

PART 2: Evaluation of the Save the Children Response to Cyclone Nargis

ANNEX 1: Review Participants¹

Save the Children Office, Yangon

Management (country, emergency, operations, regional)

Logistics

Funding

Finance

HR

WASH sector

CP sector

Health sector

Nutrition sector

Food & Livelihoods sector

M&E, Accountability

Save the Children Area/Sub-Area Offices

Deedugone Office, Middle Island

Thingangone Office, Middle Island

Laputta Office, West Delta

Maw'gyun Office, East Delta

Pyapon Office, East Delta

Village-level Community Discussions

Kan Seik village, Middle Island

Ale Thaug village, Middle Island

Kone Gyi village, Middle Island

Htaw Pone Nar village, Middle Island

Thone Gwa village, Middle Island

Ka Nyin village, Middle Island

Gyuan Gyi village, Middle Island

Mya Yar Gone village, West Delta

Bo Gone village, West Delta

Sin Chay Yar village, West Delta

Zee Phyu village, West Delta

Myit Pauk village, West Delta

Daunt Chaung village, West Delta

Yae Dwin Kone village, West Delta

Pyin Htaung Twin village, West Delta

Tha Byu Gone village, West Delta

Gant Eik village, West Delta

Tha Yet Chaung, East Delta

Mazeli Oo Tow, East Delta

Sin Ma Wei Chaung, East Delta

Shwe Bo village, East Delta

¹ In the interests of efficiency, review participants are grouped by sector (in the case of the Yangon office), or location (for Area Offices and community discussions). In each of the Area Offices, interviews were conducted with management and sectoral staff, in each village, discussions were held with a range of stakeholders.

Kyone Tut Tanyi village, East Delta

Kyaung Su village, East Delta

Too Myaung village, East Delta

Ta Man Gyi village, East Delta

Ka Ni village, East Delta

Kun Dyne village, East Delta

ANNEX 2: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

Evaluation of the Cyclone Nargis Emergency Response, Myanmar 2008

9th February – 30th March 2009

1. BACKGROUND

Cyclone Nargis struck Myanmar on 2 and 3 May 2008, making landfall in the Ayeyarwady Division and passing into Yangon Division before hitting the former capital, Yangon. With a wind speed of up to 200 km/h the damage was the most severe in the Delta region, where the effects of the extreme winds were compounded by a sizable storm surge. Some 2.4 million people are believed to have been affected by the cyclone, of a total 4.7 million people living in the affected Townships. Official figures put the number dead or missing at more than 130,000.² Cyclone Nargis was the worst natural disaster in the history of Myanmar, and possibly the most devastating cyclone to hit Asia since the cyclone that struck Bangladesh in 1991.³

Local and international relief efforts began just after the storm hit, although the international response was delayed while humanitarian access arrangements were agreed. Save the Children has been operational in Myanmar (SCiM) for the last 13 years and prior to the cyclone had a sizeable programme (but not in the Delta area) employing around 500 staff with a planned budget of GBP4.25m for the financial year 08/09. (NB this represented a sizeable increase of 35% on actual expenditure from the previous financial year)

In January 2009, eight months after the cyclone, SCiM employs over 1400 staff, working in 14 out of the 15 most affected townships in the Delta with an emergency response budget of approximately GBP26m spanning a seven sector response including shelter, food security, livelihoods, WASH, nutrition, child protection and education⁴. The scale up to the response has been massive and the size, scale and programmatic scope of this emergency has not been seen in Save the Children since the response to the Boxing Day Indian Ocean tsunami of 2005.

It is essential that the agency take stock of this response and conduct an evaluation of the response to date both from a programmatic standpoint and in order to satisfy the principles of Alliance engagement in emergencies which state the requirement for an evaluation on any ELT declared emergency.

This evaluation will benefit from the Save the Children (SC) Emergency Liaison Team operational review of the Myanmar response (ELT OR) and the Farringdon based Emergencies Section lessons learned exercises already conducted, and will also benefit from a number of sector specific evaluations already carried out in country. However this is a stand alone and independently led

² OCHA Situation Report No. 33, 19 June 2008

³ Myanmar Revised Appeal: Cyclone Nargis Response Plan 2008 Consolidated Appeal, 10 July 2008. p. 1.

⁴ For more information refer in the first instance to the SC Cyclone Nargis emergency response strategy of 08th September 2008

evaluation and as such brings a whole level of added value for the organization in terms of ensuring accountability to our stakeholders through an impartial and robust process.

2. OVERALL EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

This is an external evaluation with a threefold purpose of;

(a) Assessing the quality and effectiveness and technical strength of Save the Children in Myanmar's Emergency Response to cyclone Nargis between May 2008 and January 2009

(b) Measuring the extent to which the response has been accountable to the local needs (of children and their families).

(c) Recommending improvements for the longer-term strategies of the response programmes focusing on programme and management quality and accountability.

In doing this, the evaluation should respond to the following **seven key questions**:

- 1) What were the (positive and negative) outcomes of the emergency response of SCiM for children and their families affected by the cyclone?
- 2) How accountable has the response been in terms of addressing the needs of children and their families?
 - a. Did we identify the most relevant needs for the affected children, their families and communities?
 - b. Were the needs we identified the needs prioritized by the affected population?
 - c. Did we do what we said we would do?
 - d. Was what we did enough to address the needs that beneficiaries had, given the context and the environment (regarding funding, capacity), etc?
 - e. In what ways did SCiM internalize (better or worse) feedback from beneficiaries in its regular implementation of the emergency response?
 - f. What were the elements of the response that benefited from extended participation of beneficiaries and how, and which are those that need improvement?
- 3) How technically strong are sector-specific interventions in education, child protection, livelihoods, health / nutrition, food security and WASH?
- 4) How did the way the response was managed in country affect (positively or negatively) the quality of the programmes and operations? What were the critical management decisions made and why?
- 5) Was (internal) inter-sectoral coordination effective and if not, why not?
- 6) In terms of preparedness **(NOTE: It was agreed this would be deleted from the ToR)**
 - a. The cyclone was heading for Burma for 3 or 4 days before landfall. What was the impact of any contingency planning activities conducted by SCiM. This question should prioritise internal (to SCiM) preparedness, but if time permits, contact could be made with other agencies to discuss the issues.

- b. What were the most important emergency preparedness measures in the initial mobilisation and later response period? Following areas should be considered (i) national staff capacity including training and domestic response teams, (ii) emergency preparedness planning, (iii) international staff capacity, (iv) specific technical interventions in development programmes (i.e. data gathering to create baselines, livelihoods work) (v) response systems at a national level, (vi) work with other agencies in Burma, (vii) other

7) In terms of connectedness

- a. What improvements could be made to ensure high quality implementation of the emergencies response into longer-term strategies? What would be the recommendations?
- b. Have key linkages between the relief and recovery phase been established?
- c. To what extent has local capacity been supported and developed?

The evaluation will also apply selective criteria from the overall framework of the OECD-DAC⁵ criteria in identifying the worth and merit of the interventions: The OECD-DAC framework includes relevance and appropriateness of the intervention/s, timeliness, connectedness, coherence, coverage, efficiency, effectiveness and impact.

For the purposes of this evaluation, which is looking at quality, effectiveness and technical strength, the OECD-DAC criteria to be used are; relevance and appropriateness, effectiveness, timeliness and coverage. The criteria of connectedness will be covered under objective c of the overall evaluation objectives and will also be covered under question 7 of the seven key questions above.

The criteria of impact, efficiency and coherence will not be studied for this evaluation. It has been agreed that an impact study, while interesting to conduct, will not be possible in the time frame available. Similarly this evaluation will not look at the criteria of connectedness. It has been agreed that an analysis of the broader operating environment, policy and external actors is not necessary for this response. The criteria of coherence is rarely applied to the evaluation of single project, single country, single agency responses. Lastly, the criteria of efficiency will also not be evaluated as it would require a review of alternative models of aid provision, an activity that is not possible in the time available. It has been agreed that this criteria is best looked at separately by a team consisting of logistics, finance and administration staff. The Global Logistics rollout in April 2009, and accompanying logistics review might be an ideal opportunity to complete this.

The team will be expected to apply SCiM's emergency strategy as reference when making recommendations⁶. It is expected that relevance and appropriateness is scrutinized in the light of SCiM's commitment to accountability to beneficiaries (HAP-I, SPHERE, ECB) to help SCiM understand the best practices in being accountable to beneficiaries (children) and what improvements SC (globally) may realistically put in place to better the quality and accountability aspect of the emergency response.

⁵ LINK HERE: http://www.odi.org.uk/alnap/publications/eha_dac/pdfs/eha_2006.pdf

⁶ Three pillars

Each sector evaluator / leader will have a specific terms of reference, with detailed leading questions for their sector.

3. EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will be composed of 10 members (1 x team leader and 7 x technical evaluators, 1 x child participation specialist, and 1 colleague from Myanmar civil society) SCiM will be responsible to engage technical advisers from peer organizations to join the evaluation team to this end. Evaluators from the Save the Children Alliance are also to be approached to make this a learning process across the alliance and to also represent the continued involvement and importance of the alliance to the Myanmar response. One evaluator will be sourced from the London Emergencies Team in order to ensure that learning is also shared throughout the department. This evaluator will take on the WASH sector.

The SCiM regular programme will identify and train children in the sampled geographical areas where evaluation will take place, to prepare them for the evaluation in order to provide children's perspective/s of the emergency response.

4. METHODOLOGY

At the beginning of the response, a set of multi-sector or sector-specific initial rapid assessments were held, to inform the further design of the Nargis response. While those were not consolidated into a formal baseline yet, it is expected that the evaluation will compare the currently achieved results against the situation in May, 08 (as per rapid assessments). It will need to focus on general and sector specific comparisons in analyzing strengths and areas for improvements using not only SCiM but also data collected by other agencies (to regain a full picture of the situation in May).

It is important to note that the findings and recommendations need to be contextualized, understood and explained in the given time and period when they were relevant, given the Nargis Response was managed in a very dynamic and changing environment.

The evaluation team must be prepared to work with children to ensure their voices are heard and represented in the evaluation. Effort should be made to use terminology and languages (apply translation as needed) to integrate children in the discussions of highly sophisticated topics and debates. A Child Participation Working Group (CPWG) has been formulated in country, consisting of SCiM staff with expertise in this area. The CPWG will provide overview and a steer for the methodology and will link with the Child Participation Specialist as a primary client, and will provide guidance to the evaluation team through this channel. Lastly an Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) has also been formulated in country and is composed of senior managers. This group will provide management support to the evaluation, the team and will also ensure that the logistical arrangements related to the evaluation are taken care of.

5. RESPONSIBILITIES

The team leader will be responsible for:

- Being thoroughly familiar with the response (objectives, outputs, previous phases including previous activities, problems, budget time schedule, context, etc.).

- Agreeing with project management and funding agencies on the methodology of the documentation review and methodology of evaluation, in terms of i) level of participation vis-à-vis management of the process, data collection, data analysis, drawing conclusions/supplying recommendations and giving reactions to draft conclusions and ii) the methodology to be followed.
- Making a brief summary of the results of the initial rapid assessment/s for the evaluation team (adult and children members) to be used in the assessment of impact. **(Note: this was deleted)**
- Leading on the evaluation process and outputs.
- Drafting and leading data collection tools, data analysis.
- Ensuring that the evaluation report responds to the needs of the client and is actionable.
- Ensure equal participation of the evaluation team members in the process, particularly the voice of children.
- Drafting the expected outputs and circulating for feedback and comments.
- Finalizing the expected outputs and submitting to SCIM.

The evaluation team members will be responsible for:

- Being thoroughly familiar with the response (objectives, outputs, previous phases including previous activities, problems, budget time schedule, context, etc.).
- Supporting the consultant in designing data collection tools.
- Collecting data and taking record of the data.
- Participating at data analysis and providing technical input into data collection and analysis.
- Drafting and finalising their own sector report.
- Providing technical input into the draft versions of the final overall report.

Save the Children will be responsible for:-

- Finalising the Terms of Reference (both generic and sectoral)
- Providing all necessary documentation to the evaluation team members
- Recruiting evaluation team members
- Coordinating with fellow agencies to collect available initial rapid assessment data for the evaluation team
- Providing administrative support to the evaluation team.
- Providing feedback to the initial draft of the evaluation report.

6. ACTIVITIES AND TIMEFRAME

The evaluation time period will be between 9th February 2009 and March 30th 2009. The field work will take place between 15th February and 01st March 2009. It is expected that a final report will be available by 30th March.

ACTIVITY	LOCATION/MEANS	WHO	START AND END DATE	EXPECTED OUTPUT
Desk review	UK/Yangon	Lead Evaluator	09 -13 Feb	Familiarisation with programme, key staff and external contacts
Training of children	Labutta, Pyapon	SC Staff, Participation	16 – 22 Feb Lbt 24 –28 Feb Pyp	Children's views inform evaluation

		Consultant		findings
Evaluation team preparation work	Yangonn – reading and one team meeting	Evaluation Team, Lead Evaluator	13 Feb (reading and documents distributed prior to meeting)	Familiarisation with programme strategies and achievements
Data collection	Thingangone, Labutaa, Mawlameingyun, Pyapon	Evaluation Team	16 Feb – 01 st March	Judgement on quality of SC emergency response as per TOR
Data analysis	Yangon	Lead Evaluator and Evaluation Team	27 Feb (all team) 1-5 March Lead Evaluator	Evaluation Report
Draft of internal report			9 March (tentative)	
Draft of external report			9 March (tentative)	
Final internal report			16 March (tentative)	
Final external report			16 March (tentative)	

BUDGET

The total budget for the evaluation is currently set at GBP 41,000. Please see attached DRAFT budget spreadsheet.

7. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

External report

The external report should convey the broader findings and recommendations of the Nargis emergency response focusing on the top line findings to meet the interests of external audiences, that of general public and affected populations, donors, media and partners. It should discuss strengths and areas for improvement that concern management of the operation, technical strength of the programmes, coordination and the extent to which SC managed (or didn't) to impact the lives of children, their families and communities. It should also reflect on the extent to which the Nargis response was accountable to the needs of the affected populations in terms of quality and quantity of offered services, as well as the systems to capture and operationalize feedback from beneficiaries.

The report should not exceed 30 pages of length (with annexes) and should be comprehensible for a group of children.

Internal report

The main audience of the internal report is SCiM and SC Alliance. The report should focus on details that will not find a place in the external report, bringing more specific components to help decision making and action planning going forward. It should closely tie to SC's specific documents such as Programming Framework, internal management issues and specific processes and systems of SCiM that would not be relevant for an external audience. The internal report will inform SCiM and regional/global team on the effectiveness of various preparedness interventions in the past and will offer guidance as to what kind of organisational preparedness should be maintained after the current emergency operation has run its course. It will also inform the DRR programming which is currently being developed across the Delta.

(Note: it was agreed that a single final report would be produced, which would form the basis for a children's report to be written by the child participation consultant)

Recommendations

It is expected that the recommendations of both internal and external reports follow a template that will be given by SCiM. In brief, the recommendations have to be specific, have to be tied to specific management levels of the Response, have to be time-bound and should clarify the responses needed to implement those. They should directly link to the long-term strategies, particularly focusing to support better emergency preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction work for SCiM. Recommendations should avoid recommending changes for programmes that are due to end in January or at any closer date. Guidance on those programmes will be shared with the consultant and the team in January 2009.

(Note: It was agreed that the report would contain detailed recommendations but that the timeframe and plan of implementation would be determined by SCiM)

ANNEX 3: Methodology Matrix

Evaluation of Save the Children's Response to Cyclone Nargis⁷
Andy Featherstone, METHODOLOGY MATRIX

Evaluation Criteria							
	Effectiveness	Timeliness	Coverage (inc.co-ord)	Relevance	Technical Merit	Connectedness	Accountability (inc. Participation)
Description	The extent to which the activities achieved their purpose or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs - linked closely to other criteria	The extent to which the programme was delivered according to its timetable and the extent to which this appropriate to the needs of beneficiaries	The overall size of the programme relative to needs taking into account other agency programmes and gaps in coverage	The extent to which the programme activities are in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policy)	Strengths and weaknesses of response across all technical areas (education, child protection, livelihoods, health/nutrition, food security, WASH)	The extent to which the activities of the emergency programme are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and issues of programme integration into account	Upwards & downwards accountability: provision of information, communication, participation, reporting, decision-making
Standards, Benchmarks & Information Sources	<u>CoC:</u> We shall respect culture and custom; Ways shall be found to involve programme beneficiaries in the management of relief aid; Relief aid must strive to reduce future vulnerabilities to disaster as well as meeting basic needs;	<u>CoC:</u> The humanitarian imperative comes first; In our information, publicity and advertising activities, we shall recognise disaster victims as dignified humans, not hopeless objects	<u>CoC:</u> The humanitarian imperative comes first. <u>ER Cluster Strategy:</u> The delivery and coordination capacity of assistance providers and implementing agencies is key to the success of this strategy. Agencies must be able to demonstrate their presence in the affected areas, and their capacity to deliver against agreed objectives. Early recovery activities should be closely coordinated within and between agencies and clusters, to maximize their effectiveness, avoid gaps, minimize overlap, and reduce any burden that agency presence may place on communities. Ideally, early recovery initiatives should work to foster cooperation among local authorities and civil society groups	<u>CoC:</u> The humanitarian imperative comes first; Aid is given regardless of the race, creed or nationality of the recipients and without adverse distinction of any kind. Aid priorities are calculated on the basis of need alone; Aid will not be used to further a particular political or religious standpoint; We shall endeavour not to act as instruments of government foreign policy; We shall respect culture and custom; We shall attempt to build disaster response on local capacities; Ways shall be found to involve programme beneficiaries in the management of relief aid	Sphere standards, INEE standards, internal policy on child participation, HAP Accountability standard	<u>CoC:</u> Relief aid must strive to reduce future vulnerabilities to disaster as well as meeting basic needs. <u>ER Cluster Strategy:</u> Projects and programmes will seek to address the vulnerabilities of cyclone-affected communities, ensuring that risks are not rebuilt into the recovery effort and the capacities of communities are strengthened to reduce further risk.	<u>CoC:</u> We shall respect culture and custom; We shall attempt to build disaster response on local capacities; Ways shall be found to involve programme beneficiaries in the management of relief aid; We hold ourselves accountable to both those we seek to assist and those from whom we accept resources. <u>ER Cluster Strategy:</u> ER efforts will be designed and implemented in a transparent manner, through effective information sharing, inclusive local level consultations and dispute resolutions to ensure full accountability to beneficiaries and donors. <u>HAP Accountability Principles:</u> (i) commitment to humanitarian standards and rights (ii) setting standards and building capacity (iii) communication (iv) participation in programme (v) monitoring compliance (vi) addressing complaints (vii) implementing partners; <u>SC Practice standards in child participation:</u> See standards document

⁷ This matrix is based on a concept by Sarah Routley, methodology consultant

Questions	<p>Effectiveness: Are the outcomes clearly articulated in project documents and measurable? Did the programme/project outputs achieve their intended outcomes? Why was this so (or not)? Who benefitted (disaggregated data)? Were the changes a direct result of the project or did factors outside of the project contribute to these changes? At Community Level: What affect has the cyclone had? What assistance was provided by SC? What were the objectives and to what extent were they met? What number of beneficiaries were targeted? How did the assistance change the situation of the project participants? What project activities contributed to the change? What is different as a result of the assistance? (do the impact of the cyclone and the contribution of the project match?)</p>	<p>Timeliness: Timeline for SC activities compared against log frames. At Community Level: When did you need assistance and what assistance did you need? When did the team arrive and the project start? When would you have most liked to have received assistance?</p>	<p>Coverage: What were the main reasons that the intervention provided or failed to provide major population groups with assistance and protection, proportionate to their need? What approach did SC take towards coverage (globally and locally)? Why was this decision taken? How was targeting conducted? At Community Level: Did some groups within the community have special needs? Were these needs met by the assistance provided? How were specific needs linked to agencies interventions? Did any specific groups not receive the assistance they needed? Why was this? How were beneficiaries selected? Could this have been improved? Did those most at need get the most? Co-ordination: How did SC seek to co-ordinate its activities with other agencies (were interagency co-ordination mechanisms adequate and did CS participate in these?) Were there different agencies carrying out similar work? Was there duplication, gaps, delays? Did agencies work together to ensure they worked in a similar way? Were there differences in approaches used? Did SC co-ordinate appropriately with local authorities?</p>	<p>Relevance: Did SC have relevant skills to deliver the programme? If not, how successful were they in obtaining these? What approach was taken by SC to seek to ensure projects were relevant to the situation (culturally appropriate, needs-based, appropriate for different sections of the community)? Is this borne out by project data such as assessment reports? Did the type of assistance match community requirements? Was it of good quality (how did SC decide what was adequate? Were they guided by quality standards such as Sphere?)? Could any improvements have been made? Would more or less have been better? Interventions appropriate to needs of individuals within the community (HIV, children, orphans, women, elderly etc.)</p>	<p>Technical Merit: These have been developed by SCiM and circulated to evaluation team members. It will be important that these are checked for consistency and that ALL CRITERIA are applied across all technical sectors.</p>	<p>Connectedness: Were appropriate linkages made between relief, early recovery and recovery in SCs programmes? Have partnerships been developed (with local NGOs, Int orgs, comms) that support the transition of the programme? To what extent has the programme built local capacity that will strengthen the process of recovery? What practical steps should SC take to ensure a smooth transition from relief to recovery? Integration: To what extent did the relief response build on the strengths of the long-term programme? To what extent was internal co-ordination evident and to what extent did sectoral activities build on each other? If not, why was this?</p>	<p>The level of involvement of beneficiaries in key aspects of the project cycle: What approach did SC take towards beneficiary involvement throughout the project cycle? At Community Level: What is the perception of community members about their participation? How were they involved (decision-making, implementation, responsibility, provision of ideas, planning, assist in understanding, consent on decisions, informed only)? What do beneficiaries feel about their involvement? How did it benefit the project activities? How else would they have liked to have been involved? Had a say in what agencies did, priorities, process, provided feedback, consulted on effectiveness: What was the approach of SC to providing information, consulting and incorporating feedback (find examples of this from project records, minutes etc)? Did communities know in advance what SCs plans were? How did they find out? Did SC discuss any changes to these plans? Who was consulted (chief, men, women, children, all)? Was there any written agreement or documentation about the entitlements? Were communities asked what they wanted and what their priorities were? If there had been a problem, how would it have been dealt with? Did communities have to report any problems? How was this dealt with? Do SC have examples of complaint handling?</p>
-----------	---	---	---	--	---	---	---

Child Participation: Good Practice and Methods	<p>Timelines – Explores key milestones and challenges over time as well as issues of timeliness, accountability, participation and is a good entry point into sectoral programmes;</p> <p>'H' Assessment – uses the shape of an 'H' to explore the strengths, weaknesses and ideas to improve humanitarian/development initiatives;</p> <p>Before/After Body Map – where children draw, write or describe differences to them (what they see, hear, say, what they think, where they go, what they know, how they feel) and any changes about how people behave with them or listen to them as a result of the programme</p> <p>Assess risks. Before each consultation, assess the risks participants may face by taking part in the consultation and take steps to minimise these risks</p> <p>Do no harm: Efforts should always be made to ensure that children's participation does not harm children in any way. This includes taking measures to protect children from abuse by those working with them.</p> <p>Gain consent and provide information. Families should be consulted well in advance regarding the involvement of children in the consultation and their consent should be sought wherever possible. In addition, seek the support of community leaders or others who play an important role in children's lives. Children (and adults) should always have a choice about whether or not they take part in the consultation. To make this choice they need to understand the purpose of the consultation and how the findings will be used and by whom. They must be aware that they can withdraw from the consultation at any time.</p> <p>Avoid raising expectations about the direct benefits of the consultation. Be honest and clear about how the outcomes of the research will affect those who are taking part.</p> <p>Ensure representation of a wide range of children in terms of age, gender, ability, circumstances, ethnicity and religion etc. Make sure that your programme does not reinforce existing inequalities in the society by acting upon the opinions of a few more advantaged children and excluding others. Applying a rights based approach brings with it an obligation to ensure that the voices and concerns of boys and girls whose rights are most violated are raised with priority. Separate focus group discussions using participatory activities should be arranged with girls and boys of different age groups (for example, under 7 years, 8-12 years, 13-18 years) and from different backgrounds.</p> <p>Consider the timing and location. Consultations must take place in appropriate settings that give children the confidence, privacy and space to share their true feelings (but preferably in their own environment). It should not interfere with children's schooling or rest.</p> <p>Develop child friendly communication skills. For example, staff should be patient and non-judgmental, use language appropriate to a child's age/ culture, and encourage children through listening attentively and respecting children's views.</p> <p>Prepare resources: For example, trained staff (trained in child protection, work in pairs to enable monitoring of colleagues behaviour), food, transport, materials.</p> <p>Plan follow-up and seek advice on how to respond to any allegations or disclosures (for example, of abuse), make referrals, and provide further support to children and families.</p>						
Data Collection & Information Sources	project proposals, logical frameworks, sitreps, trip reports, interviews with SC staff in country, beneficiary interviews, household surveys, observation	project proposals, logical frameworks, sitreps, trip reports, interviews with SC staff in country, beneficiary interviews, household surveys, observation	project strategy, project reports, gap analysis, interviews with SC staff; interviews with co-ordinating agencies (OCHA) and NGOs, observation	project proposals, donor agreements, beneficiary interviews at individual/household, community level, observation, technical reports, trip reports, shelter survey, household survey	project proposals, trip reports, interviews with technical staff, beneficiary interviews, observation	project proposals, logical frameworks, sitreps, trip reports, interviews with SC staff in country, beneficiary interviews, household surveys, observation	structured community survey work; beneficiary interviews at individual, households, community level; internal documents on participation; internal interviews on project implementation; observation

ANNEX 4: Children's Suggestions

Below are suggestions from children compiled from the two children feedbacks workshops.

Programme areas	Suggestions
Child protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help us not to get scolded by elders. • We want many drawing items at CFS. • We want you to rebuild/reopen the CFS. • (If the CFS reopen) We want a better building for CFS. • We want more toys at CFS. • We need more knowledge. • Some children can't go to the CFS. They need to learn to read and write. • Some teachers shout at children. We don't like it.
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want you to provide books for children in order to improve knowledge. • We want jogging machine and slides at ECCD (to strengthen muscles and bones). • ECCD teachers should take care of children more. • We would like you to provide us TV (DVD) so that we can watch educational movies. • We would like you to provide us all types of game. • We want teachers from ECCD to teach the children in order to improve educational knowledge.
Food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More distribution of livelihood items.
Livelihood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to get re-distribution of rice, pulse, cooking oil and salt. (We have to spend all our wages daily) • We would like you to do more distribution of pigs, ducks, and boats. We need distribution of business materials. • We would like you to conduct discussions on knowledge. • We want boats. We can use it in going to school/travel in rainy season. We can use it in fishing.
Nutrition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want you to encourage people not to feed babies with disqualified milk powder. • We want you to provide more nutritional education to mothers on proper breast-feeding for babies from 6 months to 2 years old. • We want you to provide people with nutritional knowledge on supplementary feeding to the babies who are over 6 months old. • Some pregnant women need awareness raising so they will want to breastfeed their children. • Pregnant women need more nutrition food. • We want you to find lactating woman for motherless babies. • We want you to cure children who are sick.

Health**WASH**

- We want to put fence on more ponds.
- We would like you to provide a latrine for each household.
- We would like you to make a brick road heading to the pond (to get cleaner water).
- We prefer latrines with bamboo walls.
- We would like you to build a rain-collection tank at CFS.

ANNEX 5: Timeline of Significant Events that Shaped the SCiM Response

DATE	ACTIVITY
MAY	
May 2/ 3	Cyclone Nargis makes landfall in Myanmar in the late evening / early hours of the morning. Programme team decision to launch a response
May 05	SC assessment teams reach some locations in the delta and Yangon Division. SC immediate response reaches over 50,000 people with immediate relief including cash, food and NFI's. First SC sitrep issued to the alliance. ELT decision on emergency response and lead member made. First official SC press release issued although lines and quotes were going out from 04 May.
May 06	IASC Country team meeting and development of flash appeal. SC Alliance appeal for GBP5m opened. First SC Funding tracker spreadsheet developed. SC emergency snapshot issued by lead member
May 07	First SC (private and public) advocacy points circulated and updated three times over the course of the day. Media efforts carried out with CNN international, Bangkok Post, International Herald Tribune, CBS, BBC, Ashai TV, TV News 2 Denmark, Spanish Radio, Radio New Zealand, Swedish Radio. SCUUK media manager arrives in Bangkok to coordinate media (Kathryn Rawe). Sarah Tyler, Alliance Communications Manager already in Bangkok to communicate alliance communications. DEC appeal launched in the UK. First SC HR Spreadsheet developed
May 08	David Wightwick (SCUK Emergencies Advisor) and Sonia Khush (SCUS Emergency Programme Manager) arrive in Bangkok, awaiting visas, joining other regional support including Dan Collison (Regional Programme Manager). Eight (8) Alliance members pledge funds to the response totalling approx GBP100, 000. GBP5m alliance appeal opened. Media interest massive (UK, Danish, Aljazeera, US all interested)
May 09	UN flash appeal launched. Letter sent to John Holmes on behalf of IWG pressing for UN pressure on international aid agency access to the Delta (SC is a signatory). SC circulates advocacy / power analysis to the alliance on key actors / governments in the response. SC updates previous (public and private) advocacy points with updates, to the alliance.
May 10	Lead member advocacy team develops scenario planning for the response. Rapid SC assessment conducted in East Delta
May 11	Child Protection Advisor and logistics Advisor arrive in Yangon following successful visa application
May 12	First aid flights arrive in Yangon including two for SC. Second logistics advisor arrives in Myanmar for briefing. SC given official letter from Govt of Myanmar stating official partnership in the relief response
May 13	Advocacy points updated and reissued to alliance by lead member
May 14	Lead member Advocacy team update advocacy points.
May 15	SC relief operation reaches 115,000 people with cash, NFI and tarpaulin. SCUUK Advocacy team issue briefing for IASC telephone hook up, supporting calls for increased aid and humanitarian access.
May 16	6 SC (international) staff members arrive in Yangon including the Emergency Response Coordinator (David Wightwick) from Bangkok. Lead member releases update emergency snapshot (10 days on). Lead member updates advocacy points
May 18	Jasmine Whitbread (SCUK CEO) arrives in Yangon.
May 20	Strategic Finance Manager arrives in Bangkok.

May 25 Strategic Finance Manager arrives in Yangon.
May 26 International staff (for SC) granted access visas to the delta for the first time.

JUNE

June 01 Rapid assessment of west delta report released.
June 02 Lead member issues one month on press release.
June 03 Lead member Advocacy team update advocacy points.
June 06 Lead member advocacy team update advocacy points. SC team in Yangon begin cash transfer programme, distributing 58m Kyat in this first five days
June 10 SC team in Yangon begin distributing a further 72m Kyat in the cash transfer programme over 2 days
June 12 SC cash transfer programme suspended, following political concerns
June 18 Lead member advocacy team update advocacy points
June 24 SC draft emergency strategy issued
June 29 A final 41m Kyat is distributed over 2 days by the SC team in Yangon as the cash transfer programme is temporarily resumed. Gareth Owen (Emergency Director) makes first visit to Yangon
June 30 The SC cash transfer programme is terminated but not before 171m Kyat (approximately USD171, 000) is distributed in total in the nine days that the programme runs for.

JULY

July 24 SC emergency strategy updated and finalised

AUGUST

August 02 Lead member issue 3 months-on press release and media / comms work
August 18 Lead member advocacy team develop ideas for 3 months on communication work