**Annex 1: Terms of Reference of Evaluation**

##### A. Preface

In order to have clarity in the periods under Evaluation, it is important to point out that the JP on IDPs/Expellees falls in two UNDAF Programme Cycles. The First Phase of the JP covers the period October/November 2004 – May 2006. The Expanded and revised JP on IDPs/expellees signed between the parties on April/May 2006 covers activities undertaken till the present time. Moreover, the JP is also neatly divided into two categories of financing, namely: pooled funding managed by the UNDP as a lead agency to the JP, parallel funding implemented by other participating UN agencies such as UNICEF, UNFPA and UNHCR respectively.

Moreover, there is also a further complexity to the Evaluation. While the overall evaluation will focus on all issues related to all activities financed by Norway, UNDP, UNICEF, Italy, The Netherlands, USAID, we are obliged to single out the evaluation of the EC contribution under the Food Security Project separately (excluding the health facility component). Under the JP we have also treated Food security components financed by UNDP, Norway, EC, UNOCHA under one umbrella, but with separate accountability. It would be full hardy to separate them in the evaluation exercise, to accommodate contractual obligations for bureaucratic reasons, especially when we address the issue of impact and sustainability for the same beneficiaries and living in the same localities. A separate International consultant will be recruited who will be part of the Evaluation Team financed by the EC and selected by UNDP from a list of three short-listed candidates to be provided by EC. This consultant shall conduct an independent evaluation of the EC/UNDP Food Security Project and produce a report, which will be incorporated as a chapter of the overall evaluation report of the Joint Program or annexed to the Main Evaluation Report of the Joint Programme. As indicated earlier, the EC financed international consultant shall be a member of the evaluation team composed of an international consultant who will be a team leader and two other national consultants that will be financed by the UNDP.

We have also tried to resolve the problem of the JP falling under two distinct UNDAF Programme Cycles; namely: UNDAF-2002-2006 and UNDAF 2007-2011. If we are to make Outcome Evaluation, we need to combine the two for this specific JP rather than artificially separate them. It would be futile and unnecessary to have two outcome evaluations for the same JP which has identical objectives and components but overlapping time lines. Since there has been recently a Mid Term Review (MTR) for the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2007-2011 and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2007-2011, covering the period 2007-2009, it may be prudent to wait for a full Evaluation of the Emergency & Recovery Theme after the cycle is completed in 2011. The present CPAP and UNDAF MTRs would serve as an important input to the proposed Evaluation.

Moreover, although Mine Action falls under the thematic area Emergency and Recovery, it is not part of the JP on IDPs/Expellees return resettlement. However, a separate independent evaluation of the Mine Action by an international consultant has been conducted in 2008 and it will serve as an input to the current evaluation.

Last year (03-04 December 2009) a |Mid Term Review and Assessment was conducted for the JP on IDPs/expellees with the participation of all stakeholders including Government counter parts and donors. One of the findings and consensus agreements of the midterm review and assessment was to phase out the JP on IDPs/expellees and replace it by new joint programme focusing on area based development interventions. Based on this agreement UNDP has formulated a Framework for a “Transition and Early Recovery Programme”. The UNDP is in the process of soliciting the views of other UN Agencies if they would be interested and willing to subscribe to the three year Framework (2010-2012) with pooled funding. So far the UNHCR has indicated to be a co-signee and has earmarked funds to that effect. Hence, the O2E is final evaluation of the JP on IDPs/Expellees rather than a Mid Term Evaluation as originally anticipated.

##### Background

The Eritrean-Ethiopian border war (1998 – 2000) and the on going border demarcation stalemate have reversed positive post-independence achievements in Eritrea. Since the end of the border war, the average growth in Gross Domestic Production (GDP), a key factor of poverty reduction, has been low. Internally displaced persons (IDPs) and expellees by and from Ethiopia and returnees, as well as the urban poor, the disabled, pastoralists, female-headed households, orphan and high-risk HIV/AIDS groups have been particularly hard hit. In spite of this reality, the GSE put “IDPs, expellees, returnees and other war-affected and drought-affected are reintegrated and have secure livelihoods and access to basic social services.” as one of its national priorities. In accordance with this national priority, the UN System and the GSE agreed that Emergency/Recovery to be one of the focus areas of the UNDAF. In the UNDAF it has been recognized that recovery needs are largely a result of displacement and thus apply to returnees and refugees, expellees, IDPs, and other war-and drought-affected populations.

The Emergency and Recovery program components (where the JP on IDPs/expellees programme is under this category) address UNDAF goals and aim to support national development goals including the Millennium Development Goals. In order to attain the goal of UNDAF, “By 2009, assist the Government through an integrated multi-sector approach, to ensure that IDPs, expellees, returnees and other war and drought-affected are reintegrated and have secure livelihoods and access to basic services”, the UN System and the GSE work towards achieving a number of CP outcomes, namely:

1. “IDPs, expellees, returnees and host/war affected communities have basic rights fulfilled (shelter, water, sanitation, health, education) as the foundation for human development, with a special focus on HIV/AIDS and gender issues; and
2. IDPs, expellees, returnees and host/war affected communities have increased and diversified livelihood opportunities, and economic reintegration is enabled”.

**Geographic, Social and Economic Context**

Located in the Horn of Africa, Eritrea has an area of approximately 124 thousand square kilometers with an estimated resident population of 3.55 million people. It borders to the east on the red sea, to the west with Ethiopia, to the South with Djibouti and Ethiopia, and with Sudan to the North and North East. It is divided into six administrative regions, and has an arid to semi-arid climate prone to recurrent and severe droughts. Eritrea was liberated in 1991 after a protracted 30-year war and became formally an independent nation two years later following an internationally supervised referendum. The new nation was to start, however, under less than propitious socio-economic conditions. Thirty Years of war coupled with recurrent droughts and the neglect of the previous Ethiopian administration left a severely underdeveloped economy

Massive population displacements were the tragic consequence of both the war of liberation and the border war with Ethiopia. Some 500,000 people fled the country during the war of liberation. Most went to Sudan. At the height of the border war, as many as 1.1 million people, or a third of the population, were driven from their homes into internal displacement. In addition, over 75,000 Eritreans and Ethiopians of Eritrean origin were dispossessed of all property and forcibly deported from Ethiopia..

During the past eight years, substantial rehabilitation and reconstructions of war-damaged infrastructure has taken place throughout the sub regions under government programmes supported by the UNDP and key donors and the World Bank.

With regard to the collaboration with other recovery efforts in the country, during the period 1996 to 2007, UNDP played a leading role and was fully involved in the return/resettlement of internally displaced persons and expellees and have successfully implemented projects worth more than US$ 90 million with the successful settlement of expellees and the return/resettlement of internally displaced persons under its recovery programmes.

Through the UNDP led Recovery Programmes over 20,000 houses were rehabilitated/reconstructed/constructed in war-affected regions of Eritrea. An additional 39 schools were rehabilitated/reconstructed and furnished with teaching materials and 21 health facilities were reconstructed and stocked with medical supplies. Bakeries were opened, markets rebuilt and twenty villages in desperate need of clean water benefited from the construction of 26 boreholes, wells and water pipelines.

The previous Recovery programmes also supplied over 4,729 women with chicks for backyard poultry farming and another 400 women with the materials and training for beekeeping activities. Courses in home economics, weaving, traditional handcraft and construction were offered. Over 6,000 farmers were provided with livestock, seed and fertilizer and in the chaos of the immediate post-war situation, cash-for-work projects aided 125,000 persons.

Moreover the recovery Programme also assisted in the resettlement of over 12,000 rural deportees from Ethiopia through the provision of 3,000 hectares of cleared, ploughed and planted land as well as provided shelter kits, potable water systems, constructed a health facility and constructed make-shift temporary schools.

In late 2004, there were 12,976 HHs (50,853 persons) internally displaced persons (IDPs) in camps/host communities in Gash Barka. In the same period there were also 4,714 HHs (20,354 persons) in camps in Debub. Moreover, there were 1,995 HHs (10,900 persons) in host communities in and around Tessenei and Goluj Sub Zoba in Gash Barka.

In November 2004 a joint programme between GoE and participating UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR and WFP) was signed addressing the return/resettlement needs of 30,000 IDPs and expellees from Adi keshi, Kotobia and Mai Wurai emergency camps. Among the 30,000 IDPs, about 5,054 HHs (18,663 persons) of them were returned to their villages of origin in 2005. In March 2006, the GoE decided to return/resettle all the remaining IDPs/expellees sheltered in camps/host communities in Gash Barka and Debub to their villages of origin or to new resettlements and close all emergency camps in the two regions.

Hence, the First Phase JP needed revision and expansion in content and resources. This resulted in a revised and expanded joint programme which was signed by the GoE and UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR and UNFPA for the recovery-related activities of some 12,633 HHs (52,544 persons) who were in camps/host communities. These IDPs/Expellees consist of 11,000 persons from *Mai Wurai* and *Kotobia* camps, as well as IDPs and Expellees from the emergency camps in Metera, Shambuqo and those in the surroundings of *Tsorona* and *Senaf*e towns. The IDPs/Expellees are to return to some 14 villages of origin or new re-settlement areas over the period of 2006 and 2009. It was then agreed that the IDPs/expellees will be assisted to return/resettle in areas that have been cleared of landmines and unexploded ordnances.

The activities envisaged under this Expanded Joint Programme are the safe and dignified transportation of the IDPs, provision of potable water supply and sanitation facilities, provision of shelter (temporary and permanent), and provision of agricultural inputs and services (seeds, tractor ploughing, farm hand tools, restocking of livestock) and environmental rehabilitation/protection through soil and water conservation interventions, community PV solar systems, fuel saving stoves, and income generating activities(beekeeping development and cash for work safety net programme).. In all interventions priority was given to some of the most vulnerable households specially by women headed households. Moreover, under the parallel programmes were activities related to food aid rations, school feeding, supplementary feeding, school rehabilitation and temporary school construction and supplies, health facilities rehabilitation including health post construction and supplies and promotion of health services at their respective return/resettlement sites, and provision of education equipment/materials.

From 2005-2008 all IDPs/Expellees have been returned/resettled to their communities of origin or new designated resettlement areas successfully and as a result all emergency IDPs/expellees camps have been closed. In accordance with the agreed schedule of activities, 5,079 HHs (2,891 in Gash Barka and 2,188 in Debub) were returned to their communities of origin or resettled in new areas in May/June 2006. Moreover, in June 2007, 5,031 HHs were returned or resettled in Gash Barka and all the remaining 2,526 HHs IDPs/Expellees in camps in Debub have also returned to their original homes or were resettled elsewhere.

This particular evaluation will include the original Joint Program on IDPs/expellees return/resettlement signed in November 2004 and its expanded version which was signed in May 2006. Hence, the evaluation will address interventions conducted in six consecutive years, i.e., from 2004 to 2009.

The JP on return/resettlement IDPs/expellees have been supported by a number of donors including Norway, Netherlands, USAID, UNDP, Italy, EC and UNOCHA and have mobilized USD 46,027,540 and registered an expenditure of USD 45,191,706.62\_from 2004 - 2009.

##### OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

To provide decision makers in the Government of Eritrea and the Donors including the European Union, Norway and UNDP with sufficient information to make an informed judgment about the past performance of the JP on IDPs/Expellees return/resettlement (its efficiency, effectiveness and impact), to document lessons learned and to provide practical recommendations for follow-up action.

1. The Outcome and Outputs Evaluation (O2E) will assess the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the Joint Programme on IDPs/Expellees return/resettlement. It will also address sustainability of the programme from the design and implementation vantage point.
2. The 02E shall include an assessment of the programme/project management capacity and structure of the relevant regional administrations.

# OTHER MATTERS TO CONSIDER DURING THE O2E

1. Not limiting the above, the evaluation of the JP will also:
	1. Assess the accomplishments of the various components of the programme by reference to the stated programme objectives and targets;
	2. Review progress and mid term review and assessment(participated by all stakeholders) reports that have been prepared by the Recovery Unit– what are the main constraints, challenges identified and proposed actions;
	3. Review the work planning processes: adequacy of annual work plans to guide programme implementation; whether such work plan was being discussed and agreed among the key partners in implementation (Regional Administrations of GB, Debub and SRS, UNDP);
	4. Assess and review independently prepared project appraisal and result oriented mission(RoM) reports by independent consultants employed by Norway and EC respectively.
	5. Review and assess the programme implementation arrangement, donor coordination, and monitoring and evaluation modalities of the programme.
	6. Compare and assess the pro and cons of the UNDP Direct Execution (DEX) verses National Execution (NEX) implementation modality, in the context of Eritrea.
	7. Identify the staff recruited for the programme, their expertise, and roles pertaining to capacity building of the implementing partners/ institutions;
	8. Identify major institutional, financial and operational issues that have assisted and/ or constrained effective implementation of the Joint Programme.
2. The evaluation team shall identify strengths and weaknesses of the Emergency and Recovery programmes in the light of relevant International Standards and best practice in the sector, as well as the particular circumstances of the country. The evaluation team will make recommendations for improvement, future transition and early recovery programme support, co-ordination, implementation and policies in Eritrea.

# OUTPUTS

1. The output of the evaluation will be a report (to be provided in hard copy as well as electronic format) that provides findings, identifies lessons learned in the JP supporting the Return/resettlement of IDPs/Expellees ( emergency and recovery programme )on the basis of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability, and presents recommendations.

# SCOPE OF WORK

# Relevance

1. Are the stated outcomes and outputs of the JP supporting the Return/resettlement of IDPs/Expellees( Emergency and Recovery programme) as developed, revised and implemented during the period 2004-2009:
	* Appropriate considering the particular needs and priorities of Eritrea;
	* Design of the joint program; including diagnostic assessment of conditions on the ground, identification & understanding of target populations’ needs and prioritized concerns, problem identification and analysis as well as identification of stakeholders/actors;
	* Approaches and methodologies employed by the joint program;
	* In keeping with international standards, trends, and guidelines including relevant UN and Government policies?
2. Considering the country context what needs to be done and/or changed to ensure continued relevance of supports addressing the Emergency and Recovery needs within the country?
3. **Efficiency**
4. Given the circumstances in which the Programme was developed and implemented, were there better options for achieving the stated outcomes and outputs? To what degree have the stated outcomes and outputs of the Joint Programme been realized?
5. To what extent have the UNDP Recovery Unit been able to develop the capacity of their counterparts in accordance with the agreed Annual Work Plans? Where capacity was not developed what were the reasons? What actions should be taken by all parties to ensure that regional capacity is developed?
6. Have the resources of the JP pooled funding been managed in accordance with UNDP financial regulations, rules, policies and procedures that apply to such programmes including such things as ensuring that appropriate processes are in place for such matters as: procurement processes, logistical management of equipment and other assets?
7. Have the resources of the JP been managed in compliance with UNDP and donor agreements? And have relevant reports been presented to donors and national partners consistently?
8. What structures have been put in place within the executing agency (UNDP), implementing partners (Regional Administrations) to support the national execution modality (NEX) of the JP pooled-funding? What are the lessons learnt for future national execution programmes?
9. Have the resources of the JP Pooled-Funding been managed in such a way as to meet the requirements of the implementing partners/ institutions?
10. **Effectiveness**
11. To what extent was the JP programme on IDPs/Expellees and Host communities considered to be part of the Eritrean Government response to recovery, reconstruction and development needs in the country? Were the structures established by the Government appropriate, in the circumstances, to support the programme? Include lessons learned.
12. To what extents have the planned outputs of the JP been delivered? What contributed to/ inhibited delivery?
13. How are interventions and the outputs of the various components of the joint program and their contributions in the efforts to respond to humanitarian crisis in the country perceived by key stakeholders?
14. To what extent was capacity building for implementing partners considered part of the UNDP CO response to recovery, reconstruction, and development in the country? Where appropriate structures put in place by UNDP CO to support the recovery programmes in Eritrea?
15. In considering the above two questions, consider whether the structures were:
	* Appropriate;
	* Adequate - sufficiently supported (i.e. resourced and staffed) by the Government to implement their mandates;
	* Effective.
16. What major policy changes and discussions, relating to recovery programmes, have been taken at the National level and how have these affected the JP; how has the UNDP RU responded?
17. Have the responses of the JP PF to the events, in the emergency and recovery sector in Eritrea, been timely, appropriate? What could have been done differently?
18. **Impact and Sustainability**
19. Identify and assess effects and immediate impacts of the joint program on the target communities
20. Has the JP been designed in such a way as to facilitate sustainability? Has implementation been attentive to sustainability considerations?
21. Do the implementing partners/ institutions have the required skills to continue with emergency and recovery activities in accordance with accepted international norms and standards?
22. Is there a National strategy in place to ensure long-term sustainability of recovery programmes in Eritrea including budget support out of national resources? What steps should be taken by all partners to ensure management and financial sustainability?
23. **Accountability**
24. Have JP PF resources been managed by concerned parties in accordance with relevant agreements and procedures?

###### METHODOLOGY

1. The O2E should be participatory involving key stakeholders. In order to achieve a thorough understanding of the Joint Programme and the context, the evaluation review team is expected to employ such participatory techniques as they deem necessary not excluding:
* Comprehensive **document review** **and analysis** of all emergency and recovery related documents;
* **Interviews** and participatory meetings with Government (Regional Administrations, UN Agencies and donor officials; and the UNDP RU staff.
* Visit to project sites and conduct participatory meetings with direct beneficiaries of the joint program.
	1. **COMPOSITION OF EVALUATION TEAM**
1. The evaluation team will be composed of three (3) members including an international consultant as team leader and two national consultants.
2. The evaluation team will have expertise in the evaluation of operational and structural management arrangements for emergency and recovery programmes.
3. The evaluation team will have expertise in the following areas:
	* Evaluation of humanitarian and development activities particularly emergency and recovery;
	* Various types of support within recovery (shelter, input to agriculture, water, soil and water conservation, strengthening of capacity of implementing agencies, enhancement of the environment – Fuel Saving Mogogo (stoves), and transportation of IDPs/Expellees);
	* Planning and implementation of Projects/programmes within the emergency, recovery, rehabilitation, reintegration context;
	* Strategic planning, institutional development and management as well as familiarity with both relevant Government and UNDP policies and guidelines.
4. The evaluation team will be composed of the following :
	* Evaluation team leader with extensive professional experience in the areas of humanitarian and development particularly skilled in holistic analyses of contexts and evaluation of post war emergency, recovery, rehabilitation & reintegration;
	* An international consultant who will be part of the evaluation team to be financed by the EC and selected by UNDP from a list of three candidates to be provided by the EC. This consultant shall have a professional background in livelihoods security in general and food security in particular in a context of post war rehabilitation and reintegration;
	* A national consultant with a professional background in gender and socio-economic studies
	* A national consultant with a professional background in livelihoods and natural resource management
5. Familiarity with current situation in Eritrea would be an asset.

# H. WORK PLAN

1. The evaluation will take place over a period of 4 (four) weeks (20 working days for each consultant). The EC financed International Consultant may have a different schedule as the need arises.

**40. Proposed Schedule**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Activity** | **Timing** |
| **May/June 2010** | **June 2010** |
| **Week 1** | **Week 2** | **Week 3** | **Week 4** |
| **31** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **14** | **15** | **16** | **17** | **18** | **21** | **22** | **23** | **24** | **25** |
| **1** | **Review & analyze relevant documents**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2** | **Field Visits (Debub and Gash Barka);****Consult Govt., UNDP, Donors, UNDP RU Staff** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3** | **Prepare first draft report** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4** | **Presentation of findings & synthesis to Govt., donors & UNDP** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5** | **Incorporate Govt., donor, UNDP views after the presentation & produce final report** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6** | **Submit final report** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |