

Real Time Evaluation of CRS' Flood Response in Pakistan
Jacobabad and Kashmore, Sindh



November 2010

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Background	1
Methodology	1
Limitations	3
Findings	3
Relevance and Appropriateness	3
Effectiveness	5
Connectedness and Sustainability ...	8
Coverage	9
Coordination and Coherence	9
Impact	10
Conclusions	10
Priority Recommendations	11
Lessons Learned	12
Annex A. List of Staff Interviewed	13
Annex B. Terms of Reference	14
Annex C. Data Collection Tools	18
Annex D. Action Plan for CRS Sindh.....	25
List of Tables	
Table 1. RTE Data Collection Methods ...	2
Table 2. Successes of Response	5
Table 3. Challenges of Response	7

Executive Summary

At the end of July 2010, heavy rains caused catastrophic floods across large sections of Pakistan. Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and its implementing partners are currently responding to the needs of affected communities by providing non-food item (NFI) kits to meet household basic needs, locally-appropriate transitional shelter, vouchers and cash grants to restart livelihoods and hand pump repair and hygiene promotion trainings to improve access to clean water and improve community sanitation.

The real time evaluation (RTE) was held approximately eight weeks after CRS' flood response began in Kashmore and Jacobabad to allow staff to learn from progress and achievements to date and to identify ways to apply this learning to improve the quality of on-going implementation. The methodology was designed to address the standard evaluation criteria associated with RTEs and included an additional focus on issues of beneficiary accountability. The RTE collected qualitative data from beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in Jacobabad and Kashmore and conducted interviews with CRS and partner staff.

The RTE findings demonstrate a positive and very timely flood response despite challenging conditions including demands from neighboring districts and union councils to extend coverage, damaged infrastructure, stagnant flood waters in some areas and a constant stream of returning IDPs. The response has been characterized by a high degree of community participation, and a dedicated and flexible emergency response team. CRS and its implementing partners were the first NGOs to respond in the target areas. A formal accountability system is in place and project teams were able to use community feedback to quickly adapt aspects of the response. Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in the target communities were satisfied with the targeting strategy, the process and the respectful treatment they received from CRS and its partners, and reported a notable degree of impact for this early phase of the response. As well as stating that their basic needs had been met, beneficiaries cited improved health in Jacobabad and peace of mind from having a safe place to sleep in Kashmore.

These positive findings reflect an on-going effort by CRS to build staff capacity, conduct quality assessments, and strengthen systems for emergency response. The focus in the response on participation, transparency and accountability has also fostered a strong relationship between communities and the project teams which will provide a solid foundation for future phases of the response.

The RTE also highlighted some weaknesses: the response has yet to meet the changing needs of communities due to the cold of winter, and supply chain delays exist that are slowing implementation of the shelter program. In addition, staff in both locations noted gaps in the current staffing structure and the need for additional staff capacity building.

The RTE included a day of reflection with CRS and partner staff which culminated in a set of recommendations and an immediate action plan. The plan includes action points to not only address current gaps or weaknesses but to maintain the high degree of community participation, transparency, accountability and overall quality achieved by the early phase of the response.

Background

At the end of July 2010, heavy rains caused catastrophic floods across large sections of KPK and Baluchistan, as well as parts of Punjab and Azad Jammu and Kashmir provinces of Pakistan. In mid-August, as two waves of floodwaters traveled down the Indus, the situation in southern Punjab and Sindh deteriorated, with communities flooded on either side of the river and its tributaries. Over 1,600 deaths have been reported countrywide and an estimated 20 million people - and one-fifth of the country's land mass - have been affected by the disaster, described as the worst flooding in living memory. Raging floodwaters have washed away bridges, schools, water systems and medical facilities. Over 1.8 million houses have been either damaged or destroyed.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and its implementing partners¹ are currently responding to the needs of communities heavily affected by the recent catastrophic floods in the Shangla, Kohistan and Swat Districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) province; Jaffarabad, and Naseerabad Districts in Baluchistan; and Jacobabad and Kashmore Districts of Sindh. Immediately after the floods, CRS began addressing households' urgent need for water purification and storage, hygiene, and basic shelter, while initiating cash-for-work projects in the north to repair the crucial infrastructure that enables communities to regain access to assistance, markets, and services. CRS is now providing more durable transitional shelter to those who have lost homes, repairing damaged community hand pumps, providing hygiene promotion trainings and helping households to regain their livelihoods.

This real time evaluation (RTE) was held during the last week of November in Kashmore and Jacobabad in Sindh, approximately eight weeks after the CRS' flood response began in those districts. A previous RTE was conducted in Baluchistan and KPK, approximately nine weeks after the CRS emergency response started in those provinces. In total, CRS conducted RTEs in all 3 of the provinces in which response activities are taking place. The objectives of both RTEs were to enable CRS staff and staff from implementing partners to learn from progress and achievements of the flood response and to identify ways to apply this learning to improve the quality of on-going implementation. Additionally, the RTE aimed to promote a learning approach within each organization and identify emerging lessons learned and best practices.

Methodology

The RTE in Sindh was conducted using the same methods and data collection tools as the previous RTE conducted in KPK and Baluchistan. The RTE collected qualitative data from project beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries,² and held interviews with CRS staff and partner staff. The preliminary findings were

¹ For this response, CRS' implementing partners are Research and Development Foundation (RDF) in Kashmore and Youth Action Pakistan (YAP) in Jacobabad. CRS is also beginning a partnership with GSF Goth Seengar Foundation.

² Non-beneficiaries were defined as households that did not meet the targeting criteria to receive NFI kits, shelter kits, cash grants or livelihood vouchers but reside in communities where other households did receive this support from CRS or its implementing partners. Non-beneficiaries were only included in Kashmore because, according to this definition, there were no non-beneficiaries in Jacobabad.

shared with the project team, including staff from CRS, RDF, YAP and a donor, the Catholic Agency For Overseas Development (CAFOD), during a one-day reflection workshop in Sukkur. During the workshop, participants were able to engage with the RTE findings, discuss successes and challenges of the response, and develop a list of recommendations to be incorporated into the on-going response. The workshop culminated in an action plan to address these recommendations citing specific actions to be taken, persons responsible and a corresponding timeline. An additional reflection session was held in Islamabad for senior managers to review the findings and action plans and reflect on learning from both RTEs conducted during this emergency response.

The qualitative data collected from targeted communities consisted of focus group discussions and observations. The methodology was designed to represent Kashmore and Jacobabad, non-beneficiaries, beneficiaries, and men and women separately. Detailed information on the methodology is provided below in Table 1, and the names of staff persons interviewed are provided in Annex A.

Table 1. RTE Data Collection Methods

Method	Type of group / individual	# in Kashmore	# in Jacobabad
Focus group discussions	Female non-beneficiaries	1	-
	Female beneficiaries	1	1
	Male non-beneficiaries	1	-
	Male beneficiaries	1	1
Observation	Community observation	2	2
Staff interviews	CRS staff	20	
	RDF staff	1	-
	YAP staff	-	1

The RTE used standard evaluation criteria of appropriateness/relevance, effectiveness, connectedness/sustainability, coverage, coherence/coordination, and impact³ to formulate evaluation questions, develop data collection tools, and structure team reflection. The five basic elements of accountability included in the Good Enough Guide⁴ were incorporated as an overlay to complement the evaluation criteria. The evaluation questions are included in the findings below and in the terms of reference (TOR) in Annex B. The four tools used for data collection are in Annex C.⁵

³ While impact is not ordinarily included in real-time evaluations, the RTE team determined that it was worthwhile to include impact to learn about preliminary changes in target communities due to the intervention.

⁴ Impact Measurement and Accountability in Emergencies: The Good Enough Guide. ECB Project. Oxfam Publishing 2007.

⁵ Note that the staff interview tool is presented in its entirety but different questions were used for different interviewees based on their role and experience in the response. The entire tool was not used with any one staff person.

Limitations

Due to the nature of the emergency response in Sindh, project interventions were staggered. Thus no community had received all four interventions (NFIs, shelter, WASH, and livelihoods) at the time of the data collection. This limited the RTE in its ability to represent and learn about the impact and effectiveness of integrated programming. For example, in Kashmore, all of the eligible households in the community targeted for the RTE had already received shelter and NFIs but only 45% of the registered households had received livelihoods inputs and WASH programming had not yet begun. In Jacobabad, all of the registered households in the community where data was collected had already received WASH, NFIs and livelihood programming but only 27% of the shelter intervention had been rolled out. This means that any findings related to WASH are based only on Jacobabad. Although fewer respondents had received shelter kits and seeds at the time of the data collection, in general, all the respondents in both communities were familiar with the programs for shelter and livelihoods as they were currently underway in their villages. Regardless, the findings for these interventions are based on fewer respondents.

The RTE team, in consultation with CRS senior leadership, determined that it would not be possible to delay the RTE until all four interventions had been rolled out as programming deadlines in December would have made it impossible for staff to participate and it was determined that it was necessary to conduct an RTE prior to January to be able to apply the findings during this emergency response.

Although this RTE represents only one of the four areas covered in CRS' flood response, another RTE was conducted in early October that covers the response in Baluchistan and Besham. The RTE team, with input from CRS Pakistan senior management, determined that the response in Swat would not be included in either RTE due to a more complex and fluid security situation and also because the response mirrored that of Besham.

Furthermore, due to travel time for data collection (between 5-6 hours daily) and limited staff availability, it was not possible to include additional communities in the RTE. Even with only two communities, 3 days were spent in data collection as teams had to travel 5-6 hours daily to reach the communities. Normally, an RTE involves only 2 days of data collection.

Findings

1. Relevance and Appropriateness

- ✓ How was the assessment carried out and were decisions on how to respond based on the findings?
- ✓ To what extent were targeted households involved in the needs assessment, design, and implementation of the response?
- ✓ How satisfied are communities with the response?
- ✓ How effectively did the response provide opportunities for two way communication with beneficiaries?

Initial assessment: Assessments in both Kashmore and Jacobabad were of high quality, due to close collaboration with partners and strong participation from community members, government officials and other stakeholders. Sector specific assessments were carried out in WASH, agriculture and shelter. Based on these assessments, a Sindh-specific emergency response strategy was developed to respond to the priority needs identified by the communities. For example, both the NFI and shelter kits were adapted for Sindh and livelihoods and WASH programs were rolled out. Assessments, informal information gathering and working closely with partners were key to developing good area profiles and tailoring interventions to meet community needs as CRS is new to the area. Interventions were adjusted as new information was collected. The assessments were carried out through community-level focus group discussions, observations and transect walks which were complemented with household-level information gathered through the registration process. The registration process was conducted together with the community distribution committee who verified that the HH registered were indeed flood affected and helped identify vulnerable community members.

Beneficiary involvement in all stages: Community participation was high throughout all stages of the response. In addition to the assessment, both male and female community members provided input in the planning and design for the transitional shelters and NFI kits and actively participated in shelter construction. This extensive beneficiary participation led to high levels of community ownership.

CRS organized community committees to help implement the beneficiary registration and distribution processes. All castes present in the community are equitably represented in the community committees and leadership positions are divided among the castes. For example, if the chairman is from one caste, then the general secretary is from another caste. The committees were responsible for organizing volunteers who provided crowd control during the distributions, unloaded the trucks, assisted vulnerable people in transporting their NFI kits, shelter or livelihoods materials, and helped to ensure the security of CRS and partner staff, materials and vehicles in the field. A community focal point was also appointed to facilitate communication between the project staff and the communities. Although women were not represented in the community committees,⁶ women participated in all stages of the intervention informally by providing input directly to female CRS and partner field staff or through their male family members.

Community satisfaction of the response: Community members in both areas were very satisfied with the response. Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries felt the targeting process was clear and fair and that the assistance met their basic needs except for their ongoing need for food. Other emerging needs were also identified by field staff and validated during the RTE. For example, both men and women commented on the need for winterization of the shelters. Male community members also requested support for their livestock and access to water for crops while the women mentioned the need for bathing spaces. Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries noted that living conditions had greatly

⁶ Staff believe that it would be possible to include women in the community committees but, due to cultural considerations, it is first necessary to explore the issue at the community level as the community committees bring together representatives from different castes. This exploration has not yet been possible due to time constraints.

improved in the affected communities. Additionally, beneficiaries noted that they appreciated that CRS and partner staff treated them with respect, dignity, friendliness and involved them in all aspects of the response. CRS was the first (and only) organization responding in many areas and sectors, especially livelihoods.

Two-way communication: In the response, two-way communication has been effective. All respondents were now familiar with CRS, despite the fact that CRS has not previously worked in these areas. Overall, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in both locations felt that they had received enough information from CRS and that the process of project implementation was clear and transparent. In particular, the targeting criteria was clearly understood by community members (beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries) and considered fair, and community members were aware of the support they would receive. The early development and successful implementation of formal and informal feedback mechanisms provided clear ways for community members to provide feedback to CRS and its partners through a helpline, suggestion boxes, helpdesk or personal cell phones. Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were aware of how to give feedback, and said that they provided feedback to CRS or implementing partners in person as needed.

2. Effectiveness⁷

- ✓ What are the project's main successes and challenges in implementation? How can the challenges be addressed?
- ✓ Was the project able to meet its planned outputs on time? Why or why not?
- ✓ Is the staffing structure and capacity sufficient for effective implementation?
- ✓ Is the M&E system able to track changes and incorporate feedback into the process?

Successes: The high level of community participation, the appropriateness of the interventions, the quality of the coordination, and the quick roll-out of a response despite obstacles were identified as key successes. The quick mobilization of internal and external TDYers with past emergency experience and the effective leveraging of partner knowledge of the area and culture were identified as key contributing factors. Table 2 presents the detailed successes identified during the reflection session held in Sukkur.

Table 2: Successes of the Response in Sindh

Community participation was high

- ➔ Communities understand who CRS is and what the response entails
- ➔ Good relationship between CRS and the community

⁷ Effectiveness questions were addressed through input by CRS and partner staff, either in individual interviews or during the reflection sessions. Finance, procurement, and logistics systems were discussed, in addition to human resources and M&E systems. Staff cited many successes and challenges. Those outlined below were the main ones on which the groups focused during the days of reflection. The solutions to these challenges are reflected in the recommendations below.

- Communities trust CRS and felt ownership over the project
- High level of transparency about project activities
- Beneficiaries in Jacobabad noted that they have changed their hygiene practices
- Involvement in design: community was consulted on the NFI kit design and livelihood inputs needed
- Involvement in implementation: village committees/volunteers took part in registration and distribution resulting in peaceful, efficient distributions; women and men participated in shelter construction and sowing seeds
- Community members determined committee membership based on criteria
- Community members, especially women, were empowered
- Strong community linkages built
- Good reputation of CRS in the eyes of government and other stakeholders
- Good relationship established with local and national vendors

Coordination and strong relationship with all actors (including local partners, communities and government agencies) resulted in benefits

- Communities treated with respect, dignity and friendliness
- Strong community linkages
- Good reputation of CRS in the eyes of government and other stakeholders
- Established good relationship with local and national vendors

Partner and other staff capacity built

- Early identification and selection of good partners
- Quick orientation of new staff and building of partner capacity
- Ongoing on-the-job training through TDYers and experienced staff

Appropriate and relevant response

- CRS was the first NGO to respond in many areas
- Approach was appropriate (relevant interventions, timeliness and phasing of interventions)
- Initial priority needs met (except for food)
- Secured significant funding

Good targeting/design/strategy

- Quick mobilization of resources
- Quick office/program set-up
- Purposeful selection of union councils; project design covers 100% of selected union councils
- Holistic approach
- Timely development of program strategy
- Sindh-specific strategy

Challenges: Despite a largely successful response, field- and Islamabad-based CRS staff noted challenges related to CRS systems, especially supply chain management, security, and human resources (namely challenges recruiting new staff and retaining staff in a very competitive environment), as well as winterization and communication. The field teams noted additional details related to these challenges which are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Challenges of the Response in Sindh.

Challenges
→ Pipeline/supply chain delay, including issues with the quality of materials
→ Pressure from the shelter cluster due to differences between the cluster strategy and the CRS strategy (the cluster was slow to determine their strategy and CRS was already building transitional shelters by the time the cluster adopted their core shelter strategy)
→ Shelters and NFI kits are not fully winterized
→ Growing security risks for partner and CRS staff, such as threats received from landlords and neighboring, un-served union councils
→ Community expectations are high (beyond current targets)
→ Staffing, specifically the identification, hiring and retention of qualified permanent staff (especially women and M&E staff) and offering comparatively low salaries in a saturated market
→ Key positions remain unfilled
→ Low staff capacity - more experienced staff needed for CRS and partner staff
→ Some newly hired staff did not receive an initial formal introduction on CRS policies and procedures as they were needed immediately and sent straight to the field for on-the-job orientation
→ Timely communication between partners and CRS
→ Internal communication between offices
→ Targets very high, time is limited
→ Language barriers combined with low education levels require additional staff time to ensure community comprehension in some communities (in some areas several different local languages are spoken and only some community members speak Sindhi or Urdu – thus, translation is necessary)
→ Damaged infrastructure especially roads increases travel time for field staff and materials
→ Slow government response to repair irrigation infrastructure, which negatively affects livelihoods programming
→ Registration and verification of data – field staff noted that it was time consuming to verify the data compiled during the joint registration

Effectiveness of Systems: Overall, strong existing systems and on-the-job training on new staff by experienced TDYers contributed to the timeliness of the emergency response. However, the high turnover of TDYers and delays in hiring permanent, experienced staff for the Sukkur, Jacobabad and Kandhkot offices caused slight delays in implementation. Many of these hiccups have been ironed out, but additional training in CRS policies and procedures is needed.

Formal and informal monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms have provided staff with a general sense of project progress, and input from targeted communities has allowed the project team to be

responsive to community feedback. CRS conducted a reflection session that allowed staff from the shelter program to discuss their observations and any input they had received to make timely management and programmatic decisions. Best practices from both the Besham and Baluchistan emergency responses were shared with CRS and partner staff in Jacobabad, Kandhkot and Sukkur to facilitate learning between different CRS sub-offices. Although data entry has been a challenge for formal monitoring, data is shared informally and through daily/weekly reports which allow program managers to incorporate feedback quickly. Additionally, a central repository of monitoring forms adapted for the emergency response in Sindh has been created.

While CRS Sukkur is supported by a M&E working group that includes a recently appointed country-wide M&E officer and regional M&E support staff, a full-time, permanent M&E staff person is needed for the Sukkur office to provide ongoing support and training for CRS and partner staff in data collection, compilation and reporting using the existing M&E tools. Although monitoring data is collected on a regular basis and M&E tools and systems are in place, CRS and partner staff need additional support to facilitate timely and accurate M&E reporting. This will allow the existing formal data to be more fully used and facilitate the monitoring of the longer-term response by the project team.

3. Connectedness and Sustainability

- ✓ To what extent are beneficiaries participating in the response? Is their participation sufficient and can it be improved?
- ✓ How have the needs of the target population changed since the original project design? How has the project met these needs?
- ✓ How is the current phase of the intervention laying the foundation for subsequent phases?

Community Participation: As noted above, community participation was high and has contributed to the trust, community ownership and a strong relationship between community members and CRS and its partners. Staff recommended that additional female CRS and partner field staff be hired to facilitate the integration of women in the community committees, where possible given cultural considerations, and to strengthen women’s voices in the planning and decision-making for the response.

Changing Population Needs: As initial and priority needs for water, shelter and NFIs were met through CRS programming, community priority needs changed. Emerging priority needs were already known to CRS and partner staff through ongoing monitoring systems, staff contact, and the informal and formal feedback mechanisms in place. In particular, with the coming of winter and the start of a new cropping season, beneficiaries need blankets and winterized shelters, and livelihoods support (e.g. repair of irrigation channels, seeds, fertilizer, water for crops and animals). CRS and partner staff have already begun programming to address these needs. Other community needs identified were access to medical care, education, and bathing spaces.

Transition for future phases: The current response has provided a solid foundation for future phases by cultivating a strong relationship between CRS/partners and communities. There is a high degree of trust by communities in CRS’ work and promises, and standards of quality. Currently, communities are organized, motivated and eager for continued programming and CRS and its partners have developed

strong profiles of the affected areas. In addition, CRS' commitment to continue to increase partner capacity in areas such as M&E, management and finance will contribute to the strength of longer-term programming.

Furthermore, CRS' country-wide strategy is to work with people who are in or near their home communities and not with displaced people in camps which facilitates the move into the recovery phase in communities where the emergency projects are taking place.

Additionally, strong coordination with the provincial and district governments and other local stakeholders will help the scaling-up of assistance to affected communities and facilitate government support for CRS' future work. The community committees in place will also be the mechanism through which CRS can implement future projects.

4. Coverage

- ✓ Were the targeting criteria and methodology appropriate (community level and household / individual level)?
- ✓ Did targeting decisions allow us to reach the greatest need?

Appropriateness of targeting: Communities confirmed that the right people were targeted for the right priority needs in this phase of the response. In Kashmore, this was underlined by people who did not receive support from CRS, as they confirmed that others were in greater need of that assistance than they were. Furthermore, the response targets two of the most affected districts in northern Sindh, Jacobabad and Kashmore, and the most of the highly affected union councils within each.

Meeting greatest need: The response has met the greatest need in both locations based on community input and assessment findings. However, community members noted that there are recently returned IDPs that meet the target criteria but have not yet been registered to receive assistance. The field teams are planning to register these households.

5. Coordination and Coherence

- ✓ How effective is coordination between CRS, UN, INGOs, CI partners and local, implementing partners and what could be improved now?
- ✓ How did the availability of emergency funding from various sources affect the speed of response?

Effectiveness of coordination: CRS worked immediately with local partners to conduct assessments and decide on an implementation plan. CRS coordinated closely with the government at the local, provincial, and national levels from the very beginning of this emergency response. For example, CRS was the first INGO to attend the District Coordination Officer's (DCO) meetings in Jacobabad. CRS and partner staff also coordinated with UN agencies (especially through the cluster system), with international NGOs through the clusters, the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum (PHF), and bilateral discussions, and with local

NGOs and other local actors. CRS/partners specifically reached out to all organizations working in our target areas to build a relationship, even if they were not participating in the cluster or other coordination mechanisms. This avoided duplication of efforts and resources. At the national level, CRS is the new chair of PHF, which continues to advocate with the national government to create a conducive environment for humanitarian actors. CRS has either coordinated or directly collaborated with Caritas International and its members.

However, it has sometimes been difficult for CRS staff to attend all cluster meetings. At the provincial level, field staff often have to travel long distances to participate, which is not always practical. At the national level in Islamabad, CRS does not have a large enough number of programming staff to send staff to every cluster meeting, and the technical experts for shelter, livelihoods and WASH are all in the field. Another challenge has been that the clusters have taken a longer time to get established in the South – for example, the agriculture cluster for Northern Sindh just began operating in November.

Effect of funding on speed of response: CRS' access to its private funds as well as a few early donors allowed CRS to respond immediately throughout the country as the flood situation evolved. Some of the early external donors provided funding with short project periods and rapid reporting requirements that were challenging for CRS when information was not always easily available and field staff were busy with conducting the response. However, these sources allowed CRS to quickly make a decision to raise its targets beyond what its private funding could accommodate.

6. Impact

✓ To what extent is the intervention improving the condition of affected communities?

Changes in communities: Though CRS' response is still in progress, communities clearly indicated that the assistance had significantly improved their situation and they cited multiple specific benefits for households. The responses varied between locations. However, both locations noted that beneficiaries were using all of the items in the NFI kits, households that have already received shelter are living inside their new homes, those that have received seeds have already sowed them, and community members have become less worried about the future and more empowered, confident and united. In Jacobabad, beneficiaries also noted significant health improvements from access to clean water (through hand pump repair and distribution of Aquatabs) and mosquito nets, and improved hygiene practices through access to soap and hygiene information. Beneficiaries particularly commented on the health benefits for children.

Conclusions

The findings of the RTE demonstrate a positive and appropriate flood response by CRS and its implementing partners. The response has been characterized by a high degree of community participation throughout design and implementation and a dedicated and flexible emergency response team. Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were satisfied with the targeting strategy and reported a notable degree of impact for this early phase of the response. The project team is particularly proud of

the strong relationship developed with targeted communities during the early phases of this response and the high level of trust that communities have placed in CRS and its implementing partners. These positive findings mirror those of the earlier RTE conducted in Besham and Baluchistan.

The RTE also highlighted some weaknesses in processes which will shortly be addressed through the action plans developed by project teams. Specifically, the winterization of NFI and shelter interventions is needed and gaps remain in the current staff structuring which will become more glaring as the response expands its coverage and scope.

The positive findings for the overall response reflect a concerted effort within the region and in Pakistan to build the capacity of staff in the areas of assessments, community involvement, tools, and processes (such as debriefing sessions for analysis). These were areas of weakness noted in emergency responses over the past few years which have been subsequently addressed through trainings and coaching during actual emergencies.

The RTE provided an excellent opportunity for the project team to review progress and reflect on the quality of the on-going implementation. Given the quality of the response, much of the reflection with staff focused on how to maintain the high level of participation and effectiveness evidenced in the response to date. The RTE provided a timely opportunity for staff to revisit the strategy for different components of the response and to address any gaps in these strategies.

Priority Recommendations

CRS staff and partners defined the following actionable recommendations to be incorporated into the current response in both areas. While additional recommendations were discussed with the project team during the analysis workshop, these were identified as critical for maintaining and improving the quality of the current response. Annex D provides specific action points and a timeline for each recommendation.

The following recommendations emerged:

1. **Reduce Pipeline/supply chain delay/quality issues.** Continued delays in material delivery are slowing the implementation of the shelter program in both Kashmore and Jacobabad. Material, where possible, should be purchased locally to avoid transportation delays and the number of suppliers should be increased. All goods should be checked for quality at the departure point to avoid the rejection of materials in Sukkur. Additional warehouse space should be secured and additional quality control and warehouse staff should be hired.
2. **Continue CRS current transitional shelter approach while adding some items drawn from the cluster core shelter strategy.** The cluster has given a deadline for the completion of transitional shelter projects as winter is here and the transitional shelters do not provide adequate protection from the cold. We are addressing this by adding brick molds to the toolkit and thus allowing communities to add brick walls to their transitional shelters to make them semi-permanent and winterized homes. Senior management together with shelter staff should analyze our strategy in comparison with the cluster approach to see if there are any other elements that we can integrate.

3. **Winterize NFIs and Shelters.** Conduct a rapid assessment to identify winter needs and validate beneficiary-suggested solutions such as blankets and plastic sheeting to winterize the shelters. In consultation with senior management, procure, distribute and/or revise our NFI and shelter kits as needed.
4. **Re-examine current and growing security risks to partners and CRS because of increasing demand-oriented threats from non-beneficiaries; identify potential future threats as non-beneficiaries grow more frustrated; identify actions to reduce the threat to staff.** Conduct an updated security analysis and assessment for our operational area with respect to current and potential risks. Develop security recommendations and a security strategy for the present and future threats. Provide additional security orientation to CRS and partner staff and put in place strong communication mechanisms for timely sharing of information about risks (for example during daily feedback meetings). Ensure that regular formal and informal security assessments are conducted. Ensure that CRS and partner field staff have clear information about our approach and strategy to share with the community and neighboring communities that demand services.
5. **Build staff capacity and fill key positions.** Implementation capacity, especially in programs with more unfilled positions such as livelihoods, is negatively affected by the relatively small number of staff available. While TDYers have done an admirable job of filling the gaps, many staff positions need to be filled as soon as possible. For difficult-to-fill positions such as M&E officer, hire less experienced staff but pair them with experienced staff through accompaniment of long-term TDYers (i.e. at least one month). Explore immediate staff training needs and creative training options such as short lunch or dinner-time sessions in a specific policy or procedure. Provide written material on CRS programs and administration for all staff.

Lessons Learned

The flood response built upon the lessons learned identified through previous evaluations, including real-time evaluations, of CRS' emergency programming in Pakistan. In addition to those previously documented lessons, the discussions with project teams as part of this evaluation contributed the following:

- When rapidly scaling up (opening new offices, covering new areas, working with new partners, and hiring many new staff) secure experienced permanent staff to lead the response as early as possible, and extend the length of key TDYers (to at least one month) to provide consistency of the approach and enough time for meaningful on-the-job training for new CRS and partner staff;
- Early in the response, create mechanisms for clear and timely communication between CRS and partner staff and also within CRS to ensure that communities, government officials and other actors receive consistent and accurate information about our joint response.

Annex A. List of staff interviewed

CRS Islamabad

Majid Hussain Butt, Procurement Manager
Jack Byrne, Country Representative
Carolyn Fanelli, Head of Programming
Gulwali Khan, Flood Emergency Coordinator
Muhammad Nowsherwan, Senior Logistics Officer
Muzaffar Tahir, Admin & HR Manager

CRS Sindh

Mohammed Adam, Program Manager for WASH
Adeel Javaid, Program Manager for Shelter
Pipin Josephine, TDY, M&E Officer
Fahad Khan, TDY, Acting Program Manager for Livelihoods *
Shabbir Kiani, Human Resources and Administration Manager
Khizra Manzoor, TDY, Acting Program Manager for WASH *
Adhong Ramadhan, TDY, Program Manager for NFIs
Asma Rao, Human Resources Officer
James Riturban, Area Coordinator for Jacobabad
Eric Vandenbrink, Program Manager for Livelihoods
Susan van Duijl, TDY, Interim HoO
Khanzada Khan, TDY, Technical Advisor for Livelihoods

RDF

Roshan Ali Rahu, Field Operation Manager

YAP

Rabail Sheikh, Program Manager

*Note: Acting Program Managers served during a Program Manager absence or prior to their arrival.

Annex B. Terms of Reference

for Real Time Evaluation - 2010 Pakistan Flood Response

by CRS Through its Besham, Quetta and Sukkur Field Offices

1. Introduction

At the end of July 2010, heavy rains caused catastrophic floods across large sections of KPK and Baluchistan, as well as parts of Punjab and Azad Jammu and Kashmir provinces of Pakistan. In mid-August, as two waves of floodwaters traveled down the Indus, the situation in southern Punjab and Sindh deteriorated, with communities flooded on either side of the river and its tributaries. Hundreds of thousands of people from Sindh fled from existing and anticipated floodwaters.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) has responded to the needs of communities heavily affected by the recent catastrophic floods in the Shangla, Kohistan and Swat Districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) province; Kohlu, Barkhan, Sibi, Jaffarabad, and Naseerabad Districts in Baluchistan; and Thatta, Khaipur, Jacobabad, and Kashmore Districts of Sindh.

CRS has planned to conduct a first round of a real time evaluation for its response in Shangla and Kohistan (managed from the Besham field office), and Jaffarabad, and Nareerabad (managed from the Quetta field office) in early October, 2010, and one for Kashmore and Jacobabad (managed by the Sindh field office in Sukkur) in late November 2010.

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Real Time Evaluation

CRS is committed to assessing and improving the quality of its humanitarian programs. In order to meet this commitment, and create space for the emergency response team to “step back” from its work, CRS has begun to make use of Real Time Evaluations (RTE).

The overall purpose of this RTE is to enable the response team to learn from implementing the program to date and to make improvements so that the program is effective in meeting the needs of disaster affected people. This RTE will draw on learning from previous RTEs in Pakistan (Baluchistan earthquake 2008 and Swat Valley IDP return/early recovery 2009) to determine if lessons from previous experiences were incorporated or not, and why. As it takes place in the first phase of the response the RTE team needs to be flexible and ensure its work fits with the demands and challenges facing the country team(s), partners and the affected population.

The objectives for this RTE are:

1. To review the response against established criteria and recommend immediate changes that can improve the emergency program.
2. To promote a learning approach within CRS and its partners.
3. To identify good practices to use more widely and lessons learned in this response.
4. To identify persistent weaknesses for organizational learning and recommend how they can be addressed.

3. Methodology

For the Besham and Baluchistan RTE, there will be two RTE teams, each led by CRS staff external to the flood response. The teams will be divided between the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province (Shangla and Kohistan districts) and Baluchistan province (Naseerabad and Jaffarabad districts). For the Sindh response, there will be one RTE team, lead by staff from the Islamabad office.

The evaluation will collect the minimal data required to reflect upon project progress and accomplishments and identify good practices. The RTE teams will primarily collect qualitative data in target communities which will be discussed during debriefs at the end of each day. The evaluation will culminate in a participatory analysis and reflection session with the project team. In summary, the RTE methodology will include:

- ✓ interviews with CRS and partner staff members;
- ✓ focus group discussions with project beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries;
- ✓ observations in targeted communities; and
- ✓ a participatory analysis and reflection session with the project teams.

Data collection and interpretation will center around standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of appropriateness and relevance; effectiveness; connectedness and sustainability; coverage; and coordination and coherence. It will also include a light examination of impact. Under each criterion, specific evaluation questions have been drafted for the project context. The evaluation questions are as follows:

Relevance/appropriateness (are we doing the right thing?)

- ✓ How was the assessment carried out and were decisions on how to respond based on the findings?
- ✓ To what extent were targeted households involved in the needs assessment, design, and implementation of the response?
- ✓ How satisfied are communities with the response?
- ✓ How effectively did the response provide opportunities for two way communication with beneficiaries?

Effectiveness (are we achieving what we planned?)

- ✓ Was the project able to meet its planned outputs on time? Why or why not?
- ✓ What are the project's main successes and challenges in implementation? How can the challenges be addressed?
- ✓ Is the staffing structure and capacity sufficient for effective implementation?
- ✓ Is the M&E system able to track changes and incorporate feedback into the process?

Connectedness and sustainability (does the response link to longer term programs?)

- ✓ To what extent are beneficiaries participating in the response? Is their participation sufficient and can it be improved?
- ✓ How is the current phase of the intervention laying the foundation for subsequent phases?
- ✓ How have the needs of the target population changed since the original project design? How has the project met these needs?

Coverage (who and how many people are we reaching?)

- ✓ Were the targeting criteria and methodology appropriate (community level and household / individual level)?
- ✓ Did targeting decisions allow us to reach the greatest need?

Coordination/coherence (how are we working with others?)

- ✓ How effective is coordination between CRS, UN, INGOs, CI partners and local, implementing partners and what could be improved now?
- ✓ How did the availability of emergency funding from various sources affect the speed of response?

Impact (is what we are doing making a difference?)

- ✓ To what extent is the intervention improving the condition of affected communities?

4. Presentation and documentation of findings and recommendations

The RTE teams will debrief with the respective field teams and partners on its main findings at a Day of Reflection workshop. The team leads will return to Islamabad to debrief with the country program managers and available regional staff. The team leaders will complete a draft report for comments upon return to their base. A final report should be produced ideally within the following week. The report should be brief, not exceeding 15 pages plus some short annexes containing the Terms of Reference and a timeline of the response. The final report will be signed off by the commissioning manager noting his/her agreement or not with the action plan and posted on CRS Global. The country program office and partner agencies will be responsible for taking forward the action points and recommendations relevant to them, as well as any sharing of findings with funders and regional/HQ level managers.

5. Ownership, resourcing and timing for the Sindh RTE

The Head of Programs is the RTE commissioning manager, and the final report will be approved by the Head of Office in Sukkur and the Country Representative. The evaluation team will be accountable to the commissioning manager. The following timeline will be followed:

Activity	Date
Team leads travel to field	November 23 rd
Field teams are oriented and trained in the tools	November 25 th
Data collection in the field with communities and field office staff	November 26-28 th
Data analysis and preparation for the Day of Reflection	November 29-30 th
Day of Reflection	December 1 st
Team leads travel to Islamabad	December 2 nd
Debrief with country level and regional managers	December 6 th
Drafting of report	December 7 th , 8 th

6. Assumptions and requirements

- Evaluators will have access to all documentation and can take part in relevant meetings and field trips.
- Evaluators will have access to key staff in the responding CRS office and/or, partner offices for conducting interviews.
- All members of the evaluation team will have access to members of the affected population for conducting interviews.
- Evaluators will take confidentiality and objectivity into consideration during the process.

Annex C. Data Collection Tools

Pakistan RTE – November 2010 – FGD tool for Beneficiaries

Provide standard introduction: *We are with CRS/_____ and we'd like to talk to you about the support given to your community. We hope to learn how to provide better support from this discussion. This discussion will last approximately 1.5 hours. Your participation is purely voluntary and in no way influences any future support for your household and your community. We thank you for your valuable time and input.*

1. What information did CRS/____ give you at the beginning of the flood response? *Please be specific.*
 - a. What information did they give about what support would be provided?
 - b. What information did they give about who would receive support?
 - c. Was this enough information for you? If not, why not?

2. Did the response meet your priority needs right after the floods?
 - a. If so, how?
 - b. If not, why not?

3. How did your community participate in the response, for example in planning or carrying out the activities?
 - a. Who participated in this?
 - b. How did they participate?
 - c. Should there have been more community participation in providing the support? If so, why? If so, how?

4. [Jacobabad] Your community received NFIs, Hygiene promotion + shelter from CRS.
[Kashmore] Your community received NFIs and shelter from CRS.
 - a. [Both] Do you know the criteria for households receiving NFIs? What were they?
 - b. [Both] Do you know the criteria for households receiving shelter kits?
 - c. Were the criteria above appropriate for meeting the greatest need in your community? If not, why not?
 - d. Was anyone left out that should have received support? If so, who? If so, why?
 - e. Was anyone who received support who shouldn't have? If so, who? If so, why?

5. Do you know how to give feedback to CRS/____ about the response? If so, how?
 - a. Have you given feedback to CRS/____ about the response?
 - b. If not, why not?

6. Are you fully satisfied with the response?
 - a. If not, why not?

7. How have the needs in your community changed since the response began?
 - a. Have you been able to talk to CRS/_____ about these changing needs? If not, why not?

8. Has the situation in your community improved due to the response? If so, how? *Please be specific.*
 - a. Has this improvement been more for different households or groups in your community? If so, how? If so, why?
 - b. What has been the most important improvement in your community due to the response? Why is this the most important improvement?

9. Did the response cause any problems in your community?
 - a. If so, what problems? If so, for whom?
 - b. How can these problems be avoided in the future?

10. What else do we need to know to make the response better in the future?

Pakistan RTE – November 2010 – FGD tool for Non-Beneficiaries

Provide standard introduction: *We are with CRS/_____ and we'd like to talk to you about the support given to your community. We hope to learn how to provide better support from this discussion. This discussion will last approximately half an hour. Your participation is purely voluntary and in no way influences any future support for your household and your community. We thank you for your valuable time and input.*

11. What information did CRS/_____ give you at the beginning of the flood response? *Please be specific.*
 - a. What information did they give about what support would be provided?
 - b. What information did they give about who would receive support?
 - c. Was this enough information for you? If not, why not?

12. [Jacobabad] Your community received NFIs, Hygiene promotion + shelter from CRS.
[Kashmore] Your community received NFIs and shelter from CRS.
 - a. [Both] Do you know the criteria for households receiving NFIs? What were they?
 - b. [Both] Do you know the criteria for households receiving shelter kits?
 - c. Were the criteria above appropriate for meeting the greatest need in your community?
If not, why not?
 - d. Was anyone left out that should have received support? If so, who? If so, why?
 - e. Was anyone who received support who shouldn't have? If so, who? If so, why?

13. Do you know how to give feedback to CRS/_____ about the response? If so, how?
 - a. Have you given feedback to CRS/_____ about the response?
 - b. If not, why not?

14. Has the situation in your community improved due to the response? If so, how? *Please be specific.*
 - a. Has this improvement been more for different households or groups in your community? If so, how? If so, why?
 - b. What has been the most important improvement in your community due to the response? Why is this the most important improvement?

15. Did the response cause any problems in your community?
 - a. If so, what problems? If so, for whom?
 - b. How can these problems be avoided in the future?

16. What else do we need to know to make the response better in the future?

Pakistan RTE – November 2010 – Observation Tool

***Instructions:** Complete the following questions based on your observations throughout the community at the end of the day in the community. Please note anything you think is important or relevant in the notes section.*

Note the current observed needs related to:

Environment

Infrastructure

Shelter

Other buildings

Markets

Water

Sanitation/hygiene

Location of IDPs

Other

Notes: _____

Staff Interview Questions (note: not all questions were asked to all staff interviewed)

1. What impact (negative, positive or unintended) does the agency have on the affected communities?
2. In what ways are beneficiaries participating in the response?
 - Is the current level of community participation sufficient?
 - If not, why not?
 - How can it be improved?
3. How is the current phase of the intervention laying the foundation for subsequent phases?
4. Are the needs of the target population changing?
 - If yes, in what way?
 - If yes, how can we adapt the project to better suit the longer term needs?
5. What are the project's main successes and challenges in timely implementation?
 - in general
 - related to HR systems (capacity, staffing, deployments)
 - related to other systems (finance, logistics, etc.) Were there support systems accessed? Did they have the tools and forms available, and use them?
 - related to other support/preparedness systems (tools, forms, guidance) [were the systems accessed?] Were there support systems accessed? Did they have the tools and forms available, and use them for assessments, distributions, protection etc.
6. How can the challenges be addressed? What other changes can be made to make the program more effective?
7. How is the M&E system able to track changes and incorporate feedback into the process (GEG)?
 - Is the project team able to use feedback to increase project impact?
 - Is the project M&E system able to capture the changing needs in communities?
8. How was the assessment carried out? How was the response designed based on the findings?
 - Did the assessment provide a sufficient profile of affected communities and HHs (GEG)?
 - Did the assessment identify the changes that affected people want to see (GEG)?
9. To what extent were community members and partners involved in the needs assessment, design, and implementation of the response?
 - Has the project involved people at every stage? If not, why not?
 - Who wasn't involved?
 - How can this be improved (GEG)?
10. How many people did the project target in relation to the total number of people affected?
11. Is the project reaching the planned number of people? If not, please explain (also if more beneficiaries have been reached than planned).
12. Is the agency targeting the most vulnerable areas where the needs are the highest? (based on local data)
13. With whom are we coordinating (UN, INGOs, CI partners and implementing partners)?
 - With whom did we coordinate before starting our response?
 - What has been the biggest success in coordination and what were the gaps?

14. Has there been collaboration between the CBH agencies responding to this emergency? Please explain. [ActionAid, Action Against Hunger, CARE International UK, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Concern Worldwide UK, Helpage International, International Rescue Committee, Islamic Relief Worldwide, Merlin, Oxfam GB, Plan International UK, Save the Children UK, Tearfund and World Vision UK.]
15. Were you/your staff able to participate in the cluster system? If not, why?
16. Who are our local partners? What is the nature of the relationship with local partners? How have we supported our local/implementing partners? How beneficial was the partnership?

Annex D. Action Plan for CRS Sindh

Action Point	Persons Responsible	Date to be completed
1. Reduce pipeline/supply chain delay and quality issues		
Field support officers locate local warehouse	Nasir Khan	Dec. 9th
Contact Islamabad procurement every time goods are ready to be loaded to ensure quality control sign-off at supplier loading point	Imran Ud-din, Sukkur Logistics Officer	Starting date: Dec. 3rd
Twice weekly follow-up with Islamabad regarding supplies received, supplies to be sent and consistency of Islamabad quality control staff approving quality of shipped items in advance of their departure for Sukkur	Gul Wali and Trudy	Ongoing, starting Dec. 2 nd
PMs provide Rashid with shelter BoQs for local purchasing	Muhammad Adam Adeel Javaid	Dec. 3 rd Dec. 3 rd
Assess market for purchasing material in Kashmore, Jacobabad and Sukkur	In Sukkur, Procurement Officer, Rashid Abbassi In Jacobabad and Kashmore, FSOs with guidance from Rashid Abbassi	Dec. 9 th
Twice weekly follow-up with Islamabad regarding supplies received, supplies to be sent and capacity of quality staff	Gul Wali and Trudy	Ongoing, starting Dec. 2 nd
Ensure with Imran that protocol in place and followed regarding his communication to the field the time that trucks depart Sukkur for Jacobabad and Kashmore, as well as any delays along the way	Trudy	Dec. 3th
2. Continue CRS current transitional shelter approach while adding some items drawn from the		

cluster core shelter strategy		
Gul Wali, Carolyn, Adeel, Trudy review and investigate cluster shelter approach strategy vs. current CRS shelter strategy and identify specific compromise additions to our current approach	Carolyn	Dec. 9 th
Continuously engage cluster and keep abreast of their approach while advocating for CRS approach	Gul Wali	ongoing
3. Winterize NFIs and Shelters		
RDF and YAP, in consultation with Adeel, to conduct a rapid validation of suggestions, that were identified by beneficiaries during the RTE, to winterize NFIs and shelters	Samad (RDF) and Khameso (YAP)	Dec. 6 th
Consult with other organizations regarding their winterized NFI and shelter items	Adeel Javaid	Dec. 7 th
Based on funding available and procurement realities, determine with Trudy and Carolyn, what items can be added to winterize NFI and shelter packages	Gul Wali	Dec. 9 th
Determine with Gul Wali, Trudy and Carolyn whether we can distribute new additional winterized items to beneficiaries who have already received non-winterized NFI's and shelters	Adeel Javaid	Dec. 10 th
With Mumtaz Memon and/or Majid begin procurement (raise PRF) and add winterization items to NFI and shelter kits	Adeel Javaid	Dec. 11 th
4. Re-examine and specify current and growing security risks to partners and CRS because of demand-oriented threats from non-beneficiaries, and identify potential future threats as non-beneficiaries grow more frustrated; and identify actions to respond and reduce threat to staff.		
Conduct and update security assessment for our operational area	Farukh	Dec. 10th

(formal and informal) with respect to current and potential future risks		
Develop security recommendations and a security strategy for the present and future as risks/threats grow	Farukh	Dec. 10th
Provide security orientation for CRS and partner staff	Farukh	Dec. 10th
Provide security orientation for new CRS and partner staff, after Farukh's departure	Shabbir and Trudy	Dec. 31 st
Appoint security focal person in the field to share information with staff through the phone tree and to Shabbir/Trudy	Trudy	
Ensure that daily feedback meetings include sharing of security related information and report any issues or concerns to field security focal point	PMs	Daily starting Dec. 3 rd
Adeel, Gul Wali, Trudy and Carolyn assess what we can offer "non-beneficiaries" who were promised shelter (for example, pay for shelter from private funds or provide a something less)	Trudy	Dec. 12
Remind staff to share helpline number widely and communicate information clearly about coverage and target UCs with non-beneficiaries (i.e. we are working only in 3 UCs but can advocate for you in the coordination forum)	PMs	Dec. 3 rd
Remind PMs, HoO and Emergency Coordinator to share requests for support in areas or sectors where CRS does not serve in cluster and coordination meetings	Trudy	Dec. 2 nd
5. Build staff capacity and fill key positions		
Explore new strategies for hiring such as pairing less experienced staff with experienced staff (accompaniment of	Requestor with HR and Trudy (can consult with	ongoing

long-term TDYers, at least one month) which allows us to hire lesser-experienced staff and thus fill unfilled key positions (M&E officer)	Sharen)	
Conduct needs assessment with staff identifying their top learning needs with regards to policy and procedures	Trudy	Dec. 4 th
Create an outline that lists a series of short training sessions responding to the results of the needs assessment re priority policy and procedures learning needs	Trudy	Dec. 31 st
Request CRS staff orientation package from Islamabad and other offices	Asma	Dec. 4 th
Request translation of CRS staff orientation package into local language (Urdu or Sindi) to keep in field office	Asma	Dec. 4 th