

**ANNEX I:  
Agenda of Meetings  
And Visits**

Date	Time	Description
17/1	5:00	Departure from La Paz
18/1	13:00	Arrived Managua
18/1	15:30	Meeting with NGO's – presentation of mission objectives
19/1	8:00	Meeting at ENACAL with Solidaridad International from Spain and ACH
	11:00	Meeting with Mr. Arturo Harding, responsible as Secretary of State for Emergency Situations
	14:30	Meeting with SI and ACH – analysis of emergency activities
	20:00	Meeting with Ms. Maria Louiza Troncoso and Mr Jocelyn Lance about the proposed assignment in El Salvador.
20/1	8:00	Breakfast meeting with Mr. Luciano Columbara and Ms. Maria Luisa Troncoso
	19:00	Meeting with ECHO representatives Mr. Yves Lennaerts and Mr. Mark Vanderlinden. Light earthquake 3.5 on Richter scale
21/1	8:00	Meeting with Mr. Yves Lennaerts at COEN/COED headquarters part of Ministry of Defense. At COEN, General Perdomo gave an explanation about the role of COEN in the emergency phase.
	9:15	Meeting with international NGO's in El Salvador that are partly financed by the EC.
	10:00	Work in small groups with NGO's
	11:30	Worked in hotel
	13:00	Team left hotel for San Vicente region with Mr. Yves Lennaerts and Fabio (co-worker of Yves)
	14:30	Departure to <i>San Vicente</i> . Stop at <i>Tecoluca</i> . Meeting with FMLN, Mayor Carlos Cortés and Fundación CORDES Mr. Emilio Espín.
	15:00	Arrival and meeting at municipality with Mayor Carlos Cortez
	16:00	Tour of town – evident serious damage which was localized and depended on the quality of the building
	17:30	Arrival in San Vicente: Meeting at regional office of COED.
	17:55	Meeting with Dept. Gov. Dr. Amado Aguiluz Aguiluz,
	19:00	Arrival at hotel
22/1	10:00	San Il de Fonso, explanation of the effects of the earthquake and analysis with Mayoress Maria Julia Constanza in the region of Rio Frio
22/1	15:00	ZacaTecoluca Governor Ismael José I. Troya Major Rosa Arrebalo coordinating COED
23/1		Site visits, El Puente, Canton San Lorenzo
23/1		Caserio Rio Frio, part of San Vicente
23/1		Visit to the office of the mayor of Apaneca
23/1		Visit to the office of the mayor of Ataco
23/1		Visit to MINSA COED
23/1		Meeting with ICRC Mr. Alfonso Cartadilla – explanation of rehabilitation plans
24/1	11:00	A meeting with Ms. Murielle Guillermois – analysis of the CARE programme
24/1		Wrap up meeting with at the invitation of the British ambassador
24/1		Debriefing meeting with EU-ambassador at Mr Yves Lennaert's office
24/1	7:00pm	Meeting with NGO's ASDI
25/1		Flight to Guatemala City
25/1	11:30	Initial meeting with EU Ambassadors in Guatemala
25/1	14:00	Briefing with CONRED Ing. Alejandro. Maldonado Lutomirsky
26/1	6:00	Departure to Alta Vera Paz region with representatives of PTM, COOPI and Medi Mundo
26/1	15:00	Meeting at Medi Mundo house (PTM, MM, Medicos del Mundo, Coopi)
26/1		Jolomijx, Panzos, Alto Verapaz – Guatemala project visit to a community water system
27/1		Nueva Concepción, Municipality of Sonahú, Alto Verapaz, PTM; visit to a health clinic

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Description</b>
27/1		Salac, Alto Verapaz - community visit and site inspection
27/1		Senimbla Asiv - community visit and site inspection
27/1		Interview ACH Coordinator Eugenia Valls
27/1		Interview COOPI, Hermes Donati (COOPI), Dominique Cabrera (MM), Marco Mineli, (MM), Javier Llorenti
28/1	9:15	Flight: Guatemala to San Pedro de Sula, Honduras
29/1		La 29, community visit with Trocaire, Honduras
30/1		<b>Colegio Ilanga, Departamento Colon, Honduras</b>
30/1		Guaramon Morales, 3 de Abril. Flores de Mayo, community visits, Honduras
30/1	18:00	Dinner meeting with CISP (Alessandro Lorini)
31/1		<b>Interview CISP – Alessandro Lorini. Around 10:30-11:00 took bus to the airport in La Ceiba, then plane to Tegucigalpa</b>
1/2/01	9:00	Meeting with representatives of the embassies of member states – Tegucigalpa.
1/2/01	11:15	Ing. Anke Mollenhauer, (PRRAC-representative)
1/2/01		Analysis of information collected to date, at the ECHO office in Tegucigalpa
2/2/01	9:00	Meeting of NGO's at the delegation
2/2/01		Preparation of report material at the ECHO office in Tegucigalpa
2/2/01		Agua para el Pueblo – Gilberto Díaz, MINSA Benjamin Rivera, SANAA, Honduras (no structured interview) – description of projects in water and sanitation sector – particularly ALA 86/20
3/2/01		Las Minas, Juticalpa, Olancho, community visits, Honduras
3/2/01	14:00	La Puerta, community visit
4/2/01		Time for reflection and work at the ECHO office
5/2/01		<b>Jicaro Bonito, community visit ACH</b>
5/2/01		Colonia Cumbre, community visit, Choluteca
6/2/01		Santa Eudalia, community visit, Nicaragua
		La Tejana, Chinandega, community visit, ACSUR La Segovia
7/2		Tecuaname, municipio La Paz, Leon
7/2		Movimundo-Leon – interview
8/2	7:30	Picked up by CEPS representative and vice-director Mrs. Rosario Cuadra Fernández. Visited San Rafael del Norte. Met with Dr Harald Mossbrucker from EU project water and sanitation project PRASNIC in Matagalpa
8/2		HELP/CEPS – visit to San Francisco de Loma Azul, Municipio San Rafael, Dept. de Jinotega.
9/2		ACH Nueva Esperanza en La Sabana, latrines, Palacaguina en el municipio Las Sabanas, Madriz;
9/2		<b>Ducuali, Olivas, community visit, ACH</b>
10/2		Visit to the school San Luis en el municipio de Esteli, AAA
10/2		Las Canarias, rehabilitated drinking water system AAA
10/2		Ojochal, Esteli - school, well and latrines AAA
10/2		Jocote Renco, resettled community – schools, well latrines AAA – a quick visit
10/2		Interview AAA, Juergen Schmitz, Estelí, visit to an AAA water project – stayed with Dr Mossbrucker, PRASNIC in Matagalpa
11/2		Return to Managua by bus
11/2		Collation of field material collected to date
12/2	am	Analysis of field material, Managua
12/2	15:00	CEPS Dr Leonel Arguello – interview – Managua
13/2		Managua – report writing
14/2		Debriefing EU and report writing
15/2	9:30	Interview, USAID Thomas Membreño, Reconstruction programme coordinator
15/2	14:00	Telcon interview World Bank, Resident Representative Mr. Ulrich Lachler
16-19/2		Report writing
20/2		Departure from Managua
21/2		Arrival La Paz

**ANNEX II:  
Terms of Reference**



COMMISSION EUROPÉENNE  
OFFICE D'AIDE HUMANITAIRE (ECHO)

Conseiller Evaluation

EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
HUMANITARIAN AID OFFICE (ECHO)

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

**ECHO/EVA/210/2000/01006**

Name of consultant: Mr. Martin EDE

**1. GLOBAL PLAN TO BE EVALUATED**

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

**2. INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

health, water and basic sanitation and temporary shelter. This emergency aid included a rehabilitation component in view of preparing the transition towards more structured

rehabilitation and economic reconstruction aid from other budget sources.

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

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

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

### **3. CONSULTANT'S ROLE**

During the course of the mission, whether on the ground or while the report is being drawn up, the consultant must demonstrate common sense as well as independence of judgement. He must provide answers that are both precise and clear to all points in the terms of reference, while avoiding the use of theoretical or academic language.

This evaluation is part of a global evaluation that should be carried out by a team of three experts with both considerable experience in the humanitarian field and in the evaluation of humanitarian aid. These experts must agree to work in high risk areas. Solid experience in relevant fields of work to the evaluation and in the geographic area where the evaluation takes place is also required. Knowledge of the Spanish and English languages is obligatory.

The team members are each responsible for the following sectors:

**Mr. Dominguez Gonzalez**, team leader

- synthesis report
- health sector

**Mr. Ede**

- water and sanitation sector

**Mr. Schrikkema**

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

### **4. PURPOSE OF THE GLOBAL EVALUATION**

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

- 4.1. to assess the suitability of the Global Plans in favour of the victims of Hurricane Mitch, and the level at which the programmes in the water and sanitation, health and rehabilitation sectors have been implemented;

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

## **5. SPECIFIC EVALUATION OBJECTIVES**

**To this end, the consultant** will develop the issues below **for his own sectors (defined in chapter 3)**, and cover all points in his evaluation reports. He will only take into account the new facts since the beginning of the global plan. These specific issues must be studied in each sector evaluated as well as in the synthesis report.

- 5.1. A brief description of the Global Plans and analysis of their context:
  - the political and social-economic situation, the humanitarian needs and, where existing, any local capacities available to respond to local needs;
  - information on the various economic sectors such as social and economic policies in force, the levels of income and its distribution among the population, sanitation and medical policies, access to foodstuffs, etc;
  - identify vulnerable groups and localise them, as well as give an estimate of their needs by category;
  - the evaluation should also permit an appreciation of the capacities both of the local population and of local public authorities to deal with problems pinpointed;
  - an analysis by sector of the limiting factors for ECHO interventions should also be included.
- 5.2. Analysis of the **impact** of the Global Plans. This analysis should be based on the following non-exclusive list of indicators:
  - contribution to the reduction of human suffering;

- creation of dependency on humanitarian aid;
  - effect of humanitarian aid on the local economy;
  - effect on the incomes of the local population;
  - effect on health and nutritional practices;
  - environmental effects;
  - impact of humanitarian programmes on local capacity-building;
  - effect on the preparation, mitigation and prevention of catastrophes.
- 5.3. Analysis of the relevance of the objectives of the Global Plans, of the choice of the beneficiaries, and of the deployed strategy, in relation to identified needs;
- 5.4. Examination of the co-ordination and coherence for each of the sectors concerned with:
- other donors and international operators, as well as with local authorities;
  - other European Commission services that might be operating in the same zone with projects that are similar or related to the Global Plans;. The projects identified should be described with their cost and with the aid elements they include;
- 5.5. Analysis of the effectiveness of the Global Plans in quantitative and qualitative terms for each of the sectors;
- 5.6. Analysis of the cost-effectiveness of the Global Plans. The cost-effectiveness has to be established, notably, on the basis of the quantitative elements that have been identified under point 5.5;
- 5.7. Analysis of the efficiency of the implementation of the Global Plans. This analysis should cover:
- the planning and mobilisation of aid;
  - the operational capacities of the partners: staff, logistics, maintenance of accounts, selection of recipients, suitability of the aid in the context of local practices, etc.; management and storage of merchandise and installations; quality and quantity of merchandise and services mobilised and their accordance with the contractual specifications (including packaging conditions, the origin of merchandise and the price);
  - the strategies deployed;
  - the systems of control and auto-evaluation set up by the partners.
- 5.8. Analysis of the **viability** of the Global Plans, and notably of the feasibility of setting up development and/or co-operation policies which could eventually replace humanitarian aid as provided to date;



- 5.9. Concise analysis of the visibility of ECHO;
- 5.10. Concise analysis of the integration of “**gender issues**” (**social, economic** and cultural analysis of the situation of both women and men) in the intervention;
- 5.11. On the basis of the results of the evaluation, the consultant will draw up operational recommendations on the needs of a humanitarian nature that might be financed by the European Community. These recommendations may also cover, if necessary, other domains than humanitarian aid, such as development co-operation and specifically those included in the PRRAC;
- 5.12. Analysis of the methodology of **programme planning** used by ECHO for the global plans should be included in the synthesis report;
- 5.13. A drawing up of “**lessons learned**” in the context of this evaluation must also be provided. The “**lessons learned**” must include the role of ECHO and other services of the Commission in the decision making process and monitoring.

## **6. WORKING METHOD**

For the purpose of accomplishing their tasks, consultants may use information available at ECHO, via its correspondents on the spot, in other Commission services, the local Commission Delegations, ECHO partners on the spot and at their headquarters, aid beneficiaries, as well as local authorities and international organisations.

The consultant will analyse the information and incorporate it in a coherent report that responds to the objectives of the evaluation.

## **7. TIMETABLE**

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

## **8. PHASES OF THE EVALUATION**

- 8.1. A briefing at ECHO with the responsible staff for 2 days during which all the documents necessary for the mission will be provided. The day after the consultant will submit by e-mail to ECHO “Evaluation” a concise report of the briefing listing any clarifications to the terms of reference which will have to be taken into consideration during the mission;
- 8.2. The mission to the area concerned will last 28 days. The consultant must work with the Commission Delegation in Managua, the 3 ECHO correspondents in Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, the ECHO partners, local authorities, international organisations and other donors;
- 8.3. A briefing with the Commission delegation in Managua (Nicaragua);

- 8.4. The consultant should devote the first day **of** his mission in each country to preliminary and preparatory discussions with the correspondent and local ECHO partners;
- 8.5. The last day **of the** mission in each country should be devoted to a discussion with the correspondent and ECHO partners for observations arising from the evaluation. The team will discuss the layout and the content of the synthesis report;
- 8.6. The draft report should be submitted by electronic transmission (Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) to ECHO "Evaluation" in Brussels at least ten days before its presentation and discussion during the debriefing;
- 8.7. A debriefing at ECHO of 2 days. The day after the consultant will submit by e-mail to ECHO "Evaluation" a concise report of the debriefing listing the points which he will have to take into consideration in amending his draft report;
- 8.8. Once the necessary amendments to the draft report have been incorporated, the revised **text** will be resubmitted to **ECHO** "Evaluation", which should mark its agreement within 15 days or request further amendments;
- 8.9. Submission of the final report which should take account of any remarks, which may be made after the submission of the revised report.

## **9. REPORT**

- 9.1. The evaluation will result in the drawing up of 4 reports (1 by sector and 1 synthesis report) written in English, of a maximum length of 15 pages including the summary which should appear at the beginning of the report.
- 9.2. The evaluation report is an extremely important working tool for ECHO. The report format appearing under points 9.2.1 to 9.2.5 below must, therefore, be strictly adhered to:

### **9.2.1. Cover page**

- Report number, to be given at the debriefing, at the right top (minimum font 36);
- title of the evaluation report:
  - "Central America. Hurricane Mitch, Global Plans 1998 and 1999, health sector-2000.";
  - "Central America. Hurricane Mitch, Global Plans 1998 and 1999, water & sanitation sector-2000.";
  - "Central America. Hurricane Mitch, Global Plans 1998 and 1999, rehabilitation sector-2000.";
  - "Central America. Hurricane Mitch, Global Plans 1998 and 1999, synthesis report - 2000.";
- period of the evaluation mission;
- name of the evaluator;
- Indication that the report has been produced at the request of the European Commission, financed by it and that the comments contained therein reflect the opinions of the consultants only.

### **9.2.2. Table of contents**

### 9.2.3. Summary (see form in annex)

The evaluation summary which should appear at the beginning of the report.

EVALUATED GLOBAL PLAN (5 LINES MAX)

DATE OF EVALUATION:

REPORT N<sup>o</sup>:

CONSULTANT'S NAME:

PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY (5 lines max.):

MAIN CONCLUSIONS (+/- 20 lines)

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Co-ordination, coherence and complementarity
- Impact & strategic implications
- Visibility
- Horizontal Issues

RECOMMENDATIONS (+/- 20 lines)

LESSONS LEARNED (+/- 10 lines)

9.2.4. The **main body** of the report should start with a section on the method used and should be structured in accordance with the specific evaluation objectives formulated under point 5 above (10 pages maximum).

### 9.2.5. Annexes

- list of persons interviewed and sites visited;
- terms of reference;
- abbreviations;
- map of the areas covered by the operations financed under the Global Plan.

9.3. If the report contains confidential information obtained from parties other than Commission services, this information is to be presented as a separate annex.

9.4. The report must be written in a clear, concise and non-academic language.

9.5. Each report shall be drawn up in 20 copies and delivered to ECHO.

9.6. The report should be submitted with its computer support (diskette or CD ROM, Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) attached.

**ANNEX III:  
Abbreviations**

<b>AAA</b>	German Agro Action
<b>ACH</b>	Action Against Hunger (Accion Contra el Hambre)
<b>ALA</b>	Asia - Latin America (EC Programme)
<b>CAP</b>	Comité de Agua Potable (Drinking Water System Committee)
<b>DEC</b>	Disaster Emergency Committee
<b>DIPECHO</b>	Disaster Preparedness ECHO
<b>EC</b>	European Commission
<b>ECHO</b>	European Commission Humanitarian Office
<b>IDA</b>	International Development Association
<b>MEURO</b>	Millions of Euros
<b>NGO</b>	Non Government Organization
<b>O&amp;M</b>	Operation and Maintenance
<b>PRASNIC</b>	Proyecto de Agua y Saneamiento de Nicaragua
<b>PRRAC</b>	Proyecto de Recuperación y Rehabilitación de America central (Project for the Recovery and Rehabilitation of Central America)
<b>SI</b>	International Solidarity (Solidaridad International)
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development
<b>VIP</b>	Ventilated Improved Pit latrine

**ANNEX IV:**  
**Geographical Map**



Evaluation of ECHO's Aid to the Victims of Hurricane Mitch

