

Annex 1

Terms of reference

1. ToR summary

1.1 Purpose The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) is undertaking this review study to build its understanding of and capacity to best support its work towards preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters.

1.2 Audience The audience for the review includes the National Societies, government institutions to which the National Societies are auxiliary, the IFRC secretariat, international organizations, NGOs, donors and other partner organizations, and those in the larger international community seeking to better understand and respond to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters.

1.3 Commissioners This evaluation is commissioned by the IFRC Europe Zone Office, based in Budapest.

1.4 Duration of consultancy Estimated up to 40 working days.

1.5 Time frame Estimated January – 31 March 2015

1.6 Location To be determined in joint consultation with the selected evaluation team, but to be a convenient location in Europe: e.g., Geneva (Switzerland), Budapest (Hungary), Kiev (Ukraine), Minsk (Belarus), Moscow (Russia).

1.7 Application deadline 17 December 2014

2. Background to CHARP

The Chernobyl nuclear power plant, situated in the Kiev region in the north of Ukraine close to the Ukrainian-Belarusian, border started producing power in 1977. The fourth of a planned six reactor units began operation in 1983. On 26 April 1986, the explosion of the fourth reactor of the nuclear power plant triggered the worst disaster ever of the civil nuclear industry. The accidental explosion during a safety test destroyed the core of the unit and resulted in a massive fire, which lasted for about ten days. This led to the dispersion of millions of radioactive nuclides. For more background information please refer to ample available information, including *The Human Consequences of the Chernobyl Nuclear Accident: A Strategy for Recovery*,¹ *2005 findings of the UN Chernobyl Forum*² and other sources.³

“The Chernobyl nuclear accident of 1986 had devastating consequences for people living in the vast territories touched by radioactive fallout. Hundreds of thousands of people were evacuated, and millions of people still live in areas officially classified as ‘contaminated’” by radiation. Those who were children at the time of the accident suffer elevated rates of thyroid cancer. The three countries most affected by the accident – Belarus, the Russian Federation, and Ukraine – have spent vast sums tending to the needs of local communities. Ukraine, in addition, has assumed the burden of ensuring that the damaged reactor poses no further threat’ (*UN Action Plan on Chernobyl to 2016, Final Version approved in Vienna in November 2008, p. 1*).⁴ These activities supporting the affected populations continue today.

At the end of 1989 the Soviet Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies formally approached the IFRC with a request for support. In January 1990 the IFRC deployed a team of international experts who, together with the Alliance, conducted a survey and came up with recommendations for an intervention.⁵ As a result, the Chernobyl Humanitarian Assistance and Rehabilitation Programme (CHARP) was initiated in 1990 by the IFRC in partnership with the National Societies of Belarus, Russia and Ukraine. For a programme of such a long duration, the objectives have been both planned and emergent, including to:

1. Provide accurate information on the level of contamination and its effects on people, food-stuffs and the environment to people directly affected by the accident
2. Support health-related recovery among the affected populations, including the provision of:
 - Psychosocial counselling to the affected populations (especially in marginalized areas)
 - Health education to the affected populations (especially in marginalized areas)
 - Thyroid gland monitoring and testing to the affected populations (especially in marginalized areas)
 - Upgraded health and social institutions directly involved in the rehabilitation and treatment of the affected populations
 - Medical supplies and equipment to support National Society recovery efforts
3. Provide to the Red Cross workers the necessary equipment to ensure daily control of contamination levels in the affected areas
4. Ensure the provision of “safe food” to schools and other children’s institutions
5. Encourage closer cooperation between scientists and other interested parties, both within and outside the Soviet Union
6. Facilitate the exchange of experience and information within the Red Cross Movement and external partners on coping with the consequences of nuclear and other technological disasters.

¹ https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/strategy_for_recovery.pdf

² http://chernobyl.undp.org/english/docs/pr_chernobyl_forum_050905.pdf

³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chernobyl_disaster. This site includes a list of further reading.

⁴ <http://chernobyl.undp.org/english/index.html>

⁵ See ToR annex 1, Report of the 1990 IFRC Evaluation mission.

IFRC funding for CHARP officially stopped in 2013, but stakeholder involvement in and implementation of certain aspects of CHARP have continued. Since the very beginning of the programme in 1990, we estimate that over 25 million Swiss francs were raised by the IFRC during the 22 years of the existence of this programme.

The development and implementation of CHARP was possible due to the collaboration of a number of National Societies and the IFRC, as well as strong cooperation and support from governments and other donors. For the 22 years of its operation, CHARP evolved with regular modification to adapt to newly acquired knowledge, emerging priorities and a changing context.

Prior data collection, analysis and recommendations for CHARP that are relevant to this study include several evaluations and reviews. In 1993, 1996 and 1999,⁶ the IFRC conducted evaluations which resulted in the modification of the programme, placing greater focus on the provision of thyroid gland screening and PSS. Also in 1996, an external evaluation to assess ECHO-funded activities was conducted.⁷ In response primarily to funding concerns, in 2002 the IFRC secretariat in Geneva evaluated CHARP.⁸ In 2003 and in 2005 the Netherlands Red Cross⁹ conducted programme reviews which took account of the 2002 recommendations and findings. In 2003, with support from the IFRC, an analysis of data generated over the years was conducted and an extensive report produced, although it has never been published.¹⁰

The unique nature of CHARP, including its longevity and the number of stakeholders involved, provides a valuable opportunity for the IFRC to learn from and share with others lessons from its experience. To record and capitalize on the CHARP experience, there is a pressing need to study, analyse and document what has occurred before institutional and programmatic memory fades. For example, at the November 2011 General Assembly of the IFRC, the National Societies adopted Resolution 11/46: Preparedness to Respond to the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Accidents. The objective of this resolution is to further strengthen the knowledge and competence of the IFRC and the capacity of National Societies to assist communities in preparing for, and coping with, the humanitarian consequences during and after a nuclear accident.

In sum, with continued technological developments and the involvement of many states in nuclear and radiological activities, as well as an increase in the number of technological accidents and disasters, including the 2011 nuclear disaster in Fukushima Daiichi, Japan, the IFRC and a number of National Societies aspire to review and strengthen the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement's preparedness to respond to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters. This stated purpose and the objectives for this review study of CHARP address the needs and objectives of the IFRC by identifying, highlighting and sharing key lessons and recommended best practices to inform the planning for and implementation of future programming in the areas of practical preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters.

6 Annexes 2, 3, 5, respectively.

7 Annex 4.

8 Annex 6, *Evaluation of CHARP, July 2002, including ToR for the evaluation.*

9 Annexes 7 and 9.

10 Annex 8, *Report on medical screening data analysis.*

3. Purpose and scope of the review study

3.1 Review purpose and audience

The IFRC is undertaking this review study to build its understanding of and capacity to best support its work towards preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters.

The audience for the review includes the National Societies, government institutions to which the National Societies are auxiliary, the IFRC secretariat, international organizations, NGOs, donors and other partner organizations, and those in the larger international community seeking to better understand and respond to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters.

3.2 Review scope

The scope of the review includes the overall time frame for which CHARP was funded by the IFRC, 1990–2013, and will concentrate on CHARP activities, results and related lessons on two levels:

1. The three target countries and respective National Societies of Belarus, Russia and Ukraine
2. The Europe Zone Office and other IFRC stakeholders supporting CHARP.

The scope of the analysis is further detailed in the stated objectives below. Data collection and analysis will include relevant secondary data sources, as well as primary data collected on the basis of a review of the secondary data – both of which are detailed in the methodology section of the ToR.

4. Objectives for the review study

Three overall objectives have been identified for this review study. Objectives will be refined in the inception report (discussed below) after the commissioned review team has had the opportunity to review the available data sources to identify (in consultation with the IFRC review management committee) more detailed and evaluable objectives. The overall objectives are to:

1. Produce a comprehensive analysis of the IFRC actions and experience with CHARP in its response to the Chernobyl nuclear accident that identifies key lessons, positive and negative, and best practices/recommendations to inform planning and future programming for preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters.
2. Analyse the overall effectiveness and impact of CHARP at the country level:
 - a. The change to communities and members due to CHARP programming, especially with regard to health services, which were a primary focus of the programming.
 - b. The change in National Society nuclear accident management capacity as a result of capacity development initiatives from CHARP over the last 22 years.
3. Document the CHARP experience to preserve an institutional memory within the IFRC of such a significant long-term programme, including its origin and how it has adapted and evolved over time; this would contribute to objectives 1 and 2, above, and can highlight both accomplishments to celebrate and challenges to learn from.

It is acknowledged that additional, unintended objectives for the review may emerge upon data collection and analysis, regarding which the review team will consult with the IFRC review management committee as their inclusion. It may very well be important to include such emergent objectives if they contribute to the overall purpose of the review study (i.e. provide relevant lessons for the IFRC's work in preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters).

5. Methodology for the review study

The methodology for this review study will consist of a desktop review of the relevant secondary data, complimented by primary data collection in the form of key information interviews with relevant stakeholders. The review design and methodology will stress a utilization-focused approach, for which stakeholder consultation is imperative to ensure the evaluation is aligned with IFRC needs. In this way, the evaluation will be both useful and used.

5.1 Desktop review of secondary data

Secondary data includes all background documents on CHARP: e.g., reports, documentation, agreements, evaluations, reviews, proposal documents, budgets, timelines, tools and all other relevant information that can be located. Secondary data will be obtained from key CHARP resource people in Kiev, the IFRC Europe Zone Office and international headquarters in Geneva, the National Societies of Belarus, Russia and Ukraine, and other partners and relevant stakeholders.

5.2 Key informant interviews

An outcome of the desktop review, in consultation with immediate and knowledgeable stakeholders, will be the identification of key staff and people involved in CHARP, and a list of those who are relevant and realistic to interview for the review. In relation to the emerging areas to be explored on the basis of the desktop review, a questionnaire guide should be developed to lead interviews in a consistent and reliable manner. It is acknowledged that additional interviewees and areas to probe may emerge during the key informant interviews themselves. Examples of key informants include: National Society staff and volunteers, IFRC, PNSs, representatives of governments and external organizations, including those listed in the UN Action Plan for Chernobyl, as well as members of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Chernobyl chaired by the UNDP.

5.3 Field visits

Field visits will provide the opportunity for in-person key informant interviews, further collection of secondary data and potential site visits to served communities. Specific details for field visits will be outlined beforehand in a data-collection plan for the review, after secondary data initially available have been reviewed, making it possible to identify additional secondary data to obtain and key informants to interview.

Additional methods may be included, such as the use of a questionnaire survey; the full methodology will be articulated in the inception report (discussed below) after the commissioned review team has had the opportunity to review the available data sources and further consult with the IFRC review management committee.

6. Deliverables (outputs)

It is intended that this review study will be drawn upon to produce deliverables in a variety of formats that can be shared using different media to best achieve the stated objectives above. Specific deliverables in addition to the first three below will be identified in the inception report in consultation between the review team and the IFRC review management committee, and it is recognized that additional deliverables may be identified as appropriate for the identified objectives for the review. Deliverables identified for this review study thus far include but are not limited to:

1. Inception report An inception report will be prepared by the review team leader to demonstrate a clear understanding and realistic plan of work for the review that is in agreement with the ToR as well as the IFRC review management team. The inception report will include a description of the proposed methodologies and limitations; a data collection and analysis plan outlining key data sources (secondary and primary) and time frame; any specific technical and logistical needs with estimated costs; any potential risks to the review. The inception report will also identify, as discussed above, the specific additional deliverables in addition to the following two below.

2. Preliminary findings debrief The review team leader (possibly with other team members) will report preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to an audience of relevant IFRC/CHARP stakeholders. This will allow the review team to get initial reactions to its work and add further discussion and reflection to contribute to drafting the report.

3. CHARP review study report The review study report should address the stated objectives for the ToR and any additional, emergent objectives identified. The specific report content may vary, but at a minimum it should include a profile (background) of CHARP, why it is being reviewed, a description of the review methods and limitations, findings, conclusions, lessons learnt, and recommendations. An executive summary should provide a succinct and clear overview of the report, highlighting key findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt. The report should also have appropriate appendixes, including a copy of the ToR. Additional content items include:

- a. The CHARP implementation history and timeline, outlining key activities, events and stakeholder participation with dates.
- b. Future projections for the sustainability of the CHARP objectives based on key stakeholder (National Society) capacities, support/demand and other resources.
- c. Recommendations should:
 - (1) Apply to the specific National Society and the objectives of CHARP respective to their country contexts and capacities.
 - (2) Apply to the broader IFRC/global context to inform its work towards preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological emergencies, as well as other technological disasters.

4. Summary case-study fact sheet The purpose of this fact sheet would be for information sharing about CHARP and related lessons and recommendations for preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters. Also, it would contribute to resource mobilization for the IFRC in this area. It should be developed in a suitable format for the IFRC to share internally and externally at meetings, high-level events and other relevant forums.

5. PowerPoint and slideshow presentation Like the summary case-study factsheet, the PowerPoint presentation could be used by different IFRC people to communicate in person with other stakeholders during both internal and external meetings, high-level events, and other relevant forums. The slideshow

could be a narrated recording of the PowerPoint by the review team members, to be used for asynchronous dissemination over the internet, on the IFRC learning platform, etc.

6. Video report A 5 to 20 minute (or longer) video report of the review could be prepared with appropriate visuals and narrative helping to convey the key findings, conclusions and recommendations. This could be posted on internal and external outlets for better dissemination and use of the review report.

Overall, the consultancy is planned for up to 40 days of work, with completion by 31 March 2015. The specific configuration of and **time frame** for deliverables will be agreed in joint consultation between the IFRC review management team and the review team (described below), largely on the basis of the initial data-collection plan outlined in the inception report and resultant time and resources for deliverables.

7. Review team members and qualifications

A two-member review team is proposed for this assignment, consisting of:

7.1 Team leader

Responsibilities include upholding the quality and ethical standards (below) for the review; completion of deliverables in a timely and cost-efficient manner; overall team leadership and management of the other review team member. The team leader will be the final author of the above-mentioned deliverables, with the team member supporting and recognized. Qualifications include:

- Demonstrated experience leading review/evaluation teams, analysing both qualitative and quantitative data, and preparing relevant writing samples/reports.
- Proven track record of conducting qualitative research, including the development of interview schedules and qualitative data analysis required, and in designing and enumerating survey questionnaires electronically (and in written format).
- Demonstrated experience and advanced technical knowledge of preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents as well as other technological disasters.
- Demonstrated public health expertise of health issues related to preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters.
- University degree(s) at postgraduate level in a relevant field of study; PhD preferred, MA minimum.
- Excellent communication (written, spoken and visual) for preparation of deliverables.
- Knowledge of the Russian language and sound knowledge of the IFRC preferred.

7.2 Expert – nuclear and radiological preparedness and response

Responsibilities include contributing to the data collection, analysis and preparation of the review study, with attention to preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological emergencies, as well as other technological disasters. Qualifications include:

- Demonstrated experience contributing to relevant reviews/evaluations, including competence in conducting relevant quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis.
- Demonstrated and appropriate public health expertise with health issues related to preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological accidents, as well as other technological disasters.
- Demonstrated and appropriate disaster management experience related to preparedness and response to nuclear and radiological emergencies, as well as other technological disasters.
- University degree(s) at postgraduate level in a relevant field of study; PhD preferred, MPH minimum.
- Excellent communication (written, spoken and visual) skills.
- Knowledge of the Russian language and sound knowledge of the IFRC preferred.

8. IFRC management and support

8.1 IFRC (review) management committee

The management committee is tasked with the oversight of the review team. The review team leader will report to this committee, which will consist of the Europe Zone Office head of operations, the Europe Zone Office health and care coordinator, the IFRC senior officer for nuclear and radiological emergency preparedness based in Geneva, and the IFRC senior monitoring and evaluation officer based in Geneva. Other members may be included as determined by the committee. The committee will provide organizational and context-specific guidance to the review team to help achieve the stated objectives. It will also guide the review/revision of deliverables to best ensure stakeholder involvement for ownership and use of the deliverables.

8.2 Logistical and administrative support

Specific logistical and administrative arrangements will be identified by a review management committee in collaboration with the reviewer(s) once they have been contracted and a detailed data collection plan has been prepared. However, it is expected that the majority of logistical and administrative support for the reviewers will be provided through IFRC regional and country representations and offices in Moscow, Kiev and Minsk and through the Europe Zone Office.

9. Review quality and ethical standards

The review team members should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the review study is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of the people involved, and to ensure that the review is technically accurate, reliable and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. Therefore, the review team should adhere to the applicable principles and standards outlined in the IFRC framework for evaluation, which apply as much to reviews as to evaluations.

It is also expected that the evaluation will uphold the Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement: (1) Humanity, (2) Impartiality, (3) Neutrality, (4) Independence, (5) Voluntary service, (6) Unity, and (7) Universality. Further information can be obtained about these principles at: www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp.

10. Application procedures

Applicants may apply as a team or individually to be considered for the review team. Interested candidates should submit their application material by 17 December 2014 using the IFRC's website (<http://www.ifrc.org/en/who-we-are/working-with-us/current-vacancies/>).

1. **Curricula Vitae** (or resume)
2. **Covering letter** clearly summarizing your experience as it pertains to this assignment, **your daily rate**, and **three professional references**.
3. At least one example of a written report most similar to the purpose and scope of that described in the ToR.

Application materials are non-returnable, and we thank you in advance for understanding that only shortlisted candidates will be contacted for the next step in the application process.

11. Annex – suggested background materials

The following list is illustrative (but not exhaustive) of key documents to be used in the review study.

11.1 Movement-wide documents

- Radiation Risk Reduction: Observations: Contribution to a Background Document for the Secretary General Visit to Japan, March 2011
- Resolution 21: Disaster Relief in Case of Technical and Other Disasters, XXVI International Conference of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Geneva 1986, and Annex I on the role of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in response to technological disasters.

- IFRC Report on nuclear preparedness, June 2012, report on National Society consultation meeting on nuclear disaster preparedness
- IFRC General Assembly (Geneva, November 2011), Background to draft decision on preparedness to respond to the humanitarian consequences of nuclear accidents
- IFRC Strategic Action Plan on Nuclear and Radiological Emergency Preparedness, October 2013
- IFRC Nuclear and Radiological Emergency Preparedness and Response Guidelines, draft version, December 2014
- Communication pack on Fukushima nuclear disaster, including: a six minute mini-documentary, *Fukushima Summer*: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dfYQfWFFKTU>. Facts and Figures, stories and other communication materials with the ToR.

11.2 CHARP-related documents

- Annex 1, 1990 Survey
- Annex 2, 1993 CHARP Evaluation Report
- Annex 3, 1996 CHARP Mission Report
- Annex 4, 1996 CHARP Evaluation ECHO
- Annex 5, 1999 CHARP 3rd Evaluation Mission Report
- Annex 6, 2002 CHARP Evaluation
- Annex 7, 2003 CHARP Review, The Netherlands Red Cross
- Annex 8, 2003 CHARP Data Analysis, Medical screening
- Annex 9, 2005 CHARP Mid-term evaluation, The Netherlands Red Cross
- Annex 10, CHARP 2016 Strategy
- Annex 11, CHARP Leaflet, March 2012

11.3 External documents

- “The Human Consequences of the Chernobyl Nuclear Accident: A Strategy for Recovery”, UNDP, <http://www.un.org/ha/chernobyl/docs/report.pdf>
- http://chernobyl.undp.org/english/nat_rep.shtml
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chernobyl_disaster
- UN Action Plan on Chernobyl, which includes IFRC activities and shows the stakeholders of CHARP
- Chernobyl Forum report
- Optimizing the International Effort to Study, Mitigate and Minimize the Consequences of the Chernobyl Disaster; Report of the UN Secretary-General; October 2013
- UNSCEAR reports on Chernobyl