



**UNITED NATIONS
CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND**

**FONDS D'EQUIPEMENT
DES NATIONS UNIES**

INDEPENDENT FINAL EVALUATION ANSEBA LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

ERITREA

ERI/01/C01 (UNCDF)/ ERI/01/013/A/01/99 (UNDP)

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Financial Breakdown (by donor)

UNCDF	1,980,036 USD
UNDP	894,349 USD
BSF	3,822,552 USD
Government	<u>200,000 USD</u>
	6,896,937 USD

Executing Agency: Eritrea Ministry of National Development
(previously Ministry of Local Government)
Implementing Agency: Zoba Anseba (NEX)
Approval Date of project: 15/10/2001
Project Duration: 5 years
Evaluation Date: Q3 2009

Composition of Evaluation Team:

Team Leader:	Kevin Curnow
Team Member - international:	Richard Chiwara
Team Member – national:	Yohannes Debretsion
Team Member – national:	Dawit Ghebrehwet Kassa

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ALDF	Anseba Local Development Fund
ALDP	Anseba Local Development Project
ARR	Assistant Resident Representative
Baito	The Regional Assembly Elected by the People (Regional Council)
BSF	Belgian Survival Fund
BTOR	Back to Office Report
CNA	Capacity Needs Assessment
CO	Country Office (of UNDP)
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DRR	Deputy Resident Representative
FE	Final Evaluation
FR	Financial Regulations 1994
GoSE	Government of State of Eritrea
ICT	Information Communication Technologies
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IPF	Indicative Planning Figures
IPRSP	Interim Poverty Reduction Support Paper
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
Kebabi	Collection of villages (administrative division of a sub-zoba)
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LDF	Local Development Fund
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MCs	Minimum Conditions
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MIS	Management Information System
MND	Ministry of National Development
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
MoPW	Ministry of Public Works
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NSC	National Steering Committee
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PCP	Project Concept Paper
PEM	Public Expenditure Management
PERA	Proclamation for the Establishment of Regional Administrations
PIM	Project Identification Mission
PMs	Performance Measures
PO	Programme Officer (of UNCDF)
POP	Project Operation Plan
PST	Project Support Team
RAOM	Regional Administration Operational Manual
RCBP	Regional Capacity Building Plan
RDPs	Regional Development Plans
STA	Senior Technical Advisor
Sub-Zoba	Sub-region (Administrative Division) of Zoba
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers (Trainers of Trainers)
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
Zoba	Regional Administrative Unit of Eritrea

CONTENTS

1.0 Executive Summary	4
2.0 Purpose of Evaluation	7
3.0 FE Methodology & Approach	8
4.0 Background	8
4.1. The National and Policy Context	8
4.2 The Institutional Context	10
4.3 Anseba Region	10
4.4 ALDP Rationale	11
4.5 ALDP Design.....	12
5.0 Results Analysis	14
5.1 Anseba Log frame Analysis.....	14
5.1.1 Medium Term Evaluation Recommendations.....	15
5.1.2 – Output 1 - A participatory and transparent planning system is established that ensures the identification and design of locally prioritised pro-poor projects.....	15
5.1.3 – Output 2 - Access to and management of financial resources for funding development plans by local government units in Anseba is improved	17
5.1.4 – Output 3 - Regional and local capacity to deliver, operate and maintain projects efficiently is strengthened	19
5.1.5 – Output 4 - The Anseba planning process, styles of programming and project design, and policy issues arising from this experience inform national policy.....	20
5.1.6 – Output 5 - Natural Resource Management (from 2005 ALDP Annual Work Plan)	22
6.0 Key Evaluation Questions.....	26
6.1 Results Achievement	26
6.2 Sustainability of Results	29
6.3 Factors Affecting Successful Implementation and Results Achievement	31
6.4 External Factors	31
6.5 Programme Related Factors.....	31
6.6 Strategic Positioning and Partnerships	34
6.7 Future UNCDF role.....	34
7.0 Capacity Building	35
8.0 Lessons Learned	35
9.0 Recommendations.....	37
Annex 1 – Terms of Reference	38
Annex 2 – Documents Reviewed.....	53
Annex 3 – Stakeholders Interviewed.....	56
Annex 4 – List of projects visited and results.....	62
Annex 5 – Anseba Log frame Analysis – Development Objective, Immediate Objective & Outputs...	63
Annex 6 – Matrix of Outputs, Activities and results.....	67
Annex 7 – Matrix of MTE Recommendations and Implementation Status	72
Annex 8 – Community Investment Analysis	73
Annex 9 - Basic performance statistics for the 2 ALDP health stations.....	74

1.0 Executive Summary

Overview

The Anseba Local Development Project (ALDP) was a five-year programme approved in October 2001, and whose implementation commenced in April 2002. The programme is co-funded by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), Belgium Survival Fund (BSF), and the Government of State of Eritrea (GoSE). The objective of the Final Evaluation (FE) of the programme, conducted in September and October 2009 was:

- (a) To assist the recipient Government, beneficiaries, and the concerned co-financing partners, to understand the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact of the programme, the sustainability of programme results, the level of satisfaction of programme stakeholders and beneficiaries with the results, and whether UNCDF was effectively positioned and partnered to achieve maximum impact;
- (b) To contribute to UNCDF and partners' learning from programme experience;
- (c) To help programme stakeholders assess the value and opportunity for broader replication of the programme;
- (d) To help programme stakeholders determine the need for follow-up on the intervention, and general direction for the future course;
- (e) To ensure accountability for results to the programme's financial backers, stakeholders and beneficiaries; and
- (f) Comply with the requirement of the programme document/funding agreement and UNCDF Evaluation Policy.

Achievements and Challenges

The FE identified achievements of the project are:

- The level of engagement achieved at the zoba, sub-zoba and kebab levels of sub-national government was outstanding in its clarity, transparency and relevance to the promotion of community-lead planning and implementation. This is evidenced by the substantial roles played by the various levels of sub-national government in technically supervising micro-project implementation; engaging in the development and adoption of the Regional Administration Operational Manual; and the leadership roles of the various officials in mobilising community support and interaction.
- The programme was able to develop a replicable and sustainable model of community engagement in the planning, budgeting, budget execution and reporting processes within the regional processes that is capable of being the point of reference for future engagement.
- Communities in Eritrea have demonstrated clearly through this project that they are capable and enthusiastically willing to engage in the processes of government, not just from a planning perspective but also from the implementation perspective. This has been evidenced by the large numbers of community members engaged in project identification and prioritisation in a cooperative and united process and the direct implementation by communities in terms of planning and labour provided.
- Prioritisation and implementation of projects by communities has been demonstrated as the most effective method of directly addressing the needs of the people, as well as being the most cost effective and sustainable approach. A independent assessment by consulting engineers commissioned by the project of the value for money achieved demonstrated that communities were able to implement projects at a very substantial cost saving (in excess of 52%) when

compared to contractors, without any sacrifice in terms of implementation quality.

- With respect to the 82 physical outputs of the project (schools, dams etc), this project has demonstrated that it is possible to attain operational and maintenance sustainability through a focussed and determined engagement of the communities. Communities are continuing to voluntarily post-project mobilise their own financial and physical resources to maintain the physical outputs as they are clearly owned by the communities and they highly value the outputs and the uses to which they are put.
- For modest investment, this project identifies that it is possible to achieve substantial gains in terms of food security. Of the 82 physical outputs, over 40 of them were aimed at food security related matters, for a total investment of 14.9 million Nakfa (US\$986,000) which achieved 18 micro-dams or ponds; 6 livestock and one vegetable markets; three river diversions for small scale irrigation developments; and 12 Gabions, resulting in an annual increase of available food supply by 3 months.

The FE identified challenges of the project were:

- The linkages between these national planning, budget and budget execution processes at a national and local level have remained unarticulated and has left a substantive policy vacuum that has yet to be filled.
- The overall decentralisation policy and enabling environment in Eritrea has yet to be developed to the stage where there is a clear and articulated decentralisation policy, supported by a strategic framework and an implementation plan.

Relevance of project and quality of design to meet intended objectives

The project was relevant to the overall decentralisation processes in Eritrea. The project design met all of the expected international norms and was well suited to the prevailing circumstances in Eritrea and in achieving the intended objectives. No changes in project design were needed throughout the life of the project, with the exception of the need to reconsider the relevance of some indicators given the long project life and the need to be able to respond to changing implementation circumstances.

Efficiency of project efforts to achieve completed activities

Project efforts were within acceptable efficiency limits, although some project efforts could have been more directed and focussed to complete activities at an earlier time so as to enable greater engagement with the GoSE and other donors in terms of expanding the applicability of the project results to other regions and acceptability at a national level.

Effectiveness of project output level in supporting changes in systems, processes, behaviour on the part of beneficiaries

ALDP effectively demonstrated that the engagement at a community level with respect to community lead identification of locally prioritised development investments in Eritrea is an extremely fertile area for further effort and focus. The sub-national levels of government demonstrated a clear willingness to engage directly with these processes in a transparent and inclusive manner that was specific to the needs of Eritrea. This was evidenced by the adoption by agreement at a sub-zoba level of a method of project identification and prioritisation that completely matched a traditional Eritrean approach to an inclusive decision making process and saw the kebabis engaged at all levels of the project identification and prioritisation process, up to and including the final decisions.

The level of policy engagement and interaction attained at the sub-national government level strongly suggests further attempts that engagement at a national policy level that are focussed and collaborative amongst all donors may be of considerable value.

The impact of the programme at the sub-national government level was substantial in terms of reducing poverty in Anseba by providing basic social and economic infrastructure, improving the natural resource base of local communities, and enhancing local human capital endowments

Likely impacts of these changes on ALDP's broader objectives

The projects outputs were not exported onto a wider stage outside of the Anseba region due to the timing of the achievement of results. However, the project has created in the Anseba regional and sub-regional government a strong supporter of ALDP's broader objectives. The impact of this is that in any future project, this level of government will act as a strong champion in furthering future activities.

Sustainability of programme results

Outputs achieved at the community level have been demonstrated as being sustainable because -

- Communities took over direct implementation as it was not only far cheaper, but the level of community ownership was substantially enhanced;
- Post-programme, communities have continued to maintain the investments and are meeting the cost of O&M from their own resources; and
- Post-programme, communities are using the planning and prioritisation processes developed under ALDP in respect to other donor projects.

Indeed, in comparison to similar efforts at community level engagement in planning, budget and budget execution processes in other countries, the outputs must be recognised as being of very high value in terms of sustainability. The high level of attainment of sustainability at a sub-national government level indicates that effective engagement at a national level in the future can lead to sustainable results.

Level of satisfaction of programme stakeholders and beneficiaries with the results

Among stakeholders and beneficiaries at a sub-national level, levels of satisfaction were very high as is evidenced by their stated comments and more particularly, by the continued attention post-project of the stakeholders to the operational and maintenance needs of the various development investments. Indeed, the ALDP demonstrates that the stakeholders and beneficiaries are rightly very proud of the results, as they should be given their level of engagement.

Whether UNCDF was effectively positioned and partnered to achieve maximum impact

UNCDF was effectively positioned or partnered to achieve maximum impact at a sub-national level. Decentralisation does not yet figure highly on the GoSE national agenda and to be able to raise the profile of the issues surrounding decentralisation require further continued and robust engagement with the GoSE at a national level.

To achieve the aims and objectives of a project such as this, UNCDF in the future will need to consider a joint donor approach where the sub-national level project footprint is much higher, so as to be able to translate into national engagement and impact.

Contribute to UNCDF and partners' learning from programme experience

This has been a very valuable learning experience for UNCDF and other partners. The broad lessons learned are –

- Baseline studies are critical and must be carried at programme commencement to an international standard if they are to contribute to effective monitoring and evaluation. It cannot be assumed that in every country this capacity exists within the national skill set.
- Some programmes require a critical mass to be able to impact national processes. UNCDF needs to consider future decentralisation programmes similar to this programme in this light and consider closer liaison and integration with other donors to achieve that level of critical mass.
- In countries where there is limited decentralisation policy reform experience (including the related aspects of public financial management reform), such as Eritrea, UNCDF needs in future to consider the level of in-country technical policy experience that is required to be in place.
- Communication processes to a wider audience could be further enhanced in order to engage that audience with the outputs of the programme and further enhance the process of informing the decentralisation development process.

Programme stakeholders assess the value and opportunity for broader replication of the programme

Stakeholders at a sub-national level consider that the programme should be replicated from the point of view of a development investment process at a community level. The evaluation concludes that this should be considered.

Programme stakeholders determine the need for follow-up on the intervention, and general direction for the future course

See above.

Ensure accountability for results to the programme's financial backers, stakeholders and beneficiaries

BSF in particular should be very satisfied with the outcomes of the ALDP as the funds invested achieved, at community level, and as detailed in the "Achievements and Challenges" section above, substantial value for money over a wide range of projects that substantively addressed community identified needs of food security. The funds have been accountably disbursed and the financial and reporting requirements of all operations have been very satisfactory.

Value for money was achieved in terms of all investments made; in fact, the funds invested achieved much more than can have been reasonably expected. Not only were the communities themselves able to directly implement food security interventions at a substantial saving over contractor implementation methods, but the need to amend the project design to more specifically focus on food security issues arose from community driven demand. Given that the communities then focussed almost 50% of the total number of development investments on food security matters and have continued to provide post-project operational and maintenance support to those investments, demonstrates that not only were the community needs correctly identified, the level of ownership of the communities of those investments is high and have achieved substantive increases in terms of overall food security.

2.0 Purpose of Evaluation

The *Anseba Local Development Project (ALDP)* is a five-year programme that was approved in October 2001, and its implementation commenced in April 2002. The ALDP was executed by the Eritrea Ministry of National Development, financed as follows -)

UNCDF	1,980,036 USD
UNDP	894,349 USD
BSF	3,822,552 USD
Government	<u>200,000 USD</u>
	6,896,937 USD

The *Project Document* (PD) proposed to track day-to-day project performance through project performance monitoring, and to have two project evaluations; the *Mid-Term Evaluation* (MTE), and the *Final Evaluation* (FE). In particular, the FE, the subject of this report critically examines:

- Results Achievement: the degree to which the project attained its Immediate and Development Objectives as designed.
- Sustainability of Results: likelihood that programme results will be sustainable in the longer term, independent of external assistance.
- Factors Affecting Successful Implementation and Results Achievement.
- Strategic Positioning and Partnerships of UNCDF.
- Future UNCDF role within the decentralisation environment of Eritrea.

The *Terms of Reference* (TORs) designed to achieve the purposes of the FE are contained in *Annex 1*.

3.0 FE Methodology & Approach

The FE was conducted in a highly consultative and interactive manner focused at dealing with the matters specifically required by the TORs. The documents reviewed are contained in *Annex 2*. A hypothesis workshop and country briefings were held for orientation purposes to ensure a common understanding, and finalized the methodology and work plan.

After the preparatory phase, the FE team held a number of consultative meetings and key informant interviews with stakeholders at the national, zoba, sub-zoba and kebab levels. These to the largest degree possible replicated that of the MTE so as to ensure connectivity and relevance. The persons interviewed are listed in *Annex 3*. In addition, the FE team visited a number of projects implemented with support from the ALDF and held in-depth discussions with the beneficiaries, project implementation and management committees. The selection was that used in the MTE to again ensure connectivity and relevance and effectively captures –

- A mix of completed and ongoing projects;
- Projects from different sectors; and
- Projects contracted out and those directly implemented by the sub-zoba and/or kebab.

Annex 4 lists the projects visited and the results.

The information collected from the discussions was progressively compiled, analysed and used to prepare the FE report and the Aide Mémoire that was discussed by the stakeholders in the in-country evaluation wrap-up meeting. The specific analysis, conclusions, inferences and recommendations in this report are those of the team, and are not necessarily shared by GoSE, UNDP, UNCDF, BSF, PST and other development partners.

4.0 Background

4.1. The National and Policy Context

Eritrea covers an area of approximately 124,000 square kilometres and has a population of 3.6 million. It achieved independence in 1991 after a 30 year armed struggle with Ethiopia. On May 24 1993, Eritrea became formally independent after conducting a successful and internationally supervised referendum.

On May 23 1997, the Constituent Assembly ratified the Constitution of Eritrea. The Constitution under a number of articles emphasizes the participation and active involvement of the citizens. The Constitution also incorporated the principles of decentralization. For example, Article 7(3) states that, '*There shall be established appropriate institutions to encourage and develop people's initiatives and participation in their communities*'. Article 1(5) further states that, '*Eritrea is a unitary State divided into units of local government. The powers and duties of these units shall be determined by law*'.

The *Government of the State of Eritrea* (GoSE) elaborated the powers and duties of local governments, in the *Proclamation for the Establishment of Regional Administration* (PERA) of 1996. The PERA is the institutional definition of both the local government structure and its responsibilities for local planning and decision making.

The PERA is a remarkably short document by international comparison with many other similar elaborations of the powers and duties of local government. The Minister of Local Government is empowered to make regulations to further effect the PERA, and the national policy context lacks a formal and effective elaboration of the entire national planning, budget, budget execution and reporting framework that enables the structure of the local governments created by the PERA to operate in a clear policy context.

The PERA is not a sufficient elaboration of a policy and legal framework that allows for the translation of national sectoral policy into local government level implementation. While the current focus of the GoSE is on an overarching national recovery, both from conflict and drought, the PERA is unable to deal with structured national recovery at a local government level. This lack of clear national decentralisation policy development, elaboration and implementation is a matter that will require attention and consideration to guide decentralization processes.

The State of Eritrea's Ministry of Finance and Development (now the Ministry of Finance) issued the *Regulations on Finance* in January, 1994 and these remain in force today. These regulations are mainly concerned with the national budgeting process at central government level. There is only an implied relationship between the *Regulations on Finance* and the PERA and there is no formal linkage between regional level planning, budgeting, budget execution and reporting and the national level processes.

The GoSE formulated the *Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper* (PRSP) to implement the long-term objective of the Eritrean development framework to attain rapid and widely shared economic growth with macroeconomic stability and a steady and sustainable reduction in poverty. The government in this respect plans to mobilize all available resources and use them efficiently and effectively in the fight against poverty.

This leaves a substantial vacuum in respect of the ability to connect national sector development policy to regional and sub-regional development policies, planning, budget, budget execution and reporting. The same vacuum exists in respect of the linkages between national line ministries, the Ministry of National Development and the Ministry of Local Government *vis a vis* the regional and sub-regional levels of government. The UNCDF ALDP project was not intended to directly impact this vacuum as it sought to address issues related to poverty alleviation through sustainable development investments in locally identified priorities in a manner that informed further discussions on replicability in other regions.

4.2 The Institutional Context

The government of Eritrea has four tiers of public administration hence the national, regional (zoba), sub-regional (sub-zoba) and kebab (collection of villages). At the national level there are ministries and specialist organisations. In particular the *Ministry of National Development* (MND) is responsible for including facilitating better management and execution of the complex task of planning and co-ordination at all levels of government for a more effective use of scarce public resources, for the promotion of sustainable growth and the alleviation of poverty. No central government ministry is identifiably in charge of decentralisation matters.

At the regional level there is the regional government of council (Baito) with councillors directly elected and supporting executive (administration). The region is responsible for preparation and implementation of regional development plans (RDP).

At the sub-region level there are full time personnel but no elected councils. The sub-regions have full time staff in their locations.

At the kebab level there are kebab administrators and deputy administrators locally elected and government salaried. In addition, in place is a community court of three elected judges; personnel, secretary and finance officers (all three to be appointed as full time staff); and committees for Land, Infrastructure, Economic Development, Social Affairs and National Service.

4.3 Anseba Region

Zoba Anseba is one of the six administrative regions of Eritrea, located in the North West of the Country. The total area of the region is approximately 22,834.28Km², covering about one fifth of the country. Keren town, the Capital of Zoba Anseba, with a population of approximately 100,000 people, is located 91 km North West of Asmara, the Capital City of Eritrea.

Administratively, Zoba Anseba is divided into 11 sub-regions (sub-zobas) including the Capital, Keren town. The sub-regions are sub-divided into 109 administrative kebabs (collection of villages) comprising approximately 441 villages. Keren town is not a direct beneficiary of the ALDP leaving the 10 rural sub-regions (sub-zobas) as the eligible ones.

The total population of Zoba Anseba is estimated at around 490,000 people. The population is composed of mainly four ethnic groups, including: Tigre, Tigrigna, Billen and Hidarb. The majority of the population (approximately 80%) depends on agriculture (crop farmers and pastoralists), and the remaining 20% are engaged in business and other activities. The Anseba Region is characterized by three types of climates linked to the area's topography: Highland, intermediate, and lowland. The lowland, the hottest and driest part of the region with an altitude less than 1500m above sea level, covers 85% of the total area, and the intermediate and highland (>2000m above sea level) cover 12% and 3% respectively. The topography of the area is dominated by rugged terrain of hills, mountains and river valleys covering about 57.5 % of the total area. This terrain in particular makes accessibility difficult and the construction of infrastructure (especially roads), relatively more expensive. The total arable land is about 5.75% of which only half is currently cultivated. This exposes the region to a multitude of food security challenges. The highest and lowest annual temperature and rainfall ranges are, 47-10 degrees Celsius, and 450-150mm respectively. The rainy period, effective for production, is from June 15 to September 15.

4.4 ALDP Rationale

The formulation, approval and implementation of the ALDP was justified by a number of factors –

- There was high local demand as the GoSE needed support to implement its decentralization, democratization and local governance agenda within a challenging atmosphere of insecurity and drought.
- Whereas a number of projects were implemented in Eritrea prior to the ALDP, none of them was entirely and specifically designed to support the GoSE to implement the provisions of the PERA.
- UNCDF had a comparative advantage in this area because it has a wealth of experience in the development, innovative piloting, testing, providing concrete field-based learning and informing national and donor policies and programmes related to decentralisation and local development.
- Eritrea is one of the poorest countries in Africa and the selection of the Anseba region in particular provides the project with exceptional added value, as the region experiences relatively high levels of poverty exacerbated by drought and widespread food insecurity and has access to relatively fewer donor and NGO initiatives. UNCDF's presence in the region could have greatly contributed to increased access to public services and hence the attainment of MDGs. This was especially because the project was providing LDFs to be used by the LGs to invest in public infrastructure development.

ALDP was formulated and implemented to-

- Improve local government capacity to provide basic social and economic infrastructure, with a long-term development objective of poverty reduction.
- Address the wider national, regional and sub-regional institutional and systemic issues (planning, allocation, financing, implementation, as well as management arrangements) and their linkages to the continued delivery of pro-poor infrastructure and services by the local government in Anseba.

The ALDP rationale was four-fold –

- Within Eritrea, Zoba Anseba is one of the most drought prone regions and thus faces recurrent food security crises. Making funds available to sub-regional levels of government for infrastructure and other investments through a pro-poor and participatory planning process was expected to contribute to improving food security and reducing poverty.
- The GoSE is committed to a policy of incremental democratisation and progressive decentralisation as evidenced by the PERA. Working to strengthen local government capacities in Anseba and aiming to pilot innovative and participatory ways of planning and implementing local development will contribute towards helping GoSE drive forward its agenda on decentralisation and local governance. The UNCDF Concept Paper also observed that the PERA was not a sufficient policy for decentralised planning and budgeting at local level; and further pointed out several defects including lack of clarity of roles between the elected officials and the administration.
- Support to decentralisation is a priority area confirmed and agreed between UNDP and the GoSE and by providing concrete, field-based learning on decentralisation processes would provide UNDP and the GoSE with valuable lessons.
- UNCDF's mandate is to pilot innovative management of local development and inform national policy on decentralisation by –
 - (i) testing and promoting integrated and participatory development planning process within local government;
 - (ii) introducing new ways of financing local development; and
 - (iii) by strengthening and improving local government and community capacities to deliver, operate and maintain public infrastructure and services

Innovation was to be the key feature of ALDP.

The rationale for the ALDP project was premised on the assumption of strong GOSE commitment to a policy of incremental democratisation and progressive decentralisation as evidenced by the PERA. During the final evaluation, the evaluators concluded that in this respect, deeper national engagement with ALDP will be required if the decentralisation efforts are to move further forward than an Interim PRSP. The evaluation team also noted that since the overall design did not substantially rely on this rationale but focussed on strengthening local government capacities in Anseba and aimed to pilot innovative and participatory ways of planning and implementing local development, the project was able to make substantial headway in these areas as its short-term success was not dependent on the existence of a well developed decentralization policy. Furthermore, the evaluation found that in the broader context, the project's focus was intended to contribute towards helping GoSE drive forward its agenda on decentralisation and local governance. While that was not achieved at a national level, within the Anseba region, the creation of a sub-national champion for incremental democratisation and progressive decentralisation creates the opportunity for future projects.

4.5 ALDP Design

ALDP aimed to reduce poverty in Anseba Region as a basis for sustained self development by –

- providing basic social and economic infrastructure;
- improving the natural resource base of local communities;
- enhancing local human capital endowments (such as increased awareness of health risks like HIV/AIDS);
- directly addressing the wider institutional issues (planning, finance and implementation arrangements) linked to the continued delivery of pro-poor public infrastructure and services by local government in Anseba.

The immediate ALDP objective of the project was to ensure that local government in Anseba Region delivered public infrastructure and services based on responsive, transparent and pro-poor planning procedures. This implied that pro-poor infrastructure and services will be delivered in Anseba and that the planning system ensures this is institutionalised and officially endorsed and adopted.

The *Project Design* (PD) logical framework clearly sets out the programmes, sub-programmes, outputs and activities designed to achieve these aims and they are reflected in the *Project Operations Plan* (POP). Essentially there were 4 designed outputs and consequent activities, with a fifth being added later –

Output 1: A participatory and transparent planning system is established that ensures the identification and design of locally prioritized pro-poor projects.	
Activities	
1.	Establishing pro-poor planning procedures for local government units within Anseba and providing training in their use.
2.	Strengthening the capacity of the Regional Baito play its role in accordance with the provisions of PERA.
3.	Supporting the dissemination of information concerning the planning process and its outcomes.
4.	Strengthening the capacity of the regional and sub-regional administrations to backstop and to carry out planning exercises.

Output 2: Access to and management of financial resources for funding development plans by local government units in Anseba is improved.

Activities

1. Establish the Anseba Local Development Fund (LDF), to channel annual capital budget support to the sub-regional administrations to finance locally-identified priorities and development plans.
2. Establish sound financial management procedures (including auditing) and provide local government officials with training in financial management.
3. Strengthening the capacity of sub-regional and regional administrations to carry out financial management.
4. Carrying out action-research into local revenue mobilisation and piloting revenue mobilisation schemes in selected sub-regional administrations.

Output 3: Regional and local capacity to deliver, operate and maintain projects efficiently is strengthened.

Activities

1. Establishing procedures and provide training for procurement and implementation.
2. Support locally-based monitoring of implementation arrangements.
3. Strengthen the capacity of local stakeholders to ensure operations and maintenance of infrastructure.

Output 4: The Anseba planning process, styles of programming and project design, and policy issues arising from this experience inform national policy.

Activities

1. Setting up and managing ALDP's monitoring and evaluation system.
2. Establish a National Steering Committee for the project.
3. Organise annual stakeholder reviews of the project; or publishing and disseminating periodic lesson-learning bulletins.
4. Developing a strategy of support to the Ministry of Local Government in order to strengthen its capacity to learn lessons and formulate policy.

Output 5: Natural Resource Management (from 2005 ALDP Annual Work plan)

Activities

1. Prioritise food security micro projects

This design was appropriate and adequate to achieve the overall objectives. It benefitted from a sufficient degree of implementational flexibility that allowed for the implementers to be able to respond to issues that arose from time to time in a responsive and creative manner. The fact that the project design was not followed is another matter and has been dealt with in the relevant sections, for instance 5.1.3 below. The design was a standard design response to the need to set parameters that left the implementers with sufficient room to engage in activities in a flexible manner that did not overly prescribe or limit operational responsiveness. This design approach, which is a common international approach, assumes that the implementers will stay within the design parameters or would otherwise use those parameters to guide implementation, which, unfortunately, did not occur.

The addition of Output 5 later in the life of the project was not planned, considered or integrated within the overall project design. It therefore sits as an unelaborated output that does not benefit from indicators or integration in respect of other activities. While it could be said that this additional output to support food security limited the flexibility of the communities by prioritising food security micro-projects, the impact of the 'conditional' nature of this output was very limited because (a) the output was not elaborated in any way and (b) in any event, the communities were already focussing on food security micro-projects.

The selection of indicators was relevant to the design but given the divergence of the implementation from design, the relevance of indicators selection decreased. For example, the selection of an indicator of the change in local revenue collection is only relevant if the implementers followed the design and undertook activities that might have had an impact on own source revenue. The implementers did not undertake local revenue enhancement activities as were designed and consequently, no change in local revenue was discernable. The fault is not with project design; the fault is with the implementation. If the implementers choose, for whatever reason, to not follow the project design, then it is incumbent on the implementers to revisit the design document and consider and substitute indicators that are of relevance to the activities that the implementers have decided to implement. This was not done and the relevance of many indicators was substantially lessened. As is noted later, whatever indicators are selected, either in the original design or in a reviewed format, it is necessary for the implementers to both establish the necessary monitoring and evaluation baseline and collect the data necessary to update implementation information so that the indicator can be assessed. Neither was done in this project.

There was no indication that the project design was reconsidered at anytime during the very lengthy implementation period of the project. Given the purported addition of an output, the content of the medium term evaluation (see below) and the substantial number of designed activities that were either not implemented or were implemented very late in the life of the project, a reconsideration of project design, especially with respect to the indicators, was a matter that warranted some substantive attention that it did not receive.

5.0 Results Analysis

5.1 Anseba Log frame Analysis

Annex 5 contains a detailed overview of the Log frame, development objective, immediate objective and outputs. *Annex 6* contains a detailed matrix of all outputs, activities and results. In the larger view, the development objective and the immediate objectives were met, as were most outputs.

Within the context of the overall development and immediate objectives, the activities that were undertaken and the results achieved did, in the main, meet those objectives. However, the analysis in *Annex 5* clearly demonstrates that the divergence from project design was substantial and

unexplained. Even though this divergence was substantial, the attainment of the development and immediate objectives demonstrates that the divergence was not critical. Annex 6 is more enlightening in that the project clearly focussed on core activities that had the greatest impact on attaining the development and immediate objectives. For instance, the divergence from implementing the LDF as designed was not critical in terms of attaining the development and immediate objectives, but if it had been implemented as designed it would have improved the quality of the attainment of the objectives, as well as deepened the engagement with national government processes.

The overall Log frame would have benefited from continuous reconsideration during the life of the project to better link the relevance of the indicators to the activities that were in fact undertaken. For instance, local revenue enhancement is a long term process and there was sufficient time within the long life of the project for that to have been undertaken. A local revenue enhancement study was completed at the end of the project leaving insufficient time to implement any local revenue enhancement activities. Once it had been decided not to embark on local revenue enhancement activities at the start of the project, the development indicator of the changes in local revenue collection was clearly going to be of no relevance and should have been reconsidered and substituted with a more appropriate indicator. The lesson to be extracted from this is the need in the future for a much closer level of attention to be given to the project design and implementation as an on-going matter.

5.1.1 Medium Term Evaluation Recommendations

Annex 7 contains a matrix of the MTE recommendations and those that were implemented. Most were not implemented. It is the opinion of the evaluators that if the MTE recommendations had been implemented, they would have enhanced the quality and relevance of the outputs. Of much greater concern, the MTE recommendations were not subjected to any consideration at any level in respect of implementation.

5.1.2 – Output 1 - A participatory and transparent planning system is established that ensures the identification and design of locally prioritised pro-poor projects

This output was substantially achieved.

In respect of the output indicators –

- All sub-zoba level development planning with respect to programme funds was aligned completely with kebabi identified priorities. This was confirmed by the FE from the focal group discussions (FDG) only as no written kebabi plans could be identified or produced when requested.
- Sub-zoba and zoba annual plans were approved as presented and this was confirmed by the FE by enquiries made at sub-zoba and zoba level.
- The FE found that no micro projects were targeted at agreed poverty indicators because no poverty indicators were ever agreed. This is not considered relevant by the FE as there was a general lack of available poverty indicators in any event, given the overall lack of baseline or other data sources.
- The operations manual went through several editions and was approved and well received at all levels.

In terms of the 11 key activities of Output 1, all targets were generally met and exceeded. Key Activity 1 was to provide training on PERA provisions to regional and local administration and to elected Baito members and this was achieved. The evaluators question the relevance of this activity in terms of project design. As has been highlighted in the policy context, the PERA is an inadequate document in terms of overall decentralisation policy elaboration, especially in respect of the linkages

between the various levels of government in terms of the national planning, budget, budget execution and reporting processes. It does little, if anything, therefore to enhance the aim of Output 1, unless considered with Key Activity 2.

Key Activity 2 was to undertake process consultations for the definition of planning, appraisal, budgeting, approval and M&E procedures (for LGU staff, Baito members and others). The project design therefore clearly recognised that Key Activity 1 would create the realisation (if it had been correctly undertaken) in all stakeholders that the PERA was a completely inadequate document for all relevant programme purposes. Therefore it would be necessary to undertake consultations to elaborate the sub-national planning, budget, budget execution and reporting processes. This was not done by the project, according to the final project report.

However, under activities 1.4 – 1.6 *Elaborate procedures for planning, prioritisation and appraisal of programmes and projects and for approval of plans and budgets*, titled the Regional Administration Operations Manual (RAOM) was developed. This document went through three editions and originally appeared as a project operation manual. Through interaction with regional and sub-regional officials the RAOM developed essentially into a regional planning, budgeting, budget execution and reporting manual that was adopted at regional level in 2008 and lead to the consultative creation of the Regional Development Plan that was to feed the Ministry of Local Government budget request to the Ministry of Finance.

The document (in its 3rd and final form) is a curious document that both recognises the lack of policy and legal guidance to regions under a nationally endorsed system, but then goes on to elaborate that system. The overall processes elaborated are consistent with good international decentralised regional planning, budgeting, budget execution and reporting processes and are consistent, in the main, with project design. The ROAM has had no impact outside of Anseba Zoba that was able to be described by any government officials and the central government does not appear, in the main, to be aware of it.

The 3rd edition of the ROAM was developed in the last year of the project and perhaps this explains why the project was not able to engage in policy discussions outside of the zoba in respect of this elaborated model. This timing is unfortunate because it represents an opportunity missed, if the development could have been undertaken in line with project design timings that would have allowed for wider dissemination and discussion to occur. The manual is judged by the evaluation team as representing a model that encapsulates, in the main, features of community-led development investment prioritisation and regional planning, budgeting, budget execution and reporting processes that provides a the reasonable basis for further discussion, development and interaction on a national scale.

Given that this elaborated model of ALDP is captured in the RAOM and has been used in Anseba Zoba, this represents a very solid basis in respect of which policy engagement and discussion might be further supported by UNCDF in the future. The ALDP and UNCDF have engendered great support within Anseba Zoba and it represents a clear champion for the cause of furthering decentralisation policy and process elaboration within all of Eritrea.

It is noted that the ROAM, in all editions, was translated into all relevant local languages and this is to be commended. The evaluation team is of the opinion that the quality of the translations of the ROAM have been adequate in terms of accurately capturing the technical aspects of the subject matter. Activity 1.3 required the establishment of inclusive planning committees at regional, sub-regional and kebede levels. This was done on a timely basis and the committees all times operated in line with operations manual procedures as the operations manuals were available early in the life of

the project, almost as the first achievements. These committees received consistent planning system training throughout the life of the project and the results of that training are still plain and evident. At all levels, the planning committees operated on a gender inclusive basis and in a fashion consistent with Eritrean cultural requirements that emphasise consensus. During the focal discussion groups of the evaluation female community members were at pains to make clear that they believed that all aspects of the project had been implemented with regard to gender inclusivity, particularly the operations of the planning committees and in subsequent implementation. The test of this success of their operation is in both the high levels of ownership of the development investments that have lead to their continuing repair and maintenance is good operating condition by the communities and the adoption of these consultative processes in determining priorities in other donor funded projects.

This successful planning committee operation and internalisation, coupled with the elaboration of processes that exists in the RAOM, form a solid base for future interaction in Eritrea in respect of decentralisation policy and processes.

Study tours were organised to various relevant countries and these appear to have been concluded without issue. However, in the future, it is recommended that this not be engaged in, but rather appropriate experts from various countries be engaged to travel to Eritrea to enable discussions with much wider numbers of people than can be engaged in study tours. This is a more useful method of lesson learning, especially to enable the engagement of a much wider audience in Eritrea. East Africa is a very fruitful field for future interactions as the RAOM process bears great similarities, in principle, to the processes elaborated in the RAOM.

5.1.3 – Output 2 - Access to and management of financial resources for funding development plans by local government units in Anseba is improved

The indicators for Output 2 were –

- % of eligible sub-zobas which qualify for LDF allocations increases (by year 3);
- x% of sub-zobas obtain performance-based LDF increments by year 4; and
- x% of sub-zobas manage finances according to established procedures

Unfortunately, all of these indicators had to be ranked at 0% as the LDF procedure as contained in the project design document was not followed, for a variety of reasons. All project reports refer to an LDF as if it was in place, but the distinction must be drawn between an LDF that was in the hands and daily management of sub-national government staff (as was designed) and the availability of project managed funds for allocation to and payment for development investments. Project managed funds are not LDF funds; they are project funds.

The reasons for this were many: release issues between UNDP and ALDP; issues arising with the Regional Governor and a lack of clarity in respect of process at a sub-national level. While the failure to establish an LDF as designed is understandable, it is also a critically necessary requirement if the sub-national governments are to enhance their capacity to financially manage such funds in the future. These problems are commonly encountered in most countries where LDF type funding is established and it does require specific care and attention by project management to ensure that this has occurred.

Key Activities 2.1 and 2.7 called for the establishment procedures for LDF allocation and financial management procedures (channels, accounting, minimum conditions, performance incentives and auditing). ALDP did establish was clear and transparent procedures for planning management as well as engaging in sub-national government training in respect of financial management generally, but it

was not linked to the management of an LDF as designed. The design criteria and requirement was clear as the ALDP agreement with the GoSE states –

'ALDF allocations to sub-regions will be channelled to them in accordance with existing GoSE arrangements for budget flows. A special ALDF account will be opened by the Treasury department of MoF in Asmara, from which funds – following approval of MoLG's annual budget – will be transferred to the Regional and then sub-regional administrations.

In the first year of the project, as the planning system is put into place, ALDF will make limited extra-budgetary allocations to sub-regions in order to avoid frustrations with the slowness of delivery. These allocations will nonetheless be made through MoF, but will not figure in GoSE's 2002 approved budget;'

In practice the LDF was channelled from UNDP to the project account in Zoba Anseba and payments made direct to service providers under the joint signatures of the PST Team Leader and Zoba Head of Administration and Finance.

The importance of this is high because if the funds had been in the hands of the sub-national government, the training that was provided would have been of more appropriate use as well as being consistent with design. ALDP did disseminate information on mechanism and procedures provide training in financial management procedures and announce and disseminate information on resource allocation. This was done well, but it was in relation to a project funding modality and not an LDF. The relevant indicator for the establishment of the LDF was the x% of sub-zobas managing finances according to established procedures. As the LDF was not under the control of the sub-national government, they could not manage the finances in accordance with established procedures, as the funds always remained project funds. Therefore, unfortunately the indicator is rated at 0% but noting that as a result of the financial training that was provided, the sub-national government was able to better manage government funds.

In future, this critical design requirement must be achieved as a matter of priority in order to ensure the maximisation of benefit from other interventions, such as financial management training.

The design of the LDF also called for appropriate allocation processes, linked to allocation increases tied to general and overall performance. All allocation processes are meant to be transparent, needs based and poverty sensitive to comply with internationally recognised allocation principles. To achieve this, parameters must be selected that are both relevant to the grant purpose and are supported by robust and independent data. This was not achieved by ALDP and this was noted in the MTE and recommendations that were made were not implemented. Eritrea is not a data rich environment in any event and in absence of that data, baselines must be set and reviewed annually in order to act as data proxies. Baselines were not established and instead an allocation process was adopted where the ALDP used area and population, subjectively adjusted for perceived performance. Area and population may be relevant for the grant purpose, but there are many more or other parameters that are more relevant if data was available. The selected parameters are also not poverty sensitive.

The importance of this matter is that allocation processes are a critical matter which sub-national government needs to be exposed to in order to ensure transparency and equity in allocations when funds are within their control. This is made more critical by the need to link allocation processes to national sectoral priority so that communities can implement locally identified priorities within that national sectoral policy.

In the future, the relevant parameters and data must either be available or the relevant baselines undertaken that within designed timelines in order that the sub-national governments become

exposed to and engage with transparent, needs based and poverty sensitive allocation processes in respect of funds that are within their direct control, as designed.

The last Key Activities of this output related to undertaking action research into improved local revenue mobilisation; organising stakeholder's workshops on results of action-research into local revenue mobilisation and organising stakeholder's workshops on results of action-research into local revenue mobilisation. A local revenue study was undertaken late in the life of the project and it was disseminated, but without workshops or the design of local revenue enhancement activities.

The timing of the local revenue mobilisation study was unfortunate in that it would have been better if the study had been undertaken at a much earlier time. However, this is to be understood within what the evaluators perceive as a faulty project design, in that the design should have programmed a local revenue mobilization study at the commencement of the project, which incorporated in it a local revenue potential study. The design was not clear in this aspect, either as to the importance of the timing or the relevance of the inclusion of a local revenue potential study. Further, while the design countenanced activities that might have had an impact on own source revenue, these should have been programmed after these studies had been completed to have had added relevance. Activities could have been undertaken as programmed in the design in respect of own source revenue that would in all probability impacted own source revenue collections, but these would have had greater relevance if these studies had been completed that would have given the necessary focus to the activities. Best international practice in respect of local revenue enhancement is that before any enhancement activities are considered, a local revenue potential study must be undertaken, by all sources, tax and non-tax, in respect of current and potential sources, that also identifies the costs of collection, the constraints in respect of collection by source and identifies the cost: benefit analysis of potential interventions. This revenue potential study then forms the evidence base for the policy and interaction development process as to the identification of the most cost effective local revenue activities that might be considered.

Local revenue potential studies not easy to conceptualise or perform and require a specific technical skill set to be able to be undertaken. While local revenue enhancement is a critical matter within decentralisation processes, in future, this should be undertaken in a more structured policy design environment that would ensure the potential for better traction in this area.

5.1.4 – Output 3 - Regional and local capacity to deliver, operate and maintain projects efficiently is strengthened

The performance indicators for this output were –

- x% of projects are delivered according to specifications;
- x% of projects are delivered on time; and
- x% of projects are delivered according to budgeted costs

These were evaluated at 100:0:0% respectively. This must be understood in context.

According to project staff that were available to talk to the evaluation team, FDGs and ALDP reports, all projects were completed to specification. This was confirmed by discussions with sub-national government officials and by the random sampling of the FE. Not only were the projects completed to specification, but all of the development investments sampled were continuously maintained by the community groups that identified the local priority and which had participated in their supervision, if not the actual implementation.

Projects were not necessarily completed on time. This was due to a variety of factors, such as the availability of contractors and materials. Time was, however, of no relevant issue. Failure to complete on time did not impact micro-project cost and there was no other adverse implication.

Projects were not also completed to original budget. This was due to a variety of factors, mainly related to original budget miscalculation. This is to be understood within the context of that when independent examination was made, for instance, of the costs of direct community implementation, it was found to be substantially cheaper than projected contractor costs. The reality appears to be that the development investments were achieved within a final budget that was value for money. The budgeting errors did not impact wider project implementation as the overall absorption rate was less than maximum and sufficient funds were always available.

The lesson to be learned from this is that some further attention needs to be given to enhanced budgeting practices at an early time. Budgeting inexperience is to be expected within communities and projects that do not have the technical competence in every area of development investments. It may be that sub-national government possesses the necessary budgeting experience, but communities require assistance to better frame micro-projects within allocations. This could be achieved by the development of a menu of indicative costs that would guide community decisions (such as for instance, the cost per kilometre of road renovation in mountainous areas and flat terrain). Alternately, consideration might be given to engagement of engineering staff on future project designs.

The Key Activities were all undertaken successfully: consultative reviews of (i) existing implementation and procurement guidelines and (ii) O&M procedures for completed projects were undertaken; implementation and procurement guidelines were established and complied with; training in implementation and procurement procedures to LG personnel was undertaken; guidelines for (i) project implementation monitoring committees at local level and (ii) O&M of completed projects were undertaken; and training of project implementation committees were continuously undertaken.

Training which is undertaken on a hands-on and continuous basis is, in international experience, more successful than training by workshops. ALDP undertook training by both methods. In the future, consideration needs to be given to a more elaborated system of evaluating the value and relevance of training undertaken. This would enable better directed training and learning from the evaluations.

The evaluation concludes that the overall output of increasing regional and local capacity to deliver, operate and manage projects was achieved, albeit the achievement would have been more substantial if project design had been followed in critical areas such as LDF design and allocation processes. These are areas that can be developed at a later time and do not adversely impact the overall general attainment of the overall output.

5.1.5 – Output 4 - The Anseba planning process, styles of programming and project design, and policy issues arising from this experience inform national policy

The Output Indicators were –

- MoLG invites Anseba project to present lessons learnt at national seminars/workshops;
- National local government training courses incorporate Anseba planning and implementation methods; and
- Donor-assisted projects adopt Anseba planning system.

The first two output indicators were not achieved. This must be understood in terms of the relevance of the indicators. Previous discussion has identified that a combination of the

development and adoption of the RAOM and the local planning process have in fact created a model that might have been used to form the basis of discussions in respect of replicable models of participatory planning and process development, but due to the factors identified, this wider dissemination did not occur. The FE doubts the relevance of the first two indicators given that the ALDP was operating within a policy development environment at a sub-national level that in fact had an unknown likelihood of success, given the potential obstacles that might have been encountered. The FE finds that ALDP has created a model capable of informing national policy but due to the factors identified, this was not able to inform national policy but it did inform sub-national policy.

The third indicator was achieved but not quite as designed. As designed, donors were meant to have taken up the replicable model in other project designs. This did not occur, but what has occurred is more important. The FDGs confirmed that the communities who participated in the ALDP process have both insisted that ALDP planning processes be used by other donors (in particular, a USAID project) and have informed other communities of these processes and these communities also insist on the use of the ALDP community based planning and implementation processes. While the wider donor community was not exposed to the Anseba planning process by the project itself, they are being exposed to it by the communities themselves. This is considered more important as result in the longer term.

The first of the Key Activities was the set up and management of the project M&E system. It was in this area that the FE had some reservations. No reliable baseline studies were undertaken and annually reviewed in a consistent manner so that there was a reliable M&E system in place. The FE finds that the designed M&E systems were not operational at any time in the project life and that no reasonable alternatives were developed, considered or implemented. This was specifically raised by the MTE and the recommendations do not appear to have been considered and applied.

Monitoring and evaluation is a specialised activity and can be particularly challenging in a data poor environment, especially when the overall project value does not allow for substantive expenditure on monitoring costs. Capacity in M&E in project staff cannot be assumed and the failure to develop an M&E system either as designed or as a reasoned substitute is a function of either project staff inexperience or lack of quality technical supervision. This is made more troubling by the direct MTE recommendations that were not even considered. This is a serious matter for UNDP/UNCDF further consideration and action.

In future, consideration should be given to either of two approaches –

- Ensure that every project has a qualified and experienced M&E officer who is capable of personally undertaking most of the required monitoring and evaluation activities; or
- If the number of in-country projects are sufficient but their overall budgets might not individually sustain a qualified M&E officer, to appoint a single M&E officer for all projects to operate at country level.

The National Steering Committee (NSC) was set up and did operate as planned for some time, but for most of the project life, the NSC did not operate. Project steering committees are a valuable tool in providing overall policy and implementation direction and are an important channel in engendering government engagement. If the NSC had operated continuously, it may have been able to contribute direction with respect to the broadening the discussions in respect of the Anseba planning process. However, the value of project steering committees is directly proportional to the experience of the members with respect to the subject matter and the quality of the information provided to the steering committee. International experience is that project steering committees that are not fully and completely engaged with the subject matter of a project have a tendency not to be as useful as they might have otherwise have been.

In the future, when consideration is given to the project steering committee there must be substantive consideration given to the selection of appropriate members and their continued engagement in the project.

The Key Activities required annual stakeholder reviews of the project to be undertaken and these meetings are confirmed by the final project report but the FE were not able to see any minutes or agendas for such meetings. This limited the ability of the FE to evaluate the value of these reviews. The Key Activities in respect of the publication of six monthly bulletins, the dissemination of those bulletins and the development of strategy support for MoLG policy processes were not undertaken. One bulletin was produced towards the end of the project and the dissemination of that bulletin appears to have been adequate. The project design was appropriate and closer attention to these activities was warranted.

In particular the Key Activity that required the development of strategy support for MoLG policy processes was a Key Activity that required close attention. The view of the FE and the project staff, as is evident from the direct statements in the project reports, was that broadly, the ALDP had two large aims –

- act as a policy experiment for the development of locally based planning, budget, budget execution and reporting processes within the national structure that was engaged and capable of and was replicated by the GoSE and other donors, and
- sustain that policy experiment development through the funding available via the project funds (or LDF).

This view is not held by all, as some would quantify the relative importance of the development investments through a participative planning process as of much more importance due to the relative differential in budget size of the two different elements. The FE prefers the view held and reported by the ALDP that the two large project aims were of equal importance. This Key Activity is one that should have claimed greater attention as it was a potential vehicle for the wider engagement with the planning process that had been developed by ALDP. There is no indication of a reluctance of the GoSE to engage in this activity and the FE is unable to determine why this was Key Activity was not undertaken.

5.1.6 – Output 5 - Natural Resource Management (from 2005 ALDP Annual Work Plan)

This output was developed in the middle of the project life and did not benefit from substantive elaboration in terms of Output Indicators and the like. The Output was developed as a result of a review recommendation that most community identified priorities should focus on food security and water related investments, which in fact reflected exactly what was already occurring. This focus translated into a single Key Activity of Prioritise food security micro projects, which was also unsupported by elaborated indicators or means of verification.

In the Annual Work Plan (AWP) of 2005, the assessment of potential possibilities for food security and environment management was prioritized as a major concern. A budget was not allocated nor were clear indicators put in the AWP for this activity. The PST only managed to accomplish the activity by reallocating resources from the local revenue mobilisation budget.

The MTE found that despite being a widely acknowledged problem, food security was not directly prioritized during community-based planning. The FE does not concur with that finding, in that any analysis of the nature of development investments would have indicated the contrary. The anticipated support from UNCDF to guide the project on how to handle food security issues did not materialize and the planned recruitment of a water resources or catchments engineer did not

happen because of alleged budgetary constraints, yet water resources was perceived as an essential aspect of food security.

The FE cannot conclude that there were any budgetary constraints that would have prevented the recruitment from occurring as the burn rate of the project was very low at this time. The real reason appears to have been the difficulty of recruiting people to work in Eritrea. However, sufficient technical assistance was made available from the sub-national government, although this could have been more effective if it had been planned and supported within an elaborated project design.

The following table contains an analysis by the evaluation mission of the micro-projects undertaken and it clearly demonstrates that the majority of all projects were directly related to food security, in that a total of 40 out of 82 projects (49%) directly impacted food security related matters, while a substantial number of the others (such as the roads investments), had an indirect effect on food security by either increasing access to markets or decreasing food transport costs.

Food Security Micro-Projects

No	Micro-project Type	No. of projects	Expenditure (Nakfa)
1	Micro-dams	11	8,756,430.14
2	Ponds	7	3,454,398.67
3	Gabion	12	1,333,513.65
4	Livestock market	6	3,405,189.20
5	Fruit and Vegetable Market	1	433,000.00
6	River diversion	3	1,830,364.13
	TOTAL	40	19,212,895.79

If a further Output was needed, it required extensive elaboration in order for it to fit properly within the overall project design and the M&E processes. This was not done and is indicative of either project management inexperience of the in-country staff and technical supervision or is reflective of a desire to ensure the effective identification of food security projects. This lack of elaboration makes evaluation difficult when there are simply no guidelines for the evaluators. This is compounded because in the absence of a project design elaboration of the intention of the output, it becomes difficult to intellectually substitute potential proxy indicators. Overall, this lack of elaboration was unfortunate.

While it is hard to gauge intent in an unelaborated design environment, if the overall intent of the creation of Output 5 was to focus community attention to food security related investments, this could have been more easily achieved in a variety of ways. More appropriate methods of attaining that intention was by the implementation of a development menu for development investments that would have required that focus or applying sector specific allocations to development investments.

On a theoretical level, neither the Output should have been created nor alternate means of limiting or focusing community attention to food security matters should have been considered or adopted. The reasons lie in the project design. The intended LDF (which were, as have been noted, project funds and not an LDF as designed) was meant to be treated as a non-sectoral conditional development grant channelled as such through the GoSE fiscal transfer mechanisms. The project design did not call for sectoral limitations or positive and negative investment menus. To create the Output 5 or to turn the non-sectoral design into a sectoral design by investment direction or limitation ran completely counter to entire project design, which may go some way to explain why there was no elaborated process that accompanied this change as it required a fundamental recast of the project design.

Given that it may have been the intent that food security related investments be closer monitored, this could have been better achieved through refinements in the M&E system. However, as the evaluation of Output 4 points out, there was no operational M&E system that could have coped with such a refocus. The conclusion is that the development and non-elaboration of Output 4 is unfortunate from all points of view. It was an error that should not have occurred with effective technical supervision.

Food security is defined as the access by all people at all times to food of adequate quantity, quality and safety for a healthy and active life. This implies that food security has three dimensions: availability, access and stability. Availability means that adequate food quantities must be present in a country, community or household to satisfy consumption demand. Access refers to the requirement that all people must have opportunity to have the food supply they need by either producing or buying so that no person remains hungry. Stability means eliminating or minimizing the possibility that food availability becomes less than the consumption needs at any time. Low and erratic rainfall in much of the country, as well as declining soil fertility (especially in the highlands areas) resulting from reduced or non-existent fallowing cycles, deforestation and severe erosion are identified amongst the main factors causing inadequate production of food in Eritrea.

The FE found that the project was effectively addressing issues of soil erosion and scarcity of water for irrigation and livestock production in Anseba Region, thereby contributing to domestic food production. About 50 percent (40 micro projects) of all micro-projects were directly targeted at addressing food security issues. The project had constructed 18 micro-dams or ponds; 6 livestock and one vegetable markets; three river diversions for small scale irrigation developments; and 12 Gabions.

In Elabaered sub-zoba, community members in Debresina village when interviewed and triangulated by the evaluation team said that they used water from the micro-dam for irrigation. They said that 265 households had an average of 0.1 hectares of irrigated land, which provided them an additional 3 months supply of food. They noted that without the food output from the micro-dam, they would normally run out of food supply by about December each year, but in the last two seasons, which despite the low rainfall, they had extended their food supply to April. In Hamadey community, villagers said that before the micro-dam, they ran out of water in December resulting in some of their livestock dying on the way to the nearest water source about 2-3 hours away. They also had to ration water drinking, even for children as they had to fetch the water that far.

In Selaa sub-zoba, a river diversion project was undertaken in Kefertay village. Almost 70 hectares were under irrigation, providing an additional 3-4 months of food supplies per household. A second river diversion project was completed in Gamhumer village in Halmelalo sub-zoba. The project had also constructed 13 Gabions to prevent soil erosion on river banks and/or stabilize bridges. In addition, through a Global Environment Fund (GEF) project supported by UNDP, many of the communities in the highlands areas were also erecting terraces to prevent soil erosion and conserve moisture. The villagers in these communities said that they were getting bigger harvests from terraced plots, adding that the crop looked healthier and had a visibly larger stalk. The complete lack of relevant baseline data against which progress could be assessed severely constrains extensive evaluation.

These projects were identified, developed and implemented directly by the beneficiary communities with technical assistance from the zoba and sub-zoba. This community participation process endowed a sense of ownership of the projects by community members, as noted by the Administrator of Hagaz sub-zoba. For example, the kebabis in Elabaered sub-zoba had divided their

17 kilometer road into sections and each village was responsible for maintaining their respective section. The villagers provided free labour every Saturday to repair and maintain the road. The purpose of the road was indirectly related to food security as it impact food access, access to market and transport cost issues.

The table below provides highlights, from the micro projects visited, the responsiveness of the projects to community priorities and the linkages to food security issues;

Community Priorities and Linkages to Food Security Issues

Hagaz Sub-Zoba: Awenjeli kebabi	
1.	<p>Micro dam</p> <p>The micro dam was built by community labour at a cost of Nakfa 350,000 to provide water for livestock where no micro-dam or other water supply had previously existed. The micro-dam is substantial and provides water for 10,000 livestock animals daily. This micro-dam does not only benefit the immediate community, but because of wider water shortages in other areas, other communities travel considerable distances to use the dam. On the day of FE visit, a villager had travelled over 20 km to water his camels.</p>
Elabaered Sub-Zoba: Era Tahtay kebabi	
2.	<p>Road</p> <p>The community had started the road project prior to the ALDP project but had been unable to finish it due to lack of funds. The road was required to deal with a variety of matters, many of which were food security related. It has facilitated access to other infrastructure services such as private grinding mill and an elementary school funded by the World Bank. After the road was completed with ASLDP a micro dam was built after the road because heavy equipment had access. This has had impact on health and reduction in water-borne diseases. Prior to road access, community had lost pregnant women due to failure to get to health centre on time. Now community also able to bring back their dead for burial.</p>
Elabaered Sub-Zoba: Balwa kebabi	
3.	<p>Ford Bridge</p> <p>This project is directly linked with the road project above and enabled further communication to markets.</p>
Elabaered Sub-Zoba: Hamadey village	
4.	<p>Micro Dam</p> <p>The micro dam had provided much needed water to the community which in the past ran out in December each year and had to travel 2 – 3 miles either way for their water needs. The dam also supported a downstream safe-water well for human consumption. A few vegetable gardens had begun to develop around the micro dam, and these were expected to expand.</p>
Elabaered Sub-Zoba: Debresina village	
5.	<p>Micro Dam</p> <p>The micro dam supported an irrigation scheme for 265 households, and provided 3 additional months of food supplies. The villagers expect that if the micro dam had not dried due to poor rains, they could extend additional food supplies for a full year. Villagers had also sold some of their food output to raise income for other needs such as school uniforms and books. All construction was done by the community.</p>
Halmelmalo Sub-Zoba: Wazentet	
6.	<p>Elementary School</p> <p>This is an interesting example of a school having a food security impact. The community appreciated the school, noting that in the past, they had to destroy trees every year to build classroom shelters. They expressed a desire to construct a fence around the school in order to start an environment tree growing project. They also stated that in 2007, a total of 30 pupils had graduated to 6th grade, including 10 girls, but only 3 of the girls were able to go to</p>

	Hamalmalo more than 15 km away.
Halmelmalo Sub-Zoba: Genfelom	
7.	Elementary School
	This is another example of an elementary school having a food security impact, although not to the same degree as the previous example. The project built 3 classrooms, but the school still uses tree shelters for 2 classes. The community had contributed 50,000 Nakfa to build huts for teacher's accommodation. Enrolment had increased but they have some children who come about 20 km away.
Adi Tekeliezan Sub-Zoba: Ruba melhas	
8.	Micro Dam
	Two villages with population of about 140 households each benefit from the dam. The dam provides water to approximately 3,000 livestock animals and also supports a water spring downstream with clean water for human consumption. Prior to the dam the communities travelled 4-5 km to water their animals from shallow river wells but had to alternate the animals to drink every other day. The community hope to start irrigation project in the near future.
Adi Tekeliezan Sub-Zoba: Adi tekelliezan town	
9.	Livestock Market
	The market employs 6 people. Traders pay a fee as revenue to the town administration. On market days (every Thursday) the community also benefits by selling to the market goers.
Adi Tekeliezan Sub-Zoba: Adi tekelliezan town	
10.	Vegetable Market
	Not yet operational. The market has 32 stalls. Vendors will rent the stalls from the town admin. Preference will be given to licensed traders, women's groups and war disabled. There are no toilet facilities.
Hamalmalo Sub-Zoba: Hamalmalo	
11.	Youth Centre (Training)
	Construction was started in September 2008 and completed in March 2009. Since then they have trained 23 women in livelihood skills and all of them have started their own income generation projects, with one already owning her own sewing machine The Centre employs 3 full time employees.

The FE concludes that the food security projects undertaken will significantly enhance food security in all aspects within Anseba Region, although it would have preferred to have had access a better M&E system to further quantify those impacts.

6.0 Key Evaluation Questions

The following are the Key Evaluation Questions required to be answered by the FE according to the Terms of Reference taking into account the implementation status of the programme and the resource disbursements made to date. :

6.1 Results Achievement

1.0	Question: <i>Given output achievement and related delivery of inputs and activities, what is the evidence that the programme has or is likely to attain its Immediate and Development Objectives?</i>
	Evaluation: The above analysis of the delivery of inputs and activities provides the clear evidence that the programme has attained its immediate and development objective.
	Question: <i>Specifically in this regard what evidence is there that the programme will contribute to:</i>
1.1	<i>Alleviating programme-relevant dimensions of poverty (including food security) in the Anseba</i>

	<p><i>region</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The alleviation of programme relevant dimensions of poverty is clear and unassailable. Firstly, in the analysis in respect of Output 5, it was identified that almost 50% of all development micro-projects were focussed on food security related matters. Secondly, in respect of the education-related investments, each of these either directly contributed to training and the placement of people in income earning positions or were focused at further education which has the ultimate effect of enhancing employability.</p>
1.2	<p><i>Improving access to infrastructure and services</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The Department of Education provided statistics showing a net decrease in attendance from 1,848 (1,144 boys and 704 girls) at the time of the MTE to 1,784 (1,091 boys and 693 girls) by the end of 2008. The department said the net decrease in enrolment was a positive result, which indicated that as more schools become available, overcrowding was reduced and also age appropriate enrolment becomes possible.</p> <p>The Department of Water said that based on the World Health Organisation standard of 20 litres of water consumption per day per individual and 30 litres for livestock; the project had provided safe drinking water to 30,170 individuals. This translated to a contribution of 7.94 percent, bringing the Regional statistics for clean water supply to 68 percent.</p> <p>The evaluation mission noted that the project had contributed to substantial delivery of public infrastructure and services. The infrastructure were directly selected by the communities, and in some cases, the communities had already started working on these projects prior to the support provided by the project. For example, the road project in Elabaered sub-zoba was started by the community on their own prior to the ALDP project.</p>
1.3	<p><i>Achieving more equitable participation and distribution of benefits across gender, ethnic and socio-economic groups</i></p> <p>Evaluation: This was achieved because of the community based planning processes almost all of the projects benefitted all groups. There was no specific focus on particular disadvantaged groups, with the exception of the employment policies adopted at the various markets established so that this was prioritised to disadvantaged groups.</p>
1.4	<p><i>Improving food security of vulnerable groups (e.g. Reducing malnutrition of children below 5)</i></p> <p>Evaluation: There was no specific focus on particular vulnerable groups. This must be understood within the context that Anseba Zoba is one of the poorest and most drought impacted regions in Eritrea. This is a region where most of the population must be considered to be vulnerable.</p>
1.5	<p><i>Influencing policy reforms and implementation that support effective decentralization.</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The planning model represented by the RAOM features of community lead development investment prioritisation and regional planning, budgeting, budget execution and reporting processes that can form the reasonable basis for further discussion, development and interaction on a national scale. Given that this elaborated model exists and has been used in Anseba Zoba, this represents a very solid basis in respect of which policy engagement and discussion that might be further supported by UNCDF in the future. The ALDP and UNCDF have engendered great support within Anseba Zoba and it represents a clear champion for the cause of furthering decentralisation policy and process elaboration within all of Eritrea.</p> <p>The establishment of inclusive planning committees at regional, sub-regional and kebab levels and their successful operation and internalisation, coupled with the elaboration of processes that exists in the RAOM, form a solid base for future interaction in Eritrea in respect of decentralisation policy and processes.</p>
1.6	<p><i>Capacity development of local governments</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Extensive training was undertaken with respect to enhancing the capacity levels of local government in all areas of planning, budgeting, budget execution and reporting. This is evidenced by the internalisation and use of the ROAM to develop the Regional</p>

	Development Plan in 2008. This could have been further enhanced if the LDF design had been followed, but the capacity building activities were substantial, relevant and evidenced.
1.7	<p><i>Replicating of the approach by Government and/or other donors.</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The Anseba planning process has been elaborated and regionally accepted and internalised within Anseba Region and this represents a major base from which further national and donor engagement is possible. This is enhanced by the adoption by communities of the Anseba planning process within other donor funded projects. It is the ultimate example of communities internalising appropriate participatory planning processes</p>
1.8	<p><i>Improvements in poverty levels compared to the regional household survey of 2004</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The regional household survey 2004 was not well done and its methodology was flawed and its results not capable of forming a solid baseline for any comparisons. It was not considered appropriate to attempt to remedy the defects of the 2004 survey given that 5 years had passed since it had occurred.</p>
2.0	<p>Question: <i>Is the achievement of the Development Objective a result of the achievement of the Immediate Project objective or are their other external influences?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: No external factors were identified by the FE and the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the attainment of the development objective was a direct result of the attainment of the immediate objective.</p>
3.0	<p>Question: <i>Has the programme achieved programme outputs (as per log frame indicators and annual work plan targets) and related delivery of inputs and activities?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: This has already been subjected to extensive and detailed analysis and comment in this FE. The answer is yes, in the main, subject to the identified and analysed exceptions.</p>
4.0	<p>Question: <i>What immediate results have been achieved? How effectively and efficiently have these been achieved, and to what quality? (analysed by output)</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Please refer to the forgoing extensive analysis that will not be repeated here.</p>
5.0	<p>Question: <i>Are the results reported through the programme's monitoring/Management Information System validated by evaluative evidence? Analyse any discrepancies</i></p> <p>Evaluation: the project M&E system was not operationalized, as has been analysed. It was not able to support any conclusions. All FE conclusions were supported by evidence obtained by the FE itself and not from any M&E or MIS created or operationalized by the project. As has been previously stated, this is an area of substantial concern.</p>
6.0	<p>Question: <i>Assess the significant changes (positive and otherwise) in the country relating to decentralization and local development during the programme lifetime and assess the programme's contribution to these changes (i.e. the criticality of programme results). What level of value added and consequence can be attached to the programme in the area of decentralization in the country?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: During the lifetime of the project, on a national scale, there have been no changes in respect of decentralisation as all policy developments on a national basis have been stalled for some years as the GoSE is focused on recovery from the last war and the drought. The project did not spread its results beyond the Anseba Region, as has been analysed. However, the creation of the Anseba planning process and its adoption at a regional level does position UNCDF for further effective policy interaction with the GoSE.</p>
7.0	<p>Question: <i>Assess the relative effectiveness and efficiency (cost-benefit, value for money) of the programme strategy compared to other strategies pursued by the Government, other donors or actors to achieve the development objectives? Is there evidence of any unintended negative effects of the programme?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: There were no other donor or government projects operational in Anseba and no comparison is possible. No negative effects of the project were observed or raised during any discussions.</p>
8.0	Question: <i>Assess the progress realized in strengthening the participative planning process. Is</i>

	<p><i>the bottom-up planning process fully implemented and adhered to by the different tiers of the Public Administration?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The assessment the progress realized in strengthening the participative planning process is a straightforward matter and has been fully analysed already. The bottom-up planning process was fully implemented and adhered to by the different tiers of the sub-national government as has been evidenced by the adoption and use of these processes within the RAOM, the development of the Regional Development Plan which relies extensively on these processes.</p>
9.0	<p>Question: <i>What is the level of satisfaction of various programme stakeholders with the programme and the results achieved?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: At the sub-national level, levels of satisfaction among all stakeholders could not be higher. There were no negative comments or views expressed at that level. This is not the case with the GoSE that expressed reservations based on the failure of the project to attract additional development funds either to itself, or by way of other donors adopting the same or similar processes in other regions.</p>
10.0	<p>Question: <i>Have the agreed recommendations of the mid-term evaluation of the programme been implemented? How has this affected programme performance, relevance, management etc?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: As has been analysed, the MTE recommendations were not considered or implemented. Each of the recommendations would have had a substantial impact in improving the impact of the project, particularly in terms of M&E. Please see earlier analysis.</p>
11.0	<p>Question: <i>Evaluate any other critical issues relating to results achievement (for example, time and cost effectiveness of infrastructure delivery, quality of infrastructure, operations and maintenance, provision for recurrent costs, quality of participation in different phases of planning and infrastructure delivery, linkages between investment planning and budgeting and from local to regional/national planning frameworks, contribution of the programme to co-ordinated multi-sectoral planning, local resource mobilisation, local governance culture and accountability, etc.)</i></p> <p>Evaluation: All of these issues have already been addressed. The only exception is in respect of the timeliness of transfers of funds from UNDP to the project which delayed contractor payments from time to time. To meet these payments, the sub-national government made the payments and were subsequently reimbursed. This did not adversely impact the project given the excellent relations between the sub-national government and the project.</p>

6.2 Sustainability of Results

1.0	<p>Question: <i>What is the likelihood that the programme results (e.g. integrated regional development planning and budgeting model) will be sustainable in the longer term, independent of external assistance, in terms of systems, impact on policy and replicability, institutions, capacity, local governance culture, infrastructure and services delivered, financing, and in terms of benefits at the individual, household and community level?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Within the Anseba region, the planning model developed is sustainable as it has been adopted, refined and reviewed through three iterations by interaction with the sub-national government (including communities). The model has produced the Regional Development Plan and the evidence given to the FE is that the sub-national government continues to use these processes. Communities also evidenced to the FE during the FGDs that they continue to insist on this planning model being used not only by the sub-national government but also by other donors. The model itself might not be replicable in all regions, but it forms a very solid basis from which policy engagement can be launched based on its success within Anseba. The evaluation mission developed a qualitative assessment rating of several sustainability parameters on a three-tier scale of high, indicating that the project had</p>
-----	---

	achieved maximum sustainability on the specific parameter; medium , indicating that the specific parameters needed strengthening; and low , indicating that the project had not achieved sustainability on the parameter. The table below shows the rating of the sustainability parameters that were identified.																				
	Assessment of sustainability parameters for ALDP project																				
	<table><tr><th>Sustainability parameter</th><th>Rating</th><th>Overall assessment</th></tr><tr><td>Community support and enthusiasm for “bottom-up” planning and project implementation</td><td>High</td><td>The community members in the kebabis and villages visited all demonstrated high enthusiasm and sense of empowerment by using the ALDP planning model. In all communities, the evaluation team found that projects funded by other donors were now implemented using the ALDP model. For example, in Elabaered, the community had formed a three-member project implementation committee for the school project funded by the World Bank.</td></tr><tr><td>Statutory provisions for local government</td><td>Medium</td><td>PERA provides for regional administrations to execute administrative, social service and development programmes, prepare and implement regional development plans and budgets, and to prepare and allocate regional recurrent budgets. However, there are some inconsistencies such as (1) unclear role and limited powers of elected Baito with regard to planning and budgeting in the regions; (2) apparent duplication of programming and planning functions by both the Baito and Zoba administrations; and (3) lack of clear provisions for fiscal decentralization.</td></tr><tr><td>Demonstrated results for delivery of public infrastructure and basic services</td><td>Medium</td><td>Although substantial infrastructure was delivered, some of the schools did not meet national standards. For example, the project had constructed 4 classrooms in schools where the national standard stipulated 5 or more. In addition, the project had not addresses all dimensions of poverty such as environment, energy and jobs/income.</td></tr><tr><td>National capacity</td><td>Low</td><td>This is difficult to rank as it is unclear if there is a lack of national capacity or the lack of political will to engage in the project processes. It has been ranked ‘Low’ on the basis that whether it be a capacity or political will , the result is the same in terms of available national capacity to engage in these processes.</td></tr><tr><td>Documentation of procedures to enable replication and support the development of comprehensive policy framework</td><td>Low</td><td>The specific procedures that were applied and the lessons learnt were not documented. Project experience and lessons therefore resided in the memory of individuals, which made for difficult transfer and replication.</td></tr></table>	Sustainability parameter	Rating	Overall assessment	Community support and enthusiasm for “bottom-up” planning and project implementation	High	The community members in the kebabis and villages visited all demonstrated high enthusiasm and sense of empowerment by using the ALDP planning model. In all communities, the evaluation team found that projects funded by other donors were now implemented using the ALDP model. For example, in Elabaered, the community had formed a three-member project implementation committee for the school project funded by the World Bank.	Statutory provisions for local government	Medium	PERA provides for regional administrations to execute administrative, social service and development programmes, prepare and implement regional development plans and budgets, and to prepare and allocate regional recurrent budgets. However, there are some inconsistencies such as (1) unclear role and limited powers of elected Baito with regard to planning and budgeting in the regions; (2) apparent duplication of programming and planning functions by both the Baito and Zoba administrations; and (3) lack of clear provisions for fiscal decentralization.	Demonstrated results for delivery of public infrastructure and basic services	Medium	Although substantial infrastructure was delivered, some of the schools did not meet national standards. For example, the project had constructed 4 classrooms in schools where the national standard stipulated 5 or more. In addition, the project had not addresses all dimensions of poverty such as environment, energy and jobs/income.	National capacity	Low	This is difficult to rank as it is unclear if there is a lack of national capacity or the lack of political will to engage in the project processes. It has been ranked ‘Low’ on the basis that whether it be a capacity or political will , the result is the same in terms of available national capacity to engage in these processes.	Documentation of procedures to enable replication and support the development of comprehensive policy framework	Low	The specific procedures that were applied and the lessons learnt were not documented. Project experience and lessons therefore resided in the memory of individuals, which made for difficult transfer and replication.		
Sustainability parameter	Rating	Overall assessment																			
Community support and enthusiasm for “bottom-up” planning and project implementation	High	The community members in the kebabis and villages visited all demonstrated high enthusiasm and sense of empowerment by using the ALDP planning model. In all communities, the evaluation team found that projects funded by other donors were now implemented using the ALDP model. For example, in Elabaered, the community had formed a three-member project implementation committee for the school project funded by the World Bank.																			
Statutory provisions for local government	Medium	PERA provides for regional administrations to execute administrative, social service and development programmes, prepare and implement regional development plans and budgets, and to prepare and allocate regional recurrent budgets. However, there are some inconsistencies such as (1) unclear role and limited powers of elected Baito with regard to planning and budgeting in the regions; (2) apparent duplication of programming and planning functions by both the Baito and Zoba administrations; and (3) lack of clear provisions for fiscal decentralization.																			
Demonstrated results for delivery of public infrastructure and basic services	Medium	Although substantial infrastructure was delivered, some of the schools did not meet national standards. For example, the project had constructed 4 classrooms in schools where the national standard stipulated 5 or more. In addition, the project had not addresses all dimensions of poverty such as environment, energy and jobs/income.																			
National capacity	Low	This is difficult to rank as it is unclear if there is a lack of national capacity or the lack of political will to engage in the project processes. It has been ranked ‘Low’ on the basis that whether it be a capacity or political will , the result is the same in terms of available national capacity to engage in these processes.																			
Documentation of procedures to enable replication and support the development of comprehensive policy framework	Low	The specific procedures that were applied and the lessons learnt were not documented. Project experience and lessons therefore resided in the memory of individuals, which made for difficult transfer and replication.																			
2.0	<p>Question: <i>Is there sufficient financial capacity/ funding available (from the Government and/or donors) to support programme innovations in the pilot area, and the wider adoption or replication of the model piloted by the programme?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: No. All donors engaged by the FE evidenced reservations about engagement with the GoSE. The World Bank has currently suspended all projects. Donors were unaware of the ALDP in terms or purpose and approach. There was no evidence that any donor was willing to consider programme innovations or replication.</p>																				
3.0	<p>Question: <i>Is the institutional human capacity strong enough to continue the functioning of the local governments?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The strong answer is yes. The sub-national governments possess all relevant skills and are sufficiently stable. That is not to say that further capacity development would not enhance those skills.</p>																				

4.0	Question: <i>Are UNCDF and partner strategies for exit/further engagement appropriate with regards to promoting sustainability?</i>
	Evaluation: The answer is a qualified yes. UNCDF has engendered strong support at a sub-national level within the Anseba Region but has not achieved the same in reference to the GoSE. National level engagement is a critical matter and the support within Anseba region may form the basis for building that engagement in the future.
5.0	Question: <i>Are project results (e.g. regional development plan and budget model), adopted by national government? Did the project have any other impact on the wider policy environment?</i>
	Evaluation: This has already been answered at some length in other places. The results are limited to within Anseba Region only.

6.3 Factors Affecting Successful Implementation and Results Achievement

Question: <i>Was programme implementation and results achievement according to plan, or were there any obstacles/bottlenecks/issues on the UNCDF/UNDP/Government side that limited the successful implementation and results achievement of the programme?</i>
Evaluation: The only obstacles were in reference to the failure to follow project design at all times and each of these has been already identified. The failure to consider MTE recommendations was not helpful, but on reflection, this adoption of the recommendations would not have substantially impacted the attainment of the results as they were attained in any event. The absence of an operating M&E system prevented appropriate levels of quality assurance.

6.4 External Factors

1.0	Question: <i>Has the policy environment had consequences for programme performance?</i>
	Evaluation: No. The project did not attempt to project its outputs beyond the Anseba region and therefore the overall policy environment in Eritrea did not have any consequences for programme performance. If the project had attempted to project its outputs, there may well have been consequences as the GoSE seems stalled in terms of decentralization policy development. An Interim PRSP was developed some years ago, but there the process ended.
2.0	Question: <i>To what extent does the broader policy environment remain conducive to the replication of the lessons learnt from the pilot programme?</i>
	Evaluation: The FE concluded that the Anseba pilot could be used effectively to replicate lessons-learned at a national level. This issue should be discussed in depth in any future project appraisal and formulation efforts.
3.0	Question: <i>Are there any other factors external to the programme that has affected successful implementation and results achievement, and prospects for policy impact and replication?</i>
	Evaluation: No.

6.5 Programme Related Factors

<i>Programme design (relevance and quality):</i>	
1.0	Question: <i>Was the programme logic, design and strategy optimal to achieve the desired programme objectives, given the national/local context and the needs to be addressed?</i>
	Evaluation: Yes, the programme design was in general appropriate and relevant and fully considered all factors and context. Additional consideration could have been given as the importance of various activity timings, such as the local revenue mobilization study.
2.0	Question: <i>In assessing design consider, among other issues, whether relevant gender issues were adequately addressed in programme design.</i>
	Evaluation: Gender issues were not specifically addressed in a manner that would have

	allowed for their specific address in Anseba. It might have been possible to allocate programme funds to deal with gender specific identified priorities, but this was neither called for in the project design nor undertaken.
3.0	<p>Question: <i>Is the programme rooted in and effectively integrated with national strategies (e.g. poverty reduction strategy) and UN planning and results frameworks (CCA, UNDAF) at country level?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: No. The programme is not rooted in national processes at all, as has been extensively analysed. The national policy framework is substantially unarticulated and has been stalled for some years. It is within the UN planning and results framework at country level but much further work needs to be undertaken to develop the articulation of the national strategies to allow for this connection to be made.</p>
4.0	<p>Question: <i>Have the programme's objectives remained valid and relevant? Has any progress in achieving these objectives added significant value?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The programme objectives remained valid and relevant at all times. Significant value has been added by the results attained within Anseba Region that will allow for the further interaction with the GoSE, the other regions and the donor community.</p>
5.0	<p>Question: <i>To what extent was the programme adapted to changes in the external environment?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The programme did adapt to the external environment by occasionally varying from project design. This was not always substantially successful, such as the failure to establish the LDF as designed.</p>

Institutional and implementation arrangements:

1.0	<p>Question: <i>Were the programme's institutional and implementation arrangements appropriate, effective and efficient for the successful achievement of the programme's objectives?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The design of the institutional and implementation arrangements was appropriate, efficient and effective, but in terms of programme experience, the institutional arrangements were difficult to maintain with a constant change over of staff. This occurred for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was the movement of staff from the programme to Asmara to work for various UN agencies. This caused some difficulties with sub-national government as it was aware of these staff movements. Qualified staff was difficult to attract to work in Anseba region in any event. It would have been better if these staff movements were not engaged in by UN agencies.</p>
2.0	<p>Question: <i>Where there any institutional obstacles hindering the implementation/operations of the programme?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: No.</p>

Programme management:

1.0	<p>Question: <i>Were the government and management arrangements for the programme adequate and appropriate?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Yes. The co-operation and engagement of the sub-national government at all levels was adequate and appropriate.</p>
2.0	<p>Question: <i>How effectively has the programme been managed at all levels? Is programme management results-based and innovative? Has financial management been sound?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Programme and fiscal management was proper, professional and adequate in order to achieve effective management.</p>
3.0	<p>Question: <i>Have the programme's management systems, including M&E, reporting and financial systems functioned as effective management tools, and facilitated effective implementation of the programme.</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The financial management and reporting systems functioned properly and</p>

	<p>effectively. The M&E system, as has been analysed elsewhere, was not functional for the reasons already described. This impacted effective implementation in that there was no system in place that was able to properly inform programme management in respect of implementation matters.</p> <p>Burn rates in terms of funds utilised to undertaken planned activities were all well below planned levels. This was a continuous feature of the project until the very last years. As a programmatic diagnostic, this information should have displayed to management that there were serious and fundamental matters that required address. The low burn rate cannot be said to be a function of absorption capacity as the original allocated figures were based on a design that was meant to have fully considered absorption capacity.</p> <p>It was not until the third year of the project after the inception phase that releases picked up to a pace that started to reach acceptable levels. For instance, the very first allocation for LDF was US\$400,000 in the first year for ‘quick-win’ projects and the MTE reported this as having been released. In fact only US\$102,552 was released and the balance was released in the following year. At the time of the MTE, the release against allocation rate on a sub-zoba basis was 38% which points to fundamental issues with the allocation process.</p>
4.0	<p>Question: <i>Have the programme’s logical framework, performance indicators, baseline data and monitoring systems provided a sufficient and efficient basis for monitoring and evaluating programme performance?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: No. the logical framework is adequate but many of the indicators are framed too narrowly to be of effective use and relevance. This has been dealt with in the log frame analysis. There were no effective baseline data and monitoring systems in place. This adversely impacted all monitoring and evaluation of programme performance.</p>
5.0	<p>Question: <i>Has the M&E system supported effective programme management, corporate decision-making and learning?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: No, for the reasons already highlighted.</p>

<i>Technical backstopping</i>	
1.0	<p>Question: <i>Is technical assistance and backstopping from programme partners appropriate, adequate and timely to support the programme in achieving its objectives??</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Technical advice from UNCDF in New York visited the project bi-annually through most of the life of the programme. The programme staff very much welcomed that level of technical backstopping and the technical advisor attempted to provide the level of senior government linkages and interactions that were required by the programme. The FE finds that it would have been much more efficient and effective to have resident technical advisory capacity within Eritrea to enable the development of the engagement with the GoSE and other donors that the FE considers necessary to be able to provide the degree of technical backstopping that was necessary to have taken the results of the project outside of the region and used them as the basis for the elaboration of further policy engagement. It is also noted that the RAOM, which is such a critical document, took a very long time to develop to the stage where it was adopted by the sub-national government and this only bore fruit after 6 years of programme implementation in the development of the regional Development Plan in 2008. This period of time could have been substantially shortened with resident technical capacity in Eritrea which would in turn then lead to a greater potential for the export of the results outside of the regional. Lastly, resident technical capacity would also have ensured that critical M&E matters were addressed.</p>

6.6 Strategic Positioning and Partnerships

<i>Has UNCDF, through this programme and any other engagement in the country, optimally positioned itself strategically, with respect to:</i>	
1.0	<p>Question: <i>UNDP and other UN/donor/government efforts in the same sector in the country?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Yes. As has been already covered, the combination of the RAOM, the planning process that was developed and the goodwill engendered within Anseba sub-national government, UNCDF is well positioned for further engagement with all stakeholders. However, there is no evidence that other donors are expressing any discernable interest in this sector at this time.</p>
3.0	<p>Question: <i>Implementing national priorities, as reflected in national development strategies?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: See above.</p>
4.0	<p>Question: <i>UNCDF corporate priorities</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Yes, this programme is squarely within UNCDF corporate priorities and for the reasons highlighted above and in the analysis, UNCDF is well positioned.</p>
5.0	<p>Question: <i>Has UNCDF leveraged its comparative advantages to maximum effect?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Yes, with the exception of the failure to promote the Anseba planning process outside of the region.</p>
6.0	<p>Question: <i>Has UNCDF leveraged its current/potential partnerships to maximum effect?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: Yes. The partnership with BSF was well leveraged. However, if the Anseba planning process had been promoted outside of the Anseba region, UNCDF may have been able to better leverage potential partners to further effect.</p>

6.7 Future UNCDF role

1.0	<p>Question: <i>What are the remaining challenges and gaps in the area of decentralization in the country? How are various actors positioned to address these? Is there a conducive environment for further progress on decentralization? In light of the above, is there a future opportunity for UNCDF to add value following the end of the current programme? In what capacity?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: The gaps in decentralization processes in Eritrea are large, as has been analyzed at length. The current policy framework is undeveloped on a national level but this presents an opportunity for engagement based on the results and achievements of the ALDP. Donors are not well positioned to address these gaps because there is no discernable interest in this sector. The UN system also appears to have disengaged in that after assisting with the development of the Interim PRSP several years ago; further engagement has been slight at a national level. There is no conclusive evidence of an appropriate environment for further progress on decentralization. The statements made to the FE by senior GoSE officials tend towards the position that other priorities occupy the attention of the GoSE. However, given the level of traction at the sub-national level, it does appear that programme replication in other sub-national governments is a potential fruitful area of programme engagement. UNCDF through ALDP attempted partnering with some donors either in the implementation of activities (co-funding) or having donors finance aspects of LDF funded projects but this did not eventuate to a substantial degree apart from limited interactions with the ITU and UNICEF. ALDP was not seen (by donors or national government) as a pilot for decentralisation in Eritrea. Most of the donors and NGOs, with whom discussions were held, either expressed total ignorance or had scanty information about the ALDP.</p> <p>The MTE noted a general scepticism about the commitment of the GoSE to implement decentralisation, arguing that priority for GoSE was restoration and maintenance of security and rehabilitation (humanitarian activities).</p>
------------	---

	Within GoSE, information about the ALDP is mainly restricted to staff of MND, who were involved from its design, while working with the former Ministry of Local Government. This was caused not only by the absence of the UNCDF Country Office Programme Officer, but also by the limited pro-activeness of the PST in disseminating the project lessons beyond Anseba and the NSC. The function of liaising with donors and higher levels of government was not performed.
2.0	<p>Question: <i>Analyse and comment on any emerging vision, strategy and measures proposed for disengaging or continuing UNCDF's programming in the country.</i></p> <p>Evaluation: No emerging vision has been elaborated except at the last meeting of the NSC when a programme drafted proposal to extend the programme was endorsed, subject to conditions. This was not lead by the NSC but was internally generated by UNDP/UNCDF and programme staff. The FE has made recommendations in this respect in the analysis and the vision that has the greatest chance of success is by building on the achievements of the programme and by engaging the Anseba sub-national government as a champion with Eritrea for the furthering of this engagement.</p>
3.0	<p>Question: <i>What are findings and lessons from the final evaluation of the current programme that should influence any decision on a future role for UNCDF and its partners?</i></p> <p>Evaluation: For a further programme to be successful, the FE recommended that resident technical advice be available within Eritrea to ensure that project design was adhered to as well as managing national level engagements. This can be a difficult matter as the engagement of appropriately qualified technical staff willing to commit long term to Eritrea is not certain, based on experience to date. Without this level of resident technical capacity being available, UNCDF must consider closely how it will technically support a further programme to the required levels.</p>

7.0 Capacity Building

ALDP did not have and never attempted to develop a comprehensive capacity building plan based on a capacity needs assessment, given overall project design. The project design contemplated various capacity building interventions, but capacity building interventions can only be considered on the basis of a capacity building needs assessment. The capacity building needs assessment should have considered all levels of government, particularly as it was a policy experiment and to be able to implement the experiment and then extrapolate the results, an overarching capacity building plan based on the capacity building needs assessment was fundamental and critical. Consequently, the capacity building undertaken was ad hoc and without structure within the context of the policy experiment.

This lack did not appear to be understood within the zoba or sub-zoba levels of government or within the PST (or such of the members as could be engaged in discussion). The perception is that an ad hoc examination of capacity needs as was undertaken was a capacity needs assessment and the training undertaken took place within this framework. , it appears that ALDP project staff have had little exposure to standard project operational processes. However, not to have undertaken a capacity needs assessment within the overall framework of the needs of the project is a fundamental failing that limits the value of the training that was undertaken. While the project design did not specifically call for a capacity needs assessment, this is a standard requirement in respect of all capacity building interventions and should have been conducted in any event.

8.0 Lessons Learned

1. When no specific activities and resources are allocated for documenting processes, procedures and lessons learnt, institutional memory is lost due to staff movements and attrition. The lack of documented procedures deprived the project of value addition to national policy dialogue and prevents replication based on established good practices and proven experience.
2. Participatory planning processes empower communities and facilitate a sense of ownership. Numerous examples were obtained from field visits of community members voluntarily putting on extra hours in community work outside the agreed contribution levels because they regarded the projects as their own.
3. Implementation of projects by communities substantially reduces costs without necessarily compromising quality, as long as there is adequate technical backstopping support. The project established in a consulting engineers assessment that was commissioned by the project that community implemented projects were completed faster than private contractor implemented projects and at 30-40 percent less cost. In addition, communities had no motivation to cut costs by using sub-standard materials, while also supervision by technical staff tended to be more effective for community implemented projects than private contractor projects due to responsibility and accountability factors.
4. Without an effective M&E system, it is not possible to make precise assessments of progress achieved and contribution to results. An effective M&E system must start at the planning stage with clear, relevant and adequate indicators as well as a detailed plan for tracking and monitoring the indicators regularly.
5. Donors are wary to increase cooperation agreements with the government, and would prefer a situation where UN agencies can develop partnerships around specific programmes. Future actions should strive to create a broad-based programme with several components and develop a resource mobilization strategy whereby different donors support specific components of the programme that address their areas of cooperation with the GoSE
6. Unanticipated changes in the government institutional arrangements affect the pace of activity implementation. Working through the formal government structures stimulates project ownership and is likely to lead to sustainability. However, in some cases, it can reduce the pace of implementing project activities, especially where the staff turnover is high leading to loss of institutional memory and necessitating a need to re-train new staff. Capacity building is more effective if it is a 'learning by doing process'
7. The principles of decentralisation are not well enshrined or elaborated in Eritrea. Conducive institutional structures are a requirement, but are not alone sufficient to successfully implement decentralisation. The commitment for central government is a basic and fundamental requirement to achieve the long term institutional changes and capacity improvement required.
8. Failure to perform the advocacy and lobbying functions by the UNDP and UNCDF side resulted in a slower pace of policy impact and replication. The advisory and advocacy/lobbying functions have to be well prepared and performed. As the MTE noted, external policy, institutional and environmental issues greatly influence the project's attainment of stated objectives. The good lessons and experiences learnt should be consciously publicized if they are to be replicated by other donors and to impact on policies by government. There is need for continuous and strategic lobbying and selling out of the project process and outputs. This is best achieved when UNCDF has adequate contact with high government offices and donors/NGOs. Decentralisation is a novel strategy and will typically face resistance in the initial stages, on the assertion that the lower levels lack capacities to

implement the demanding tasks. UNCDF has to insist on practical testing, risk taking, learning by doing and if the results are evident, the 'buy-in', policy impact and replication processes become easier

9.0 Recommendations

1. The evaluation team recommends that UNCDF should apply the lessons and experience of the ALDP project to develop a broader programme that addresses the wider dimensions of poverty including, food security, access to basic services; environment and energy; and job creation (as was the original project design) but with substantially enhanced technical supervision to ensure programmatic compliance with project design.

2. The process should involve the following initial major steps –

- Engage the GoSE in a dialogue to ensure that there is continued support for the decentralization agenda at the highest levels. This will involve, among other things, review of institutional mechanisms and systemic and structural issues such as the roles and relation between the Ministries of National Development and Finance in the realm of development; as well as further review and defining the flow of information in the National Development Planning process and the respective roles of the regional and sub-regional administrations in the process.
- Undertake comprehensive needs assessment exercise to collect relevant and targeted baseline data for all zobas. In addition, this will involve the development (possibly as part of the project) of institutional mechanisms and regional level capacities for tracking and monitoring these indicators on an on-going basis.
- Engage in dialogue with the broader donor community to develop a targeted partnership that can provide adequate resources for the launch of the project on a national scale. This will involve developing a partnership strategy that can unpack the various components of the programme so that respective donors can provide support only for those components that address their respective areas of cooperation with the GoSE. For example, specific programme components can be built around environment, gender, civil society, energy and private sector development.
- Undertake a comprehensive capacity development programme for project teams to lead the projects in the regions. The specific composition of the regional management teams will depend on the sectoral components of the programme.

3. Any future programme must have a resident senior technical advisor as a basic and fundamental requirement. This person must be capable of engaging the GoSE on a continuous technical basis to ensure the capture of the concepts by the GoSE and the implementation of the outcomes on a national basis. Ideally, this person should be a project staff member

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference



UNITED NATIONS
CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

FONDS D'EQUIPEMENT
DES NATIONS UNIES

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INDEPENDENT EVALUATIONS

Project Data Sheet

Country: Eritrea

Programme Title: Anseba Local Development Project

Programme nbr: ERI/01/C01 (UNCDF)

ERI/01/013/A/01/99 (UNDP)

Financial Breakdown (by donor)

UNCDF	1,980,036 USD
UNDP	894,349 USD
BSF	3,822,552 USD
Government	<u>200,000 USD</u>
	6,896,937 USD

Delivery to date (per donor per year):

Delivery	UNCDF	UNDP	Belgian Survival Fund (BSF)	Total	
2001	152 422		0	152 422	Figures from mid-term evaluation
2002	246 802		151 000	397 802	
2003	95 048		123 759	218 808	
2004	79 545	99 318	65 785	244 648	Atlas figures

2005	388 318	124 279	634 351	1 146 948		
2006	8 089	80 383	730 920	819 392		
2007	418 078	78 243	600 638	1 096 959		
2008	286 353	90 778	1 057 847	1 434 978		
2009	-143 443	530 512	467 613	854 682		
Total	1 531 212	1 003 513	3 831 615	6 366 340		
Total project Budget			6,896,937,USD			

Executing Agency: Eritrea Ministry of National Development (previously Ministry of Local Government)

Implementing Agency: Zoba Anseba (NEX)

Approval Date of project: 15/10/2001

Project Duration: 5 years

Project Amendment: No

Evaluation Date: Q2 2009

Composition of Evaluation Team:

Team Leader – international:

Team Member - international:

Team Member – national:

Team Member – national:

Team Member – national:

Other current UNCDF projects in-country: No

Previous UNCDF Projects: No

Previous evaluations: Mid-term evaluation Anseba Local Development Fund in November 2005 (see documentation list)

B. Purpose, Timing and Users of the Evaluation

a) Purpose

The objectives of a UNCDF Final Evaluation are:

- ✓ To assist the recipient Government, beneficiaries, and the concerned co-financing partners, to understand the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact of the programme, the sustainability of programme results, the level of satisfaction of programme stakeholders and beneficiaries with the results, and whether UNCDF was effectively positioned and partnered to achieve maximum impact;
- ✓ To contribute to UNCDF and partners' learning from programme experience.
- ✓ To help programme stakeholders assess the value and opportunity for broader replication of the programme.
- ✓ To help programme stakeholders determine the need for follow-up on the intervention, and general direction for the future course.
- ✓ To ensure accountability for results to the programme's financial backers, stakeholders and beneficiaries.
- ✓ Comply with the requirement of the programme document/funding agreement and UNCDF Evaluation Policy.

b) Evaluation timing

The final evaluation is expected to involve 5 days preparation, 20 days in-country and 10 days report finalization.

c) Evaluation collaboration

The evaluation will be co financed by UNCDF and BSF. UNCDF is fully responsible for managing and executing the evaluation process. A draft version of the Terms of Reference of the Evaluation has been shared with BSF and its observations have been included in the final Terms of Reference. BSF is expected to comment on the draft final report and also participate in the Global Debriefing organized by the UNCDF Evaluation Unit.

B. Programme profile

a) Country context/status of decentralization in terms of strategy, policy and implementation:

Eritrea achieved independence in 1991 and ratified its Constitution on May 23 1997. The Constitution under a number of articles emphasizes the participation and active involvement of the citizens. The Constitution also incorporated the principles of decentralization. For example, Article 7(3) states that, 'There shall be established appropriate institutions to encourage and develop people's initiatives and participation in their communities'. Article 1(5) further states that, 'Eritrea is a unitary State divided into units of local government. The powers and duties of these units

shall be determined by law'.

The law, which elaborates the powers and duties of local governments, is the **Proclamation for the Establishment of Regional Administration (PERA)**, and it was declared and effected in 1996. The PERA is the institutional definition of both the local government structure and its responsibilities for local planning and decision-making.

The Government of Eritrea has formulated a draft Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper where it is stated that the long-term objective of the Eritrean development framework, is to attain rapid and widely shared economic growth with macro economic stability, and a steady and sustainable reduction in poverty. The government in this respect plans to mobilize all available resources and use them efficiently and effectively in the fight against poverty.

It is against the background of this critical recovery and rehabilitation period that the ALDP was formulated and implemented to strengthen the local government capacity to provide basic social and economic infrastructure, with a long-term development objective of poverty reduction. The project also addresses the

wider institutional and systemic issues (planning, allocation, financing, implementation, as well as management arrangements), linked to the continued delivery of pro-poor infrastructure and services by the local government in Anseba.

Brief background to the institutional context

The government of Eritrea has four tiers of public administration hence the national, regional (zoba), sub-regional (sub-zoba) and kebabi (collection of villages).

At the **national level** there are ministries and specialist organisations. In particular the Ministry of National Development is among others responsible for decentralisation and local government affairs including facilitating better management and execution of the complex task of planning and co-ordination at all levels of government for a more effective use of scarce public resources, for the promotion of sustainable growth and the alleviation of poverty.

At the **regional level** there is the regional government of council (Baito) with councillors directly elected and supporting executive (administration). The region is responsible for preparation and implementation regional development plans (RDP).

At the **sub-region level** there are full time personnel but no elected councils. At the **kebabi level** there are kebabi administrators and deputy administrators locally elected and government salaried. In addition, in place is a community court of three elected judges; personnel, secretary and finance officers (all three to be appointed as full time staff); and committees for Land, Infrastructure, Economic Development, Social Affairs and National Service.

b) Programme summary:

The Government of Eritrea's efforts to reduce poverty in the Anseba region have been supported through the ALDP since 2002. The project was formulated in 2001 and has support from UNCDF, UNDP and the Belgian Survival Fund. It is UNCDF's first intervention in Eritrea and has a total budget of \$ 6,896,937.

The project works to strengthen local government capacity to provide basic social and economic infrastructure, improve the natural resource base of local communities, and enhance local human capital endowments (such as increased awareness of health risks like HIV/AIDS). In addition, the project is directly addressing the wider institutional issues (planning, finance and implementation arrangements) linked to the continued delivery of pro-poor public infrastructure and services by the local government in Anseba. The project has been operational from April 2002 until December 2008. To keep the development momentum in the Region of Anseba, an extension programme of the project for 2009 is currently underway with UNDP support. (The extension programme is a transitional intervention aimed at maintaining the continuity of the project in the expectation that UNCDF will be in a position to provide further support for an expanded joint programme based on the results of the final evaluation. The final evaluation will be limited to the lifespan of the project that ran from April 2002 to December 2008.

c) Programme expected results:

Development objective: Reduce poverty (including food security¹) in Anseba Region as a basis for sustained self-development.

¹ Food security exists when all human beings, have physical and economical access to sufficient, wholesome, nutritious food at all moments that allows them to satisfy their energy needs and food preferences to lead a healthy active life' (FAO definition for the 1996 World Food Summit). The 4 pillars of food security are, (1) *availability* (agricultural, production),

Immediate objective: Local government in Anseba Region delivers public infrastructure and services based on responsive, transparent and pro-poor planning procedures.

Output 1: A participatory and transparent planning system is established that ensures the identification and design of locally prioritized pro-poor projects. Activities to achieve this output include:

- _ establishing pro-poor planning procedures for local government units within Anseba and providing training in their use;
- _ strengthening the capacity of the Regional Baito – the only elected body in the system of local government – to play its role in accordance with the provisions of PERA;
- _ supporting the dissemination of information concerning the planning process and its outcomes;
- _ strengthening the capacity of the Regional and sub-regional administrations to backstop and to carry out planning exercises.

Output 2: Access to and management of financial resources for funding development plans by local government units in Anseba is improved. Activities to achieve this output include: _ setting up and managing the Anseba Local Development Fund, which will channel annual capital budget support to the sub-regional administrations in order to finance locally-identified priorities and development plans;

- _ establishing sound financial management procedures (including auditing) and providing local government officials with training in financial management;
- _ strengthening the capacity of sub-regional and regional administrations to carry out financial management;
- _ carrying out action-research into local revenue mobilisation and piloting revenue mobilisation schemes in selected sub-regional administrations.

Output 3: Regional and local capacity to deliver, operate and maintain projects efficiently is strengthened. Activities to achieve this output include:

- _ establishing procedures for procurement and implementation, for which training will be provided;
- _ supporting locally-based monitoring of implementation arrangements;
- _ strengthening the capacity of local stakeholders to ensure operations and maintenance of infrastructure.

Output 4: The Anseba planning process, styles of programming and project design, and policy issues arising from this experience inform national policy. Activities to achieve this output include:

- _ setting up and managing ALDP's monitoring and evaluation system;
- _ establishing a National Steering Committee for the project, within which national stakeholders would be represented;

(2)access to roads, markets, income... , (3) *stability* (analysis of seasonal food shortages) and (4) Utilization (nutritious food at all times that allows to satisfy energy needs and food preference to lead a healthy active life).

_ organising annual stakeholder reviews of the project; or publishing and disseminating periodic lesson-learning bulletins;

_ developing a strategy of support to the Ministry of Local Government in order to strengthen its capacity to learn lessons and formulate policy.

Additional Output 5: Food security is considered as one of the criteria for prioritizing micro projects. Taking into consideration the interests of BSF and Zoba Anseba Administration, and in accordance with the decision taken by the National Steering Committee, the issue of food security gained its proper place in the ALDP since late 2004. To this effect, a fifth project output under the title of Natural Resource Management was included separately in the 2005 ALDP Annual Workplan, since it was not found appropriate to include the forthcoming activities related to food security in either of the original four ALDP outputs.

d) Programme status:

The Programme has come to an end in December 2008 and project results have been documented in the ALDP End of Project Report (see Annex). The **major realizations** of the programme are listed hereafter:

- The Local Development Fund – the foundation of the programme – has enabled the execution of 6 investment cycles (yearly cycle in 2003-2008) with a total worth of 4 million USD
- 82 micro-projects were funded and project prioritizations happened following a participatory process. The micro-projects in the first 3 years were implemented in all sectors, but the focus shifted in the last 3 years towards micro-projects concentrated on food security and water programmes. The vast majority of projects was following Implementation by Sub-Zobas and Kebabis
- Capacity building trainings executed by the ALDP programme have enabled local government staff to manage local development processes such as planning, financial management, project implementation, operations & maintenance, etc. Training sessions since 2006 are specifically tailored according to the demands made by the Zoba while earlier training sessions were based on the project operations plan

During its execution, the Programme has faced a number of important **challenges or constraints**:

- ALDP's National Steering Committee has not been functioning since March 2005, after the former regional governor wanted to change the structure and the membership of the committee. No meetings have been held until the end of the project.
- Micro-project implementation has often been delayed in the course of the project due to scarcity of buildings materials and fuel
- The project has seen repeated resignations from Project Support Team Staff. Due to non-competitive salary packages, project staff left to the capital when they could secure a better position there
- Some delays especially in connection to the release of LDF were regularly experienced. Payment Certificates sent to the PST had to be kept sometimes over a month unpaid.

Documentation of results and progress is recorded in a number of reports:

- ALDP prepares an Annual Work Plan, and monitors and evaluates activity performance to produce subsequent periodic progress reports on project output achievements.
- Annual Progress reports are prepared since 2002 and the project has been concluded by an end of project report.
- In addition to these narrative quarterly and annual reports, the project also enters basic data such as AWP, project implementation reports, micro-project status including contracts and payments made quarterly in UNCDF MIS and submits these reports directly to UNCDF.

In addition while no baseline study with quantitative measures was executed at the start of the project, a regional household survey executed in 2004, including quantitative poverty measures, can be used as a reference for the project.

The Mid-term evaluation (executed in November 2005) identified the following challenges (quoted directly from Mid-Term Evaluation report):

- The participatory planning process at the kebabi level is not deepened because the Kebabi level is limited to 'raw project ideas identification'. Though it is the project's intention, the linkages between the bottom-up and regional development planning processes are not explicit;
- The allocation of LDF across sub-zobas is based on population and poverty, but the project lacks concrete and reliable data on poverty, which makes the horizontal allocation formula prone to subjectivity;
- There is gross under-spending of LDF (at approximately 38% of the budgeted expenditure) because of the suspension of project activities in 2004, and delays in implementation due to difficulties in attracting contractors, as well as contractors hiking fees, and the unavailability of construction materials;
- The LDF is not transferred to and managed by sub-zobas as intended, and the incentive-based allocation system is not operational (for example, the minimum conditions are not formally assessed, and rewards and sanctions not applied);
- The project has not been able to implement priorities and investments directly in the productive sector, despite the food insecurity in the region; and
- Some stakeholders do not see (or are not aware of) the ALDP as a 'policy experiment' and UNCDF has a limited profile within the donor community and higher levels of government.

More details on the recommendations made during the midterm evaluation can be read in the report of the mid-term evaluation, added in the documentation list.

The project life span was extended with one year, while keeping the same budget ceilings as an immediate result of the mid-term evaluation. This implied that the project end date was shifted to December 2008.

C. Content and Scope of the Evaluation

a) Key Evaluation Questions

Taking into account the implementation status of the programme and the resource disbursements made to date, the evaluations will explore the following questions:

1. Results Achievement

- ✓ Given output achievement and related delivery of inputs and activities, what is the evidence that the programme has or is likely to attain its Immediate and Development Objectives? Specifically in this regard what evidence/ is there that the programme will contribute to:
 - Alleviating programme-relevant dimensions of poverty (including food security) in the Anseba region
 - Improving access to infrastructure and services
 - Achieving more equitable participation and distribution of benefits across gender, ethnic and socio-economic groups
 - Improving food security of vulnerable groups (e.g. Reducing malnutrition of children below 5)
 - Influencing policy reforms and implementation that support effective decentralization
 - Capacity development of local governments
 - Replicating of the approach by Government and/or other donors.
 - Improvements in poverty levels compared to the regional household survey of 2004
- ✓ Is the achievement of the Development Objective a result of the achievement of the Immediate Project objective or are their other external influences?
- ✓ Has the programme achieved programme outputs (as per log frame indicators and annual work plan targets) and related delivery of inputs and activities?
- ✓ What immediate results have been achieved? How effectively and efficiently have these been achieved, and to what quality? (analysed by output)
- ✓ Are the results reported through the programme's monitoring/Management Information System validated by evaluative evidence? Analyse any discrepancies.
- ✓ Assess the significant changes (positive and otherwise) in the country relating to decentralization and local development during the programme lifetime and assess the programme's contribution to these

changes (i.e. the criticality of programme results). What level of value added and consequence can be attached to the programme in the area of decentralization in the country?

- ✓ Assess the relative effectiveness and efficiency (cost-benefit, value for money) of the programme strategy compared to other strategies pursued by the Government, other donors or actors to achieve the development objectives? Is there evidence of any unintended negative effects of the programme?
- ✓ Assess the progress realized in strengthening the participative planning process. Is the bottom-up planning process fully implemented and adhered to by the different tiers of the Public Administration?
- ✓ What is the level of satisfaction of various programme stakeholders with the programme and the results achieved?
- ✓ Have the agreed recommendations of the mid-term evaluation of the programme been implemented? How has this affected programme performance, relevance, management etc?
- ✓ Evaluate any other critical issues relating to results achievement (for example, time and cost effectiveness of infrastructure delivery, quality of infrastructure, operations and maintenance, provision for recurrent costs, quality of participation in different phases of planning and infrastructure delivery, linkages between investment planning and budgeting and from local to regional/national planning frameworks, contribution of the programme to co-ordinated multi-sectoral planning, local resource mobilisation, local governance culture and accountability, etc.)

Sustainability of Results

- ✓ What is the likelihood that the programme results (e.g. integrated regional development planning and budgeting model) will be sustainable in the longer term, independent of external assistance, in terms of systems, impact on policy and replicability, institutions, capacity, local governance culture, infrastructure and services delivered, financing, and in terms of benefits at the individual, household and community level?
- ✓ Is there sufficient financial capacity/ funding available (from the Government and/or donors) to support programme innovations in the pilot area, and the wider adoption or replication of the model piloted by the programme?
- ✓ Is the institutional human capacity strong enough to continue the functioning of the local governments?
- ✓ Are UNCDF and partner strategies for exit/further engagement appropriate with regards to promoting sustainability?
- ✓ Are project results (e.g. regional development plan and budget model), adopted by national government? Did the project have any other impact on the wider policy environment?

Factors Affecting Successful Implementation and Results Achievement

- ✓ Was programme implementation and results achievement according to plan, or were there any obstacles/bottlenecks/issues on the UNCDF/UNDP/Government side that limited the successful implementation and results achievement of the programme?

3.1 External Factors:

- ✓ Has the policy environment had consequences for programme performance?
- ✓ To what extent does the broader policy environment remain conducive to the replication of the lessons learnt from the pilot programme?
- ✓ Are there any other factors external to the programme that have affected successful implementation and results achievement, and prospects for policy impact and replication?

3.2 Programme-related Factors:

Programme design (relevance and quality):

- ✓ Was the programme logic, design and strategy optimal to achieve the desired programme objectives, given the national/local context and the needs to be addressed?
- ✓ In assessing design consider, among other issues, whether relevant gender issues were adequately addressed in programme design.
- ✓ Is the programme rooted in and effectively integrated with national strategies (e.g. poverty reduction strategy) and UN planning and results frameworks (CCA, UNDAF) at country level?
- ✓ Have the programme's objectives remained valid and relevant? Has any progress in achieving these objectives added significant value?

- ✓ To what extent was the programme adapted to changes in the external environment?

Institutional and implementation arrangements:

- ✓ Were the programme's institutional and implementation arrangements appropriate, effective and efficient for the successful achievement of the programme's objectives?
- ✓ Where there any institutional obstacles hindering the implementation/operations of the programme?

Programme management:

- ✓ Were the government and management arrangements for the programme adequate and appropriate?
- ✓ How effectively has the programme been managed at all levels? Is programme management results-based and innovative? Has financial management been sound?
- ✓ Have the programme's management systems, including M&E, reporting and financial systems functioned as effective management tools, and facilitated effective implementation of the programme.
- ✓ Have the programme's logical framework, performance indicators, baseline data and monitoring systems provided a sufficient and efficient basis for monitoring and evaluating programme performance?
- ✓ Has the M&E system supported effective programme management, corporate decision-making and learning?

Technical backstopping: Is technical assistance and backstopping from programme partners appropriate, adequate and timely to support the programme in achieving its objectives?

4. Strategic Positioning and Partnerships

- ✓ Has UNCDF, through this programme and any other engagement in the country, optimally positioned itself strategically, with respect to:
- ✓ UNDP and other UN/donor/government efforts in the same sector in the country?
- ✓ Implementing national priorities, as reflected in national development strategies?
- ✓ UNCDF corporate priorities
- ✓ Has UNCDF leveraged its comparative advantages to maximum effect?
- ✓ Has UNCDF leveraged its current/potential partnerships to maximum effect?

5. Future UNCDF role

- ✓ What are the remaining challenges and gaps in the area of decentralization in the country? How are various actors positioned to address these? Is there a conducive environment for further progress on decentralization? In light of the above, is there a future opportunity for UNCDF to add value following the end of the current programme? In what capacity?
- ✓ Analyse and comment on any emerging vision, strategy and measures proposed for disengaging or continuing UNCDF's programming in the country.
- ✓ What are findings and lessons from the final evaluation of the current programme that should influence any decision on a future role for UNCDF and its partners?

D. Evaluation methodology and instruments

Evaluations are generally expected to take place within the capital city of a country and in designated areas where the LDPs are implemented. Essentially, the evaluation process in country will consist of several broad steps:

In the capital city:

- 1) Briefing of the Evaluation Team by UNCDF personnel, the UNDP Resident Rep and government / other relevant national institutions;
- 2) Hypothesis formulation workshop (using the original log frame/RRF as the base) for team orientation.
- 3) Interviews by the team with national stakeholders such as key ministries and donors;

In the implementation area(s) - regional level:

- 4) Launch of the evaluation in an area via a kick-off workshop with local level, key stakeholders such as government and programme officials, and community representatives;
- 5) One-on-one interviews with some of the stakeholders from the kick off workshop;
- 6) Stakeholder report-back and participatory appraisal workshops at end of fieldwork.

In the implementation areas – local level- Anseba:

- 1) Interviews with local government political representatives and officials
- 2) Interviews/FGDs with infrastructure and associated service providers and users
- 3) Interviews with private sector operators involved in construction and maintenance
- 4) Interviews with knowledgeable informants (journalists, lawyers etc)
- 5) Focus Group Discussions with group representative of broad population and with a group representative of the very poor & women
- 6) Assessment of physical infrastructure projects

In the capital city:

- 1) Debriefing of the UNDP Resident Representative
- 2) Report back workshop with programme stakeholders, presenting key findings;

The following table provides a summary of the evaluation instruments that may be used in the evaluation process.

Proposed Instrument	Evaluation team meetings	regional and local stakeholder interviews	Kick off workshop	Regional & Local stakeholder meetings	FGDs	Surveys	Physical infrastructure structure assessment	Local and national report back workshop
Team Hypothesis Workshop Guide	✓							
Key informant interview Questionnaires		✓		✓			✓	
Stakeholder Participatory Appraisal Guide			✓					✓
Focus Group Discussions (FGD) Guide					✓			

Survey Questionnaires						✓		
Presentation format on Key Findings			✓					✓

E. Composition of Evaluation team

a) Consultant profiles and responsibilities

The Final Evaluation is to be conducted by a team of 4 consultants, 2 international consultants and 2 national consultants with the profiles outlined below.

1. EVALUATION TEAM LEADER – Expert in Decentralization and Public Expenditure Management Specialist(International) - 35 working days

The lead international consultant shall be an expert in Decentralization and PEM/Local Government with extensive experience in undertaking evaluations.

Profile and Qualifications:

- Master's Degree or higher in political science, public administration and other relevant fields;
- At least 10 years or more of international comparative experience in the field of decentralization and local development, especially in the developing countries;
- Excellent experience in leading evaluations of decentralization and local development support programmes.
- Sound knowledge and experience in evaluation of the development programme/project;
- Strong ability for data collection and analysis and writing a good report;
- Skills and expertise in institutional setup are assets;
- Understanding of the institutional, political and cultural context of decentralization;
- Sound interpersonal and communication skills.
- Substantial track record in the formulation, implementation or evaluation of decentralization and local development support programs that address the following:
 - The policy and legal framework for decentralized local governance encompassing fiscal decentralization, civil service, planning and sector decentralization and other service delivery policies.
 - Local authority institutional structures and operating systems.
 - Local authority capacities in public expenditure and asset management encompassing the strengthening of participatory systems, participatory needs assessment, integrated planning, budgeting, procurement, project implementation management, monitoring and reporting.
- Thorough understanding of key elements of results-based programme management.

Responsibilities:

- Documentation review and framing of evaluation questions
- Leading the evaluation team in planning, execution and reporting (Hypothesis workshop).
- Deciding and managing division of labour within the evaluation team
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the debriefing for the Government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, and UNCDF HQ
- Leading the drafting and finalization/quality control of the evaluation report

2. EXPERT in basic social service delivery (International) – 30 working days

- Master's Degree or higher in economics or related field of expertise;

- At least 5-10 years of sound experience in the field of basic public service delivery in rural areas ;
- Ability to link poverty analysis with access to basic services, in an evaluation exercise;
- Experience in assessing food security issues as part of the poverty dimensions; Knowledge of the BSF approach to food security would be an asset;
- Sound knowledge and experience in evaluation of development programmes/projects;
- Strong ability for data collection and analysis and writing a good report;
- Sound knowledge and understanding of gender sensitivity and ethnic cultural sensitivity;
- Skills and expertise in institutional setup are assets;
- Understanding of political and cultural situations, especially the sub-national systems is an advantage;
- Sound interpersonal and communication skills;
- Ability to collect and analyses qualitative & quantitative data sets and writing reports.

This expert will be responsible for evaluating the poverty reduction impact of the project, encompassing food security issues and access to basic public services in water provision, health, education, and access to economic infrastructures. The expert will analyze and document how such basic service delivery has impacted on overall poverty levels in the areas of intervention.

3. NATIONAL EXPERT IN INFRASTRUCTURE – 30 working days

Civil engineer/chartered surveyor, with

- specialised knowledge of infrastructure and service delivery, design and construction of small-scale infrastructure projects,
- assessing technical quality and cost-effectiveness of infrastructure and services,
- appropriateness and quality of procurement processes,
- provisions for recurrent costs, operations and maintenance,
- community participation in procurement, delivery, operations and maintenance of infrastructure and services delivered.

4.NATIONAL EXPERT – PEM specialist – 25 working days

The national consultant should be a PEM specialist with experience in undertaking evaluations. While the team leader is a strong expert in PEM policy and the wider decentralization issues, this national expert will look into the details of the procedures followed. The consultant will verify compliance with agreed processes (procurement process, infrastructure project documentation,...). S/he will have the following qualifications:

- At least Bachelor's Degree or higher in economics, business administration, social science or relevant field;
- 3-5 years experience in Public Expenditure Management in Eritrea;
- Sound knowledge and understanding of Eritrean PEM regulation;
- Understanding of political structure and sub-national government systems;
- Strong interpersonal and communications skills;
- Fluent in English language both speaking and writing;
- Ability to collect data, data analysis and write report
- Experience in analysis of Capacity Development Initiatives

Roles and Responsibilities of the National Consultant:

The consultants working with the team leader will play the following roles and responsibilities:

- Provide overall assistance the team in terms of data collection and data analysis;
- Administer the focus group discussions at all levels;
- Conduct interviews at all levels
- Attend the briefing and debriefings with UNDP CO and government agencies both at central and local levels;
- Provide translation and other assistance to the team;
- Be responsible for report writing covering their areas of competence.

F. Workplan in-country for the Evaluation mission (to be adjusted, if required)

Activity	Responsibility	# Work days	Schedule
CAPITAL	Team/UNCDF etc	Number	Date
▪ Team Leader arrive	Team leader	1	29 June
▪ Preparation for evaluation: Hypothesis workshop ▪ Review documentation ▪ Refine and agree evaluation methodology, ▪ Discuss division of labour, etc	Team leader	1	30 June
▪ Final planning meeting of evaluation team ▪ Briefing meeting with Programme Officer / programme staff ▪ Security Briefing	Team leader	1	1 July
Meetings/ interviews in capital city Please indicate partners and stakeholders to visit	Team leader	2	2-3 July
Travel to region		1	4 July
▪ Kick-off workshop ▪ Meetings in Zoba – Anseba ▪ Visit micro – projects ▪ Regional debriefing	Team leader	12	6-20 July
Travel to Capital		1	21 July
Write aide memoire / evaluation summary	Team leader	1	22 July
Debrief with stakeholders in country	Team leader	1	23 July
Total		20	

G. Deliverables

The lead consultant and his/her team will be responsible for preparing and submitting the following deliverables:

Pre-mission

- Inception Report (max 7 pages)

In-country

- Aide Memoire (max 15- 20 pages) which contains key findings and recommendations
- Power Point presentation (20 slides) of the key points contained in the Aide Memoire for presentation at the National and Global Debriefing
- Annotated Contents section of the draft Evaluation Report (maxi 5 pages)
- The team leader is responsible for consolidating the inputs of team members, and taking into consideration comments received at the in-country evaluation meeting, the UNCDF Debriefing to produce a coherent Draft Evaluation Report and Evaluation Summary and to be submitted to UNDP and UNCDF;

Post- mission

- Executive Summary (max 6-8 pages)
- Final Evaluation Report (max 40-50 pages including standard data tables/graphs for which template will be provided)
- Brief synopsis of evaluation and key findings (500 words for corporate communications use)
- Completed matrix for the Management Response to be prepared at country level
- Based on comments received on the drafts, the team leader will finalize the deliverables, with input from other evaluation team members, as required and submit to the UNCDF Evaluation Unit by the agreed date.
- The Evaluation Unit is responsible for circulating the finalized report to all concerned parties, for inclusion on the UNCDF website and the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre database
- The evaluation team leader is responsible for compiling the first column (Evaluation Issues) to enable Management Response from UNCDF/ UNDP and other partners as appropriate which will be uploaded in the UNDP/Evaluation Resource Centre database

The Evaluation Team's contractual obligations are complete once the UNDP and UNCDF have reviewed and approved the Final Evaluation Report and other deliverables for quality and completeness as per the TOR.

ANNEXES:

Annex 1 - Indicative Documentation List

Annex 1: Indicative documentation list

(1) UNCDF DOCUMENTS

All relevant programme-related documentation will be provided to the Evaluation Team. Documentation will include, at minimum:

- Mid-term evaluation November 2005
- Copy of original signed Project/Programme document
- Copies of any substantive project document and budget revisions
- Previous evaluations
- Baseline studies as relevant
- Technical studies
- Mission reports
- Annual work plans, progress reports (Management Information System reports) and financial reports
- Programme Audits
- Documentation, guidelines, studies produced by programme
- UN Common Country Assessment and UN Development Assistance Framework for the programme country
- UNCDF Strategic Results Framework

(2) Other relevant Non-UNCDF Documents

Documents prepared by the Government, national stakeholders and other international and national stakeholders of value in terms of preparing the team with relevant background should be listed here.

Annex 2 – Documents Reviewed

	Document	Author
1	ALDP Annual Work Plan 2002	ALDP
2	ALDP Annual Work Plan 2003	ALDP
3	ALDP Annual Work Plan 2004	ALDP
4	ALDP Annual Work Plan 2005	ALDP
5	ALDP Annual Work Plan 2006	ALDP
6	Atlas ALDP Annual Work Plan 2006	UNCDF
7	ALDP Annual Work Plan 2007	ALDP
8	ALDP Annual Work Plan 2008	ALDP
9	ALDP Annual Report 2002	ALDP
10	ALDP Annual Report 2003	ALDP
11	ALDP Annual Report 2004	ALDP
12	ALDP Annual Report 2005	ALDP
13	ALDP Annual Report 2006	ALDP
14	ALDP Annual Report 2007	ALDP
15	ALDP Annual Report 2008	ALDP
16	Financial Management and Auditing Procedures Manual	ALDP
17	Food Security Study (Draft & Final version)	ALDP
18	Procedures and Guidelines for Procurement, Implementation, Operation and Management of Community Based Projects	ALDP
19	Quarterly Financial Reports	ALDP
20	Report and Financial Statements, for the year ended 31 December, 2002	ALDP
21	Report and Financial Statements, for the year ended 31 December, 2003	ALDP
22	Report and Financial Statements, for the year ended 31 December, 2004	ALDP
23	Report and Financial Statements, for the year ended 31 December, 2005	ALDP
24	Report and Financial Statements, for the year ended 31 December, 2006	ALDP

	Document	Author
25	Report and Financial Statements, for the year ended 31 December, 2007	ALDP
26	Report and Financial Statements, for the year ended 31 December, 2008	ALDP
27	ALDP Synoptic Progress Report, Jan-Dec 2002	ALDP
28	ALDP Synoptic Progress Report, Jan-Dec 2003	ALDP
29	ALDP Synoptic Progress Report, Jan-Dec 2004	ALDP
30	ALDP Synoptic Progress Report, Jan-Dec 2005	ALDP
31	ALDP Synoptic Progress Report, Jan-Dec 2006	ALDP
32	ALDP Synoptic Progress Report, Jan-Dec 2007	ALDP
33	ALDP Synoptic Progress Report, Jan-Dec 2008	ALDP
34	ALDP Monthly Progress Reports	ALDP
35	ALDP Community Based Planning Cycle, Regional Administration Operations Manual	ALDP
36	Bulletin of the ALDP	
37	Italian Cooperation in Eritrea, a Decade in Review	Italian Cooperation
38	Dimensions of Poverty in Eritrea, Draft Report of the LSMS Survey (poverty assessment),	National Statistics and Evaluation Office
39	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
40	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
41	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
42	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
43	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
44	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
45	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
46	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
47	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
48	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
49	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF
50	Back to Office Report, Eritrea – Anseba Local Development Project	R. McGill, STA, LDU, UNCDF

	Document	Author
51	The Constitution of Eritrea	Constituent Assembly
52	The Lutheran World Federation, Department for World Service Eritrea Program, Annual Report 2004	Lutheran World Federation
53	UNCDF, Business Plan 2005 – 2007 Investing in the LDCs to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals	UNCDF
54	UNCDF, Strategy for Policy Impact and Replication, in Local Governance and Microfinance	UNCDF
55	UNCDF Project Agreement, ALDF	UNCDF
56	UN Development Assistance Framework (2002 – 2006), Eritrea,	UN
57	UN Development Assistance Framework Post 2006, Eritrea,	UN
58	Guide to Evaluation of UNCDF's Local Development Programmes	UNCDF
59	Project Data Sheet- Terms of Reference – UNCDF Final Evaluation of ALDP	UNCDF
60	ALDP Final Report	ALDP
61	MTE	Consultants
62	GoSE policy statements etc in respect of decentralisation, governance and accountability	GoSE
63	National Steering Committee Minutes of meeting and all agenda papers	GoSE

Annex 3 – Stakeholders Interviewed

List of persons met during the Evaluation process

1. Ministry of National Development, UNDP, Embassies, consulates and delegates

No	Full Name	Organization	Post
1	Mr. Kidane Tsegay	Ministry of National Development	Director General, Development Planning
2	Dr. Mamadu P. Diallo	UNDP	Resident Representative
3	Ms. Verity Nyagah	UNDP	Deputy Resident Representative
4	Mrs. Helen Tekleab	UNDP/UNCDF	Admin/Programme Associate
5	Mr. Kifle Tekleab	UNDP	UNDP Programme Specialist/ARR
6	Mr. Tedros Demoz	UNDP	Former Project Communication Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist
7	Ms. Marisia Pechaczec	Netherlands Embassy	Charge de affair
8	Mr. Peter Herzig	European Union	Head of ECC/Gov & Social Sector
9	Mrs. Paola Cerea	European Union	Programme manager, Economics Governance and Social Sectors Section
10	Mrs. Elin Eikeland	Royal Norwegian Embassy	Counsellor
11	Mr. Efrem Fitiwi	World Bank office	Administration and finance
12	Mr. Issac Araya	Belgium Consulate	Honorary Consul
13	Dr. Ikem Chiejime	UNICEF	Chief of Education
14	Mr. Jacob Mbeya	UNICEF	Chief of Operations

2. Anseba Regional Administration (Kickoff workshop) 08/10/2009

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Giorgis Girmay	Anseba Regional Administration	Governor of Anseba Regional Administration
2	Mr. Kibrom Andemichael	Anseba Regional Administration	HEAD, Economic Development Department
3	Mr. Gebru Hayle	Anseba Regional Administration	Head, Infrastructure Department
4	Mrs. Zeyneb Omar	Anseba Regional Administration	Head, Social Services Department
5	Mr. Girmay Araya	Anseba Regional Administration	Director of the Governor's Office
6	Mr. Kiros Sereke	Ministry of Health, Anseba Region Branch	Representative of the Branch Head
7	Mr. Bokretsion Habtemichael	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Head of Branch Office
8	Mr. Jabir Ahmed	Ministry of Agriculture, Anseba Region Branch	Head of Branch Office
9	Mr. Sebhatu Gebremaiam	Ministry of Land, Water and Environment, Anseba Region Branch	Head of Branch Office
10	Mr. Maekele Beyn	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Project Management
11	Mr. Michael Teklemariam	Anseba Regional Administration	Infrastructure Development department
12	Mr. Fetsum Gebregziabiher	Keren Town Administration	Social Services Department
13	Mr. Gebreselassie Amine	Anseba Regional Administration	Economic Development department
14	Mr. Ibrahim Idris	Anseba Regional Administration	Planning and Statistics,

			Head of statistics unit
15	Mr. Kiflay Kidane	Anseba Regional Administration	ALDP, Project Coordinator
16	Mr. Abraham Hayleab	Anseba Regional Administration ALDP (PST)	Administration and Finance Head
17	Mr. Siele Ghebru	Anseba Regional Administration, ALDP	Accountant
18	Mr. Tedeos Tesfay	Anseba Regional Administration	Engineer, Infrastructure Department
19	Mr. Fisehaye Araya	National Union of Eritrean Women	Project Coordinator
20	Mr. Gebretensae Woldu	Head of Branch Office	Expert, Economic Development department
21	Mrs. Shamla Gebrekidan	National Union of Eritrean Youth and Students	Women's Follow up
22	Mr. Nebay Teweldemedhin	Anseba Regional Administration	Social Services Department

**3. Discussion with Anseba Regional Administration Department Heads, Line Ministries Heads and Experts
08/10/2009**

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Kibrom Andemichael	Anseba Regional Administration	HEAD, Economic Development Department
2	Mr. Gebru Hayle	Anseba Regional Administration	Head, Infrastructure Department
3	Mr. Bokretsion Habtemichael	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Head of Branch Office
4	Mr. Maekele Beyn	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Project Management
5	Mr. Jabir Ahmed	Ministry of Agriculture, Anseba Region Branch	Head of Branch Office
6	Mr. Kiros Sereke	Ministry of Health, Anseba Region Branch	Malaria Control Coordinator
7	Mr. Habtesellase Yohannes	Ministry of Health, Anseba Region Branch	PHC Coordinator
8	Mr. BerhaneAbraha	Ministry of Health, Anseba Region Branch	Environmental Health Unit

4. Zoba Administration experts and PST members visiting and facilitating all the field visits

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Michael Teklemariam	Anseba Regional Administration	Infrastructure Development department
2	Mr. Gebretensae Weldu	Anseba Regional Administration	Economic Development Department, Project Management
3	Mr. Kiflay Kidane	Anseba Regional Administration	ALDP
4	Mr. Maekele Beyn	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Project Management
5	Mr. Siele Ghebru	Anseba Regional Administration, ALDP	Accountant

5. Discussion with Sub Zoba Governors, Heads, Experts and Beneficiaries: 09/10/2009

5.1. Hagaz Sub Zoba, Fana Elementary School and Awenjeli Micro-dam

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Idris Mohmmad Guelay	Administration of Hagaz Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Metu Estifanos	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Director of Fana Elementary School

5.2. Elabered Sub Zoba, Balwa-Era Tahtay Road and Ford Bridge : 10/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Tekleberhan Mehreteab	Administration of Elabered Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Fitiwi Gebremeskel	Administration of Elabered Sub Zoba	Finance and Administration Head
3	Mr. Tesfamichael Yohannes	Balwa town	Community member
4	Mr. Debesay Ogbazghi	Balwa town	Community member
5	Mr. Kiros Biemnet	Balwa town	Community member
6	Mr. Mesghina Mebrahtu	Balwa town	Community member
7	Mr. Gabir Teklay	Erta tahtay Village	Administrator
8	Mr. Abraham Ogbazghi	Erta tahtay Village	Chair person of the project implementation committee (PIC)
9	Mr. Tsegay Tesfamariam	Erta tahtay Village	Secretary (PIC)
10	Mr. Yemane Tewoldeberhan	Erta tahtay Village	Cashier (PIC)

5.3. Elabered Sub Zoba, Debresina Micro Dam: 10/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Teklemariam Mehreteab	Administration of Elabered Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Fitiwi Gebremeskel	Administration of Elabered Sub Zoba	Finance and Administration Head
3	Mr. Yikealo Asgedom	Debresina Village	Chair person of the project implementation committee (PIC)
4	Mr. Teklehaymanot H.Michael	Debresina Village	Secretary of the (PIC)
5	Mr. Abrehet Nor	Debresina Village	Case controller of the (PIC)
6	Mr. Gebremesqel Gebrezgi	Debresina Village	Community member
7	Mr. Weldeslasie Temelso	Debresina Village	Community member
8	Mr. Dribel Habtetsion	Debresina Village	Community member
9	Mr. Beyn Mebrahtu	Debresina Village	Community member
10	Mr. Hagos Weldu	Debresina Village	Community member
11	Mr. Samuel Weldetsion	Debresina Village	Community member

5.4. Elabered Sub Zoba, Hamedey Micro Dam: 10/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Teklemariam Mehreteab	Administration of Elabered Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Fitiwi Gebremeskel	Administration of Elabered Sub Zoba	Finance and Administration Head
3	Mr. Yosief Ogbagiorgis	Hamedey Village	Community member
4	Mr. Debesay Gabir	Hamedey Village	Community member
5	Mr. Kidane Adhana	Hamedey Village	Community member
6	Mr. Ibrahim Seid	Hamedey Village	Community member
7	Mr. Asmeret G.medhin	Hamedey Village	Community member
8	Mr. Hiwan wenjer	Hamedey Village	Community member
9	Mr. Nazgi Teklu	Hamedey Village	Community member
10	Mr. Kidane Janjer	Hamedey Village	Community member
11	Mr. Aybu Haymn	Hamedey Village	Community member
12	Mr. Mulue Nayzghi	Hamedey Village	Community member

5.5. Elabered Sub Zoba, Women's Trining Center: 10/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Teklemariam Mehreteab	Administration of Elabered Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Fitiwi Gebremeskel	Administration of Elabered Sub Zoba	Finance and Administration Head
3	Mrs. Letehaymanot Tekeste	NUEA Eden City	Member
4	Mrs. Walet Shiger	NUEA Eden City	Member

5	Mrs. Fereja Humed	NUEA Eden City	Member
6	Mrs. Aster Mehreteab	NUEA Eden City	Member
7	Mrs. Letekidan Gerezgiher	NUEA Eden City	Member
8	Mrs. Tsirha Habtemariam	NUEA Eden City	Member
9	Rishan Gerezgiher	NUEA Eden City	Member
10	Mrs. Ogba Tesfazgi	NUEA Eden City	Member
11	Mrs. Milite Kidane	NUEA Eden City	Member
12	Mrs. Letengus G/tSION	NUEA Eden City	Member
13	Mrs. Asrat Teklemariam	NUEA Eden City	Member
14	Mrs. Letezgi Embaye	NUEA Eden City	Member
15	Mrs. Elsa G.michael	NUEA Eden City	Member
16	Mrs. Letemichael Welday	NUEA Eden City	Member
17	Mr. Hagosa Asgedom	NUEA Eden City	Member
18	Mrs. Nitsihti Abraha	NUEA Eden City	Member
19	Mrs. Himan Kidane	NUEA Eden City	Member
20	Mrs. Lemlem Bayru	NUEA Eden City	Member
21	Mrs. Akberet Solomon	NUEA Eden City	Member
22	Mrs. Mihret Aynom	NUEA Eden City	Member
23	Mrs. Senayt Fesehaye	NUEA Eden City	Member
24	Mrs. Tsegereda Tsegay	NUEA Eden City	Member

5.6. Hamelmalo Sub Zoba, Wazentet Elementary School: 11/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mrs. Haregu Weldegiorgis	Administration of Hamelmalo Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Teumizgi Yohannes	Administration of Hamelmalo Sub Zoba	Finance and Administration Head
3	Mr. Abdalla Hazot	Wazntet Village Administrative kebab	Administrator
4	Mr. Mdohammad Ali Habil	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Teacher
5	Mr. Abdurahman Mohammad	Wazntet Village Administrative kebab	Executive director
6	Mr. Mohammad jabir	Wazntet Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
7	Mr. Osman Saleh	Wazntet Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
8	Mr. Abdurhman Omar	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Teacher
9	Mrs. Zahra Mohammad	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Teacher
10	Mrs. Almaz Zemihret	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Teacher
11	Mr. Ali Mohammad Ali	Wazntet Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member

5.7. Hamelmalo Sub Zoba, Genfelom Elementary School: 11/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mrs. Haregu Weldegiorgis	Administration of Hamelmalo Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Teumizgi Yohannes	Administration of Hamelmalo Sub Zoba	Finance and Administration Head
3	Mr. Husein Mohammad Ezaz	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	School Master
4	Mr. Omar Mussa Mohammad	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Teacher
5	Ms. Abadit kidane	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Teacher
6	Ms. Sutina Mohammad	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Teacher

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
7	Mr. Israel Girmaleul	Ministry of Education, Anseba Region Branch	Teacher
8	Mr. Amer Said	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
9	Mr. Mahaj Mohammad	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
10	Mr. Adim Said	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
11	Mr. Mohammad Idris Omar	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
12	Mr. Mohammad Hawarshek	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
13	Mrs. Nisret Ibrahim	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
14	Mrs. Amna Mohammad	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
15	Mr. Jamie Bekhit	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
16	Mr. Mohammad Nur Humed	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
17	Mr. Yasin Ali	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
18	Mrs. Bekita Jabir	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
19	Mr. Mohammad Osman Said	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member
20	Mrs. Sutina Omar said	Genfelom Village Administrative kebab	Parent-Teacher Association member

5.8. Hamelmalo Sub Zoba, Youth Centre Elementary School: 11/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mrs. Haregu Weldegiorgis	Administration of Hamelmalo Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Teumizgi Yohannes	Administration of Hamelmalo Sub Zoba	Finance and Administration Head
3	Mr. Mohammad Ferej Akhad	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
4	Mr. Idrisnur Hamid	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village Kebab Administrator
5	Mr. Abubakar Ali Bekhi	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
6	Mr. Salih Ahmed Bekhit	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
7	Mr. Mohammad Ali Mohammad	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
8	Mr. Osman Mohammad	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
9	Mr. Adem Mohammad Nur	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
10	Mr. Mohammad Said Saleh	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
11	Mr. Osman Ibrahim	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
12	Mr. Said Suleiman Idris	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
13	Mr. Idris Omar Abib	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
14	Idris Mohammad Ali	Hamelmalo Village Administrative Kebab	Village elder
15	Mrs. Fatna Yasin Said	Hamelmalo Youth Centre	Trainer
16	Mrs. Rahya Abubakar	Hamelmalo Youth Centre	Youth Centre Head
17	Mrs. Jumya Adem	Hamelmalo Youth Centre	Trainer
18	Mrs. Tirhas mehari	Hamelmalo Youth Centre	Trainer

5.9. Ruba Melhas Micro Dam, Aditekelezan Livestock and fruits and vegetables markets: 13/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Kafil Musa	Administration of Aditekelezan Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Demoz Tesfagergish Girmay	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebab	Village Kebab Administrator
3	Mr. Tesfankiel Tijar Gedamu	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebab	Communal Court
4	Mr. Weldezghi Ogbagabir	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebab	Community member
5	Mr. Kesete Tela Tesfu	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebab	Community member
6	Mr. Kesete Goitom Berhe	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebab	Community member
7	Mrs. Haregu Gebsha G.Amlak	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebab	NUEW

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
8	Mrs. Akberet Gerense Gofar	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebabi	Community member
9	Mr. Aynom Nirayo Zerizghi	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebabi	Community member
10	Mrs. Akberet Fisahaye Okbu	Rub Melhas Village Administrative Kebabi	Community member

5.10. Aditekelezan Youth Recreation Centre, Livestock and fruits and vegetables markets: 13/10/09

No	Full Name	Ministry/Organization	Post
1	Mr. Kafil Musa	Administration of Aditekelezan Sub Zoba	Sub Zoba Administrator
2	Mr. Birhane Imam	Aditekelezan Town	Town Administrator
3	Mr. Siele Tewolde	Adi Tekelezan Sub zoba	National Union of Eritrean Youth and Students

Annex 4 – List of projects visited and results

Sub-Zoba	Village	Project type	Year completed
Hagaz	Fana	School	2004
Hagaz	Awenjeli	Micro-dam	2008
Elabaered		Road	2004
Elabaered		Ford (bridge)	2007
Elabaered	Elabaered	Women Resource Center	2008
Elabaered	Hamedey	Micro-dam	2007
Elabaered	Debresina	Micro-dam	2008
Hamelmallo	Wezentet	School	2004
Hamelmallo	Hamelmallo	Youth Center	2007
Adi Tekeliezan		Livestock Market	2007
Adi Tekeliezan		Fruit and vegetable Market	2008
Adi Tekeliezan		Youth Center	2007
Adi Tekeliezan	Ruba Melhas	Micro-dam	2008

Annex 5 – Anseba Log frame Analysis – Development Objective, Immediate Objective & Outputs

Development objective	Reduce poverty in Anseba Region as a basis for sustained self-development			
	Indicators	Indicator Result/Presence	MoV	MoV Availability
	# sub-regions in which poor/ disadvantaged groups use public infrastructures and services provided by Local Governments (per sector, gender, region)	Indicator present.	Annual field surveys, with additional reference to the National Bureau of Statistics	No annual field surveys undertaken by project. No baselines established by project. NBS has undertaken no work that acts as proxy or even sets a baseline at some other time for this indicator.
	Food security increases (# of months per year additionally covered by local market supply)	Indicator present .	Annual field survey (sample) & national food security monitoring system	No annual field surveys undertaken by project. No baselines established by project. Food security increases are anecdotal.
	-% of locally generated revenue retained by local governments	0%.	Annual reports of tax authorities	No local revenue enhancement activities undertaken.
	Anseba planning system officially endorsed by MoLG (by year 3)	Indicator not present.	Policy declaration	Anseba planning system not considered by MoLG
Evaluation: The development objective was met based on 2 indicators. On the balance of the relative importance of the individual indicators to overall programme purpose, the development objective was met.				
Immediate objective	Local government in Anseba Region delivers public infrastructure and services based on responsive, transparent and pro-poor planning procedures			
	Indicators	Indicator Result/Presence	MoV	MoV Availability
	Access to public infrastructures increase x % per year (access to water, primary education)	Indicator present , but not quantifiable.	Final evaluation Annual progress report of Line ministries	No project or GoSE baselines. FGD identified increases and some proxy indicators suggested increases, but quantification not possible.
	# of projects per sub-region where Line Agencies provide technical support for implementation and maintenance	All.	Focus group discussion / annual stakeholder review	Where technical support was required, it was provided.

	x% of projects are directly targeted at women	0%	Focus group discussion / annual stakeholder review	FGD confirms no activities targeted directly at women. No annual stakeholder reviews undertaken.
	Primary stakeholders (including local women) are active at all levels in the planning process	Indicator present	Final evaluation	FGD confirm primary stakeholder participation.
	x% of infrastructures are well maintained 3 years after completion	100%	Focus group discussions with user committees	FGD and final evaluation inspection confirm level of maintenance.
	x% of sub-zobas increase local revenues by 100% by year 4	0%	Audit reports and project documents	Project documents confirm that no local revenue enhancement activities undertaken.
	Annual regional plan is approved by the Regional Baito before MoLG approval	Indicator present, with exception of no evidence of MoLG approval	Official adoption by MoLG	MoV not available,

Evaluation: Immediate objective mostly achieved.

Output1	1. A participatory and transparent planning system is established that ensures the identification and design of locally prioritised pro-poor projects			
	Indicators	Indicator Result/Presence	MoV	MoV Availability
	x% of sub-zoba annual plans are derived from Kebabi identified priorities	100%	Kebabi and sub-zoba plans Minutes of planning committees' meetings;	No kebabi plans were identified as they did not exist. Sub-zoba plans indicate that all development planning relative to kebabis are kebabi identified priorities.
	x% of sub-zoba and Zoba annual plans are approved as presented	100%	Minutes of annual stakeholder reviews	No minutes available and no evidence of formal plan approval available. Final evaluators found sufficient evidence of approval.
	x% of projects targeted at agreed poverty indicators	0%	Minutes of Baito meetings; MoLG budgets	There were no agreed poverty indicators. GoSE do not use this process in their planning and budgeting. Indicator therefore rated 0%

	Operations manual approved by Regional administration	Indicator present	Transmission note for operations manual	Manual approved
Evaluation: This output was substantially achieved, with the exception of the linkages to targeting at agreed poverty indicators which seems of lesser relevance given that that GoSE does not plan and budget in this fashion.				
Output 2	2. Access to and management of financial resources for funding development plans by local government units in Anseba is improved			
	Indicators	Indicator Result/Presence	MoV	MoV Availability
	% of eligible sub-zobas which qualify for LDF allocations increases (by year 3)	0%	Project documents and reports	The LDF design was not used or followed and therefore the indicator is 0%
	x% of sub-zobas obtain performance-based LDF increments by year 4	0%	Audit reports	The LDF design was not used or followed and therefore the indicator is 0%
	- x% of sub-zobas manage finances according to established procedures	0%	Audit reports and project documents	There are no available audit or project reports that support or deny this indicator. In the absence of any means of verification, the indicator is 0%
Evaluation: The LDF design was not used by the project and the local government units had no access to or control over the financial resources provided by the project for funding development plans. Output not achieved. This Output and its indicators should have been recast to reflect the processes adopted by the project.				
Output 3	3. Regional and local capacity to deliver, operate and maintain projects efficiently is strengthened			
	Indicators	Indicator Result/Presence	MoV	MoV Availability
	x% of projects are delivered according to specifications	100%	LGU and consultants' reports	No LGU reports available. All consultant and final evaluation reports confirm all projects completed to specification.
	x% of projects are delivered on time	0%	LGU and consultants' reports	No LGU reports available. All consultant and final evaluation reports confirm that no projected delivered on time.
	x% of projects are delivered according to budgeted costs	0%	LGU and consultants' reports	No LGU reports available. All consultant and final evaluation reports confirm no project

				completed to budgeted costs.
Evaluation: Output achieved. The most relevant indicator was whether the projects were achieved according to specification. This was completely achieved. The budgets were not necessarily well cast as there was limited experience with costing, but given the slow burn-rate of project funds, this did not adversely impact the project. Timelines were also of less relevance as most projects were implemented by the communities and completion was more important than time of completion.				
Output 4:	4. The Anseba planning process, styles of programming and project design, and policy issues arising from this experience inform national policy			
	Indicators	Indicator Result/Presence	MoV	MoV Availability
	MoLG invites Anseba project to present lessons learnt at national seminars/workshops	Indicator not present.	Letters of invitation	No letters of invitation
	National local government training courses incorporate Anseba planning and implementation methods	Indicator not present.	Curricula of national training courses.	No curricula incorporate Anseba planning and implementation methods
	Donor-assisted projects adopt Anseba planning system	Indicator present – Anseba based communities used Anseba planning processes for other donor project implementation	Donor project documents	No donor project document adopts Anseba planning system.
Evaluation: Output partially achieved. Not achieved from the point of view of wider dissemination of planning process.				
Output 5:	5. Natural Resource Management (from 2005 ALDP Annual Work plan)			
	Indicators	Indicator Result/Presence	MoV	MoV Availability
	None given	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Evaluation: On an indicator basis, there is no comment as there were no indicators given. However, the majority of all projects identified by communities were food security related and therefore this output is considered achieved.				

Annex 6 – Matrix of Outputs, Activities and results

Outputs/Activities	Indicators/Milestones	Planned Target 2008	Achieved Targets (Dec 2008)	End of Project Targets	Remarks
Output 1: A community-driven planning system is established that ensures the identification and design of locally prioritised pro-poor projects	X% of sub-zoba annual plans are derived from kebabi identified priorities	85%	100%	95%	Kebabi level planning was without resource constraint or linkages to national or zoba identified priority sector policies.
	X% of sub-zoba and Zoba annual plans are approved as presented	85%	100%	90%	Zoba and sub-zoba annual plans were approved as presented and the RDPs prepared .
	Operations manual approved by Regional Administration	-	3 rd edition of RAOM in place.		RAOM adopted in 3 rd edition.
Key Activities	Milestones				
1.1 Provide training on PERA provisions to regional/local administration and to elected Baito members	# of Baito members trained by contracted trainers	400	400	400	Target achieved.
	# Zoba and sub-zoba officials trained by contracted trainers	20	Various	20	Target achieved.
1.2 Undertake process consultations for the definition of planning, appraisal, budgeting, approval and M&E procedures (for LGU staff, Baito members and others)	# of participants and stakeholders involved in process consultations	1470	0	0	Target not achieved. No process consultation undertaken.
1.3 Establish inclusive planning committees at regional, sub-regional and kebabi levels	# of Kebabi committees established	101	109	101	Functional planning and implementation committees established and functional at all levels.
	# of sub-zoba committees established	10	10	10	
	# of Zoba committees established	1	1	1	

Outputs/Activities	Indicators/Milestones	Planned Target 2008	Achieved Targets (Dec 2008)	End of Project Targets	Remarks
1.4 – 1.6 Elaborate procedures for planning, prioritisation and appraisal of programmes and projects and for approval of plans and budgets	Procedures established	3	-	-	Target achieved. The procedures are elaborated as part of the RAOM.
1.8 Provide training on planning system	# of people trained	550	1470 + 70	550	Target achieved.
1.9 Organise study tours	# of people undertaken study tours	4	4	4	Target achieved.
1.11 Support dissemination of information concerning planning process and outcomes	# of sub-zobas where information has been disseminated	30	30	50	Target achieved.
Output 2: Access to and management of financial resources for funding development plans by local government units in Anseba is improved	All eligible sub-zobas qualify for LDF allocation by year 3	10	0	10	Target not achieved. No assessment or clear definition of minimum access conditions. All sub-zobas received LDF but none qualified as designed.
	X% of sub-zobas obtain performance based LDF increments by year 4	4	0	0	Target not achieved. Performance based processes and measures not introduced as planned or recommended.
	X% of sub-zobas manage finances according to established procedures	10	0	10	Target not achieved. Sub-zobas not permitted to manage finances contrary to project design and recommendations.
Key Activities	Milestones				
2.1 & 2.7 Establish procedures for LDF allocation and financial management procedures (channels, accounting, minimum conditions, performance incentives and auditing)	Procedures established	3	0	0	Target not achieved. Procedures as defined in project design not followed. Allocation procedures established but not appropriate. No minimum conditions or performance incentives designed or assessed. Basic financial and audit procedures defined.

Outputs/Activities	Indicators/Milestones	Planned Target 2008	Achieved Targets (Dec 2008)	End of Project Targets	Remarks
2.2 Disseminate information on LDF mechanisms and procedures	# of sub-zobas where information has been disseminated	30	0	50	Target not achieved. Intended LDF mechanisms and procedures not disseminated as were not applied as designed.
2.4 Announce and disseminate information on LDF annual allocations	# of sub-zobas to which allocations have been announced	50	50	50	Target achieved. LDF allocations are announced to sub-zobas annually.
2.6 Provide training in financial management procedures	# of sub-zobas and Zoba officials trained	50	88	75	Target achieved.
2.8 Provide training in auditing procedures	# of Zoba officials trained	50	88	50	See 2.6 above
2.9 Undertake action research into improved local revenue mobilisation	# number of sub-zobas where action research has taken place	5	5	5	Target achieved.
2.10 Organise stakeholders workshops on results of action-research into local revenue mobilisation	# of participants at stakeholders workshops	50	0	100	Target not achieved. No action taken in respect of local revenue mobilisation study.
2.11 Design and implement pilot local revenue mobilisation schemes	# of sub-zobas where pilot revenue schemes have occurred	3	0	18	Target not achieved. No pilot revenue schemes implemented.
Output 3 Regional and local capacity to deliver, operate and maintain projects efficiently is strengthened	X% of projects are delivered according to specifications	80%	100%	95%	Target achieved. All projects implemented as per specifications.
	x% of projects are delivered on time	100%	94%	95%	Target achieved. Prior to the MTE, most projects did not complete within planned time due to external factors such as availability of contractors, materials and releases. Post MTE, all projects completed within time. All activities completed.
	X% of projects are delivered	80%	0%	95%	Target not achieved. Post budget approved price increases

Outputs/Activities	Indicators/Milestones	Planned Target 2008	Achieved Targets (Dec 2008)	End of Project Targets	Remarks
	according to budgeted costs				impacted approved budgets adversely.
Key Activities	Milestones				
3.1 – 3.6 Undertake consultative review of (i) existing implementation and procurement guidelines and (ii) O&M procedures for completed projects	Review undertaken	3	0	3	Target not achieved. No consultative review undertaken.
3.2 Establish implementation and procurement guidelines	Implementation and procurement guidelines established	3	0	3	Target achieved but not as a result of consultative review.
3.3 Provide training in implementation and procurement procedures to LG personnel	# of sub-zoba and zoba officials trained	110	88	110	Target achieved.
3.4 & 3.7 Establish guidelines for (i) project implementation monitoring committees at local level and (ii) O&M of completed projects	Guidelines established	3	3	3	Target achieved.
3.5 Train project implementation monitoring committees	# of sub-regional trainers trained	220	30+30	220	Target not achieved. 30 participants were trained in project monitoring and 30 participants in MIS.
Output 4 The Anseba planning process, styles of programming and project design, and policy issues arising from this experience inform national policy	MoLG invites Anseba project to present lessons learnt at national seminars and workshops	1	0	1	Target not achieved. No lessons learned developed; no national seminars and workshops undertaken.
	National and LG training course incorporate Anseba planning and implementation methods	1	0	1	Target not achieved.
	Donor-assisted project adopt Anseba planning system	3	0	3	Target achieved.

Outputs/Activities	Indicators/Milestones	Planned Target 2008	Achieved Targets (Dec 2008)	End of Project Targets	Remarks
Key Activities	Milestones				
4.1 Set up and manage project M&E system	M&E system designed and operational (operational quarterly and annual reports)	30	30	30	Target achieved. The PST and Zoba Anseba produce and submit quarterly and annual reports.
4.2 Establish national steering committee	NSC established	1	1	1	Target achieved. NSC was established.
4.3 Organise six monthly meetings of NSC	# of NSC meetings	12	4	12	Target not achieved. NSC meetings were held bi-annually for a short time then not continued.
4.4 Organise annual stakeholders review of project	# of stakeholders reviews	3	0	5	Target not achieved. Annual stakeholder reviews not conducted as designed.
4.5 Publish six-monthly project lesson learning bulletin	# of six monthly bulletins published	6	1	10	Target not achieved. One bulletin produced.
4.6 Disseminate six-monthly lesson – learning bulletin to relevant institutions	# of six-monthly bulletins distributed	450	0	700	Target not achieved. One bulletin produced with limited dissemination.
4.7 Develop strategy of support for MoLG policy processes	Strategy developed (project strategy paper)	1	0	1	Target not achieved. The strategy development not undertaken.
Output 5. Natural Resource Management (from 2005 ALDP Annual Work plan)	None given	-	-	-	-
Key Activities	Milestones				
Prioritise food security micro projects	None given	-	-	-	Most community identified microprojects did prioritise food security.-

Annex 7 – Matrix of MTE Recommendations and Implementation Status

	MTE Recommendation	Actions taken to address recommendation
1.	Define project planning and implementation mandates (nature of projects) for the different levels (kebab, sub-zoba and zoba)	This recommendation was not addressed. No specific guidelines to differentiate what can and what cannot be implemented at each level. However, the process of project selection is well defined, from kebab to sub-zoba planning committee to zoba planning committee.
2.	Allocate budget ceilings for the different levels (sub-zoba and kebabs) based on their mandates (vertical allocation of LDF)	This recommendation was not addressed.
3.	Develop a mechanism for communication, transparency, accountability and provision of feedback.	No specific institutional mechanism was established.
4.	Provide incentives for those sub-zobas and kebabs that actively participate in planning.	No action taken.
5.	Review the allocation formula to include indicators that can be easily replicated to other regions.	There are no documented guidelines for allocation formulae. At sub-zoba level, selection is based on consensus.
6.	Develop and implement an incentive-based allocation system, including elaboration of performance measures with indicators that can be scored.	No incentive system was established.
7.	Decentralize procurement to sub-zobas that meet the minimum conditions through their planning and implementation committees.	Procurement was decentralized to kebabs and community project implementation committees.
8.	Complete the Regional Development Plan (RDP) document the process, including lessons learnt and have formal commissioning with high-level GoSE and donor stakeholders.	The RDP was completed and submitted to MND. However, the process was not documented and there is no evidence of a high-level launch.
9.	Organize annual stakeholder reviews of the project to discuss and publish lessons learnt.	Lessons learnt were not documented or published. No annual reviews.
10.	Support development of Regional Capacity Development Plan (RCDP) to guide implementation of the RDP.	This recommendation was not addressed.
11.	Develop guidelines to capture food security issues in the integrated community-based and RDP processes.	A food security study was undertaken and a report published in December 2005.

Annex 8 – Community Investment Analysis

Approved Projects

Sector	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved
Education	5	2	0	0	3	1
Water	0	9	3	0	28	9
Health	0	2		0	0	1
Roads	0	2	5	0	3	2
Agriculture				0	3	4
Totals	5	15	8	0	37	17
%	6.09%	18.29%	9.75%	0	45.12%	20.73%

Value & Proportion of Sector Investments

Sector	Total	% of Sector Projects/Total Project Numbers	Value USD	% of Sector Value/Total Value
Education	11	13.41	959,904	23.78%
Water	49	59.75	1,785,731	44.24%
Health	3	3.65	356,991	8.84%
Roads	12	14.63	641,204	15.88%
Agriculture	7	8.53	292,619	7.24%
Totals	82	100	4,036,451	100%

Annex 9 - Basic performance statistics for the 2 ALDP health stations

INDICATOR	Himbol Health Station Population: 6,995		Habero Tsaeda Health Station Population: 14,511	
	2007	2008	2007	2008
Childhood immunization:				
BCG	152	275	NA	207
OPV Total	613	813	NA	641
DPT Total	507	808	NA	632
Measles	164	299	NA	179
Antenatal care/clinic:				
New registrants (first visit)	188	227	NA	168
Total revisit	95	273	NA	175
Deliveries:				
Total # of women delivered	6	20	NA	6
General outpatients treated	4,973	6,333	NA	6,864

Note: Himbos Health Station became operational in May 2007 and Habero Tsaeda in August 2008

Source: Anseba Regional Administration department of Health