

## Evaluation Report

Evaluation of ECHO's Global Plan 2000 - Angola

### **Sector: Emergency Relief (Non-Food Items)**

Country: Angola  
Period: January till December 2000  
Programme: ECHO/AGO/210/2000/01000  
Author: Franz Gustav Schild, Economist  
GERMAX Gerli GmbH - Germany

Project: Evaluation Global Plan 2000 - Angola  
GMX-PN: EC/ECHO-03/2000  
Period: November 2000 – January 2001  
Contract: ECHO/EVA-B7-210/2000/01010

in Cooperation with

**GERMAX** · GERLI GMBH  
BERATUNGSGESELLSCHAFT



This report has been produced at the request of the European Commission.

The opinions and comments contained in this report reflect the opinions of the consultants only and not necessarily those of the European Commission.

## **Executive Summary for Cross Evaluation Purposes**

### **Evaluation**

**Subject:** Global Plan 2000 (GP) for Angola. The GP 2000 defined the assistance framework for EC/ECHO funded humanitarian operations in Angola, covering the fields of Health & Nutrition, Water & Sanitation and the distribution of Non-Food Items to IDPs in the country.

**Sector:** Emergency Aid - Non-Food Items (NFI) distribution during the reference period January – December 2000.

**Report No.:** EC/ECHO-03/2000

**Date of Evaluation:** 14 November till 11 December 2000

**Consultant Name:** Franz Gustav Schild, Economist, Germax Gerli GmbH

### **Purpose and Methodology**

The purpose of the evaluation was to (i) assess the suitability and effectiveness of the GP2000, (ii) quantify the impact in terms of output and analyse the link between emergency, rehabilitation and development. The evaluation focussed on all three sectors, Health and Nutrition (H&N), Water and Sanitation (Watsan) and Non-Food items (NFI). For each sector one expert participated in the assignment. The mission was well prepared and interviews with all parties involved at the various levels were conducted.

### **Main Conclusions**

**Relevance** – The NFI distribution of the three ECHO funded NGOs is considered to be highly relevant due to the fact that the target group (IDPs) lost all their property during forced migration and the provision of NFI distribution provided basic items to continue life under very difficult circumstances.

**Effectiveness** – The distribution activities were found well targeted and properly managed. The effectiveness was high, since the ECHO NGOs have chosen the right local partners to physically organise the distribution and the related basic monitoring and control measures.

**Efficiency** - Spot-checks and comparisons with programmes of other donors revealed that the ECHO funded NGOs organised the procurement in a very economic way and the cost per beneficiary are reasonable in comparison to other programmes. Logistics, distribution and monitoring are properly handled and the programme can be called efficient. Nonetheless, centralised procurement and logistics organisation leaves room to further increase in efficiency.

**Coordination and Complementarity** – Basically the coordination and the exchange of information amongst the NGOs is well functioning and overlaps are prevented to occur. The different donors programmes clearly complement each other. The relationship between the

executing partners and ECHO has suffered from slow administration processes. Significant delays in contracting were reported by the ECHO partners.

***Impact & Strategic Implications*** – The impact and the coverage of the NFI distribution can be considered as remarkable in those areas supported by ECHO funded NGOs (21% coverage of the IDPs currently supported by the NGO community in Angola). Nonetheless, it turned out to be very difficult to measure the quantitative impact of the programme due to missing (success) indicators, which should have been set up during project planning. This gives a clear orientation for future programmes: Ex-ante assessments including the development of indicators, which would allow the measurement of the impact.

***Visibility*** – The visibility of ECHO was good at field level, but it was found weak at local administration and national level.

***Horizontal Issues*** – Gender aspects and conflict prevention measures are not yet well introduced in the projects designs and would need more attention in future project planning and implementation. The same applies to environmental issues in the context of prevention of de-forestation.

## **Recommendations**

1. The centralization approach of SCF-UK, which proposes centralised procurement of products should be encouraged by ECHO.
2. The operation contracts need to be signed by both parties, ECHO and the NGOs, before the start of an operation.
3. Guidelines for writing proposals and reporting should be developed for the ECHO operations in order to prevent delays and unnecessary correction loops.
4. ECHO should develop procedures to prevent delays in payment to implementing partners.
5. The entire exchange of information between ECHO and its implementing partners should be streamlined.
6. The ECHO partners should put more attention to the quality of products to be distributed. Standards should be fixed for ordering of commodities. Items out of metal (preferably aluminium) should have preference against items made of plastic.
7. It is recommended to consider the inclusion of the following items in future NFI distributions: shoes, clothes, locally produced energy saving stoves, carpets of local raw material, mosquito-nets.
8. Together with proposals for future distribution activities, the ECHO partners should present a training scheme for the locally employed NGOs.
9. The permanent ECHO staff in Luanda ought to visit the field operations more regularly to stimulate better exchange of information.
10. In order to increase the visibility of the ECHO assistance in Angola, local media should be more involved in public relations.
12. Gender issues, human rights affairs and environmental protection measures should be given more attention in future NFI distribution programmes.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary	5
1. Introduction	8
2. Methodology	8
3. Context and humanitarian situation	9
4. Relevance and appropriateness	10
5. Effectiveness	10
6. Efficiency	11
7. Co-ordination, coherence and complementarity	15
8. Impact and strategic implications	16
9. Visibility	17
10. Horizontal issues	18
11. Management	19
12. Recommendations	20

### Annexes

Annex 1	Terms of Reference
Annex 2	List of persons interviewed
Annex 3	Work programme of the team
Annex 4	Documents consulted
Annex 5	List of abbreviations
Annex 6	Summary of all ECHO projects under GP2000 by province
Annex 7	Definitions used for this assignment
Annex 8	Security situation in Angola
Annex 9	Map of Angola – NFI distribution
Annex 10	Number of confirmed IDPs by province – NFI distribution by agency
Annex 11	Procedure for the award of contracts in humanitarian operations
Annex 12	Statement of Save The Children – UK / Procedural delays
Annex 13	Formato De Recepcao (sample Johanniter)

### **Acknowledgements**

The preparation of the evaluation report of the Global Plan 2000 – Angola would not have been possible without the support and valuable contributions of the Head of Units and staff members of the Directorate General for Development and of the European Community Humanitarian Office involved in the planning and implementation of the humanitarian assistance operations and development programmes in the target areas.

The evaluation team is very grateful to the staff in the EU Delegation in Luanda, the ECHO representatives and the staff members of the NGOs who kindly gave their time and contributions and supported the evaluation in all phases of the exercise with logistical support and guidance.

Finally, but by no means least, it has to be stated that without the efficient and kind help and the organisational know-how of Mrs. Gloria Fatima Nunes Chargas, ECHO-office Luanda, the mission could not have performed its tasks during the limited period time available for the assignment.

## Executive Summary

Between the 14<sup>th</sup> of November and the 11<sup>th</sup> of December 2000, a team of three external consultants evaluated at the request of the European Commission the Global Plan (GP) 2000 in Angola. This is the report for the sector “Emergency Relief” (Non-Food Items). The main objective of the assignment is to provide ECHO with indications for future funding of humanitarian assistance programmes under the GP 2001 in Angola.

After being briefed by ECHO services in Brussels on November 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, the consultants conducted a field mission from November 16<sup>th</sup> onwards in Angola. Interviews with national and international authorities and organisations were combined with visits to project locations throughout the country. The present report focuses on the three NGOs active in the field of non-food items distribution: Johanniter Unfallhilfe e.V., Save The Children Fund–UK, and Lutheran World Federation contracted by ECHO in the framework of the GP 2000 for Angola.

In the last 30 years Angola has been subjected to continuous warfare. Tactics have recently changed to guerrilla war. Despite some recent successes of the Central Government, the overall situation has not improved significantly. Attacks and counter-attacks force the civil population to continue to move around the country. According to the changing situation or military action and its location in the country, the IDP statistics show a variation in numbers, and locations where they reside. Nonetheless, the total number of IDPs in Angola remains basically the same. Since no significant change is expected for the near future, the need for emergency relief (NFI) will persist for a medium term. Additional people will become displaced and furthermore, residents in newly accessible areas will be in need of NFI. At present, logistics are in a bottleneck. Accessibility to the extended safe perimeters of provincial centres can normally only be assured by air. Secure access on roads is limited to the coastal belt and parts of Southern Angola (see Annex 8).

The general situation, as described in the Global Plan 2000 for Angola regarding the need for emergency relief has not significantly changed during the last year. The distribution of NFI to IDPs, vulnerable groups and resettled people will continue to be needed in 2001. Currently about 638,437 out of the estimated<sup>1</sup> 1,092,956 IDPs receive NFI in the country. The remaining 454,519 IDPs are not covered by NFI support, partially due to lacking accessibility. The three ECHO funded partners account for about 133,500 individuals supported, which represents a coverage rate of about 21% of those IDPs assisted by the NGO community in the country.

Out of the above mentioned one million confirmed refugees about 338.000 individuals became newly displaced in the year 2000 according to UNHCR Angola. The figure clearly shows the prevailing dynamic of the displacement process in the country and the continued need for NFI.

**Relevance** – The support provided for IDPs through the ECHO funds was found *highly relevant*, due to the fact that the target group lost all their property and the support provides the basic items to continue life under very difficult circumstances. In addition the NFI distribution reduces tension between residents and IDPs, cares for personal self-esteem and imparts hope.

---

<sup>1</sup> IDP Fact Sheet, 30 September 2000, prepared by OCHA

**Effectiveness** – The effectiveness of the assistance greatly depends on the performance of the local NGOs, which are employed by the European NGOs (contracted by ECHO) to support the distribution process at local level. At present, their technical and administrative proficiency is at times insufficient. The local NGOs still need guidance and transfer of know-how from their West-European partners. Nonetheless, the small local NGOs, together with the local leaders, the "Soba", assure to a certain degree the targeted distribution among the beneficiaries and spot-checks during the evaluation showed that the items effectively reached the people in need.

**Efficiency** - The ECHO funded distribution activities in the NFI-sector are *efficient*. The calculated cost per beneficiary is reasonable, the procurement is done by the NGOs (contracted by ECHO) in a very economic way, trying to keep costs to minimum and the direct support to the final recipients to a maximum. Logistics are well handled even under the currently prevailing constringent conditions. It should be stated that there is still space to increase the efficiency. The NGOs involvement in NFI distribution could centralise their procurement activities. SCF-UK proposed to partly handle the procurement for the other NGOs involved in NFI distribution. Once applied, this could again reduce costs and save time. Furthermore, it can be stated that the currently applied registration process in the areas covered by ECHO assistance allows the monitoring of general distribution activities to the IDPs, but does not provide the necessary information to introduce firm criteria for a more targeted distribution within the groups of recipients. By mandate the activities of ECHO are of short-term nature. Taking this into account, only those IDPs, which became newly displaced in 2000 might be considered to be the real target group of ECHO activities. This criterion can only be applied if the registration scheme will allow it.

**Co-ordination** – The exchange of information and the co-ordination between the NGOs is functioning well. The team leaders of the NFI projects maintain regular contact with other NGOs working in the same geographic areas, communicating and exchanging experiences.

Nonetheless, it has to be stated that the past NFI-distributions did not always take into account the real needs of the individual families (different family sizes). The distribution system of the NGOs needs harmonisation in this respect. Wear and tear is not sufficiently taken in consideration. A system of exchanging damaged items against new items may prove to be feasible in this respect.

The relationship between the executing partners and ECHO has partially suffered due to the slow administration process of preparing and communicating decisions. Emergencies should be dealt with in a faster and more efficient way at general administrative level. The obvious delays in the process are partially caused by repeated reviews of project proposals at desk level. One reason for the delays is the lack of well prepared guidelines to assist project proposals writing, although there are already existing forms to be completed such as the forms "Presentation Form for a Proposal for an Operation and a Financing Request" and the "Presentation Form for a Proposal for an Operation and a Financing Request for Urgent Operation", these forms would need further explanations in the form of guidelines.

**Coverage and Impact** - are significant in those areas supported by the three NGOs contracted by ECHO. The actual coverage rate (ECHO assistance) is 21% of those IDPs being assisted by the NGOs community in the country. During the year 2000, about 338,000 individuals became displaced. Although it is not possible to distinguish between the "new" displaced and the "old" displaced (since 1998), it can be assumed that a significant coverage of this group has been achieved.

The chronic character of the crisis in Angola and the longstanding support would allow to conduct ex-ante assessments on needs and the setting-up of realistic objectives for each intervention, and for the development of easily verifiable success indicators for their achievement and the anticipated impact. It is the view of the evaluator that such studies should be conducted as part of the project planning process including the presentation of the projects applying an adapted logical framework approach.



Looking to the ex-post impact assessment, only one smaller study on the impact of NFI distribution activities has been carried out recently according to an "Evaluation of Danish Humanitarian Assistance" (DANIDA, Volume 3, Angola, 1999).

**Visibility** was found sufficiently covered at field level. Despite the fact that in one case an NGO used commodities (tents) from Care bearing the logo of this organisation and no ECHO sign. The visibility at general public level was found to be weak. This could be significantly improved by actively involving the local public media in the information process.

**Horizontal issues** such as environmental protection measures are not yet systematically introduced the projects activities and need more attention in future operations (e.g. one of the main reasons for deforestation in Angola is the cutting of fire-wood especially around IDP camps). Gender aspects and conflict prevention measures are as well not introduced in the projects designs and would need more attention in future project planning and implementation. One Issue in this respect would be the provision of stoves for cooking, which could reduce the efforts of women collecting firewood by reducing the quantity of wood needed. At the same time competition regarding the use of limited forestry resources would decrease.

The NGOs (contracted by ECHO) currently perform well in the internal *Management* area of their operations. The available documentation on distribution activities and at storage level is generally transparent. Looking at the management approach of ECHO Luanda, it can be stated, that strengthened personal contact with the field operations (as requested by the NGOs) would improve the current deficit in direct exchange of information between the office and the field offices of the implementing partners.

The following *recommendations* are derived from the assessment of the ECHO funded NFI projects :

1. The centralization approach of SCF-UK, which proposes centralised procurement of commodities should be encouraged by ECHO.
2. The operation contracts should be signed by both parties, ECHO and the NGOs, before the start of the field operation in order to prevent financially risky situations for the implementing partner. In addition ECHO is requested deploy procedures to prevent delays in payment to implementing partners.
3. The already existing "Forms for project proposals and financing requests" should be explained by guidelines (precise description on how to fill in) in order to prevent delays and unnecessary correction loops. The necessary guidelines have to be developed on the basis of past experiences of ECHO.
4. The entire exchange of information between ECHO and its implementing partners should be streamlined. General inquiries should be answered within two weeks. A response to detailed project proposals should not take longer than four weeks.
5. The ECHO partners should put more attention to the quality of products to be distributed. A compromise between quality and price must be sought. Standards should be fixed for ordering of commodities. Items out of metal (preferably aluminium) should have preference against items made of plastic.
6. It is recommended to consider the inclusion of the following items in future NFI distributions: shoes-at least sandals, clothes, locally produced energy saving stoves, carpets of local raw material and mosquito-nets. The introduction of new items should be started within pilot areas with the greatest relevance of such inclusions.
7. Together with proposals for future distribution activities, the ECHO partners should endorse training schemes for the locally employed NGOs in order to stimulate local capacity building with a clear and systematic concept.
8. The permanent ECHO staff in Luanda ought to visit the field operations more regularly to stimulate better exchange of information.

9. Gender issues, human rights affairs and environmental protection measures should be given more attention in future NFI distribution programmes (see detailed recommendations in Chapter 12).
10. In order to permit a more targeted distribution (to most vulnerable groups amongst the IDPs) and to increase the efficiency of the funds used, the ECHO partners should be encouraged to collect reliable and more detailed data on their target group. This appears only possible and feasible if a joint approach between the NGOs and UNHCR can be stimulated (UNHCR approach for the introduction of a IDP-Card/Registration). If reliable data on the target group would exist (e.g. time of displacement, etc.), clear criteria for the reduction of amounts distributed and the reduction of the number of final beneficiaries could be applied. A catalogue of criteria could be set-up and be applied in this respect (details see Chapter 12).

## 1. Introduction

The present report is part of the evaluation of ECHO's 2000 Global Humanitarian Plan in Angola. Sectors under assessment have been Health and Nutrition, Water and Sanitation and Emergency Relief (Non-Food Items, NFI). The present report refers to "Emergency Relief (Non-Food Items, NFI). The main objective of the evaluation (see Terms of Reference, Annex 1) is to provide ECHO with suggestions for future funding of humanitarian assistance programmes in Angola with regard to the GP 2001. NFI, in this case includes no seeds and agricultural tools. ECHO Brussels wished to exclude both items from being included. The NFI sector mainly comprises of the following items: blankets, kitchen sets (pots, plates, cups/mugs, spoons, forks, knives, bowls), soap, jerry cans, buckets, and plastic sheets for covering self-made shelters.

In the framework of GP 2000, three NGOs were contracted by ECHO to distribute the above mentioned items: Johanniter Unfallhilfe e.V. - Germany, Save The Children – United Kingdom, and the Lutheran World Fund. The target groups of the distribution activities were IDPs who became displaced after 1998 and different vulnerable groups. The physical distribution of the items in the different target areas was delegated to local NGOs and supervised by the staff members of the three ECHO funded NGOs. Altogether, 50 organisations and institutions are currently involved in the resettlement activities, shelter provision and the *distribution of non-food items* to IDPs in Angola (see Annex 10).

The present evaluation focuses on the organisational framework of the NFI distribution (analysis of relationship between ECHO and all types of factors in the field of humanitarian assistance and the provision of recommendations for future planning and project management) rather than on the in-depth evaluation of the individual projects or NGOs involved in project execution. Nonetheless, a performance analysis of the individual projects ~~has been carried out by the consultants provided in Annex 12~~, based on the following criteria: relevance and appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, co-ordination, coherence and complementarity, impact and strategic implications, visibility and other horizontal issues.

## 2. Methodology

After an intense briefing concerning the Terms of Reference of the evaluation and the current situation as seen by ECHO Brussels, which took place on 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> November in Brussels, the evaluation team involved consisted of three sectors; health, water and sanitation, and emergency relief for IDP's (in the form of non-food items, NFI), departed on 15<sup>th</sup> November for its field mission in Angola.

On 16<sup>th</sup> November the team was introduced to the permanent ECHO staff in Luanda. First meetings were arranged with the major partners involved and a first work plan for the field mission was drawn up. Meetings and interviews with national and international organisations, specifically with the ECHO partners in Luanda, started on 17<sup>th</sup> November.

Extensive field visits started on 20<sup>th</sup> November. In addition to the meetings with the ECHO funded NGOs, visits to the representatives of the target groups and representatives of international organisations were included in the work programme (see detailed work programme of the evaluation team in Annex 3).

During the initial meeting with the permanent ECHO staff in Luanda and the EU-Delegation, it was agreed that the evaluation should strictly follow the Terms of Reference (see Annex 1) and concentrate on the more recent projects of the Global Plan 2000.

The evaluation team compiled its findings and developed recommendations in order to streamline ECHO-funded activities. Suggestions for the design of future GP 2001 were detailed based on common criteria for the projects planning and management such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, co-ordination and coherence, sustainability, visibility.

### **3. Context and humanitarian situation**

The belligerent activities in Angola have lasted 30 years and continue to persist. Despite some successes, the overall situation has not improved. Insecurity and fear increased again in many rural areas leading to new migration often connected with repeated losses of basic items needed for survival. The desperate situation of the affected population has shown no improvement over the last decade. The IDPs statistics show 3.8 million according to official (governmental) sources and 1,092,956 according to reports of the Humanitarian Agencies working in the country (see Annex 10).

Aside the covered beneficiaries, another half a million people are in need of NFI in Angola. At the end of June 2000 the covered group of beneficiaries for NFI distribution was estimated to amount to 638,437 people living in 13 provinces<sup>2</sup>.

The number of IDPs varies over time due to a changing status of internal security. Although the number of people forced to leave their homes during the year 2000 did not reach the level of the previous year, the process of migration is expected to continue. The UN estimates that again an additional 100,000 people might become displaced in the near future. In addition to this group, persons in newly accessible areas will also require basic items.

Persons displaced during the past years are reported to be staying in the provinces of Bengo, Kuanza Norte, Kuanza Sul, Malange, Benguela, Huambo, Bié, Lunda Sul, Moxico and Kuando Kubango. The geographic movement of great parts of the population is hardly to monitor. The existing IDP population figures are rough estimates. Up-to date no harmonized registration and monitoring system, which eventually could track the movements of the IDPs, has been put in place. Once implemented, a functioning system could provide more precise indications on beneficiaries, their number, origin and their current locations. The most reliable figures concerning IDPs originate from NGOs working in the field, which is the above mentioned "confirmed" figure of 1,092,956 people. The general situation depicted in the Global Plan 2000 regarding emergency relief did not change significantly during the year 2000. UNHCR reports on about 338,000 newly displaced during the year 2000.

Accessibility to the recently extended safe perimeters of provincial centres is still a great problem. About 2,600 mine-fields (see Annex 8), continued re-mining, harasses and attacks alongside roads are jeopardising logistics. Transport can mostly be assured by small airplanes which are able to approach the badly maintained airfields. Access to most parts of the coastal belt is relatively secure. The same applies to parts of southern Angola (see the map on secure accessibility in Annex 8). The flaring up of military actions induce further movements of population. Consequently Humanitarian Assistance must

---

<sup>2</sup> source: UN, Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for Angola, January to June 2000, p. 9, Resettlement, Shelter and Non-Food Items

continue for a protracted period, even if only focusing on most vulnerable groups and most recently displaced persons being in need of basic items.

Efforts of the Angolan Government are expected to complement foreign assistance but it is expected that the weak manpower basis and the underdeveloped organisational structure of public administration in the country will hamper any progress.

#### **4. Relevance and appropriateness**

The loss of virtually all property of the IDPs due to sudden and unplanned displacement makes the provision of non-food items indispensable. The programme supplying NFI to IDPs and vulnerable groups currently follows the priorities of ECHO, the UN and the Angolan Government<sup>3</sup>. The distribution of NFI provides basic items for daily life, calms down eventual tensions between local residents and IDPs, and increases personal self-esteem and imparts hope.

The provision of NFI became part of the assistance of ECHO and other donors. Consequently the distribution of ECHO-funded NFI is very relevant to the areas supported by the three NGOs. Since all assistance is designed to meet the local needs, which are currently of an urgent nature, the support is highly appropriate. The fact that the current assistance can only reach a relatively small part of the total IDPs in the country does not reduce its importance.

#### **5. Effectiveness**

The ECHO funded NFI distribution (see Annex 10) reached in the second half of 2000 a target population of 133,500 people (IDPs). This figure represents a coverage of 11 % of the 1,092,956 confirmed IDPs. The coverage increases to about 21 % if the 133,500 people receiving ECHO funded NFI are put in a relation to the IDPs which are supported with NFI by the NGO community in Angola. Whatever relation is used, the results are very positive and ECHO was successful in choosing the right partners for the NFI distribution: all three partners achieve reasonable results in very difficult surroundings and are integrating into the structure of humanitarian aid in the country.

The technical and administrative proficiency of the *local* NGOs involved in NFI distribution is not in all cases sufficient, although it is recognised that it is essential to employ them for the physical distribution activities. These small local NGOs are very active and they have good knowledge of target groups, but assistance is needed in formulating project proposals and in bookkeeping/monitoring. One of the small local NGOs is the “Accao para a vida homem livre nao tem fronteiras”, projecto Okupanga (OKUTIUKA), Kubal. This NGO covers a target population of 400 families. Wherever the international NGOs, are able to assist, they try to impart the necessary know-how to local NGOs. This is also done in the interest of institution building for future take-over.

The local NGOs have the advantage of the knowledge of the local conditions and also of the target groups and their members. Their participation helps to avoid unauthorized persons receiving items (against whatever signature). At village level there is in addition a certain degree of social control amongst the members of the target group. Normally the local leader, the Soba, is also involved in the distribution process. Finally it can be stated that the system of involving local NGOs is logical and future oriented. The international staff contracted by the ECHO partners supervises the distribution, ensuring that the items reach the intended target group, losses can be considered to be modest.

Some NGOs reported that they would have appreciated more frequent field visits from Brussels based officers in order to create more awareness and understanding of the operation at headquarters level. The same applies to field visits of Luanda based permanent ECHO staff.

---

<sup>3</sup> OCHA Angola Report on Rapid Assessment of Critical Needs, Luanda, April 2000, and the MINARS Plan of Emergency Action , Luanda, July 2000, Recommendation.

The effectiveness of the actions is threatened by the political, social and economic instability in the country. The frequent changes of the situation with regard to political and administrative control over great stretches of land create difficulties when attempting to make more reliable estimates of the actual needs of the people. The Report on Rapid Assessment of Critical Needs, edited by OCHA in April 2000, gives a rough picture of the most urgent needs (including NFI) in the different geographical areas. NGOs have taken these findings into account. Regarding security OCHA outlines that landmines are so widespread that the perimeter of security around the provincial capitals, although widening, is usually between only 12 and 30 km. In most cases, no mine assessment, or mine clearance has been done outside these perimeters.”<sup>4</sup> So even if the needs are identified, satisfying such needs in due time is a problem.

## 6. Efficiency

The NGOs involved in NFI-distribution showed professional administrative knowledge. They are flexible, and adhered in the best way possible to the initial distribution plans. All ECHO partners organised logistics and management successfully. Orders were placed as soon as possible, all administrative tasks were executed without delay. The quality of goods ordered showed occasional deficits, as comments of the target groups proved. The organised transport arrangements functioned without difficulties.

### Cost-Efficiency

A tentative approach to estimate cost-efficiency in the field of NFI is the calculation of cost per beneficiary. Among the three funded ECHO partners contracted for distributing NFI the ratio ranges between 11.81 Euro/Beneficiary and 15.84 Euro/Beneficiary (see below table).

NGO	Total Budget (Euro)	Reserve/Contingencies (Euro)	Budget net of Contingencies (Euro)	Target group (Persons)	Expenditure/Beneficiary (Euro)
LWF	700,000	90,642,90	609,357.10	38,500	15.82
SCF-UK	670,000	36,388,67	633,611.33	40,000	15.84
JU	650,000	38,038,47	649,961.62	55,000	11.81

Since the composition of items distributed by the individual NGOs varies (Johanniter Unfallhilfe e.V. distributed – seeds and tools as stated in their contract with ECHO) and since the quantities of individual items distributed per beneficiary vary, cost per beneficiary can hardly be compared. A comparison of cost of individual items, e.g. blankets fails due to different qualities. Kitchen sets distributed were similar (mainly enamelled pots, but partially also aluminium ware) and the cost budgeted is similar among the three ECHO partners distributing NFI (~~see Annex 12~~). In general the budgeted costs may be deemed to be reasonable especially if they are compared with UNHCR-figures.

Comparing the administrative costs budgeted in the last contracts stipulated in 2000 with the individual NGO-budgets (net of contingencies/ reserve) for all of the three NGOs administrative costs are about 6.1 %, which is deemed to be adequate.

### Storages

Storing and the pertaining documentation was, at the time when this study was made, well organised. The locally employed staff members were trained by the ECHO partners and were found competent and capable to cope with the challenges of the operations. The evaluation team inspected stores outside the capital. The organisation of the bookkeeping and the monitoring of the stocks was properly

<sup>4</sup> cited source, p. 15

handled. Radio-communication to the main office in Luanda is functioning without great lapses. The quality of reporting shows, however, still some deficiencies. The co-ordination capacity complies in general with the needs.

### Procurement

The present procurement procedures applied by the NGOs are based on direct procurement by requesting three offers or by local open call for tenders. Since the NFI items consist of many different commodities, a separate procurement procedure for each product is allowed.

According to the procedures for the awarding of contracts, applicable for humanitarian operations (Contrat Cadre de Partenariat, Document N° 14, see Annex 11) the procurement of supplies when not exceeding EUR 45,000 may be done by requesting three offers to tender, the procurement of supplies between EUR 45,000 and EUR 150,000 is done by organising a local open call to tender. The values of individual items to be procured by the ECHO partners did not exceed the a.m. amounts. Consequently the procedure followed by the ECHO funded NGOs complied with the regulations. Foreign companies were also invited to tender in some situations (e.g. CECCI, Copenhagen, supplying soap).

The three NGOs proved to have good knowledge of the markets concerned and the experience to inquire reasonable offers in respect to prices, quality, delivery time, transport. The unit prices calculated for products in question by UNHCR, Luanda ~~[(see Annex 12)]~~ can be compared, but are subject to limitations, as mentioned under “Cost-Efficiency”.

The UNHCR office in Luanda, confirms that local procurement is more expensive than procurement abroad. Nonetheless, local procurement has a significant time-saving effect. Furthermore, procuring items from local producers stimulates the local economy. The production of selected items in Angola would neither be capital intensive nor complicated.

Stoves and mats as well as soap may be produced by locals, who are made acquainted with the required techniques and assisted in starting or extending businesses. The business activities could be sponsored by the NGOs funded by ECHO. If ECHO assures to provide the cash needed for the procurement of a certain quantity of the locally produced products, the NGOs and the local producers involved would at least for some time run no risk regarding the sales. NGOs best fitting the mentioned concept, are those with earlier experiences from income generating programmes. They could train new business partners following proved ILO-methodologies and programmes as "How to start a Business". Purchasing local products would include the use of locally available raw material. The substitution of imports would strengthen the balance of payments and contribute to the development of local production and employment. Even modest projects could give signals. The already existing Angolan soap factory LONGERAL, Luanda, could become a supplier of soap to all NGOs contracted by ECHO. Apart from assisting the local economy direct contact to the local suppliers could strengthen business relations and promote the production of products of a better quality. The proposed income generating components could stimulate sustainability, even in the context of the short-term funding nature of ECHO programmes.

### Streamlining of Logistics & Procurement

The proposal made by SCF-UK dated mid of July 2000 to supply other NGOs from its warehouse in Lobito with non-food items can only be appreciated. The implementation of the proposed concept would streamline logistics and save costs for the other NGOs. This approach would, when feasible for the other NGOs, reduce the costs and/or increase the amount of direct assistance to the final recipients. In addition it would contribute to standardization of qualities and the most experienced NGO (SCF-

UK) would take over important parts of the logistic chain. The advantages will only be noticed by the NGO`s who have access to the port of Lobito.

The recently initiated change from a pre-packed family kit concept to individual items is another step towards a streamlined organisation of NFI distribution.

### Documentation & Monitoring

The three evaluated operations showed a comprehensive documentation, which reflected the actual situation of the distribution activities to the beneficiaries. The available documentation allows proper general monitoring of the activities and flexible reaction to changes in the distribution plans. It has to be stated that the current monitoring system is based on beneficiary lists of all beneficiaries living in a target group community and does not reflect any other details on the individuals.

The results, performance, effectiveness of NFI distributions should be subject to a continuous monitoring process. At present the applied monitoring system allows to monitor the physical distribution activities in terms of performance.

Basically, the monitoring process should comprise the observation of quantities distributed and the cost involved, which is possible using the currently applied system. Nonetheless, it should not be restricted to that. It is recommended to extent the monitoring efforts according to the below mentioned details at least in selected areas with limited samples of a significant size to provide representative data and results. Lack of time and concentration on logistics and last not least lack of financial means should not be reasons to restrict monitoring to basics without having sufficient evidence. On principle the NGOs would be able to ameliorate their monitoring efforts by having more data on their target groups, provided they would be able to finance such activities. Since the results would be of interest to UNHCR (IDP-ID Card), the organisation might be able and willing to provide financial means for the additional tasks.

### Proposed Monitoring Concept

The fundamental basis of monitoring is a comprehensive knowledge of the recipients' personal data. Until now "guesstimates" and estimates regarding the approximate number of members of target groups (IDPs, refugees) are prevailing in the planning process. Consequently the real impact of emergency aid is not proved by reliable figures. The hereto attached "Formato de Recepcão" refers to where a certain number of families received a certain number of items (see Annex 135, source: Johanniter Unfallhilfe e.V.). More in detail goes e.g. Accao Agraria Alma in Benguela Province at Hungulo and Chico specifying beneficiaries of NFI by families, persons adult females, adult males, female children over 5, male children over 5, female children under 5 and male children under 5.

More personal data are needed. UNHCR Angola discussed already the introduction of a personal document (family passport, as a first step in the direction of demographic Electronic Data Processing EDP) containing many personal data such as: origin of the family, last place where the family lived, rural/urban origin, date of arrival at the present domicile, assets (if any), profession/skills of the head of the family and the family members, actual work (permanent/occasional/none), degree of vulnerability (stating reasons).

Experiences made in other countries show, that such documents have the advantage for the donor of excluding recipients who receive more than originally foreseen, of excluding people not belonging to the target groups, enabling the donors to control the adherence to certain regulations (e.g. an exit strategy).

UNHCR Luanda estimates that about 27 % of the expenditures could be saved by excluding not authorized beneficiaries. The introduction of a family passport system will take a long period of time



and include expensive administrative red tape. This would exclude the direct engagement of ECHO, with its short term funding focus. The NGOs, however, contracted by ECHO could at least in a pilot area, introduce forms to be filled in by local representatives for each family containing demographic data. This obviously needs close cooperation and coordination with the UNHCR in order to prevent non-compatible and stand alone solutions. Apart of the family passport new forms could be introduced showing the receipt of assistance. The forms should be more precise than the presently used ones (see Annex 135). It is recommended that ECHO Luanda propose to the NGOs to approach UNHCR to explore the possibilities and chances for a joint effort in this respect. If they would succeed, this could be to the advantage of ECHO. The organisation would get valuable basic information for a future study on the impact of NFI distribution and last but not least save money by reducing the number of beneficiaries.

Aside the regular reporting schemes, the NGOs could elaborate *monthly reports* of physical performance (quantity of items purchased, on stock, distributed). The ECHO office Luanda could incorporate the results in a table, which would then be regularly distributed by ECHO to the NGOs distributing NFI in order to create transparency. The physical performance is always to be compared with the targets set.

For items imported c.i.f. costs per item should be listed and the border point where the items cross into Angola should be indicated. In co-ordination with the NGOs and international organisations as UNHCR, ECHO should agree on a general specification of the items to be distributed and quality of all items subsumed under NFI.

The monitoring of NFI distribution should be supervised by a member of the ECHO funded NGO. The documents showing the performance could comprise the following details:

- NGO charged by ECHO to distribute NFI
- Current number of IDPs in the province where NFI are distributed
- Size of the target group of the NGO which should be assisted by means of NFI provided and distributed with assistance of ECHO
- Actually assisted part of the above mentioned target group (number of families and of persons) which gets NFI with ECHO assistance
- Reasons for not assisting, if that is the case, part of the target group originally intended to be assisted with the help of ECHO.
- NGO(s) subcontracted by the NGO charged by ECHO with distributing NFI (name, address, legal status, name and title of the person responsible for NFI distribution)
- Places and localities, villages, municipality, province, where NFI are distributed, items, quantities, date of distribution
- Quantity of items distributed to each family
- Number of members in the individual families by gender
- Number of members of families of working age and able to work (16-60 years)
- Area of origin, year of displacement, reason of displacement

Monitoring is a precondition for a clean *Exit Strategy*. The NFI are indispensable when IDPs/refugees arrive in a place without household items and other assets or access to assets at this specific place of arrival. The short-term nature of emergency aid should, however, lead to a fixing of criteria for stopping such aid. In the following list some possible criteria are presented:

The distribution of NFI should be stopped if:

- the household concerned is asking for replacing worn out / ruined NFI in intervals of less than half a year (in this case the items are not well treated and kept, or were sold)
- the household is longer than one year at the specific place of residence
- at least one member of the household got permanent work or established a business
- to the household was given land for cultivation



- other donors supply NFI to the household concerned
- no household passport (after its introduction) is presented and no form testifying the receipt of NFI is filled in at the place where NFI are distributed

The above mentioned systematic would allow targeted distribution, stimulate efficiency and would be the basis for a potential exit at mid term. In combination with income generating components, as described earlier, it could help to reduce dependency on humanitarian aid and would stabilise the life of the IDPs.

## 7. Co-ordination, coherence and complementarity

The ECHO financed NFI- distribution activities are geographically divided by provincial boundaries and no overlapping in aid provision has occurred thus far. The map in Annex 9 shows the current division of tasks among the ECHO partners by province. Other, non-ECHO funded NGOs, which work in the same target areas are regularly contacted by the ECHO funded NGOs and the activities are coordinated properly. The table below shows the areas of coverage of the ECHO partners.

Target-Province	NGO distributing ECHO funded NFI	[Resident] IDPs Population	IDPs supplied to by the NGOs	Percentage of IDPs supplied to in the target area of each NGO	
Cunene	Die Johanniter	230,000	7,051		
Huila		800,000	125,309		
Kuando Kubango		150,000	51,606		
Namibe		85,000	14,121	198,087	55,000
Moxico	LWF	240,000	83,197		
Lunda Sul		120,000	61,970		
Lunda Norte		250,000	13,047	158,214	38,500
Benguela	SCF-UK	670,000	73,425		
Bié		1,200,000	123,041		
Huambo		1,000,000	126,566		
Kuanza Sul		610,000	89,752	412,784	40,000
<b>T o t a l</b>		<b>5,355,000</b>	<b>769,085</b>	<b>133,500</b>	<b>13</b>

At present the registration system and the available data on IDPs does not allow to distinguish between new IDPs (338,000 displaced in 2000) and old IDPs (displaced since 1998). If the number of total IDPs supported by the NGO community in Angola (638,437) is put in relation to the number of IDPs supported by ECHO in the context of GP 2000, the coverage of the three NGOs reaches a percentage of about 21 %. This underlines the importance of ECHO assistance in the field of NFI support.

For a certain period of time the Johanniter Unfallhilfe e.V. was supplying the southern parts of Moxico and LWF the northern part of the province. Proper co-ordination avoided potential overlapping.

It can be stated that the ECHO funded NFI-distribution activities are basically well coordinated, planned and transparent, without overstraining the technical capabilities of the local partners.

An additional co-ordination effort is needed regarding standardisation of quantities of NFI according to the family size. All three ECHO partners have different guidelines for their personnel and different tables showing how many items should be distributed to families of different size. Consequently, the amount, which a large family receives, still depends on the applied distribution system, which varies from one NGO to another.

It was found that in one case the quantity distributed per family was dimensioned according to the stocks available. It was not reported that a later adjustment was made in order to meet the needs of the people when the stocks were replenished. Wear and tear has not yet been introduced to the NFI-distribution system but it should be considered (damaged/ruined items changed against new items) for future operations. It is estimated that about 5 % of the total items distributed become spoiled or worn

down. Consequently the quantities of items foreseen for distribution should be split up in quantities foreseen for "primary" distribution and an additional 5 % for "secondary" distribution (replacement).

Future contracts to be concluded with NGOs should clearly distinguish between these two groups. If the size of the target groups in certain areas remains the same, and if all the members of these target groups are supposed to receive NFI, the value of the contracts is to be increased by 5 %. It may be assumed that spoiled items handed back (as a prove that they were not sold or given away as a gift) will be eliminated and disposed on the spot without causing significant costs.

The new Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal 2001 of the UN, under the headline "Non-Food Items and Disaster Preparedness" (see p. 70) only mentioned ADPP (clothing for newly displaced and resettled families) and Save The Children-UK (replenishment of contingency stock and distribution of survival items) as appealing organisations. For the three ECHO partners this might result in a possibility of co-operating with ADPP. The NGOs could make use of ADPP as a supplier of clothing to their target groups. The feasibility of this approach depends on the location of the main stores of ADPP and on the transport logistics that can be made available. Most probably transport by airplane will be needed to the target areas. The problem of available capacity in scheduled freight carriers, and potentially budgeting for additional charter flights must be taken into consideration.

Only part of the confirmed IDPs living in Angola currently receive NFI support. International donor organisations and institutions involved in humanitarian assistance should be aware that there is a gap between the needs of the people and the actual coverage rate. To narrow this gap quickly and efficiently is a challenge for the donor community.

The short duration of ECHO funded projects, and sometimes their nature, especially the nature of NFI distribution, does not form the ground for sustainability. It is evident that the objectives of DGDev are not the same as those of ECHO and only in a few cases will it be possible for DGDev to step in and take over activities initiated by ECHO. In the case of NFI distribution and its pure emergency/emergency recovery nature, the taking over of these activities is not likely to occur.

## **8. Impact and strategic implications**

The qualitative impact of NFI-distribution cannot be measured without great time-consuming and costly efforts. Comprehensive studies concerning the qualitative impact are not yet in use in Angola.

Emergency assistance needs prompt action, which ECHO does not always manage. The impact depends on such prompt reaction, especially in continuously changing situations. If decision making, based on data describing a specific situation lasts too long, decisions are no longer tuned to the actual situation but to an out-dated one. The actions are not tailored to actual needs. Working with out-dated plans means continuously playing catch-up, and potentially not meeting the needs of the people it is aimed at. Save The Children – UK, gave one example. The decision concerning a request for funding was given more than three months after the proposal had been submitted (see Annex 123).

The impact of activities on gender questions and conflict prevention seems not to be in the centre of interest. It is taken for granted that certain activities have a positive impact and (eventually positive) side effects. From its character, emergency activities do not leave much time for such considerations. Clear and realistic objectives for each intervention and easy to be verified indicators for their achievement are in need. But in the case of the current, *chronic* emergency situation in Angola, time should be given for such considerations.

Annex 10 shows confirmed IDP-numbers, by provinces and IDPs assisted by the NGOs involved in procuring, handling and distributing NFI. It demonstrates a relatively good coverage when looking at the number of beneficiaries and comparing it to the actual number of IDP's supported by the NGO

community (21%). However, the coverage is less impressive, if the number of beneficiaries supported by the NGOs is compared to the total number of confirmed IDPs in the whole country (12,2%).

If the number of IDPs receiving NFI from all NGOs distributing such items is put in a relation to the number of confirmed IDPs in the related provinces it becomes evident that little less than half of all confirmed IDPs receive NFI. 47 %, i.e. about 454,519 confirmed IDPs remain without NFI. The coverage of the target population funded by ECHO partners varies between 4 % (LWF, SCF-UK) and 5 % (Johanniter Unfallhilfe e.V.). From a total of 1,092,956 IDPs (being IDPs since 1998) in the whole country the mentioned three NGOs cover 12,2 %. (see Annex 10).

Monitoring of contracted partners' activities at ECHO headquarters level is based on the incoming reports from the projects and the correspondence with the field officers. Occasional visits in the field complement the picture gained. The monitoring reports are provided in writing and are well detailed. Attention should not only be paid to financial figures, but especially to physical achievements and results observed. This means more than distributing items: it also includes changes in the socio-economic framework of the beneficiaries caused by the distribution of the items which should be observed and documented. In a participatory approach wishes of the beneficiaries should be recorded and if feasible should be followed up.

Impact and sustainability of the achievements is greatly dependent on a peaceful social and political environment. Therefore, peace building efforts by propagating human rights protection and the assistance enabling the differences between the individual groups involved to be overcome should gain importance. LWF understood this challenge and employed trained staff who are involved in finding solutions to such problems.

## **9. Visibility**

Visibility in this sense means more than labelling of products and vehicles, it also includes public relations. At least the decision-making groups of the local public administration and of the general public in the country should know about the objectives of the European Commission / ECHO assistance framework and its contribution.

The philosophy of Humanitarian Aid for which ECHO stands should be communicated at local level. Public relations activities consequently need publication in the local media: newspaper, radio and television. ECHO Luanda could possibly provide useful material adapted to the Angolan conditions and could try to disseminate such material. It is evident that these efforts should not deviate from the essential work in the field but it could subtly contribute to a corporate identity of ECHO and to an appreciation of ECHO's contribution to alleviate misery in the country.

To assure visibility also means to make use of the ECHO-logo in the stores where ECHO-funded items are stocked and from where they are distributed. To label NFI, as occasionally done (e.g. on buckets) has an effect towards the recipients. The final recipient is informed where the items are coming from. Looking to UNHCR plastic sheets, they prove a good visibility. In a similar way, ECHO could mark rolls of reinforced plastic material used for covering roofs. Also in the stores, the NGOs should stress visibility of ECHO funding. It is easier and sometimes space saving to mix similar type of products funded by different donors in the same stores, but the books must clearly separated in order to make inventory work more easy.

Without doubt the objective of visibility could not be overstressed. A balance has to be found between common sense and the wish to make clear where the European tax-payer's money is used.

## 10. Horizontal Issues

### *Gender Issues*

The supply of non-food items particularly supports vulnerable groups, such as women being heads of households with children. Giving priority during distribution of hut covering plastic sheets in the camps shows this practice. But this approach is not based on a general strategy. It was done "ad hoc". Facilitating the efforts of women collecting fire wood by introducing energy saving stoves would enable them to focus more on income-generating activities (as mat/carpet production) and to reduce economic and social dependence. As explained in the Annex to this study the type of stove most suited to the local conditions and habits can be identified only by means of a study to be performed on the spot. Such a study would most probably last two weeks on the spot, one week work for elaboration and presentation, and would cost about Euro 30,000, depending on the organisation employed. From a very rough estimate the cost per stove (using fire wood) would be about 5 Euro per stove. The stoves might for a first stage be introduced in such areas only, which already face environmental problems (tree cutting, erosion) such as Luena. The total cost of a campaign therefore depends on the number of pilot areas and the resulting number of families involved. If the three ECHO partners would supply the currently supported families (JU 11,000 + LWF 7,700 + SCF-UK 13,000 = 31,700 families) the total cost of stoves would amount to Euro 158,500. The selection of the type of stove suitable might range from very cheap earthen stoves to more expensive stoves out of scrap metal. All calculations of potential costs therefore depend on the type of stove most suitable to a specific geographic area. The results of the project could be measured by ascertaining the use of the new stoves, time saved collecting fire-wood, use of the time saved for productive purposes as gardening, home work, income generating activities. The collection and processing of such information could be done on basis of representative samples.

Remark: The evaluation team has provided the ECHO desk with a comprehensive study conducted by the GTZ on the use and the benefits of energy saving measures in Refugee Camps: "Benefits of Household Energy Measures in Refugee Camps", Helga Habermehl, 1997

### *Environment*

At present, logging activities for cooking purposes causes environmental problems. The traditional way of cooking in Angola makes use of some stones in between which sticks of wood or roots are burnt heating a pot or kettle posed on top of the stones. This type of cooking is energy intensive and needs a continuous supply of firewood, which is difficult and dangerous to collect. The result is significant logging activity, deforestation and erosion. The process could be slowed down by using energy saving stoves (see above arguments), adapted to the local conditions and made by traditional artisans.

The local production of energy saving stoves could help to resolve an emergency situation and stimulate economic activities, probably beginning in the form of food-for-work/cash for work and later on switching to market oriented production.

### *Socio-economic Effects*

The procurement and distribution of NFI for IDPs provides a basis for living. The money saved for buying the items donated can be spent on essentials as food or others. Providing at least some of the basic needs paves the path for personal initiatives. If the NGOs involved in NFI distribution can be induced to assist income-generating activities in the field, the first steps will be done in the direction of rehabilitation. The procurement of work strengthens economic independence and promises to make further distribution of NFI less necessary.

### *Local Capacity Building*

The NGOs employed by ECHO practice until now training on the job. Local groups, associations, organisations and entities are generally assisted in distributing NFI and in complying with the needed administrative work by members of the permanent staff of the mentioned NGOs. Consequently their capacities are increased to the benefit of the social network. Training on the job should, however, be supplemented by a more formal training of the main stakeholders. Provisions for ECHO should include such formal training in the contracts to be concluded with the NGOs. This formal training would be indispensable if the local groups and organisations would be involved in collecting additional personal data to reinforce the monitoring system. The training would prepare them to take over more responsibilities and to relieve the European NGOs. The training should refer to procurement, logistics, simple bookkeeping, stock keeping and management of stocks, as well as to data collection and processing. The training could be done monthly, lasting not more than one day. Each contract to be concluded by ECHO includes this task in the Terms of Reference. Extra travel should be avoided combining the distribution of NFI with the training activities. Material for training should be calculated apart.

### *Contribution to social peace*

The distribution of NFI contributes to social peace. This effect could be increased if ECHO would request its partners to provide advisory activities in the field of human rights (as already initiated by LWF). The results of this specific project component of LWF are expected to considerably contribute to social peace and calm down existing tensions between residents and IDPs. First of all the feeling of not being left alone will be transmitted, which is important and necessary to overcome traumata and to stimulate the process of re-integration of the IDPs in the new socio-economic framework.

### *Linkage to other humanitarian programmes and projects*

The basic correspondence of interests of all donors active in the provision of NFI in Angola forms a valuable precondition for linking ECHO programmes to the programmes and projects of other humanitarian organisations.

As outlined in chapter 6 Efficiency, Documentation & Monitoring, there might be a chance to stimulate the NGOs to closely co-operate with the UN, especially UNHCR, in the field of data collection. The co-operation would be to the benefit of all parties involved. A precondition is, however, that the UNHCR financially and technically supports such efforts. Neither ECHO, due to legal restrictions, nor the NGOs, would be able to take over the funding of such efforts themselves.

## **11. Management**

The project management of the NGOs contracted by ECHO for distributing NFI was professionally handled by competent staff members. The available documentation complies with the requirements and appeared to be comprehensive and transparent. It allows proper monitoring of the physical distribution and flexible planning of the activities.

The presence of the ECHO permanent staff in the field is considered by the NGOs as infrequent and insufficient. However, the paper-based flow of information between ECHO office in Luanda and the NGO field offices is regular and well documented.

The implementation procedures developed by the NGO partners for the NFI-activities under the Global Plan 2000 showed flexibility to adapt the initial planning to changed conditions. Savings made were invested in additional items to be distributed, which had the support of the local ECHO staff. The subdivision of geographic zones amongst the three different ECHO-funded NGOs proved to be successful, and the option to surpass the borders of these Geographic Zones were considered necessary

and useful (see southern Moxico). When Johanniter Unfallhilfe e. V. gets road-access from the south to the Moxico Province they will be able to supply the southern part of Moxico with NFI, making use of their efficient and relatively cheap logistic system. The switch from the “family kit”, containing several NFI, to the distribution of loose items, in order to react to real needs of the families, was a positive development. The practical follow up, however, still needs some harmonisation between the NGOs involved. They need to introduce a common system of quantifying what is to be distributed to families of different sizes.

Concerning NFI distribution the Global Plan 2000 became a valuable instrument giving room for further refining in the form of the Global Plan 2001, intended to concentrate more on “new” IDPs, vulnerable groups and resettling people.

## **12. Recommendations**

- (1) The distribution of Non-food Items (NFI) remains imminently a necessary tool for the short and medium term in order to efficiently alleviate the hardship of Angolan IDPs.
- (2) The contracting of the NGOs should strictly follow their procedural guidelines. NGO activities should never begin before the contract is signed by both contractual partners. In order to avoid time-consuming clarifications and to increase the professional quality of the requests for funding, a comprehensive checklist for the preparation of project proposals/requests should be designed, and feedback should be made available to the implementing partners. The desk officers should likewise receive clear guidelines for the process of analysing and evaluating project proposals.
- (3) The reports compiled by the NGOs should not only include cash flow related questions but also physical results. A form could help to standardise the reports.
- (4) Whenever feasible NFI should be procured locally in order to assist also local commerce and industry. The production of some NFI is neither capital intensive nor complicated. Local people, who are made acquainted with requested techniques and assisted in starting or extending business, may produce stoves and mats. The business activities could be sponsored by NGOs that are co-operating with ECHO in distributing NFI. If ECHO assures to provide the cash needed for buying a certain quantity of the products in question, the NGOs sponsoring entrepreneurship as well as the producers involved would at least for some time run no risk regarding the sales. NGOs best fitting the mentioned concept, are those with earlier experience in income-generating activities.
- (5) In the case that local products are not available, could not be produced locally or could not be procured cost-efficient at local level, the cost-efficiency might be increased by international tendering. Since high costs of engaging media (publishing of invitations to tender) should be avoided, use should be made of Chambers of Commerce and Institutes for Foreign Trade and their periodic publications for members. Also business address data-banks (CD-Rom Disks as “who supplies what” or “Kompass”etc.) may prove to be useful, combined with a direct approach to selected companies in the case where restricted tenders are admitted and the selection of three potential suppliers is sufficient.
- (6) Items to be ordered should comply with the specific local requirements. Items should not be of green colour since soldiers are taking them away claiming that the items belong to the army.
- (7) All orders should be accompanied by precise technical specifications in order to make the different orders comparable (see "example for technical specification, procurement under the headline Operational Recommendations").

- (8) NFI should be sturdy, long lasting, easy to clean, and practical. Procurement should look for a compromise between quality and price.
- (9) The quantities of NFI (kits) to be distributed should be standardised according to the size of the families. A suitable method might be the system now used by Johanniter Unfallhilfe e.V..
- (10) The currently distributed items could in future be complemented by the following items:
  - shoes / sandals
  - clothing (eventually in co-operation with ADPP)
  - energy saving simple stoves
  - mosquito nets after a phase of instruction and trial on pilot basis
  - it should be checked whether it is possible to provide incentives for the preparation of carpets out of local material (e.g. reed, leaves etc.) for covering the seasonally cool and wet earth floor of the huts. Such mats are already used in the Casseque Camp III, near Huambo. The mats could help to prevent sicknesses.
- (11) The budgets granted to the NGOs should be less focussed on the number of beneficiaries served by the individual NGO but on the specific costs involved in procuring and distributing items (e.g. transport costs).
- (12) The contracts of all of the three NGOs were signed after the start of the activities. This has had consequences. It obliges the contractor to begin (costly) activities before the contract was signed. It is risky for both parties. It is risky for the party funding the activities because the contract does not formally oblige the client to invest or order at the specified time. On the other hand it is risky for the contractor who invests or orders before being covered by a legal document. Advance payments are transferred earliest four weeks after signature of an operation contract. For a small NGO this might cut the life-line. Final payments to NGOs after having submitted proper final technical and financial reports were transferred on average in about 50 days in 1993, in about 80 days in 1994 and after more than 3 months<sup>5</sup> in 1995. The reaction time since then has not significantly changed. If that is so the structure of the final reports should be formulated in such a way as to reduce the need for repeated reviewing. Since the local ECHO office has to check all reports, the capacity of manpower available in the local ECHO office should be so structured and dimensioned that occasional absence of certain members of the staff should not slow down administrative process.
- (13) As a donor organisation in the field of emergencies aid ECHO should react fast. Answers to requests for funding which last more than three months are not in time and do not reflect the character of an organisation ready to combat emergencies (see hereto attached letter of SCF-UK of 29<sup>th</sup> November 2000, Annex 1~~2~~3).
- (14) Possibilities to up-grade the quality/price ratio should be used. LWF distributes blankets of a convincing quality at reasonable price. This type of blanket should become standard.
- (15) The NGOs should respect Sphere guidelines to increase effectiveness: Under the headline “Housing (Shelter)” it is mentioned that “the average household of five people should receive at least one 4 m x 6 m sheet of plastic. This is best imported in rolls for easy transportation, storage and distribution ...”. “plastic sheeting provided for shelter should meet the specifications defined by UNHCR”. Most sheets were not supplied in rolls. The quality varied. The size of sheets distributed was 4 m x 5 m.

---

<sup>5</sup> source: <http://www.eca.eu.int/DE/RS/1997/k4sb2.htm> - Original document available in Germax Archives and on the CD-ROM version of the evaluation report in ECHO.

The Sphere standards for “items for households and livelihood” indicate to provide for each person 1 eating plate, 1 metal spoon and 1 mug. The introduction of family size oriented distribution of NFI will provide the possibility to fulfil this standard.

- (16) It is recommended to intensify the training of local NGOs in taking over responsibilities in NFI distribution and administration. This would stimulate increased capability with respect to self-help initiative in the local communities. Efficiency and institution building must be balanced in the interest of a future socio-economic recovery.
- (17) Field visits of ECHO resident staff should be used as a valuable planning and management instrument. If the present manpower-basis does not allow sufficient contacts / visits, the manpower should be increased.
- (18) Whenever IDPs receive NFI, a system of substitution of worn out items should be implemented where possible. This would require collecting the worn out items (to prove the request for replacement) and substituting them against new items. The worn out items would need to be discharged locally in to prevent misuse of the system.
- (19) Gender issues should be more systematically looked at during the design of the NFI distributing programmes and relevant measure should be proposed by the ECHO partner in the request for funding. If gender issues are not relevant in a specific case, this should be clearly stated in the document.
- (20) Final financial reports should be assessed by the ECHO office in Luanda and processed within six weeks in order to assure punctual payments to the partners.
- (21) It is recommended that (based on monthly NGO reports of physical achievements) a list showing the achieved results in comparison with the original targets for each of the project activity should be published every three months. This might also act as an incentive to the NGOs involved. Such a list also contributes to visibility. It is a quick, informative overview showing performance, even if sometimes additional information is needed for judgement. At least in the field of Non-Food Items such a list can be elaborated.
- (22) The ECHO funded NGOs should be encouraged by ECHO to raise the interest of UNHCR to (also financially) contribute to a more sophisticated way of collecting and processing basic data on the IDPs (also being of interest to UNHCR). They could contribute to the introduction of the already discussed family passport and the collection of more detailed personal data for monitoring purposes.
- (23) The NGOs should be obliged by contractual provisions to organise and execute formal training of the local partners involved in NFI distribution on the spot.
- (24) ECHO should support the NGOs to include also advisory services concerning human rights in the projects, an example was given by LWF, which included a human rights component in the distribution programme.
- (25) For a more efficient NFI distribution, criteria as mentioned in chapter 6 Efficiency, Documentation & Monitoring (see p. 14) should be introduced. In the following list some possible criteria are presented:

The distribution of NFI should be stopped if:

- the household concerned is asking for replacing worn out / ruined NFI in intervals of less than half a year (in this case the items are not well treated and kept, or were sold)
- the household is longer than one year at the specific place of residence



- at least one member of the household got permanent work or established a business
- to the household was given land for cultivation
- other donors supply NFI to the household concerned
- no household passport (after its introduction) is presented and no form testifying the receipt of NFI is filled in at the place where NFI are distributed.

## Additional Operational Recommendations

### A. Content of Proposals for Non-Food-Item Distribution

Project proposals concerning the distribution of NFI should contain the following information:

- Description of the Situation and why NFI's are needed
- Target group
- Target area, localities
- NFI distributing organisations in the target area, type of items distributed, quantities, explanation how overlapping or double supply are avoided
- Accessibility (by truck, by airplane)
- Security hazards, risks involved (risk assumption)
- Total population in the target area and the localities, number of IDPs and members of vulnerable groups living in the target area and the localities, coverage (families, persons), source from where the figures were obtained
- Local NGO/NGOs involved in distribution, short description indicating the range of activities and the capacities as available manpower, available stores, method of distribution proposed
- Gender Issues / Environmental Issues of the planned distribution activities
- Type and number of items to be distributed, description of norms forming the basis for procurement
- Method of procuring items (international open invitation to tender, international restricted invitation to tender, local open invitation to tender, simplified procedure, negotiated <single bid> procedure, procurement through third parties as e.g. SCF-UK), short description of how to identify potential bidders
- Means of transport, transport costs
- Supervision and monitoring of distribution activities by own staff (number, position)
- Month foreseen for beginning distribution, foreseen end of distribution
- Planned reserve stock

### B. Example for technical specifications (Procurement)

The following are examples to show what could be included in the technical specifications:

<i>Blanket, heavy</i>	<i>woven, 30 – 40 % wool and rest of other fibres (cotton, polyester) blanket with stitched ends, size 150 cm x 200 cm, weight 1.3 kg, packed in pressed bales of 50 pieces. Each bale of 50 pieces would be about 0.35 m<sup>3</sup> volume and weigh 65 – 70 kg. Large quantities are generally available.</i>
<i>Blanket, light</i>	<i>Cotton, size 140 cm x 190 cm, weight approx 850 gr., usually packed in pressed bales of 100 pieces. Each bale of 100 pieces would be about 0.4 m<sup>3</sup> volume and weigh 85 – 90 kg. Fairly large quantities generally available ex-stock</i>
<i>Bucket, plastic</i>	<i>Bucket/pail 10 l capacity, aluminium with plated steel-wire bail handle, conical seamless design, suitable for stacking, reinforced or turned lip.</i>
<i>Family cooking set</i>	<i>12 piece aluminium utensils as follows:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <i>cooking pot, 6 litres, with bail handle and cover</i></li><li>- <i>cooking pot, 4 litres, with bail handle</i></li></ul>

- *dinner plate, aluminium (4 each)*
- *aluminium mug (4 each)*
- *coffee pot, aluminium, 2 litres*

*The set is packed in a cardboard carton 25 cm x 25 cm x 20 cm, weight 2 kg. Cutlery included: five stainless steel soup spoons and one stainless cook's knife, blade 15 – 17 cm.*

*Plastic sheeting*      *White seamless polyethylene sheeting, 250 microns (1000 gauge), width 5 m, supplied double-folded in lengths usually of 100 m – 800 m, approx weight 1 kg / 4 m<sup>2</sup>. For multipurpose use: roofing, ground sheet, linings.*

*Tarpaulin material*      *4 m wide, 50 m long (200 m<sup>2</sup>), in centre-folded roll of 2 m width, 250 mm diameter. Reinforced polyethylene, ultraviolet ray resistant; 0.25 mm thick (275 gr/m<sup>2</sup>). Plastic eyelets both sides every metre, double row of eyelets across every 5 m. Colour blue. Approx. 50 kg. Considerably stronger than above described plastic sheeting.*

The above outlines are rough guidelines, which should be agreed upon and fixed by the different suppliers of NFI working in Angola. Standardisation of items would make it easier to compare prices and to find the cheapest suppliers.

### **C. Additional Items recommended to be introduced in future NFI distributions**

IDPs themselves expressed an urgent need for the following additional items to be distributed:

- *shoes*, at least sandals (the latter cost on the local market about US \$ 1.25). The sandals would cover the most basic need.
- *clothes*, at least used ones, especially clothes for children. The clothes could be provided from European Red Cross Societies at very modest prices. ADPP (Ajuda de Desenvolvimento de Povo para Povo) intends to distribute clothing for 350,000 newly displaced and resettled people in 2001 (budget US \$ 408,500, see UN Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeals for Angola 2001, p. 133). Nevertheless there remains an uncovered need, if the figure of 500,000 persons being in need of basic items – clothing included - is valid. A close co-operation with ADPP should be sought and financial means should be earmarked by ECHO for covering the gap. In principle ADPP could also donate clothing to the here discussed three NFI distributing NGOs. LWF co-operated already in this sense with ADPPs during the period of the LWF-contract with ECHO which ended on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2000. At this time clothing was handed out to LWF for distribution in Luena, Moxico Province (for 5,000 families).
- IDPs, interviewed on the quality of items delivered, mentioned that instead of the items (for use in the household as pots, cups) delivered with enamel surface, *aluminium items* would be more adapted to their situation, they could be easily cleaned with sand and would be shock-resistant. The plastic buckets supplied should be less flexible or be made out of aluminium.
- IDPs are consuming much wood for cooking. Wood collection burdens the women and endangers the environment (example Luena with its ravines). Collecting wood in mined areas endangers lives. A proven very simple, *even locally producible stove* could help to save energy, to reduce logging, to reduce the efforts of women and to expose them less to

the dangerous wood collecting. Samples were worldwide tested by many big NGOs. Designs are available.

- The huts constructed by the IDPs have floors of pure soil. In the cooler rainy season the cool soil affects health. By means of food-for-work programmes IDPs could be stimulated to produce a kind of *carpet from local raw material* (grasses, reed, straw). This would help them to get more healthy living quarters and to exert a profession which later on could lead to a new product on the local markets. This might generate income and improve technical proficiency. The activity could be seen as a future link to rehabilitation. Samples of such carpets are already used in the camp of Casseque III, near Huambo.
- The IDP-communities had until now no simple means to prevent malaria. If they could be interested in making use of *mosquito-nets* the number of patients suffering from malaria could be reduced with imminent economic results. Since the target group did not use such nets until now there should, before distributing such nets, be organised an information campaign also showing the right use and maintenance of the nets. Teachers could be trained to spread the idea and to create interest. No chemically treated nets should be used since children might be affected, and washing of nets would reduce effectiveness.

## **ANNEX 1**



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
HUMANITARIAN AID OFFICE (ECHO)

### ***TERMS OF REFERENCE***

#### ***FOR THE EVALUATION OF ECHO'S 2000 GLOBAL HUMANITARIAN PLAN in ANGOLA***

**ECHO/EVA/210/2000/01010**

Name of firm: GERMAX Gerli GmbH

Name of consultant: Gustav SCHILD

#### **Global Plan to be evaluated**

- Decision:
  - ECHO/AGO/210/2000/01000 for an amount of 13,5 MEURO
- Sectors to be evaluated:
  - Health & Nutrition
  - Water & Sanitation
  - Emergency Relief (Non Food Items)

#### **Introduction**

In view of the substantial amounts that have been allocated over recent years to finance humanitarian action for the benefit of affected populations in Angola, and in view of the need to draft a new strategy framework to assure coherent humanitarian action, ECHO has decided to launch an evaluation of its activities in this country.

More than 25 years of civil war in Angola have caused massive disruption to the civilian population's livelihood and survival mechanisms. The humanitarian situation deteriorated in 1998 as renewed fighting drove waves of displaced people from the countryside towards the safe provincial capitals and towns of the central regions. Although UNITA overrun about 70% of the country in the opening weeks of fighting, a government offensive launched in September 1999 has succeeded in recapturing many territories. The government has now re-established authority in the central, northern and eastern regions, including several former rebel strongholds.

The widespread instability resulting from the resumption of fighting makes for ECHO any medium/long term planning virtually impossible. As stated in the 1999 and 2000 Global Plans, the Office decided to focus on a limited number of realistic objectives that could be immediately implemented, giving priority to proposals concerning the places and people most directly affected by conflict and with the greatest humanitarian needs.

With emergency food assistance being covered by WFP and EC food security services, the main priorities by sector in Angola have been health, water and sanitation, and emergency relief to Internally Displaced People (IDPs). Although health remains the

central focus of ECHO funded actions, the Office's aim has been not to consider it in isolation and to take full account of the obvious links between health and nutrition and health and water/sanitation. ECHO's current health strategy is the result of a joint strategy undertaken by ECHO and DEG DEV in 1997 (Etude pour une aide humanitaire et une aide a la rehabilitation du systeme de santé en Angola, 1997-1998).

The will to refocus on the original ECHO mandate as defined by the Council Regulation has been increasing in the Commission. ECHO has already, during the implementation of the Global Plan 2000, asked its partners in Angola to start designing an exit strategy for the longer-term components of their actions. Therefore, actions to be funded in the future should be designed to bring immediate relief and avoid focussing on longer-term development issues. Nevertheless, given the need to link relief with rehabilitation and development, any action which suit this purpose should also be taken into consideration.

### **Consultant's role**

During the course of the mission, whether on the ground or while the report is being drawn up, the consultant must demonstrate common sense as well as independence of judgement. He must provide answers that are both precise and clear to all points in the terms of reference, while avoiding the use of theoretical or academic language.

This evaluation is part of a global evaluation that should be carried out by a team of experts with both considerable experience in the humanitarian field and in the evaluation of humanitarian aid. These experts must agree to work in high risk areas. Solid experience in relevant fields of work to the evaluation and in the geographic area where the evaluation takes place is also required. Knowledge of the Portuguese language is obligatory.

The team members are responsible for the sectors mentioned hereafter:

#### **Mr. Chabot, team leader**

- Responsible for the synthesis report;
- health sector.

#### **Mr. Risjdijk**

- water & sanitation sector

#### **Mr. Schild**

- emergency relief (non food items) sector

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of this evaluation is set out under points 4.1 to 4.5 below:

*to assess the suitability of the last Global Plan 2000 in favour of the Angolan population, and the level at which the programme in the various sectors of activity concerned has been implemented;*

*to assess the degree to which the objectives pursued have been achieved and the effectiveness of the means employed;*

*to quantify the impact of the Global Plan in terms of outputs;*

*to analyse the link between emergency, rehabilitation and development;*

a. to establish precise and concrete proposals on:

- a possible ECHO's "exit strategy" from certain activities, should DG DEV be considered to be in a better position to handle the situation;

- the future of ECHO's funding by sector and activities where ECHO's aid be still deemed necessary, with a view to improve the effectiveness of future operations and precise sectors of intervention in order to allow the Office to concentrate on specifically targeted beneficiaries (very vulnerable groups, IDP's, etc)

### **Specific evaluation objectives**

To this end, each consultant will develop the issues set out under points 5.1 to 5.14 below for **his own sector (defined in chapter 3)**, and cover all points in his evaluation report. They will only take into account the new facts since the beginning of the global plan. These specific issues must be studied in each sector evaluated as well as in the synthesis report.

#### ***A brief description of the Global Plan and analysis of its context:***

- ***The political and social-economic situation, the humanitarian needs and, where existing, of any local capacities available to respond to local needs.***
- The analysis of the country's present condition in political and socio-economic terms, should include an overview which permits to situate the Global Plan financed by ECHO. This analysis should contain information on the various economic sectors such as social and economic policies in force, the population's degree of dependency on humanitarian aid, the levels of income and its distribution among the population, sanitation and medical policies, access to foodstuffs, etc.
- The second part of the analysis should be devoted to identifying vulnerable groups and localising them, as well as giving an estimate of their needs by category.
- The evaluation should also permit an appreciation of the capacities both of the local population and of local public authorities to deal with problems pinpointed.

#### ***Analysis of the relevance of the objectives of the Global Plan, of the choice of the beneficiaries, and of the deployed strategy, in relation to identified needs.***

##### ***Examination of the co-ordination and coherence for each of the sectors concerned with:***

- the other donors and international operators, as well as with local authorities;
- other European Commission services that might be operating in the same zone with projects that are similar or related to the Global Plan;. The projects

identified should be described with their cost and with the aid elements they include;

***Analysis of the effectiveness of the Global Plan in quantitative and qualitative terms for each of the sectors;***

***Analysis of the cost-effectiveness of the Global Plan. The cost-effectiveness has to be established, notably, on the basis of the quantitative elements that have been identified under point 5.4.***

***Analysis of the efficiency of the implementation of the plan global. This analysis should cover:***

- the planning and mobilisation of aid;
- the operational capacities of the partners;
- the strategies deployed;
- major elements of the Global Plan such as: staff, logistics, maintenance of accounts, selection of recipients, suitability of the aid in the context of local practices, etc.;
- management and storage of merchandise and installations;
- quality and quantity of merchandise and services mobilised and their accordance with the contractual specifications (including packaging conditions, the origin of merchandise and the price);
- the systems of control and auto-evaluation set up by the partners.

***Analysis of the impact of the Global Plan. This analysis should be based on the following non-exclusive list of indicators, bearing in mind that consultants might well add others:***

- contribution to the reduction of human suffering;
- creation of dependency on humanitarian aid;
- effect of humanitarian aid on the local economy;
- effect on the incomes of the local population;
- effect on health and nutritional practices;
- environmental effects;
- impact of humanitarian programmes on local capacity-building.

***Investigation of the sustainability of the Global Plan, and notably of the extent of which some actions currently financed by ECHO and more rehabilitation-oriented could be integrated in medium-long term rehabilitation/development programmes. For these actions, some specific recommendations on the conditions and measures to be taken in order to improve their impact and sustainability have to be elaborated.***

***Analysis of the visibility of ECHO.***

***Analysis of the integration of “gender issues” (social, economic and cultural analysis of the situation of both women and men) in the intervention.***

***Analysis of the measures taken to assure the security of aid workers, both ex-patriat and local: means of communication placed at their disposal, specific protection measures, emergency evacuation plan;***



*On the basis of the results of the evaluation, the consultant will draw up operational recommendations on the needs of a humanitarian nature that might possibly be financed by the European Community. These recommendations may also cover, if necessary, other domains than humanitarian aid, such as development co-operation;*

*An analysis of the methodology of programme planning used by ECHO for the Global Plans for Angola should be included in the synthesis report. This analysis should also include the study of possible alternatives to the Global Plans' approach.*

*A drawing up of "lessons learned" in the context of this evaluation must also be provided. The "lessons learned" must include the role of ECHO and other services of the Commission in the decision making process and monitoring.*

### **Working method**

For the purpose of accomplishing their tasks, consultants may use information available at ECHO, via its correspondents on the spot, in other Commission services, the local Commission Delegation, ECHO partners on the spot, aid beneficiaries, as well as local authorities and international organisations.

The consultant will analyse the information and incorporate it in a coherent report that responds to the objectives of the evaluation.

### **Phases of the evaluation**

*A briefing at ECHO with the responsible staff for 2 days during which all the documents necessary for the mission will be provided. The day after the Team Leader will submit by e-mail to ECHO "Evaluation" a concise report of the briefing listing any clarifications to the terms of reference which will have to be taken into consideration during the mission;*

*A briefing with the Commission delegation in Luanda.*

*The mission to Angola will last 28 days. The consultant must work in close collaboration with the Commission Delegation on the spot, the ECHO correspondent, the ECHO partners, local authorities, international organisations and other donors;*

*The consultant should devote the first day of his mission to the area concerned to preliminary and preparatory discussions with the correspondent and the local ECHO partners;*

*The last day of the mission should be devoted to a discussion with the correspondent and the ECHO partners on observations arising from the evaluation. The team will discuss the schema and the content of the synthesis report;*

*The draft report should be submitted by computer support (Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) to ECHO "Evaluation" in Brussels at least ten days before its presentation and its discussion during the debriefing;*

*A debriefing at ECHO of 1 day. The day after the consultant will submit by e-mail to ECHO "Evaluation" a concise report of the debriefing listing the points which he will have to take into consideration in his report;*

*Once the comments given during the debriefing, that entail amendments to the draft report, have been incorporated, the revised text will be submitted back to ECHO "Evaluation", which should mark its agreement within 15 days.*

*Submission of the final report which should take account of any remarks.*

### Timetable

The evaluation will last 45 days, spread out between the date of signature of the contract and its end on the 15 February 2001 with the submission of the final reports.

### Report

*The evaluation will result in the drawing up of 4 reports (1 par sector and 1 synthesis report) written in English, of a maximum length of 15 pages including the evaluation summary which should appear at the beginning of the report.*

*The evaluation report is an extremely important working tool for ECHO. The report format appearing under points 9.2.1 to 9.2.5 below must, therefore, be strictly adhered to:*

#### Cover page

- Number of the report, that will be given on the debriefing, in the right top (minimum font 36)
- title of the evaluation report:
  - “Angola, Global Plan 2000, medical sector - 2000.”
  - “Angola, Global Plan 2000, water & sanitation sector - 2000”;
  - “Angola, Global Plan 2000, emergency relief sector - 2000.”; “Angola, Global Plan 2000, synthesis report.”
- period of the evaluation mission;
- name of the evaluator;
- Indication that the report has been produced at the request of the European Commission, financed by it and that the comments contained therein reflect the opinions of the consultants only.

#### Table of contents

##### Summary (see form in annex)

The evaluation summary should appear at the beginning of the report.

EVALUATED GLOBAL PLAN (5 LINES MAX)

DATE OF EVALUATION:

REPORT N°:

CONSULTANT'S NAME :

PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY (5 lines max.):

MAIN CONCLUSIONS (+/- 20 lines)

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Co-ordination, coherence and complementarity
- Impact & strategic implications
- Visibility
- Horizontal Issues

RECOMMENDATIONS (+/- 20 lines)

LESSONS LEARNED (+/- 10 lines)

**The main body of the report should start with a section on the method used and should be structured in accordance with the specific evaluation objectives formulated under point 5 above (10 pages maximum).**

#### Annexes

- list of persons interviewed and sites visited;
- terms of reference;
- abbreviations;

- map of the areas covered by the operations financed under the Global Plan.

*If the report contains confidential information obtained from parties other than the Commission services, this information is to be presented as a separate annex.*

*The report must be written in a direct and non-academical language.*

*Each report shall be drawn up in 20 copies and delivered to ECHO.*

*The report should be submitted with its computer support (diskette or CD ROM, Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) attached.*

## SUMMARY FRAMEWORK FOR THE EVALUATION OF AN OPERATION OR A GLOBAL PLAN

The summary should provide clear and concise information about the key findings of the evaluation. Its structure must follow the main criteria commonly used for the management and evaluation of aid interventions. All subsections must be addressed. If not, a justification should be given.

To better understand this document, details on each criterion are provided in the attached annex.

<p><b>Subject of the evaluation :</b></p> <p>Country of operation (<i>or region</i>) :.....</p> <p>Name of partner (<i>main partners</i>) : .....</p> <p>Operation contract n° (<i>Decision n°</i>) : .....</p> <p>Dates &amp; duration of the operation (<i>period covered</i>) :</p> <p>Amount : .....EURO</p> <p>Sector(s) concerned and description (max. 5 lines) : .....</p>
<p><b>DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Dates for the evaluation (from - to):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Report n° (to be filled in by ECHO) :</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Name of consultant:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Purpose &amp; methodology (5 lines max.)</p>
<p><b>CONCLUSIONS (+/- 25 lines)</b></p> <p><i>Relevance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Needs assessment, identification of beneficiaries, problem analysis, methods used for needs assessment.</li> <li>- Understanding of the context and analysis of the humanitarian situation .</li> <li>- Relevance and feasibility of the intervention strategy: general objective(s), project purpose, results, activities and means, timetable, external factors, community participation, protection systems, ....</li> </ul>
<p><i>Effectiveness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analysis of the attained results and the level of achievement of the project's purpose; adaptation to changes in the situation.</li> <li>- Cost-effectiveness.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Efficiency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partner's operational management, organisation and implementation (technical competence, staff, effectiveness of monitoring and co-ordination), quality of products.</li> <li>- Administrative management ( costs, budget management).</li> </ul>
<p><i>Co-ordination, coherence and complementarity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coherence et complementarity with interventions of other donors and Commission services.</li> <li>- Co-ordination arrangements in the field (other humanitarian agencies, local authorities, member states and others, co-operation with ECHO).</li> </ul>
<p><i>Impact &amp; strategic implications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analysis of the operation's impact (measures utilised)</li> <li>- Analysis of other effects, including sustainability (dependence, environment, gender, ...).</li> <li>- Perspectives, link between emergency, rehabilitation and development.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Visibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Visibility (beneficiaries, partners, local authorities)</li> <li>- Means used and effects.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Horizontal issues</i></p> <p>Gender ; LRRD ; human rights; security of humanitarian staff.</p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS (+/- 20 lines)</b></p>
<p><b>LESSONS LEARNED (+/- 10 lines)</b></p>

**SUMMARY FRAMEWORK FOR THE EVALUATION OF AN OPERATION OR A  
GLOBAL PLAN  
ANNEX**

<p><b><i>Relevance</i></b> <i>(Appraisal of the intervention's objectives. Justification of objectives in relation to the problems and needs)</i></p>
<p><u>Needs assessment</u> Identification of the beneficiaries (type, number, localisation, socio-economic information, ...) ? Description of the beneficiaries' problems ? Analysis of their needs ? Identification of the priority needs (in relation to the political and humanitarian context, and to ECHO's intervention strategy) ? Methods used to assess the needs (participatory consultations, norms used to identify humanitarian emergency, technical assessment, ...) ?</p>
<p><u>Context and humanitarian situation</u> Understanding of the country's overall situation (political, social, economic, security) and constraints ? Knowledge and analysis of the humanitarian situation ? Knowledge of the national authorities' strategies (in particular concerning disaster preparedness) ? Partner's experience ? Knowledge of the local capacity to respond to the humanitarian situation ? Description of other interventions addressing the humanitarian situation ?</p>
<p><b><i>Co-ordination, coherence et complementarity</i></b> <i>(Efficient account taken of connected interventions)</i></p>
<p><u>Coherence and complementarity</u> with present and future interventions of other donors ? other Commission services ?</p>
<p>Organisation set in place for field <u>co-ordination</u> : ministries and local authorities, other humanitarian agencies (UN, NGOs), direct link with beneficiaries, co-operation with ECHO correspondent and delegation, ... ?</p>
<p><b><i>Effectiveness</i></b> <i>(level of achievement of the intervention's objectives)</i></p>
<p><u>Results</u> Attained results (qualitative et quantitative) ? Results' contribution to the project purpose (beneficiaries reached ? means of measurement, ...) ? Account taken of the situation's evolution ? Effectiveness of modifications ? Project cost in comparison with the level of achievement of the project purpose ?</p>
<p><u>Monitoring</u> Measurement systems put in place ?</p>
<p><u>Factors of success/ failure</u> Description of success strategies ? Analysis of weakness and recommendations ?</p>

<b><i>Efficiency</i></b> ( <i>Economic quality of the transformation of means into results and achievements</i> )
<u>Partner's operational management / organisation &amp; implementation</u> Technical competence : planning (respect of timetable, management system, ... ), mobilisation capacity ? Logistics management ? Appropriate quality and quantity of products delivered ? Transport, distribution and storage systems ... ? Respect of local habits ? Technical aspects specific by sectors ? Personnel : Competence of employed personnel ? Organisation in the field ? Personnel security measures ? Communication ? ... Monitoring : quality of the monitoring ? Auto-evaluation ? Quality control ? Quality of the reporting ? ... Co-ordination : quality of the co-ordination ?
<u>Administrative management</u> Costs ? Budget management ? Supply policy ? ...
<b><i>Impact &amp; strategic implications</i></b> ( <i>Effects deriving from the intervention. Changes in the situation after the intervention</i> )
<u>Impact</u> Analysis of the impact ? Measures used ? Contribution to the reduction of human suffering ? Dependence on humanitarian aid ? Effects on the local population's income ? Effects on gender aspects ? environment ? strengthening of local capacities ? Other effects ?
<u>Perspectives &amp; viability</u> Perspectives for the future ? Emergency, protracted crisis, rehabilitation ? Opportunity to initiate development operations ? Respect of the Madrid Declaration principles ?
<b><i>Visibility</i></b> ( <i>Means of communicating about ECHO's presence and actions</i> )
Means used ? Visibility » achieved ?
<b><i>Horizontal issues</i></b> (...)
Gender : were the gender aspects appropriately taken into account in the design phase and during the implementation of the project ?
LRRD :
Human rights :
Security of the humanitarian staff :
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b> (+/- 20 lines)
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b> (+/- 10 lines)

i.

ANNEX 2

## LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED DURING THE ASSIGNMENT

NAME	DESIGNATION / ORGANISATION
<i>Personalities met in Europe (Brussels and Amsterdam)</i>	
Mr. Steffen Stenberg	Head of Unit ECHO 1, Africa
Mme J. Coëffard	Evaluation officer ECHO (former head of unit)
Mr. R. Lewartowski	Evaluation officer ECHO
Mr. A. Felizes Sanchez	Administrator Evaluation service ECHO
Ms M. Pantaleoni	Desk officer Angola, ECHO, Brussels
Mr. Matthew Sayer	Previous desk officer Angola, ECHO
Ms. L. Foa	Desk officer Angola DG Dev, Brussels
Ms. E. Feret	Principal administrator social development, DGDev Brussels
Ms Corinne Bolet	SCR, Brussels, responsible for Angola
Mr. Pierre Capdegelle	Health expert, Regional Bureau Nairobi, Kenya
Mr. Franco Tranquilli	Food security expert, ECHO
Ms S. van der Kam	MSF-H, Nutritionist, PH department.
Technical staff working in the Delegation in Luanda	
Mr. António Cardoso Mota	EC Delegate in Angola.
Ms Mercedes Navarro	Task officer ECHO programme Luanda (non health)
Mr. Alberto Pasini	Previous task officer ECHO Luanda (non health)
Mr. Berend de Groot	Current task officer ECHO Angola (non health)
Mr. Giuseppe Chió	Task officer ECHO programme Luanda (health)
Dr. Guida Rottlandt	Previous task officer ECHO Luanda (health)
Dr. Raúl Feio	Medical Officer, DG Dev Angola (health)
Ms Glória Chagas	Office manager of ECHO in Luanda
Mr. Pietro Magini	Head Nucléo Europeio de Segurança Alimentar (NESA)
Other personalities of agencies and NGO's met in Luanda	
Ms Lise Grande	Head of the Secretary of OCHA in Angola
Ms Paola Carosi	OCHA Field coordinator
Mr. Werner Schellenberg	UNHCR/Representative
Ms A. Cabrera/Ms R.Okoro	UNHCR, Programme officer / Protection officer
UNHCR, Watsan coordinator	UNHCR, Watsan coordinator
Ms. Pilar Dyangani	UNICEF, Section health and nutrition, Resp. ECHO program
Ms Marie Noelle Vieu	UNICEF, Health and Nutrition
Mr. Hanock Barlevi	UNICEF, Mine Awareness Project Officer
Mr. Aidan Mcquade	OXFAM, Head of mission, Coordinator of the programme
Ms Rachel Searie	OXFAM, Programme Service manager
Dr. Luciano Tuseo	GVC (Italy)
Mr. Mike McDonagh	CONCERN (Ireland)
Mr. Peter McNichol	CONCERN, Assistant Director
Mr. Robert Broeder	MSF-H (Country Manager ai)
Mr. Mario Oliveira	ADRA International (Germany), Head of mission.
Mr. Volker Artmann	ADRA International (Germany). Germany
Mr. Marco Brudermann	ICRC, International Committee Red Cross, Head of mission
Mr. Francisco Raposo	CIC, Head of mission in Luanda
Dr. Paolo Abel	Angotrip, Caritas Angola, Head of mission
Mr. Massimo Manzoni	CUAMM Representative Angola
Ms Maria José Garção	AMI, Delegate for Angola
Mr. Rob Kevlihan	GOAL, Field Director

Mr. Jean-Luc Grisel Mr. Angelo Lopes	HI, Handicap International, Director of Projects PEPAM, National Education Programme for the Prevention of Mine Accidents
Mr. António Quaresma Ms. Sophie Bruas Mr. Carl J. von Seth Ms. Sheri Lecker Ms. Marisa Astill-Brown General Hélder Cruz Mr. José Morais Mr. Dag Höiland Mr. Kenneth O'Connell	DNA, Chef de Departamento de Abastecimento de Aqua ACF, Country representative LWF, Lutheran World Federation, Representative SCF-UK, Programme Director SCF-UK, Humanitarian Assistance Officer INAROE, Director General, Luanda INAROE, programme officer NPA, Norwegian People Aid MGM, Menschen gegen Minen
<i>Persons met in the field (Malange, Moxico, Huambo, Uige, Saurimo, Benguela and Lobito).</i>	
Dr. Pedro Francisco Chagas Mr. Xavier Honorato Ms Annette Hearn Els Adams, Laura Bedford Dr. Bimpa and Ms Alina Dr. Antonio Otati Dr. John Ifeawyi Ms Erica Hazelaar Mr. Luiz Augusto Monteiro Mr. Diamantius Neto	Malanje, Directeur Provincial de Santé Malanje OCHA, Responsible Security Malanje, CONCERN Malanje MSF-H, Coordenador e Infirmeiro Tecnico. Malanje GVC, Médico e parteira Malanje ADRA/International Malanje UNICEF Representative Malanje Malanje OXFAM, Programme Manager Malanje, Representative ADRA/National Malanje, Director Provincial de Aqua
Mr. Nico Heijenberg Mr. Moises Gourgel Mr. Emilio Sassa Saihnujien Mr. Frederic Jamar Mr. Salomão Sacuissa Mrs. Gregoria Gomes Sarr Mrs. Blessing Egrebe	Moxico, Coordinator MSF-B Moxico, Coordinator LWF Moxico, Officer for Human Rights, LWF Moxico, Watsan specialist MSF-B Moxico, Director Provincial de Departamento d'Aqua Moxico, UNICEF, Head of office Moxico, WFP Head of Office (ai)
Mr. Michael Masson Ms Patricia Lee Mr. Luis Suzanne Mr. Sandy Machulay Mr. Fernando Arroyo	Huambo, Coordinator ICRC programme Huambo, Nurse in Huambo hospital Huambo, Coordinator Movimondo programme Huambo, SCF-UK Acting provincial manager Huambo, OCHA field advisor
Mr. Conçalo da Costa Dr. Vincenzo Pisani Dr. Paolo Abel Mr. Manfred Arit Mr. W. Tarpai / Mr. Ramirez Ms Irma Lindamarira Bedin	Uige, Coordinator CIC programme Uige, Coordinator CUAMM programme Uige, Coordinator Angotrip programme Uige, Project Coordinator 4 ME Uige, UNHCR Head of office / Protection officer Uige, Caritas Head of Office
Mr. Jon Tellum Mr. Wolfgang Tacke Mrs. Rebecca Wallace Dr. Xavier Bartoli Mr. Abeld da Costa Mr. Pintar	Lubango, Project Director, Norwegian Refugee Council. Lubango, Johanniter, Project Director, Lobito, Emergency Project Officer, Save The Children (UK) Cubal, MSF-E, Head of Project Benguela, Director Provincial de Aqua de Huila Benguela, Coordinator ACF programme (water) Matala



ii.

ANNEX 3

WORK PROGRAMME OF THE TEAM

DATE	MORNING	AFTERNOON
06 Nov	Informal meetings:	Ms M.Pantaleoni, Ms L.Foa and E. Feret.
14 Nov	12.00 Meeting of the team	14.00 Meeting with staff of evaluation unit, ECHO-Angola desk, DG Dev., ECHO-staff in Luanda and former ECHO responsables for Angola (list of persons see annex 2)
15 Nov	Meeting DG Dev and ECHO-Angola desk.	Meeting M. Tranquilli and M. Pasini. Draft report on the briefing 20.55 Departure to Luanda AF 2577
16 Nov	07.15 Arrival of team AF 928	Preparation work programme
17-11	13.00 NESAs (team) 14.00 OCHA (team) 11.00 Anton: UNHCR	Anton: 16300 Oxfam Jarl: 15.30 UNICEF Franz: -
<b>18-11</b>	09.00 Meeting with NGO's Malanje: GVC, CONCERN and MSF-H.	17.00 Enrique Pavignani/SCF-UK
<b>19-11</b>	Preparation field visits	
20-11	12.55 Chabot/Rijsdijk Malanje GVC TFC+Hospital, OCHA. Anton: OXFAM	07.30 Schild to Lubango (SAL) Franz: With Joanniter to Namibe and Matala
21-11	Malanje: MSF-H, Concern, GVC, DPS, UNICEF. Jarl: Lombe/ADRA Anton: OXFAM	07.30 Schild in Lubango: Johanniter office. 10.00 To Benguela (SAL) SCF-UK! 11.30 To Lobito (road) and visit to NFI
22-11	Malanje: Debriefing Anton: ADRA-Nat., Oxfam. 15.00 Chabot/Rijsdijk: Luanda	Schild: Lobito to Cubal to Ganda to Luanda (PAM) + Visite IDP's Schild return to Luanda
23-11	08.30 LWF 09.00 ADRA-International 11.00 CIC, Angotrip/Caritas 14.00 Concern 15.00 ICRC 11.30 UNICEF (Rijsdijk)	12.00 UNICEF (NFI-Déminage) 14.30 Handicap International 17.00 SCF-UK (Schild) 17.30 ACH (Rijsdijk) 18.30 Reception Délegué CE.
24-11	09.00 INAROE (M. H. Cruz)	14.00 Meeting DNA/Luanda
<b>25-11</b>	10.00 Meeting NGO's Moxico, Huambo: AMI, GOAL, Caritas/It, Movimundo, Concern, COSV	12.00 Debriefing Feret/Feio 14.00 Luis Ramalho .
<b>26-11</b>	Preparation field visits	17.00 Meeting with Enrico Pavignani
27-11	07.00 Team: Moxico Jarl: MSF-B, Hospital	LWF: office and Camps
28-11	Team: Moxico 3 HP's, 1 TFC, 1 SFC.	3 IDP-camps and 1 Resettlement UNICEF, WFP
29-11	07.00 Moxico, Return	14.30 Interview Mercedes + Giuseppe
30-11	07.00 Rijsdijk: Lubango ACF	14.30 MGM, Mr. Kenneth O'Connell 16.00 NPA, Mr. Dag Hoiland

01-12	05.30 Huambo Jarl: ICRC + Movimondo, ConcernUNICEF	Franz: SCF-UK, Camps Casseque, Km25 17.00 Retour Luanda (CICR)
<b>02-12</b>	10.00 CUAMM	15.00 Anton retour Luanda
<b>03-12</b>	Prepare debriefing/sector	17.00 Meeting M. Enrico Pavignani
04-12	Arrival Ms Pantaleoni 10.00 Anton to UNHCR	15.00 Debriefing Taskforce/EC (NESA, ECHO, DG Dev, Brussels)
05-12	07.00 Uige: CIC Hospital, UNHCR; Camps and water	Negage: CUAMM and Angotrip. Frantz: UNHCR/Luanda
06-12	Prepare debriefing note. Work on individual reports	17.00 Finalise debriefing note 15.00 Draft debriefing note to Kunze
07-12	Prepare draft reports	Prepare debriefing presentation NGO
08-12	Prepare sector reports	13.00 Debriefing ECHO partners
<b>09-12</b>	Finalise debriefing notes and sector reports	13.00 Meeting M. Broeder/MSF-H
<b>10-12</b>	Finalise debriefing notes and sector reports	Draft debriefing notes to ECHO-Brussels
11-12	08.00 Visit Bengo (COSV)	22.00 Departure to Paris AF 929
12-12	10.00 Arrival Paris/Amsterdam	
19-12-00	10.00 Editing Kunze-Chabot	(meeting in Aachen)
05-01-01	4 draft sector reports in Brussels	
15-01-01	09.30 Debriefing Angola at	ECHO, Brussels.
17-01-01	Report of the debriefing to ECHO	
24-01-01	Comments of ECHO desk to	Evaluation team
10-02-01		Submission second draft reports.

## DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- GOA, 07-99. Programa Nacional de Emergencia para a Assistencia Humanitária (PNEAH).
- GOA, Decree on the Norms of Resettlement for Internally Displace Populations (IDP).
- MINARS, 07/2000. Plan of Emergency Action, with provincial emergency plans available.
- InterAction Member Activity Report Angola, December 1999. A guide to humanitarian and development efforts of InterAction Member Agencies
- ‘Council Common Position of 19<sup>th</sup> June 2000 on Angola’. Published 21-06-00 in the official Journal of the European Communities.
- Council Regulation No. 1257/96 of 20<sup>th</sup> June 1996. Published 02-07-1996 in the official Journal of the European Communities.
- ECHO, 31-01-00. 2000 Global plan for Angola.
- ECHO, undated. Plan Global Angola 1999 and 1998.
- ECHO, 10/97. Proposition de financement communautaire pour une aide en faveur de la population Angolaise 1998.
- ECHO, undated. Preliminary reflections on the implementation of an exit strategy in Angola (as of December 1999).
- ECHO, Guide d’utilisation du Contrat Cadre de partenariat (Framework Partnership Agreement). A l’usage du personnel de ECHO en vigueur le 01-01-99, y compris les modalités d’exécution (documents 1-16).
- LRRD, March 1996. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD).
- DG Dev, Mars 1999. Tableau Récapitulatif des interventions communautaires regroupées par stratégie et instrument financier, Angola-Secteur Santé.
- Sanches AA, 10/1999. ‘EU cooperation with politically fragile countries: lessons learned from Angola.’ ECDPM Discussion paper 11, Maastricht, the Netherlands.
- ECHO, Mr. P. Capdegelle, 27-10-00. Report on a mission to Angola (5<sup>th</sup> à 19<sup>th</sup> -10/00).
- ISADE/Dallemagne G., Juin 1997. Mission d’identification et de programmation des interventions communautaires dans le secteur de la santé en Angola. Rapport de mission.
- ISADE, Janvier 1997. Etude pour une aide Humanitaire et une aide à la réhabilitation du système de santé en Angola 1997-1998. Rapport globale & compte rendu, suivi de la réunion de concertation de Bruxelles du 20-21 Février 1997.
- Pavignani E. and Colombo A, 2000. Draft 09/00. Providing health services in countries disrupted by civil wars, a comparative analysis of Mozambique and Angola 1975-2000.
- MSF, 11/00. Angola, behind the façade of ‘normalization’: manipulation, violence and abandoned populations. A report by MSF, Luanda, 9<sup>th</sup> of November 2000.
- ODI draft 24-12-1997. Humanitarian Policy Programme. Good Practice Review, evaluating humanitarian assistance programmes. ODI, Portland House, London.
- Jaspers S, ODI, Humanitarian Policy Group, August 2000. Solidarity and soup kitchens: a review of principles and practice for food distribution in conflict.
- Kam v.d. and Tuynman, March 2000, MSF-H, Mission report to Malanje, Angola.
- MSF-H, Nutrition guide, draft 10/00. Part III and VI, revised MSF Nutrition guidelines.
- Baquet and van Herp, 03/00. A Pellagra epidemic in Kuito, Angola.
- Authors, 1998. HAT: an emerging PH crisis. BritMedBulletin, 54, 341-355
- OCHA, 04/00. Report on the Rapid Assessment of critical needs.
- OCHA, Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for Angola 2001.
- Evaluation Danish Humanitarian Assistance Volume 3, Angola. 1999.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

ACH=ACF	Ación/Action contre la Faim (Spain)
ADPP	Support the Development from People to People (Danish)
ADRA	Adventist Development and Relief Agency (Germany)
AEC	Association Européenne pour la Coopération
AEDES	Association Européenne pour le Développement et la Santé (Belge)
AMI	Assistenza Medica Internazionale (Italy)
ANC	Ante Natal Care (to pregnant women)
Angotrip	Project to combat Trypanosomiasis (SS/HAT) in Angola.
AT	Assistance Technique
CARITAS	Catholic Relief Agency (present in Italy, Germany, Netherlands etc)
CE	Commission Européenne (EC)
CIC	Associação para a Cooperação Intercambio e Cultura (ONG Portugal).
CICR	Comité International de la Croix Rouge (ICRC)
CISH	Comissão Inter-ministerial para a Situação Humanitária (12-07-1999, PNEAH)
CMPR	Centre de Médecine Physique et de Réhabilitation
CONCERN	Concern
COSV	Coordination committee for the Organisations in Voluntary Service (Italy)
CRS	Catholic Relief Services (American)
CUAMM	Collegio Universitario Aspirante e Medici Missionari (Italy)
DfID	Department for International Development (UK).
DMS	Direction Municipale de la Santé
DNA	Direcção Nacional das Aguas
DPS	Direction Provinciale de Saúde (Santé)
DNSP	Direction Nationale de la Santé Publique
EM	Etat Membre de la Communauté Européenne (CE)
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Office (OHCE)
FFW	Food For Work (promoted and distributed by PAM)
GOA	Government of Angola
GOAL	NGO operating in the field of health (Ireland)
GP2000.	Global Programme 2000 (Programme of ECHO for the year 2000)
GVC	Grupo Voluntário Civile (Italy)
HAT	Human African Trypanosomiasis (see SS)
HC	Health Centre
HCR	Haut Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les Réfugiés
HI	Handicap International (France)
H&N	Health and Nutrition (one of the three sectors of GP2000)
HP	Health Post
HIS	Health Information System
HIV/AIDS	Human Immune suppressive Virus / Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICRC	International Commission of the Red Cross (CIRC)
IDP	Internally Displaced Populations
IMC	International Medical Corps (USA)
INAROOE	Institut National Angolais pour l'Elèvement des Obstacles et autres Engins Explosifs
IOM	International Organisation of Migrations
Johanniter	NGO active in the field of Non Food Items (Germany)
LWF	Lutheran World Federation (Swiss)

LRRD	Linkage with Relief, Rehabilitation and Development
MCH	Mother and Child Health
MDM	Médecins du Monde (France)
MGM	Menschen gegen Minen (People against Mines) (Germany)
MINARS	Ministry of Social Affairs and Re-integration
MOVIMUNDO	NGO operating in health (Italy). Also called “Molisy”.
MPLA	Mouvement Populaire pour la Libération de l’Angola
MSF	Médecins Sans Frontières (Offices in Belge, Netherlands, Swiss, Spain)
MWG	Medium Weight Gain (gram per kg per day)
NESA	Núcleo Europeio de Segurança Alimentar (EU)
NF	Nuova Frontiera (Italy)
NFI	Non Food Items (Emergency Relief)
ONG	Organisation Non Gouvernementale (NGO)
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (secretary to UNDP)
OXFAM	NGO amongst other interventions operating in water (UK)
PAM	Programme Alimentaire Mondial (=WFP)
PAR	Programme d’Appui à la Recontruction (EU)
PATSA	Programme d’Appui Transitoire à la Santé en Angola
PEPRM	Educational Programme for the Prevention of Mine Related Accidents
PEV	Programme Elargie de Vaccinations (EPI)
PHC	Primary Health Care (Cuidados Primários de Saúde = CPS))
PIN	Programme Indicatif National
PNEAH	Programme Nacional de Emergencia para a Assistencia Humanitária (CISH)
PSC	Poste de Santé Consolidé (CHP)
PSPE	Programme Post Urgence
SARR	Système d’Alerte et de Réaction Rapide
SCF	Save the Children Fund (offices in the UK or USA)
SCR	Service Commun Relex (Relations Extérieures of the EC in Brussels)
SFC	Supplementary Feeding Centre
SS	Sleeping Sickness (THA)
STD	Sexual Transmitted Diseases
TA	Technical Assistance
THA	Trypanosomiasis Humana Africana (SS)
TF	Task Force (existing in Brussels and the various Delegations)
TFC	Therapeutic Feeding Centre
UCAH	Département d’Aide Humanitaire des Nations Unies (OCHA)
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children’s Fund
UNITA	Union Nationale pour L’Indépendance Totale de l’Angola
UNOPS	UN Office for Project Services
UTCAN	Technical Unit for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance
VRD	Voluntary Relief Doctor
Watsan	Water and Sanitation sector
ZIH	Zone d’Intervention Humanitaire
ZTS	Zone Transitoire de Santé

v.

ANNEX 6

Summary of all ECHO projects under GP2000 by province.  
(incl. some plans for 2001).

PROVINCE / town	ONG/PROJECT In GP2000	SUBJECT	STATUS in 2001	Budget (Euro) Contract date / Pop.
<b>Health and Nutrition projects</b>				
<i>Outside the Planalto</i>				
1. *Uige / Negage	CUAMM (Italy)	Health: Municipal Hospital with 2 HC's and 6 HP's Nutrition: 1 / 1	DG Dev / <b>CUAMM</b> (Art 255)	355.000, 17/8 Pop: 35.000
2. Uige / Negage	CARITAS (D) through Angotrip	Health: Trypano-somiasis assistance	ECHO or DG Dev?	270.000, 29/6 Pop: 35.000
3. *Uige / Uige	CIC Portugal Stop, to CUAMM	Health: Provincial Hospital (pediatric)	DG Dev / <b>CUAMM</b>	300.000, 4/3 Pop: 100.000
4. Lunda Norte /various towns *Lunda Sul / Saurimo	CARITAS (Italy) via Caritas Angola CARITAS (Italy) via Caritas Angola	Health: support 8 HP Health: support 8 HP	DG Dev / Caritas It. (Art 255)	280.000, 31/3 Pop: 34.000 Pop: 26.000 IDP: 75.000
5. *Lunda Sul / outside Saurimo	GOAL (Ireland) Stop, Caritas Italy will take over.	Health: Hospital Saurimo and 5 HP's. Nutrition 5 / 0 Camps in Luari	DG Dev / <b>Caritas It.</b> (Art 255)	210.000, 26/7 Pop: 60.000 IDP: 62.000
6. Moxico / Luena	MSF-Belge	Health: 3 HP's Nutrition 2 / 1 (Camps in 3 places)	ECHO@ / MSF-B and AMI Italy	400.000, 24/2 Pop: 44.000 IDP:
(Kuanza Nort / Ndalatando	GVC (Italy). This programme stops.	Health: 1 HC in Ndalatando + 3 HP's	ECHO@ Other GVC Programme?	See GVC-Malanje) Pop: 65.000 IDP: 19.000
7. *Kuanza Sul / Gabela, Seles  Amboim Sumbe	Nuova Fronteira (Italy)	Health: Hospitals in Gabela and Seles. HC Conda and 7 HP. ?? 4 Camps in Sumbe	DG Dev / <b>Nuova Fronteira</b> (+Huila) (Blina/2000)	600.000, 3/4 Pop: 350.000 Pop: 82.000 Pop: ?? Pop: ?20.000
8. *Malanje (Malanje + Cangandala)	GVC (Italy)	Health: Prov Hospital (Pediatria+Maternity) and 9 HP's + drugs Nutrition: 1 / 0	DG Dev / <b>GVC</b> (Reliquat 6* FED)	570.000, 31/10 Pop: 200.000 IDP: 135.000
9. Malanje / Malanje + Cangandala	MSF-H	Nutrition: 0 / 9, (now 1 TFC and the HP in Cangandula)	ECHO	205.000, 20/7 Pop: 200.000 IDP:
10. *Malanje / Cacuso	ADRA (Germany)	Health: Municipal Hosp of Cacuso + 3HPs .	DG Dev/ ADRA	440.000, 31/7 Pop: 70.000 IDP: 600
11. Bengo / Caxito	COSV (Italy)	Health: Hosp Caxito Nutrition: 1 / 0	ECHO@ COSV/ Quibaxe	140.000, 29/02 Pop: 56.000 IDP: 26.000

<i>Inside the Planalto</i>				
12. Huambo + Bié / (Huambo + Kuito)	ICRC (CICR)	Health: surgical support for OPD and IDP's +twoHospitals	ECHO / ICRC stop funding	800.000, 6/6. Pop: 400.000 OPD: 6.000. OPD
13. Huambo, Malanje (Can) Bié	CONCERN (Ireland)	Nutrition: 4 / 2 Nutrition 5 / 0 (0 / 1) Nutrition: 1 / 2	ECHO /CONCERN	800.000, 31-08 Pop: 50+40+?30.000.
14. Huambo / Huambo	Movimundo (Italy) ME+paediatric work by SCF-UK (+Benguela)	Health: Prov. Hosp. (Pediatric) 4 HC's and 3 HP's Nutrition: 4 / 3	DG Dev SCF-UK ( <i>Reliquat 6* FED</i> )	560.000, 1/7 Pop: 400.000
15. Benguela / Ganda	See ACF Spain/KK To Dutch Coop?	Health: Hosp. Ganda. Nutrition: 1 / 1	Stop	See KK/ACH Pop: 108.000
15. Kuando Kubango (KK) / Menongue	ACF Spain To Spanish Coop?	Health: Hosp. Kuito Kuanavale + 6 HC's Nutrition: 4 / 1	Spanish cooperation?	650.000, 25/7 Pop: 86.000
(Benguela)	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	Health: Hospital Cubal (Pediatric) Nutrition: 0 / 1	Stop	200.000, 7/4 IDP: 240.000
<b>Non Food Interventions(NFI) in Angola.</b>				
19. +Lunda Norte, Lunda Sul, Moxico.	LWF (Swiss)	Non food relief IDP 3 Camps in Saurimo + Luena	ECHO@ (through Dan-Church-Aid?)	700.000, 20-07 Pop: 38,500, 24%
20 +Kuando K, Huila, Namibe Kunene	Johanniter Unfall Hilfe (Germany)	Non food relief IDP's	ECHO@	650.000, 20-07 IDP: 55,000, 28%
21. +Huambo, Bié, Kuanza Sul, Benguela	SCF-UK	Non food relief IDP's	ECHO@	670.000, 12-7/20-9 IDP: 40,000, 10%
<b>D. Water and Sanitation related projects</b>				
17. # Malanje, Moxico, Uige	OXFAM (UK) 1999	Water and sanitation Camps in 3 provinces	ECHO /OXFAM	355.000, 17-12-99 Pop: 20,000
18. #Huila (Matala and Quipungo).	ACH Spain 1999	Water systems #Request KK/2001 Menongue is made	Stop 1999.	100.000 Pop: 15.000
<b>National level projects</b>				
(National level)	ECHO Angola	Functioning costs	ECHO	111.000+245.000)
(National level)	WFP (PAM)	Support airplane	ECHO	700.000)
16. National 55 Municipios in 11 provinces	UNICEF 2000	Emergency immunisation project IDP's: Measles/TT2	ECHO	950.000, 29-06-00 Pop: 650,000
22. National level (6 prov.)	Handicap Int.	IEC/Mine awareness	ECHO	230.000, 20/9 Pop: 108,000, 3%

\* = Projects that are proposed to be included in the DG Dev projects

# = Water and Sanitation related projects

+ = Non-food relief programmes (first necessity, mainly for IDP's)

H = Health = PHC programmes + support to Provincial / Municipal Hospitals

N = Nutrition = Supplementary Feeding Centres (SFC) and Therapeutic Feeding Centres (TFC)

Camps = Direct assistance to camps with IDP's and other displaced persons

@ = New programmes requested and/or foreseen for ECHO in the next year 2001 (not complete).

## ANNEX 7

### **DEFINITIONS USED FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT.**

For internal use by the evaluation team, an effort was made to define the most important concepts, used during this assignment. The “Good Practice Review” of the Humanitarian Policy Programme (HPP), provided excellent background reading in this respect. The following definitions, relevant to our evaluation are given in the HPP report (pages 17-19):

**Evaluation** is an examination, as systematic and objective as possible of an on-going or completed project or programme, its design, implementation and results, with the aim of determining its efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and the relevance of its objectives

**Relevance** is concerned with assessing whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities, as well as with donor policy.

**Efficiency** measures the outputs (quantitative and qualitative) in relation to the inputs. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been used. This may involve consideration of institutional, technical and other arrangements as well as financial management.

**Effectiveness** measures the extent to which the project or programme achieves its objectives or at least progress toward its purpose; whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs of the project.

**Impact** looks at the wider effects of the project (social, economic, technical, environmental) on individuals, communities and institutions. It can be immediate and long-range, intended or unintended, positive or negative, macro (sector) or micro (household). Impact addresses the question: what real difference has the project made to the beneficiaries? How many have been affected? It determines to what extent objectives have been reached (on the basis of outcome indicators) or measures efficiency through output indicators (like tonnes of food delivered, nbr latrines dug, nbr consultations provided or vaccinations given etc. In this way output indicators, that are easy to collect, relate directly to impact. Finally these indicators also refer to management practice of the agency and thus can be used for internal feed-back and monitoring

**Sustainability** is concerned with measuring whether an activity or an impact is likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable

**Cost effectiveness** Analysis links cost (input) with performance (output) and seeks the least expensive way of realising certain benefits.

In Emergency relief, in particular during the joint evaluation of the emergency assistance to Rwanda, the OECD criteria sustainability and relevance were replaced by the following 4 criteria, to make them more pertinent to the emergency character of the humanitarian response.

**Connectedness:** The need to assure that activities of short term emergency nature are carried out in a context which takes longer term and interconnected problems into account.

**Coherence:** The need to ensure that the activities of the international community are carried out with an effective division of labour among actors, maximising the comparative advantages of each



**Coverage:** The need to reach major population groups facing life-threatening suffering wherever they are, providing them with assistance and protection proportionate to their need and devoid of extraneous political agendas

**Appropriateness** or relevance seeks to determine whether a programme meets local needs

**Annex 8 Security Situation in Angola (August 2000)**



Remark: Accessible Regions shaded with grey  
Prepared by OCHA – information: UNDP Security Office – October 2000  
The ECHO1 Desk Angola has been provided with a more detailed survey on the current security situation in the country.





Prepared by OCHA – 4. April 2000 – Mine information collected from INAROE



**Annex 10 Number of Confirmed IDPs and Beneficiaries receiving Non-Food Items from humanitarian agencies, by Province**

	<b>Province</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Confirmed IDPs</b>	<b>NFI Beneficiaries</b>	<b>dx100/c</b>
	a	b	c	d	e
1	Bengo	310.000	25.827	25.060	97
2	Benguela	670.000	73.425	36.997	50
3	Bié	1.200.000	123.041	113.711	92
4	Cabinda	170.000	6.995		
5	Cunene	230.000	7.051	1.112	16
6	Huambo	1.000.000	126.566	78.227	62
7	Huíla	800.000	125.309	117.048	93
8	Kuando Kubango	150.000	51.606	11.325	22
9	Kuanza Norte	420.000	46.651	22.256	48
10	Kuanza Sul	610.000	89.752	26.458	29
11	Luanda	3.000.000	11.104		
12	Lunda Norte	250.000	13.047	3.427	26
13	Lunda Sul	120.000	61.970	17.125	28
14	Malanje	700.000	131.931	65.650	50
15	Moxico	240.000	83.197	59.286	71
16	Namibe	85.000	14.121	6.919	49
17	Uíge	500.000	97.486	49.959	51
18	Zaire	50.000	3.877	3.877	100
<b>Total</b>		<b>10.505.000</b>	<b>1.092.956</b>	<b>638.437</b>	<b>58</b>

**Coverage of confirmed IDPs by NFI-Distribution (ECHO funded)**

<b>Name of NGO</b>	<b>Target Population of the NGO</b>	<b>Percentage of confirmed IDPs (1.092.956) covered</b>
Lutheran World Federation	38.500	3,5
Safe the children UK	40.000	3,7
Die Johanniter	55.000	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>133.500</b>	<b>12,2</b>

The confirmed number of IDPs shows the situation reported by the IDP Fact Sheet of 30 September 2000, prepared by OCHA. The number of inhabitants (residents) by provinces is a cautious estimate of the present situation. The numbers of beneficiaries of NFI are taken from UN, 2000, Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for Angola, October 2000.

**Organisations and Institutions involved in Resettlement/Shelter Provision and Distribution of Non-Food Items in Angola (2000)**

Number	Organisation	Province															
		Bengo and Luanda	Benguela	Bié	Cabinda	Cuando Cubango	Cunene	Kwanza Norte	Kwanza Sul	Huambo	Huíla	Lunda Sul	Malanje	Moxico	Namibe	Uíge	Zaire
1	AAA	X	X						X								
2	AAD	X	X						X								
3	AADC		X														
4	ABLA-ORR		X														
5	ACORD	X															
6	ADAC					X											
7	ADAPRZ										X						
8	ADC							X									
9	ADPP	X									X						
10	ADHHBO										X						
11	ADG										X						
12	ADRA		X														
13	ADRA-A									X			X				
14	ADRA-I	X															
15	AHA	X															
16	AICF					X											
17	ASD										X						
18	CARE										X						
19	CARE-I			X													
20	CARITAS		X					X					X			X	
21	CICV										X						
22	CONCERN									X							
23	CRS		X														
24	DRC	X														X	
25	DW	X															
26	GVC							X									
27	HORIZONTE		X														
28	ICRC									X							
29	IERA	X															
30	INTERSOS	X				X											
31	JOHANNITER						X				X				X		
32	JRS	X														X	
33	LWF											X		X			
34	MAFIKU										X						
35	MBWEMBA					X											
36	MOLISV					X											
37	MOVIMONDO	X															
38	MSF-H					X											
39	NPA							X									
40	NRC	X					X				X				X		X
41	OIKOS						X		X	X	X		X		X		
42	OKUTIUKA		X														
43	ORA-A		X														
44	PEPELA										X						
45	SCF-UK	X	X	X						X							
46	SCF-US								X					X			
47	UNHCR															X	
48	UNICEF					X										X	
49	WVI							X					X				
50	ZOA										X						
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>



**Annex 11 Contract Award Procedures**

**Procedure for the award of contracts**  
**Applicable for humanitarian operations**  
(Contract Cadre de partenariat, Document no. 14)

Services	Supplies	Works
X >= Euro 200.000	X <= Euro 150.000	X >= Euro 5.000.000
International restricted call for tenders with 4 to 8 service providers invited	Open international call for tenders	1. Open international call for tenders 2. Restricted international call for tenders (exceptional cases)
	Euro 45.000 <= X <= 150.000	Euro 300.000 <= X <= 5.000.000
	Local open call for tenders	Local open call for tenders
X > Euro 200.000	X < Euro 45.000	X < Euro 300.000
1. Simplified consultation procedure with a minimum of 3 services providers invited	1. Simplified consultation procedure with a minimum of 3 suppliers invited	1. Simplified consultation procedure with a minimum of 3 contractors invited
2. X <= Euro 5.000: only one offer is necessary	2. X <= Euro 5.000: only one offer is necessary	2. X <= Euro 5.000: only one offer is necessary

**Annex 12 Statement of Save the Children UK – Procedural Delays**



Save the Children  
UK

Mr Franz Schild  
ECHO  
Ole Hotel Avenida  
Luanda

20th November 2000

Dear Mr Schild

### Delays in ECHO project proposal decisions

We enjoyed meeting you at our office in Luanda the other day.

As we discussed, I have looked at our records of correspondence with ECHO regarding any significant delays in response. The only recent incident which is apparent from our records is in receiving notification of a decision from ECHO after we submitted a request for funding for the current non food relief items project (operation number EC/OC-A/00/100000/0101). We submitted the proposal for this to the ECHO office in Brussels on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2000. We did not receive a decision until 17<sup>th</sup> July – a delay of more than three months – which, as we discussed with you, we feel is unacceptable for a request for funding to respond to an emergency.

I hope this provides the kind of information you were looking for.



Humanitarian Assistance Officer

at Mercedes Avenida, ECHO, Luanda



**Annex 13      Formato De Recepcao (sample Johanniter)**

## FORMATO DE RECEPÇÃO

Município \_\_\_\_\_ Comuna / Aldeia \_\_\_\_\_

Centro de distribuição: \_\_\_\_\_

Comunidade: \_\_\_\_\_

No. de Famílias: \_\_\_\_\_

Tipo de mercadoria: 'Bens não Alimentares'

Artigos	Quantidade
Sacdo	
Mamoa	
Paripua	
Prata	
Cenouca	
Colhoera	
Carra	
Barras / c. Tampas	
Budo - 100	
Lona - 5x4m	

**Obs:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

ASSINATURA

\_\_\_\_\_

ASSINATURA

\_\_\_\_\_

Data \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

