

Evaluation of CCF Earthquake Relief in Nepal

Inception Report, *Cameron Conner, Grant Gallaher, 9/16/15*

Abstract: This Inception Report details the plans for an evaluation of the humanitarian aid provided to Nepali earthquake victims by the Conscious Connections Foundation (CCF). This evaluation is being conducted in order to provide greater accountability for the donors of CCF, guide CCF's future humanitarian actions, and assess the overall impact of small-scale aid organizations such as CCF. This Inception Report contains the project's background, purposes, scope, rationale, management arrangements, expected outputs, methodology, anticipated risks and challenges, key contacts, evaluation questions, reference documents, several sample data collection forms, and a glossary of key terms.

This Inception Report and project as a whole have been largely guided and informed by the ALNAP² Evaluation of Humanitarian Aid Pilot Guide.

1. Background

1.1 Conscious Connections Foundation

The Conscious Connections Foundation is a 501(c)3 public charity organization founded in September of 2014. CCF came about as earlier relief projects that had been carried out under the non-profit umbrella of the Fabric of Life Foundation grew and necessitated the establishment of a separate non-profit. CCF's programs have been in effect in Nepal for over six years, but they draw on the experience and connections built by CCF Chairwoman Denise Attwood and Board Member Ric Conner over their 30+ years of working in Nepal as owners of Ganesh Himal Trading, a Fair Trade import company.

CCF was established to promote and develop the education of young girls through the "Power of 5" program and to provide primary health care to the remote village of Baseri and its neighbors through the Baseri Clinic Project. Additionally, in the aftermath of the April 25th earthquake in Nepal, CCF utilized its preexisting connections and resources to launch several "Fair Aid" Earthquake Relief Projects (ERPs).

1.2 The Nepal Earthquake

On Saturday, April 25th at approximately 11:45 am, a magnitude 7.8 earthquake hit Nepal. Following that, another devastating earthquake of magnitude 7.3 hit on May 12th. The country has experienced more than 200 aftershocks, which ranged between magnitudes 4.5 and 6.6.

8,712 people have died in Nepal as of June 5th, while approximately 2.8 million are in need of assistance according to the Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX). In total, the United Nations estimates that over eight million people have been “affected.” Many of the most severe losses have occurred in the more remote villages of Nepal which are scattered among the Himalayas, and thus isolated from Kathmandu. As such, many of the deaths recorded are either a direct result of the earthquake and subsequent landslides or due to lack of necessary resources such as food, shelter and medicine.

1.3 CCF’s Response

CCF responded to the earthquake of April 25th and many subsequent aftershocks by pursuing three specific ERP’s:

- **Artisan Earthquake Relief:** Mostly initiated by Ganesh Himal Trading but now transitioning into the domain of CCF, this project concentrates on producers known by CCF and Ganesh Himal Trading to have lost their homes and/or means of livelihood. Artisan Relief focuses on helping these already marginalized individuals get back to work and/or on providing grants so that they can obtain the necessary supplies and materials to survive and begin rebuilding.
- **Baseri Earthquake Relief:** Immediate aid was provided to the villages of Baseri and Budhatum in the Dhading district within one week of the initial earthquake in the form of durable, but temporary, shelters, food and medicine.
- **General Earthquake Relief:** CCF partnered with many Nepalese organizations and individuals to distribute relief supplies beyond what CCF could achieve alone.

1.4 Main Earthquake Relief Goals

These are the main goals that the CCF Board of Directors had in mind at the inception of the organization’s humanitarian efforts.

- **Emergency Earthquake Relief** (short-term)
 - Save lives by providing shelter and food
 - Save lives by providing medical aid
 - Distribute relief resources rapidly through trusted channels
 - Provide a trusted conduit for donors to give and be involved in earthquake relief in a responsible and effective manner
- **Future Rebuilding** (long term)
 - Reconstruct the Deurali Community Service Center, home to the Baseri Clinic
 - Restore people's ability to generate income and make a living
 - Reduce the affected communities future vulnerability to similar disasters

The completion of the above goals will allow CCF to resume work on its primary initiatives, such as the Power of Five and Deurali Community Service Center.

2. Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to better understand the effectiveness of the disaster aid provided by CCF in Nepal. This information will be used to provide greater accountability to CCF stakeholders, including aid recipients, as well as to guide future organizational actions as the relief and rebuilding processes continue. Secondly, the purpose of this research is to study the relationship between small-scale aid organizations such as CCF and larger International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) and understand how their respective work might compliment each other in future disaster scenarios.

2.1 Main Guiding Questions

1. Did CCF's earthquake response achieve its short term purpose?
2. Where was CCF's short term earthquake response effective and where was it not?
3. How and where can CCF most effectively provide relief to achieve its long term goals?
4. Where do CCF and other similar small-scale aid organizations belong in the overall context and community of humanitarian aid?

2.2 Types of Evaluation

A learning-oriented evaluation⁷ will be used to analyze what aspects of CCF's earthquake relief projects worked, what was missed, and how CCF's involvement can effectively transition from providing immediate and emergency assistance, to supporting various groups and communities in their process of rebuilding. Additionally, an accountability-oriented evaluation¹ will assess the effectiveness of past aid provided by CCF in realizing the needs of Nepalese earthquake victims, so as to determine the organization's accountability to those who financed its work, those it seeks to aid, and other humanitarian actors.

2.3 Larger Implications

By analyzing both the learning-oriented, and accountability-oriented evaluations, CCF's work and model will be examined in the larger context of the overall relief process which has taken place in Nepal. The combination of this analysis along with similar evaluations of other humanitarian aid perspectives has the potential to demonstrate how CCF can become more efficient and effective. Should this project prove successful, CCF and this research have the potential to serve as models for other small organizations who also seek their place in the overall system and community of humanitarian aid. Likewise, this research may have the ability to demonstrate the importance to larger INGO's of the niche occupied by small-scale organizations, and thus reveal the potential for mutually beneficial partnerships.

3. Scope of Evaluation

3.1 Evaluation Projects

This research will evaluate each of CCF's three primary ERPs:

- **Artisan Relief:** Evaluation will take place in both the Kathmandu Valley and the outlying Districts of Dhading and Gorkha. The Artisan Relief evaluation will involve Sadle Traders, the Association of Craft Producers, Cameron Handloom Designs, Cotton Bag Associates, Stupa Trading, Muktinath Cargo, Bhaktapur Women Craft Paper, and Tibet Wears, all long time partners of Ganesh Himal Trading. Many employees of these partnering organizations were heavily affected by the earthquake.
- **Baseri Relief:** Evaluation will take place in the villages of Baseri and Budhatum. Research will assess the immediate aid provided directly after the earthquake and future aid needed for the planning and reconstruction of the Deurali Community Service Center, home to the Baseri Health Clinic, as well as assessing the best potential rebuilding techniques for permanent housing in the area.
- **General Relief:** Representatives will travel from Kathmandu, up the Buri Gandaki River to Baseri, visiting and evaluating six CCF-assisted villages which lay along this path. CCF representatives will attempt to travel further up the Buri Gandaki in order to reach even more remote villages and assess their situation. Should time be available, CCF representatives will also visit several villages in the district of Sindhupalchowk which were supported by CCF's donations to TEAM Nepal.

3.2 Outside Evaluations

In addition to the work with those directly affected by CCF, CCF representatives will be spending up to a month working with and interviewing representatives of organizations other than CCF to gain as much experience as possible observing and studying the various perspectives and methods which different models of humanitarian aid organizations employ to achieve their goals. The primary approach for the moment is to volunteer at an INGO, studying the perspective on the distribution and evolution of international humanitarian aid specific to a larger, globally recognized institution in the context of the Nepal Earthquake.

4. Why this Evaluation is Necessary

As the process of providing immediate relief to those affected by the earthquake diminishes, the process of permanent rebuilding must come to the forefront. Yet before CCF can embark on this process, it must first determine what form these new projects might take; what new goals should be set in place and how they can be achieved.

4.1 Why this Evaluation is Valuable to CCF

The Earthquake Relief Projects undertaken by CCF have been the largest source, and expenditure, of resources in the organization's history, with over \$154,200 being raised and close to \$40,000 already distributed as of August 2015. The rest of these resources are being held aside for the future process of rebuilding. Since these projects initially arose as a reaction to an unforeseeable crisis, CCF has had little time to critically and credibly analyze its accountability to its mission and guidelines. The information collected through this research will provide a credible analysis of the recent actions undertaken by CCF, so as to increase the transparency of

its actions and hold it financially⁶, strategically¹¹, and managerially⁸ accountable to its donors and those it seeks to aid.

4.2 Ongoing Importance

Furthermore, as climate change takes an ever more noticeable toll on this planet and natural disasters become an ever more prevalent problem in our changing world, a better way to help those affected becomes an ever greater necessity. This becomes an increasingly important topic as unease about the highly variable performance amongst humanitarian agencies becomes increasingly widespread. As such, it is apparent that an evolution of aid must take place to restore trust and faith in the ability of humanitarian aid to help those affected by natural disasters and accurately realize the desires of those who wish to help. This project has the potential to further catalyze this evolution.

4.3 Why this Evaluation is Valuable Now

The specific window of opportunity in which CCF has to conduct this research presents a unique view of the issue. Visiting Nepal less than six months after the earthquake will allow us to observe the relief process while still in full swing, but without interfering in this process and hampering necessary and immediate relief. Furthermore, when CCF representatives Ric Conner, Denise Attwood, Cameron Conner and Grant Gallaher arrive in Nepal at the beginning of October, monsoon season will have recently come to a close. Vehicles will finally be able to reach outlying villages, many of which have been isolated since the middle of May, if not the end of April. As transportation to and from many villages becomes an option, so does the potential for reconstruction and a slow return to normalcy; a goal that can only be assured when survival and the bare necessities are provided for. When monsoon season ends, villagers will once again have access to these necessities and, with the help of CCF, can then make the transition from temporary aid to permanent reconstruction.

5. Management arrangements

5.1 CCF Evaluation Team

- Cameron Conner
- Grant Gallaher
- Denise Attwood
- Ric Conner

5.2 Steering Group

A group comprised of key stakeholders who will guide evaluators in the articulation of key guidelines, goals, and Terms of Reference. Overall, the steering group will steer the evaluation through key stages in writing the inception report and drafting the final report. The Steering Group will initially be comprised of:

- Board of Directors, Conscious Connections Foundation

5.3 Peer Review Group

A group that advises on quality issues made of evaluators and other specialists chosen for their knowledge of evaluation, the region, or the type of intervention being evaluated. The Peer Review Group will continue to evolve over time. This evaluation's Peer Review Group will initially be comprised of:

- Matt Shelley: Director of Global Engagement, Murrow College of Communication, WSU
- George Wilson: Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Advisor, Mercy Corps
- Kimberly Maynard: Mansfield Fellow in International Affairs, University of Montana

6. Expected Outputs⁹

- **Inception Report:** This document, the purpose of which is to outline goals, methods, expectations, limitations, and guidelines.
- **Blog updates from the field:** Updates directed at CCF's Board of Directors and the CCF website describing the progress being made on the project. Available to any party which might be interested and posted on the front page of the CCF's website.
- **Main Report:** Containing the results of the field studies conducted, volunteer work comparison, final conclusions, and the future actions recommended based on these findings.

7. Methodology

As this research is based on both learning-oriented, and accountability-oriented evaluations, this evaluation will attempt to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. This research will be carried out with the following methods of evaluation:

7.1 Interviews with Key Informants

These interviews are in-depth discussions guided by prearranged and interview specific questions to be held with Key Informants. Each interview will aim to address a key point of view which may represent the particular perspective of a larger group, organization, community, etc.

See Annex A for a list of Key Informants to be interviewed.

See Annex D for a Draft Interview Outline.

7.2 Surveys

These surveys are a brief collection of standardized, prearranged questions presented to one individual at a time. Further in depth questioning will be conducted where necessary so as to more comprehensively understand survey findings and determine how to respond to feedback provided by the affected population. As most communities will have received aid from other organizations as well as CCF, most responses from this survey will not be directly attributable to

CCF's work. Therefore, these surveys will be conducted with the intent of gathering general data from the affected population to inform CCF's next steps.

See Annex E for a Draft Survey.

7.3 Desk Review

Desk review focuses on the analysis of international journal, magazine, newspaper, and online articles, books, and other documents concerning either the humanitarian action taken in Nepal, the culture and history of Nepal, and/or methods of conducting evaluations on humanitarian aid. This information is used to gain a clearer understanding of the environment this research will be conducted in, and to build expertise necessary to more credibly and professionally conduct this research.

See Annex C for a list of Key Reference Documents and Materials used during Desk Review.

7.4 Field Observations

Field observations will be conducted in each village that CCF representatives visit, regardless of whether or not they have received aid from CCF. As representatives enter and reside in each village, they will note key observations regarding food, shelter, medical supplies, and other resources that may be indicative of the aid received and the current condition of each village. These observations provide a point of reference on the reality of the situation in Nepal that can be compared against interview answers to see if they support the same conclusions.

See Annex F for a Draft Field Observations Form.

8. Anticipated Risks and Challenges

The following is a list of anticipated ambiguities and areas of concerns that have the potential to affect the overall findings of this research.

- Due to time and geographical restraints in Nepal, the representatives of CCF will not have the ability to reach every ERP. As such, any information presented at the end of this research will only represent a portion of CCF's work and can therefore not be said to represent the organization's work in its entirety.
- The guiding standards and goals against which this project will assess the actions of CCF were established several months after initial intervention took place. This was predominantly due to the rapid pace at which CCF initially acted. The current standards reflect as accurately as possible what would have been CCF's guiding standards and goals had CCF had time to put them in place, yet it is important to concede that they may or may not be different than what would originally have been conceived.
- Cultural gaps that are naturally present in this work will likely make communication difficult. Local translators and extensive cultural study will be used to attempt to reduce the potential negative effects of this cultural barrier.

- In each village, CCF representatives will aim to survey 30-40 individuals from a random selection of the community. As this will only be a portion of the village and small percent of the district as a whole, the information gathered by this project will be merely indicative rather than entirely representative.
- Because this evaluation is being conducted by representatives of CCF, the final report may be subject to biases due to lack of third party objectivity. The involvement of unbiased, third party professionals in the Peer Review Group will hopefully reduce this potential for bias.

LIST OF ANNEXES to Evaluation of CCF Earthquake Relief in Nepal

- Annex A: Contacts
- Annex B: Evaluation Matrix
- Annex C: Key Reference Documents
- Annex D: Draft Interview Outline
- Annex E: Draft Survey
- Annex F: Draft Field Observation Form
- Annex G: Glossary

Annex A: CONTACTS (list is constantly evolving)

Facilitators Those individuals who directly organized which emergency aid would go where, obtained the necessary resources, and how the aid would be transported and distributed.

- Neel Bahadur Shahi, TEAM Nepal, neel@teamnepal.org.np
- A.D. Aryal, Sadle Traders, sadle@ntc.net.np
- Meera Bhattraai, Association of Craft Producers, program@craftacp.org.np
- Chunta Nepali, Ganesh Himal Trading, chuntayangzom@gmail.com

Distributors: Those who actively took part in distributing aid resources.

- Dhan Bahadur Gurung (Dhane), Besari Health Clinic, gurungdhane@hotmai.com
- Gabish Joshi, Hinrich Foundation, gabish_joshi@hotmail.com.
- Kesang Yudron, Padhma Creations, kyudron@gmail.com

Outside Key Disaster Relief Representatives: Individuals who have played/are playing a role in the Nepali earthquake relief process, but are not directly connected with the work of CCF.

- John Rose, Waves for Water, john@wavesforwater.org
- Ryan Sirianni, Waves for Water, rsirianni@roarkrevival.com
- Massimo Diana, United Nations, massimo.diana@one.un.org
- Rachel Houglum, GlobalGiving, houglumr@gmail.com
- George Wilson, Mercy Corps., spokeytown@yahoo.com
- Reeti K.C., Women LEAD, kcreeti@gmail.com
- Owen Geiger, Geiger Research Institute of Sustainable Building, naturalhouses@gmail.com
- Ishwor Basnet, Cotton Bag Associates, cbahandicraft@gmail.com

Consultants:

- Ram Karki, Ram's Treks and Tours, himalayanram@yahoo.com
- Pradeep Karki, Ram's Treks and Tours, pradeepkarki57@yahoo.com
- Kim Maynard, Mansfield Fellow in International Affairs, maynard@maters.us
- Matt Shelly, Edward R. Murrow School of Journalism WSU, matthew.shelley@wsu.edu

Key Informants will also be contacted from the following categories:

- **CCF Recipients:** Those who can directly attribute aid they received to CCF. They will be able to give specific feedback on CCF's aid, procedures, and effectiveness.
- **General Aid Recipients:** Those individuals who received disaster relief from any aid organization, not just CCF. They will be valuable in assessing the overall landscape of humanitarian aid in Nepal and in determining what future steps should be taken.

Annex B: EVALUATION MATRIX

EVALUATION CRITERIA	QUESTIONS	METHODOLOGY: Approach most likely to answer questions DR=Desk Review KI=Interviews with Key Informants S=Survey FO=Field Observations
RELEVANCE¹⁰	1. Have CCF's Earthquake Relief Projects addressed the most pressing humanitarian needs in Nepal?	1. KI, S, FO
EFFECTIVENESS⁴	1. How many of the Emergency Earthquake Relief goals set by CCF have been achieved? 2. Do all primary stakeholders have access to all relevant and necessary information? 3. Were the resources provided by CCF distributed fairly and without prejudice? 4. Were the resources provided by CCF effectively and responsibly used?	1. KI, S, FO 2. KI 3. DR, KI, S, FO 4. KI, S, FO
EFFICIENCY⁵	1. How efficiently has the money donated for CCF Earthquake Relief Projects been utilized? 2. Were the resources provided by CCF efficiently distributed? 3. How long did it take CCF's aid to reach its intended recipients? 4. How can CCF more efficiently utilize and distribute its resources in the future?	1. DR, KI 2. DR, KI 3. DR, KI, S 4. KI, S
SUSTAINABILITY¹²	1. What long-term problems and solutions were taken into account at the initial project inception? 2. How will CCF achieve their goals for future rebuilding and long term relief? 3. What are the greatest needs of the Nepali people as the relief process shifts towards rebuilding?	1. DR 2. KI, S, FO 3. KI, S, FO
COORDINATION³	1. Where can CCF be the most effective in the overall humanitarian aid arena? 2. What can CCF learn from other humanitarian aid organizations? 3. What aspects of CCF's intervention could be applied to other organizations?	1. DR, KI 2. DR, KI, FO 3. DR, KI

Annex C: KEY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS (list is constantly evolving)

Earthquake Humanitarian Aid Efforts

- Bell, T. (2015, August 19). The Nationals and the Internationals. *Himal Southasian*.
- Community Perceptions in Post-Earthquake Nepal

Evaluation of Humanitarian Aid

- Kania, J., Kramer, M., & Russell, P. (n.d.). Strategic Philanthropy for a Complex World. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 26-37.
- Moriniere, L.C. (2011). *Evaluation of the ERRF Component of the Haiti Emergency Response (ERF) Fund*. UN OCHA - Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.
- Buchanan-Smith, & M., Cosgrave, J., Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action.
- Evaluating Humanitarian Action using the OECD-DAC criteria. An ALNAP Guide for Humanitarian Agencies.
- Knox-Clarke, P., Darcy, J., Insufficient Evidence? The quality and use of evidence in humanitarian action.

Culture of Nepal

- McConnachie, J., & Meghji, S. (2012). *The Rough Guide to Nepal* (7th ed.). London: Rough Guides.
- Tucci, G., & Edwards, L. (1962). *Nepal: The Discovery of the Malla*. New York: Dutton.
- Feller, Tessa. (2010). *Nepal - Culture Smart!: The Essential Guide to Customs & Culture*. Bravo Limited.

Annex D: DRAFT INTERVIEW OUTLINE

Interview questions and format will be adapted for each Key Informant.

Date

Village

Interviewers GG CC Other

1. Name, Agency, and Location
2. What was your role in the earthquake relief process?
.....
.....
3. What is your connection to CCF?
.....
.....
4. Overall impression of the earthquake relief work?
.....
 - a. Greatest strength/benefit.....
 - b. Most important weakness/gap.....
5. Any specific comments regarding:
 - a. Time, pace, and chronology of aid distribution
 - b. Equality of of aid distribution (particularly in regards to marginalized groups)
 - c. Coordination of relief efforts
 - d. Collaboration with other organizations
 - e. Relevance of the aid distributed
 - f. Quality of aid distributed
 - g. Flexibility and adaptive ability of relief process
 - h. Management of relief process
 - i. Collaboration of aid workers with local custom and culture
 - j. Accountability to beneficiaries of aid
 - k. Undiscovered/unknown emergencies
 - l. Long term problem solving (both initially and now)

Annex E: DRAFT SURVEY

The content and order of some questions may be changed before the actual surveying begins.

Date

Village

Surveyors GG CC Other

1-5 Scale for Close-Ended Questions:

1 - "not at all" 2 - "not very much" 3 - "neutral" or "I have no opinion"

4 - "mostly yes" 5 - "completely yes"

Interviewee Name, Age, Caste

- 1. What happened?
.....
- 2. How did the monsoons affect you? Were you prepared for them?
- 3. Are your main problems being addressed? 1...2...3...4...5
- 4. Do you have the information you need to get relief and support? 1...2...3...4...5
- 5. Do you have the ability to communicate your needs? 1...2...3...4...5
- 6. Is support provided in a fair way? 1...2...3...4...5
- 7. As a (insert demographic here), are your particular problems 1...2...3...4...5
being addressed?
- 8. Are you ready to begin rebuilding? 1...2...3...4...5
- 9. What are the most pressing needs of your community at this point in time?

Final comments

Annex F: DRAFT FIELD OBSERVATION FORM

Date

Village

Observers GG CC Other

TYPES OF AID OBSERVED

COMMENTS

HOUSING

- Temporary shelter
- Raw materials (tin, roofing, walls, doors)
- Assembly assistance
- Utilities (electric, gas)

FOOD/NUTRITION

- Food (rice, dal, protein sources)
- Food storage/refrigeration
- Water (filtering, village sources)
- Agricultural aid (seeds, money, labor)

HEALTH/SANITATION

- Medical (clinics, medicine, personnel)
- Sanitation (pit toilets, soap)

GENERAL

- Money
- Unskilled volunteers
- Specialists (foreign, Nepali)

OTHER OBSERVATIONS/COMMENTS

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Annex G: GLOSSARY

These definitions are provided by the ALNAP *Evaluation of Humanitarian Aid Pilot Guide*.

1. **Accountability-oriented/Summative Evaluation:** An evaluation of how well resources have been applied.
2. **ALNAP:** Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action
3. **Coordination:** The extent to which different actors' interventions are harmonised, promote synergy, and avoid gaps, duplication, and resource conflicts.
4. **Effectiveness:** How well an activity has achieved its purpose, or can be expected to do so on the basis of existing outputs (defined deliverables provided by the actor or actors being evaluated).
5. **Efficiency:** A measure of the outputs (defined deliverables provided by the actor or actors being evaluated), qualitative and quantitative, achieved as a result of the inputs.
6. **Financial Accountability:** The duty an organization has to its donors and other stakeholders to be as cost-effective and efficient in its actions as possible.
7. **Learning-oriented/Formative Evaluation:** An evaluation designed to facilitate individual, group, or organizational learning. Highly effective at examining what worked, what didn't, and how performance can be improved.
8. **Managerial Accountability:** The duties, rules, and standards which managers are held responsible for carrying out and adhering to.
9. **Outputs:** Defined deliverables provided by the actor or actors being evaluated (i.e. inception report, advice provided by the evaluation team directly in the field, workshops, the evaluation report, and dissemination events)
10. **Relevance:** How well humanitarian activities are tailored to local needs.
11. **Strategic Accountability:** The duty an organization has to fulfilling its mandates and objectives.
12. **Sustainability:** The extent to which short-term emergency response steps take longer-term and interconnected problems into account.