



## TERMS OF REFERENCE

For the evaluation of ECHO's Nutrition and Food Aid activities for Burmese refugees in Thailand and a review of the nutritional food aid situation of refugees not benefiting from ECHO's activities in Thailand and of IDPs at three resettlement sites in Burma

Contract n°s: ECHO/EVA/210/2003/01007

ECHO/EVA/210/2003/01008

Names of consultants: Dr Claudio SCHUFTAN, Ms Albertien VAN DER VEEN and Dr Pattanee WINICHAGOON (SHER) and Mr Gregory VAZ (Prolog Consult)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### a. **Context:**

The Burmese military junta, the SPDC, has ruled the Union of Burma (Burma) by force and repression since 1998, with no form of democracy and total non-respect for human rights. Ethnic minorities are the most vulnerable and, particularly in border areas, the military junta sees them as a major problem. The junta considers them to be passive or active supporters of the rebel movements, giving shelter or backing to elements of resistance. They are therefore maltreated and suffer violent repression at the hands of the military. Local populations in these ethnic minority areas live in fear of their 'leaders'.

Burmese refugees arriving at the Thai border predominantly belong to the principal ethnic minority groups, (Karen, Karenni and Mon). The refugees say that they have fled to escape oppression, forced labour, and financial extortion. They claim they have had their homes destroyed, their crops burnt and other goods confiscated, and they claim that hunger and fear force them to flee across the Thai border.

Displaced persons seeking to obtain official refugee status from the Thai authorities cross the border in small groups in order not to attract the attention of the Thai authorities. Many of them do not obtain this status from the Thai authorities because they do not comply with the strict requirements imposed by the authorities. These 'unofficial' refugees are therefore forced to live clandestinely around the camps to obtain aid from the humanitarian organisations. Those refugees accorded official refugee status do not receive aid from the Thai authorities. They are forbidden to work and only authorised NGOs may run humanitarian programmes to support them. Official refugees are not permitted to leave the camps and if they are caught breaking the rules they risk being imprisoned. They have no economic independence, they cannot return to their place of origin and are therefore increasingly dependent on humanitarian aid for their survival.

The political situation in Burma has not changed. The Burmese authorities have proposed resettlement sites while refusing access to the UNHCR. Without access,

the UNHCR cannot exercise its mandate. The review of the 3 resettlement camps in Burma by ECHO consultants is contingent upon access being granted.

**b. Humanitarian situation and ECHO's response:**

ECHO has been operating in the camps for the Burmese refugees on the Thai border since 1995. In 2000 it financed a humanitarian aid plan for 60,000 refugees in three different camps Mae La, Um Piem and Nu Po. The plan covered a period of 10 months and provided €4,500,000. In 2001 ECHO's aid package again covering a period of 10 months also amounted to a total of €4,500,000. Priorities under the plans have been coverage of the refugees' needs (mostly from the Karen ethnic group) for nutrition and food aid in three camps located in the central border region and for medical facilities, water and hygiene in four camps located in the northern border region.

The number of new refugees has continued to rise even though entry conditions have become tighter. In December 2000 there were approximately 127, 914 refugees in 10 camps in Thailand spread along the border, one camp is to be relocated and there may be only 9 left by the end of the year 2003 (there are also 3 resettlement camps for the Mon inside Burma). In November 2001 this rose to 137,899 and by October 2002 there were approximately 142,525 individuals spread along the border with no immediate prospects of them returning to Burma. More than 30 donors are involved. At the end of 2002 ECHO's nutrition and food aid activities were ended at Nu Po but are continuing at Mae La and Um Piem.

For its Nutrition and Food Aid activities in 4 camps located in the central border region, ECHO has financed operations with a Dutch NGO, the InterChurch Organisation for Development Co-operation (ICCO) since 1995. Contracts have been signed with operational budgets amounting to nearly €21.5 M, for the financing history see the table below. ECHO will provide copies of contracts and related information going back to 2000. A decision with a budget of €4,450,000 for the continuation of programmes of humanitarian assistance was approved on 13/05/03, with €3,500,000 for ICCO, the contract was signed on 28/05/03.

| Contract Number          | Version | Amount        | Code Desk | Partner |
|--------------------------|---------|---------------|-----------|---------|
| ECHO/TH-/B7-217/95/0102B | 1       | 750,000.00    | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/TH-/B7-217/96/0101  | 1       | 700,000.00    | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/TH-/B7-217/96/0401A | 2       | 1,065,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/TH-/B7-217/97/0201A | 1       | 1,060,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/217/1998/01001  | 1       | 1,060,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/217/1998/03002  | 1       | 1,335,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/217/1998/04002B | 1       | 49,000.00     | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/217/1999/01001  | 2       | 3,250,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/210/2000/01004  | 1       | 3,000,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/210/2001/01002  | 2       | 3,205,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/210/2002/02001  | 1       | 2,000,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/210/2002/05001  | 1       | 500,000.00    | 3         | ICCO    |
| ECHO/THA/210/2003/05001  | 1       | 3,500,000.00  | 3         | ICCO    |
|                          |         | 21,474,000.00 |           |         |

In Thailand the ICCO works with a local partner the Burmese Border Consortium (BBC). The BBC works through the respective refugee committees and under the umbrella of the Committee for Co-ordination of Services to Displaced Persons in

Thailand (CCSDPT)<sup>1</sup>. The present chair of the CCSDPT is from the BBC. BBC programming is carried out with the authorisation and approval of the Thailand Ministry of the Interior.

At present the BBC is made up of the following organisations:

Thailand Baptist Missionary Fellowship  
Jesuit Refugee Service (Asia-Pacific)  
Diakonia  
Norwegian Church Aid  
ZOA Refugee Care Netherlands

The Board of Directors of BBC consists of one person from each member organisation. The BBC budget in 2002 was about US\$14 million with approximately 40 donors, including some 11 governments, supplying funding.

**c. Justification and timing of the evaluation:**

Although in 2002 ECHO evaluated its Health, Water and Sanitation activities for Burmese Refugees in northern-Thailand, the last evaluation of food aid to the refugee population in the Thai-Burmese border took place in 1997. (Only copies on paper of this evaluation now exist. These will be made available to the consultants awarded the contract.) Given the 6 years that have elapsed, this evaluation is of historic interest only.

It is therefore timely and appropriate to launch an evaluation of the ECHO-funded food aid activities in this area in order to: evaluate the nutritional quality of the basic food aid basket provided to refugees in the 2 camps covered by ECHO at present (Mae La and Umpiem in Tak Province) and review the situation particularly in the camp with which ECHO has ended food aid since the end of 2002, (Nu Po<sup>2</sup>); obtain an independent appraisal of the BBC's procurement practices and logistical management of distribution; and assess ECHO's intervention in a structural crisis situation and give pointers to the extent and direction of future interventions.

The timing for the fieldwork is mid-November 2003, this is to ensure that the consultants avoid the end of the rainy season.

The consultants should consider ECHO's activities going back to 2000, however the emphasis is on the most recent activities 2002/3. This will require that the consultants visit all three camps, Mae La, Umpiem and Nu Po, with which ECHO has had an active involvement.

ECHO is proposing the use of three nutritionists in the team of four consultants in order that, depending on local travel circumstances - both internal visas and internal travel logistics, as many as possible of the 9 to 10 camps still existing by year end 2003 can be visited. During the early life of the contract ECHO will seek to obtain visas for the three nutritionists to visit the Mon camps in Burma. In the possible but not probable event that this is successful ECHO requires that the team leader with the agreement of the two other nutritionists prioritise the visits in

---

<sup>1</sup> The refugee committees include; the Karen Refugee Committee, the Karenni Refugee Committee and the Mon National Relief Committee.

<sup>2</sup> ECHO requires the consultant for logistics and procurement to attend a distribution in each of the two camps where ECHO is currently active a list of distribution dates is attached below.

Thailand in order to cover the maximum of camps/maximum of persons and the 3 resettlement camps inside Burma.

The full list of 10 camps in Thailand is given below.

Mae Hong Son Province

Ban Kwai, Ban Mai Nai Soi, Ban Mae Surin, Mae Kong Kha where ECHO has funded also the health project, Mae Ra Ma Luang (idem for health funded project by echo)

Tak province

Mae La, Umpiem Mai, Nupo (where ECHO has funded also the health projects in these camps)

Kanchanaburi Province

Ban Don Yang

Ratchaburi Province

Tham Hin (Where ECHO has also funded health projects)

In the Mon area in Burma, the 3 Mon resettlement sites are Halochanee, Bee Ree, and Tavoy.

The consultants should also consider meeting with:

- Mahidol University Nutrition Department in Bangkok
- Karen Refugee Committee, Mae Sot and Mae Sariang
- Karenni Refugee Committee, Mae Hong Son.
- Karen Women's Organisation, Mae la and Mae Sariang
- David Sawah (CAN project), Karenni Site 1
- MOI Camp Commanders
- Store Managers (all camps)
- BBC suppliers
- Inspection Companies, SGS and MISG (headquarters in Bangkok, but may be able to observe checks in progress)
- UNHCR Mae Sot Field Office

Due to the restrictions on the refugees leaving their camps and the interdiction to practice economic activities, ECHO also wishes to consider the possible financing of additional activities for the refugees of a personal human development nature, such as, education, adult literacy etc. To these activities could be added activities orientated towards reducing the high levels of psychological stress borne by the refugees, some of who have been in the camps ten years. The consultants will have to take into account the restrictions imposed by Thai authorities.

[In 2000 DanChurchAid organised an evaluation of the local NGO the Burmese Border Consortium relief programme, in relation to the Sphere project humanitarian charter and minimum standards in disaster response food aid and nutrition components. An e-copy will be sent to all firms invited to tender. The evaluation of nutritional and food aid activities should consider the Sphere minimum standards, as well as relevant professional standards.]

## 2. PURPOSES OF THE EVALUATION

### 2.1. Global objective

To obtain the necessary information for improvement of nutrition and food aid actions and the future strategy of ECHO in favour of the Burmese refugees in Thailand and of IDPs at three resettlement sites in Burma (the work in Burma is conditional upon access).

### 2.2. Specific objectives

To have an independent structured evaluation of the ECHO-funded nutrition and food aid actions, and procurement and logistical and distribution activities in favour of the Burmese refugee population in 4 camps in Thailand - their **relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the actions** and results (accountability) - and of the way these results have been achieved (lesson learning). The evaluation should contain conclusions and recommendations at both strategic and operational levels covering not only nutritional and food aid matters but also logistics and procurement.

### 2.3. Desired results

The desired results of the evaluation are:

- To obtain an overall view of the funded actions, showing their intervention logic and their relation to the overall objectives of the decision taken and to the overall objectives of the Commission in the area. This will require:
  - An analysis of the strategy and methodology used in the elaboration of the decision;
  - An analysis, taking into account the ECHO mandate, of the coherence, co-ordination and complementarity of the actions implemented under the decision with regards other actions funded or carried out by other donors and EC instruments. The consultants will have the previous evaluations undertaken by ECHO available to them.
- To assess the results and the means employed as compared to the objectives mentioned in 2.2.
- To draw conclusions and make recommendations for future strategy and improvements in methodology.
- To study how the following cross-cutting issues have been taken into account:
  - **Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD), (particularly in relation to the links between ECHO actions and those under the AIDCO's uprooted population budget line);**
  - **Children;**
  - **Handicapped;**
  - **Elderly;**
  - **Gender;**
  - Effects on the environment;
  - **Protection/Respect of Human Rights;**

- Donor visibility.
- Besides the general objectives and the other desired results of the evaluation there are specific issues that need to be tackled in the study. These are:
  - Regarding the **sector of intervention** the study should provide an overall view of the nutritional and food aid situation in the camps and the quality of nutritional levels achieved: would there be a need to add more nutritional and food aid activities in future projects? To what degrees are professional and Sphere minimum standards are met and exceeded? Are there additional personal human development activities for the refugees, such as, education, adult literacy etc that could be considered?
  - Regarding the **performance of ICCO and its local partner the Burmese Border Consortium (BBC)**, which works under the Committee for Co-ordination of Services to Displaced Persons in Thailand (CCSDPT), the study should assess:

The relationship between ICCO and BBC, particularly in respect of the ICCO's technical oversight and review of the BBC's operations, including its procurement and logistical and distribution activities;

ICCO/BBC's performance in the camps, and in particular of the quality of the nutritional/food aid work carried out by expatriate and local staff, most specifically the quality of the food aid basket. In evaluating the food basket the nutritionist will have also to consider the nutritional study undertaken in 2002 by the BBC with the assistance of the University of Madihol;

The BBC's management of the logistics of distribution and of its procurement practices must be examined. Among other matters: the quality of locally based ICCO/BBC staff, particularly in relation to professional qualifications, continuity and levels of staff turnover - are they sufficient in numbers - are they adequately equipped to carry out monitoring of population movements and recipients, both seasonal and other movements, (e.g. with vehicles, a methodological approach, standard reporting formats etc) - what controls do they operate over procurement, both concerning the choice of supplier and over the quality of merchandise supplied; the controls over storage in warehouses; and over distribution to beneficiaries (e.g. use of ration cards; the management of the Food Aid - are ration sizes varied with family size, is gender considered, do the elderly and handicapped receive adequate attention etc.

The current visibility strategy and examine the advisability of elaborating a new visibility plan for the actions carried out by ICCO/BBC. (It is noted that there is no mention of ECHO on the ICCO website.)

The consultants will take into account the non-exclusive list of criteria referred to in 2.2. The definition of these criteria and sample questions to be answered regarding each of them are given in annex 2 to these ToR.

The weight given in the study to these criteria will depend on the level of implementation of the action and of the importance given to these by ECHO during the briefing session.

### 3. WORK PLAN

The evaluation is made in 3 stages:

### 3.1. Attendance at ICCO Donor Conference and briefing in Brussels and visit to ICCO HQ in Amsterdam (maximum 5 days including travel)

- A **briefing** at ECHO with the responsible staff during which all the documents available for the mission and necessary clarifications will be provided by the requesting service.
- **Examination and analysis** of documents (desk study). This phase is to allow a careful planning of the activities/visits to be undertaken in the field. The consultants will have to determine with ICCO and the BBC how much time should be spent in BBC's field offices at Bangkok and Mae Sot and how much in the camps in the field. (It is essential that the majority of the time should be spent in the camps.)

### 3.2. Field Study (maximum 40 days including travel, 5 days of which are conditional upon access to Myanmar (Burma))

The consultants will have to anticipate possible delays in obtaining internal travel visas and permission to enter the camps. ECHO Bangkok will give information regarding all authorisations to travel to the camps. In the event that access is granted to the camps in Myanmar (Burma) and additional days to the five already foreseen are required, these must be approved by ECHO before the end of the contract.

- The consultants must work in co-operation with the Commission Delegation and the ECHO expert in Bangkok, ECHO partners, local authorities, international organisations, specifically the UNHCR, and other donors;
- The consultants should devote **the beginning of the mission** to the field concerned to preliminary and preparatory discussions with the Delegation, the ECHO expert and the BBC, its principal offices are at Bangkok and Mae Sot;
- At **the end of the mission** the consultant should meet with the Delegation, the ECHO expert and ECHO partners for discussion of observations arising from the evaluation.

### 3.3. Debriefing (maximum 2 days including travel) and submission of reports

- The first **draft reports** in accordance with the format given in point 4.2 below shall be submitted by electronic transmission (Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) to ECHO 15 calendar days after the consultant's return from the field.
- The starting date for the **debriefing** in Brussels will be fixed by ECHO not earlier than 10 working days after the submission of the first draft reports. Prior to the meeting, ECHO will have transmitted in writing any substantial comments to the consultant.
- On the basis of the results of the debriefing the **draft final reports** will be submitted to ECHO within a maximum of 15 calendar days. ECHO should mark its agreement within 15 calendar days or request further amendments.
- Submission of the **final reports**.

## 4. REPORTS

- ### 4.1.
- The evaluation will result in the drawing up of 1 report, written in a straightforward manner in English. This report should be of a maximum length of 60 pages,

including the Executive Summary of between 5 to 7 pages that should appear at the beginning of the report.

The report shall have:

One opening section giving contextual information on the situation of the refugees and IDPs, in particular the consultants should outline the roles and work of the various humanitarian actors involved;

One section devoted to food aid nutritional matters in the three camps, **Mae La, Um Piem, Nu Po**, the consultants must go into the nutritional status of the refugees in detail by sub-groups, the composition of the actual food aid against what the refugees require etc;

One section devoted to - the logistics of the distribution and procurement matters in the three camps, **Mae La, Um Piem, Nu Po** (in the section(s) of the report on the three camps with which ECHO has been actively involved the and, the distribution of the rations, the quality, monitoring and management of the stock, delivery etc);

One section giving an overview of the nutritional and food aid situation in the other 6-7 camps remaining;

One section giving an overview of the nutritional and food aid situation in the resettlement camps for IDPs in the Mon region in Burma.

One section on possible personal human development activities covering all camps that could be considered for financing by ECHO.

The report is to be written in a straightforward manner, in English. The font to be used should be Times New Roman, the font size 12. Paragraphs should be sequentially numbered.

- 4.2.** The evaluation report is an extremely important working tool for ECHO. The evaluation report is the primary output of the evaluators and once finalised the document is placed in the public domain on the Internet. The report is to promote accountability and learning. Its use is intended for Humanitarian Clients, EU Member States, ECHO's operational personnel, other donors and humanitarian actors.

At the date of financial decision making ECHO's operational units are required to state in the draft financing decision whether or not an evaluation has taken place and the follow up that has been given to the evaluation. The report format appearing below must, therefore, be strictly adhered to:

- Cover page
  - title of the evaluation report:
  - “For the evaluation of ECHO's Nutrition and Food Aid activities for Burmese refugees in Thailand and a review of the nutritional food aid situation of refugees not benefiting from ECHO's activities in Thailand and of IDPs at three resettlement sites in Burma”;
  - date of the evaluation;
  - name of the consultant;
  - indication that “the report has been financed by and produced at the request of the European Commission. The comments contained herein reflect the opinions of the consultant only”.
  - Cost of the evaluation in Euro and as a percentage of the budget evaluated.



- Table of contents
- Executive Summary:

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component of the main report. It should be short, **no more than five to seven pages**. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation and assessment, outline the context and the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text. Member States receive each Executive Summary, which is also published on the ECHO Web Page. The consultants should take this into account when drafting this part of the report

The structure of the Executive Summary must be as follows:

- MAIN CONCLUSIONS:  
For the evaluation of intervention plans and for the Assessment of future strategy.
- LESSONS LEARNED
- RECOMMENDATIONS, see below:

- Main body of the report:

The main body of the report shall elaborate the points listed in the Executive Summary. It would include references to the methodology used for the evaluation and the context of the Intervention Plan. In particular, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation. Conclusions should be fully substantiated with findings from the evaluation. For the evaluation of intervention plans these conclusions should refer to the main evaluation criteria and cross-cutting issues identified by the consultants and set out under point 2 of the ToR. Recommendations should be prioritised, directed at specific users and where appropriate include an indicative timeframe. Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the Intervention Plan, and of the resources available to implement it both locally and in the Commission.

Annexes:

- Terms of Reference;
- List of persons interviewed and sites visited;
- Map of the areas covered by the operations financed under the action;
- Abbreviations.

- 4.3. All confidential information shall be presented in a separate annex. The consultants are to be particularly aware that any risk of libel is to be avoided. Where necessary the name of any NGO that is criticised should be replaced with an anonymous title.
- 4.4. All confidential information shall be presented in a separate annex.
- 4.5. Each report shall be drawn up in 20 copies and transmitted to ECHO.
- 4.6. An electronic copy of each report (diskette or CD ROM, Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) including all annexes must be submitted together with the final reports' hard copies.

## 5. **REQUIRED SKILLS FOR THE CONSULTANTS**

This evaluation should be carried out by a team of 4 experts with experience both in the humanitarian field and in the evaluation of humanitarian aid.

The consultants are required to carry out their work in accordance with international standards of good practice in approach and method. All conclusions must be substantiated with adequate data. The methodology section of the report should clearly outline the method being used. The consulting team is also required to evaluate the use and application of international standards for humanitarian actions, such as: relevant professional standards, the SPHERE standards; the 'Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship' endorsed by the Stockholm Conference.

In the conduct of their work the consultants should use a multi-method approach and triangulate between different sources of information. These information sources should include i.a. primary stakeholders (specifically humanitarian clients, members of the host communities), local government (or equivalent such as group/tribal leaders), international agency staff, partners (both expatriate and local employees of partners), ECHO experts, EU Delegation and main operators - other donors and humanitarian actors.

In order to substantiate evaluation findings the numbers, sex, ethnicity etc of primary stakeholders should be noted, as well as ways in which confidentiality and dignity have been assured in the interview process. In this consultation, the evaluation team is encouraged to use participatory techniques.

In carrying out their work, the consultants should be vigilant as to any non-respect of international humanitarian law and principles, standards and conventions, UN protocols, Red Cross codes, and declarations, such as the Madrid declaration. The consultants should report any non-respect of such matters by ECHO financed entities to ECHO.

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 a local language would be advantageous. At least one of the consultants should be a woman. ECHO encourages the use of local national evaluators or personnel from research institutes/NGOs to form part of the evaluation team, where feasible. ECHO recognises that, all other things being equal, evaluations tend to be stronger where there is a mix of national and international evaluators, as long as the national evaluators have adequate capacity. For other complementary information, see Annex 1.

The 4 members of the team must work in close co-ordination. One of them will be designated Team Leader and he/she will have the added responsibility of the overall

co-ordination of the mission and of the final coherence of the report, both in terms of content and presentation.

The team leader should have the authorisation to dismiss an expert in the case of non-performance.

Below ECHO has set out a suggested division of tasks, other divisions covering these competencies will be considered. ECHO considers that the consultants proposed should have both relevant qualifications and experience of the domains to be covered and not just relevant experience only. ECHO considers that the team members shall be responsible for the following sections of the report:

- ECHO envisages that three team members shall be responsible for the work on food and nutrition, that one shall be responsible for the work on logistics and procurement, including post surveillance distribution, and one shall be responsible for personal human development activities. The nutritionists must have a relevant qualification in either nutrition or medicine and solid experience of dealing with nutritional projects. One of the three medical/nutritionists should have a background in psychosocial projects that would allow them to comment upon possible personal human development activities that could be financed by ECHO. The logistician should have solid experience of distribution and procurement.
- The members of the team work in close co-ordination. One of them will be designated Team Leader and will have the added responsibility of the overall co-ordination of the mission, of the drawing together of the executive summary and of the final coherence of the reports' sections, both in terms of content and presentation.
- It is essential that one member of the team be a woman.
- Experience in the south-east Asia geographic region would be an advantage. Please note that the award committee will be giving particular attention to any potential risks to the impartiality and objectivity of the experts.

## 6. ASSIGNMENT OF TASKS

The team members are responsible for the following sections of the reports:

**Dr Claudio SCHUFTAN, Team leader**

- The overall co-ordination of the mission, the elaboration of the executive summary and of the final coherence of the report's sections both in terms of content and presentation,

**Ms Albertien VAN DER VEEN, Nutrition and Food Aid expert**

- Jointly responsible for the Nutrition and Food Aid sections of the report.

**Dr Pattanee WINICHAGOON, local Nutrition and Food Aid expert**

- Jointly responsible for the Nutrition and Food Aid sections of the report.

**Mr Gregory VAZ, Logistics expert**

- Responsible for the Procurement, Logistics and Distribution section of the report.

## 7. **TIMETABLE**

The evaluation will commence in early October at ECHO headquarters and in the field for in mid-November to avoid the end of the rainy season. The mission will last 67 days for the team leader - including 15 days for the drafting of the reports, 58 days for the principal nutritionist - including 10 days for the drafting of the report, 7 days for the local nutritionist and 42 days for the procurement logistics/distribution expert - including 10 days for the drafting of the report.

## Annex 1

### Guidelines for the consultants

#### 1. Regulatory basis

The Regulatory basis for the evaluation of the aid provided by ECHO are established in **Article 18 of Regulation (EC) 1257/96** concerning humanitarian aid, which states "the Commission shall regularly assess aid operations financed by the Community in order to establish whether they have achieved its objectives and to produce guidelines for improving the effectiveness of future operations".

#### 2. Terms of Reference. What are they?

The Terms of Reference set out the boundaries of the evaluator's mission, the issues to be considered and the evaluation timetable. They allow those commissioning the evaluation to express their needs (**guidance function**) while providing the evaluator with a clear idea of what is expected from him (**control function**).

#### 3. Methodology

For the purpose of accomplishing their tasks, the consultants shall use information available at ECHO, via its technical experts on the spot, in other Commission services, the relevant Commission Delegation, ECHO partners on the spot and at their headquarters if necessary, aid beneficiaries, as well as local authorities and international organisations.

#### 4. Scope of the evaluation and topics of study

Complementary to the initial information contained in the ToR, the **first session of the briefing in Brussels** will serve to provide everyone involved in the evaluation (operational unit, ECHO-Evaluation, the evaluators and other Commission services) with the opportunity to discuss on their content and to establish priorities of study. This meeting should, as well, allow the consultants to **clarify any doubts** there might be about the scope of his mission. Any important remark or comment on the content of the ToR at this stage will be considered as an **integral part** of these and will be documented by the consultants team leader in a note that will have to be submitted to ECHO-Evaluation at the end of the briefing session, and before the team's departure to the field.

During the process of the evaluation the consultants must try to **cover all the items and criteria in the Terms of Reference**. Their treatment, the relative importance given to these and their coverage in the final reports will depend, however, on the consultants own opinion as a result of the information found, both, during the desk study phase or in the field. Any decision not to cover any of the main evaluation criteria described in the ToR will have to be **justified** in the text of the reports.

#### 5. The evaluation report

By commissioning an independent evaluation ECHO expects to obtain a **critical, readable, transparent and creative analysis** of the progress made with its interventions. This analysis should contain recommendations on future courses of action. The evaluation report should be, above all, a document that can function as a **learning tool**. Therefore, while writing it, the consultants should always bear in mind why is the report done, for whom, and how will the results be used.

Furthermore, the evaluation report is a working tool of value to ECHO if it clearly reflects the **evaluator's independent view**. ECHO's greatest concern is to respect this independence.

## Annex 2

### Criteria and sample questions to be considered in the evaluation of humanitarian aid\*

#### *1. Is the Action relevant?*

**Relevance** is concerned with assessing whether the Action correctly identified problems and real needs and whether the projects funded under the Global Plan/Intervention Plan/Operation were in line with local needs and priorities as well as with donor policy.

One should therefore analyse in addition:

- **how well the reality of problems and needs**, as well as target humanitarian clients were identified and incorporated into the action plan;
- Connectedness, links into local capacity, its plans and aspirations, how local capacities for absorbing the aid were analysed, and co-ordination of the Members efforts;
- Whether coping strategies of the affected population were supported by ECHO-financed interventions;
- **how the actions were prepared**, noting particularly any obvious omissions. This should include policy assessments, sector reviews, planning workshops and how far they were incorporated into the Action.
- **whether prior consultation** were undertaken with appropriate people on the spot: intended humanitarian clients; the Delegation, national and local authorities, and other donors and aid organisations (the latter being particularly important to ensure complementarity and avoid overlap);
- **How the programme complements and enhances**, rather than duplicates and hinders, related activities carried out by other EC services, governments and donors.

#### *2. Is the Action effective?*

**Effectiveness** measures the extent to which the activities funded under the Action achieve their purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen based on the outputs. Implicit within the effectiveness criterion is *timeliness and appropriateness of response*. **This would also cover issues of capacity and preparedness to enable a rapid and sensitive response**. There might be value in using it more explicitly as one of the standard criteria because of its importance in the assessments of emergency programmes.

Therefore, effectiveness should indicate the real difference made in practice by the activities funded, how timely the intervention was; equally how far means were used to their maximum effect, how far the intended beneficiaries really benefited from the products or services it made available.

Similarly, issues of resourcing and preparedness may be addressed.

The points to be taken into consideration will therefore be:

---

\* For the definitions and questions contained in this annex the following documents and publications have been used: "Manual for the evaluation of Humanitarian Aid", ECHO, 1999, "A Guide to the evaluation Procedures and Structures currently operational in the Commission's External Co-operation Programmes" AIDCO, European Commission, 2001, and OECD's "Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies", 1999.

- **whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received**, as perceived mainly by the key humanitarian clients, but also taking account of the views of donor management, the responsible national Government authorities, and other concerned parties (NGOs, local organisations, etc);
- if the **assumptions and risk assessments** at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or **external factors** intervened, **how flexibly management adapted** to ensure that the results would still achieve the purpose; and how well it was supported in this by key stakeholders including Government, Commission (HQ and locally), etc: in summary, “**were the right things done**” to ensure that the potential beneficiaries actually benefited?;
- whether the **balance of responsibilities** between the various stakeholders was correct, what accompanying measures were or should have been taken by the partner authorities, and with what consequences;
- what **unplanned effects of** the action, if any, have there been in the region;
- whether any shortcomings at this level were due to a failure to take account of **cross-cutting or over-arching issues** such as gender, environment and security during implementation.

### ***3. How efficient were the various activities?***

*Efficiency* measures how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (outputs) maximising quality, quantity and timeliness.

This links with the question “**were things done correctly?**” and thereby also addresses the concept value-for-money, that is whether similar results could have been achieved more by other means at lower cost in the same time.

An analysis of Efficiency will therefore focus on:

- the operational capacities of the partners;
- the systems of **control and auto-evaluation** set up by the donors and partners, whether it was appropriate, accurate and followed up;
- the quality of day-to-day management of the aid, for example in:
  - management of the budget (including whether an inadequate budget was a factor);
  - management of personnel, information, supplies, etc.
  - whether management of **risk** was adequate, i.e. whether flexibility was demonstrated in response to changing circumstances;
  - relations/co-ordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors;
  - respect of deadlines.
- **costs and value-for-money**: how far the costs of the activities were justified by the benefits - whether or not expressed in monetary terms - compared, mutatis mutandis, with similar projects, activities or approaches elsewhere;
- whether the chosen **indicators** of efficiency were suitable and, if not, whether management amended them;
- did any **unplanned results** arise from the activities?

### ***4. What was the total impact of the Action?***

*Impact* looks at the wider effects of the Action. Impact can be short and long-term, intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household).

This section should therefore show:

- **to what extent the planned overall objectives were achieved**, and how far that was directly due to the actions financed. This should take into account aspects such as contribution to the reduction of human suffering, effects on health (mortality and morbidity) and nutritional practices, effect of the humanitarian aid on the local economy, effects on local capacity-building, etc;
- whether there were any **unplanned impacts** (e.g., creation of dependency on humanitarian aid), and how they affected the overall impact;
- where appropriate, all **gender-related, environmental, security and human rights - related impacts** and any lack of overall impact resulting from neglecting of these issues;
- Coverage, the scale and ability to reach those most in need, given political, religious and social context of the emergency.
- whether the desired wider impact could have been better achieved otherwise.

##### 5. *What is the sustainability of the Action?*

*Sustainability* is concerned with measuring whether an activity is likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn and also whether its longer-term impact on the wider development process can also be sustained at the level of the sector, region or country.

In the case of strictly humanitarian actions, *connectedness* might replace the concept of sustainability. It is defined as the extent to which activities of a short-term emergency nature, which are not in principle supposed to be sustainable, are carried out in a context which takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account. Coherence must also be considered; coherence is concerned with the integration of relief activities to policy and practice changes needed to address root causes.

The **LRRD** (Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development) issue is of great importance for the Commission in this context since it addresses the need to link relief activities with longer-term development actions, in order to reduce deficiencies resulting from the different approaches and priorities.

An analysis of sustainability will focus on the aspects below. Their relative importance will depend on the nature of the project; it is useful to examine how concern for, or neglect of, one or other of the factors may have affected the sustainability of the outcome:

- **ownership (agreed communality) for objectives and achievements**, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and remained in agreement throughout the duration of the project;
- **policy support and the responsibility of the beneficiary institutions**, e.g. how far donor policy and national policy corresponded, and the effects of any policy changes, i.e. coherence; how far the relevant national, sector and budgetary policies and priorities affected the project positively or adversely; the level of support from governmental, public, business and civil society organisations; and whether national bodies provided resources;
- **institutional capacity**, e.g. the degree of commitment of all parties involved, such as Government (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) and counterpart institutions; the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; whether counterparts were properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;
- the adequacy of the project budget for its purpose;



- **socio-cultural factors**, e.g. whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power-structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it seeks to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it was based in any event on an analysis of such factors, including target group/ beneficiary participation in design and implementation; and the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities, notably their leaders;
- **financial sustainability**, e.g. whether the products or services provided were affordable for the intended beneficiaries and remained so after funding ended; whether enough funds were available to cover all costs (including recurrent costs, i.e. operating and maintenance costs), and continue to do so after funding ended;
- **technical (technology) issues**, e.g. whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service provided fitted in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii) alternative technologies were considered, where there was a choice; (iii) the intended beneficiaries were able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance; and minimal maintenance, operating and replacement costs; using national resources (notably, in creating jobs); and with minimum waste;
- wherever relevant, **cross-cutting issues** such as the already mentioned Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) question, gender, environmental impact, respect of human rights, etc.

## **6. Other definitions.**

### **Co-ordination.**

Co-ordination may be defined as - the activities of two or more humanitarian actors that are intended to mobilise aid resources or to harmonise their policies, programmes, procedures and practices so as to maximise the effectiveness of humanitarian aid resources.

### **Complementarity.**

ECHO's policy shall be complementary to the policies pursued by other humanitarian actors.

### **Coherence.**

The results or effects of policy that are in keeping with the principles and aims of that policy. (May be negatively defined as the occurrence of effects of policy that are contrary to the intended results or aims of policy.)

**Annex 3**

**Probable\* Delivery and Distribution Dates ECHO-funded camps: Mae La and Umpiem, taking October through December 2003.**

| Camp   | Consumption Month | Item        | Delivery Dates | Distribution Dates |
|--------|-------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Mae La | Oct-03            | Rice        | 27-30 Sep-03   | 01-03 Oct-03       |
|        |                   | Rice        | 14-16 Oct-03   | 17-18 Oct-03       |
|        |                   | Mung Beans  | 02-04 Oct-03   | 06-07 Oct-03       |
|        |                   | Cooking Oil | 02-04 Oct-03   | 06-07 Oct-03       |
|        |                   | Charcoal    | 06-07 Oct-03   | 08-10 Oct-03       |
| Mae La | Nov-03            | Rice        | 29-31 Oct-03   | 01-04 Nov-03       |
|        |                   | Rice        | 13-15 Nov-03   | 17-18 Nov-03       |
|        |                   | Mung Beans  | 03-05 Nov-03   | 06-07 Nov-03       |
|        |                   | Cooking Oil | 03-05 Nov-03   | 06-07 Nov-03       |
|        |                   | Charcoal    | 06-07 Nov-03   | 08-11 Nov-03       |
| Mae La | Dec-03            | Rice        | 27-29 Nov-03   | 01-03 Dec-03       |
|        |                   | Rice        | 11-13 Dec-03   | 15-17 Dec-03       |
|        |                   | Mung Beans  | 02-04 Dec-03   | 05-06 Dec-03       |
|        |                   | Cooking Oil | 02-04 Dec-03   | 05-06 Dec-03       |
|        |                   | Charcoal    | 05-06 Dec-03   | 08-10 Dec-03       |
| Umpiem | Oct-03            | Rice        | 27-30 Sep-03   | 01-03 Oct-03       |
|        |                   | Mung Beans  | 02-04 Oct-03   | 06-07 Oct-03       |
|        |                   | Cooking Oil | 02-04 Oct-03   | 06-07 Oct-03       |
|        |                   | Charcoal    | 06-07 Oct-03   | 08-10 Oct-03       |
| Umpiem | Nov-03            | Rice        | 29-31 Oct-03   | 01-04 Nov-03       |
|        |                   | Mung Beans  | 03-05 Nov-03   | 06-07 Nov-03       |
|        |                   | Cooking Oil | 03-05 Nov-03   | 06-07 Nov-03       |
|        |                   | Charcoal    | 06-07 Nov-03   | 08-11 Nov-03       |
| Umpiem | Dec-03            | Rice        | 27-29 Nov-03   | 01-03 Dec-03       |
|        |                   | Mung Beans  | 02-04 Dec-03   | 05-06 Dec-03       |
|        |                   | Cooking Oil | 02-04 Dec-03   | 05-06 Dec-03       |
|        |                   | Charcoal    | 05-06 Dec-03   | 08-10 Dec-03       |

\* Delivery and Distribution dates subject to weather, road conditions and availability of supplier's transportation. No Delivery or Distribution on Sundays.