

Organisational Learning Review of Caritas Internationalis' Response to the Tsunami Emergency

FINAL REPORT



Ralf Otto (Channel Research)

Claudia Conrad (Channel Research)

Emery Brusset (Channel Research)

Liz Stone (Caritas Internationalis)

November 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
1 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Purpose and Objective of Learning Review	4
1.2 Purpose of this report.....	4
2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY OF THE LEARNING REVIEW	5
2.1 Approach.....	5
2.2 The Users	6
2.3 Scope	7
2.4 Methodology	8
2.5 Composition of Expert group and Core group.....	10
4. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS (LESSONS TO BE LEARNT).....	11
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	13

Annexes

ABBREVIATIONS

CI	Caritas Internationalis
ERST	Emergency Response Team
GSMT	General Secretariat Management Team
ICC	International Cooperation Committee for Emergencies
ICD	International Cooperation Department of CI General Secretariat
FP	Facilitating Partner
LSP	Learning Support Person (in-country)
MO	Member Organisations
PRA	Participatory Rapid Appraisal
PSO	Project Support Officer
QA	Quality Assurance
SOA	Special Operation Appeal
TISG	Tsunami International Support Groups (National Caritas/local implementing Caritas and Facilitating Partners MOs)
ToR	Terms of Reference
TRA	Tsunami Response Activities

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank all stakeholders involved in the review for their assistance in preparing this report. Particular thanks to Liz Stone (CI Rome) who supported the review in the best way. Thanks also to the in-country contact persons, in particular the national Caritas Organizations of India, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Indonesia for their valuable briefings both before the fieldwork began and for their feedback on the findings.

In addition, the evaluation team would like to thank all persons interviewed during the review, including staff from the General Secretariat, and staff from single member agencies, for their openness and willingness to share information with us. The authors benefited greatly from formal and informal sharing of information and findings, and from the general strength of team spirit that prevailed throughout the review period.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Objective of Learning Review

Following the discussions of the International Cooperation Committee (ICC) for Emergencies and the 2nd Partners Meeting for Tsunami Relief and Recovery in September 2005 Caritas Internationalis (CI) has commissioned a learning review of the response to the Tsunami disaster of 26 December 2004.

The objective of this exercise - as defined in the Terms of Reference (ToR) dated March 2006¹ - is to undertake an organisational review to facilitate learning for the CI Confederation in terms of how the Confederation responded to the Tsunami emergency in the affected countries of India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia and Thailand.

The focus of the learning review laid on the following aspects:

- Development and role of the Emergency Response Support Team (ERST) assessments, and the subsequent Special Operation Appeal (SOAs) and programmes
- Capacity building and role of in-country partners
- Communication – primarily *within* the organisation – but also *outside* media relations and advocacy
- Adherence to Confederation Response Mechanisms and structures; CI Guiding values, and international standards and principles.
- Role of CI General Secretariat

The Learning Review of the Tsunami Response Activities has **pilot character** for CI. It has been commissioned by the CI General Secretariat which is responsible for further elaboration and dissemination of the findings and recommendations.

1.2 Purpose of this report

This report is a short version of the Final Report of the Learning Review. It puts an emphasis on the approach and methodology. It is more detailed on methodology than on programme background and findings.

The purpose of this report is to present this exercise and its methodology to those interested in the approach. It is meant to contribute to the further development of this methodology inside and outside of Caritas Internationalis.

A principle Final Report of this review is used by Caritas Internationalis internally. It contains more comprehensive and detailed sections about findings from the country workshops.

¹ See Annex 1

2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY OF THE LEARNING REVIEW

2.1 Approach

According to the Mission Statement for the Confederation, Caritas Internationalis will provide “a forum for dialogue and exchange among member organisations to share ideas, learn from each other and support each other’s efforts.”² **CI is a learning organisation** and one of the CI Secretariat’s roles is to initiate and promote learning within the CI Confederation.

Based on the experiences of the Tsunami response the learning process aims to improve the Confederation’s response to emergencies worldwide. The emphasis of this exercise lies on organisational learning and not on a validation of the performance or the results.

The product and approach will not be control for accountability in a traditional sense – with the delivery of an independent report as the main end result. Instead **process** and **participation** will be key to fresh and broader perspectives acquired by the organisation. This makes it important to continually involve representatives of the Caritas Confederation and partners and to allow participation of key stakeholders and information from other stakeholders at all phases of the learning review.

The main purpose of the review has been to facilitate **communication** and **dialogue**, by creating a structure and a conducive and “safe” environment for the development and exchange of lessons learned and the extraction of good practices replicable elsewhere.

The methodology is based on the following principles:

- **Participation:** International and national representatives of the Caritas Confederation, as well as staff of other implementers in the field play an important role in the process to ensure assimilation of learning. Implementing Caritas Member Organisations (MOs) play a leading role in the country review sessions right from the beginning of the process, and they will be the main users of the country related findings together with CI General Secretariat. Learners themselves formulate their own questions, seek out answers and analyse the implications of any answers, preferably under the guidance of someone in a mentoring or coaching role. The motivation to learn comes from a genuine interest and desire to ‘find the best way’.
- **Openness and transparency:** The key stakeholders are invited to participate and to contribute with comments and suggestions. Other stakeholders are informed about the approach and the findings. The process intends to lead to a positive learning atmosphere, which allows open discussion about good and weak points of the response, without fear of negative consequences. The idea of this review is to create a non-judgemental environment, in an inclusive process, building shared understandings among the participants. The review does not conduct field assessments on intervention level (be it project or programme).

The focus of this review has been laid on the process of facilitating the learning and experience sharing between the various member organizations involved in the Tsunami response activities of the Caritas network. After a desk-study and initial interviews held at the General

² *The Strategic Plan of Caritas Internationalis* (November 1997) p.16

Secretariat in Rome, in-country workshops have been conducted with the local partners on national and local level. These workshops took place in

- *Chennai (India)* with Caritas India and representatives of the international and local partners
- *Colombo (Sri Lanka)* with Caritas Sri Lanka and representatives of the international and local partners
- *Surat Thani (Thailand)* with Bishop Joseph Prathan, the Diocese of Surat Thani and local partners including religious congregations
- *Medan (Indonesia)* with representatives of the SOA Unit, SOA Working Group agencies and Indonesian Partners

The consultants of Channel Research mainly provided guidance and quality control on methodology and process. The joint Learning Review team facilitated and led the process, but did not conduct a 'traditional' field assessment containing the collection of primary indicators of results and impact.

2.2 The Users

During the preparation phase of this exercise CI Secretariat and the consultants have identified those who will provide most insight into the CI Response to the Tsunami in 2005: **"in terms of sharing experiences and ideas ... for more effective action"**³ through this review process. They can be called the key stakeholders.

For the purpose of this exercise the Review team has determined **five categories of users** in the Confederation's response to emergencies:

1. Implementers (Dioceses/local Church, national Caritas, international partner MO advisers)
2. National coordinators (National Caritas organisations and Facilitating Partner MOs)
3. International and regional coordinators (CI Secretariat and Regional Secretariat)
4. International funding partner MOs
5. Governance (ICC)

Each group of users will be involved in this exercise and will be approached individually by the CI Secretariat after consultation with TISG members. There will be two degrees of involvement:

Group 1, 2, 3:

The involvement of the local Church implementers, national Caritas and international MO representatives and advisers has been to the highest degree possible. The key elements were review sessions in each of the four countries for Groups 1 and 2 and in Rome for Group 3.

Groups 4 and 5:

³ From 'Guiding Principles: Learning', *The Strategic Plan of Caritas Internationalis*: op cit, p.22

The international funding Caritas MO partners and the governance structure have been mainly involved in sharing key information during the exercise and providing feedback in writing.

In addition, some international funding Caritas MO partners have been consulted by telephone. Due to the limited resources this involvement has been limited and did not cover all partners to the same degree.

Findings have been presented and discussed during the partners meetings in Europe at the end of the process.

All users have been kept informed about the major steps of the exercise and have been invited to comment on and to contribute to key Review documents. Key documents will be:

- The Inception Report (including in annex: ToR and Timeline for the Inception Phase)
- Country Notes from Review Sessions
- Final Report

2.3 Scope

The ToR mentions a “review across all Tsunami Special Operation Appeal (SOA) Programmes” [in India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia and Thailand] “and how the Confederation’s response followed the agreed CI working structures and mechanisms⁴”.

The time period covered by the Review has been 26 December 2004 until 26 December 2005.

During the preparation of the exercise a number of issues have been identified that are directly linked to relations between the members of the Confederation and are likely to have relevance on the implementation and outcomes of the SOA programmes. While being as comprehensive as possible; time and resources made it necessary to limit the scope and coverage of the study to CI working structures and mechanisms.

This important **prioritisation exercise** has been done jointly by the consultants and CI Secretariat during the Inception Phase in Rome (May – June 2006). The proposed scope in the ToR under the headings: “Development of SOA and programme response” and “Confederation Response Mechanism” presented a very good starting point for this prioritisation.

It suggested **focus** of the learning review on the processes of:

- Development and role of the Emergency Response Support Team (ERST) in assessments, and the subsequent SOAs and programmes
- Capacity building and role of in-country partners
- Communication – primarily *within* the Confederation – but also *outside* for media relations and advocacy
- Adherence to Confederation Response mechanisms and working structures; CI Guiding values and principles, and international standards and principles.
- Role of CI General Secretariat

⁴ As set out in ‘Our Guiding Values, Principles, Working Structures and Mechanisms for Response to Major Emergencies – Approved by ExCo, June 14, 2001’. Published by CI as: *Our Response to Major Emergencies* (April 2002).

Issues mentioned here may be more or less important in the context of specific country programme activities or a specific partner in the Confederation response; therefore the intention to limit the review to the TOR headings is not going to be applied that strictly. Issues arising may and will be included during the process and aspects within these issues can be more or less stressed during discussions.

2.4 Methodology

The detailed scope and methodology of the exercise were agreed upon in the CI General Secretariat in Rome on the 20th and 21st of June, 2006. This period were used also to hold the first interviews with CI representatives mainly involved in the Tsunami Response Activities. The field travel took place between the 10th and the 27th of August, visiting all four Tsunami affected countries. The workshops with international and national members of the Confederation took place at a central place, convenient to reach for everybody. The review team has not visited any project sides nor has conducted interviews with beneficiaries.

Information and Synthesis Phase (June-July)

During this phase the key stakeholders of the review have been informed about the process, the approach and the work plan. Their feedback has been collected and analysed. This process served the preparation of the next phase - content and also logistics-wise.

The Principal Learning Review Consultant has gathered all necessary information to prepare the in-country review sessions and to do a further prioritisation of the most relevant issues for the workshops. For this process the Learning Review Consultant did interviews in Rome and did desk research on key programme documents held by CI General Secretariat. The synthesis of this preparation has been looked at by staff from CI Secretariat and by the Process Advisor (PA) and Quality Assurance (QA) Consultant.

Joint Reflection and Learning Phase (August)

This phase has been about a series of Review sessions in the programme countries and one in Rome.

There have been one and two one-day workshop sessions in each of the four countries where Tsunami SOA programmes are located. One brought together those involved at a **national level** and involved mainly coordinating bodies of the Caritas network and representatives of international and national Caritas organisations. One or two workshops were in the **programme locations** and involved mainly the implementing organisations of the Diocese and local Church.

All workshops were facilitated by the Principal Learning Review Consultant, assisted by the Tsunami Desk Officer at CI Secretariat and one (or two) in-country Learning Support Persons (LSPs), nominated for each National or implementing Caritas in the four countries. The identified LSP staff participated in all workshops and will assure cross-learning and the sharing of findings for the national Caritas level.

The methodology of the sessions has been according to the above-mentioned principles of participation and openness. Facilitated by the Principle Learning Review Consultant the participants of the session had the opportunity to share and reflect on the good and bad examples of planning, cooperation, coordination, communication, negotiation for implementation of the Tsunami programmes during 2005.

To ensure comparability, the same working instrument applied in all workshops. :

Preparation Work: Beforehand a local learning person was identified by the national Caritas. The main tasks of this person were ensuring the information flow between review team and the other actors, organisational preparation of the workshop-day (determine location and time of venue, organization of workshop utensils like flip charts, pens, separated rooms for working groups, ensure the arrival and (if necessary) the overnight stay of participants, coffee breaks, lunch etc.). At the same time the learning person was responsible for the briefing of the review team before the workshop, the de-briefing after the workshop and the follow-up steps in the country. Last but not least the local learning person assisted in determining the composition of the working groups during the workshops.

Individual preparation: Experiences have shown that workshops are as more effective as better the participants have prepared themselves beforehand. Therefore a questionnaire has been elaborated with some key questions. While answering the questions, the workshop participants could re-call what has happened between 26 December 2004 and 26 December 2005. This preliminary preparation made it easier during the course of the workshops to identify success factors and factors which hampered the TRA. To focus the memories three levels were set up: the 1st level provided a general overview, the 2nd level concentrated more on the issue “cooperation” and the 3rd level went into further details of cooperation. The questionnaire has been send out 2 – 4 weeks before the workshop. The workshop participants were asked to send the questionnaire to the facilitator. The answers to the questionnaires were kept confidential and helped to prepare the structure of workshops and the trigger questions for the second part of the workshop.

Structure of Workshops: The workshops were designed as one-day workshop with a morning session (3 hours) and an afternoon session (3 hours). The focus in the morning laid on an Actor-Analysis elaborated in group work and presented on flip-chart to the plenum afterwards. After the presentation of all charts the participants discussed within the plenum the contents and statements.

Each Review session progressed through a series of exercises in three sessions:

- (1) Actor-analysis : relationships, expectations and benefits
- (2) Cooperation management : negotiation and communication
- (3) Future cooperation : recommendations.

Key questions in each session guided participants in sharing and discussion of the experience of CI's Tsunami response in 2005.

Dissemination and Feedback Phase (September-October)

During this phase the findings of the various workshops have been compiled and presented to the TISG, CI General Secretariat and ICC. They were invited to comment on these findings.

The findings and comments were presented in coordination meetings of Caritas MO partners and of the governance body (ICC) in Rome during September 2006.

Finally, the findings were revised and compiled into a final findings report. It is important to note, that the country notes and the final review document are not the key results of this exercise. It is the implementation of the process itself and the review sessions in the countries that will be the key elements of the learning process. Based on this, the purpose of the written deliverables will be to record the findings of the learning process in a format that is convenient for using and sharing the main findings and recommendations of the participants.

2.5 Composition of Expert group and Core group

Expert Group

CI has mandated Channel Research with the facilitation of the Learning review. The review team consisted of the following members:

- Claudia Conrad, Principal Learning Review Consultant
- Liz Stone– Review Team Member
- Ralf Otto – Process Consultant and Team Leader
- Emery Brusset, Quality Assurance Consultant

The external learning review team was accompanied throughout the whole process by Liz Stone (CI Secretariat) as the internal resource person. She accompanied the fieldtrips in all four countries.

Core Group

The Core Group for the Review consists of key staff members of the CI General Secretariat:

- Duncan MacLaren - Secretary General
- José Maria Gallardo Villares - Head of International Cooperation Department (ICD)
- Father C.X Sanedrin - Asia/Oceania Regional Desk Officer.

The Core Group's role is to give overall guidance on the process and to advise on the direction of the Review exercise. The group will be informed about the main steps of the learning review on a regular basis. The Core Group will comment and approve the key decisions and documents of this review.

4. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS (LESSONS TO BE LEARNT)

- The CI Tsunami Response activities will utilize funding of US\$ 457.85 Million for funding emergency relief and rehabilitation projects. The main sources of the funds were private donations. Even local actors (not only on national, but also on diocesan level) had their own funds which were used mainly within the emergency phase for direct assistance to the affected people.

This unique situation gives the opportunity to direct the view on the benefits and specific contribution agencies' have brought into the response activities. The contributions made by the international MOs are based on institutional policies, structures, and working procedures established long time before Tsunami. Further, almost all international MOs have long-standing working experiences in how to respond in emergencies and how to elaborate rehabilitation programmes.

This pre-requisite for the implementation of a CI network response was not given to the local partners to the same extent. Only in India the capacities can be assessed as almost comparable to the standards of international relief work. In Sri Lanka the local partner could build its activities on a wide network within the country (combining different religious groups) but lacked capacities and human resources to cope with the response activities on such a large scale. In Thailand and Indonesia the local partners had firstly to be found respectively integrated into the network.

Therefore, the main asset of the local partners laid on level local contacts and regional knowledge.

Because of these institutional imbalances the 2 main focuses within the CI tsunami response had to be on

- (1) **how to scale up** the capacities of the national and local partners that they are in the position to respond to the situation adequately with corresponding activities (focus context-related)

and

- (2) **how to transfer the required knowledge** to the national and local partners that they learn the procedures and working mechanisms within the CI network and the international cooperation (focus network-related).

- It appears to be that this main focus was not raised sufficiently by the stakeholders involved. The pressure to act quickly – stirred up by the international media attention and the enormous presence of other relief networks and/or agencies (concurrence) – has been given precedence over an analytical view on the given context within the CI network.
- The CI working mechanisms ERST and SOA are basically tools which deliver the required information about appropriate assistance to the affected region respectively the affected population. However, this is not enough to lift the network activities from pure operational and implementation aspects of relief activities to a higher level of a coordinated and coherent programming on network level. To ensure the latter a concept and/or a strategy is needed which combines the requirements of all stakeholders

involved and which gives clear orientation how to implement the jointly agreed objectives in the specific context.

- Context-knowledge is primarily with the local partners and is a valuable comparative advantage. The prevailing deficit-orientation has to be replaced by a more solutions-oriented perspective on the existing capacities inside the CI network and must be therefore integrated in the overall programme response on conceptual or strategic level.

The perception matters: MOs in the south cannot be longer seen as “less developed” (concerning the capacities, resources, knowledge) than western MOs. This does not meet the reality in the affected tsunami regions as the local partners have proven the knowledge and strategic thoughts. In India and Sri Lanka the national Caritas Organizations have a solid basis for programme implementation established. This has to be acknowledged within the network.

It is less important whether programmes are implemented inside or outside of the SOA; it has to be avoided that local structures and local know-how are neglected respectively a strategy for a network response has to raise the question what local initiatives do exist and how to integrate them adequately in a overall response.

- Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Thailand are categorized as middle-income countries. India is a low income country but due to its political and economic influence in the region can be regarded as an anchor country with considerable influence in the region. The conflicts in Sri Lanka and Indonesia determine to a great extent any collaboration model. These are important features which determine the strategic orientation within a network based response.
- At the moment there is no central steering how and in what direction local capacities can be developed. The huge diversity within the network leaves this to the individual MOs which fulfil this task according to their own institutional directives – and in the end their own institutional interests.

As far as it concerns the western MOs show a greater loyalty to their “own” institutions in the home country including the institutional backdonors than to the Confederation. Although this can be easily understood, it has to be seen as well that the local partner organisations feel that the benefit is unequally distributed. Somehow it appears that national or local structures are reduced to being a water-barrier in the interest of the western MOs.

- Another area of conflict results obviously out of the different proximity to the local church. As western MOs have run through a period of more independence from the catholic church in their home countries, the local church and Caritas structures appears to be more or less the same in the Tsunami affected countries, being hierarchic structured and having the Bishops conference at the highest level.
- All the workshop charts showed a different picture although almost the same rules, the same methods and the same tasks were applied in all countries. This shows that Caritas is not one solid line of agencies but has enough space for different views. It is important to ensure that each actor has its space in this network.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

To establish an approach of institutional learning based on the Tsunami experiences within CI the following recommendations are made:

Assessment phase

1. The national Caritas are decisive for efficient needs assessment as they have the context-knowledge and the required contacts. Therefore, the national Caritas should have the overall management and steering role in the assessment phase. They should be supported by MOs with advisory services, funds and human resources.
2. The assessment phase determines right from the beginning the direction and orientation of the subsequently programme development. Therefore, an institutional process should be initiated right from the beginning which clarifies mandates and roles of the MOs directly involved.
3. The needs assessment should not only focus on information gathering within the affected area. It is of utmost importance to link the collected data to the local capacities on the ground on national and local level. Therefore, the needs assessment has to be conceptually accompanied by CI General Secretariat which should analyse the given data and elaborate a link to the existing capacities of the local partner. This information should be shared with all MOs interested and involved in the programming for any response activities.

Programme development

4. CI General Secretariat should elaborate an easy guideline about programme implementation phases within the Humanitarian Context ("what to do and how to do it"). This should be distributed and shared with the National Caritas as well as the MOs involved. The guideline should streamline the elaboration of the SOA operation referring to international standards and principles of Humanitarian Work.

Capacity building

5. The local capacities are decisive for the quality of the response activities. The SOA budget and the commitment of the individual MOs have to acknowledge this through the means of funds for human resources and equipment, organizing trainings and the secondment of technical advisors at the national level.

Communication

6. Clear lines of communication have to be established from the local level/regional/national level within the affected country and between national Caritas, the MOs operationally involved and CI General Secretariat. This formalization should happen in the very first beginning of the response activities.
7. Coordination meetings on the ground should be compulsory on regular basis for all stakeholders within the programme. A central coordinator for the preparation, facilitation and the follow up of the meetings should be put in place. This coordinator should have the mandate by CI General Secretariat and should mediate in case of conflict.

Confederation Response Mechanisms

8. The composition of the ERST should involve national and regional experts of the affected areas. The trainings for potential ERST members should also include staff members of national Caritas Organizations.
9. Further, the ERST should be composed of persons who are not only technically qualified but have also sound knowledge about the Caritas network and working procedures.

Facilitating Partners

10. There should be a continuous quality monitoring about the advisory service conducted by the FP (3-months-monitoring). The agreement between the FP and the national Caritas resp. local Partners should be elaborated on a basis of a clear mandate with set objectives, expected results and a determined time-frame.

CI General Secretariat

11. The MOs should increase the contributions to the General Secretariat to ensure appropriate human resources.
12. CI General Secretariat should focus more and additional to conceptual works to make more use of the information received by the MOs and to strengthen their own role and mandate within the network.

Annex 1:

PROPOSED ORGANISATIONAL REVIEW OF CI RESPONSE TO TSUNAMI EMERGENCY

INDIA, SRI LANKA, INDONESIA AND THAILAND

TERMS OF REFERENCE (February 2006)

Introduction: The International Cooperation Committee for Emergencies (ICC) recommended at its meeting on 26-28 September 2005 at Caritas Internationalis (CI) General Secretariat that an independent review be undertaken of the CI Confederation's response to the Tsunami emergency of 26 December 2004.

The review will take into account the discussions at the 2nd Partners Meeting for Tsunami Relief and Recovery Programmes in September 2005 that recommended *inter alia* that CI conduct a learning review of the Confederation's response to the Tsunami emergency across all Tsunami Special Operation Appeal (SOA) programmes and how the Confederation's performance accorded with the agreed CI working structures detailed in Part II of the CI document 'Our Response to Major Emergencies'.

Objective: To undertake an organisational review to facilitate learning for the CI Confederation in terms of how the Confederation responded to the Tsunami emergency in the affected countries of India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia and Thailand.

Criteria: The review will apply the following widely used OECD/DAC criteria for drawing up key learnings from the CI Special Operation Appeals and programme responses in India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia and Thailand:

- Relevance/appropriateness,
- Effectiveness
- Impact
- Efficiency
- Coverage
- Coherence
- Connectedness.

Proposed Scope:

1. Development of Special Operation Appeal / Programme Response

1.1 Assessment

- Was the ERST assessment done in each accordance with internationally accepted/ proposed standards?

- Did the ERST assessment take account of Caritas structures in the affected areas?
- What could be improved in future?

1.2 Programme development

- How was the assessment data used to develop a programme?
- Who was responsible for programme development?
- How were activity targets and resources for programmes determined?
- How was the timeframe for programme implementation decided?
- What internationally recognised standards and frameworks were followed in drawing up the programme document?
- What could be improved in future?

1.3 SOA development

- What was the process for presenting the programme to CI as a Special Operation Appeal (SOA)?
- Was the programme developed in 1.2 the same as the SOA programme presented to CI as a SOA? If not, what changed?

1.4 Communications

- Who managed the media and external requests for information for the ERST and SOA programme to the CI Confederation?
- How were advocacy and political issues relating to the tsunami response handled?
- What could be improved in a future communications strategy?

2. **Confederation Response Mechanisms**

To what extent did CI General Secretariat and MOs follow the agreed CI working structures in the following areas:

2.1 Onset of crisis

- How was communication established with affected countries?
- Who initiated first communications?

Selection and dispatch of Emergency Response Support Team (ERST)

- Were CI guidelines followed?

Function of ERST teams in-country and Terms of Reference

- Who managed ERST in-country?
- Did the ERST stay in-country for the time required to complete the TORs?
- What communications channels were established by ERST and with whom?

Role of National Caritas/local Church agencies

- How was the National Caritas and local Church structure in-country affected by the CI response to the Tsunami?
- What other Church agencies were involved in the CI response?
- What coordination issues were faced with respect to CI General Secretariat, Caritas MOs and non-Caritas actors?

- What resource issues were faced by National Caritas/local Church agencies to participate in the CI response to the Tsunami - eg. logistics, staff availability, systems, telecommunications, accommodation, etc

Establishment of Facilitating Partners and sub-Facilitating Partners

- How were Facilitating Partners and sub-Facilitating Partner MOs chosen?
- How were staff selected by FP and sub-FP Partner MOs for in-country positions?

Support from CI General Secretariat

- What assistance was most valued from the CI General Secretariat? (for example: coordinating funding pledges, hosting meetings, recruitment of dedicated staff member, email communications, etc)
- What improvements would you like to see in the future?

Cross-cutting Issues for Consideration:

The CI working structures are based on a shared understanding and commitment to the guiding values and principles of the CI Confederation.

Part I of the CI document 'Our Response to Major Emergencies' lists the Guiding Values and Principles that are the foundation of CI's mission:

- Moral Mandate
- Solidarity and Mutuality
- Subsidiarity
- Partnership and Stewardship.

Under 'Moral Mandate', it is noted that "All CI [Member Organizations] MOs are bound to uphold the Code of Conduct [for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief], the Sphere Project's Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards, gender equity and other concerns."

The organisational review will assess the extent to which these guiding values and principles were reflected in the process and decision making in CI's Response to the Tsunami Emergency.

Methodology:

The organisational review will be conducted as a combination of:

- Desk review of relevant literature from CI General Secretariat, National Caritas/local Church partners in country, the Facilitating Partners, sub-Facilitating Partners and other Caritas MOs involved in ERST and/or programme implementation in-country
- Key informant interviews by telephone.
- Focus group discussions at country-level (for time and cost reasons this may be at the time of other meetings that bring together involved people such as Working Group meetings in-country).

- Evaluation Questionnaires by Tsunami ERST participants, that were submitted to CI -ICD (Nik Bredholt) will also be made available.

Management:

The review process will be overseen by CI International Cooperation Department and managed by Liz Stone who will also accompany the reviewer during in-country visits.

In each country, the National Caritas/local Church partner together with the Facilitating Partner will nominate an in-country Learning Support Person to assist the reviewer with access to all documentation and key staff in country, arrange transport and accommodation as required for the conduct of the review. This person will have a role in reporting back to in-country stakeholders – field level, diocesan level, national Caritas, as appropriate.

Review Staffing:

The review will be lead by one external consultant contracted by CI.

In each country, the review consultant will be assisted by a nominated Learning Support Person in order to maximise learning feedback to National Caritas/local Church partners.

Timeline:

- a) Selection and contract of external reviewer – February/March 2006.
- b) Desk review and telephone interviews, planning of country visits – April 2006.
- c) In-country visits to be completed – May to June 2006.
- d) Draft findings to be presented – end August 2006.
- e) Presentation of Final Review Document – ICC Meeting, 25-27 September 2006.

Annex 2:

Conceptual Thoughts

The Tsunami Emergency Response Activities were based on joint efforts within the Caritas Confederation. They were planned by many actors⁵, negotiated, implemented and steered. With this, the actors created a living system of reciprocal relations and dependencies. They acted on the basis of their ascribed role and of the expectations they have to meet, on the basis of their influence and their resources. Usually, the relation between actors within a network changes in the course of a cooperation; the same applies to power and influence. Furthermore, actors within a network create their own reality, they tend to invent an affirmative or sometimes a hostile environment. They sometimes admire or even demonize events or other actors. The acting strategies are not only determined by the knowledge the actors might have. Strategies are also determined by the way how the actors anticipate their relationship as such and what kind of interpretation they have. The scientific precise and measurable facts as collected in a “normal” evaluation are only one part of reality; within the world of a network the actors have wishes and demands, interests, a certain conception of the world and specific motives. This powerful part is seen only from „face to face“ in a personal meeting and when the actors talk with each other and exchange views and opinions. Therefore, intercultural understanding within an international network works only in the context of individual experience.

Actors within a network have different interests. Actors are differently affected by a disaster. In this learning review we wanted to capture the different interests and positions towards the event as such and towards the CI response mechanisms. The challenging task for the learning review team was to make these interests, perceptions and opinions visible. We assumed that all actors involved in the TRA created „their own reality“ on the basis of their experiences and their expectations. Therefore, we created a forum for dialog and discussion in which the actors could assess and interpret the successes and challenges from their perspective. The way the in-country workshops were facilitated gave space to the specific knowledge of the single actors (agencies), their cultural orientation, and the predominant norms and preferences.

International cooperation leads per se to a shift in power and influence. A change within a society – be it due to a longterm process (development) or due to a sudden event (disaster) – goes along with a change of roles and existing relations and a shift within the political, economical, social and gender related power constellation. Projects and Programmes have influence on the local structures and processes, interventions influence actors and the access to resources. We learned in the review that all partners changed during the implementation process of the TRA. This has been found out while asking for the institutional benefits for each actor.

To ensure that the process continues within CI the workshop tools applied during the in-country workshops are attached below.

⁵ The term „actor“ refers here to the stakeholders within CI Confederation which are linked to each other because of the same beliefs and values. These actors articulate and defend their interests when they negotiate and establish strategic alliances with others on the basis of agreed rules or on the basis of their power, influence and authority.

Annex 3: Chronology of Tsunami Response Activities within CI

The following list shows the involvement of the TRA coordinated by CI General Secretariat in Rome.

26 December 2004 (messages sent by CI officer on duty from home):

- Message of solidarity to Caritas Sri Lanka
- Message of solidarity to Caritas India
- Message of solidarity to Caritas Malaysia
- Message of solidarity to Caritas Bangladesh

Messages to SOA Recipients:

- ALERT - INDIA - Earthquake / Tsunami
- SRI LANKA - National Calamity: Tidal Wave – Information from Caritas Sri Lanka
- Information on teleconference envisaged for 27 December
- Earthquake/Tsunami disasters - Telephone Conference / Proposed Agenda

27 December 2004:

- INDIA - Emergency - Tsunami killing more than 2000 people - 1st Caritas India Situation Report
- INDIA - Earthquake/Tsunami Disaster – Situation Report No. 2
- Sri Lanka - National Calamity: Tidal Wave – Update from Caritas Sri Lanka
- Invitation to telephone conference on same day (12.00 a.m.)
- Bangladesh - Earthquake - Situation report

28 December 2004

- BANGLADESH Update
- SE ASIA - Minutes of Telephone Conference and Profiles
- INDIA - Tsunami attack - pictures from Andhra
- INDIA -Tsunami attack – pictures
- BANGLADESH - Update No. 2
- THAILAND - Update No. 1
- MYANMAR - Information received from Dolores Bachmann (Caritas Denmark)
- S/SE Asia Earthquake/Tsunami] Report IASC Heads of Agencies Conference Call 27/12/04
- INDIA - Earthquake / Tsunami Disaster – Situation Report No. 3

29 December 2004

- INDIA - Earthquake / Tsunami Disaster - Caritas India Situation Report No 4
- INDIA - Sea erosion - Photos Kottar Diocese, submitted by Caritas India
- INDIA - Tsunami Hits Parts in K.K. Dist – Photographs
- Caritas India message regarding photos
- ASIA DISASTER - Today's teleconference - Proposed Agenda and Concept Note submitted by Caritas India

30 December 2004

- Travel schedule of Fr. Yvon Ambrose, Asia Regional Coordinator / Time schedule for UN SE Asia Flash Appeal, submitted by SCHR
- SRI LANKA - Field trip report by Aloysius John / Project Management Mechanism / The needs of the dioceses
- Minutes of CE Teleconference - 29.12.04 & CORDAID Situation Report

31 December 2004

- SE ASIA DISASTER - India and Sri Lanka ERSTs

3 January 2005

- Sri Lanka - Tidal Waves - Update 2 January 2005
- ASIA - Earthquake & Tsunami Disaster - Notes of December 30 Teleconference / Confirmation of January 5 Teleconference
- Sri Lanka - ERST Terms of Reference
- Sri Lanka - Draft SOA Tsunami – Narrative

4 January 2005

- ICD temporary staff (Emergency Asia /Darfur) – Message to CI MOs
- ASIA DISASTER - Teleconference of 5 January on India and Sri Lanka - Proposed Agenda
- Main points from the IASC information meeting on Indian Ocean Earthquake / Tsunami, Geneva, 3 January 14:30

5 January 2005

- INDIA - Tsunami - Situation Report No. 5
- Sri Lanka - Tsunami - Draft SOA

6 January 2005

- Tsunami and Church response (messages sent by CI officer on duty from home)

7 January 2005

- SE Asia - Minutes of India & Sri Lanka Telephone Conference, January 5, 2005
- URGENT - Postponement of CI telephone conference on Indonesia
- SE Asia - Annex to Minutes of India & Sri Lanka Telephone Conference, January 5, 2005 - Financial Update

10 January 2005

- THAILAND - Tsunami - COERR Concept Paper
- SE EAST ASIA - CI Telephone Conference on INDONESIA
- S/SE Asia Earthquake/Tsunami, situation in Myanmar

11 January 2005

- INDONESIA - Earthquake / Tsunami Emergency - Joint Caritas Agency Meeting Minutes
- Lessons for the Tsunami Response
- INDIA - Tsunami - Situation report – 6
- SRI LANKA - Tsunami - Situation report No. 1

12 January 2005

- Important message re fund transfers in response to Sri Lanka tsunami emergency
- SE Asia Disaster - Documents of interest

13 January 2005

- Indonesia - Minutes of Telephone Conference 11 January 2005 and Pledges' Update
- INDIA - Tsunami emergency – call for fund transfer

14 January 2005

- Sri Lanka - Considerations to be distributed - Some considerations regarding “Over funding” for Sri Lanka

- New S.O.A. 02/2005 - INDONESIA - Tsunami Response

17 January 2005

- New S.O.A. 03/2005 - SRI LANKA - Tsunami Relief & Rehabilitation Programme
- New S.O.A. 04/2005 - INDIA - Tsunami Appeal 2005
- Asia - Tsunami Emergency - Donor and Programme Management Meeting 25 & 26 January – Invitation

18 January 2005

- Asia Tsunami Emergency, CI Meeting 25 & 26 January 2005 - Draft Agenda & and CI Position regarding Child Sponsorship

19 January 2005

- Situation Report 2 - ERST Tsunami Sri Lanka

20 January 2005

- Indonesia - JRS position in Aceh

21 January 2005

- Sri Lanka - Tsunami Emergency - Update No. 3
- Asia Tsunami Emergency - CI Meeting 25 & 26 January - Revised Draft
- INDIA - Situation Report No. 7 and Financial Update

24 January 2005

- Thailand - Tsunami - Draft SOA and Report by Dolores Bachmann of Caritas Denmark

26 January 2005

- Sri Lanka - ERST TSUNAMI - Situation Report No. 4

27 January 2005

- Report on analysis of the Tsunami response
- Indonesia - Correction of Cordaid bank account details and JRS update

28 January 2005

- Indonesia - Recruitment advertisements

1 February 2005

- HIV in humanitarian responses, submitted by CAFOD
- Trocaire Aceh Background paper - CONFIDENTIAL - FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY
- Indonesia - Situation Reports 29 & 30 January 2005 and Article by Shawn Kelly Communications and Information Officer, APHD, about the Caritas Asia Gender Working Group meeting, Bangkok September 23, 2004

2 February 2005

- CRS/Indonesia Situation Report for January 31

4 February 2005

- Tsunami Relief & Rehabilitation Programme Donor and Programme Management Meeting, 25 & 26 January 2005 - Summary of Resolutions & Decisions and JRS update - 3 February 2005

8 February 2005

- Sri Lanka - bank account details

10 February 2005

- Asia - Tsunami - Update 10 February 2005
- Sri Lanka: Situation and action reports - 31 Jan - 6 Feb 05

15 February 2005

- INDONESIA - CRS Situation Report for 7-14 February

17 February 2005

- INDONESIA - Update on Catholic Agencies Activities in Aceh & North Sumatra

21 February 2005

- Thailand - Tsunami - Thai Solidarity Team Update - 18 February 2005

22 February 2005

- THAILAND - Caritas story, by Peter Tran, editor of UCA (Union of Catholic Asian) News

23 February 2005

- INDONESIA - CRS Situation Report February 15-21

24 February 2005

- THAILAND - TST Update no. 2, Thai Solidarity Team (TST) ToRs and Mandate

25 February 2005

- Sri Lanka – important message regarding Tsunami relief containers and cargo

28 February 2005

- Indonesia - SOA 02/2005 - SOA Working Group Documents.