

**Report on the**

**External Review**

**SDC's Post-Tsunami Relief and Rehabilitation**  
**Assistance for Fishing Communities**  
**of**

**Ko Phra Thong and Ko Kho Khao**  
**Khura Buri District, Thailand**

For: Federal Department of Foreign Affairs FDFA  
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC  
Humanitarian Aid and SHA

Implemented by: Sureerat Kritsanarangsarn  
Helmut Scheuer (Team Leader)

Date: March 12<sup>th</sup> to March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2008

## Table of content

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2 Review Objective and Methodology</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>3 Context for SDC's Post-Tsunami Relief and Rehabilitation Project in Thailand</b> .....	<b>4</b>
3.1 Context in the assessment phase.....	4
3.2 Changing context during the implementation phases.....	5
<b>4 Relevance, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Connectedness – Activity by Activity</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1 The role of SDC Humanitarian Assistance and Swiss Solidarity .....	6
4.2 Rehabilitation of infrastructure .....	6
4.3 Access to income generating activities on the islands (livelihood projects).....	8
4.4 Coast Guard Volunteers .....	9
4.5 Housing .....	9
<b>5 Cross-cutting issues</b> .....	<b>10</b>
5.1 Institutional mandates of SDC and Swiss Solidarity .....	10
5.2 Baseline studies .....	10
5.3 Basic approaches .....	10
5.4 Adjustments during the intervention .....	11
5.5 Minorities and Gender .....	11
5.6 Risk Management.....	11
5.7 Cooperation Partners .....	11
5.8 Reporting and Monitoring .....	12
5.9 Exit.....	12
<b>6 Conclusions and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>12</b>

### Attachments:

1. Mission ToRs
2. Mission Itinerary and Persons Met
3. Bibliography

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Review conducted in March 2008, had the objectives to assess whether the project design and implementation modalities of SDC's Post-Tsunami Relief and Rehabilitation Programme in Thailand were appropriate and conducive to reach the goals and formulate recommendations for the last phase of the programme implementation.

The involvement of Switzerland in Thailand is considered a positive contribution to early recovery/ reconstruction by all persons interviewed. Swiss support is held in high esteem in Thailand. Through the implementation of projects by own personnel visibility of SDC and Swiss Solidarity was achieved. The project implemented during the last three years provided indispensable preconditions for hundreds of people to return to their native islands of *Ko Phra Thong, Ko Kho Khao* and *Ko Ra*.

Infrastructure projects were implemented in accordance with binding Thai national standards and proved to be important investments for the future of the islands. They provide important infrastructural bases to secure the long-term existence of village communities.

The early livelihood programme components (provision of boats and fishing gear) are considered to be a full success. Due to other preoccupations the later implemented small livelihood projects could not be followed up as intensively as the initial ones. One option would have been to conduct the external review at an earlier stage. By doing so a better planned, more realistic and more appropriate approach could have been reached.

Recommendations focus on a concentration of the remaining tasks from Phase III to be implemented in a phase IV and on procedures to hand them over to respective local partners.

## 1 Introduction

The Asian Tsunami on 26<sup>th</sup> December 2004 hit Thailand along its western coast, killed more than 8.000 persons and destroyed much of the coastal infrastructure. The hardest hit Thai fishing communities on the Andaman Sea islands lost many of their family members, their houses and their predominant economic source of living: Their boats and fishing equipment. The survivors fled to the mainland or to higher locations on the islands. In January 2005 Switzerland in cooperation with local authorities initiated a rehabilitation project aiming at the return of the inhabitants of three villages of the island *Ko Phra Thong* including also communities from the neighbouring islands *Ko Kho Kao* and *Ko Ra*. The intention was to assist the victims to regain their economic independence and to (re-) construct the infrastructure enabling permanent settling on the islands. It was decided to follow a participatory approach in planning and executing the projects. SDC's rehabilitation activities were implemented in two main phases (I+II) starting in January 2005 until the end of 2006. The infrastructure projects implemented where formally turned over to the Thai authorities and to the beneficiaries step by step by the end of 2006. Alongside of the main project activities several additional "livelihood" projects had been planned and started in the course of 2006. In order to achieve a higher degree of sustainability SDC decided to continue its involvement in livelihood projects by entrusting respective tasks to a local employee – guided by the Regional Humanitarian Aid Coordinator of SDC based in Bangkok. These activities are still going on at the moment and will be completed during 2008.

In the year 2007 the firm Price Waterhouse Coopers audited the bookkeeping of project phases I and II. In January 2008 the management of SDC's Humanitarian Aid decided to conduct an external review of the Post-Tsunami Relief and Rehabilitation Programme in Thailand in order to assess the development of the project and deduct inputs for the final period.

## **2 Review Objective and Methodology**

As laid down in the Terms of Reference (ToR) (see Attachment 1) the overall objective of this external review was:

(a) To assess whether the project design and implementation modalities were appropriate and allowed to reach the goals set at the project launch and revised in the course of its implementation.

(b) To highlight key findings, provide inputs on how to rapidly integrate recommendations into a possible fourth phase of the project, and how to capitalize on them for future disaster response.

The review team conducting the task in March 2008 consisted of one international expert and one local expert and was accompanied by the SDC National Project Officer (NPO) during the field visits. Review methods included desk review of relevant documentation, stakeholder interviews/talks with (ex) SDC and Swiss Embassy staff, Government Departments and partners in the target area; visit to the SDC field – office in Khura Buri; site visits to the targeted 4 villages on Ko Kho Kao and Ko Phra Thong and on-site interviews with local authorities, participants and beneficiaries. Evaluation findings were shared in a debriefing session in Phuket with the Regional Humanitarian Aid Coordinator of SDC at the end of the mission and with SDC Headquarter staff in Berne immediately after the return from the mission. (For the Mission's Itinerary and Persons Met see Attachment 2). A formal debriefing took place in Bern on May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

## **3 Context for SDC's Post-Tsunami Relief and Rehabilitation Project in Thailand**

### **3.1 Context in the assessment phase**

During the assessment phase the Swiss experts to whom the formulation of an appropriate project design was entrusted had to take the following main aspects into consideration:

- Everyone in Thailand was appreciative of the quick and generous interventions of the Thai Authorities and Thai civil society right after the Tsunami. These interventions contributed to save many people including Swiss citizens. Under this impression the Swiss Minister of Foreign Affairs during a visit in Thailand in early January 2005 announced publicly that Switzerland would help to rebuild the livelihood of a fishermen community in Southern Thailand. This offer was accepted and approved by the Thai Government on January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2005.
- Thai Authorities were rather reluctant to accept foreign financial aid per se and announced in a very early stage that finances should rather be directed to the poorer countries affected by the Tsunami. However material support was welcomed from the onset.
- It was expected that the tourist areas around Phuket were going to be the prime target for rehabilitation efforts through both national and international actors. Consequently the search for an appropriate less favoured target area concentrated on more distant places assuming that support would be slow and sparse there.

- Although the authorities had accepted the Swiss support in general, particularly concerning the reconstruction of public infrastructure, at the beginning they were reluctant to give the green light to the reconstruction of private housing on the island of Ko Phra Thong chosen as target area. (This restriction was not applied for reconstruction of housing on Ko Kho Kao, because there, environmental issues and legal preconditions were not as sensitive matters as was the case on Ko Phra Thong). In the later course of events the authorities modified their position.
- Thai authorities were able to care for the immediate needs such as provisional shelter, food and health care for the victims by themselves and did not need outside support. Therefore it was obvious that a programme should be oriented primarily towards the rehabilitation of infrastructure and the access to the main traditional income generating fishing activity; both were seen as important factors related to enabling a quick return of evacuees.
- It was assumed that traumatized victims would need a considerable psychological support in order to return to normal life.
- It appeared uncertain how the minorities of so-called sea gypsies, lacking certain rights such as Thai citizenship but living in the target area since many years, would react on help from the outside since.

The basic intentions of the proposed early recovery measures were - as the result of the assessment - translated into the main objectives, prioritized and logframed as follows:

- The community members have safe, equal and fair access to education, health services and other community services on the islands chosen.
- The community members have immediate and long-term access to income generating activities.
- All the community members enjoy permanent and safe housing with adequate infrastructure.

Villages on the two islands Ko Kho Kao (Mueang Mai) and Ko Phra Tong (Thung Dap, Pak Chok and Tae Pae Yoi) were chosen as target area concentrating on the villages of Ko Phra Thong. A village on Ko Ra was added later on. The time frame initially foreseen to implement a two-phase programme was in the range of 11/2 to 2 years.

### **3.2 Changing context during the implementation phases**

Contrary to the expectation formulated in the assessment within a short period up to 50 agencies were active in the area of Khura Buri, all of them engaged in relief and rehabilitation. On Ko Phra Thong alone around 20 agencies were working with different approaches and means. For better understanding it seems essential to retrospectively outline contradicting priorities and approaches:

- *Return to the island or relocation to the main land:* Whereas SDC (in accordance with the Thai Government) had decided to support and enable the return of people, others – mainly the government itself through the Chaipattana Foundation, supported by the Royal Family and Red Cross Societies – went for the establishment of new villages on the mainland.
- *Assisting victims who had land titles and assisting victims without land titles:* SDC felt bound to their obligation to support only those people holding a land title. Others such as the Lions Club on the island or other NGOs on the mainland simply acquired land and build houses.
- *Integrated approach versus sectoral support:* SDC was one of the few agencies to provide assistance applying an integrated and participatory approach.

- *Spontaneous support or a careful planned implementation*: Most of the NGOs and their volunteers withdrew rather quickly. Only a few stayed for a longer period.

The parallel efforts, on the one hand assistance for quick return/enable a stay for those whose houses were not destroyed and efforts to relocate people on the mainland on the other hand, generated new options for the affected population. One could even speak of unintended competition of approaches.

Generally speaking there was big pressure to allocate the rather high amount of donated funds and show quick results. SDC with the additional financial support of Swiss Solidarity was able to work with a longer-term perspective. In addition SDC could draw on the comparative advantages: Direct access to Government partners, in-house competence, personnel and own financial means. However it was still a difficult task given the magnitude of the disaster.

Contrary to the expectations of humanitarian aid experts, traumata many people suffered by the Tsunami disaster were not observed as decisive redundant factors impairing reconstruction efforts. Initial reluctance to resume fishing activities, for instance, had been overcome by the Thai fishing community when the fishing season started in autumn 2005.

## **4 Relevance, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Connectedness – Activity by Activity**

### **4.1 The role of SDC Humanitarian Assistance and Swiss Solidarity**

The Swiss Government was motivated to assist by fundamental humanitarian principles reinforced by the fact that Swiss citizens among the Tsunami victims received quick and generous assistance by Thai authorities and civil society organisations. The overall objective was to respond to the disaster situation in the most relevant manner possible.

Activities were from the onset connected with the overall intentions/policies of the Thai Government and the local authorities. In that way they can be considered embedded in the “official” early recovery measures.

The intention was to provide the basis and to encourage the islanders to start sustainable development work in addition to reconstruction efforts. This process is and will in future be accompanied by a limited number of local and international organisations such as Rak Thai and IUCN.

The involvement of Switzerland in Thailand is considered a positive contribution to early recovery/ reconstruction by all persons interviewed. Swiss support is held in high esteem in Thailand. Through the implementation of projects by own personnel high visibility of SDC and Swiss Solidarity was safeguarded. The project implemented during the last three years provided the precondition for hundreds of people to return to their native islands of *Ko Phra Thong, Ko Kho Khao and Ko Ra*.

### **4.2 Rehabilitation of infrastructure**

The infrastructure projects were implemented in accordance with binding Thai national standards and proved to be important investments for the future of the islands. They provide the basis for the long-term survival of village communities.

#### **4.2.1 Schools**

The objective of this programme component is the provision of improved educational facilities and at the same time safeguard the secondment of teaching staff by the Thai Government. Furthermore the availability of adequate schooling facilities is a precondition for the return of families having children in school going age.

Due to time pressure the damaged school in Thung Dap was quickly renovated. This made it possible to resume schooling at a very early stage after the Tsunami. At a later stage another school building was constructed on the same compound fulfilling better the requirements of hazard prone areas. The way it is constructed it could serve as a safe flood shelter for the local population. In today's perspective the renovation of the old school can be seen as too "ad hoc" but understandable because the project manager was under considerable time pressure. Adequate schooling for children was and still is seen as one of the main pull factors for the return and resettlement of families. Consequently the project manager was confronted with high expectations from all sides.

The renovation of the old school was finished in time for the new school year starting May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2005 through active participation of the local people and volunteers. The new school building, a teacher's house and a number of out door facilities on the same compound where designed and constructed by local companies after approval by the Ministry of Education and where inaugurated in December 2006.

The school constructed in Pak Chok was built at a later stage supporting the establishment of the new village built by the Lions Club. Both schools built by SDC function according to the regulations set by the Thai Ministry of Education.

Given the present population size the schools may appear oversized. However they provide ample opportunity for multi purpose use now and in future as it can already be observed in Pak Chok where one classroom is used to accommodate a medical first aid post. Salaries for regular staff and other recurrent cost are met by the Ministry of Education according to the Director of Primary Education in the Department of Education in the provincial capital.

#### 4.2.2 Public Health Centre

The reestablishment of a Public Health Centre on the island was top priority for the Thai Government. The lay out and equipment of such health centres is standardized under the policy of the government including provisions for staff housing. The centre serves as the point of entry to the referral system of the government public health care system since its opening in August 2006. Among other functions the centre fulfils an important role in preventive health care, Mother and Childcare and the (curative) treatment of endemic diseases (dengue fever and malaria) on Ko Phra Tong and Ko Surin. Staff members of the centre are supposed to do outreach work, for instance coordinating voluntary health workers in villages – which serve as lowest level within the referral system.

In agreement with the local authorities and the Ministry of Public Health, the former centre was not re-established in its original place (Pak Chok) but shifted to the less Tsunami prone eastern side of the island to the most populous community called Tha Pae Yoi.

In any case the government has the full responsibility for the staffing and recurrent expenditure for the centre

#### 4.2.3 Meeting Halls

Three meeting halls in Mueang Mai, Thung Dap and Pak Chok were sized according to the number of the previous and forecasted population strength. Such halls are an integral part of Thai culture and community life and serve as the main meeting point in almost every settlement. The new community halls serve the purpose of revitalizing civil society and help to stabilize the coherence of village life. Therefore they are fully in line with the overall objective of the Swiss Project. The building standard is low cost and simple, and easy to maintain.

#### 4.2.4 Piers

The piers of Pak Chok and Mueang Mai were fully or in part destroyed. For fishermen communities the provision of piers is indispensable as they permit loading and discharging of

freight at low and high tide. The contour of the beach area and the draught of the boats define the length of piers. If properly constructed piers are practically maintenance free. The structural design of piers followed standards set by the Thai Authorities. The design is purely utilitarian. Their construction exclusively followed technical requirements and local needs.

#### 4.2.5 Walkways

In the initial plan the building of additional walkways was foreseen to improve communication and transport between the villages of the island irrespective of weather conditions. Due to differing interests between population groups, the high potential cost involved and ecological / environmental considerations only the connection between the pier of Thung Dap and the village (1,9 km) and a connecting road between the pier and the village of Pak Chok (270 m including a bridge) was constructed.

The subject of road construction will have to be reconsidered in the infrastructure master plan the government will have to elaborate. To find an appropriate answer to solve the imminent questions was far beyond the scope and timeframe of the Swiss mandate.

#### 4.2.6 Drinking Water

Fresh water supply was a problem before the Tsunami and remains problematic in spite of all rehabilitation measures taken. The initial expectation that wells, which have gone saline as an aftermath of the Tsunami would purify automatically did not materialize. As a matter of division of labour the NGO ADRA concentrated on water supply and SDC basically concentrated on other sectors.

Only in two locations (Tha Pae Yoi and on Ko Ra) a tapped water system was rehabilitated and Water / Sanitation measures were taken by SDC.

The rehabilitation of the tapped water system in Tha Pae Yoi was the only possibility to guarantee access to clean water to the local Moklen Community. The user group handling the water supply system is at the same time in charge of a local small diesel driven electricity generator. The supply management functions to a limited extend. Although the set-up was conceived as a group initiative according to the person in charge the other group members do not actively participate in management. For the time being the water system is still in a good shape and well functioning. However if a major breakdown would occur, it is doubtful whether the group would get things going again without outside assistance.

### 4.3 Access to income generating activities on the islands (livelihood projects)

In the phase of initial response to the disaster, boats and fishing gears were distributed amongst those who had lost their belongings in the targeted villages (73 boats and fishing gear). Thus the objective of a quick return to the traditional main source of income could be met. At a later stage initiatives closely related to fishing, such as the installation of a wharf cum repair workshop to maintain outboard engines - including training elements - were established. Intention was to reduce expenditures for the upkeep and repair of boats and outboard engines. Some other initiatives were to serve the purpose to diversify the sources of income such as the establishment of aqua farms (initially 4 groups) and waste management. Other ideas such as shrimp paste production were considered but dropped because they appeared to be less promising or too ambitious for the time being. A third category of activities was related to kitchen gardening. The latter was intended to improve the diet of villager in combination with the reduction of spending for vegetables brought from the main land. Training was offered in as different fields as for instance production of liquid fertilizer, biological pest control and composting.

The adoption of livelihood projects other than traditional fishing and/or directly related activities is rather limited so far and apparently require more training input and guidance

before being adopted.

The idea to organise economic activities in a quasi-cooperative way (aqua farming in particular) proved not to be in line with the present lifestyle of fishermen and therefore was not adopted. At present a certain focus is on using schoolteachers and schoolchildren as “change agents” to eventually achieve the adoption of potentially relevant innovations. However results can be expected only in a long-term perspective.

It remains to the people to decide whether the development of a soft eco-tourism is desirable. Yet it appears that a speedy and lasting diversification of sources of income can - given the prevailing circumstances- only be achieved through tourism. However, diversification seems to be a pressing need particularly if one takes into account that there is an imminent danger of over fishing in the whole region.

#### **4.4 Coast Guard Volunteers**

The intention of this component is to protect the fishing grounds “belonging” to local residents along the coasts of the islands. It was envisaged to support an approach utilizing the knowledge and presence of local fishermen to that end. According to the representative of the Department of Marine and Coastal Resources he can only cooperate with organized fishermen groups but not with individuals. At present it is planned to establish a formal group including fishermen from the mainland around Khura Buri. To establish such a group on Ko Phra Tong is judged as not being feasible for the time being. It appears that the plans for the implementation of this programme component are rather unclear and not realistic considering the short period remaining. This does not mean that the approach is questioned in principle.

#### **4.5 Housing**

In the implementation process the original objective to rebuild two villages in the same or safer places was continuously reviewed and eventually scaled down for a number of reasons. The main limiting factors were missing officially sanctioned land titles. SDC did not want to get involved in sorting out legal matters in relation to land rights. The second reason was that other national and international implementing agencies got strongly involved in building up new communities on the main land, which was definitely not an option for SDC. Therefore the number of private dwellings was in the end reduced to 16 houses in the community of Mueang Mai and 8 houses in Thung Dap.

Potential beneficiaries were invited to choose among various types of houses and thus participated to seek solutions, which deemed most appropriate.

The cost of houses was between CHF 16'129,- (Thung Dap) and CHF 18'228,- (Mueang Mai) per unit which is a rather fair price considering that building materials had to be shipped to the islands.

The two locations where houses were built show considerable differences. Mueang Mai has obviously more favourable conditions as the basic infrastructure such as electricity and the connection to the road grid are available compared to the isolated environment of Thung Dap where houses are scattered and not connected to an electric grid and only partially to a central water supply system. It is in the second place where houses are not permanently occupied. Reasons for that are obvious as the economic perspectives are much less favourable compared to the first place. That does not mean that the state of affairs will remain the same. Any improvement of the economic situation, especially if tourism is introduced, will change the picture completely.

For the time being the owners of the reconstructed houses in Thung Dap have at least ascertained their right to settle and defend their claim to eventually receive a complete land title. Taking into account the complex legal situation regarding land titles, this can be seen as a valuable achievement. Even if numbers are small SDC achieved its original objective to support permanent return to the island. In Pak Chok, the Lions Club was not limited by the precondition of certified land titles held by beneficiaries, as they were able to buy land, which

they turned into building sites.

## **5 Cross-cutting issues**

### **5.1 Institutional mandates of SDC and Swiss Solidarity**

It can be stated that the experts in charge of the assessment and the implementation of the programme strictly followed the basic guidelines of SDC and Swiss Solidarity. These can be put together in 6 main basics:

- The support has to be impartial, gender balanced and in the interest of the victims;
- A participatory approach has to be applied;
- Projects have to be sustainable and should serve their purpose for a long period;
- Projects should be safe considering natural hazards (preventive aspect), environmentally sound and at the same time pave the way to long term sustainable development;
- Support should not increase tensions or even create new conflicts (“Do no harm”);
- The visibility of the Swiss donation should be ensured.

### **5.2 Baseline studies**

The multiethnic composition of the villages on Ko Phra Tong and the ongoing dispute over the future of the island regarding the establishing of a national park called for additional information regarding the rehabilitation measures meant primarily to serve victims and render solidarity to those who’s voices are not much listened to, the Moklen.

Baseline studies were commissioned to two groups:

- A group of Ethnologists who had past experience concerning the Moklen villages on the island
- The World Conservation Union (IUCN) Thailand Programme who had been active in the sphere of environment and habitat in the region prior to the Tsunami

The findings of studies - related to the protection of minorities and to environmental aspects - led to important adaptations of the programme (for instance SDC’s proposal to abandon the construction of a road which was to cut through an environmentally sensitive area).

### **5.3 Basic approaches**

It proved successful to seek popular participation at all stages from planning to implementation. This can be seen especially in the cooperation with local authorities on local and central levels. The construction of social infrastructure and the acceptance of ownership were only possible because the authorities were on board and took over the responsibility after the projects were handed over. The selection of an appropriate housing type was done together with the beneficiaries. The selection and implementation of livelihood projects were accompanied by a number of joint meetings with the beneficiaries, demonstrating the advantages of active participation vis a vis individual approaches. Of course it remains to be seen whether such approaches will take roots in future.

By choosing an integrated approach combining aspects such as shelter, protection of nature, income generation and protection of minority rights it was made possible that conflicting views among the island population could be overcome and facilitated to define common interests. This process is still continuing and is accompanied now and in future by the partner organisation IUCN.

#### **5.4 Adjustments during the intervention**

One of the key features of the programme was flexibility and adaptability in view of fast changing requirements. In this light, the change from the original plan to build 70 houses on the island Ko Phra Thong towards the realisation of a smaller number of units is assessed positive. The main reason was that no timely solution to meet the legal prerequisites (land titles) for a bigger number of houses could be found.

In the course of programme implementation it was rightly concluded that latent tensions between different interest groups existed, results could only be achieved through concentration on feasible and pragmatic actions in line with the long-term interest of island dwellers.

After phase II the ongoing livelihood projects were judged to be insufficiently sound. Therefore it was decided to extend the presence of SDC for a third phase. Due to other preoccupations, small livelihood projects implemented were not followed up as intensively as might have been desirable. An external review at that moment might have streamlined and enhanced all relevant pending planning endeavours (concept, monitoring and implementation).

#### **5.5 Minorities and Gender**

The overriding intention to enable and empower the island population (especially the ethnic minorities) to raise their voice and participate in the long-term development of their environment can be identified in the existence of lasting infrastructure and in the provision of boats and fishing gear. However the additional small livelihood activities lack a long-term concept.

On the other hand it can be stated that due to the participatory approach, offering equal attention to men, women and children and practising gender balanced cooperation provided a perspective to institutions willing to continue to work on Ko Phra Thong in the same spirit.

#### **5.6 Risk Management**

Risks regarding the programme implementation of the main components were realised at an early stage. However they were not managed in a planned and formalized manner. By doing so it would have been possible to react more adequately. E.g.:

- The reconstruction of the 8 houses in Thung Dap was executed according to the formal agreement with the Thai side. However, since there permanent occupation proved to be heavily dependant on the general economic development of the island the risk that they will not be utilized for a certain period was rather high and hazardous to the reputation of SDC and Swiss Solidarity. By having defined measures to minimize this risk one could have reduced irritations related to public relation in Switzerland and maybe could have been able to initiate a longer term user concept.
- The decision to go for small livelihood activities was taken without any formalized risk assessment at all. Consequences are already described under chapter 4.3 and 4.4.

#### **5.7 Cooperation Partners**

The programme benefited considerably from an early and sound partnering with the Thai Authorities on national and local levels. On a local level the partnership with IUCN and ADRA (drinking water supply) was especially constructive. Beneficiaries were perceived as partners. This led to positive results concerning the acceptance of projects as well as concerning the image of seriousness attributed to Swiss assistance.

## 5.8 Reporting and Monitoring

In the beginning of the implementation reporting and progress monitoring was quite intense. Reporting was oriented mainly on results rather than on problems faced, emerging options and processes. At the time of the external review it proved to be difficult to recollect arguments leading to decisions taken especially concerning phase III.

The "Logframe" elaborated for phase III defines quantitative indicators only. However, this principally laudable effort makes it difficult to monitor the quality of the implementation process and of achievements.

A systematic follow up of impacts (e.g. use of social infrastructure, housing, piers and walkways, use and maintenance of water and sanitation projects) triggered of by SDC's intervention would have been possible due to the fact, that an SDC NPO was still engaged in the target area. However such a follow up monitoring was not formally initiated.

## 5.9 Exit

The exit foreseen end of 2006 concerning the main activities was well planned, publicly announced and implemented. The respective government partners were included in this process.

The exit strategy concerning the ongoing livelihood activities however remains rather vague.

## 6 Conclusions and Recommendations

The positive **results of the programme** implementation of Phases I and II are obvious, especially when looking at the overall objective of SDC's programme: To enable the return or stay of the population of Kho Phra Tong. The project management followed exactly these set objectives.

However SDC was only one of the main humanitarian actors. Some of the other (sometimes competing) actors encouraged the victims to permanently move to the mainland and others such as SDC were supporting the stay or return to the island.

By considering the new situation after incoherent approaches led to an overcapacity of houses and boats in the Khura Buri District, the present situation can be described as showing some degree of duplication of facilities created for the same target group. Some beneficiaries can now opt whether they prefer staying on the mainland or on the island.

This factor in combination with the present unwillingness/inability of the Thai Government to definitely decide together with the inhabitants of Ko Phra Thong about the future economic development of the island are counterproductive with view to permanent settlement. Therefore people still commute back and forth (mainland and island). Whether this uncertainty sufficiently explains why the owners of the newly constructed houses in Thung Dap do not move in permanently remains uncertain. So far it is only known that there is no single dominant reason why this is so.

### Recommendation:

- a. It is recommended to assess the intentions of the owners of the rehabilitated houses in Thung Dap concerning future utilisation.

If implementing **livelihood projects** containing elements other than the reestablishment of traditional income generating activities is intended, project management should be more conscious about consequences. If for example ordinary fishermen are asked/encouraged to manage aqua farms it should be understood that this type of fish production is a demanding business showing dynamics and requiring skills much different from traditional fishing. To make a valuable input in this area of activities takes a much longer period to implement than the usual duration of humanitarian activities right after an emergency. Similar problems can be seen in all livelihood activities.

## **Recommendations:**

- a. It is recommended to assess the potential of the ongoing livelihood projects with regard to a realistic implementation scheme to be followed during the remaining time of SDC's presence in Thailand.
- b. It is recommended to assess whether it is possible and realistic to win over implementing partners for the unfinished activities, who are really in the position (as far as competence, capacity and financial means are concerned) to carry on with the support of the activities by themselves.
- c. It is recommended not to continue with activities whose implementation period requires more time than can be covered in a possible phase IV. By all means additional new activities should be avoided, unless long term involvement is taken into consideration.
- d. It is recommended to elaborate a monitoring plan with quantitative and qualitative indicators and a realistic work-plan for the remaining period facilitating adequate supervision.
- e. If activities seem to bear a potential, joint planning should be arranged for, and an understanding should be reached with the respective local partners clearly explaining, what can be expected from SDC and what would be the obligations of potential local partners.

The **review of programme activities** would certainly have been more fruitful if carried out at the beginning of phase III. At this junction new insights would have allowed to react timely and initiate appropriate alterations particularly with view to a smooth handing over process and termination of livelihood programme activities.



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **EXTERNAL REVIEW**

#### **TSUNAMI OF 26 DECEMBER 2004 IN THAILAND**

#### **EMERGENCY AND REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE FOR FISHING COMMUNITIES OF KO PHRA THONG AND KO KHO KHAO (PHASE I AND II, JANUARY 2005 - JANUARY 2007)**

#### **LIVELIHOOD SUPPORT FOR TRADITIONAL FISHING COMMUNITIES (PHASE III, FEBRUARY 2007 – JANUARY 2008)**

### **1 Background**

In the morning of the 26<sup>th</sup> of December 2004, an earthquake of a 9.0 magnitude in the Andaman Sea originated a huge tidal wave that killed close to 300'000 people and destroyed much of the coastal infrastructures in the exposed regions of Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Southern India and Thailand. In Thailand itself, more than 5'000 persons lost their life in the tsunami, among which half were tourists. Numerous local and international organizations supported the Thai authorities' efforts to assist the victims. Switzerland participated to the coordinated efforts by immediately providing emergency assistance to the people affected by the disaster, which included a number of Swiss nationals, and by assisting the Thai authorities in the difficult task of identifying victims.

The Head of the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA), Micheline Calmy-Rey, visited Phuket and Bangkok on 2-3 January 2005. In response to the huge humanitarian needs in the aftermath of the tsunami and as a token of thanks for the rapid assistance provided by the Thai authorities to victims (which included Swiss nationals), she also offered Swiss support for the rehabilitation of affected Thai communities, in particular traditional fishermen, who counted numerous fatalities and lost their houses, boats and fishing equipment. An expert from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) travelled to Thailand from the 6<sup>th</sup> to the 12<sup>th</sup> of January 2005, to consolidate the Swiss "Rehabilitation of Fishing Communities in Thailand" project. The project was welcomed and officially accepted by the Royal Thai Government on the 25<sup>th</sup> of January. It encompasses the rebuilding of social and economic infrastructures as well as the re-launch of fishing activities, and has been financed by the Swiss government, private enterprises and by a generous donation from the Swiss people via Swiss Solidarity. The project implemented by SDC has been planned in close collaboration and with the participation of the beneficiaries, local authorities and specialized organizations, and carried out by local architects and construction companies. SDC implemented the project in line with the agency's fundamental values, focusing on quickly relieving the distress of disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. The fishermen of Ko Phra Thong and Ko Kho Khao are among the poorest victims of the tsunami, and the nomad ethnic minorities that have been residing on these islands for generations still receive only limited consideration and enjoy only restricted rights. By supporting the reconstruction of their homes, boats and social infrastructure, the project has ensured the survival of these communities whose livelihood was wiped out in a matter of minutes.

## 2 Switzerland's project

Switzerland offered assistance in rebuilding the livelihood of 280 families in four fishing communities on the islands of Ko Kho Khao and Ko Phra Thong, about 220 km north of Phuket. The project's goals, expected results and activities were formulated, and SDC mobilized the various technical and social skills required to integrate aspects as diverse as habitat and regional planning, social equity, the construction of buildings capable of withstanding a tsunami and the promotion of earnings. To this end, the agency opened an office on site, and recruited and deployed qualified personnel. It also concluded agreements with public and private partner organizations brought in to support the project, such as architects, construction companies, anthropologists and environmentalists. The expert who identified the project in January 2005 was contracted as a back stopper. The project's logical framework and budget were revised in 2006, to adapt the project's goals, expected results and activities to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities.

The first two phases of the project, covering the emergency assistance and the early recovery and rehabilitation, implemented from January 2005 to January 2007, consisted mainly of the **reconstruction** of public and private infrastructure, namely schools, community halls, piers, roads, a health centre and houses. It also provided assistance to the local population and authorities on **sustainable land-use** and social integration of sea-gypsies **minorities**. A particular emphasis was given to the rehabilitation and improvement of the **livelihood** of the beneficiary population, with the supply of fishing boats and equipment, the support to fishing regulations implementation, the establishment of fish farms, the training of the fishermen and the development of alternative income generating activities. Whilst fishing activities picked-up rapidly after the distribution of new boats and equipment, all the other components of the livelihood programme needed further support to attain sustainability and self-sufficiency. A third phase of the project was then implemented from February 2007 until January 2008, during which the beneficiaries were able to receive the first additional incomes linked to their new activities. Presently a last extension of the project has been launched, with the objective to integrate livelihood activities in the school curriculum and to raise the islanders' awareness on environmental issues. Phase 3 and 4 are financed by SDC alone.

The project has been regularly visited by Swiss Solidarity President, Director and other representatives, by SDC Director, Head of the Humanitarian Aid Department and other representatives, by the Ambassador of Switzerland in Thailand and other members of the embassy, and by SDC Humanitarian Coordinator for Southeast Asia. All these visitors assessed the on-going of the project and verified its pertinence and efficiency. The accounts of the phases one and two of the project were audited by PricewaterhouseCoopers.

## 3 Objectives

The overall objective of the review is :

(A) to assess whether the project design and implementation modalities have been appropriate and allowed to reach the goals set at the project launch and revised during its implementation.

(B) to highlight lessons learnt, and provide inputs on how to rapidly integrate them into the fourth phase of the project, and how to capitalize them for future disaster response.

The review shall aim at :

### A Project review

1. Assess the impact of the project : *How suitable is SDC strategy in regard to the context and in terms of benefits to the affected population? Does the project address*

*the relevant issues? Do the adopted solutions contribute to resolve the targeted problems? Are the appropriate beneficiary groups being targeted? Are the needs of the targeted beneficiaries met? Are the beneficiaries being empowered? How appropriate is the choice of partners?*

2. Review the relevance of the project in regard to the institutional mandates of SDC-HA and Swiss Solidarity ?
3. Analyse and evaluate the outcomes of the project (logical framework).
4. Assess the efficiency / effectiveness of the project and rate the timeliness of the project : *do the services reach the beneficiaries? Is the use of financial / human resources appropriate in relation to the results? Are the management arrangements of the project appropriate? Are the human resources appropriate?*
5. Assess how the project is aligned with / linked to the RTG plans
6. Evaluate the level of cooperation / coordination with international and local partners : *is the project harmonized with other donors projects? Are the beneficiaries, municipalities and other involved authorities satisfied with the provided solutions and the implementation modalities?*
7. Appraise the sustainability of the project's results.

## **B Lessons learnt**

8. Point out strengths and weaknesses of the project (SWOT analysis) : *define best practices and propose measures and recommendations for immediate improvement and long term capitalization, define what lessons, positive or negative, can be drawn from the experiences of the project.*

## **4 Scope**

The review will analyse all activities undertaken jointly by SDC and Swiss Solidarity (for phase 3 by SDC alone) for the communities of Ko Phra Thong and Ko Kho Kao after the 26<sup>th</sup> of December 2004 tsunami.

## **5 Methodology**

The methodology has to be participative and focus on accountability and lessons learnt. The review team will consist of one international expert, with good knowledge of SDC and Swiss Solidarity visions, humanitarian strategies and policies, if possible knowledge and experience of the post tsunami assistance context and operational environment, and one local consultant. The team will preferably be gender balanced, and the members must possess between them the following skills and experience:

- Substantial evaluation experience;
- Extensive experience of donors response in the context of a major natural disaster;
- Good knowledge of SDC and Swiss Solidarity visions, humanitarian aid strategies, intervention modalities, operational principles;
- Good knowledge of the local context, in particular the post tsunami operational environment for donors and humanitarian actors;
- Experience of working with local authorities and communities ;
- Field experience, in particular in direct action programmes or projects ;
- Demonstrable experience in integrating minority rights and advocacy considerations;
- Technical expertise in the following domains: disaster response, construction, livelihood, environment, minorities issues;
- Excellent spoken and written communication skills in English.

The review is based on the following sources of information:

- Evaluation of the relevant documents (see chapter 8)
- Briefing and debriefing with representatives of SDC in Bern (Humanitarian Aid Department), Swiss Solidarity in Switzerland, representatives of the Embassy of Switzerland in Bangkok, SDC Humanitarian Coordinator for Southeast Asia in Bangkok.
- Project' visits and interviews with beneficiaries, local authorities, partners, SDC staff and other key stakeholders;
- Meetings with representatives of other donors, national, provincial and local authorities, the United Nations, International organisations, NGOs and local organisations in Thailand.

## 6 Tentative Time Schedule

Months		February				March				April				May			
Time Range	Week	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Prepare TOR		■	■														
Select and contract review team				■	■	■											
HQ briefing (1 day)							■										
Review in Thailand (~10 days)							■	■									
Submit draft report									■	■	■						
Debriefing in Thailand (TBC)								■					■				
Debriefing at HQ Bern (1 day)														■			
Feedback on draft report by SDC															■		
Final Report																	■

The evaluation shall be limited to the following working days per expert, including travel time:

	Team Leader	Local consultant
Preparation (incl. briefing in Switzerland)	3	3
Field work	9	7
Writing report & debriefing in Switzerland	5	2
Total	17	12

## 7 Output

- A draft report in English, not exceeding 10 pages, including a short executive summary, is to be submitted to the Humanitarian Aid, Division Asia and Americas in Berne within three weeks after the return from the mission. The revised final report (3 hard copies and 1 soft copy) is expected two weeks after SDC staff has commented the draft.
- In addition, key lessons learnt and recommendations shall be shared with representatives of the Embassy of Switzerland in Bangkok and SDC both in Thailand and in Bern, shortly after the review.
- The report will be made public.

## 8 Documentation

1. Federal Law on international cooperation for development and humanitarian aid of 19 March 1976

2. Message to the Parliament for the continuation of international humanitarian aid by the Confederation of 13<sup>th</sup> of June 2007
3. SDC Strategy 2010
4. 2010 SDC Humanitarian Aid Strategy
5. Programme humanitaire dans le Sud-Est asiatique: rapport annuel 2006
6. Mission reports by Rolf Grossenbacher, back stopper to the project
7. Project proposals, interim reports, final reports by SDC
8. Swiss Solidarity reports
9. Credit proposals
10. Mission reports NOV and SOZ
11. Periodic reports, mission reports and other reports by SDC Humanitarian Coordinator for Southeast Asia

## Appendix 2: Mission Itinerary and Persons Met

Date	Activity and place	Persons met / Participants
March 13 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	<b>Arrival in Bangkok</b> Briefing and meeting at Amari Boulevard Hotel	Mr. Jean Michel Jordan, SDC Humanitarian Coordinator Ms. Sureerat Kritsanarangsang, Local Consultant Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant
March 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	Meeting with the Thai Ministry of Foreign Affairs Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation (TICA)  Embassy of Switzerland  Flight to Pukhet and Travel to Khura Buri	Ms. Rumpuey Patamawichaiporn, Director External Cooperation Ms. Wichaya Sinthusen, Programme Officer Mr. Jean Michel Jordan, SDC Humanitarian Coordinator  Mr. Jacques Lauer, Minister Mr. Jean Michel Jordan, SDC Humanitarian Coordinator  Ms. Sureerat Kritsanarangsang, Local Consultant Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant
March 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	<b>Travel to Ko Kho Kao, via Thung Ia Ong</b>  <b>Baan Muaeng Mai:</b> Visit of Fishermen Community, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pier</li> <li>• Road</li> <li>• Houses</li> <li>• Community Hall</li> <li>• Boats and Fishing Gear</li> </ul> <b>Travel to Ko Phra Tong</b> <b>Baan Thung Dap</b> Visit of Fishermen Community, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkway</li> <li>• Houses</li> <li>• Schools, teachers house and a number of out door facilities</li> <li>• Community Hall</li> <li>• Marine and Mechanic Workshop</li> <li>• Boats and Fishing Gear</li> <li>• Kitchen Garden</li> </ul>	Ms. Purn, National Project Officer, SDC Ms. Sureerat Kritsanarangsang, Local Consultant Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant  Mr. Prajob Disapan Head of the community Mr. Sathorn Tontalay, Beneficiary Ms. Pratin Kamarin, Beneficiary Mr. Najui Kamarin, Beneficiary  Mr. Banha Kawsakul, Aor Bor Tor Mr. Papon Thinpangnga, Contractor Ms. Noi Pechsai, Woman group and and beneficiary Ms. Ya Pechsai Woman group and and beneficiary

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity and place</b>	<b>Persons met / Participants</b>
March 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	<b>Khura Buri, Green Garden Hotel</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion about context and first findings</li> <li>• Documents exchange</li> <li>• Roles of consultants</li> </ul>	Ms. Sureerat Kritsanarangsan, Local Consultant Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant
March 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	<b>Khura Buri Town</b>  SDC office and IUCN office   Department of Public Health Department of Fisheries Department of Agriculture Chaipattana village "Caritas village"	Miss Supranee Kumpongsun, National Project Officer, SDC Mr. Somsak Sunthornwanapatr Mr. Prateep Meekatidhama  Ms. Chantanee Kongpat, Representative Mr. Sakesan Majcha, Representative Mr. Jua Siriporn, Representative Mr. Suriyon Kwanoon, Beneficiary Mr. Care Klatalay, Beneficiary
March 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	<b>Travel to Ko Phra Tong via Khura Buri Pier</b> <b>Baan Tha Pae Yoi</b> School built by Unilever <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kitchen Garden activities, Fish Farm and Waste management</li> </ul> Health Centre  Fishermen Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water system</li> <li>• Crab bank</li> <li>• Boats and Fishing gear</li> </ul>	School teachers responsible for aqua farm and kitchen garden project : Ms. Maree Kamkaew Mr. Sumate Traitrong  Ms. Siam Nukul, Public Health Officer  Mr. Pathomporn Sae Eaid, Aor Bor Tor Ms. Wancharin Kamkaew, Beneficiary Ms. Saijai Klatalay, Beneficiary Ms. Somsri Phochana, Beneficiary Mr. Jang Klatalay, Beneficiary Mr. Suchart Rithee, Beneficiary Mr. Tep Kumkaew, Beneficiary
March 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	<b>Travel to Ko Phra Tong via Khura Buri Pier</b> <b>Baan Pak Chok,</b> Fishermen Community, the "Lions village" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pier, bridge and road</li> <li>• Community Hall</li> <li>• School and sanitary blocks</li> </ul>	Mr. Boonlert Limsakul, Head of Lions Community Ms. Tipawam Pingthai, Beneficiary Ms. Pimol Promkiree, Beneficiary Ms. Tipawan Somrak, Beneficiary

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity and place</b>	<b>Persons met / Participants</b>
March 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	Nautilus, NGO  Tourist Resort (separate from village)  <b>Khura Buri Town</b> Meeting with former SDC employee	Volunteer of the NGO  Mr. Wichit Poocharean, Former Aor Bor Tor Chairman, Lions Club Member and owner of the tourist resort  Ms. Tu, former Finance Officer, SDC Khura Buri Office
March 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	<b>Travel to Tap Pod</b>  Department of Education  Department of Skill Development  Meeting with SDC Humanitarian Coordinator  <b>Khura Buri Town</b> SDC office, reporting system  IUCN office	Mr. Jean Michel Jordan was met there Ms. Purn, National Project Officer, SDC Ms. Sureerat Kritsanarangsana, Local Consultant Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant  Mr. Wipol Nakapan, Director of Primary Education division 4  Mr. Rosapol Chanpen, Director of Skills and Development Centre Mr. Saengtean Lamee, Skill trainer  Mr. Jean Michel Jordan, SDC Humanitarian Coordinator Ms. Purn, National Project Officer, SDC Ms. Sureerat Kritsanarangsana, Local Consultant Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant  Ms. Purn, National Project Officer, SDC Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant  Mr. Somsak Sunthornwanapatr Mr. Janaka A. De Silva, Programme Coordinator Thailand Programme
March 21 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	<b>Khura Buri, Green Garden Hotel</b> Meeting with representative of the Department of Marine and Coastal Resources <b>Travel to Phuket Airport</b> Meeting with former SDC employee  Debriefing with SDC Humanitarian Coordinator  <b>Flight to Bangkok resp. Zürich</b>	Mr. Sambung  Mr. Good, Architect  Mr. Jean Michel Jordan, SDC Humanitarian Coordinator Ms. Purn, National Project Officer, SDC Ms. Sureerat Kritsanarangsana, Local Consultant Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant  Ms. Sureerat Kritsanarangsana, Local Consultant Mr. Helmut Scheuer, Consultant

### **Appendix 3: Bibliography**

- [1] Programme humanitaire dans le Sud-Est asiatique: rapport annuel 2006
- [2] Mission reports by Rolf Grossenbacher, back stopper to the project
- [3] Project proposals, interim reports, final reports by SDC
- [4] Swiss Solidarity guidelines
- [5] Credit proposals
- [6] Mission reports NOV and SOZ
- [7] Periodic reports, mission reports and other reports by SDC Humanitarian Coordinator for Southeast Asia
- [8] Jacques Ivanoff et.al. 2006 ; Turbulence on Ko Phra Thong
- [9] IUCN Reports, 2006 :
  - a. Emergency Rehabilitation of Koh Phra Thong, IUCN Partnership in the SDC Project
  - b. A Post Tsunami Environmental Profile of Koh Phra Thong
  - c. Land Use Plan for Koh Phra Thong, Kuraburi District, Phang Nga Province, Thailand,  
A Report to The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
  - d. Assessment of Tsunami Affected Areas of Koh Phra Thong,  
Potential Opportunities in Livelihood and Environmental Rehabilitation
  - e. IUCN Training and Field Demonstration Activities: Summary Report