

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of UNDP's Role and Effectiveness in Conflict-affected Countries

BACKGROUND

Since the end of the Cold War, there has been a significant increase in the incidence of war and violent conflict. According to the *Human Development Report 2002*, over the past decade there were 53 internal conflicts resulting in 3.6 million deaths, immense political upheaval, immeasurable social damage and billions of dollars' worth of economic destruction. In response to this deteriorating international environment, the Executive Board of UNDP revisited the organization's role in crisis and post-conflict development and urged the organization to renew its commitment to peace-building and post-conflict rehabilitation.¹ As a result, UNDP launched several new initiatives in conflict-ridden countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. This has been done in coordination with the mandates of other key UN partners. Four years have passed since this policy shift was first articulated, and the organization is now in a position to conduct an independent evaluation of the nature and effects of its post-crisis transition assistance to improve future interventions.

The overall aim of UNDP's efforts has been to identify and elaborate options for policies and instruments to enhance transition assistance during the immediate post-crisis period in order to avoid the recurrence of violence and assist the country towards recovery and development. These efforts have focused on providing physical and socio-economic security, rebuilding governance structures for a political framework, fostering reconciliation and justice, and facilitating mechanisms for

transition, where short-term and long-term frameworks—i.e., the sum total of many different interventions at various times within an overall process—may be analysed in terms of promoting 'human security'.

The idea of 'human security' marks a new threshold in the ongoing redefinition and broadening of traditional concepts of security in development thinking. In recent years, the policies of the international aid community, including UNDP, have increasingly incorporated into the post-crisis agenda a range of social, economic, legal, environmental, demographic and cultural concerns. In fact, few post-crisis situations can be framed without reference to human security issues arising from poverty, gender disparities, continuing conflicts often along ethnic and/or religious lines, landmines, refugee problems, illicit drugs, infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS and environmental degradation. Indeed, much of the 'old' development agenda can now be found under the 'human security' rubric in one form or another, partly because countries that are no longer actively 'at war' with other countries do not necessarily achieve 'peace' within their own borders. Peace increasingly means more than the absence of threats and discrimination. It means freedom from fear and want (e.g., economic security and basic human rights) for which responsive, accountable governance structures are prerequisites. As such, human security has acquired a dimension far larger than the original State-centred notion of the UN Charter, and its absence at the local and national levels has demonstrated long-term negative consequences. Peace-building

1 *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, to the Secretary-General (henceforth referred to as the Brahimi Report). UN document A/55/305 – S/2000/809.

efforts towards legitimate and lasting security in post-crisis situations are now expected to be rooted in the well-being of people, and the security of people emerged as a complementary and distinct notion from that of the security of the State.²

Building up pluralist democratic politics shares much with the fundamental principles underlying human security, since both are grounded in human development perspectives.³ Human security has evolved to mean inclusion, cohesion and integration—a sense of belonging to a society and a prevailing order within and among nations that is predicated on fairness and respect for differences and human dignity.⁴ It is a concept that focuses on the viewpoints of individuals to protect them from threats to their lives, livelihoods and dignity. However, human security cannot be equated with human development since it is both the outcome of a successful development process and a condition, if not a cause, of human development. Human development, on the other hand, is only possible in a ‘secure’ context. As such, human security is reinforced by human development and ultimately realized through it.⁵

The implications of this redefinition of terms are significant and present a number of unique challenges, not the least of which is the expansion of the traditional development policy agenda in post-crisis situations into issue-areas that have traditionally been viewed in a narrower social, economic, and developmental—as opposed to ‘human security’—context. Yet, every stage of crisis and post-crisis has a development dimension and, in real life,

development and humanitarian concerns very much tend to overlap.⁶ Therefore, the evaluation would focus on some of the broader conceptual and policy implications of the widening ‘human security’ issues in transition assistance and what this means for enhancing development effectiveness of UNDP and partners in responding to post-crisis situations from a human development angle.

OBJECTIVES

The evaluation will cover four key objectives:

- 1) To help UNDP document and analyse the transition assistance it has provided in selected countries since 2000 in the sensitive and frequently fragile post-crisis (cease-fire) period in reference to specific human security issues and their human development dimensions to reveal both patterns of interventions that have been successful and those that have been less successful.
- 2) To provide critical guidance by assessing results of UNDP programming interventions to date and providing recommendations on how to improve the effectiveness of current programming approaches in the early transition period and their implications for longer-term development. In doing so, it aims to highlight areas where UNDP’s comparative advantage has been proven or is emerging as well as to identify gaps and provide recommendations on how UNDP could address these gaps.
- 3) To indicate how UNDP has used partnerships at local, national and

2 While each country, as a nation state, is still responsible to its people for ensuring state security and in control of security and economic policies at the state level, such policies are now expected to be complemented by efforts focused on individuals to ensure human security and human development.

3 Mary Kaldor. 1999. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity.

4 “Human Securitymeans, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life—whether in homes, in jobs or in communities.” *Human Development Report 1994*. Published for UNDP, p. 23.

5 The scope of human security includes: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security. *Human Development Report 1994*, p. 24.

6 ‘Sharing New Ground in Post-conflict Situations. UNDP Interventions in Support of the Reintegration of War-affected Populations.’ UNDP, 2000.

international levels and positioned itself vis-à-vis other actors, who provide both transition and longer-term development support, including suggestions as to what capacities and skills the organization should prioritize and further develop to bring greater coherence and relevance to its interventions in post-crisis situations.

- 4) To provide substantive insights on how to ensure that lessons learned from programmes and strategies implemented in the immediate post-crisis period can be institutionalized within the organization through systematic monitoring and evaluation, adapted and made more relevant to country needs.

SCOPE AND COUNTRY CASES

The term ‘post-crisis’ reflects a complex and protracted process. However, while the main focus of the evaluation is on the immediate post-crisis period,⁷ it is necessary to take into account a broader perspective to include the preparatory work undertaken before an actual crisis, which tends to be critical. For instance, UNDP presence is likely to shift depending on different and emerging priorities during the different phases, from ‘normal’ development, through the crisis to transition and recovery efforts towards achieving normalcy. Also, UNDP is increasingly involved in countries where steps towards attaining a peace agreement have been forged but not finalized, and/or where crisis levels have subsided but conflict continues. Thus, it is necessary to look at UNDP programming in both these uncertain contexts and in the more traditional post-conflict environment where a peace agreement has been finalized and where armed conflict has ceased.⁸ The evaluation is further circumscribed by the

time-frame being considered. In many instances, UNDP plays a dual role: it first designs programmes to support the peace and bridge the gap between humanitarian assistance and development; but it subsequently designs and implements recovery and governance programmes that have much longer time horizons. Therefore, key questions that the evaluation will try to address are how to improve the effectiveness of UNDP strategy (i.e., is it doing the right things?) and interventions (i.e., is it doing things right?). The overall scope of the evaluation will include the following:

- UNDP’s performance *within its existing role* in providing post-crisis assistance, in particular preparations for peace-building activities in the period prior to crisis so as to ascertain the relevance of different phases of interventions in the past and programmatic shifts and key decisions on planning resource mobilization.
- UNDP’s response during the immediate post-crisis period, including the level of understanding within the organization—and in its programming—of its immediate post-crisis role, and what is required to improve coordination and delivery of interventions.
- UNDP partnerships with relevant organizations within the UN system and clarity of the delineation of roles and responsibilities.
- Level of consistency in the implementation of policy by UNDP and relevant partners in their coordination and development efforts, including the level of flexibility required in the mechanisms and instruments for developing and implementing policy.
- Critical gaps between humanitarian efforts and promotion of a longer-term

7 Although ‘immediate’ is usually understood as the first 12 months following the adoption of a cease-fire agreement between warring parties, this evaluation will take a more flexible approach with regard to the period before and after crisis, based on country context.

8 The threshold for looking at pre-crisis interventions is likely to vary from country to country according to the duration of conflict and other factors, and, therefore, should be defined on the basis of the specific country context.

human security agenda and human development, and their policy implications for UNDP, UN partners and other stakeholders.

- Results of local partnerships in immediate post-crisis assistance, including level of ownership of initiatives and activities (e.g., identification of problems, needs and solutions) and their implications for partnership and cooperation with formal, non-formal and traditional structures of leadership, assessing operational needs, risks and opportunities.
- UNDP approaches in monitoring and evaluating programme activities, and how monitoring and evaluation knowledge is used to contribute to operational guidelines, programme implementation, evaluation of programme performance and criteria for success.

A number of key issues and questions are highlighted in Addendum 1 that should be included under the general scope of the evaluation highlighted above. These specific issues are by no means exclusive, and the evaluation is expected to address and clarify these issues, and provide answers to the questions in relation to the general scope.

The evaluation will have a corporate focus. However, in order to ensure the feasibility of the evaluation, specific case studies will be limited to the following six countries: Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guatemala, Haiti, Sierra Leone and Tajikistan. These countries represent a good cross-section of cases where the post-crisis period is in various stages of development and where UNDP has engaged in multiple cross-sectoral transition initiatives with greater focus on policy instruments and advocacy in supporting these countries

to move away from crisis and conflict towards recovery.⁹

Finally, the evaluation seeks to be more of a learning and forward-looking exercise than an evaluation of past results. It will lay special emphasis on lessons learned in terms of what has worked and what has not worked to help practitioners and decision-makers to be able to review and better understand the quality and relevance of UNDP services in addressing human security issues, their flexibility, acceptability and adaptability in different context/roles, as well as to guide future planning and implementation of programmes in immediate post-crisis situations.

EVALUATION TEAM

The core evaluation team will comprise three international consultants. One of the international consultants will be designated as the Team Leader, the other two will be designated as Principal Consultants. In addition, and depending on the evaluation methodology developed by this core team, other national consultants/advisers/agencies may be hired to contribute to the evaluation process. Each of the three core international evaluators (i.e., the Team Leader and Principal Consultants) will conduct the evaluation in at least two countries with the support of the relevant UNDP country office. The country office will designate a focal point to provide such support during the respective country missions.

The team will be supported by one or two research assistants in New York Headquarters.¹⁰ The composition of the Evaluation Team should reflect the independence and substantive results focus of the exercise. The Team Leader and all other members of the Evaluation Team

9 Country selection was determined by BCPR, using a number of criteria: i) representing innovative cross-sectoral programmes since 2002; ii) reflecting geographic diversity; iii) providing a good cross-section of cases where the post-crisis period is in various stages of development.

10 Job descriptions for Team Leader, international consultant, national consultants and research assistants will be based on these Terms of Reference and issued separately.

will be selected by the Evaluation Office.¹¹ See Addendum 2 for the specific roles and responsibilities of the Team Leader and the Principal Consultants for undertaking the evaluation.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will follow the guidance issued by the Evaluation Office, and consist of three key phases: *preparation* (with preliminary desk review, programme mapping, Terms of Reference proposal, theme-specific desk research and developing a web-based document repository for the evaluation); *conduct of the evaluation* by designated members of the evaluation team; and *follow-up* (dissemination, corporate discussions, country office management response, stakeholder consultations, learning events).

The evaluation will employ a variety of methodologies, including desk reviews, stakeholder meetings, client surveys, and focus group interviews and select site visits. The Evaluation Team will review all relevant national policy documents, including current national plans and strategies of the selected countries and all other relevant documents that give an overall picture of each country context.¹² The Team will also consider any thematic studies/papers, select project documents and programme support documents as well as any reports from monitoring and evaluation at the country level, as well as available documentation and studies from other development partners. Statistical data will be assessed where relevant. The evaluative evidence will be gathered through three major sources of information: perception, validation and documentation—according to the concept of ‘triangulation’.¹³ Evaluators are expected to draw on reviewed documents, field visits and consultations with programme

implementers, all relevant partners and programme recipients to obtain data and information for their analysis during the selected country missions.

Preparatory phase and desk review

The Evaluation Office will engage a research assistant who will be responsible for working with focal points in country offices to collect relevant programme documents: project documents, relevant evaluation reports, reports to donors, old SRF/ROAR (Strategic Results Frameworks/ Results-oriented Annual Reports), Common Country Evaluations, UNDAFs (UN Development Assistance Frameworks, and the new corporate MYFF (Multi-year Funding Framework). Concurrently, the Evaluation Office will hire an Evaluation Team.

The Evaluation Team will initially meet to a) develop specific methodologies to carry out the evaluation; b) develop a work plan to operationalize this methodology. The work plan will build on this Terms of Reference and should describe how the evaluation will be carried out, refine and specify expectations, methodology, roles and responsibilities, documentation and time-frame.

Evaluators will conduct a comprehensive desk review of programme documents provided by the Evaluation Office in consultation with UNDP country offices, bilateral and multilateral donors and other national and international partners. Evaluators will also draw on relevant discussions in UNDP knowledge networks and, where appropriate, use these networks to gather further data not provided by document review. They will design a comprehensive questionnaire that will assist in gathering data needed to answer

11 The more detailed modalities of the evaluation will be agreed among the Evaluation Office, UNDP country offices, and the Evaluation Team members. It will include a briefing of the international consultants by the Evaluation Office and the country offices; setting up country mission parameters and responsibilities for data- and information-gathering; post-evaluation briefing in Headquarters and final report-writing.

12 A web-based document repository for the evaluation will be developed by the Evaluation Office and will be accessible by the Evaluation Team and the relevant UNDP country offices.

13 See Assessment of Development Results (ADR) methodology paper, Evaluation Office, UNDP.

the evaluation questions. This questionnaire will guide their interviews in New York, UNDP country offices and the Geneva Office of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR). The questionnaire will be reviewed by the Evaluation Office, BCPR and other select Headquarters units.

Evaluators will meet with Headquarters-based units (including BCPR, the Bureau for Development Policy and the regional bureaus) in New York and in Geneva and conduct interviews using the questionnaire. They will also contact, where appropriate, identified experts in the relevant UNDP regional centres and conduct phone interviews.

The preparatory work will be carried out in advance based on guidelines provided by the Team Leader and the designated Evaluation Office Task Manager. This will include an analysis of key issues to be explored and documented by the Evaluation Office. This work will entail the review of available reports and surveys, collecting additional documentation, conducting select interviews, analysis and brainstorming, and will be based on specific Terms of Reference in addendum to these generic Terms of Reference.

As part of the methodology, the evaluation will use a set of key indicators (or 'markers') that are (i) country-specific and (ii) more generic. Both types of indicators are to be used to analyse pre- and post-crisis phases in each of the selected country cases to not only assess major 'turning points' in the environment and strategic choices made by UNDP in its transition assistance, but also to allow comparison of UNDP approaches to transition assistance from a wider, human development perspective.¹⁴ The country-specific indicators will be developed by the Team Leader with the help of the desk review.

Country visits and country case studies preparation

Prior to the country visits, team orientation will take place in New York with the Team Leader and Evaluation Office, including a brief orientation on outcome and other evaluation methodologies, in addition to a review of documentation and desk review mentioned above. The Evaluation Team will be divided into two groups. Each international consultant will visit at least two countries. In each country, s/he will be supported by a focal point from the UNDP country office and an independent 'national adviser' to be identified by the Team Leader. The UNDP country office focal point will be expected to organize all relevant meetings with the country office team, government representatives and all other relevant partners, including civil society institutions, NGOs, and selected beneficiaries of projects/programmes. The evaluation questionnaire will also serve as a guide for collecting data during the interviews. Visits will involve meetings, interviews, surveys and focus group discussions with stakeholders.

In each country the international consultant and the selected national adviser will receive backstopping from i) the other members of the core Evaluation Team on all evaluation issues; and ii) a focal point designated by the UNDP country office on all local administrative issues. Country visits will each be 7-10 days in duration. During the country visits, the national adviser will provide relevant support to the international consultant, including access to civil society and political representatives in the country.

ADVISORY GROUP

As part of the consultative process in undertaking such an evaluation, an external Advisory Group comprising 2-3 individuals (composed of well-known development

14 While there should be sufficient flexibility in reviewing each country context, these indicators are intended to help develop a 'minimum standard' for post-crisis assistance. The evaluators are expected to further refine and expand these generic indicators, as appropriate.

thinkers, academics and practitioners) from different countries, including representatives of international development agencies, will be set up by the Evaluation Office. Each member of this group will a) oversee and identify the substantive evaluation issues highlighted in this Terms of Reference as an independent expert; b) ensure quality control of the evaluation; and c) review and provide comments on the draft evaluation report before submission to the Evaluation Office. The Evaluation Office will form part of the extended Advisory Group, which will remain in existence until the completion, dissemination and final review of the evaluation. The inputs and comments from the Advisory Group are expected to enrich the process and enhance understanding of the issues among a wide audience.

FINALIZATION OF STUDY, EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND TIME-FRAME

The Team Leader for the Evaluation will ensure:

- Presentation and review of the preliminary main draft report and findings—i.e., review by the Evaluation Office and Advisory Group, by other UNDP country offices and Headquarters units and stakeholders
- Finalization of report and debriefing of relevant stakeholders in New York through a lessons learning workshop to be organized in consultation with BCPR after the submission and approval of all products expected from the Evaluation.

The Evaluation products will consist of the following:

- A main evaluation report between 50 and 70 pages (excluding annexes), using 12-point type with an executive summary (5-6 pages) that will include the results of the six country visits, key findings and forward-looking recommendations for UNDP's future

transition assistance in conflict-affected countries, taking into account the objectives and scope of these Terms of Reference

- A summarized analysis and evaluation of the results of the questionnaire to all relevant countries/stakeholders, as an annex to the main report
- Six separate country reports—between 20 and 30 pages each, using 12-point type (including annexes)—that describe UNDP's transition assistance in these conflict-affected countries in terms of programme strategy, contribution to results, lessons learned and future directions.

The main evaluation report and the six country reports are to be formally submitted to the Evaluation Office by 28 February 2006 by the Team Leader. These will be approved by the Evaluation Office and the findings will be presented to UNDP's Executive Board at the UN in 2006 and circulated to participating country offices, partner organizations and other key stakeholders.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The Evaluation Office will manage this independent evaluation and ensure coordination and liaison with all concerned units at Headquarters. The designated Task Manager of the Evaluation Office will support the evaluation process, in close consultation with BCPR and the relevant country offices. The Evaluation Office will also ensure substantive supervision of all research, and determine the Evaluation Team composition.

The six UNDP country offices will take a lead role in dialogue and interaction with stakeholders on the findings and recommendations, support the Evaluation Team during the country mission in liaising with key partners and in discussions with the team, and make available to the team all relevant evaluative material. They

will also provide support on logistical issues and planning for the country visits by the Evaluation Team. In addition, each country office will appoint a focal point for this evaluation who will assist in preparing relevant documents, hiring national consultants, and setting up meetings with all relevant stakeholders.

The international Evaluation Team will be responsible for the development, research, drafting and finalization of the evaluation. However, they will consult with the designated Evaluation Office Task Manager and other relevant staff from BCPR, Bureau for Development Policy, the regional bureaus, Operational Support Group and the *Human Development Report* Office to obtain more information on lessons learned and their technical agreement.

The Evaluation Office will meet all costs related to conducting the Evaluation.

FOLLOW-UP AND LEARNING

This corporate evaluation is expected to help UNDP identify key lessons on strategic positioning and results that can provide a useful basis for strengthening UNDP support to country offices in post-crisis situations. It will present good practices from the country case studies in terms of 'what works' and also draw lessons from unintended results. The relevant country offices will be able to use the evaluation to strengthen their strategic position and vision vis-à-vis partners; UNDP Headquarters is expected to use the evaluation as a tool for advocacy, learning and 'buy-in' among stakeholders.

The evaluation report and recommendations will be shared within the organization through a variety of means. First, they will be posted on the BCPR and Evaluation Office websites and country offices will be encouraged to discuss findings. Second, the recommendations will feed into ongoing UNDP and partner organizations' policy discussions and strategic planning exercises for post-conflict scenarios. Third,

the findings will be presented and discussed at national-level workshops.

ADDENDUM 1: KEY ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

1. Country context, intervention phases and instruments

The evaluation will analyse the specific context of each country as indeed the trigger, the nature and the period of transition will be different in each case and should be documented in objective and rigorous terms in order to understand the rationale of UNDP and relevant partners in adopting the kind of programming interventions they chose to pursue in each case. Results achieved in each country context should be used to assess the validity, scope and depth of approaches used by UNDP and identify good practices, weaknesses and possible constraints.

What was UNDP's overall strategy in each country? What specific tools and methodologies were used to analyse the country situation prior to conflict and further down the line to design its strategy for deploying or mobilizing what is generally understood as 'transition assistance'? The comparison is intended to capture the dynamic of change and transformation. What were the results in terms of delivery efficiency, which in a post-crisis situation is of essence? What needs to be done to improve delivery efficiency?

2. Longer-term development perspective

Notwithstanding close linkages between the human development and human security agendas, in practice there is still in the human security outlook the notion of urgency, i.e., implicitly, or in terms of priority. While development is a condition of human security, crises will be linked to the latter, calling for immediate action, staking primary claims to resources, and demanding political priority. There is a risk that overlapping agendas between different government departments will mean less

visibility for long-term development and for government's action toward these problems as a whole, since short-term problems—like humanitarian emergencies—take precedence over longer-term ones.

Therefore, what are the key challenges for UNDP to incorporate longer-term developmental principles and approaches into the immediate, routine operations to address different types of human security concerns? For instance, to what extent do trade, human rights and governance aspects reflect part of a common policy strategy in the country or region? What are key criteria or principles used by UNDP to assist institutions capable of providing human security for the well-being of communities and individuals within the state?

3. Physical security

The process of disarmament, demobilization, reinsertion and reintegration (DDRR) of former combatants plays a critical role in transitions from war to peace. The success or failure of this endeavour directly affects the long-term peace-building prospects for any post-crisis situation. Since there is a close relationship between peace-building and the DDRR process, it needs to be analysed in relation to other approaches—for instance, promoting dialogue between citizens and security officials, assisting in the protection and relocation of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees, ensuring protection from mine fields, and launching HIV/AIDS-awareness training for ex-combatants, IDPs and post-conflict communities.

It may be possible to focus on three specific DDRR issues: disarmament as a social contract; demobilization without cantonment; and the relevance of financial reinsertion assistance. When such initiatives adopt a 'guns-camps-cash' approach, they seem to provide only a limited perspective for dealing with a wide range of complex issues related to the DDRR process. Therefore, the evaluation should review

and clarify whether there is a need for a more comprehensive consideration of disarmament by acknowledging and responding to its social, economic and political implications for other human security concerns.

In war, HIV/AIDS tends to spread rapidly as a result of sexual bartering, sexual violence, low awareness about HIV, and the breakdown of vital services in health and education. In conflict situations, young people are most at risk. Many young women and girls in refugee and post-crisis settings are forced to use their bodies to get food and clothing for themselves and their families.

What kind of initiatives were taken as part of early planning (i.e., what was done in terms of pre-negotiations to prepare during and after conflict)? Do these initiatives reflect a longer-term development approach? Did UNDP exploit key entry points with other UN agencies (UN Country Team) to enhance aid coordination and overall operational response to providing physical security to returning IDPs and refugees? How have local authorities integrated human rights policies and mechanisms into the national reconstruction efforts? What have been the effects of these on vulnerable groups (women, children and ethnic minorities, in particular)?

4. Coordination & partnership

The fact that human security, because of the range of issues it addresses, brings together a broad array of players, a central issue in the implementation of a human security agenda is institutional coordination. Given the range of issues covered and their mutual embeddedness, effective tackling of any significant human security situation calls for coordination and partnership among major government and donor agencies and other stakeholders. In finding entry points and strategies, the strengths and weaknesses of all potential partners (international, regional, local) need to be analysed. Within this context, UNDP's support to the UN's Resident Coordinator

function plays a key role in assisting national authorities to set up an accountable and rational coordination system for international aid. The measures that UNDP takes to assist in coordinating donors and aid providers have important implications for the design and implementation of post-crisis responses. In this context, the issue of distribution of roles within UNDP and among UN agencies and its implications for UNDP's policy in post-crisis assistance are critical.

Therefore, are interventions well coordinated within different parts of UNDP? Within the UN family (e.g., the UN Development Group Office, the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Food Programme, and the UN Children's Fund, among others)? With external actors like the national government, neighbouring governments, the NGO community, bilateral donors, and international financial institutions? What are the decisive elements of a partnership strategy at the national or local level in so far as they relate to coordination? To what extent has UNDP drawn upon the most relevant partners, making use of their comparative advantages? What lessons can be learned about coordination (or the lack thereof) in the approach or strategy employed by different UNDP Headquarters units in terms of providing support to country offices? What specific actions are needed by UNDP to institutionalize and strengthen post-crisis transition assistance at i) the policy level; and ii) the operational level?

5. Rebuilding governance structure

In post-crisis situations, short-term, tangible reconstruction measures need to be balanced by concern for long-term civil society and social programmes that incorporate mechanisms of local participation and a culture of multifaceted accountability, which can help rebuild governance structures. The role that UNDP plays in providing governance assistance is designed

to strengthen democratic processes, ensure democratic accountability of state institutions, and support the emergence of robust economic management and social service delivery. Weak or dysfunctional governance structures are characteristic of post-crisis countries. It is the failure of governance and breakdown of legitimacy that frequently contribute to the outbreak of violence and that, if not remedied, can thwart recovery. For this reason, key features of UNDP's transition assistance include programmes that help government set up truth and reconciliation commissions, assist government in formulating national recovery plans and policies and reform public sector administration (this includes the justice and security sector institutions), and, where appropriate, creating the conditions and mechanisms for free and fair elections. At a very early phase in the recovery, UNDP's role in fostering national reconciliation dialogues can serve as a first step towards fostering good governance practices. However, rebuilding governance structure cannot necessarily rely on state initiatives alone since, more often than not, the governance structures of the states are responsible for the conflict and may be resistant to changes. It may well be partnerships with civil society that provide the most leverage in fostering peace and changing governance structures.

To what extent have pre-existing governance programmes shifted to respond to new needs during post-crisis assistance? What were the key challenges and how was this process handled by UNDP and partner agencies? How did UNDP and local partners continue to undertake activities on the ground that were in themselves contributing to the promotion of peace-building or community reconciliation during the post-crisis period? What have been the effects of UNDP interventions on social/community/civil society mobilization and national dialogue? Was UNDP support adequate to ensure appropriate governance of national institutions in accordance with the principles of human development, democracy and civilian oversight?

6. Economic security

In order to promote sustainable livelihoods, and address recovery and reconstruction needs, post-crisis assistance is designed to jump-start local economies (quick impact projects) and to provide a means of livelihood for different communities of ex-combatants, refugees and internally displaced persons. Programmes that seek to revive the private sector, agriculture and mining and provide local infrastructure and credit facilities may also be initiated during the early stages of post-crisis assistance. Also falling under this category are UNDP programmes that support the provision of basic services such as water, sanitation, energy, health care, education and communications.

What are the critical challenges in promoting dialogue for economic security among returnees, local beneficiaries and different factions? Have the various interventions strengthened social capital among different communities? Have sufficient measures been taken to revive trade and investment, including the formulation of trade policies, procedures and relevant institutions? How do interventions reflect women's economic security and empowerment as part of a strategic focus? How have UNDP interventions contributed to define longer-term needs of different communities and groups, including the development of skills for livelihoods, social relations, leadership structures, etc.? Were these interventions part of a comprehensive approach (i.e., managing conflict between local people and returnees, and, in addition to other aspects of economic security, providing basics such as health care, access to clean water and other types of protection and services)?

7. Civil society and participatory processes

Central to the concept of human security is the specific focus on issues related to personalization, globalization, democratization, and demilitarization, where a special role needs to be given to civil society and its organizations in the

development and implementation of human security policies. This is necessary in view of the fact that the central role of the state is displaced by a wide array of actors in the management or elimination of human security threats. Experience indicates that civil actors and organizations gain access to the very definition of human security issues, where their security becomes the core preoccupation of policies and they are key players in the design and implementation of those policies. Furthermore, civil society and local support programmes, including citizens groups and human rights organizations, should be in the mainstream of international responses to rehabilitation. Glaring imbalances between short-term, project-centred funding for physical rebuilding, and funding for social and civil development where long-term qualitative change is made, could thus be avoided. The emphasis on elections as a test of democracy is often a cosmetic exercise, at least during the early phases of post-crisis assistance. It overshadows the need to support, where appropriate, civil society projects and local support networks that promote political responsibility and accountability. Furthermore, problems of transition arising from criminalized war economies and donor policies of neo-liberal conditionality might be better addressed by promoting transformation strategies that enhance capacity-building measures for local institutions and communities. In particular, higher levels of public participation might be incorporated into strategic plans to make external and local implementers more accountable to recipients.

Therefore, to what extent have UNDP and local partners taken advantage of participatory approaches to gain better understanding of 'local knowledge' and resources (i.e., carefully considered and corroborated information from refugees and other local people) in planning and in making strategic decisions? Do UNDP interventions reflect sufficient consultations with civil society representatives and non-governmental organizations? If so, how have they added value to UNDP's role in post-crisis transition assistance?

8. Gender

The evaluation needs to focus on how gender concerns have been integrated into policies and programmes at local and national levels. Available evidence indicates a slow but positive shift in international opinion and understanding about the consequences of conflict on women and the importance of their participation in peace-building processes and post-crisis social transformation. However, gender discrimination continues to manifest itself in such forms as political exclusion, economic marginalization, and sexual violence during and after conflict, which deny women their human rights and constrain the potential for development. In post-crisis situations, rape, domestic violence and sexual exploitation often go unchecked. Peace-building, despite being arguably more gender-sensitive, has so far given inadequate attention to the construction of gender norms and the processes by which they can be transformed to ensure more equitable gender relations in post-crisis situations.

What are the effects of UNDP efforts to introduce gender-sensitive approaches to peace-building? To what extent do they address underlying norms that define gender relations and power dynamics in the design and implementation of interventions in the immediate post-crisis assistance? Does the level of competence on gender issues and training among UNDP staff enable the organization (UNDP country offices) to provide effective programme support?

ADDENDUM 2: GENERIC ISSUES TO CONSIDER FOR DEVELOPING THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

- The nature and scale of UNDP's geographic coverage—i.e., the types of interventions and the number of personnel and sub-offices on the ground prior to the crisis and afterwards.
- The timeliness and level of operational response at the onset of the crisis.
- The relevance of interventions and responsiveness to the core needs of the communities affected by crisis, taking into account demographic and ethnic factors.
- The extent to which relevance, design and scale of transition assistance provides scope for longer-term development assistance around human security issues from a human development perspective.
- The level of engagement with civil society actors in interventions before and after the crisis, taking into account the role generally played by civil society actors at the national level.
- The level of human and financial resources mobilized in relation to intended objectives and results achieved.
- The percentage of the returnee population served by interventions.
- The quality of ratings and perceptions provided by external partners and local communities of UNDP's coordination efforts and other interventions.
- The extent and quality of gender perspectives applied in interventions.
- The percentage of most vulnerable and/or marginalized groups served by interventions and quality of support provided after crisis.
- The presence of clear, well-designed exit strategies.
- The types of post-crisis issues not being addressed or poorly addressed by interventions.
- The extent and quality of the documentation/recording of decision-making and monitoring and evaluation during different phases of interventions—i.e., pre- and post-crisis—and how such information is used.
- The use of relevant and credible local knowledge and expertise in planning
- The types of strategic choices and strategic connections between interventions made based on lessons learned to define UNDP's role and build its capacity for future work in post-crisis environment (e.g., a comprehensive country policy on peace-building).