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**Executive Summary**

The 2007-2011 Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) was designed to address national priorities of the Government of the State of Eritrea and was closely aligned to the five key outcomes of the UNDAF, namely:

1. support in increasing equitable access and utilization of quality basic services, with particular emphasis on improving the access of vulnerable groups to these services;
2. the establishment of an integrated and effective development planning, monitoring and evaluation framework to address the shortfalls in attaining the MDG targets and the implementation of the MD;
3. improvements of access to food for the most vulnerable population sectors, thereby contributing to the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger by 2015 (MDG 1), and working towards environmental sustainability (MDG 7);
4. assist the government through an integrated multi-sector approach to ensure that IDPs, expellees, returnees, and other war and drought affected communities are reintegrated and have secure livelihoods and access to basic services;
5. support the attainment of equal opportunities, rights, benefits and obligations for women in all areas of life.

The evaluation team concludes that nearly all the planned results were successfully achieved with a few exceptions. This is a shared achievement by UNDP and all its partners (central government, regional administrations, mass organizations and donors). Through this collaborative effort, the implementation of the CPAP has made a significant contribution to national development efforts. The programme was well managed as evidenced by the country office being rated the top performer in the UNDP Africa region for the last two successive years. Strong and effective partnerships were forged with all stakeholders and significant resources were mobilized and efficiently disbursed to address critical capacity gaps and tangible grassroots needs. However, less success was registered on the policy front; as many policies, laws, proclamations and guidelines UNDP helped develop remain unapproved as yet. Below are highlights of key programme achievements, resource mobilization performance, and programme management.

**Assessment of Results Achieved**

*National Capacity Development*

The national capacity development component of the CPAP has four outcomes: (i) capacity is improved and a system established within the National Statistics Office (NSO) and sector ministries; (ii) development planning and budgeting processes, implementation, monitoring and evaluation in the Ministry of National Development (MND) and key national stakeholders are strengthened; (iii) operational, regulatory and human capacity of the civil service in all government offices and institutions strengthened; and (iv) strategy for disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation developed.

The CD component has successfully targeted key public institutions responsible for the service delivery, attainment of the MDGs and other international obligations of the country. Institutions supported include the Ministry of National Development (MND), Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), Civil Service Administration (CSA), Ministry of Finance (MoF), Ministry of Tourism (MoT), Department of Immigration and Nationality (DIN), National Confederation of Eritrean Workers (NCEW). Overall, with the exception of the establishment of disaster prevention strategy where little progress has been registered, the programme has delivered most of the planned CD results.

The support provided by UNDP has strengthened the planning, operational, regulatory and human resource capacities of these institutions. The human resource capacities were enhanced through short and long-term education, training and study tour programmes organized within and outside the country, as well as through equipment and materials provided. As a result of the trainings provided, skills of civil servants were upgraded which is evidenced by the changes noted in the quality of services provided. The CD support benefited government organizations at central, regional and sub-regional levels.

The implementation of the Anseba Local Development Project (ALDP) strengthened the planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting capacities of the regional, sub-regional and local communities of Zoba Anseba. In addition, the micro-projects (water, health, education, roads, marketplace, etc.) brought multiple benefits to rural populations of Zoba Anseba (new income generating initiatives, increased food security, easy access to markets and basic social services, improved project implementation capacity, etc).

However, the delay by the government in the approval of the policies plans and laws drafted with UNDP’s support affected the impact of the programme. Updating of the national database is not done as planned due to delay in producing the EDHS report. Another setback of the programme is the lack of progress in relation to the establishment of a national coordination mechanism for disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation. Efforts made by UN under the leadership of UNDP resulted in the preparation of a concept note on establishing/strengthening national early warning systems for hydro-met related information. However, this was curtailed by the recent policy shift of GoSE on development aid.

*Food Security and Sustainable Environment Management*

The CPAP sought to achieve three outcomes under this component: (i) enhanced decision (policy) making on food security by 2008; (ii) improved access and availability of food; and (iii) support development and protection of the environment and national resources by 2011.UNDP successfully designed a variety of interventions to address critical national priorities linked to these outcomes. Most of the planned results were either fully achieved or a strong foundation has been laid, with the exception of the outcome related to improved policy where very limited progress was made and efforts were abandoned.

UNDP assistance to improve access to food through its project in Zoba Maekel has created the infrastructures and established the platform for rural households to envisage and plan an alternative future. The project when fully implemented can bring significant stability and predictability to farming activities and to the lives and livelihoods of the rural poor. Furthermore, UNDP support has also enabled the accreditation of the fish quality control laboratory which has provided an opportunity for exports and therefore benefits to the economy as a whole and to households. The two projects designed and implemented by UNDP and partners to enhance food security and reduce poverty are therefore promising. However, given the depth of poverty in Eritrea, they are judged to have a limited localized effect. On the positive side, the interventions are scalable given adequate resources.

Many of the planned results under the sustainable environmental management outcome were largely achieved. Overall, the evaluation team judged that these interventions addressed critical national and international environment concerns relating to climate change, loss of biodiversity, environmental conservation and sustainable land management, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions leading resulting in significant household and national economic and social benefits. In addition, longer term national and local capacities to assess, design and manage programmes to address critical environmental challenges have been enhanced. The UNDP wind energy project aimed at reducing Eritrea’s fossil fuel dependency and promoting a greener energy environment has contributed to technical and institutional innovations on the use of renewable energy technologies. GoSE is now working to upscale its renewable energy sources based on the successful implementation of the pilot wind energy project. The pilot sustainable land management project covering 28 villages and involving close to 48,000 people is facilitating the introduction of a more permanent forms of land ownership to replace the present seven-year ownership system, which is widely regarded as a hindrance to investments aimed at improving land productivity. Much progress has been made in terms of putting in place the physical structures and there are plans to work with the Ministry of Land, Water and Environment (MLWE) to use the SLM project for piloting implementation of Proclamation 58/94. With UNDP support, a national land use policy was drafted but not endorsed but a viable Land Information System (LIS) was designed and implemented using local capacity. UNDP also supported several interventions aimed at preserving and improving the management of Eritrea’s fragile coastal, marine and island ecosystem.

Unfortunately on the policy front, there was less success: a proclamation to establish an Integrated Coastal Zone Management Authority (I-CAM-A) was drafted but not approved yet. . Similarly in June 2007, an Integrated Coastal Area Management Proclamation was finalized but not enacted so far. A proclamation for Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) for three island areas was prepared but has not been endorsed to date as was the ICAM Policy. The draft land use policy is also among the list of policies not yet approved by government. The finalization of the draft Environmental law met the same fate. The delay experienced in obtaining feedback from GoSE on draft policies and laws affected programme implementation.

*Gender Equity*

The gender component was implemented as a Joint Programme (UNFPA, UNDP UNIFEM, UNICEF and WHO), with UNFPA as lead agency and focused on the following outcomes: (i) capacity for gender responsive advocacy planning, monitoring and evaluation for gender equality strengthened in 12 key national institutions; (ii) NUEW capacity to address economic empowerment of women in difficult circumstances increased.

Several key results have been achieved. A fully equipped resource and research center is established at NUEW head office which will play a critical role in building capacity for gender related issues, including gender mainstreaming, gender budgeting, etc. The establishment of the Gender Resource and Research Center will significantly strengthen gender training and research on women’s issues in Eritrea.

Notable progress was made on gender mainstreaming in Government ministries; of the twelve Ministries targeted six have designated gender focal points, five have developed Gender Mainstreaming Strategy and finally four have developed Action Plans. Already this is yielding concrete results – the MLWE is reported to reserve 30% of land bank parcels to be distributed to disadvantaged women; the Ministry of Education reduced the entrance requirements for girls to tertiary education and provided 30% quota for girls joining technical, vocational education and training (TVET). Gender analysis has been strengthened across the board. Gender budgeting has been difficult to pursue due to delays observed in endorsing the draft national development plan. NUEW staff provided gender advocacy training to 8,256 persons and a legal training manual is developed. Advocacy and awareness raising is conducted at all levels – grassroots, sub-regional, regional and national and sensitization materials have been published in three languages (Tigrinia, Arabic, and Tigre).

*Basic Social Services*

The planned results of the basic social services component of the CPAP include: (i) by 2011, access to permanent shelter and sustainable human settlement increased by 20% with focus on vulnerable groups; (ii) HIV/AIDS transmission to infants born to HIV positive women is reduced by 50% and HIV prevalence among young people reduced by 25%. Under this component, very little was done with respect to shelter. It is however important to note that UNDP has provided significant support to shelter as part of the Transition and Early Recovery component of CPAP.

With respect to the outcome related to HIV/AIDS, the HIV/AIDS workplace policy is drafted but not yet approved by the MoLHW and thus its implementation in 80% of public sector institutions and public and private enterprises is not delivered. The HIV/AIDS support enhanced the human and institutional capacities of the NCEW Training and Documentation Centre and HIV/AIDS and OSH (Occupational Safety and Health) Unit. In addition, the support resulted in the establishment of HIV/AIDS and OSH (Occupational Safety and Health) committees in 45 public and private enterprises in Zoba Maekel, constituting about 20% of the 230 targeted enterprises organized under the NCEW.

As a result of the training and sensitization activities undertaken by the HIV/AIDS and OSH unit of the NCEW and the HIV/AIDS and OSH committees, awareness of the workers about HIV/AIDS is raised. This has positively contributed to overall reduction of HIV/AIDS prevalence rate. Available information shows that the HIV/AIDS prevalence rate in the country has fallen from 2.4% to 0.7%[[1]](#footnote-1). However, there was no evidence that shows the increase in awareness has led to behavioural change.

*Transition & Early Recovery*

Ensuring that IDPs, expellees, returnees and other war-affected and drought-affected are reintegrated and have secure livelihoods and access to basic social services, was one of the key national priorities of the Government of Eritrea in its quest to ensure post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction of the country after years of war and displacement. The CPAP had the following outcome under this component: war affected IDP populations resettled, returned, and reintegrated in an environment that is safe from landmines andUXOs.

The planned results under this component have been fully achieved. All IDPs and expellees that were still in camps at the start of the programme (17,690 households or 71,207 persons) have been successfully and safely transported with their belongings from camps to their villages of origin or new settlements in the designated areas. Hence, all IDP/expellees camps were closed by March 2008. The evaluation team concluded that the JP has undoubtedly helped and provided an opportunity for large segments of the war – affected population to begin to restore their lives and livelihoods. It has been effective in addressing the needs of the vulnerable such as, female-headed households, children and poor families, and contributed to closing the chapter on war and displacement in Eritrea. By helping to rebuild critical socio-economic infrastructure, restored livelihoods the JP also contributed to laying the foundation to medium and long-term socio-economic development, poverty reduction and attainment of the MDGs in Eritrea. The JP has succeeded to consistently respond and provide support to very deserving communities. IDPs/expellees and returnees were provided with shelter, basic social services, improved stoves, home solar systems, farm tools, oxen, land clearance and traction, seeds, and land to ensure livelihood security. Consequently, IDPs and expellees have started a dignified and purposeful life, free from the uncertainties of camp life. In the focus group discussion, beneficiaries reported: “*In the camps, yes we had enough to eat, but now we have our own land, our own houses, and we are now in full control of our lives*”. Compared to their pre-displacement situation, IDPs have now better access to basic social services such as water (for human and animal consumption), shelter, and school. However, they are far below their pre-displacement position in terms of their livelihood.

The joint programme also enhanced the planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting capacities of the regional and sub-regional administrations in Gash Barka, Debub and Southern Red Sea Regions. This was achieved through the provision of training and office equipment. The capacity building support has also benefited sub-zoba administrations responsible for the provision of technical support to communities and monitoring implementation of joint programme activities. Consequently, regions have become more efficient in coordinating programme activities and delivering projects, though their monitoring activities were affected by shortage of transportation facilities.

***Resource Mobilization &Partnerships***

UNDP Eritrea was highly successful and effective in mobilizing, managing and delivering substantial amount of resources to meet programme objectives. Figures show that UNDP over the five years of the CPAP mobilized approximately USD 52 million , exceeding its resource mobilization target by 261% or by two and a half times. The country office raised USD 2.08 for every USD spent from its core resources, demonstrating a high leveraging capacity. Delivery of programme resources was also excellent; out of a budget of USD 81.7 million UNDP delivered USD 73.3 million leading to a 90% delivery rate.

However, going forward, there are already clear signs of weaknesses in UNDP’s resource base made more challenging by the small donor base in Eritrea and the government’s change of policy. UNDP should strategize on how to tap other sources, and the evaluation team makes several recommendations on this point.

UNDP forged effective partnerships with central government ministries, regional administrations, mass organisations and donors. At all these levels, UNDP is regarded as a credible and trusted partner, recognized for its flexibility and adaptability. Close cooperation was also established with sister UN agencies.

***Programme Management***

The programme was implemented through national execution modality and was efficiently managed at all levels. For example, the Transition and Early Recovery programme adopted a highly successful project implementation modality by working directly through regional administrations, and in the process strengthened their capacities to plan, execute and monitor and report on projects. This modality in the view of the team represents a best practice in the field of post-conflict recovery internationally.

Monitoring and evaluation was largely satisfactory, and efforts were made to develop the appropriate instruments and templates to enhance follow up and reporting. A key problem was getting permits for field visits by UNDP staff and management, as well as donors. Notwithstanding the impressive implementation record, the evaluation team also identified several challenges faced by UNDP and government partners.

Many of UNDP’s interventions were planned to be jointly implemented with other UN agencies. There were varying degrees of success in these joint programmes. The collaboration was not as was foreseen due among others to limited resources pledges by other UN agencies, leaving UNDP to bear major responsibility for mobilizing resources, as well as differences in modalities for channeling resources to implementing partners, particularly at regional level.

Two key lessons standout in terms of implementation of the CPAP: ***Firstly***, the high delivery rate of programme resources which was consistent throughout the CPAP period. This was due to a variety of factors, including training and mentoring provided by UNDP staff, the stability of staff in implementing partners, the dedication and commitment of government personnel to national development goals, the limited corruption in the public service and finally the attitude of UNDP country office staff who treated their government counterparts as equals and with respect. A ***second*** key lesson was that the CPAP was implemented without recourse to costly and disruptive programme implementation units. Nearly all programmes, both at national and regional levels were fully integrated into partner structures with no need for CTAs or separately remunerated programme managers and other project staff. This success is largely due to strong government leadership and its policy that discourages the creation of especially dedicated programme units within government structures.

***Conclusions and Way Forward***

At the time the evaluation was undertaken, the cooperation between GoSE and the UN system in Eritrea had entered a decisive phase with the UNDAF 2007-2011 cut short by six months and in its place a new cooperation framework centered on health, water supply and sanitation and lasting 18 months, to December 2012. The recent policy shift on UN-Eritrea cooperation is part of a broader policy of the Government to phase-out from grant/aid financing and put in place its long stated goal of a development blue print based on its self- reliance principle, and was not specifically targeted at the UN system

On the way forward in this challenging context, the team recommends that a UN and/or UNDP retreat be organized to seriously reflect on options to pursue. The purpose is to undertake a scenario planning exercise underpinned by analysis of strategic options faced by the UN after December 2012. This will help the UN/UNDP to be ready should GoSE wish to engage them.

To aid the reflection proposed, the team has briefly outlined some of the options UNDP could be faced with based on the three scenarios that may arise after December 2012. The way forward could be discussed based on the following three possible scenarios.

* + - ***Scenario One***: UN system support expanded
		- ***Scenario Two***: Government would inform UN by April 2012 at the latest on whether to extend, modify, expand or end cooperation after 2012: UN System continues to work within the existing cooperation framework (with possible modification**).**
		- ***Scenario Three***: UN system further scale down or phase out its support

These three scenarios represent different technical, financial and administrative implications for UNDP CO and HQ.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

This report presents the findings of the final evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for the period 2007-2011. The CPAP was conceived, designed and implemented jointly with Government of the State of Eritrea (GoSE).

The evaluation was undertaken at a time when the cooperation between the UN-system in Eritrea and the GoSE has entered a critical phase following a decision by government to cut short the 2007-2011 UNDAF and circumscribe the UN’s work in the country to three areas, namely: Health, Water Supply and Sanitation. Furthermore, only a 12-month programme framework has been agreed lasting till December 2012 after which GoSE will either extend, modify or end its cooperation with the UN. The future therefore is uncertain. It is important to note however, the policy shift by GoSE affects all development partners and not just the UN

Given this situation, the evaluation does not, as it normally should, easily lead to development of programme proposals for a new cycle of cooperation with the GoSE, building upon the past CPAP. The report thus attempts first of all to assess and document what UNDP has accomplished over the period against what was planned – i.e. to fulfill its accountability requirement – and to a lesser extent to provide some ideas for a possible way forward in this complex setting.

The report is divided into six parts, with the key areas covered and their respective sections as follows: Assessment of programme performance (Section II); Resources & partnerships (Section III); Programme management (Section IV); Overview of implementation challenges (Section V); and Conclusions and way forward (Section VI).

 A midterm review of the CPAP undertaken in 2009 provided a detailed assessment of progress, results achieved, lessons learnt and made many recommendations all of which were judged by the final evaluation team as highly pertinent. Rather than repeating some of these findings, readers are referred to that report.

* 1. **Background**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been operating in Eritrea since 1992 to promote and implement sustainable human development strategies and programmes based on national development priorities of the Government of the State of Eritrea (GoSE). In this regard, it successfully designed and implemented in collaboration with the GoSE three successive country programmes: (i) From 1997 – 2001, a Country Cooperation Framework (CCF) signed between the UNDP and the GoSE was implemented and its primary focus was capacity development and institution building; (ii) For the period 2002-2006 which also coincided with the first UNDAF for Eritrea; and (iii) Finally, the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan for the period 2007-2011, which coincided with the second UNDAF for Eritrea.

Prior to this – from 1992-1993, UNDP assistance mainly focused on rehabilitation and reconstruction, as Eritrea was just emerging from a 30-year liberation struggle with Ethiopia and independence was just realized then. The period from 1994 – 1996, the support of UNDP was mainly targeted on capacity development programmes, a continuation of the post-war emergency programmes aimed at rehabilitating, resettling and reintegrating returnees and refugees as well as demobilizing and reintegrating ex-combatants. The overall objective of the UNDP supported programmes has been geared toward strengthening national capacity in key national institutions to enhance development effectiveness.

* 1. **National Development Context and UNDP Response**

This section briefly reviews the national context and the main issues and challenges faced when the CPAP was being formulated, and UNDP’s response in terms of the programme priorities agreed with government. This brief overview demonstrates that the UNDP CPAP of 2007-2011 addressed issues of critical national importance and was thus highly relevant – this is so both at an overall level, as well as in terms of the specific programmatic interventions which were designed and implemented. Thus the evaluation team concurs with the findings of the CPAP MTR on this question.

* + 1. **National Development Context**

The UN Common Country Assessment and the situational analysis of the UNDP CPAP provide a detailed picture of the challenges and issues confronting Eritrea at the start of the 2007-2011 programme cycle, and which informed the UNDAF and UNDP CPD/CPAP. Only brief highlights of these issues are presented here – readers can refer to the CCA and other relevant documents for more details.

In terms of governance, Eritrea had exerted significant efforts to enhance the process of governance and to establish an efficient system of public administration. The Country’s Constitution was ratified in May 1997, and a number of complementary measures had been taken in the areas of justice and decentralization including the enactment of the 1996 Proclamation for the establishment of regional administrations (PERA). To enhance local participatory planning, a project was being piloted in the Regional Administration of Anseba. Eritrean law provides equal rights and opportunities for women and the country ratified the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in 1995. A series of complementary measures geared to enhance women’s rights; opportunities and participation have also been taken. Eritrea had made significant progress in all these areas; yet, the gains achieved needed to be sustained and deepened in order to attain more significant results.

Although GoSE had developed a number of policy frameworks (e.g. Macro Policy, Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, Food Security Strategy, etc), assessments consistently showed that human and institutional capacity gaps were resulting in delays and difficulties in the implementation of these key GoSE policy initiatives. National capacity issues and constraints were thus identified as key concerns in the CCA process underpinning most development challenges across all sectors. The issues were even more serious at the regional and local levels. Accordingly, a long-term effort was required to build capacity at the central, regional and local levels, as well as at a sector level.

Economic performance in the early years of independence (1993-1997) was impressive with an average GDP growth of 7.4 %, increases in per capita income and other marked improvements. Significant progress was made in rehabilitating infrastructure (roads, seaports, schools, health facilities, etc.). However, the period after 1998 was adversely affected by the sudden eruption of the border war (1998-2000) with Ethiopia. Consequently the economy did not perform as well due to the border war and the lingering demarcation stalemate compounded by recurrent droughts, severe resource constraints, and human capacity gaps. For instance, Eritrea’s Human Development Index (Human Development Report, 2005), having improved from 0.416 to 0.446 between 1999 and 2001, fell back to 0.439 in 2002. In 2005, Eritrea’s ranking of 161 on the HDI was six points below its 2002 rank. Thus poverty was widespread and progress to reduce it was seriously constrained.

As a consequence of both the long war of liberation and the brief border war with Ethiopia, there were still significant numbers of Internally Displaced People (IDPs) and expellees, who together with the urban poor, the disabled, pastoralists, female-headed households, orphans, and high-risk HIV/AIDS groups were particularly hard hit. Within these groups, women and children were the most disadvantaged, both socially and economically. Estimates indicated that there were about 50,000 IDPs sheltered in camps and being assisted with emergency aid. The resettlement and reintegration process of this population which was underway had significant implications for extra resource mobilization. At that stage, most of the IDPs were back to their original villages or other settlement areas; however, much remained to be done if they were to lead normal, productive lives.

Eritrea faced acute food security challenges. While the contribution of agriculture to GDP is low (15-20%), about two thirds of the Eritrean population depends on subsistence agriculture for its livelihood. The sector is highly exposed to the vagaries of nature and its production level low that it hardly covers subsistence consumption even in good harvests; the country faced continued chronic food deficits. Even at times of good harvest, for instance in the crop year of 1998/99, Eritrea produced only 60-70 % of its domestic food requirements. In 2002, agricultural production was equivalent to 30% of the country’s domestic food requirements and the quest for food security remains as one of the key challenges facing the Country.

Regarding shelter, the Country faced with acute housing shortages, especially in the urban areas. Although housing construction efforts have been undertaken in the major towns, the supply cannot presently meet the cumulative demand. The high costs of construction materials have accentuated the shortage of housing, especially in the urban areas of the Country.

Eritrea’s arid and semi-arid climatic condition means a fragile environment and both natural and human forces have contributed to the relatively fast environmental degradation in the Country. Population pressure with its adverse impacts on the environment is intense, especially in the highlands. About 96% of energy consumption in the rural areas is biomass, thereby damaging the forest stock of the country. Soil erosion is a serious problem and continued wars as well as persistent droughts have caused soil to lose its vegetation cover and agricultural productivity has been adversely affected. Eritrea’s accession to global environment and energy conventions, are among the country’s attempts to reverse the worsening trends which include: integrated land reclamation activities, a rural electrification fund, pilot wind power projects, preliminary geothermal studies, among others. However, extra efforts need to be embarked upon if these initial schemes are to be furthered and bear meaningful results.

Overall, the border war with Ethiopia and its lingering economic effects, coupled with the recurrent droughts eroded the immediate independence gains. The key challenges in the Government’s efforts to promote a sustainable socio economic development and to achieve the MDGs, inter alia, included: restoring macroeconomic stability and sustained economic growth; ensuring food security; addressing environmental degradation; enhancing capacities for competent public service delivery; and mobilizing the required resources.

**1.2.2 UNDP Response**

In the face of the issues and challenges briefly highlighted in the previous section, and in line with the UNDAF priorities, the overall objective of the 2007-2011 UNDP support programme was geared towards creating national capacity in priority areas.

The UNDP CPAP was closely aligned to the five key outcome areas of UNDAF namely:

1. support in increasing equitable access and utilization of quality basic services, with particular emphasis on improving the access of vulnerable groups to these services;
2. the establishment of an integrated and effective development planning, monitoring and evaluation framework to address the shortfalls in attaining the MDG targets and the implementation of the MD;
3. improvements of access to food for the most vulnerable population sectors, thereby contributing to the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger by 2015 (MDG 1), and working towards environmental sustainability (MDG 7);
4. assist the government through an integrated multi-sector approach to ensure that IDPs, expellees, returnees, and other war and drought affected communities are reintegrated and have secure livelihoods and access to basic services;
5. support the attainment of equal opportunities, rights, benefits and obligations for women in all areas of life.

Many of UNDP’s interventions were to be jointly implemented with other UN agencies as identified during the UNDAF process. The matrix below presents the five programme components and associated intervention areas of the 2007-2011 UNDP CPAP.

**Matrix of UNDP CPAP (2007-2011) Programme Components and Intervention Areas**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme Components** | **CP Outcomes**  | **Areas of Intervention** |
| **Component 1: National Capacity Development for Attaining MDG Targets** | (i) capacity is improved and a system established within the National Statistics Office (NSO) and sectoral ministries; (ii) development planning and budgeting processes, implementation, monitoring and evaluation in the MND and key national stakeholders are strengthened; (iii) operational, regulatory and human capacity of the civil service in all government offices and institutions strengthened; and (iv) strategy for disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation developed. | * *Capacity Development of the Ministry of National Development (UNDP)*
* *Strengthening capacities to plan, deliver, monitor, and evaluate at national, regional, and local levels (Joint programme): (UNFPA, ILO, UNICEF, WB, UNCDF, WHO)*
* *Establishing a National Database (Joint programme): (UNDP,UNICEF,UNFPA)*
* *Strategy for Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation (Joint Programme):(UNDP,FAO,UNICEF,WHO)*
* *Strengthening Local Development Planning Processes (Joint Programme):(UNDP,UNCDF)*
* *Enhanced Capacity for the Promotion and Administration of Justice (Joint Programme): (UNDP,UNFPA)-*
* *Capacity Development in the Civil Service Administration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Eritrean Institute of Management, Department of Immigration and Nationality, and Ministry of Finance, (UNDP)*
 |
| **Component 2: Food Security, Natural Resources and Sustainable Environmental****Development**  | (i) Enhanced decision (policy) making on food security by 2008.(ii) Improved access and availability of food (iii) Support development and protection of the environment and national resources by 2011. | * *Food Security (UNDP)*
* *Conservation Management of Eritrea’s Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity(UNDP)*
* *Wind Energy Applications(UNDP)*
* *Selected Energy Services for the Achievement of the MDGs(UNDP)*
* *Sustainable Land Management (UNDP)*
 |
| **Component 3: Achievement of equal opportunities, enhanced rights, benefits and obligations for women in all areas of life**  | (i) Capacity for gender responsive advocacy planning, monitoring and evaluation for gender equality strengthened in 12 key national institutions. (ii) NUEW capacity to address economic empowerment of women in difficult circumstances increased. | *Gender programme – strengthening capacity of the National Union of Eritrean Women* **(**Joint Programme: UNICEF, WHO, UNIFEM, ILO, UNHCR, UNDP) |
| **Component 4: Access to Basic Social Services** | (i) HIV/AIDS transmission infants born to HIV positive women is reduced by 50% and HIV prevalence among young people reduced by 25%.to (ii) access to increased by 20% with focus on vulnerable groups.  | * *HIV/AIDS Intervention Programmes in the Workplace (Joint Programme)( UNDP,ILO)*
* *Shelter and Human Settlement (Joint Programme UNDP,HABITAT)*
 |
| **Component 5: Support to Transition and Early Recovery**  | War affected IDP populations resettled, returned, and reintegrated in an environment that is safe from landmines andUXOs.  | * *Supporting community-based reintegration of IDPs, expellees and host communities (Joint Programme UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNAIDS)*
* *Support to Mine Action(UNDP)*
* *Social and Economic Reintegration of Demobilized Soldiers(UNDP)*
 |

* 1. **Evaluation Objectives & Methodology**

The overall purpose of the final evaluation of the CPAP 2007 – 2011 is to assess the impact and its overall contributions to development effectiveness in Eritrea relative to its five strategic areas of intervention. In addition, the evaluation assessed the progress attained against the targets set out in the CPAP, assess the CPAP in terms of overall relevance and appropriateness, effectiveness and alignment with the national development priorities – see Terms of references in Annex 1.

Accordingly, the evaluation assessed the extent to which the programme has contributed to development results and the outcome of each strategic programme intervention in light of the approved country programme. In doing so, the evaluation focused on assessing the strategies, implementation mechanisms and programmatic results based on the management, programme coordination, design of the country programme and communication and cooperation between and among all stakeholders.

In terms of specific objectives, the final evaluation sought to achieve the following:

1. Assess progress towards achieving expected results;
2. Assess the contributions of UNDP to development effectiveness, nationally;
3. Document best practices/success stories and lessons learned in the course of the programme implementation, including but not limited to, implementation of RBM, resource application and monitoring and evaluation of progress;
4. Assess the impact of activities carried out under each of the programme components, especially with regards to human and institutional capacity building, gender mainstreaming and human rights-based approach;
5. Assess and document any evidence of transformational change at the national level; and
6. Assess the continuous relevance of the country programme components to development effectiveness in Eritrea.

The evaluation was conducted in close consultation with key national and regional institutions/stakeholders and implementing partners throughout the entire process to ensure that the principles of national ownership, transparency and mutual accountability are followed.

The relevant national and regional implementing partners were consulted at all levels of the evaluation process. In other words, the participatory and consultative approach was pursued throughout the evaluation process, ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are consulted. In terms of data collection, the evaluation team used both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods.

Specifically, the evaluation comprised the following stages of data collection and procedures: desk review, consultations and interviews, field visits, finalization of evaluation methodology and work plan, and debriefing session.

1. ***Desk Review***: of all available documents related to the country programme, including projects/programmes evaluation reports, CPAP MTR report, project/programme review/progress reports, CPAP document, UNDAF document, UNDAF MTR report, and available national policy and strategy documents.
2. ***Consultations and Interviews***: with various key stakeholders and selected implementing partners identified in consultation with UNDP, including line ministries and other national institutions, project/programme focal persons/coordinators in national institutions and UNDP. UNDP Senior Management and staff, international development partners, and regional administrators were also met.
3. ***Field Visits***: Field visits were undertaken to selected sites of interventions to gather first-hand information by interviewing concerned government officials at central, regional and local levels, and other partners and stakeholders’ civil societies, and target beneficiaries. The visits were planned to cover transition and early recovery interventions, food security and environment and capacity building and strengthening of local planning capacities. Field visits were conducted in Endabastifanos and Mehrad Chele, sub-zoba Tsorona in Zoba Debub and Shilalo in sub-zoba Lalai Gash, Zoba Gash Barka and Serejaka and Gala Nefhi sub-regions in Zoba Maekel. The selection of the sites visited was made in consultation with the concerned staff of Transition and Early Recovery Unit and JP coordinators in the regions. Evaluation methodology involved key informant interviews with government officials at central, regional, sub-regional and kebabi levels. Focus group discussions were also conducted with beneficiaries from Endabastifanos, Mehrad Chele, Una Nazo, Kudo Weiba in Debub and Shilalo in Gash Barka. A total of 34 beneficiaries (both men and women) participated in the focused group discussions. The aim was to hear diverse views from those representing different sections of the target communities about the benefits, impact and sustainability of the transition and early recovery programme. Direct observation was also employed to assess the quality of services provided and whether benefits delivered by the programme in visited areas have been put into proper use.

Field visits were also undertaken in Zoba Maekel to assess the results of UNDP interventions on food security, environment and sustainable land management. Visits were paid to sub-zoba Serejeka (Mekerka and Taareshi villages), sub-zoba Gala Nefhi (to visit three dams serving seven villages: Lamza, Adi-Hakefa, Laguen, adi Hamushte, Adi Keih, Adi Tsenaf, Adom Zemat). Discussions were held with Ministry of Agriculture field staff, farmers/beneficiaries and local authorities.

1. ***Debriefing Session***: The evaluation team debriefed UNDP Senior Management and programme team and staff of the country office on the initial findings of the final evaluation, including key observations and recommendations. UNDP country office undertook to share the final report to relevant national stakeholders as appropriate.
2. **ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE**
	1. **Overall Assessment of Performance**

The 2007-2011 CPAP was a highly successful effort, an achievement that is shared by UNDP and all its partners (Central Government, regional administrations, mass organizations, other UN agencies and donors who contributed resources). Programme interventions were well designed, efficiently managed and implemented and highly effective, contributing, in very concrete terms, to building national capacities at central government and regional levels, as well as transforming lives and livelihood of thousands of rural poor of Eritrea, particularly the war-affected and other vulnerable populations. Through programmes of the CPAP, gender equity has been enhanced and a good foundation laid for the sustainable management of Eritrea’s fragile ecosystem. The programme was however less successful in instigating significant policy changes, although much effort was made in supporting preparation of many draft policies, guidelines and proclamations. This reflects more on the complexity of the policy making process within Eritrea than anything else.

A key strategy that underpinned the CPAP was to mainstream gender, human and institutional capacity building and Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) in all its programs. The team found substantial evidence to support the conclusion that gender was effectively integrated in all of the CPAP outcomes – examples are discussed under the assessment of Gender component. Similarly also strengthening human and institutional capacities was a major part of all programme components. Substantial numbers of government staff received trainings in relevant fields which had a positive impact on institutional performance – see below for details. The performance of institutions was also improved across the board in all programme components through strengthening of systems and provision of other forms of support such as equipment. Progress was also made in adopting a human rights-based approach as evidenced by the emphasis on improving access to services for disadvantaged groups such as the displaced, women headed households, persons affected by HIV/AIDS. The thrust of UNDP’s programmes in targeting the poor, marginalized and vulnerable sectors of the communities in its programmes clearly reflects concern for issues regarding rights, in the context of Eritrea.

At the time the final evaluation was undertaken, there was a noticeable drop in momentum and rhythm of programme activities and this was felt both within UNDP and implementing partners; activities had slowed down considerably. This was as a consequence of the shift in GoSE policy of cooperation with the UN. Although the CPAP had built a good foundation in many of the partner institutions, the dramatic turn of events has raised questions of sustainability and the ability of national partners to consolidate the gains made. This is having a somewhat dampening effect on the programme at this stage of CPAP implementation.

Below are the findings of the detailed review of the five programme components and the associated planned results for the 2007-2011 CPAP.

* 1. **Component I: National Capacity Development (CD)**

The CD component of the CPAP emerged as an off-shoot of the governance programme area and was aligned to the UNDP strategic plan (2008-2012) and the UNDAF. The CPAP identified four major strategic focus areas, namely: Capacity Development, Poverty Reduction, Environment and Transition and Early Recovery. To ensure that governance issues are also addressed, UNDP channeled CD support to key public institutions that deal with individual rights and social justice issues such as the MoJ, CSA, DIN, NUEW, etc. For example, by supporting the MoJ, UNDP contributed to safeguarding the rights of the citizens who stand to benefit from more efficient judicial system.

Even though CD is generally viewed as a cross-cutting issue in many projects and programmes, it is treated here as a separate, stand-alone component dealing with the strengthening of the human and institutional capacities of key government institutions to help them deliver their mandated public services effectively and efficiently. The overall objective of the National Capacity Development component of CPAP aims to strengthen institutional and human capacities to ensure the effective delivery of public services to meet the basic needs of the population and also sustain progress towards the achievements of the MDGs.

The four outcomes of the national CD component of the CPAP are: (i) capacity is improved and a system established within the National Statistics Office (NSO) and sector ministries; (ii) development planning and budgeting processes, implementation, monitoring and evaluation in the MND and key national stakeholders are strengthened; (iii) operational, regulatory and human capacity of the civil service in all government offices and institutions strengthened; and (iv) strategy for disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation developed. With the exception of the outcome related to disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation where there was little progress, most of the planned results under the remaining three CP outcomes are delivered.

It is important to highlight right from the outset that UNDP support has given enough considerations to human capacity building. Of the total resources allocated for the CD component (USD 11 million), 25% was utilized for providing training to staff of targeted public institutions, which is quite significant. This does not give the full picture of the scale of investment made by UNDP in human resource development as substantial training inputs was also put into the other components of CPAP.

**CP OUTCOME 2.1: By 2001, capacity is improved and a system established within the NSO and sectoral ministries to conduct surveys, collect and disseminate data and update the national data base. (JP: UNFPA is the lead agency, and UNDP, UNICEF, and ILO are participating agencies.)**

**Assessment**

The training and equipment support provided by the project improved the capacity of the NSO in relation to data collection, analysis and dissemination which are critically required for national planning and policy development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. As a result of the support, the NSO was strengthened to be able to independently conduct national surveys and assessments. Capacitated by the support, the NSO conducted a comprehensive EDHS covering wide ranging demographic and health issues by interviewing more than 30,000 households nationally. The preliminary report is prepared but not yet disseminated. As a result, the expected result of updating and publishing national data is not yet generated and national database is yet to be established, depriving policy makers and national planners from having access to crucial, up-to-date gender and age disaggregated data.

Eritrea produced its first MDG Report in 2005. The preparation of the second MDGR which was planned for 2009 is long overdue. Its preparation would have allowed the government and its partners to assess progress made by the country towards meeting MDG targets as an input to decide on a plan of action needed to accelerate progress. It would be important for UNDP to initiate discussion with the government to know the status of the EDHS, which would subsequently lead to the initiation of the MDGR.

**CP OUTCOME 2.2: By 2011, development planning and budgeting processes in the MND and key national stakeholders are strengthened. (JP: UNDP is the lead agency and UNFPA, UNICEF, and UNCDF/BSF are participating agencies.)**

**Assessment**

The training offered, and equipment and technical support provided to MND and key national stakeholders by the project enhanced their planning and budgeting capacities. As a result, the MND launched, with the participation of all sector ministries and regions, a comprehensive and participatory planning process intended to culminate in the preparation of a 5-year Indicative National Development Plan (2009-2013). As part of this support, planning units were established in three ministries and all six regional administration offices. Furthermore, to guide and facilitate the planning process, the MND organized a series of capacity building programmes including tailored training and coaching exercises. As a result, sector and zoba development plans were prepared which, after being consolidated, led to the preparation of a draft Indicative National Development Plan. The Plan however is not yet endorsed.

Nevertheless, the participatory process followed by the MND to develop the Plan strengthened the planning skills of the staff of sector ministries and regions. The guidelines and manuals prepared to facilitate the planning process are now in the hands of sector ministries and regions which will continue to serve them as reference materials whenever they decide to engage in a similar planning exercise. No matter how useful these guidelines and manuals are, the delay observed in approving the National development Plan still represents a major setback for the project as there is greater likelihood of losing the momentum created during the planning process and the staff may also show less enthusiasm to engage in similar planning processes in future. The delay may have been partly a result of the change of ministers and key technical staff of the MND at a very crucial stage of the planning process.

UNDP support contributed to improved regulatory capacities of the Ministry of Mines and Energy in relation to the mining sector which at present is growing fast. In view of the potential impact of the sector to national economy and the environment, supporting the MoME to strengthen its regularity capacity was both necessary and timely.

The Anseba Local Development Project (ALDP) enhanced the planning, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation capacities of the regional administration of zoba Anseba. CD interventions of ALDP involved training of government officials at zoba, sub-zoba and kebabi levels as well as local communities in a wide range of areas including bottom-up planning, monitoring and evaluation, computer applications, soil and water conservation, etc. As a result of the trainings offered, equipment provided and software supplied, the regional administration managed to independently prepare a five-year regional development plan (2008-2012) for Zoba Anseba. The bottom up, participatory planning approach introduced by the ALDP is consistently followed by the regional administration in all other local development planning processes.

The participatory planning approach of ALDP was further consolidated by providing communities in remote areas of Zoba Anseba the opportunity to plan, implement, operate and maintain community-based micro-projects. Based on this approach and with the technical inputs and financial support of UNDP and UNCDF, the regional administration of Zoba Anseba, together with the communities, implemented over 100 micro-projects in different sectors (education, health, road, water, agriculture, etc.) during the entire lifespan of the project.

It is observed that community demands for micro-projects has been growing overtime and the project had to focus on the most basic needs and priorities such as safe drinking water, health services, schools, and micro-dams. Over the past 2-3 years, the thrust of the project was more on food security, focusing on the construction of micro-dams (10) and hand dug wells (3) in different parts of Zoba Anseba. Farmers in these areas are currently engaged in downstream horticultural production with the purpose of meeting own consumption and supplying the local market. Communities have proven their commitment to the projects by fulfilling their obligations through cash, labour or material contributions or a blend of them.

In collaboration with UNCDF and the regional administration of Zoba Anseba, basic data on ALDP were organized and preliminary development priorities for the second phase programming prepared. However, replication of the ALDP project has not taken place mainly due to resource constraints and the MND’s decision to shift UNDP resources towards the preparation of the 5-year Indicative National Development Plan.

**CP OUTCOME 2.3: By 2011, Operational, regulatory and human capacity of the civil service in all government offices and institutions strengthened (Financed by UNDP and the Government of Norway.)**

**Assessment**

UNDP support strengthened the capacities of some of the most important government bodies with the objective of ensuring efficiency and equity in public service delivery. The support aimed to contribute towards filling operational, regulatory, and human capacity gaps of key public institutions with important roles to play in helping the country meet its national priorities and its international obligations. These institutions include Ministry of Finance (MoF), Ministry of Justice (MOJ), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Civil Service Administration (CSA), Department of Immigration and Nationality (DIN) and the National Confederation of Eritrean Workers (NCEW).

The support provided produced important results in terms of strengthening the human and institutional capacities of these institutions. Human resource capacities were upgraded by improving the knowledge, skills and attitudes of the management and staff of these organizations through long, and short-term in-country and overseas education, training, and study tours organized by either UNDP or the IPs themselves. As human resource development was not viewed as a sufficient condition to improve personal and organizational efficiency, UNDP further extended its support to the provision of office equipment and furniture (MoF, CSA, MoJ, and DIN), establishment of training/resource centers (MoF, DIN, and CSA), and development of computer database systems (DIN, CSA).

Overall, the CD interventions contributed to improved public service delivery and operational efficiency of these institutions, which in turn resulted in better customer satisfaction. For example, UNDP support to community courts ensured improved judicial services to the rural population. With the support of UNDP, DIN has totally transformed itself from time-consuming manual operations to computer-based system. The MoFA was also able to improve its organizational performance, identify its training gaps, develop new job descriptions, prepare better plans, and improve communication including quality of reports. The capacities of the CSA to develop HRM policies on issues related to rights and obligations of civil servants as well as deliver HRM services were strengthened. In the MoF, though still early, the support has already contributed to improved operational capacity of the various departments at the HQ and regional offices, created better working environment, and enhanced data collection and analysis activities.

Even though the major share of the CD resources have gone to central line ministries, the benefits of the capacity building support have also trickled down to zoba and sub-zoba levels. For example, MoF provided training and IT equipment (computers and printers) to its branch offices in the regions, CSA trained director generals, administration and personnel heads from the regions, MoJ trained community court magistrates, DIN trained staff from the regions and linked zoba offices with the head quarter, etc.

While the CD support led to the development of a number of policies and laws covering wide-ranging rights issues (Eritrean laws, CSA laws, etc.), they are yet to be implemented due to delays in approving them by the Government. Even though the main objective of the policy formulation process was to enhance the regulatory framework of relevant sectors, supported ministries have nonetheless derived certain benefits from the policy formulation and law development exercises. In addition to strengthening their policy formulation capacities and initiating limited policy discussions, the support has made these institutions more aware of the human, physical and financial resource implications of the draft policies and laws. For example, the finalization and partial implementation of the Civil Service Law enhanced the confidence of personnel managers in public institutions on human resource management matters (e.g. the draft Law provided clear guidelines on how to deal with disciplinary issues). This is however said in full cognizance of the risk of losing the importance and currency of these policies and laws if their approval is further delayed. For example, the effective introduction of the CSA’s Performance Appraisal system greatly hinges on the promulgation of the civil service law.

The CD programme has its own share of setbacks, and chief among them is the lack of feedback from the Government with respect to the status of drafted laws, policies and plan. Another area of concern is the delay observed by the MoJ to replicate case flow management system piloted in Zoba Maekel High Court. Moreover, the statutory laws needed to empower the CSA with the necessary power and duties are yet to be put in place, and as a result, the CSA has not been able to appropriately organize itself in a way that would enable it to exercise those powers and duties as stipulated in the Civil Service Laws.

The output related to the establishment of a national office mandated to follow up conventions, laws and treaties signed by Eritrea is not delivered and the function continues to be handled in a fragmented manner by individual ministries (e.g. convention related to child right and labour by the MoLHW, convention on desertification and wildlife by the MoA, etc.).

**CP OUTCOME 2.4: By 2011, a national coordination mechanism is established on national, regional and local levels for disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation. (JP: FAO is the lead agency and UNDP, WFP, UNICEF and WHO are the participating agencies.)**

**Assessment**

The efforts made by UN under the leadership of UNDP were curtailed by the government’s change of policy on UN Eritrea. These include: consultations held with the MND and the workshop conducted on disaster risk reduction; the meeting of UN agencies and government ministries held to chart out a road map to advance the development of a comprehensive DRR policy on Eritrea; the participation of an Eritrean delegation to the second Inter-Ministerial conference on DRR which was organised by AU Commission supported by UNISDR; and the development of a concept note which was prepared with the support of UNDP on establishing/strengthening national early warning systems for hydro-met related information. Although the concept note has not moved far due to policy changes, it influenced the inclusion of the hydro-met equipment into the new frame of cooperation.

**Impacts of Capacity Development Support**

For some projects under the CD component, it may be too early to expect major impacts as policies, laws, and computer programmes developed using the support are either not approved (CSA laws) or not fully implemented or being operational (DIN software, CSA database system, MoF training centre). For others, there are either early indications of potential impacts or already full-fledged impacts, which can be presented as follows.

1. Service delivery of targeted public institutions enhanced as a result of the CD interventions, which involved training, supply of new office equipment and improved work systems. E.g. In the DIN, the support provided has completely transformed service delivery system from manual to automated system, which reduced the time required to: (i) produce a new ID card from two days when it was done manually to half an hour using computers; (ii) renew an ID card from about seven days mainly to search and retrieve one’s personal file from shelves to about two hours; (iii) verify and fulfill passport services from two to three days to about 20 minutes; (iv) render visa and residence permit to foreigners from one day to half an hour; and (v) offer passenger services at the airport by half. Improvement in service delivery resulted in greater customer satisfaction.
2. As a result of the trainings provided in different areas, skills of staff of public institutions were upgraded as can be clearly seen from the changes in the quality of services provided, and progress reports (especially financial) prepared.
3. The training programmes and equipment provided to public institutions raised staff morale. For example, in DIN, MoF, MoFA, MoJ, the support substantially improved staff motivation and led to greater staff commitment and dedication.
4. IT support (training and database establishment) contributed to improved efficiency in the day-to-day operations of IPs. For example, as a result of the maintenance training provided, DIN was able to carry out its own computer maintenance works, and this has saved financial resources that would otherwise have gone to outside maintenance service providers. In the MoF, the training is expected to develop the capacity of the System development team, networking team, the PC maintenance team and the Customs ASYCUDA support team and enable them to deliver their service in an efficient way.
5. The fully automated system of the MoJ facilitated monitoring of the case flow from opening of case files to final judgment. As a result of the new system, reporting is made easier and can generate court reports much faster and easier. The support brought more efficiency to the MoJ in dealing with cases from initiation to conclusion and removed the clogging of the system, which is noticed by the citizens/general public who are positively impressed.
6. The LAN introduced in the MoJ and MoFA resulted in improved communication systems for sharing information, transmitting reports and exchanging messages. However, the effective use of the LAN system is constrained by the existing slow internet service.
7. The strengthening of community courts resulted in faster settlement of cases. Prior to the establishment of the community courts (about 600 of them), the rural population used to spend considerable time and money to get their cases heard by the formal courts. The establishment of the community courts has brought judicial services closer to the rural population and this in turn saved time, money and energy that they can invest in other productive activities.
8. Although still low, women benefited from the various trainings and CD interventions of the project. They are also more empowered due to their involvement in the implementation of community-based micro-project in Zoba Anseba as well as their participation in community courts.
9. The construction of micro-dams in some of the remote areas of Zoba Anseba allowed the rural population to engage in horticultural production, which represents an important contribution to household food security and poverty reduction. Improved access to safe water, markets, education, health and other services has positively impacted the livelihoods of the targeted communities.
10. The establishment of resource and training centers (MoF, DIN and NCEW) enhanced the capacity of IPs to provide training. In the NCEW, capacity of trainers and technical staff engaged in the planning activities has been strengthened through various workshops and trainings. The IPs would also be able to provide staff training at a lower cost as they would no longer depend on rented premises for such kind of activities.

**Sustainability**

1. The most critical issue casting serious doubts on sustainability of systems and services delivered by the project is related to the delay to the enactment of draft policies, laws and plan. For example, the continued use and sustainability of modern database established within the CSA greatly hinges on the endorsement and full implementation of the Civil Service Law.
2. UNDP support enhanced the human and institutional capacities of the IPs which is an essential prerequisite for sustaining the systems developed, services introduced and equipments provided by the project. For example, as part of their efforts to sustain services, DIN and MoF trained their own staff in computer maintenance which, in addition to saving maintenance cost, helped in ensuring continued services to the public.
3. Since the projects implemented under the CD component were among the top national priorities, they are very likely to enjoy continued government support well beyond the CPAP period (E.g., establishing training centers, strengthening community courts, CSA, and NSO, etc.).
4. The sustenance of the newly introduced computer-based work systems in some public institutions such as DIN, CSA, MoF, etc. would require additional financial resources for their maintenance and replacement. As the equipment are new, sustaining them may not be a problem in the short run. Since the government is encouraging public institutions to introduce improved work systems, it is likely that budget may be allocated by the MoF for their operation, maintenance and replacement.
5. IPs have greatly relied on local expertise and resources to implement different interventions including the development of computer programmes, provision of in-country training, establishment of training/resource centers. This ensures continued cooperation with local service providers and suppliers which are expected to contribute to project sustainability.
6. Extending the tenure of the magistrates of the community courts (which is now only two years though it can be extended by another two years if they are elected for another term) or incorporating them into the formal court system could help the MoJ reap maximum benefit from the training investment made on community courts.
7. Communities have actively participated in the construction of micro dams and ponds both as part of ALDP. The organization and capacity developed during the project implementation phase will be used by beneficiary communities to regularly maintain the soil and water conservation structures such as check dams, stone band, soil bands, and terraces and thereby control siltation and extend the useful life of the micro dams and ponds constructed by the project.
8. As part of sustaining water supply systems, communities pay for water (ranging from 0.25 to 0.50 Nakfa per Jeri can) which will be used to cover cost of operation and maintenance including wages paid to guards and pump operators and in some cases cost of spare parts. Communities have also hired guards to protect micro dams and ponds from transgressors.
9. The NEX implementation modality has also been instrumental in building the capacities of implementing agencies, which ensures sustainability of benefits generated by the Programme.

**2.3 Component 2: Food Security, & Sustainable Environment Management**

UNDP through its Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) sought to achieve the following results for this component: (i) enhanced decision (policy) making on food security by 2008 (UNDP/FAO); (ii) improved access and availability of food (UNDP/WHO); (iii) support development and protection of the environment and natural resources (UNDP/UNFCC/GM/GEF).

To achieve the planned results, UNDP designed and implemented five projects as follows: (i) Wind Energy application programe; (ii) 2nd National Communication to UNFCC; (iii) Improving Fishing Communities Livelihoods; (iv) Sustainable Land Management; (v) Food security and Sustainable Livelihoods Programme. In addition, a number of small catalytic activities in the field of environment were supported and these are also briefly discussed in this section.

These interventions were designed and implemented in partnership with several national partners (Ministry of Energy and Mines – Dept. of Energy; Ministry of Land Water & Environment -Dept. of Environment; Ministry of Marine Resources; and Ministry of Agriculture - Zoba Maakel Branch. Local administrations in the respective sites of implementation, as well communities also participated in and were often the target beneficiaries of UNDP’s interventions.

**Results & Impacts**

According to most reports, Eritrea has been largely spared the worst effects of the severest drought of the past 60 years affecting the Horn of Africa. Although reasonably good rains in Eritrea over the last two years is an important factor, there are also little doubt that the massive investment by GoSE in dam construction, improved seeds for farmers, ploughing services, rural infrastructure development and other support has made a significant contribution. UNDP, as a key partner of GoSE in addressing food security and environmental rehabilitation, played a part in this positive situation. It should be noted however, that although there is no reported critical food shortage as such, food prices are high relative to the population’s income levels and all segments of society are affected.

The evaluation team took into account several factors in assessing what UNDP has achieved under this component of the CPAP:

1. A review of its project portfolio reveals that UNDP’s contribution to food security, poverty reduction and environmental rehabilitation in Eritrea is embedded in many areas of its work, including in particular the work undertaken in the context of the Transition and Early Recovery outcome, and to a lesser extent, the Anseba Local Development Project (ALDP) under the national capacity development outcome. While this section examines the results achieved with respect to food security outcome, contributions from the other outcomes discussed in other parts of the report should be borne in mind.
2. Several of the projects designed and implemented by UNDP under this CPAP component are multifaceted in nature, and simultaneously address poverty, food security and environmental concerns. For example, notwithstanding its focus on environmental rehabilitation, the SLM project integrates actions that directly address food security and poverty reduction objectives; similarly also the food security project implemented in Zoba Maakel has many aspects that are geared towards promoting environmental rehabilitation. In the view of the evaluation team, such an approach is a sound one, given that at household and community levels, issues of poverty, food security and environmental security are inextricably linked, and that well designed integrated projects can benefit from the resulting positive synergies, and are likely to resonate better with beneficiaries;
3. Under the UNDAF, and as indicated earlier, it was envisaged that nearly all the planned results under outcome 3 would be implemented in partnership with other UN agencies. In practice however, none made significant financial contributions and UNDP was left to bear the full burden of designing the interventions, mobilizing resources and implementing the programmes. This factor has a direct bearing on the results achieved vis-à-vis the scale and magnitude of the challenges under this outcome; and
4. Finally, many of the UNDP interventions under this outcome are yet to be fully implemented, and consequently, it may be too early yet to determine impacts. The situation is aggravated by the rather abrupt termination of many of the interventions due to the recent policy shift by GoSE with respect to its collaboration with the UN system. Nonetheless, the evaluation team could identify several emerging potential results that may mature fully in the medium and long term.

The evaluation team had no means to objectively verify whether the target of providing access to adequate food at all times for 10% of the poor by 2011 was achieved or to measure progress made towards that target. The main reason for this is the lack of baseline data and the unavailability of quantitative data from monitoring reports due to difficulties to access data in Eritrea. Nonetheless, the evaluation team concluded that UNDP has contributed to improving access to food, thus to national efforts for achieving of halving of hunger and ensuring environmental sustainability. This contribution is exemplified by the following key results discussed below.

**CP Outcome: Enhanced decision (policy) making on food security by 2008.**

**Assessment**

Little progress was made under this outcome**.** Some effort was expended to support food security policy making but this effort did not proceed far and was abandoned.

**CP Outcome: Improved Access and Availability of food (UNDP/WHO)**

**Assessment**

The UNDP food security and livelihoods interventions, initiated late 2009, consisted of support for farming activities in Zoba Maakel and support to the fisheries sector.

*Zoba Maakel Food Security Project*

The pilot project in Zoba Maakel involved construction of two dams (600,000 m3 capacity ) and rehabilitation of a third one (capacity 175,000 m3), as well construction of terraces, access roads, check dams, re-afforestation, provision of support for farming and livelihood activities such as poultry, beekeeping and other farming activities. The project area in sub-zoba Gala Nefhi covers about 2,184 HHs in seven villages (Lamza, Adi Hakefa, Laguen, Adi Hamushte, Adi Keih, Adi Tsenaf, Adom Zemat).

At the time of the final review, physical works had been largely completed but full scale production activities had not been initiated as the main irrigation infrastructures were not yet installed. Thus it is too early to assess impact. However, once fully effective, the project is expected to generate a stream of benefits for local communities from incomes generated from irrigation, IGA, wells recharged, hygiene and sanitation and environmental impact. UNDP assistance has created the infrastructures and established the platform for rural household to envisage and plan an alternative future. With time and resources, communities can improve their livelihoods. The project when fully implemented the project will bring much needed stability and predictability to farming activities and to the lives and livelihoods of the rural poor.

*Support to the Ministry of Fisheries*

UNDP support has enabled the accreditation of the fish quality control laboratory which has provided an opportunity for exports and therefore benefits to the economy as a whole and to households – previously Eritrea was denied export of fish to EU. The new laboratory has now been certified by international accreditation institutions.

The two projects designed and implemented by UNDP to enhance food security and reduce poverty are promising. However, given the depth of poverty in Eritrea, they have a limited localized effect. On the positive side, many of the interventions are scalable given adequate resources.

**CP Outcome: Support development and protection of the Environment and Natural resources (UNDP/UNFCC/GM/GEF).**

**Assessment**

To promote sustainable environmental management, UNDP supported a range of actions including: renewable energy initiative; sustainable land management; improved capacity for land use planning; build capacity on climate-related issues; promoted/facilitated coastal zone management. UNDP also provided several punctual and catalytic support related to the environment to GoSE over the 2007-2011 CPAP.

Overall, the evaluation team judges these interventions as appropriate as they addressed critical national and international environment concerns relating to climate change, loss of biodiversity, environmental conservation and sustainable land management, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions with significant household and national economic and social benefits. In addition longer term national and local capacities to assess, design and manage programmes to address critical environmental challenges have been enhanced.

Unfortunately a big gap exists in the area of policy which has been less successful as a raft of draft laws and proclamations remain unapproved which can undercut the gains being made.

*Renewable Energy*

In the field of energy, UNDP implemented the wind energy project aimed at reducing Eritrea’s fossil fuel dependency and promoting a greener energy environment. Three grid connected wind turbines, with a capacity of 250Kwh each, were installed and commissioned in Assab port city in November 2007. Seven decentralized, village-based stand-alone, small turbines were erected and partially commissioned in southern coastal villages and in the Southern Region. Additional clean electricity increased the electricity hours of the town from 16 to an average of 22 hours per day and reduced the generation cost of the power plant by around 20% for approximately 30,000 residents of Assab. The lifetime of the Assab Wind Farm is more than 20 years and the investment made is anticipated to reach a breakeven point between 6-7 years.

The Wind Energy Applications Pilot project in Eritrea is the second in Sub-Saharan Africa after Mauritania. After five years of implementation, the project was found technically and economically viable and has contributed to breeching the technical and institutional barriers on the use of renewable energy technologies. GoSE is now working to upscale its renewable energy sources based on the successful implementation of the pilot wind energy project. The successful implementation of the Pilot Wind Energy project has now led to firm indications and commitment of GoSE to develop a Renewable Energy Policy. In using wind energy technology in Eritrea, an array of applications was piloted. These included construction of three 275 KW wind farm which has saved 682,000 liters from the Assab Diesel Power Plant at a cost of approximately USD 730,000/year; 50 KW wind diesel hybrid; 10 KW wind standalone system; 5 kW wind electric pump and battery charging station; 3 kw wind mechanical water pump. These systems provided village lightening, potential use for desalinization and ice maker for fishermen, provide carbon credits as additional funding, reduce fossil fuel imports and CO2 emission. The expected CO2 reduction per annum from the wind farm is 1,700 MT and from the small village-based turbines 17.7 MT/annum. Social, environmental and health benefits include***:*** longer hours of electricity access for crucial use of ventilation and cooling systems; preservation of fish and other perishables; improved community and individual household livelihood; better health status of the population due to breathing of clean air expected; reduction of respiratory and eye diseases caused by kerosene lamps, in the villages; and reduction of pollution due to used lubricants, from the diesel generators.

The necessary skilled manpower to plan, design, install, operate and maintain wind energy systems in Eritrea was achieved. Training was provided on the operation and maintenance of the newly installed technologies given to Eritrean Electric Corporation (EEC) and Renewable Energy Center (REC) technical personnel. Technical and managerial trainings provided to around 25 members of the Ministry, private Electrical Contractors and the UNDP-CO. Barriers of Renewable Energy Technologies (RETs) removed, and awareness raised, capacity to replicate and a strategy to replicate the use of clean energy sources promoted. A write up on Eritrea’s new and green technology was awarded the highest prize for successfully implemented CC stories of under-reported states at the Copenhagen, COP15 Global Conference on Climate Change.

In addition to wind energy, UNDP has also supported improved stoves through the Transition and Early Recovery programme, as well as in the central region within the SLM project. It is estimated over 100,000 trees have been planted (5 trees are planted for each improved stove). Women have been the main beneficiaries.

*Sustainable Land Management Project*

UNDP is piloting implementation of a sustainable land management project in 28 villages and involving close to 48,000 people directly or indirectly. Piloting implementation of the land proclamation that seeks to introduce more permanent forms of land ownership to replace the present seven year ownership system which is widely regarded as a hindrance to investment and improving land productivity was a key part of the project. The project has started with implementation of physical works such as terracing, forestry closures, dam constructions and introduction of temperate fruit tree culture (Apples and Peaches), horticulture and irrigation. The purpose is to enhance productivity and conserve the environment through a multifaceted approach. Baseline socio-economic has been collected but baseline for natural resources (land, water, soil and forests) is not yet completed

While the physical works are nearing completion, there is uncertainty with respect to the land re-distribution aspect due to the fact that it is not yet clear if the project will be affected by the new GoSE policy and whether the environment portfolio will be exempted from the new policy. It is also still early for establishing a knowledge network to share experiences or mainstream the lessons into strategies.

The strategy adopted to synchronize all partners and stakeholders (research, extension, land & water, communities, administrators, etc), and set up community structures (village committees include; (i) forest/closures; (ii) farm land; and (iii) water and irrigation) has improved chances for sustainability. The SLM project fits into the larger land use plan developed by the MLWE which provides a good foundation for sustainability.

The potential impact on household incomes is significant: Each HH is allocated 15 pits for temperate fruit trees (apples and peaches) which at peak production may yield up to 40 kg/tree. At current market prices of 200 nkf/kg for apples, this would yield decent incomes. Each HH has: (i) fruit trees; (ii) horticulture plots; (iii) forest trees; and (iv) cereal crops. This would have major impact on lives and livelihoods.

With regards to the introduction of a change in tenure system whereby farmers hold permanent title to the land instead of the current practice of rotating land ownership every seven years limited progress made so far. Change in land tenure can encourage greater willingness by farmers to invest in raising land productivity and there are plans working with the MLWE, to use the SLM project for piloting implementation of Proclamation 58/94.

The project strategy of closure and allocating forest trees to individual HH has meant greater care and higher survival rates of planted trees; as well as reduced risk of forest fires. The SLM project has brought into production marginal land which hitherto was considered only good for grazing. This will enhance value of hitherto marginal land and increase the areas under cultivation. However, this can have the potential effect of reducing land available for grazing, and needs to be properly managed to ensure that everybody benefits

*Support to Improved Land Use Planning*

With UNDP support, a national land use policy was drafted but not endorsed. A viable Land Information System (LIS) comprising of six modules was designed and implemented using local capacity. Satellite images purchased for a wide area enabling the Department to produce land use maps of the whole Central (Maakel) and parts of the Southern (Debub) Regions. The capacities of the staff of Land Department enhanced to survey, plan, and store and analyze land-related data and information. Thus, land-related information now more easily available and capacity to interpret land use information strengthened leading to enhanced/better land use planning, at least in central (Maakel) region.

*Building Capacity on Climate Related Issues*

National capacity to conduct greenhouse gas emission inventory and mitigation assessment has been enhanced through training of staff of Ministry of Agriculture, Energy and Mines and the Land, Water and Environment. This has enabled Eritrea to access resources of the CDM to realize sustainable development while at the same time contribute to global CO2 abatement efforts. It also now gives opportunity for GoSE to construct future climate change scenarios and facilitate better planning for climate resilience.

*Management of Eritrea’s Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity*

UNDP supported several interventions aimed at preserving and improving the management of Eritrea’s fragile coastal, marine and island ecosystem. Through this support, a number of achievements were registered: Basic data through rapid assessment for 80% of the coast and 70% of the 350 islands collected and a CMI biodiversity database on marine and coastal ecosystems and habitats established and coastal zoning prepared by end of 2006. An atlas of the coast has been prepared and a State of the Coast report published and widely distributed to potential information users. Most recent technology applied for coral reef, video monitoring and image treatment. Educational material is now available on the marine environment, protected areas and biodiversity in schools. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) process focusing on impacts of the Massawa Free Zone area undertaken lays the basis for more sensitive planning based on environmental considerations. Much investment to enhance the human and institutional capacity of, mainly, the Ministry of Marine Resources has been made. Example: GIS was fully operational with only national staff. However, the positive contribution of the project towards capacity building was reversed with a significant staff drain from the Ministry. Networking, exchange of information, and development collaboration initiated with regional bodies and countries like Egypt and Tanzania. All these served to strengthen the capacity to manage coastal and marine resources of Eritrea.

Unfortunately on the policy front, there was far less success: a proclamation to establish an Integrated Coastal Zone Management Authority (I-CAM-A) was drafted but not approved yet and an I-CAM Guidance for Implementation was prepared. Similarly in June 2007, an Integrated Coastal Area Management Proclamation was finalized but not enacted so far. A proclamation for Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) for three island areas prepared but was not endorsed to date. ICAM Policy was drafted but has not been endorsed up to now. The finalization of the draft Environmental law met the same fate. The delay experienced in obtaining feedback from GoSE on draft policies and laws affected programme implementation. This impacted delivery of key outputs, reflecting negatively on programme performance.

Catalytic Support

Other limited actions include: UNDP assisted the establishment of Small Grants Programme (SGP) in Eritrea and hosted the newly established office, and played an active role as a member of the Executive Board and provided technical support to 10 already formulated SG projects under implementation; solar PVs and improved traditional stoves installed and constructed for IDPs in Gash Barka Region for over 2000 HHs. assisting UNEP and the GoSE draft an Environmental National Action Plan which will be the basis for future development cooperation between the two partners; organized, facilitated and financed a high-level government of Eritrea officials to attend UNFCCC COP 15 meeting in Copenhagen which enhanced the negotiation and advocacy skills of the team members; facilitated preparation of the 3rd and 4th national report to the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) and supported the Government in fulfilling its regular and global commitment; prepared a coastal community food security project and initiated a land-based food security and livelihood promotion project in two regions.

While of great value, many of these catalytic interventions introduced a certain degree of scatter in UNDP Eritrea’s environment portfolio. Unfortunately there is no easy answer to this problem as many of them emanate from global commitments entered into by GoSE, and UNDP finds itself in a position where it cannot easily say no in the interest of a more consolidated and focused programme.

Several pipeline projects have also been developed that lay the basis for a substantial growth of resources for the environment sector and for UNDP’s work in the near future, should circumstances change. These are: (i) [*Increasing Resilience of Local Communities to Adapt to Climate Change Impacts through Piloting Groundwater Recharge and Natural Resources Management in Tsilima Plain*](http://www.er.undp.org/energy%26environment/env-pipline-proj.html)*; (ii)* [*Integrated Semenawi Bahri-Buri-Irrori Protected Area System for Biodiversity and Mitigation of Land and Climate Change; and (iii) Capacity Building of the Water Resources Department*](http://www.er.undp.org/energy%26environment/env-pipline-proj.html).

 **Sustainability**

Many of the projects designed and implemented under the outcome were meant to be of a pilot nature, with the goal of being eventually scaled up. Also many are still in the early stages. Thus it is difficult to talk about impact, much less sustainability. However, there are some positive indications.

The Pilot Wind Energy project is leading to change in GoSE policy and efforts to scale up. The SLM project and work done to build capacity for climate change adaptation by the environment programme has resulted in significant new pipeline projects which if implemented will further consolidate UNDP and GoSE work in this area.

Food security project was selected by villagers and feasibility study conducted by MoA. This together with the fact that the interventions are focused on addressing key priority provides grounds for believing in their long term sustainability. Furthermore all partners are contributing: Government (technical personnel, survey and design, supervision of construction, village extension workers); Communities (rip rapping - laying stones to protect embankments from erosion, establish various committees for managing assets created – water management, etc).

However, sustainability would have been more enhanced if UNDP’s downstream activities were complemented by a more enabling environment through approval of the many of the draft laws, proclamations, bills and those of similar nature produced through the UNDP supported projects.

**2.4 Component 3: Gender Equity**

The Eritrean Demographic and Health Survey of 2002 reported that women constituted 55% of Eritrea’s population. Reproductive ill-health, early pregnancy and the effects of harmful traditional practices such as early marriages and gender-based violence are some of the challenges faced, especially by young girls. Moreover, women continue to suffer from economic disempowerment, and many find themselves in a poverty trap as a consequence.

Eritrean law provides equal rights and opportunities for women and Eritrea has ratified CEDAW in 1995. Many measures geared to enhance women’s rights; opportunities and participation have been taken despite cultural barriers. However, majority of women remain poor and marginalized and the few gains made need to be consolidated and sustained.

Thus in line with the National Gender Action plan (2003-2008) and UNDAF outcome 5, UNDP sought to support the achievement of equal opportunities, rights, benefits and obligations for women through developing the capacity of NUEW and other institutional mechanisms that promote gender equality, equity and empowerment. In particular, UNDP sought to assist in establishing the Gender Resource and Research Center under the stewardship of NUEW, support institutional mechanisms to mainstream gender into policies and strategies, raise awareness and advocacy, and empower women.

The CPAP focused on two outcomes: (i) strengthening gender responsive planning and; (ii) economic empowerment of disadvantaged women as discussed below.

**CP Outcome: Capacity for gender responsive advocacy planning, monitoring and evaluation for gender equality strengthened in 12 key national institutions.**

For the 2007-2011 UNDAF, the gender component is a standalone because the mainstreaming experience did not work very well in the previous UNDAF cycle (2002-2006). Both UNCT and GoSE therefore agreed, based on that experience, to develop a full gender component as a Joint Programme, (UNFPA, UNDP UNIFEM, UNICEF and WHO) with UNFPA as the lead agency. The programme received USD 3,470, 826 from the UN agencies with USD 1,855,958.million (53.5% of the budget) from UNDP. This is particularly so with respect to the micro-credit component for which ILO, UNIDO, UNICEF and UNFPA all pledged but no funds were forthcoming. A joint final evaluation of the programme was undertaken in June 2011.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Assessment**

*Establish Gender Resource and Research Center*

UNDP took the lead with this planned output. A fully equipped resource and research center is now established at NUEW head office which will play a critical role in building capacity for gender. The long term strategy is to institutionalize gender into the country’s development activities, as well as in social and political life. Establishment of the center involved merging the gender center previously at Asmara University with that of NUEW. Three staff have been trained at Masters level (distance learning with University in Athabasca, Canada), gender training manual developed and gender database established – scanning of documents and digitalizing them to create a “one stop shop” on gender resources. There has been a significant strengthening of NUEW staff capacity at all levels, although it has been reported that two of those trained are no longer in place. The Center was planned to be established in 2007 (first year of UNDAF) but this proved to be too ambitious as the target did not take into account discussions/negotiations with GoSE, fund raising challenges as donors were focused on emergency interventions, and the lack of in-country capacity to deal with fairly complex issues such as setting up a language laboratory, digital center, etc. The establishment of the Gender Resource and Research Center will significantly strengthen gender training and research on women’s issues

*Gender mainstreaming in Government line ministries*

Twelve Ministries (Transport & Communication, Trade & Industry, Mines & Energy, Information, Education, Health, Agriculture, Land Water & Environment, Tourism, Justice and Finance) were targeted with the goal of identifying sector policies, gaps with respect to gender and develop strategies and action plans for gender mainstreaming. So far six (Transport & Communication, Trade & Industry, Health, Agriculture, Land Water & Environment) have designated gender focal points, five (Information, Education, Health, Agriculture and Land Water & Environment) have developed Gender Mainstreaming Strategy and finally four (Agriculture, Education, Health and Land Water & Environment) have developed Action Plans. Although there are challenges of capacity and commitment within line ministries, the gender mainstreaming action plans developed by the ministries of education, health, agriculture and land, water and environment represents significant progress. Already this is yielding concrete results – the MLWE is reported to reserve 30% of land bank parcels to be distributed to disadvantaged women; the Ministry of Education reduced the entrance requirements for girls to tertiary education and provided 30% quota for girls joining technical and vocational education and training (TVET). Gender analysis has been strengthened across the board. In addition, 3,825 persons, most of whom are top level management, have received training. Gender budgeting has been difficult to pursue due to lack of a national development plan – the opaqueness of the planning and budgeting system within government makes it difficult to undertake/promote gender-based budgeting. An opportunity though may exist through donor funded project. An additional stumbling block for gender-based budgeting is lack of disaggregated data.

*Advocacy and Sensitization*

NUEW staff provided gender advocacy training to 8,256 persons and a legal training manual is developed. Advocacy and awareness raising is at all levels – grassroots, sub-regional, regional and national. Difficulty though in assessing impact, although Proclamation 158/2007 bans FGM and NUEW played a critical role in mobilizing communities at Anseba region. Also noteworthy is the fact that the EDHS 2010 sex-disaggregated data base was established and NSO staff were trained in gender analysis. Sensitization materials have been published in three languages (Tigrinia, Arabic, Tigre). NUEW’s comprehensive network extending from national to grassroots has been an asset and strength. The organization has also been able to reach into schools and colleges. However, Eritrea is a patriarchal society and will take time to change attitudes, underscoring the need for continuous sensitization and changes may not be immediate. There are several constitutional provisions that treat men and women equal (e.g. land inheritance) but cultural factors stand in the way for their realization.

**CP Outcome: NUEW capacity to address economic empowerment of women in difficult circumstances increased.**

**Assessment**

According to the study on women in the informal sector, most women are in informal sector. Through support of partners, a small micro-credit programme is operating in Gash Barka. Access to credit has empowered poor and disadvantaged women. Over 630 disadvantaged women benefitted from the NUEW micro credit scheme thus resulting in improved livelihoods. This intervention was in response to the need to link work on rights/awareness with economic empowerment.

**Overview of Integration of Gender in the CPAP**

UNDP has taken measures to integrate Gender within its programmes through the following*:* integration of gender in planning of activities (training activities) and during review and/or preparation of work plans; sex disaggregated data; training of staff on gender issues organized in 2007/08 and gender mainstreaming strategy and action plan developed; and Global gender target of 50:50.

The 2010 EDHS has covered gender sensitive issues such as sexually transmitted diseases including HIV/AIDS, women’s health including obstetric fistula, gender equality, and malaria control as well as living conditions and children’s education. Women have also benefited from the various training programmes aimed to build their skills in project planning and management, procurement, computer literacy, secretarial science, archive, and financial management. For example, 40 women from the MoFA attended training on diplomacy, office management and other training programmes. DIN has trained about 140 women from its regional branches in computer applications.

The participatory approach adopted by the ALDP allowed women to actively participate in village development initiatives right from project identification to implementation and monitoring phases. As per the ROAR, about 70% of those who participated in project planning and implementation were women. Their participation in the direct implementation and monitoring of projects enhanced women’s sense of ownership and resulted in greater level of social and economic empowerment. Their access to basic social services such as water, health and education improved due to the implementation of community-based micro-projects. Nevertheless, gender mainstreaming still remains to be a major challenge of the programme. The good intentions expressed by public institutions to mainstream gender in their plans were not translated into concrete action. Moreover, due to their low representation in key positions and absence of a coherent and effective gender mainstreaming strategy in targeted public institutions (e.g. gender budgeting), a significant share of the training input have benefited men.

Under the Transition and Early Recovery Programme, gender equality and women’s empowerment were reflected in many ways. Overall, more than 60% of the total target populations of the programme are female-headed households. Environmental interventions which addressed reduction of fuel wood consumption through provision of fuel-saving stoves in households and provision of community solar-based household energy exclusively targeted women and female-headed households. In all livelihood security interventions, female-headed and resource-poor households were priority targets. In this case, female-headed households constitute 60% in provision of shelter, 64% in provision of seeds and tractor ploughing, 100% small ruminants for income generation and child nutrition and 67% participants in cash for work are women. In the target communities, women and girls are responsible for fetching water. Provision of access to potable water implies reduction in women’s workload and having more time for income-generating activities as well as time for schooling for girls. Hence, the intervention enhanced women empowerment and gender equity. Women are well-represented (40%) in local development committees. Women’s increased representation and participation in the programme has influenced resource allocations and policies by making them to address women needs and prioritized concerns.

**Impact of new GoSE policy on cooperation with the UN**

Halting of UN assistance has spurred national institutions to start reflecting on innovative ways to become self-reliant. For example, NUEW is contemplating measures such as: obtaining soft loan from a Bank to support its activities; mobilizing NUEW Chapters overseas (resources from abroad helped renovate NUEW HQ, Chapters of NUEW in Germany, Italy, UK and USA, respectively helped with centers in Barentu, Keren, Mendefera and Senafe); and establishing income generating activities (a factory to produce sanitary pads in Mendefera). However, there are significant challenges as current government subvention covers roughly 10% of NUEW total budget.

**Sustainability**

Basic training has been offered to public institutions which in addition to the designation of gender focal points, has created a pool of gender experts for each ministry. Training module on gender and development has been developed with Makarere University and will be integrated into College of Social Sciences, laying a longer-term basis for building skills on gender issues among college students and future state employees.

Although the climate is favorable for gender mainstreaming because of the history of the struggle for independence and women’s participation in it, there is need for constant upgrading so that people do not fall back into stereotypes; there is an overall trend is positive but need for continuity.

Other positive signs include: NUEW being a member of CCM of the Global Fund; improvements in women’s health as indicated by maternal mortality is going down; literacy rates among women growing but number of women in sciences still low - the Ministry of Education takes affirmative action to encourage women. At policy level the Constitution guarantees gender parity and many legislative measures have been taken (Land proclamation, FGM proclamation, CEDAW ratified, CRC) but the challenge is to institutionalize the gains.

NUEW has an established network from village level to national level making it easier for the Union not only to mobilize but also to disseminate information. The strong grassroots network needs to be complemented by a stronger human resource capacity.

Finally, NUEW has developed a Strategic Plan (2011-2015) which will help steer the institution and enable gains made from the programme to be consolidated.

**2.5 Component 4: Basic Social Services**

The basic social services component has two interventions namely HIV/AIDS and Shelter. The outcomes are:

**CP Outcome 1.5: by 2011, access to permanent shelter and sustainable human settlement increased by 20% with focus on vulnerable groups.**

**Assessment**

Very little was done with respect to shelter. The major focus was on increasing awareness on key appropriate technology options for affordable shelter at national and sub-national levels with focus on 10,000 prioritized households. Activities related to appropriate technology options particularly low cost housing using stabilized soil blocks and cement tiles were initiated with the establishment of training centres in Mendefera and Barentu. The objective was to: (i) train community members on stabilized soil blocks and other building materials; (ii) provide machines and tools; and (iii) to construct demonstration shelters in 2010. Despite the initial enthusiasm, the intervention failed to make any meaningful progress. However, UNDP has provided significant support to shelter as part of the Transition and Early Recovery component of CPAP.

**CP Outcome 1.6. By 2011, HIV/AIDS transmission to infants born to HIV positive women is reduced by 50% and HIV prevalence among young people reduced by 25%.**

**Assessment**

The support was aimed to strengthen the government’s multi-sectoral response to HIV/AIDS. It specifically focused on building the capacities of the National Confederation of Eritrean Workers (NCEW); the Eritrean Federation of Employers (EFE); the Ministry of Labour and Human Welfare (MOLHW); and the National AIDS and TB Control Division (NATCoD) of the MoH.

The output related to the implementation of the national HIV/AIDS workplace policy and programmes in 80% public sector institutions and public and private enterprises has not been delivered. This is because the draft National HIV/AIDS Workplace Policy is not yet approved by the MoLHW. However, rather than waiting for the endorsement of the National HIV/AIDS workplace policy, the NCEW meanwhile opted to promote the policy by targeting employees of state-owned enterprises, and has registered some success as some enterprises volunteered to incorporate certain provisions of the HIV/AIDS policy into their respective collective agreements.

UNDP support made valuable contributions towards strengthening the human and institutional capacities of the NCEW Training and Documentation Centre and HIV/AIDS and OSH (Occupational Safety and Health) Unit. As a result, the NCEW was able to effectively promote HIV/AIDS and OSH issues in targeted public and private enterprises. A total of 880 union leaders and members from 92 enterprises benefited from the training programmes and workshops conducted in the four regions namely Maekel, Debub, Anseba, and Northern Red Sea. HIV/AIDS guidelines were also prepared and submitted to the MoLHW for approval. A new strategy for implementing and coordinating OSH and HIV/AIDS programmes was developed, translated into local languages (Tigrigna and Arabic) and disseminated.

As a result, awareness of workers (both male and female) about HIV/AIDS increased and OSH and HIV/AIDS committees established in 45 public and private enterprises in Zoba Maekel, constituting about 20% of the 230 targeted enterprises organized under the NCEW. These committees are composed of three members representing workers and management and a health professional. The NCEW trained the committees as trainers (facilitators) and continuously supplied them with training materials and manuals on HIV/AIDS and OSH that they could use during peer groups discussions.

A total of 189 voluntary peer groups, consisting of an average of 28 workers each, were formed in workplaces. These peer groups meet 3 hours per month during working hours to discuss HIV/AIDS and OSH issues using training manuals obtained from NATCoD. Discussions held with HIV/AIDS and OSH committees revealed that peer group attendance is generally high. To secure the backing of managers, the NCEW conducted advocacy meetings for enterprise managers and owners to sensitize them about HIV/AIDS and OSH and succeeded in dispelling initial resistance. Consequently, peer groups are able to conduct their regular meetings without any opposition from the management. Some enterprises even provide them with limited material assistance such as refreshments during meetings, transport services, stationery, etc. This is in addition to the three hours time-off given every month for workers to attend peer group meetings.

All these efforts have contributed to enhancing the positive attitude on HIV/AIDS and OSH issues amongst workers and employers. The increase in level of awareness about HIV/AIDS appears to be a contributing factor to the overall reduction in HIV/AIDS prevalence rate among workers. There have been reports that an increasing number of workers in targeted institutions have shown willingness to know their health status by visiting VCTs for HIV/AIDS test.

However, there is lack of clear evidence whether increased awareness about HIV/AIDS among workers were translated into behavioral change as expected. Key informants have confirmed that project achievements with respect to behavioral change are still limited mainly because the process is slow and more challenging. While the project succeeded in targeting truck drivers, it faced significant challenge reaching mobile construction workers due to their high mobility.

**Impact**

1. Awareness of workers (both male and female) increased as a result of the various trainings and sensitization workshops as well as peer group meetings which allowed them to openly discuss about HIV/AIDS. However, it would be an exaggeration to give the project full credit for this as awareness of the general population has also increased. Though it is difficult to back it with hard facts, health professionals in visited enterprises confirmed that as a result of the efforts workers have become more conscious about HIV/AIDS which is manifested by the increased use of protective devices especially by male workers. This has positively contributed to overall reduction of HIV/AIDS prevalence rate. According to the information obtained from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in a statement presented at the 2010 MDGs summit, the HIV/AIDS prevalence rate has fallen from 2.4% to 0.7%[[3]](#footnote-3).
2. As a result of the continuous sensitization efforts made by HIV/AIDS and OSH committees, peer group members agreed to voluntarily visit VCT for HIV/AIDS test and have known their HIV/AIDS status. For example, 171 out of 400 workers of Asmara Brewery have voluntarily shown up for HIV/AIDS test.
3. The participation of women in HIV/AIDS activities enhanced by conducting training and awareness raising campaigns. Awareness and knowledge of peer group families about HIV/AIDS and OSH increased following their participation in training and sensitization programmes organized for them.
4. An important development reported by the health staff of targeted enterprises is that they are witnessing more openness among workers who want to share with them their health problem even if it is related to sexually transmitted diseases. They have also observed that workers have developed treatment seeking behavior as evidenced by their immediate visit to the clinic whenever affected by STDs.
5. Awareness of enterprise managers and owners is reported to have increased due to a series of advocacy workshops conducted by the NCEW. This led to the inclusion of certain provisions of the HIV/AIDS policy into their collective agreements as well as in supporting HIV/AIDS committee and peer group activities within their enterprises.

 **Sustainability**

The most crucial step that needs to be taken to sustain achievements of the project is to endorse and fully implement the National HIV/AIDS Workplace Policy not only in targeted enterprises but also expand it into others which have not yet been targeted.

The NCEW managed to strengthen its internal capacity and as a result was able to implement project activities with limited external support. The trainings provided improved the capacities of the NCEW and its national partners, which is vital for the sustainability of the interventions implemented under the programme.

Moreover, as HIV/AIDS continues to be a major national priority, it has reasonable chance of drawing additional resources from Government, UNDP and other development partners. Moreover, the intervention is likely to continue to be implemented as part of health sector support of UNDP. To sustain peer group activities, it is important to continue provision of training of trainers and supply of up-to-date training materials and manuals.

However, it would be important to assess the status of the draft HIV/AIDS workplace policy and see if there is any need for additional technical or financial support required to ensure that the process is fully consummated. As the HIV/AIDS policy has resource implications for enterprises, it would also be advisable to further seek the views and perceptions of the owners and employers of public and private enterprises, EFE and Chamber of Commerce specifically on these provisions of the policy.

To enhance sustainability, the team is also of the view that it would be helpful to organize a forum to enable HIV/AIDS and OSH committees in different enterprises and regions of the country to share their experience and learn from each other. This is expected to improve dissemination of information and adoption of innovative approaches tested by some of the enterprises from which others could learn.

An impact assessment of the HIV/AIDS and OSH interventions that were so far implemented to assess changes in awareness and attitudes about HIV/AIDS and OSH among workers and their families as well as enterprise owners and employers. Also investigate if the increase in awareness led to behavioral change among the target groups.

 **2.6 Component 5: Transition & Early Recovery**

At the end of a 30-year protracted war of independence, followed by a border conflict with Ethiopia (1998-2000), Eritrea was faced with massive population displacement (an estimated 1.1 million people were uprooted from their homes and had lost their means of livelihoods) and widespread destruction of the socio-economic infrastructure. Following the cessation of hostilities approximately 700,000 returned to their villages spontaneously. About 300,000 were assisted to return to their villages and provided with transport and other basic necessities. However, several thousand faced obstacles to return and remained in camps, receiving assistance from government and the international community.

Ensuring that IDPs, expellees, returnees and other war-affected and drought-affected are reintegrated and have secure livelihoods and access to basic social services, was one of the national priorities of the Government of Eritrea. In accordance with this, the UN System and the GoSE agreed that Emergency/Recovery to be one of the focus areas of the UNDAF (2007-2011). The goal of UNDAF is in this regard was “*By 2009, assist the Government through an integrated multi-sector approach, to ensure that IDPs, expellees, returnees and other war and drought-affected are reintegrated and have secure livelihoods and access to basic services*”.

**CP Outcome: War affected IDP populations resettled, returned, and reintegrated in an environment that is safe from landmines and UXOs.**

To support the achievement of this UNDAF outcome, the CPAP was focused on three programme areas as follows: (i) supporting community based reintegration of IDPs, expellees and host communities (JP with UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNAIDS); (ii) Support to Mine Action; and (iii) Social and economic integration of demobilized soldiers. UNDP placed substantial efforts on the first component dealing with reintegration of IDPs and Expellees, with far less emphasis on the last two components.[[4]](#footnote-4) Thus the evaluation focused more on the first component - *Support to community- based reintegration of IDPs, expellees and host communities[[5]](#footnote-5)*

The overall objective of the JP was to support the Government in the return and resettlement of IDPs/expellees to the communities of origin or new settlement areas and to have secure livelihoods and access to basic social services. The programme was implemented in Gash Barka, Debub, and Southern Red Sea Regional Administrations. The activities envisaged under the Joint Programme consisted of the following components: (i) the safe and dignified transportation of the IDPs; (ii) provision of potable water supply and sanitation facilities; (iii) provision of shelter (temporary and permanent); (iv) provision of agricultural inputs and services (seeds, tractor ploughing, farm hand tools, restocking of livestock) and environmental rehabilitation/protection through soil and water conservation interventions, community PV solar systems, fuel saving stoves, and income generating activities (beekeeping development and cash for work safety net programme); and (v) building the capacity of regional administration. In all interventions priority was given to some of the most vulnerable households specially, by women headed households.

Contributions to support the JP came from a variety of sources: UNDP and GoSE, financial support by the Norwegian Government, Italian Government, USAID, UNOCHA and European Union. Out of a total programme budget of USD 60 million, some USD 46 million has been mobilized of which over 90% has been delivered, making it a highly efficient operation.

**Assessment**

The evaluation team judged the JP as a highly successful programme, all the more remarkable given the complex socio-political context within which it was implemented. All IDPs and expellees that were still in camps at the start of the programme (17,690 households or 71,207 persons) have been successfully and safely transported with their belongings from camps to their villages of origin or new settlements in the designated areas from 2005 to 2008. Hence, all IDP/expellees camps were closed by March 2008.

The evaluation team concluded that the JP has undoubtedly helped large segments of the war – affected population to begin to restore their lives and livelihoods. It has been effective in addressing the needs of the vulnerable such as, female-headed households, children and poor families, and contributed to closing the chapter on war and displacement in Eritrea, and by helping to rebuild critical socio-economic infrastructure, restore livelihoods is also contributing to laying the foundation to medium and long-term socio-economic development, to poverty reduction and attainment of the MDGs for the country. The JP has succeeded to consistently respond and provide support to very deserving communities in a very complex and politically sensitive context in a commendable way. Furthermore, there are several obvious indicators of positive impact on the ground and on the lives and livelihoods of individuals, households and communities.

The functional movement areas of villages of origin and resettlement areas were cleared of land mines and/or marked with signs, and Mine Risk Education given to communities. Additional surveys are being conducted, and continuous road and farmland verification is being conducted. Mine action has been very effective, and there are no reports of casualties in villages of origin or resettled areas so far. Massive rehabilitation, reconstruction and reintegration works have been going on between 2005 and 2011. IDPs/expellees and returnees were provided with shelter, basic social services, improved stoves, home solar systems, farm tools, oxen, land clearance and traction, seeds (12 kg/ha), and land (1-2 ha/household) to ensure livelihood security. Consequently, IDPs and expellees have started a dignified and purposeful life, free from the uncertainties of camp life. In the focused group discussion, beneficiaries reported: “*In the camps, yes we had enough to eat, but now we have our own land, our own houses, and we are now in full control of our lives*”.

Provision of agricultural inputs (farmland, oxen, tractor service, seed, and pesticide) improved agricultural production which in turn helped households become more food secure. Due to good rains in 2010, supported households were able to harvest enough food which allowed them meet their food requirements from their own production. They were able to store seed from their 2010 harvest for the 2011 planting season and also managed to pay for tractor services. This clearly shows that IDPs and drought-affected population in the target regions are in much better position in terms of food production and are on track to achieve household food security. The good harvest of 2010 has already impacted on the market as evidenced by the reduction in the price of cereals such as sorghum and taff. Beneficiary communities also expect good harvest in 2011. The favorable climatic conditions of 2010 and 2011 improved animal feed situation which in turn contributed to increased livestock production.

The joint programme succeeded in securing underground water in most IDP areas. In other IDP areas where efforts made by the Government and other partners failed to secure underground water as in the case of some villages (e.g. Adi Maelel), agreement was reached with the regional administration of Gash Barka to construct micro dams and provide water to communities for both human and animal consumption. Overall, the construction of the micro-dams brought great relief to beneficiary communities in targeted areas as they have no longer to endure the pain of travelling long distances in search of water for themselves and their livestock. The communities visited as part of the field study expressed their satisfaction with the projects as they have already started to enjoy the benefits resulting from improved availability of water for them and their livestock. They said that they are looking forward to see the construction of the water distribution system completed so that they would derive the full benefits of the projects. With the exception of the micro dam in Shilalo, the construction of water distribution systems for the remaining micro dams is either completed or nearing completion. To reduce livestock pressure in areas where micro-dams are constructed, the joint programme financed the construction of several ponds to serve as a source of livestock water during certain months of the year.

The distribution of improved, fuel efficient stove (Adhanet) to IDPs contributed to reduced deforestation and time and energy wasted to collect firewood, as well as improved health for women and other members of the households due to less emission of smoke. The provision of solar home systems resulted in households having healthier and better living conditions and being allowed to carry out evening activities under superior lighting.

The programme was characterized by sound and effective partnerships (donors, UN agencies, government, regional administrations, and affected populations). By privileging links with regional administrations, the programme has not only ensured rapid and effective implementation but has strengthened programme ownership by the regional administrations and contributed critical capacity building support. The lean and efficient programme management structures and integration within existing regional structures have ensured that most of the programme resources are directed at the beneficiaries rather than the traditional heavy and costly programme implementation structures. However, while maintaining the strong decentralized operational links with regional administrations, there are benefits to establishing stronger links with central government/line ministries in order to better anchor the future programme to evolving national policy but importantly also to feed the very significant lessons learnt from the JP into national policy making process as Eritrea shifts to longer-term development- indeed the evaluation team is of the view that the lessons learnt need to be documented both for national as well as regional and international use.

The JP was highly effective as it was a government-driven initiative and the structures established were appropriate and accountable to authorities/stakeholders at different levels (Central government, donors, UNDP, Regional/local Administrations, communities). The main lesson to be derived from this experience was that it is possible to handle emergency/humanitarian operations within existing structures in an effective and efficient manner without recourse to costly and unsustainable parallel structures. Eritrea appears to set a good example in this regard. The planned outputs were delivered well and the outcomes largely achieved, except when budget constraints stood in the way (e.g. shelter for Gash Barka). Factors that contributed to such effectiveness were the relevance and appropriateness of the support provided, as well as the fact that the regions were in the driving seat and the planning process was flexible

and adaptive.

The JP also enhanced the planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting capacities of the regional and sub-regional administrations in Gash Barka, Debub and Southern Red Sea regions. This was achieved through the provision of training and office equipment. The capacity building support has also benefited sub-zoba administration responsible for the provision of technical support to communities and monitoring implementation of joint programme activities. Consequently, regions have become more efficient in coordinating programme activities and delivering projects, though their monitoring activities were affected by shortage of transportation facilities. UNDP Recovery Unit made efforts to improve the quality of progress reports prepared by the regional and sub-regional administrations by developing and disseminating reporting templates or formats which were also translated into Tigrigna to serve as a basis for the preparation of quarterly progress reports.

Beneficiary communities actively participated in project implementation by contributing labour and materials (e.g. shelter, micro dams, ponds, soil and water construction). In addition to saving cost for the project, community participation resulted in quick project delivery, improved sense of ownership, improved implementation capacity, and enhanced sustainability. To enhance project implementation, communities were empowered through training, couching and mentoring in a number of areas including project planning and management, rangeland management, animal husbandry, soil and water conservation, etc. Capacity building interventions also strengthened community-based organizations by establishing rangeland and water committees and facilitated the development of water and rangeland bylaws.

**Impact**

In terms of impact, there are significant indications of positive impact – the statement by a beneficiary: “*In the camps, yes we had enough to eat, but now we have our own land, our own houses, and we are now in full control of our lives*”, perhaps best sums up the measure of overall impact. Much socio-economic infrastructure has been built where previously there was none, and this has definitely improved access to social services. Previously women trekked long distances on daily basis to fetch water but this is now much reduced in many communities. Conservation works are rebuilding the natural resource base that will contribute in the long-term not only to enhancing productivity but also conserving biodiversity and reducing soil/land degradation and ensuring long-term sustainability. Moreover, SWC structures are often built on farmers’ own land which means that their maintenance over the long run is taken care of.

Compared to their pre-displacement situation, IDPs have now better access to basic social services such as water (for human and animal consumption), shelter, and school. However, they are far below their pre-displacement position in terms of their livelihood.

1. IDPs are now living in dignified shelter which protects them from the vagaries of nature such as rain, heat, cold, and dust. Compared to tent or even hut in which they lived either in IDP camps or in their home villages before being displaced, the shelter support provided them cleaner, comfortable, safer and more hygienic houses. The shelter support enabled households to live in more secure dwelling, being less exposed to malaria and wildlife attacks.
2. Key informants and focus group discussants interviewed during the field visit said that the good rains of 2010 and 2011 contributed to improved food security for assisted households. As a result of the good harvest in 2010, the prices of cereals have gone down in the local market. Beneficiaries were also able to meet their own seed requirement during the 2011 planting season. They have also generated enough financial resources to pay for tractor services. Livestock population in targeted areas also increased due to improved water and feed situation, though they would still need time to reach their pre-displacement position in terms of livestock possession.
3. Restocking support such as the provision of oxen, dairy goats and bees contributed to food security and poverty reduction. For example, supported farmers on average produced 10 to 15 kgs of honey per harvest season which represents an important increase in household income. Others have also sold goats to meet their immediate household needs. Moreover, households’ nutritional status for some of the supported households improved due to their ability to produce meat and milk.
4. Construction of micro dams, ponds and water supply systems relieved beneficiary communities from travelling long distance in search of water. For example, beneficiaries from Teslim Kelay and Adi Maelel used to trek with their livestock for hours towards the Ethiopian border.
5. In some areas, a small number of beneficiary communities have already started to engage in downstream horticultural production around the newly constructed micro dams. The regional and sub-regional offices of the MoA are making necessary preparations to encourage targeted beneficiaries to engage in small scale horticultural production both for household consumption and supply the local market.
6. After having started to live under more cleaner environment due to the shelter support, IDPs have now become more conscious about hygiene and sanitation as evidenced by the construction of latrines within their premises. Once widely adopted, it will generate greater impact on public health situation of the supported areas.
7. By participating in soil and water conservation activities, community members mainly women have earned new income that enabled them meet their immediate household needs. In addition, they have become more aware of environmental protection and rehabilitation and have acquired skills that they would in future use to sustain physical structures left behind by the project.
8. Planning, implementation and monitoring capacities of the regional, sub-regional and kebabi administration enhanced. As a result of training and due to the establishment of water and rangeland committees, local communities were capacitated to operate, maintain and sustain their resources.
9. The PV solar provided to beneficiary households allowed women to do their household activities in their convenient time as they do not have to rush to do it before dusk. It allowed children to spend more time on studies which is expected to improve their educational performance.

**Sustainability**

Since shelter was locally made, no major technical problem has so far been experienced by beneficiary communities in sustaining it. Beneficiaries have augmented UNDP cash and material support through their labour and material contribution which, in addition to saving cost, resulted in improved sense of ownership which is an important prerequisite for project sustainability. During the field visit, it was observed that some beneficiaries made efforts to improve the interior or exterior parts of the houses, build additional room and construct latrine.

Micro dam construction is carried out with the active involvement of beneficiary communities who contributed labour to treat catchment areas and collect stones needed to strengthen the embankment and spill ways. They have willingly participated because the micro dams have addressed their most crucial problem which is shortage of water for human and animal consumption. The participation of the communities during project implementation is expected to improve project sustainability. They have also established water point committees who were trained by the MoA. As part of ensuring project sustainability, communities hired guards to protect the micro dams (e.g. Shilalo community is paying a monthly salary of 1,500 Nakfa for the guard). They have also developed water bylaws to govern communities’ water use and management activities.

In addition, the regional Infrastructure Department has, through its water supply unit established and trained village water committees on how to operate and maintain water supply systems. Communities pay for fetching water from the public fountain, and the cash collected is used to cover salary of guard and the cost of operation and maintenance. Although there has so far been no damage to the solar system, communities may in future face problems getting maintenance services for this technology. Solar power maintenance expertise appears to be limited at the regional level, and as a result they will continue to need support from the Ministry of Land, Water and Environment or the private sector. It is therefore important to put in place maintenance arrangement as the skills may not be available close to the project areas.

1. **RESOURCES & PARTNERSHIPS**

This section of the report analyses the performance of the CPAP with respect to resource mobilization against the targets set and assesses how well the resources were managed. The partnerships forged and their effectiveness was also reviewed.

* 1. **Resources**

Over the CPAP period under review, UNDP Eritrea has emerged as highly successful and effective in mobilizing, managing and delivering substantial amount of resources to meet programme objectives. The data presented in the Tables and Figures in this section provides a clear picture of this success.

Government’s contribution to the programme was mainly in kind consisting of allocation of considerable staff hours and office facilities, equipment and materials. Quantifying these contributions was not easy. However, considering the magnitude and complexity of some of the projects/programmes implemented under the Programme, GoSE contribution has not been insignificant. Government contribution to Anseba Local Development Project stands at about 10% of the total budget.

Some salient points related to overall performance in resource mobilization are summarized below.

***Overall Resource Mobilization Performance***

UNDP ear-marked USD 19.9 million of its core resources for CPAP implementation, and it committed to mobilize an additional USD 27 million from bilateral and multilateral funding institutions, including GEF. These resources are exclusive of those mobilized for emergency purposes in response to humanitarian or crisis situation

Analysis of data shows that UNDP over the 5 years of the CPAP mobilized approximately USD 52 million for all its programmes. With this record, UNDP exceeded its resource mobilization target by 261% or two and a half times its target. Demonstrating a high leveraging capacity, the country office raised USD 2.08 for every USD spent from its core resources. This overall performance however, masks differences between the various units – Transition & Early Recovery was the most successful, while units such as Governance and Poverty & MDGs hardly raised any resources and relied almost exclusively on UNDP core funds.

UNDP over the period, budgeted USD 81.7 million and delivered USD 73.3 million, leading to a 90% delivery of planned resources.

This is an outstanding performance by all measures. Moreover, as confirmed by audit reports the funds were well managed and there were no issues of leakages or poor administration of funds. Indeed, UNDP Eritrea has been ranked as the top performer for the last two consecutive years in RBA. The UNDP Eritrea country office is remarkable for its efficiency as reflected in the following indicators:

* Delivery per UNDP staff (21): USD 3,491,681over the CPAP period;
* Delivery per UNDP programme staff (13): USD 5,640,408 over the CPAP period;
* Delivery per Admin. & Finance Staff (5): USD 14,665,060 over the CPAP period; and
* Delivery per management staff (3): USD 24,441,768 over the CPAP period.

The programmes are implemented using the NEX modality, which means that the contribution of national partners in this achievement cannot be underestimated as the funds had to be channeled through existing partners’ systems but using UNDP procedures. Despite the fact that some institutions such as the DIN were involved with UNDP for the first time, no problems arose in following established UNDP procedures as far as the evaluation team can assess. This reflects the professionalism of the staff of the institutions UNDP partnered with, and the good mentoring and coaching support provided by UNDP staff.

The efficiency of fund transfer mechanism especially with respect to the regions is particularly important given that 70% of UNDP delivered resources was from the Transition & Early Recovery programme which targeted the regions for support.

Apart from the funds used for the capacity development and gender which targeted national level institutions, the bulk of UNDP’s resources went to address needs at regional and community levels. Rough estimates would therefore indicate that some USD 60 million or about 80% of UNDP delivered resources went to the latter parties, as opposed to USD 13 million or 20% to national level. This reflects the nature of UNDP Eritrea’s programme which has focused overwhelmingly on addressing grassroots needs of rural communities of Eritrea.

***Performance by UNDP Programme Unit***

The table below globally shows the resources planned and delivered over the CPAP period by the respective UNDP programme units

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme Unit** | **Total planned (USD)** | **Total Delivered (USD)** | **% Delivery** | **% of Total Resources** |
| *Democratic Governance* | 9,209,876 | 8,428,010 | 92 | 11.5 |
| *Environment & Sustainable Development* | 6,167,012 | 4,800,885 | 78 | 6.6 |
| *Gender* | 1,891,500 | 1,629,673 | 86 | 2.3 |
| *Poverty & MDGs* | 7,267,280 | 6,324,421 | 87 | 8.7 |
| *Transition & Recovery* | 57,176,399 | 52,142,315 | 91 | 71.2 |
| **Total** | **81,712,067** | **73,325,304** | **90** | **100** |

The Tables and figures in the following pages illustrate the yearly trends for planned and delivered resources for each programme unit. The main points to be gleaned from this data are as follows:

* There was an almost linear growth in resources planned and delivered throughout the CPAP period reflecting the remarkable success of the UNDP CO in both raising and delivering resources.
* By far the most growth was registered by Transition & Early Recovery Programme which was also responsible for 71% of the resources delivered by the country office over the CPAP period. Clearly this reflects the fact that for UNDP’s donors and government alike, the issues addressed by the Transition & Early Recovery programme were the main priority.

In terms of trends, the following picture emerges:

* All programmes reflect the new GoSE policy with resources planned and delivered for 2011 showing a marked decline, with the exception of the environment portfolio and to a lesser extent gender. Some decline is however associated with the fact that 2011 is the final CPAP year and most activities should have been implemented by now.
* Declines in resources were however noticeable early for both the Governance and Poverty programmes both of which peaked in 2009 and both of which relied almost exclusively on UNDP core resources. It is not clear whether these programmes had fewer resources because the country office was internally shifting resources away from them, or whether this reflected a general shrinkage in core resources for the country office, or yet still if donors have shown less interest.

Going forward, there are already clear signs of weaknesses in UNDP’s resource based which are aggravated by the following:

* The new GoSE/UN policy framework has forced UNDP into non-traditional areas with limited prospects for resource mobilization.
* The effect of scaling back of donor support is being felt, and this will particularly hit UNDP where it has been most successful – i.e. the Transition & Early Recovery programme. This observation is strengthened by the fact that as Eritrea shifts from emergency to long term development and the Transition & Early Recovery programme addresses more livelihood questions, it is doubtful if the same success in terms of resource mobilization can be maintained as before. The implications in the medium term is for UNDP to strategize how to progressively integrate the work of the Transition and Recovery unit into its poverty reduction, food security and environment management work; that is if cooperation between GoSE and the UN expands.
* The small donor base in Eritrea and the government’s change of policy.

There appears to be a clear potential particularly for the environment portfolio because of the Global funding instruments which can be successfully tapped as indicated by the successful formulation of many pipeline projects. If negotiations on inclusion of the environment in the GoSE/UN framework succeed, then this sector can emerge as an important growth area for UNDP.

While the EC could remain as an important partner (if the GoSE policy does not adversely affect aid flows from EU to Eritrea), UNDP needs to diversify away from domestic resources and seek to tap external resources more effectively:

* The T&R programme should tap transition budget lines of many bilateral partners, as well as aggressively seek UNDP/BCPR funds and other sources, in view of the limited scope under the latter.
* The Governance programme should raise resources through UNDP HQ Funds, including the Spanish Trust Fund,
* The Poverty and Environment units should strengthen collaboration and develop more joint projects to tap global environmental funds. The objectives of the two units are very close due to the intertwined nature of poverty and environmental sustainability, especially at downstream community level.

***Donor contributions***

The tables and figures in the pages that follow show that some 12 donors contributed to UNDP programmes. However, over 45%, 23% and 10% of UNDP resources were respectively provided by EC, Government of Norway and GEF, respectively. Cumulatively this amounts to 87.5% from these three donors alone. Losing any one of them, particularly EC, would have dramatic effects on UNDP Eritrea’s resources.

In terms of number of donors supporting various UNDP units, figures show that the T&R benefited most (6 donors) followed by Environment and Gender (3). The reliance of the Governance and poverty programmes on UNDP core resources is evidenced by the fact only one donor is partnering with UNDP in these areas of work.

The CERF has been a small but important donor to T&R. Globally some USD 2.2 Billion was programmed, out of which Eritrea benefitted USD 21.3 million. Of this amount, USD 3.3 million went to UNDP, representing 16% of total CERF resources for Eritrea since 2006. However, this window is closing as reflected in the fact that UNDP did not submit any proposals for the 2011 round.

* 1. **Partnerships**

UNDP partnerships were based on the following principles: alignment with Paris Declaration on Harmonization and Aid Effectiveness; Joint programming with other UN agencies; Building relationships with major donor partners – EU, Netherlands, Norway, Italy, GEF; and most importantly partnership and working relationship with GoSE and its entities – national, regional, as well as mass movements.

*Donor Coordination Forum & Relationships with Donors*

In terms of the overall donor coordination and development dialogue in Eritrea, UNDP supported the creation of Eritrean Development Partners Forum, but by all accounts this forum did not work well largely due to non-participation of GoSE. This is contrary to experiences in other countries, where such fora have played a useful and effective role to harmonize donor interventions and dialogue with government on policy issues and on how to improve development effectiveness. This failure partly reflects GoSE preference for dealing with donors on a one-on-one basis, rather than collectively.

UNDP-donor partnerships have been extremely successful and effective as shown by the resource mobilization track record. However, apart from being a conduit for donor funds, UNDP is also seen as a very valuable and effective partner for information sharing and consultations. All donor partners met by the team have strongly indicated the very positive aspects of their relationship with UNDP. The change in GoSE policy is also affecting donors who view UN agencies as important windows for channeling resources to assist Eritrea meet its development needs. Donors met positively noted that UNDP has taken measures to keep them abreast of developments and the needed adjustments to the cooperation agreements signed.

*Joint Programming with UN Agencies*

The UNDAF 2007-2011 placed Joint Programmes at the core of its planning and delivery so as to harmonize interventions. All of UNDP’s programme areas were also meant to be implemented jointly. Unfortunately Joint programmes for a variety of reasons did not work in Eritrea. The team noted serious obstacles to joint programming, however there are few exceptions, notable the Joint Programme on IDPs (under the leadership of UNDP), Gender and HIV/AIDS which worked reasonable well.

The Joint programme on HIV/AIDS has been implemented by the National Confederation of Eritrean workers with the support and partnership of UNDP, ILO and national co-partners, MOLHW, Employers Federation of Eritrea (EFE), NATCoD. The total approved budget for the HIV/AIDS project for 2006/07 was USD 120,000.00 of which USD 100,000.00 was allocated by UNDP and the remaining USD 20,000.00 was obtained from ILO. The total budget for 2009 to 2011 is USD 500,000.00 allocated from UNDP core and USD 131,715 is mobilized from UNAIDS Programme Acceleration Fund (PAF). Total expenditure during 2007-2009 stands at USD 490,118.00, which is 94% of the budget for 2007-2009 (add expenditure for 2010 and 2011). This shows that almost all planned activities were undertaken. Concerns were however raised about UN agencies which in principle agreed to collaborate with UNDP but failed to earmark resource.

The final evaluation of the Joint programme on IDPs found that overall, the partnership and coordination “has been good with the structures set up at national and regional levels working well and acting as forum for joint planning, decision-making and follow up. At the field level though coordination has been even more effective and is simplified because of the fact that regions are in the driving seat and also staff of agencies make greater efforts to complement each other’s activities at village level. However, the evaluation team judges that partnership and coordination could be further improved if the following issues are addressed:

* Cohesion between agencies is a source of concern – seems to be a general problem of UN agencies involved in JPs. Program has not been as joint as it should have been. UNDP has been carrying the larger burden of the JP. This can be improved through more predictable allocation of core resources to support activities.
* Activities funded by the pooled and parallel-funded activities appear to be not well coordinated and there is need for common resource mobilization strategy. The existence of pooled and parallel funding makes integrated and coordinated work planning difficult. This also includes complementarity in targeting of households, villages and in the sequencing of actions. Thus significant benefited of synergy is lost. There is the reduction of coherence in the program.
* The UNDP unit cannot/has not enforced reporting on activities of other agencies – it is largely set up to managed the pooled funding under UNDP management rather than managing the JP. Consolidated reports that include pooled and parallel funding modalities were produced until 2008. However, since 2009 the JP report contained only activities done under pooled funding. This was due to the fact that the other agencies could not provide their inputs to the report. However, Standard Progress Report (SPR) under the “emergency and recovery” theme annually. The SPR is established by the UNDG (United Nations Development Group), and the SPR includes other programs that fall under emergency and recovery theme..

At national level, coordination has been hampered by use of different modalities of fund disbursement, and the fact that contributions from other agencies apart from UNDP have dried up since 2008.”[[6]](#footnote-6)

The Joint Programme on Gender also worked well, but the main problem, as with the above, was lack significant commitments of resources from other UN partners. If future joint programmes are to work well, all UN agencies need to commit significant resources to make participation meaningful, and importantly also ensure that modalities of operations relating to in particularly fund disbursement and management are harmonized.

*Collaboration with Central Government*

UNDP has been most effective in its working relationship with GoSE line ministries. Without exception, all national partners have expressed very positive views regarding UNDP. The central role of UNDP managers and staff in this relationship has been very important. The relationship is based on mutual respect, responding to priority needs, open dialogue/discussion, mentoring and coaching, backed by an efficient delivery system. The challenge though was that despite all the good faith and relationship, a glass ceiling existed when it came to policy matters and UNDP has not succeeded in breaching that.

The relationship that characterized UNDP’s relationship with GoSE is evident across programmes as the few from the capacity development programme shows. The capacity building component is implemented in partnership with a number of public institutions including MND, MoFA, MoF, MoJ, MoT, CSA, and DIN. These institutions have invariably assessed their cooperation with UNDP as strong. The IPs worked in close cooperation with UNDP Governance Unit which provided them the necessary technical support and guidance on project identification, implementation, monitoring and reporting. The technical support extended was highly crucial for most institutions as the projects were new to the IPs with no prior experience on the NEX implementation modality and UNDP reporting requirements. For example, the project was the first of its kind for DIN and its smooth implementation was achieved as a result of strong coordination with UNDP. They confirmed that project implementation procedures and reporting formats were clear and straightforward. Consequently, IPs are able to regularly submit progress and financial reports as per the requirements of UNDP. In the MOF, the partnership with UNDP was rated very satisfactory: staff of UNDP is very supportive, systems and procedures for transfer of funds very clear, reporting done on time and mentoring and coaching done. According to them, UNDP staff is very helpful and open.

*Collaboration with Regions*

UNDP has been most successful in the partnership it has built with the regions. At regional level, UNDP has built very good partnership at all levels, including the Governors, which unfortunately is being scaled down. With UNDP’s help, capacities have been built at all levels – zoba, sub-zoba, kebabi and communities. High level of accountability built (systems for reporting, planning, etc.) at regional level which lays a good basis for regions to spearhead local development efforts.

*Collaboration with Mass Movements*

The mass movements that UNDP cooperates with (NUEW, NUEYS and NCEW) were also all very much positive. In the absence of the traditional civil society organizations, support to mass movements has made it possible to reach out to a large segment of the population while at the same time ensuing that Eritrea remains engaged at the international level through these mass movements. The NUEYS declared that it was very satisfied with UNDP and characterized the relationship as a real partnership and not donor-recipient relationship. UNDP provides coaching/mentoring and suggestions on how to improve substantive and operational aspects of the interventions. NUEYS expressed the view that they can build upon what UNDP has started, especially the capacity building. They state “with small funds we are able to achieve a lot”. With respect to NUEW, previous UNDP support focused on institutional strengthening of NUEW which enabled basic gender training to all staff, including leadership team building and reporting. The team has met the management and project staff of the NCEW who expressed their satisfaction with the support provided by UNDP.

Overall, the partnership between UNDP and the NCEW is solid. UNDP has adopted National Execution (NEX) modality for implementing projects/programmes under CPAP. The NCEW is the implementing partner and is empowered to take the lead in project/programme planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The NCEW has appreciated the support extended by UNDP and called for its extension. The evaluation has revealed that the NEX implementation modality has strengthened the capacity of the NCEW to plan, implement, monitor, review and evaluate the project. The technical support and advice offered by UNDP staff is appreciated.



1. **PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT**

This section treats issues related to how the CPAP was managed, including measures put in place to monitor and evaluate activities.

* 1. **Programme Management**

The CPAP implementation was based on the national execution and national ownership which guided modalities for programme implementation and relationship with national partners. Measures taken in line with this included introduction of the HACT - Harmonized Cash Transfer - at the start of the CPAP period in a launching workshop attended by Government Ministers, followed by training for finance and administration officers of IPs. This allowed IPs to become familiar with operational procedures - AWP, FACE, technical and financial reporting all went well, and from reports received, no major problems were encountered even for institutions which were dealing with UNDP for the first time.

Contrary to many countries where UNDP projects often created separate Project Implementation Units (PIUs) wherein staff receive salaries and other incentives, Eritrea has been successful in fully integrating projects within government structures. Apart from the project coordinators (who incidentally report directly to the Regional Governors) for the Transition and Recovery programme in Debub and Gash Barka, no national receives benefits from overseeing project activities, and no vehicles are bought.

Project Steering Committees worked well. In the MOF, the PSC involved various in-house units (General Administration, Human resources, IT, etc), which was found to facilitate coordination and consultation. The Transition & Recovery Programme had a more complex programme and naturally had more complex arrangements, involving central government, the regions and UNDP, but this nonetheless worked well.

The establishment of PIUs has been one of the most intractable problems experienced in delivering development assistance. These undermine national capacity development efforts (by draining the best out of established civil services), result in poor integration of projects within government institutions, distort the incentive structures, and although roundly condemned have been firmly entrenched in practice. The GoSE should be commended for the steps taken to integrate development project implementation within its institutional framework; this ensures long term sustainability and reinforces national capacity building efforts instead of undermining them in the interest of fulfilling narrow project objectives.

The CPAP programme management process fitted within the overall UNDAF architecture for coordination. However, for UNDP, the government counterpart shifted from the Ministry of National Development to the Ministry of Finance midway during implementation. Lack of familiarity with UNDP operations initially caused teething problems.

The CPAP had also foreseen creation of Review Committee to meet twice yearly (May and November) to act as the overall policy coordination framework. The team has not been able to obtain information on how well this committee functioned, especially following designation of MoF as the government coordinating counterpart.

Internally within UNDP, programme units met quarterly to review progress. A weakness however, was that despite these regular meetings, the team saw no evidence of joint planning and greater efforts at creating synergies. Thus in design, implementation and review, the programmes effectively operated in silos.

The team recommends strengthening of the internal planning process to improve synergies and integration, as well as to facilitate mutual learning. For example, the T&R, Poverty and Environment Units are all involved in building micro-dams, undertaking environmental rehabilitation works and grassroots institutional strengthening. There is tremendous scope for streamlining approaches, documenting lessons and exchanging experiences.

The Governance Unit should not only be focused on designing and implementing CD projects, important as this is, but also provide conceptual, technical and methodological support to other units involved in CD activities.

In order to provide opportunity for interaction, building synergies between programmes and exchange lessons, the team recommends the holding of annual review/programming meetings with all partners and stakeholders.

* 1. **Monitoring and Evaluation**

The CPAP included the following provisions to guide monitoring and evaluation: be based on UNDAF results matrix and monitoring and evaluation plan; GoSE and UNDP will be responsible for continuous monitoring on a quarterly and 6-monthly basis; Project steering committees will be established for project monitoring and reviews; Field visits; Periodic progress and financial reports; An evaluation plan; A UNDP CPAP review committee to be established with MND responsible for overseeing programme implementation will hold 2x yearly meeting (May and November); Establishment of benchmarks and indicators; sound financial and administrative management and accountability framework - audits. The purpose of monitoring and evaluation was to help UNDP assess and determine how the country programme can contribute more effectively to national development.

The evaluation team assessed the mechanisms, instruments and processes established by UNDP and concluded that these were largely followed:

1. An in-house M&E team in place consisting of the DRR/P and staff of SAPU – this is implementing a recommendation of the MTR;
2. A number of instruments developed for M&E: (i) Back-to-Office Field Report; (ii) evaluations’ recommendations tracking template; (iii) on-line ATLAS quarterly update of risks and assumptions rigorously followed; (iv) records of meetings with IPs
3. A number of standard M&E reports are produced: Field Monitoring Report (QTR); Progress Reports (QTR); Financial Reports (QTR); Donor Reports (Technical and Financial) as per agreement.
4. Evaluation plan was developed at beginning of CPAP cycle as a mandatory requirement and budgeted and reviewed yearly. Also outcome and project evaluations also done. All evaluation ToRs developed for evaluations are shared with SAPU (for inputs) and with the Regional Service Center.
5. UNDP takes an active part in the UNDAF M&E Working Group/Taskforce.

Two main key weaknesses however:

1. Lack of or delays in getting permits for field visits. The question of permits has adversely affected the ability of UNDP staff to physically monitor projects at times;
2. Weaknesses in the UNDAF baseline and indicators has affected UNDP ability to track progress;
3. Restrictions on data collection.

Based on this assessment, the team recommends that to strengthen M&E in the future, UNDP should document successes and lessons more systematically, and consider producing Annual Reports for larger distribution.

**5: OVERVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES**

This section discusses the main challenges confronted in implementing the CPAP by UNDP and Government partners. Programme specific challenges were identified during the MTR and readers are referred to that report for details.

**5.1. UNDP**

1. ***Programme design and management***: in general UNDP projects were well designed but the fact that there were many projects give the impression of fragmentation, and many opportunities for consolidation were not sufficiently exploited. For example, the national capacity development outcome could have been designed as one major programme rather than the many individual projects. Another challenge was that responsibility for delivering on some programme outcomes was divided among the various UNDP in-house units. For example, the food security and environment outcome. That in itself is not too detrimental if there was significant cross-unit cooperation and coordination, but such collaboration did not appear to be strong in the view of the evaluation team.
2. ***Policy development process***: UNDP faced significant challenges in supporting policy development. Through UNDP support a number of codes and laws have been drafted over the years which have never been formerly adopted. Examples include: criminal code, commercial codes, civil code, etc - prepared at the request of the Ministry of Justice; the civil service proclamation that UNDP helped elaborate, has not been adopted, although certain parts of it are operational; the land use policy drafted but not yet approved, although land use information system for central region in place and other regions are interested; coastal development: plans have been produced, but not approved yet; and the proclamation to establish the Eritrean Coastal Authority has not yet been approved. Although UNDP has provided significant and meaningful support downstream, this success has somewhat been undercut by failures to effect significant policy change. The evaluation team could not determine the reasons for blockage in the policy-making process but there could be several reasons for this, including the fact that policy making does not seem to be fully under the control of line ministries. Eritrea seems to be different from other countries where many policies are adopted but often not implemented. On the contrary in Eritrea, policy adoption appears to be more cautious and slow which may indicate more thorough analysis of implications prior to adoption, because once adopted policies are apparently fully and seriously implemented. A good balance between these two extremes is needed. On the other hand it may be due to centralization of policy process, and of lack of capacity. UNDP needs to understand better, the policy making process and combine this with more thorough discussion at the appropriate level prior to engaging in policy formulation. The team notes that UNDP has been more successful at capacity building than in supporting policy making. It is important to explain that the GoSE requested policy formulation support from UNDP but the process to approve policies drafted took more time than expected.
3. ***Governance thematic area***: UNDP faces a challenge in design and implementation of the Governance thematic area due to the GoSE alternative perspective towards democratic governance. GoSE places greater emphasis on community, societal and national rights rather than individual rights; as well as onissues of social justice such as access to education, health and equal access to services regardless of locality. There are therefore differences between how corporate UNDP and GoSE approach human rights issues. Nonetheless, UNDP integrates human rights into its programmes, and focuses on ensuring that state capacity to deliver services to citizens was strengthened. For example justice system was unclogged and citizens’ access to justice enhanced through support provided to community courts. These courts based on customary law are responsible for dealing with issues such as land, grazing rights, water rights, etc, issues of direct interest to communities – grassroots level governance. Nonetheless UNDP interventions broke new ground by opening up discussions on human rights and support for advocacy actions. A major achievement was the UPR process. In the absence of civil society organizations, support to mass movements (NUEW, NUEYS, NCEW) which served as conduits to reach a large segment of the population while at the same time ensuing that Eritrea was engaged at the international level through these mass movements. Overall, UNDP governance programme can be characterized by choice of modest entry points but with potential for significant impact.
4. ***Lack of a National Development Plan***: The lack of an approved and publicized National Development Plan has posed challenges in defining the UN’s work in Eritrea. GoSE may have its own planning and budgeting system/process but UNDP has limited or no information regarding this. A related challenge is lack of data and information on indicators and baselines for programme development and for assessing impacts. Nonetheless UNDP has managed to link its work to critical national priorities through existing sector plans, policy statements and close working relationship with GoSE. UNDP has provided support to the government to strengthen the capacity of the National Statistics Office (NSO) and establish a system within the NSO and sector ministries to conduct surveys, collect and disseminate data and update the national data base.
5. ***Resource Mobilization***: A weakening donor base in-country has meant more challenges in resource mobilization. For example, UNDP’s work on poverty reduction requires substantial input of resources, but poor donor environment coupled with limited UNDP resources and huge needs of Eritrea and lack of progress nationally in combating poverty translates into very slow progress in meeting the related MDG target. This situation has been rendered all the more challenging due to the fact that the anticipated benefits from Joint Programming in terms of pooling of resources and expertise envisaged under the UNDAF did not materialize.
6. ***The change of government policy regarding areas of cooperation*** affected all UNDP’s interventions and impacted on its relations with donors. For example, for food security interventions, this entailed approval to shift resources from food security to water supply, health and sanitation in line with the new policy of the Government which proved to be more challenging for EC due to strict financial regulations that allows limited room for making significant changes in committed resources.

**5.2 Government**

The main cross-cutting challenges faced by government counterparts include the following:

1. Time consuming GoSE procurement procedures, coupled with scarcity and high prices makes procurement lengthy. It should be noted however, GoSE has been flexible in allowing UNDP to procure internationally.
2. New GoSE policy change regarding the UN has affected collaboration and existing projects: with Norway, agreement reached to re-programme to fit into new GoSE/UN framework. With the EC, more difficult challenge as no food security activities are allowed under the new framework, and it is unclear if EC will allow funds to target new areas as agreed between UNDP and Norway. The GoSE policy change on collaboration with the UN and the consequent closure of many activities is also having an adverse effect on government institutions.
3. Capacity deficiency especially availability of qualified human resource with the requisite project planning, management, and reporting skills within certain implementing partners, affected implementation. Procurement of goods, services and works is also one of the areas where some implementing partners faced difficulties. This problem was even more conspicuous in the procurement of IT service providers such as programmers. For example, IT training of MoF was delayed due to shortage of suitable trainer. Development of detailed technical specification for IT related items was also assessed as one of the challenges faced during project implementation (MoF, CSA and DIN).
4. Staff turnover resulting from government restructuring process affected project implementation in some of the IPs. Change in personnel often resulted in momentum being lost as the newly assigned personnel need time to learn about the project. The effect of staff turnover was more felt in IPs where it resulted in the transfer of personnel who were given specialized training that can be only be applied in a particular ministry (e.g. MoFA losing a person trained in foreign relations to other ministry). Change of key personnel and technical staff in some IPs resulted in the slowdown of programme implementation.
5. Shortage of building and IT materials and price escalations of materials in the local market affected project implementation which was manifested in either delays in project start up or slowing down project implementation. Costs higher than budgeted or anticipated costs caused delays of programme/project activities or required allocation of additional resources (e.g. oxen distribution, beehives and bee colonies).
6. Procurement of imported materials, which was necessary in view of unavailability of required materials in the local market, required international bidding that was time consuming, and affected implementation (e.g. Senafe Hospital, building materials for shelter, solar for water supply systems)
7. Transportation problems made field monitoring by project coordinators and implementing bodies difficult.

**6: CONCLUSION & WAY FORWARD**

**6.1 Background**

The UN and GoSE have a long, positive and fruitful history of collaboration and have together designed and implemented two successive UNDAFs (2002-2006 and 2007-2011). As a result of this cooperation, many significant achievements have been registered with positive impacts on the country’s socio-economic development and meetings international commitments.

However, UN/GoSE collaboration has recently entered a critical and uncertain phase. In a 26 January 2011 letter, the GoSE of Eritrea through the Ministry of Finance informed the UN that it had decided to change its modus operandi regarding its cooperation with the UN system and that it would not subscribe to another new UNDAF beyond 2011. Instead of a new UNDAF, Government wished to deal with selected UN Agencies on a bilateral basis and UN system was directed to channel its support to three areas (health, sanitation and water supply). UN Agencies were also instructed not to directly approach the beneficiary ministries, nor were the latter permitted to deal directly with UN Agencies without passing through the MoF channel. The desire of GoSE to deal with UN agencies bilaterally places a serious restriction on the ability of UN agencies to undertake joint planning and programming. Furthermore, exchanges between MoF and UN R/H coordinator show a very tight control by GoSE of the implementation of the new programme framework, including routine programme management issues.

The UNCT has agreed with GoSE and is now implementing a new cooperation framework focused on the above three areas. The programme framework lasts up to 31 December 2012. The agreement has been communicated to HQs of the various UN Agencies and the GoSE and UNCT have set up mechanisms for follow-up:

1. A Policy Committee consisting of the Minister of Finance and UN R/H Coordinator; and
2. Two sector Working Groups, one for Health and the other for Water & Sanitation comprising relevant representatives of UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, WHO, as well as the MoLWE and MoH. The SWGs will be chaired by MoH and MoLWE, respectively.

The new GoSE position represents a seismic policy shift with marked consequence for both Government implementing partners and UN Agencies. It has severely curtailed the ability of UN agencies to deliver development assistance in line with their respective mandates.

**6.2 Consequences for UNDP (and other UN Agencies)**

UNDP’s role in Eritrea has been drastically reduced and its activities have been shifted from its core mandate areas. The agency’s track record in these new intervention areas both within Eritrea and globally is not solid. The consequences of the GoSE policy shift on UNDP in the short term can be summed up as follows:

* The closure of many on-going projects: UNDP (19); UNFPA (4) and UNICEF (4). This abrupt termination has also meant fast-tracking implementation of many project activities to meet the deadlines imposed by GoSE. For UNDP, only six projects have remained open: (i) ALDP; (ii) three Transition and Early Recovery projects for Zoba Debub, Gash Barka and Southern Red Sea; (iii) HIV/AIDS; (iv) Food Security Project for Zoba Maekel.
* To support the new programme framework, UNDP has allocated resources and will be active in all the three areas – Health, Water supply and Sanitation and has developed a Results and Resources Framework to implement the new framework programme. UNDP has committed USD 9,710,204 (USD 3,340,000 for Health and USD 6,360,204 for Water supply & Sanitation) for implementation of activities agreed under the new programme framework. This represents a drastic curtailment of UNDP’s portfolio – e.g. the T&R programme annually delivered in past years higher level of resources than what is foreseen for the whole of UNDP for 2012; also there is a greater emphasis on procurement as opposed to other programme activities. Despite this drastic reduction, staffing and structure of the country have been left intact, and management has wisely adopted a wait and see attitude, for now.
* The new framework programme has had a more adverse effect on UNDP, compared to other UN agencies (e.g. WHO, UNFPA) which appear to be affected to a lesser extent – UNDP’s Global Mandate and the new GoSE priorities for the UN have little in common and the agency has lost its main areas of comparative advantage (Environment, Poverty, Governance, and Food Security). Even if UNDP manages to fit within the new programme framework and devises new programmes based on the three priority areas, it would lose the advantage of consolidation of gains from past interventions as the new situation is uncharted territory for UNDP, with limited connection with the agency’s past cooperation activities. If the situation persists beyond 2012, the role, structure and operational modality of the office are therefore likely to change radically.
	1. **Impact on Implementing Partners**

All IPs visited were clearly appreciative of the support UNDP has provided and find themselves in an uncertain situation regarding the future of their cooperation with UNDP. All have good partnerships with UNDP and value the support provided. The new GoSE/UN Cooperation Framework therefore represents a real challenge for government ministries, regions and sub-regions. In discussions with IPs, the team asked about potential impacts and plans for take-over and continuity. The evaluation team did not see any evidence of exit strategies developed by IPs, although clearly there is on-going reflection on these issues. Some few examples of how IPs said they were going to cope are provided below:

* The cut-off of UNDP funding has spurred national institutions to start thinking of ways to be self-reliant. For example, the NUEW is considering taking a soft loan from a Bank, and most probably will increasingly rely on its Chapters abroad which contribute valuable funds towards its functioning (e.g. resources from the diaspora helped renovate NUEW HQ; the NUEW Chapter in Germany helped build the center in Barentu; contributions from Italy helped build the center in Keren, and those from UK and USA respectively helped the Dubub and Sanafe centers; NUEW is also thinking of investment opportunities However, the challenge is immense – at present, government subvention covers only 10% of NUEW budget and much effort will be needed to close the budget gap.
* Many IPs at national and regional levels expect the Government to provide the financial resources they need to continue the work initiated with UNDP support and sustain project benefits and resources. With respect to DIN, for example, the Team was informed that the MoF is pleased with the changes brought on by the UNDP project and has already started providing support (MoF provided resources to cover cost of internet services needed for DIN operations).
* For NUEYS although the project is closing, various assets have been created (resource centers established in Keren and Barentu; training manual developed; trainers available) and institutional capacity has been developed. A challenge is sustaining the assets and providing subsidy for trainees who are vulnerable youth.
* Overall, cutting –off the CPAP cycle by 6 months has meant rushed implementation/fast tracking of many activities and it is unclear whether quality has/will suffer as a result?
* With respect to the SLM project, substantial progress has been made with respect to physical works (e.g. terracing, etc.) and this can continue through traditional government support, albeit at a lower momentum/rhythm as Government may be stretched by overwhelming needs of the population. However, curtailing the most important component of the project – i.e. the changes in land tenure system –represents a real setback. There is however, a small window of opportunity from two directions: (i) there is a slim chance that the environment may receive a special dispensation by Government; (ii) the Ministry of Land, Water and Environment is keen to pilot the implementation of Proclamation 58/94 on land re-distribution using the SLM project, and discussions have taken place with MoA (Zoba Maekel branch) and the outlook is promising.

**6.4 What Next?**

In order to provide a basis for further reflection by UN/UNDP, the evaluation team outlines factors to take account of and suggests steps UNDP and other UN agencies can take to map out a strategy going forward.

**Factors to Take into Account**

In going forward, the UN (including UNDP) needs to take into account a number of factors:

1. Recognize that the recent seismic policy shift with respect to its cooperation with the UN represents a serious long term ideological stance of GoSE to be self-reliant which is only being implemented now. It is not a passing fad, at least in the medium-term, and is likely fuelled by realization that with enhanced prospects of domestic resources (e.g. from mining of Gold and other minerals), GoSE may now have at its disposal the means to realize this dream. Therefore, an easy or immediate return to pre-policy status should be ruled out, unless something changes dramatically.
2. GoSE has signaled this policy shift in several ways over the years:
* Even prior to the recent decision of Government, the UNCT has had difficulties in implementing its programmes due to: scarcity of statistical data to develop baselines and indicators for planning, implementation and monitoring – result of 2010 EDHS still not in the public domain. The lack of a NDP and statistics is a serious obstacle to planning and implementing UN activities; (ii) restrictions on visits outside Asmara, as well as on entry visas for UN Technical support and donor field visits; and (iii) challenges in interaction between UN agencies and IPs, to cite a few.
1. Overall development assistance to Eritrea has been progressively shrinking over the last few years with several institutions ceasing their operations – World Bank, SIDA, AusAid, CIDA, and DFID, EU/ECHO - and many of the remaining donors have limited support to humanitarian activities. Those who are still active (EC, Norway, GEF) have been forced to scale back except IFAD. So the policy shift affects not only UN, and within UN not only UNDP. The fate of UNDP is inextricably tied to what happens to the overall collaboration between UN and GoSE. This obliges UNDP to think collectively within the UN family, rather than go it alone.
2. Review of exchanges between MoF and the UN articulates GoSE principle of self-reliance as can be gleaned from these few excerpts:
* “National development will never be materialized if it is done by depending on grant financing from UN agencies and other (bilateral) resources” (26 January 2011 letter from MoF);
* By its own accounts, GoSE goal remains attaining food security and achieving decent standard of living for its citizens through economic growth and human resources development. To achieve this goal, however, the Government has stated emphatically that “aid only postpones the basic solutions to crucial development problems by tentatively ameliorating their manifestation without tackling the root causes”. Consequently GoSE does not desire to have a programme framework supported by grant and/or aid money over a long period of time. It further states that GoSE has mapped a clear pathway to phase-out grants/aid, and is putting in place its long stated goal of a development blueprint based on self-reliance by relying on self-mobilized resources (domestic and/or foreign); and
* The key principle of GoSE is to reduce and then totally eliminate dependency on grant aid inflows to Eritrea (MoF letter 19 February 2011) as these are assessed to be harmful to the self-reliant national development efforts of recipient countries. It recognizes this as a process, but GoSE believes that aid inflows inflict structural, political and economic damage to countries.
1. However, notwithstanding its underlying issues with the UN due to the border stalemate and the sanctions issue, GoSE will, as a member state, probably continue to maintain relationships with the UN, although it is unclear what form this relationship would take. Over and above its financial and technical resources, the UN presents a valuable diplomatic forum that no Government can totally ignore; an advantage that bilateral and multilateral financial institutions do not possess. All nations without exception want to be part of the community of nations within the framework of the United Nations, and do so with the goal of preserving their national interests. One can therefore count on a continuing presence of the UN (in one form or the other) in Eritrea.
2. Recently, there have been several new developments reflecting the desire of GoSE to increase its engagement regionally and internationally: (i) GoSE for the first time participated in the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process. Government prepared a national report, took part in the deliberations in Geneva (with a High-powered delegation) and is reported to have agreed to many of the recommendations. These include the setting up of a National Human Rights Commission. Discussions were already initiated between UNDP and GoSE (MoFA) to advance this issue only to be suddenly interrupted by the new GoSE/UN Cooperation Framework. Under normal circumstances, implementation of the UPR recommendations would have provided a great opportunity for the UN, and particularly UNDP’s engagement with GoSE; (ii) Ambassador to the AU; (iii) President’s visit to the UN and wide-ranging diplomatic contacts; and the government’s renew intent to reactivate its membership in IGAD.
3. At present, there appears to be no clear picture on the way forward beyond 2012: any number of factors could influence the turn of events and open up new possibilities, or lead to further restrictions. The UN therefore has to accept a considerable degree of uncertainty about the future, given the GoSE policy making process – government does not invite outsiders on the table when it is making policy.
4. This uncertainty requires the UN (and its respective agencies) to undertake rigorous scenario planning. Admittedly though there may be a view that too much is unknown at present and that it would be better to wait till April 2012 and plan on the basis of what the GoSE decides. But assuming that there is agreement to go forward, below are suggestions on the next steps to take.

**Next Steps**

The Team feels that the UN should use every window of opportunity to continue its support to the Government and people of Eritrea. The overall UN strategy should be to continue to engage and negotiate with GoSE to widen the programming scope beyond the three areas set out in the new framework. Such a negotiation process could be helped by an appropriately timed High Level UN HQ level mission to Eritrea. Needless to say, the grounds for such a mission would have to be very well-prepared.

The Team recommends that a UN and/or UNDP retreat be organized to seriously reflect on the way forward. A key goal is to do a scenario planning exercise underpinned by analysis of strategic options faced by the UN after December 2012. This will help the UN/UNDP to be ready should GoSE wish to engage them. It can also be the basis for preparing the High level UN mission proposed above. The strategic reflection should take account the factors highlighted earlier.

For UNDP, the basis of the negotiation should be to regain certain areas of its comparative advantage wiped out by the new framework. Clearly the current truncated programme does not serve UNDP well, and it is doubtful if UNDP can be a strong partner in Eritrea if its activities continue to be defined by the new framework programme. UNDP should continue supporting GoSE - the engagement should remain intact but on the basis of an expanded role beyond that defined by the current cooperation agreement between the UN and GoSE.

The internal reflection proposed should not be based on preserving the current structures and possible windows to explore could include the following:

* ***UNDP sells more of its soft-skills focusing on policy advice and self-reliance support*** aimed to enhance poverty reduction, food security and domestic resource mobilization efforts of the government. Key questions are: How? Will GoSE allow? Such a shift means the UNDP Country Office will need to be strengthened with different sets of skills.
* ***UNDP seeks to expand its cooperation with GoSE by exploiting opportunities presented by the Global Environment*** Conventions: Eritrea is signatory to many global conventions, such as UNCCD, Climate Change and Biodiversity conventions. Eritrea therefore has a right to access and is entitled to the financial mechanisms put in place to enable all country parties meet their obligations under the global environment partnership. It could therefore be argued that GoSE and UN/UNDP should identify environment as an important niche for future collaboration, and an entry point for expanding the basis for cooperation beyond 2012. The environment sector also offers UNDP the possibility of addressing poverty and food security concerns at community level, given the linkages between these three aspects at grassroots, and as experienced from current UNDP portfolio. Also important is the opportunity to raise significant XB resources for the office, at a time when domestic resource mobilization faces many challenges. Structurally this would imply merging the environment and poverty reduction units.
* ***UNDP positions itself in Eritrea to capitalize on the new economic opportunities provided by developments in the mining sector*** (gold, potash, and other minerals.). This is a significant and positive development for the country and would require Eritrea to rapidly develop its capacity in many fields – developing and reviewing mining policies, regulations and guidelines, contract negotiations, management of mining agreements and specialized technical expertise. UNDP can play a useful facilitating role in providing assistance to GoSE to address its capacity gaps, through supporting use of nationals in the diaspora, south-south cooperation, and importantly also to develop the capacity of local institutions to undertake mining-related training within Eritrea itself. Another dimension would be to assist/support GoSE in looking at some of the forward and backward economic linkages that the growth of the mining sector provides. UNDP has played such facilitating roles in many countries including Cambodia, Sierra Leone, etc, from which the Country Office and Government partners can learn.
* ***UNDP volunteers to help the Government implement the recommendations of the UPR by availing its global expertise.***

To aid the reflection proposed, the team has briefly outlined some of the options UNDP could be faced with based on the three scenarios that may arise after December 2012. The way forward could be discussed based on the following three possible scenarios.

* + - ***Scenario One***: UN system support expanded
		- ***Scenario Two***: Government would inform UN by April 2012 at the latest on whether to extend, modify, expand or end cooperation after 201*2.* UN system continues to work within the existing cooperation framework (with possible modification)
		- ***Scenario Three***: UN system further scale down or phase out its support

These three scenarios represent different technical, financial and administrative implications for UNDP CO and HQ.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scenarios** | **Implications for UNDP** | **Possible action** |
| ***Scenario One*** | * UNDP gets opportunity to focus on areas where it has proven track record
* Allows UNDP to continue supporting existing institutions and regions so that they would be able to continue the work after UNDP support is phased out
* Poses serious challenges for UNDP to mobilize resources due to small donor base in Eritrea
* No negative consequence for staffing level at the CO
 | * Focus more on policy advice
* Consolidate achievements by supporting line ministries and regions
* Strengthen CO in terms of staffing
* Intensify resource mobilisation activities
 |
| ***Scenario Two*** | * Allows UNDP to continue its support to the Government and people of Eritrea, though at a much smaller scale
* UNDP works in sectors outside its traditional mandate and focus areas where it has no proven competency
* With some implications on staffing at the CO
* Faces no major challenge in resource mobilization
 | * Support sectoral needs assessment studies
* Develop strategies that would help best respond to sectoral gaps
* Focus on policy advice and strengthening regulatory frameworks for national priority sectors (e.g. environment, mining, health, water)
* Strengthen CO staff profile in the priority areas
 |
| ***Scenario Three*** | * UNDP will have no opportunity to influence the government’s efforts for national development or achieving MDG targets
* Risk of leaving behind unfinished projects which will negatively impact on UNDP
* With serious consequences in staffing at the CO
 | * Conduct a comprehensive status assessment of the interventions and formulate future course of action to be taken by the government to ensure that achievements are not reversed
* Resource adjustment in light of the new reality
 |

UNDP can use the brief framework outlined above as a basis for deeper reflection.

Once this internal reflection within the UN/UNDP is completed, consideration should be given to organizing a review workshop where the Government, UNDP, other UN agencies and donors can assess on-going projects. This forum could also be used by both the Government and UN/UNDP to identify areas of cooperation based on national goals and priorities and UNDP’s unique global competence and expertise.

The suggestions laid out above would of course be rendered completely irrelevant should GoSE decide to restore cooperation with the UN to its traditional form.

**6.5 General Recommendations**

Given the very drastic shift in GoSE in terms of its cooperation with the UN, the final review of the UNDP CPAP does not readily lead to proposals for a new programme of cooperation between GoSE and UNDP. The MTR has proposed a number of specific programme recommendations that the team concurs with and which would prove useful should the cooperation with GoSE revert to traditional ways.

Based on these concerns, the team has therefore focused on providing the following four core recommendations below:

1. The current 18-month programme with GoSE, represents a relatively new experience for UNDP. In the event that GoSE decides to continue along the same path of cooperation by extending the framework agreement beyond December 2012, it would be important to seriously take stock of what has been realized from a programming perspective, as well as the implications for UNDP internal arrangements. This would provide important inputs into the future work of UNDP in Eritrea.
2. UNDP has invested heavily in many development activities and worked extensively with many partners. The abrupt end to such support leaves many questions unanswered: there is visible impact of UNDP at all levels – would this be lost? Or has the programme reached such a level that IPs can now forge ahead on their own? UNDP capacity building – institutions are at a threshold were they can move forward. Are Line Ministries may be in better position than the mass organizations? Therefore it would be important to assess the extent to which IPs are able to carry on activities – in other words, there is need to assess the sustainability of UNDP’s support when the current framework ends in December 2012.
3. Regardless of the nature of the future programme with Government, UNDP should make greater efforts to integrate the work of its different units. In this regard the role of the Poverty unit needs particular scrutiny – strengthened collaboration with the environment unit and greater emphasis on supporting research to facilitate better understanding of the dynamics of poverty in Eritrea, rather than just replicate and manage similar interventions.
4. When the Government comes back to the UNDP on or before April 2012, detailing its future plans, and if such plans include at least two of the UNDP Practice areas, it would then be prudent to restructure the current programmes into two distinct categories, namely one programme for Upstream Interventions and one programme on Down Stream activities. The Upstream Programme may include activities related to micro-policy, implementation of draft national policies in the public and Environment sectors, Poverty Reduction, Food Security, Environment and Development, Climate Change, Energy, etc.). The Down Stream programme may include all activities prioritized by the Government and working with regional, sub- regional and Kebabi administrations, that the UNDP has accumulated a lot of credibility and experience (such as building micro-dams and bore hole based water systems, affordable shelter, school and health facilities, support to farmers, and capacity building at the sub-region and Kebabi levels). The UNDP core resources are dwindling every year and the resource mobilization will be a difficult exercise. Based on our experience, it may be strategic to call the Down Stream programme “Transition from Emergency to long term Development” which may attract our traditional donors to continue their support.

**Annex 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION OF UNDP ERITREA COUNTRY PROGRAMME ACTION PLAN (2007-2011)**

**1. Background**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been operating in Eritrea since 1992 to promote and implement sustainable human development strategies and programmes based on national development priorities of the Government of the State of Eritrea (GSE). UNDP’s focus from 1992 – 1993 was targeted mainly on rehabilitation and reconstruction, as Eritrea was just emerging from a 30-year liberation struggle with Ethiopia and independence was just realized then. The period from 1994 – 1996, the support of UNDP was mainly targeted on capacity development programmes, a continuation of the post-war emergency programmes aimed at rehabilitating, resettling and reintegrating returnees and refugees as well as demobilizing and reintegrating ex-combatants. From 1997 – 2001, a Country Cooperation Framework (CCF) signed between the UNDP and the GSE was implemented and its primary focus was capacity development and institution building.

The first common planning framework for all UN agencies in Eritrea, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework was formulated and implemented from 2002 – 2006. The UNDAF was informed by the UN Common Country Assessment, which was conducted in 2000 and the main priority areas of UNDP were the promotion of democratic governance and pro-poor economic growth and sustainable livelihoods. The second UNDAF 2007 – 2011 was finalized and its implementation has been ongoing, and it will end June 2011. This UNDAF was informed by the UN CCA which was finalized in 2005. The UNDP country programme document (CPD) and country programme action plan (CPAP) 2007 – 2011 were informed by the second UN Development Assistance Framework, UNDAF 2007 – 2011, and lessons learned from the previous programming period, with focus on development areas such as capacity development, emergency and recovery, environment and sustainable development, food security and gender. The overall objective of the UNDP supported programmes has been geared toward strengthening national capacity in key national institutions to enhance development effectiveness.

Specifically, the CPAP 2007 – 2011 is focusing on the following five thematic programmes areas:

1. Increasing equitable access and utilization of quality basic social services, with particular emphasis on vulnerable groups;
2. Establishment of an integrated and effective development planning, monitoring and evaluation framework to address the shortfalls in attaining the MDG targets and implementation of the Millennium Declaration;
3. Improving access to food for the most vulnerable population, thereby contributing to the eradication of poverty and extreme hunger by 2015 (MDG1), and working towards environmental sustainability (MDG7);
4. Assisting the government through an integrated multi-sector approach to ensure that IDPs, expellees, returnees and other war- and drought-affected population are resettled, reintegrated, and have secure livelihoods and access to basic services; and
5. Supporting the attainment of equal opportunities, rights, benefits and obligations for women in all areas of life in Eritrea.

A total of US$ 46.6m was required for the five-year programme intervention. Out of the total required resources, UNDP secured US$ 19.6m from its core resources and the remaining was to be mobilized from donors and other funding windows. As at December 2010, a total of US$ 66.9 million has been utilized to support programme interventions in the five thematic areas. And a total of US$ 45 million was mobilized from donors.

Major UNDP partners involved in the implementation of the programme include government line

ministries and other national institutions, including Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of National Development, Ministry of Marine

Resources, Ministry of Land, Water and Environment, Department of Immigration and Nationality, Civil Service Administration, National Union of Eritrean Women, National Union of Eritrean Youth and Students, and National Confederation of Eritrea Workers. The donor and collaborating international partners have included the European Union, the Governments of the Netherlands, Norway and Italy, the Global Environment Facility (GEF)) and UN Agencies (UNFPA, OCHA, UNICEF, FAO, WHO, UNCDF, and UNHABITAT.

The timeline of the UNDP CPAP 2007 – 2011, which conforms to the timeline of the second UNDAF 2007 – 2011, will conclude in June 2011, meaning the development of a new country programme document. To inform this process, the UNDP CO has decided to undertake a final evaluation of the CPAP in line with UNDP corporate guidelines and requirements on evaluation.

**2. Evaluation Purpose**

As the country programme nears its completion, it is a mandatory requirement to undertake final evaluation in order to draw lessons learned, best practices, and other pertinent information that will inform the preparation of a new country programme document. As such, the purpose of the final evaluation of the CPAP 2007 – 2011 is to assess the impact and its overall contributions to development effectiveness in Eritrea relative to its five strategic areas of intervention. In addition, the evaluation is expected to assess the progress attained against the targets set out in the CPAP, assess the CPAP in terms of overall relevance and appropriateness, effectiveness and alignment

with the national development priorities.

**3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

Although it was not a mandatory requirement, the country office carried out Mid Term Review of

the CPAP in the year 2009. Hence, the final evaluation will build on the midterm review. The evaluation will cover the five strategic programme interventions and it will assess the extent to which the programme has contributed to development results and the outcome of each strategic programme intervention in light of the approved country programme. Furthermore, the evaluation will cover the entire programme period and will focus on assessing the strategies, implementation mechanisms and programmatic results based on the management, programme coordination, design of the country programme and communication and cooperation between and among all stakeholders. In addition, the evaluation will highlight the strengths, weaknesses, best practices, and provide forward looking recommendations for future programme design and implementation. Verifiable achievements and lesson learned will also be a major part of the final

evaluation.

In terms of specific objectives, the final evaluation will seek to achieve the following:

1. Assess progress towards achieving expected results;
2. Assess the contributions of UNDP to development effectiveness, nationally;
3. Document best practices/success stories and lessons learned in the course of the programme implementation, including but not limited to, implementation of RBM, resource application and monitoring and evaluation of progress;
4. Assess the impact of activities carried out under each of the programme components, especially with regards to human and institutional capacity building, gender mainstreaming and human rights-based approach;
5. Assess and document any evidence of transformational change at the national level; and
6. Assess the continuous relevance of the country programme components to development effectiveness in Eritrea.

**4. Evaluation questions**

The final CPAP evaluation will address, among others, the following pertinent questions:

***A. To what extent have the UNDP development interventions attained the intended results:***

* Were the stated outputs and outcomes under the CPAP achieved?
* What progress toward the outputs and outcomes has been made?
* What were the major factors influencing the achievement/non-achievement of the results?
* To what extent have gender issues and HRBA been addressed in UNDP programme/projects?
* Do the respective component areas significantly contribute to the achievement of the Country Programme outputs and outcomes?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

***B. How UNDP development interventions have generated changes, and at which level, in the CPAP***

***programmatic areas***:

* What happened as a result of UNDP programmes/projects and soft assistance?
* How far these results are attributable to UNDP?
* How Government and public institutions have been affected?

***C. Do the five strategic programme intervention areas identified in the CPAP address the country’s***

***priorities***?

* To what extent do the outcome/outputs address national priorities?
* Does the progress made by the projects/programmes identified under the CPAP significantly contribute to the related UNDAF outcomes?
* Were the selection of projects/programmes and their outputs consistent with the intended CPAP outcome and outputs?

***D. How efficient was the programme approach in the expected achievement of results***:

* Was the most efficient process adopted?
* Was the partnership strategy efficient or not?
* Was there any duplication or lack of co-ordination between the outputs?

***E. What are the chances that the accomplishments and results will be sustained in the future:***

* How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the Government and public institutions?
* What is the level of commitment from the Government to ensure sustainability of the results achieved?
* Does the Government have the capacity to mobilize resources (human, financial) to pursue/secure the results in the future?

**5. Methodology**

The evaluation will be conducted in close consultation with key national institutions/stakeholders and implementing partners throughout the entire process to ensure that the principles of national ownership, transparency and mutual accountability are followed.

The relevant national and implementing partners will be consulted at all levels of the evaluation process. In other words, the participatory and consultative approach will be pursued throughout the evaluation process, ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are consulted.

In terms of data collection, the evaluation team will use an integrated approach to involve a combination of quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods to capture tangible and quantifiable results as well as to understand the factors and processes contributing to these results in the lives of beneficiaries of the programme components. Specifically, the evaluation will comprise the following stages of data collection: desk review, consultations and interviews, field visits, finalization of evaluation methodology and work plan, and debriefing session.

* Desk Review: The evaluators will conduct desk review of all available documents related the country programme, including reports which include projects/programmes evaluation reports, CPAP MTR report, project/programme review/progress reports, CPAP document, UNDAF document, UNDAF MTR report, and available national policy and strategy documents.
* Consultations and Interviews: Consultations and interviews will also be held with various key stakeholders and selected implementing partners identified by the evaluation team in consultation with UNDP, including line ministries and other national institutions, project/programme focal persons/coordinators in national institutions and UNDP, UNDP
* Senior Management, international development partners, and regional administrators.
* Field Visits: Field visits will be organized, if travel permit is approved by the Protocol Office, so as to get optimal inputs from the stakeholders. Actual dates will be agreed upon in consultation with the relevant teams and the evaluation team. The field visits will be supported by UNDP to facilitate the collection of qualitative and quantitative data, using various approaches such as structured surveys, structured and semi-structured interviews and observation techniques.
* Finalization of Methodology and Work Plan: In consultation with the relevant UNDP monitoring and evaluation team and possibly relevant national partners, the evaluation team will finalize the evaluation methodology and work plan. The consultative and participatory approach will continue to be a major component of the finalized methodology.
* Debriefing Session: The evaluation team will debrief all relevant national stakeholders as well as the UNDP Senior Management and programme team on the initial findings of the final evaluation, including key observations and recommendations based on verifiable facts and data. This means the first draft report shall be ready for scrutiny at the end of the evaluation period. This report is expected to be presented to all stakeholders in an arranged meeting/workshop prior to the departure of the team leader.

***6. Evaluation deliverables***

The evaluators are expected to produce a comprehensive analytical report that includes, but is not limited to the following components:

* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the evaluation approach and methodology
* Development context
* Key findings (impact of contributions, relevance of programme, effectiveness, alignment to national development priorities, etc)
* Lessons Learned
* Recommendations
* Annexes

A detailed evaluation structure comprising the work plan and evaluation methodology will be expected from the evaluators before commencing detailed work on the evaluation. A full draft report in English will be submitted to UNDP at the end of the mission. This report will be discussed within UNDP and with partners involved in the programme implementation. UNDP will transmit to the evaluators the comments made on this draft report within two weeks, and they will be expected to incorporate the comments within one week and resubmit the final draft in both soft and hard copies. All documents, including questionnaires used for the purpose of the evaluation will also be delivered to UNDP in the same format.

**7. Evaluation Team composition and required competencies**

The team will be composed of one international consultant who will be the team leader for the evaluation and one national consultant.

Qualification and required skills of the international consultant:

* Advanced university degree in public administration, economics, gender studies, international development studies or related field.
* A minimum of 10 years and more relevant experience in participatory planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation.
* Excellent knowledge and experience of development issues including the MDGs, Emergency & Recovery, poverty reduction, environment and sustainable development, gender equity, human rights-based approach, HIV/AIDS issues, and development partnerships.
* Previous experience in conducting evaluation and programme reviews, especially in developing countries.
* Familiarity with the UN system
* Proven experience in Results-Based Management (RBM) and good understanding of gender mainstreaming into programmes/projects.
* Experience working with a wide range of institutions/organizations, including highlevel government, UN agencies, and civil society
* A good team player and demonstrable ability to work effectively in a team composed of individuals of different professional backgrounds.
* Excellent oral and written communications skills in English, especially in drafting and editing reports

Specifically, the international consultant and team leader will undertake the following tasks:

* Lead and manage the evaluation process;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology for the report, including the methods for data collection and analysis;
* Decide the work specification for members of the evaluation team;
* Assume overall leadership and responsibility for the analysis, quality and timely submission of the final report to the UNDP Country Office;
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
* Finalize the entire evaluation report

Qualification and required skills of the national consultant:

* Advanced university degree in public administration, economics, gender studies, international development studies or related field.
* At least five years of work experience in participatory planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation
* Very good knowledge and experience of development issues including the MDGs, Emergency & Recovery, poverty reduction, environment sustainability, gender equity, human rights-based approach, HIV/AIDS issues, and development partnerships.
* Previous experience in conducting evaluation and programme reviews.
* Familiarity with the UN system
* Experience in Results-Based Management (RBM) and understanding of gender mainstreaming into programmes/projects.
* A good team player
* Excellent oral and written communications skills in English, especially in drafting and editing reports

Specifically, the national consultant will undertake the following tasks:

* Mobilize and review documents;
* Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
* Data collection;
* Facilitate meetings with sector ministries and other national stakeholders;
* Actively participate in conducting the analysis of the evaluation report;
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
* Assist the team leader in finalizing the evaluation report incorporating comments received on the assigned sections of the report.

***8. Implementation Arrangements***

To facilitate the final evaluation, the Strategic Analysis and Partnership Unit (SAPU) in the UNDP

Country Office will coordinate the entire evaluation process with the assistance of the Programme

Unit. The identification of a wide range of stakeholders including key national institutions, UN agencies, other bilateral and multilateral organizations, and beneficiaries will be identified by SAPU with the support of the UNDP Programme Managers for interviews by the evaluation team.

SAPU will also be responsible for connecting the evaluation team with the UNDP Senior Management. In addition, SAPU will assist the evaluation team in developing a detailed evaluation plan; facilitate field visits; and organize meetings. It must however be noted that the evaluation will be fully independent and the evaluation team will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analyzing data for the entire evaluation process. Finally, logistical support will be provided by UNDP to facilitate the entire evaluation.

***9. Indicative Time Frame for the Evaluation process (1 June – 10 August)***

**Annex 2: Final Evaluation of UNDP CPAP - Programme for Consultations and Field Visits**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Day** | **Institution/Partner** | **Comment** |
| 3/10 | Monday | UNDP Management | Afternoon |
| 4/10 | Tuesday | UNDP Programme Units | Some Units in the Morning and others in the Afternoon  |
| 5/10 | Wednesday | The following Ministries and Institutional partners are targeted: Finance; Marine Resources; National Development; Immigration; Foreign Affairs; Energy & Mines; NUEW; NUEYS; NCEW; Justice | The two consultants could be programmed to visit different institutions when necessary in order to cover all |
| 6/10 | Thursday |
| 7/10 | Friday |
| 8/10 | Saturday | **Consultants review of documents/rest** |
| 9/10 | Sunday | **Consultants review of documents/rest** |
| 10/10 | Monday | Consultations with Donors/UN Partners  |  |
| 11/10 | Tuesday | Departure for Zoba Gash Barka/BarentuMeeting with Regional Administration/Programme Coordinator | Meet Regional Administration, Programme Coordinator and MoA  |
| 12/10 | Wednesday | Field Visit to sites in Zoba Gash Barka – SHELALO/ADI TSETSER | Recovery Programme Interventions |
| 13/10 | Thursday | Travel to Anseba and discuss with Local Administration | Assess potential impact of ALDPTravel back to Asmara |
| 14/10 | Friday | Departure for Zoba Debub (Mendefera)  | Meetings with Regional Administration, Programme Coordination Unit and MoA |
| 15/10 | Saturday | Travel to TSORONA for field visit | Visit to project sites – Recovery Programme |
| 16/10 | Sunday | Travel back to Asmara |  |
| 17/10 | Monday | Field visit to Zoba Maakel | Asmara offices of MoA Branch and site visits |
| 18/10 | Tuesday | Meet Representatives of SRS  | Office to arrange |
| 19/10 | Wednesday | **Drafting of Report** |  |
| 20/10 | Thursday | **Drafting of report** |  |
| 21/10 | Friday | **Drafting of Report** |  |
| 22/10 | Saturday | **Drafting of report** |  |
| 23/10 | Sunday |  |  |
| 24/10 | Monday | **Debriefing with Partners** |  |
| 25/10 | Tuesday | **Departure of Tijan** |  |

**Annex 3: List of Persons Met**

|  |
| --- |
| **UNDP** |
| 1. | Dr. Mamadu P. Diallo | Resident Representative/Resident Coordinator |
| 2. | Ms. Verity Nyagah | Deputy Resident Representative (P) |
| 3. | Ms. Tibletz Araia | Deputy Resident Representative, (O) |
| 4. | Prof. Tekeste Ahderom | Chief Technical Advisor, Recovery and Transition  |
| 5. | Mr. Wilmot Reeves | Economics Advisor & Head of SAPU |
| 6. | Mr. Habtemichael G/egziabher | Programme Specialist/ARR, Governance Unit |
| 7. | Mr. Kifle Tecleab | Programme Specialist/ARR, Poverty Reduction & MDGs Unit |
| 8. | Ms. Rahel Haileslassie | Programme Analyst, SAPU Unit  |
| 9. | Mr. Eyob Gezae | Head, Recovery and Transition Unit |
| 10 | Mr. Yoseph Admekom | Programme Specialist, Environment & Sustainable Development Unit |
| 11 | Mr. Issac Habte | Programme Analyst, Environment & Sustainable Development Unit |
|  | Mr. Michael T/medhin | Programme Analyst, Poverty Reduction and MDGs Unit |
| **UNFPA** |
| 12 | Barnabas Yisa | Country Director |
| **OCHA** |
| 13 | Jemila Mohammed |  |
| **UNICEF** |
| 14 | Dr Hamid El-Bashir | Representative |
|  | Ms Roselyn Joseph | M&E Specialist |
| **European Union** |
| 15 | Marc de Bruycher  | Advisor |
| **Royal Norwegian Embassy** |
| 16 | Ms. Elin Eikeland  | Counsellor |
| **Ministry of Justice**  |
| 17 | Ms. Fozia Hashim | Minister |
| 18 | Abraham Mellakh Habte | Director, Office of Minister |
| **Ministry of Finance**  |
| 19 | Mr. Mehamednur Aman  | Director General, Finance and Administration  |
| 20 | Mr. Huruy Ogbazghi |  |
| **Ministry of National Development** |
| 21 | Mr. Yohannes Ghebreab  | Administration Head |
| 22 | Ghebrekristos Ogbamikael | Head, Admin & Finance |
| 23 | Yohannes Arwa | Finance Officer |
| 24 | Nardos Araia | Head Finance |
| 25 | Abraham Kidane |  |
| **Department of Immigration and Nationality**  |
| 26 | Col. Habtemichael Tsegai | Operations Department Head  |
| 27 | Col. Tekleab Belay  | Adm. & Finance Head  |
| **Eritrean Electric Authority**  |
| 28 | Weldeabzghi Haile | HIV/AIDS Committee member |
| 29 | Tesfalem  | HIV/AIDS Committee member |
| **Asmara Brewery**  |
| 30 | Solomon Yohannes | HIV/AIDS Committee member |
| 31 | Azieb Gebremussie | HIV/AIDS Committee member |
| 32 | Ashenafi Kidane | HIV/AIDS Committee member |
| **Ministry of Agriculture Central Region** |
| 33 | Abraham Daniel | Director |
| 34 | Michael Werede | Extension Officer |
| 35 | Yohannes Tecle | Food Security Programe Manager |
| **Zoba Debub** |
| 36 | Mr. Mustafa Nurhusen  | Governor  |
| 37 | Mr. Rezene Fessaha | Director General, Infrastructure Department  |
| 38 | Mr Beshir Mohammed  | IDPs Programme Coordinator  |
| 39 | Mr. Tedros Tecle, | Director, Office of the Governor |
| 40 | Mr. Woldu Medhanie | Project Coordinator, Sub-zoba Tserona  |
| 41 | Mr. Bereke Mesgina | Head, MoA, sub-zoba Tserona |
| 42 | Mr. Bahta Tedros | Head, MoA, Zoba Debub |
| 43 | Mr. Tesfamariam Teame | Administrator, Sub-zoba Tserona |
| **Zoba Gash Barka** |
| 44 | Mr. Mussa Mehamed Hamid | Governor  |
| 45 | Mr. Abdulahi Alamin,  | Director General, Social Services Department |
| 46 | Mr. Haile Asfaha,  | Head, Infrastructure Department |
| 47 | Mr. Tsegay Tewoldemedhin  | IDPs Programme Coordinator  |
| 48 | Mr. Abubekar Osman  | Head, Planning and Statistics, MoA Branch Office |
| 49 | Ms. Selas Yonas | Finance and Administration Head, Gash Barka NUEW |
| **Zoba Anseba** |
| 50 | Mr. Kiflay Kidane | Project Coordinator, ALDP |
| **Central Region** |
| 51 | Bertherna Fishatsien | Farmer |
| 52 | Bikiti Masrom | Farmer |
| **National Union of Eritrean Women** |
| **53** | **Ms. Leul Ghebreab** | **Chairperson** |
| **National Confederation of Eritrean Workers** |
| 54 | Mr. Tekeste Bayre | Chairperson  |
| 55 | Mr. Eyob Tekleab | Project Coordinator |
| 56 | Mr. Tedros Ogbay | Programme Officer |
| **National Union of Eritrean Youth and Students** |
| 57 | Mr. Mathewos Mehari | Project Coordinator |
| **Focus Group Discussants** |
| **Mehrad Chele, Sub-zoba Tsorona, Debub**  |
| 58 | Mr. Mohamed Kier | Kebabi Administrator |
| 59 | Mr. Siraj Abdela | Deputy Kebabi Administrator |
| 60 | Mr. Seid Musa | Beneficiary  |
| 61 | Ms. Salha Mohamed  |   **“** |
| 62 |  Mr. Adem Ibrahim |   **“** |
| 63 | Mr. Omer Mohamed |   **“** |
| 64 | Mr. Mohamed Ibrahim |   **“** |
|  |  |  |
| **Endabastifanos, Sub-zoba Tsorona, Debub** |
| 63 | Mr. Yasin Suleiman | Kebabi Administrator  |
| 64 | Mr. Ali Mohamed Saleh |  **Deputy Kebabi Administrator**  |
| 65 | Mr. Mohamed Haji Mohamed  | **Village Development Committee** |
| 66 | Mr. Haj Mohamed Ali | **Beneficiary**  |
| 67 | Sead Osman |  “ |
| 68 | Ahmed Ismael |  “ |
| 69. | Ismael Ibrahim |  “ |
| 70. | Seid Omer |  “ |
|  **Kudoweiba and Unanazo Kebabis, Sub-zoba Tsorona** |
|  |  Mr. Measho Tekie |  Village resident  |
|  |  Mr. Siraj Negash |  “ |
|  |  Mr. Mebrahtom Woldeabzghi |  “ |
|  |  Mohamedbrhan Afendi |  “ |
|  |  Mr. Mebrahtom Berhe |  “ |
|  |  Mr. Meles Ghebremeriam |  “ |
|  |  Mr. Abraha Ghebreyesus |  “ |
|  |  Mr. Habtemichael Ghebrekidan |  “ |
|  |  Mr. Mehari Tesfu |  “ |
|  |  Mr. Adrisho Beyene |  Village Development Committee |
|  |  Ms. Lilti Mehari |  Village Development Committee |
|  | Mr. Haj Idris | Village Development Committee  |
| **Shelalo, Sub-zoba Shelalo, Gash Barka** |
| 78 | Mr. Girmay Teklay | Kebabi Administrator |
| 79 | Mr. Basilios Zeray | Beneficiary |
| 80 | Mr. Bahta Kesete | Water Committee |
| 81 | Mr. Tsehaytu Kahsay | Village Assembly |
| 82 |  Mr. Welday Kifle | Village Development Committee  |
| 83 | Mr. Letengus Woldemichael | Beneficiary  |
| 84 | Ms. Gueba Abrahaley | Beneficiary  |
| 85 | Mr. Hentsa Ghebreselassie | Administrator, Shelalo |
| 86 | Ms. Almaz Belay | Beneficary  |
| 87 | Ms. Almaz Belay | Beneficiary  |
|  |
| 88 |  |  |
| 89 |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |
| 91 |  |  |
| 92 |  |  |
| 93 |  |  |

1. Result Oriented Annual Report, 2010, UNDP based on the statement delivered by the Foreign Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Eritrea on 21 September 2010 at the High-level Plenary Meeting of the 65th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Millennium Development Goals [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Evaluation of UNDAF 2007-2011 Gender Equity Programme, Final Report by Stifanos Hailemariam and Gebremichael Kibreab, June 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Result Oriented Annual Report, 2010, UNDP. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Land Mine Action Programme was undertaken between 2002-2006, while the bulk of the work on demobilization also took place earlier. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This section draws extensively on the Final Evaluation of the Joint programme on IDPs and Expellees undertaken in 2010 and has been complimented by field visits during this CPAP Final Evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Report of the Final Evaluation of the Joint Programme on IDPs and Expellees, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)