indicators for Sustainability be made available on the Fund's website as part of the Guideline information for completing the Grant Application Form.

3.4.10 Adequacy to Address Adverse Impacts

Focus: The adequacy of measures to address potentially adverse impacts (e.g., social and environmental impacts), as well as gender mainstreaming.

KPI: The Fund ToR, application guidelines and the review and appraisal process provide adequate measures that address gender mainstreaming and potential adverse impacts of natural hazard events.

Findings – Stakeholder Consultations: Stakeholders did not offer specific comments regarding the adequacy of Fund measures to address potentially adverse impacts.

Findings – Independent Evaluative Review: The Guidelines document does not provide submitting organizations with any guidance on the broader issue of providing adequate measures to address potentially adverse impacts (e.g., social and environmental impacts), as well as gender mainstreaming. Part K (Gender) does provide some limited guidance but is focussed on gender inequalities: "Tsunamis and other natural hazards affect men and women differently, and addressing these inequalities is a UN priority. Proposals are stronger when they have a clear strategy to address these inequalities, based on sound information on the effects of hazards on men and women."

The issue of adequate measures to address potential adverse impacts is of course much broader than gender-based issues. It is important that submitting organizations also consider in their proposals the potential impact on target groups and other affected stakeholders of foreseen and unforeseen changes and effects, positive and negative that may result from their project. In order for submitting organizations to adequately address this area, the Fund needs to provide clear guidance on what its own objectives and expectations. Part K either needs to be expanded to provide guidance on the broader issue, or a new part should be included in the Guidelines to address Potential Adverse Impacts.

Irrespective of the approach, the Guidelines document should include a definition of "adverse impact" and provide several examples to help submitting organizations better understand the Fund's objectives and expectations in this area. As for Sustainability, it would also be beneficial for submitting organizations – and Fund stakeholders – if the set of M&E performance indicators for adverse impacts were also made available on the Fund's website as part of the guidance material. Indicators should support a balanced approach, focussing on the procedure for identifying potential adverse impacts as well as the substance of how these are actually dealt with by the project.

This is a challenging area because of the diversity of local cultures and demographic and geographic conditions across the countries and regions the Fund covers, and effective work in

¹¹ From the Fund's 2007 Annual Report.

this area will require the cooperative involvement of the Fund’s partners through existing partnership arrangements.

With respect to gender mainstreaming, the Fund can show leadership by addressing gender inequalities through active promotion of gender equality. As mentioned in section 3.4.5 Part K, while it is important that proposals address how the planned outcomes may impact the traditional roles of men and women in the community, it is also important that proposals show how gender has been addressed in the project design and implementation.

These issues are addressed in determining a recommended set of performance indicators for Measures to Address Adverse Impacts, which are included within Annex B.

Recommendation(s):

14. It is recommended that the approved set of performance indicators for Measures to Address Adverse Impacts be made available on the Fund’s website as part of the Guideline information for completing the Grant Application Form.

3.5 Component 5 – Review 2009

“Development of qualitative and quantitative targets and indicators for a comprehensive review of the Fund to be carried out in 2009.”

KPI: Targets and indicators enable the substantive and administrative performance of the Fund to be effectively assessed within the context of a comprehensive triennial evaluation.

Findings: A comprehensive set of qualitative and quantitative performance targets and indicators has been developed and are presented in Annex B. The targets and indicators have been validated through their use in the 2008 Evaluative Review. The results, analysis, findings and recommendations for all areas of this Review are presented against the full set of qualitative and quantitative performance targets and indicators in Annex B.

Recommendation(s):

15. It is recommended that Annex B (unpopulated) form the basis of a template for future Fund and project evaluations and that it be incorporated within the Fund M&E Framework.
16. It is recommended that Annex B (populated) from the 2008 Evaluative Review form a performance baseline against which the 2009 triennial evaluation is to be conducted.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The Evaluative Review 2008 has been conducted in accordance with the Review ToR at Annex A.

Stakeholder feedback is a critical element in the M&E process, and the benefits far outweigh the management and administrative effort required to obtain it. The mechanism of using questionnaires communicated by email to solicit stakeholder comment requires the investment of at least some follow-up action to increase the response rate. While the Stakeholder Questionnaire was poorly subscribed during the period of the Evaluative Review, it did provide a logical framework for the consultations with stakeholders. As a result, valuable input was received from the in-person interviews conducted by the consultant.

The stakeholder consultations and independent desk review determined that:

- (1) There is widespread acknowledgement by stakeholders that the Fund is being well governed and managed by ESCAP.
- (2) The overall stakeholder consensus is that the reports produced by the Fund are useful resources, and that the Mapping Study report in particular makes a useful contribution to the discussion on tsunami warning capabilities in the region.
- (3) The Fund is successfully working with partners through established relationships and processes to carry out multidimensional technical appraisal of proposals and coordinate with the international tsunami early warning and disaster management community.

The Review, however, identified two central issues that require early attention if the Fund is to achieve its program objectives and meet the expectations of its partners and key stakeholders. These are:

- (1) The Fund suffers from the lack of a strategic direction. Fund partners and stakeholders are content with current the governance, management and administrative arrangements of the Fund. The present perception of stakeholders, however, is that the Fund is outdated and suffers from the lack of a strategic direction, which they consider is a primary reason why the Fund has not attracted new major donors.

Stakeholders are united in the view that the tsunami threat must be considered in a multi-hazard context, and similarly, EWS has to be developed in an overall disaster management/development context. A strategic vision supporting that view needs to be defined and a strategic plan developed to promote and achieve that vision.

Stakeholders are looking to ESCAP to take the lead in determining the strategic direction for the Fund and then to proactively manage the Fund in that direction. Therefore, ESCAP must engage with partners and stakeholders to obtain a general consensus, commitment and a mandate.

- (2) The Fund suffers from the absence of a stakeholder engagement strategy. ESCAP needs to be more proactive and consistent in how it engages with stakeholders and manages their expectations. The root cause of most, if not all, of the issues identified by the Review in relation to the proposal review and appraisal process, administration and management, stakeholder perceptions on performance of the Fund, usability of guidelines and templates, fundraising efforts, quality of reports and partnership

arrangements, etc. is the absence of an effective stakeholder engagement and communication strategy.

The lack of a strategic direction and the absence of an effective stakeholder engagement strategy indicate that ESCAP has adopted an *administration focus* rather than a *business focus* in its management of the Fund. ESCAP has in place good governance, M&E and fiscal accountability arrangements for the Fund, which are all important administrative functions. What appears not to be in place, however, are the business functions that drive aggressive “operationalisation” of the Fund Policy. This explains, in part, current perceptions in the region such as the Fund is outdated, is too narrow in scope, difficult to access, and has a finite life of only a few more years.

A set of recommendations are presented in Section 5 that will enable ESCAP to address these and related issues.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section provides a consolidated list of the 16 recommendations proposed in Section 3, Findings.

The Evaluative Review 2008 recommends that:

1. It is recommended that the Stakeholder Questionnaire activity for this Review be progressed through to its intended completion. Since responses were received only from one country (Bangladesh) out of 45 countries, ESCAP PMD should contact the target recipients again in an attempt to increase the response rate. The results and analysis of the Stakeholder Questionnaire responses should then be documented as an addendum to the Evaluative Review 2008 Report.
2. It is recommended that the long term strategy of the Fund be focussed on overall disaster risk reduction. The tsunami threat must be considered in a multi-hazard context, and similarly, EWS must be developed in an overall disaster management/development context. In the preliminary stage, however, it is more realistic and practical for the Fund to promote an overall multi-hazard approach by focussing on a few natural hazards common to and more prevalent in the region, i.e., tropical cyclones and floods as well as tsunami.
3. It is recommended that the Fund Advisory Council determine a Strategic Vision and commission the development of a Strategic Plan for the Fund as soon as possible. The Strategic Vision should be reviewed biennially and updated as required to ensure it remains relevant to the evolving needs of the Region. The Strategic Plan should be completed by mid-2009, and then reviewed and updated biennially to ensure it remains relevant to and addresses changes in regional priorities that are consistent with achieving the Strategic Vision.
4. It is recommended that the review and appraisal process be extended to provide a 'fast-track' process to cater for small grant proposals by individual countries and NGOs, and that ESCAP actively promote this modality to eligible countries and agencies. Clear guidelines, including a clear definition of "small grant proposal", are needed to ensure that this facility is provided and administered on a fair and equitable basis.
5. It is recommended that ESCAP explore ways in which it can assist low capacity countries to develop quality proposals consistent with the aims and objectives of the Strategic Plan.
6. It is recommended that composition of the Inter-Divisional Task Force have a broader representation of UN agencies. Instead of solely consisting of ESCAP representatives, a more appropriate model would be one representative each from ESCAP (Chair), UNDP, ISDR with secretariat support provided by ESCAP PMD.
7. It is recommended that ESCAP commission development and implementation of a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan to ensure that it is more proactive and consistent in how it engages with stakeholders and manages their expectations, particularly local communities in disaster-prone areas. The Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Communication Plan should clearly define who the Fund stakeholders are, how ESCAP engages with them, and what information ESCAP should be communicating to them and when. The Plan should be reviewed and updated annually.

8. It is recommended that ESCAP consider convening a summit of key stakeholders of the Fund (current and potential partners and beneficiaries) to address their perceptions and to establish a mandate for action and change.
9. It is recommended that ESCAP consult with low capacity countries and obtain their input into how the guidelines and templates could be improved. ESCAP may wish to consider the suggestions provided by the Consultant in section 3.4.5 and Annex F of this Report as a starting point.
10. It is strongly recommended that, in initiating any new fundraising activities, ESCAP give urgent consideration to the feedback obtained from consultations with stakeholders during the Review process.
11. It is recommended that the Mapping Study be updated annually and that its scope be widened to provide visibility of what other work is being done internationally on tsunami EWS and their integration into an all-hazards approach.
12. It is recommended that the Mapping Study address the need for a global network design of seismic and sea level gauges to support a regional TEWS in the Indian Ocean.
13. It is recommended that the approved set performance indicators for Sustainability be made available on the Fund's website as part of the Guideline information for completing the Grant Application Form.
14. It is recommended that the approved set performance indicators for Measures to Address Adverse Impacts be made available on the Fund's website as part of the Guideline information for completing the Grant Application Form.
15. It is recommended that Annex B (unpopulated) form the basis of a template for future Fund and project evaluations and that it be incorporated within the Fund M&E Framework.
16. It is recommended that Annex B (populated) from the 2008 Evaluative Review form a performance baseline against which the 2009 triennial evaluation is to be conducted.

ANNEXES

Annex A – Terms of Reference



C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Do

Annex B – Performance Targets and Indicators



C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Do

Annex C – Programme of Interviews (Bangkok, 5-9 May 2008)



C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Do

Annex D – Stakeholder Questionnaire



C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Do

Annex E – List of Questionnaire Recipients



C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Do

Annex F – Guidelines for Completing the Grant Application Form (Markup)



C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Do

Annex G – List of Documents Reviewed



C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Do