

List of Persons Interviewed and Sites Visited during the Evaluation Mission

Martin Ede (ME).

Bernd Schrikkema (BS).

Juan Luis Domínguez (JLD).

Abbreviations of experts's names are in brackets after every meeting attended or interview performed by one of them. When no abbreviations are shown, all experts were present.

- **09 January 2001.**-Briefing at Brussels ECHO HQ's. Attended: ECHO-Evaluation Jacqueline Coëffard, Esteban Díaz-Marquina and Andrés Felices-Sánchez, ECHO-3 Valeria Forlani and José Ignacio Alvarez-Gortari, DG-RELEX Victoria Gil and José González, PROLOG Mr. van Bruener, Evaluation Team Members BS, ME and JLD.

- **17-18 January 2001.**- Arrival in *Managua* of JLD. Meeting with EC head Delegation Giorgio Mamberto (JLD). Meeting with Member States (Denmark, Austria, Spain, Sweden, and France), and EC delegation, ECHO experts in Managua, and ECHO expert in Honduras (JLD). Meeting with PRRAC ("*Programa para Reconstrucción Regional de América Central*") (JLD). Arrival in *Managua* of ME. Meeting with INGO's (AC SUR Las Segovias, GVC-I, SI-E, ACH-E, AGRO Acción Alemania, MOVIMONDO/MOLISV-I, MDM-E, CESVI-I, Terre des Hommes-I, CEPS-HELP, MPDL-E, MSF), and ECHO experts (JLD & ME). Arrival in *Managua* of BS.

- **19 January 2001.**- Meeting with Secretaría Ejecutiva of the "*Sistema Nacional para la Prevención, Mitigación y Atención de Desastres*" in Nicaragua. Also present ECHO expert (ME & JLD). Meeting with MINSAs Director of vector-transmitted diseases and ECHO expert (JLD). Visit to ENACAL together with SI and ACH (BS & ME). Interview to ECHO expert Maria Luisa Troncoso (JLD).

- **20 January 2001.**- Briefing on *El Salvador*. Trip to *San Salvador*. Meeting with EC financed project representatives and responsible of the "*Célula de Reacción Rápida*" in *El Salvador* Yves Lennaarts and Mark Vanderlinden.

- **21 January 2001.**- Meeting with COEN. Meeting national and international NGO's (CRD, ASDI, Programa Ref./VE, CISP, CRIC, OIM, Atlas Logística, MDMF, MDMF Emergencias, IIZ-OED-Horizonte 3.000, CARE-F, Funsalprodes, UNES, MDME, Terre des Hommes-I, Fundación CODESPA-E, ACH-F, CRF, CRA, MPDL-E, PTM-E, EU San Vicente Productivo, Plan Internacional, Fundación REDES, PROLOGUE, Fundación CORDES, MSF, CRE, Programa DRI-PTT-UE, Fundación Segundo Montes, OITT, ASDEC El Salvador, FUNDAES, ACSUR Las Segovias, FUNDESA, GVC-I, Ayuda en Acción, OIKOS Solidaridad -38 NGO's: 27 international, 11 local). Departure to *San Vicente*. Stop at *Tecoluca*. Meeting with FMLN mayor. Meeting with Dept. Governor.

- **22 January 2001.**- Meeting between the Salvadoran Government and the international community (JLD). Meeting with COED *San Ildefonso* and *Zacatecoluca* mayors, *Rio Frío* region (BS & ME).

- **23 January 2001.**- Trip to *El Puente*, *San Lorenzo* canton. Meeting with *Apaneca* and *Ataco* mayors. Visit to MINSAs COED.

- **24 January 2001.**- Meeting with CARE (ME). Debriefing meeting with EC Delegate. Meeting with ICRC (BS & ME). Debriefing meeting with national and international NGO's. Meeting with FMLN parliamentary deputies (JLD).

- **25 January 2001.**- Flight to *Guatemala city*. 0945.- Meeting at the EC delegation with EC representatives and Food Security DGVIII. Meeting with CONRED (*Coordinadora Nacional para la Reducción de Desastres*). Meeting with Member States at the Swedish ambassador's residence (Italy, GB, Spain, Germany, France, and Sweden). Meeting with INGO's at EC office (ACH-E, CISP-I, COOPI-I, MOVIMONDO, MDME, MSF-CH, and PTM-E). Also attended EC.

- **26 January 2001.**- Departure to *Alta Verapaz* region with representatives of PTM, COOPI, CISP, and MDME. Meeting with MOVIMONDO workers, "*Promotores de Salud*" and hospital staff in "*La Tinta*" hospital (JLD). Arrived in *Panzós*. Project visit mini aquaduct in *Jolomix*, *Panzós* (ME & BS). Meeting with MDME former staff (JLD). Meeting with COOPI / MOVIMONDO / PTM / MDME representatives for interview.

- **27 January 2001.**- Trip to *El Estor*. Visit to *Nueva Concepción*, municipality of *Sonahú*. Interview to PTM community workers (JLD). Meeting with local NGO IDEAS (*Investigación para el Desarrollo, Educación, Agua y Saneamiento*) (JLD). Visits to *Salac*, and *Senimbla*. Interview COOPI and MOVIMONDO, (BS & ME). Trip back to *Guatemala city*. Interview with CISP, ACH and MSF-CH.

- **28 January 2001.**- Flight from *Guatemala city* to *San Pedro Sula*, Honduras.

- **29 January 2001.**- Visit to TROCAIRE projects in *El Progreso* (ME & JLD). Visit to the community "*Flores de Mayo*" (ME & JLD). Visit to "*La 29*" community (ME & JLD). Meeting with AHJASA (Asociación Hondureña de Juntas Administrativas de Agua) and AJASAPRO (ME & JLD). Return to *San Pedro de Sula*. Trip to *Tocoa* by car (BS).

- **30 January 2001.**- Flight to *La Ceiba* (ME & JLD). Visit to COOPI in *Sonaguera*. Meeting at *Sonaguera* Town Hall with authorities and COOPI workers. Interview to *Área de Salud n° 4* (JLD). Meeting with community women in "*Río de Piedra*" (JLD). *Colegio Ilanga*, Departament *Colón* (ME & BS)). Visiting a VIP latrine in the community of *Planes* (ME & BS). Meeting at COOPI office with COOPI local staff in *Saba* (JLD). Arrived in *Tocoa*. Met with head of health Area (JLD). Visit to "*Guaramón Morales*", and "*3 de Abril*" communities (ME & BS).

- **31 January 2001.**- Interview to CISP representative (ME & BS). Trip by plane to *Tegucigalpa* from *La Ceiba* (BS & ME). Trip by car to *Tegucigalpa* (JLD).

- **01 February 2001.**- Meeting with Member States at the CE representation in *Tegucigalpa* (France, Germany (GTZ), Italy, Spain, Sweden, EC representative and ECHO expert. Meeting with PRRAC representative. Visit to ANNF project site (BS & JLD).

- **02 February 2001.**- Meeting with INGO's at the EC delegation (GOAL-GB, CRE, CINS, ADRA, CRA, ATLAS, MPDL, OIKOS, PCA-D, CISP-I, Caritas-E, TROCAIRE-I, SI, ASB, Malteser, MOVIMONDO, CISS, ANNF, COOPI, Handicap International, ACH, OXFAM-GB, OXFAM-B / Intermon / Novib-N, OIM, NF, and PTM), EC representative, ECHO expert. Meeting with APP, MINS and SANAA (BS & ME).

- **03 February 2001.**- Project visit to *Catacamas*, *Olancho* dept., to see ASB health project. Met with *Región de Salud n° 7* and former ASB coordinator (JLD). Project visit to "*Las Minas*", *Juticalpa*, and "*La Puerta*", *Olancho* (ME & BS).

- **04 February 2001.**- Meeting with MOVIMONDO staff..

- **05 February 2001.**- Left *Tegucigalpa*. Car trip to *Cholutega* to visit MALTESER project, and OIKOS (JLD). Project visit to ACH project in "*Jícara Bonito*" (BS & ME) and "*Colonia Cumbre*". Arrival in Nicaragua. Visit to SI project in *Santa Eudalia* (ME & BS).

- **06 February 2001.**- Project visit to ACSUR Las Segovias in "*La Tejana*", *Chinandega* (BS & ME). Visit to the municipality of *Villanueva*. Interview with health centre's staff and AMI counterparts. Visit to health Post "*El Pijuel*". Project visit to ACSUR Las Segovias. Visit to health centres "*Oscar Arnulfo Romero*", and "*Roberto Cortés*" in *Chinandega*.

- **07 February 2001.**- Project visit to CRE "*El Bosque*" resettlement, and "*La Virgen*". Visit with MOVIMONDO to *Posoltega*. Visit to "*Tecuaname*" community. Meeting with health post staff and community members. Meeting at MINSA *Managua* (JLD).

- **08 February 2001.**- Trip to *Pto. Cabezas* with GCV and MINSA Epidemiology general director (JLD). Meeting at MINSA (JLD). Road trip to *Waspam*. Meeting at the MINSA *Waspam* (JLD). Meeting with CEPS representative and *Área de Salud* vice-director (BS & ME). Visited "*San Rafael del Norte*". Met with Dr Harald Mossbrucker – PRASNIC – *Matagalpa* HELP/CEPS (BS & ME). Visit to "*San Francisco de Loma Azul*", *San Rafael* municipality, Dept. *Jinotega* (BS & ME).

- **09 February 2001.**- Trip from *Waspam* to *Pto. Lempira*, *Honduras*. Meeting with Health Region authorities (JLD). Visit to ACH "*Nueva Esperanza*" in *La Sabana* (latrines) (BS & ME). Visit to *Palacaguina* in *Las Sabanas* municipality. Visit to *Madriz*, *Ducuali*, and *Olivas* with ACH (BS & ME).

- **10 February 2001.**- Road trip to *Lisagnipura*, next to *Tipimuna* and *Tipilalma*. Meeting at the health post with health staff. Back to *Pto. Cabezas* (JLD). Meeting with the GCV team (JLD). Visit to AGRO ACTION-G "*San Luis*" schools in *Las Canarias*, in *Esteli* municipality. Visit to a rehabilitated drinking water system in *Ojochal* (school, well and latrines) also AGRO ACTION-G. Visit to "*Jocote Renco*", a resettled community (schools, well, latrines). Interview to AGRO ACTION-G Jurgen Schmitz. Visit to an AGRO ACTION-G water project in *Estelí*.

- **11-12 February 2001.**- Road trip (BS & ME) and flight (JLD) back to *Managua*. Meeting with the head of the EC delegation, with ECHO experts. Interview to CE Delegation staff in charge of co-financing B7/6.000 line (JLD). Meeting with CEPS (ME).

- **13 February 2001.**- Meeting with Members States (Italy, GB, France, Finland, Austria, Denmark and Sweden), with CE counsellor and ECHO experts. Interview with DIPECHO expert Luciano Colombara (JLD). Meeting with Food Security DGVIII (JLD).

- **15-19 February 2001.**- Meeting with USAID in *Managua* (ME). Interview World Bank (ME). Interview to ECHO assistant (JLD). Meeting with MINSA Director of Epidemiology (JLD).

- **20 February 2001.**- Departure from *Managua*.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HUMANITARIAN AID OFFICE (ECHO)

TERMS OF REFERENCE
FOR THE EVALUATION OF ECHO'S AID TO THE VICTIMS OF HURRICANE
MITCH

ECHO/EVA/210/2000/01005

Name of consultant: Mr. Juan Luis DOMINGUEZ GONZALEZ

1. GLOBAL PLAN TO BE EVALUATED

- Region and countries : Central America (Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador)
- Period covered: November 1998 - August 2000
- Sectors to be evaluated: Health.
- Decisions:
 - ECHO/TPS/210/1998/12000 for an amount of 6.8 Mio €in 1998.
 - ECHO/TPS/210/1998/15000 for an amount of 9.5 Mio €in 1998.
 - ECHO/TPS/210/1999/06000 for an amount of 16 Mio €in 1999.

2. INTRODUCTION

Hurricane Mitch, which struck Central America between 26 October and 1 November 1998, is considered one of the most powerful and damaging tropical storms ever experienced in the region. It caused the death or disappearance of near 20,000 people. Material damages were estimated at 5,360 million USD, equal to 10% of the region's GDP.

The international community confirmed in December 1998, its intentions to intervene by committing funds in the form of direct aid. A large proportion of these funds was allocated to Honduras and Nicaragua, the most affected countries.

In terms of humanitarian aid the Commission adopted, on 4 November 1998, a relief programme amounting to 6.8 million €. This aid package contained food parcels, emergency relief items and medical support. This first contingency plan was implemented by several humanitarian organisations, which were already implementing ECHO projects in the region. All these actions were designed as a direct support to National Emergency Contingency Plans.

Afterwards, and on the basis of an initial assessment, the Commission adopted on 21 December a decision for a further package of humanitarian aid worth 9.5 million €. This second aid package enabled the humanitarian organisations to continue to provide support to the victims in the following areas of intervention: health, water and basic sanitation and temporary shelter. This emergency aid included a rehabilitation

component in view of preparing the transition towards more structured rehabilitation and economic reconstruction aid from other budget sources.

In October 1999 the Commission adopted a global humanitarian aid plan of 16 million € in favour of the most vulnerable victims in Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala and El Salvador. The main sectors of intervention were: health, water and sanitation and private housing rehabilitation.

Before, in April 1999, the Commission presented a proposal to the Council and to the European Parliament for a Community Action Plan for the Reconstruction of Central America worth 250 million € to be implemented over the following four years. This plan is to guarantee the link between the emergency stage (responsibility of ECHO) and the rehabilitation stage. The key component of this Plan is the PRRAC, Regional Programme for the Reconstruction of Central America. The overall objective of this programme is to help rehabilitate and improve infrastructure, facilities and the administration of education and public health services in the areas hit hardest by the hurricane.

The PRRAC should be compatible with the recipient countries national plans and be properly co-ordinated with the contributions of the Member States and other major donors. ECHO's funded actions must be also compatible with the PRRAC.

3. 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 three 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 Spanish and English languages is obligatory.

The team members are each responsible for the following sectors:

Mr. Dominguez Gonzalez, team leader

- synthesis report
- health sector

Mr. Ede

- water and sanitation sector

Mr. Schrikkema

- rehabilitation sector
- linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD) question

4. PURPOSE OF THE GLOBAL EVALUATION

The main purposes of this evaluation are set out under points 4.1 to 4.6 below:

- 4.1. to assess the suitability of the Global Plans in favour of the victims of Hurricane Mitch, and the level at which the programmes in the water and sanitation, health and rehabilitation sectors have been implemented;
- 4.2. to quantify the impact of the Global Plans in terms of outputs;
- 4.3. to assess the degree to which the objectives pursued have been achieved and the effectiveness of the means employed;
- 4.4. to analyse ECHO's role in the decision-making process as well as in other activities for which Commission services are responsible;
- 4.5. to analyse the link between emergency, rehabilitation and development and the link between strictly humanitarian and DIPECHO actions in the region.
- 4.6. to establish precise, concrete and realistic proposals on:
 - a possible ECHO "exit strategy" from the region;
 - the future of ECHO's funding by sector and activities where ECHO's aid be still deemed necessary;
 - possible ECHO actions to be handed over to other PRRAC instruments.

5. SPECIFIC EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

To this end, the consultant will develop the issues below for **his own sectors (defined in chapter 3)**, and cover all points in his evaluation reports. He 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.

- 5.1. A brief description of the Global Plans and analysis of their context:
 - the political and social-economic situation, the humanitarian needs and, where existing, any local capacities available to respond to local needs;
 - information on the various economic sectors such as social and economic policies in force, the levels of income and its distribution among the population, sanitation and medical policies, access to foodstuffs, etc;
 - identify vulnerable groups and localise them, as well as give 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;

- an analysis by sector of the limiting factors for ECHO interventions should also be included.
- 5.2. Analysis of the **impact** of the Global Plans. This analysis should be based on the following non-exclusive list of indicators:
- 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;
 - effect on the preparation, mitigation and prevention of catastrophes.
- 5.3. Analysis of the **relevance** of the objectives of the Global Plans, of the choice of the beneficiaries, and of the deployed strategy, in relation to identified needs;
- 5.4. Examination of the **co-ordination** and **coherence** for each of the sectors concerned with:
- 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 Plans;. The projects identified should be described with their cost and with the aid elements they include;
- 5.5. Analysis of the **effectiveness** of the Global Plans in quantitative and qualitative terms for each of the sectors;
- 5.6. Analysis of the **cost-effectiveness** of the Global Plans. The cost-effectiveness has to be established, notably, on the basis of the quantitative elements that have been identified under point 5.5;
- 5.7. Analysis of the **efficiency** of the implementation of the Global Plans. This analysis should cover:
- the planning and mobilisation of aid;
 - the operational capacities of the partners: 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 strategies deployed;
 - the systems of control and auto-evaluation set up by the partners.
- 5.8. Analysis of the **viability** of the Global Plans, and notably of the feasibility of setting up development and/or co-operation policies which could eventually replace humanitarian aid as provided to date;
- 5.9. Concise analysis of the **visibility** of ECHO;
- 5.10. Concise analysis of the integration of “**gender issues**” (social, economic and cultural analysis of the situation of both women and men) in the intervention;
- 5.11. 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 be financed by the European Community. These recommendations may also cover, if necessary, other domains than humanitarian aid, such as development co-operation and specifically those included in the PRRAC;
- 5.12. Analysis of the **methodology of programme planning** used by ECHO for the global plans should be included in the synthesis report;
- 5.13. 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.

6. 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 Delegations, ECHO partners on the spot and at their headquarters, 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.

7. TIMETABLE

The evaluation will last **54 days**, beginning with the date of signature of the contract by the last party and ending no later than **31/03/2001** with the acceptance of the final reports.

8. PHASES OF THE EVALUATION

- 8.1. 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 consultant 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;

- 8.2. The **mission to the area concerned** will last 28 days. The consultant must work with the Commission Delegation in Managua, the 3 ECHO correspondents in Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, the ECHO partners, local authorities, international organisations and other donors;
- 8.3. A **briefing with the Commission delegation** in Managua (Nicaragua);
- 8.4. The consultant should devote the **first day of his mission** in each country to preliminary and preparatory discussions with the correspondent and local ECHO partners;
- 8.5. The **last day of the mission** in each country should be devoted to a discussion with the correspondent and ECHO partners for observations arising from the evaluation. The team will discuss the layout and the content of the synthesis report;
- 8.6. The **draft report** should be submitted by electronic transmission (Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) to ECHO "Evaluation" in Brussels at least ten days before its presentation and discussion during the debriefing;
- 8.7. A **debriefing** at ECHO of 2 days. 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 amending his draft report;
- 8.8. Once the necessary amendments to the draft report have been incorporated, the **revised text** will be resubmitted to **ECHO "Evaluation"**, which should mark its agreement within 15 days or request further amendments;
- 8.9. Submission of the **final report** which should take account of any remarks, which may be made after the submission of the revised report.

9. REPORT

- 9.1. The evaluation will result in the drawing up of 4 reports (1 by sector and 1 synthesis report) written in English, of a maximum length of 15 pages including the summary which should appear at the beginning of the report.
- 9.2. 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:

9.2.1. Cover page

- Report number, to be given at the debriefing, at the right top (minimum font 36);
- title of the evaluation report:

- “Central America. Hurricane Mitch, Global Plans 1998 and 1999, health sector-2000.”;
- “Central America. Hurricane Mitch, Global Plans 1998 and 1999, water & sanitation sector-2000.”;
- “Central America. Hurricane Mitch, Global Plans 1998 and 1999, rehabilitation sector-2000.”;
- “Central America. Hurricane Mitch, Global Plans 1998 and 1999, synthesis report -2000.”;
- 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.

9.2.2. Table of contents

9.2.3. Summary (see form in annex)

The evaluation summary which 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)

9.2.4. 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).

9.2.5. 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.

- 9.3. If the report contains confidential information obtained from parties other than Commission services, this information is to be presented as a separate annex.
- 9.4. The report must be written in a clear, concise and non-academic language.
- 9.5. Each report shall be drawn up in 20 copies and delivered to ECHO.
- 9.6. 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 ECHO'S AID TO THE VICTIMS OF HURRICANE MITCH

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

SUMMARY FRAMEWORK ANNEX

<p>Relevance <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>Co-ordination, coherence et complementarity <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>Effectiveness <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>

<i>Efficiency (Economic quality of the transformation of means into results and achievements)</i>
<u>Partner's operational management / organisation & 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 ? ...
<i>Impact & strategic implications (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 & viability</u> Perspectives for the future ? Emergency, protracted crisis, rehabilitation ? Opportunity to initiate development operations ? Respect of the Madrid Declaration principles ?
<i>Visibility (Means of communicating about ECHO's presence and actions)</i>
Means used ? Visibility » achieved ?
<i>Horizontal issues (...)</i>
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 :
RECOMMENDATIONS (+/- 20 lines)
LESSONS LEARNED (+/- 10 lines)

