

Annexes

ANNEX I: Terms of Reference – A Scope of Service

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance to Afghanistan Provided by Denmark, Netherlands, Ireland, Sweden and the UK between October 2001 and early 2004 with a Special Focus on Internally Displaced Persons.

1. Introduction

Five bilateral donor organisations, namely Danish MFA, Netherlands MFA, Development Cooperation Ireland, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID), have agreed to cooperate on an evaluation of their assistance (humanitarian, rehabilitation and development) to Afghanistan from January 2001 to early 2004 reflecting the ousting of the Taliban regime in October 2001. The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, coherence and connectedness of the assistance provided and will identify lessons for improving the response by donor organisations in future complex security, humanitarian, rehabilitation and development situations.

This evaluation was initiated as part of the so-called 'IDP Framework Process, a wider multi-country exercise, focusing on lessons about the handling of the particular needs of IDPs within larger international humanitarian and rehabilitation programmes¹⁴⁵. While addressing the overall humanitarian, rehabilitation and development assistance to Afghanistan, a special focus within the evaluation will be on the degree to which the assistance was cognisant of, and responded to the needs of, IDPs within Afghanistan.

The IDP component of the evaluation will be approached in two steps. Because of timing required by the IDP Framework Process and the need to avoid visiting Afghanistan during the planned elections in September 2004, a Preliminary Study of IDP Assistance will be undertaken during July and August 2004, whilst the fieldwork phase of the main evaluation will only commence in the first half of 2005. The Preliminary Study of IDP Assistance will be undertaken in parallel with the preparation of a background paper for the main evaluation: an analysis of aid flows to Afghanistan, including mapping of the location of the programmes and projects funded by the five donors. The Preliminary Study of IDP Assistance and the background paper will both feed into the main evaluation as will a Public Expenditure Review, currently being undertaken by one of the five donors participating in the evaluation (Development Cooperation Ireland).

¹⁴⁵ *Responding to a request in 2003 by the EU's Humanitarian Aid Committee a group of donors decided to conduct a number of evaluations with a special focus on IDPs. In order to facilitate common approaches and comparisons between the studies a common framework was prepared. (Framework for a Common Approach to Evaluating Assistance to IDPs. Protecting Lives and Reducing Human Suffering, Danida file no. 104.A.1.E.39, 20 October 2003). In addition to the planned Afghanistan study, evaluations seeking to focus on IDP issues have been, are being or are planned for Angola (Denmark and ECHO), Democratic Republic of Congo (USAID/OFDA), Sudan (ECHO), Kosovo (Denmark), and Indonesia (Sweden).*

To facilitate direct comparison of the results from both steps of the IDP component of the Afghanistan evaluation, with the results from the other country studies being carried out under the IDP Framework Process, the Preliminary Study of IDP Assistance and the IDP component of the main evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the 'Framework for a Common Approach to Evaluating Assistance to IDPs: Protecting Lives and Reducing Human Suffering' (Danida, 2003).

The current Terms of Reference (ToR) are based on the common evaluation framework. They benefit from background work undertaken in the summer of 2003 by Kings College, London. This work included the holding of a Workshop of Specialists on Afghanistan and post-conflict reconstruction, the preparation of an Annotated Bibliography; an analysis of Aid and Resource Flows and suggestions for Key Components for the Evaluation. The scope of the current ToR is narrower than the key components suggested by Kings College but is regarded as being more feasible.

This document provides:

A brief overview of the assistance provided to Afghanistan by the five bilateral donors;

The main evaluation questions and issues;

The methodological approach, organisational framework and projected timetable for the Preliminary Study of IDP Assistance, the two background papers, including the Public Expenditure Review made by DCI and the main evaluation;

Some background information on the context in Afghanistan; an overview of the response by the international community to address the security, humanitarian, reconstruction and nation-building needs; and an overview of the situation of IDPs in the country from readily available sources (Annex I).

2. Overview of Assistance Provided by Denmark, Netherlands, Ireland, Sweden and the UK 2001-2003

A provisional overview of expenditures and the main channels of assistance used by Denmark, the Netherlands, Ireland, Sweden and the UK is provided in Table 2.¹⁴⁶ Though care is needed in aggregating this data due to differences in the periods covered by the different data sets, the total volume of assistance provided by the five donors has been approximately Euro 670 million. Total disbursements since 2002 recorded by the Afghan Ministry of Finance's Donor Assistance Database are approximately \$2.9 billion. Thus it would appear that the combined contributions of the five bilateral donor organisations represent roughly 25% of the total aid flows since 2001.

Table 2 also reveals significant differences in the scale of the assistance provided by the five donors and the relative emphasis given to different channels. Unfortunately information on the activities funded is not currently available for all five donors. Assembling the data revealed differences in the way the different donors record and collate their allo-

146 This provisional overview was prepared using data submitted to Danida's Evaluation Department by the Humanitarian and Asia Desks within the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) in the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by Development Cooperation Ireland (DCI), by the Asia Department in Sida and the Evaluation Department in DFID. Differences between the five donors in their categorisation and presentation of the data necessitated some interpretation of the data.

cations. Such differences suggest that the evaluation will need to identify a common way of classifying funds by the five donors and should also propose ways in which greater standardisation might be achieved in the way donor databases are maintained.

Table 1. Provisional Overview of Assistance Provided by the Five Bilateral Donor Organisations
(Millions of Euro)

Donor	Period	All Channels	Bilateral	NGO	Red Cross	UN + IOM	Trust Funds
Denmark							
Humanitarian ¹	10/01-3/02	13.25	0.67	4.64	1.33	6.61	0
Humanitarian Frame	4/02-2/04	24.33	0	4.95	2.73	16.65	0
Reconstruction Frame	4/02-2/04	34.05	15.89	0	0	6.78	11.38
NGO Development Fund	2002-03	7.13	0	7.13	0	0	0
Denmark Total		78.76	16.56	16.72	4.06	30.04	11.38
Proportion of Total		100%	21%	21%	5%	38%	15%
Netherlands							
Humanitarian	2001-2003	84.6	0	5.62	9.06	69.9	0
Reconstruction	2002-2003	93.2	0	0	0	0	93.2
Netherlands Total		177.8	0	5.62	9.06	69.9	93.2
Proportion of Total		100%	0%	3%	5%	39%	53%
Ireland							
Ireland Total	2000-03	19.27	0	8.21	1.42	6.09	3.56
Proportion of Total		100%	0%	43%	7%	32%	18%
Sweden²							
Sweden Total	2001-2003	88.69	?	?	?	?	?
Proportion of Total		100%					
UK							
Humanitarian ³	2001-2004	142.0		?	?	?	
Reconstruction	2001-2004	164.2	97.0	0	0	0	67.2
UK Total	2001-2004	306.2	97.0	?	?	?	67.2
Proportion of Total		100%	31.7%				22%

1 This line refers to amounts granted and not to actual disbursements.

2 A breakdown of the total by channel of assistance was not available at the time of writing

3 A breakdown of the total humanitarian assistance by channel was not available at the time of writing

3. Purpose of the Evaluation and the Evaluation Questions

The evaluation reflects the intention of donor evaluation cooperation with the objective to extract a broad range of lessons learnt to improve future assistance, not only in Afghanistan but also in other countries emerging from prolonged complex emergencies. However, the various interventions should not be treated as one collective or combined effort. Each donor's own objectives and policies should be recognised and the selection of case studies

should therefore also reflect the relevant dimensions of each donor as regards sector, channel, partners etc. The selection criteria should be described in the inception report.

3.1 The Evaluation in the Context of Available Evaluations of the Response in Afghanistan

A substantial analytical literature already exists on the military, humanitarian, reconstruction and nation-building efforts of the international community in Afghanistan since October 2001. Kings College London prepared an annotated bibliography of key sources up to August 2003 as part of its earlier background work for this evaluation. Since then there have been significant additional contributions to the literature¹⁴⁷. In addition, at least a dozen evaluations of agency humanitarian and reconstruction assistance have already been completed and are currently being reviewed by Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action as part of its Annual Review 2004 publication due for publication in the late summer¹⁴⁸. So far, however, it appears that no evaluations have been commissioned of the response by bilateral donors and apart from a joint evaluation involving UNICEF and World Vision, no other joint evaluations have yet been undertaken. As noted above, one of the five donors participating in the evaluation (Development Cooperation Ireland) is currently undertaking a public expenditure review of its support to Afghanistan and has indicated its wish to use the results to inform the larger, multi-donor evaluation.

The proposed evaluation of the assistance provided by Denmark, the Netherlands, Ireland, Sweden and the UK would therefore add value to the existing body of evaluative work, in that it will:

- a) Examine the provision of recent assistance to Afghanistan from the perspective of bilateral donors, which together appear to have contributed approximately 25 per cent of total aid flows to the humanitarian and reconstruction efforts in the country since 2001.
- b) Facilitate a comparison of approaches by five different bilateral donors, which should provide valuable insights into the challenges faced by and practices of donors providing support to complex situations such as Afghanistan.
- c) Provide an unprecedented opportunity to examine how the needs of IDPs as a specific vulnerable group within a larger international response are perceived and approached by bilateral donor organisations and the partners they support.

The evaluation is not intended as an evaluation of the response by the entire international community. By maintaining a focus on the assistance provided by the five bilateral donors it is anticipated that the evaluation will avoid being spread too broadly whilst benefiting from the comparative perspective afforded by the involvement of five different donors.

147 For instance Donini A et al. eds (2004) *Nation-Building Unraveled? Aid, Peace and Justice in Afghanistan*, Bloomfield: Kumarian Press; and assessment and publication associated with the Donor Conference for Afghanistan held in Berlin 31st March to 1st April 2004.

148 These include evaluations undertaken by CARE, WFP, Tearfund, UNICEF/WorldVision, the US General Accounting Office, OCHA, Concern Worldwide, Islamic Relief, ECHO, Oxfam and ICRC. Furthermore, the European Commission has completed external reviews of several NGO programmes, including those of DACAAR, Swedish Committee for Afghanistan, Afghanaid, HealthNet International and German Agro Action.

3.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to undertake an independent assessment of the results of the response by the MFA Denmark, MFA Netherlands and Development Cooperation Ireland, Sida and the UK DFID to the needs of Afghanistan since January 2001 with a special focus on the situation of IDPs. The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, coherence and connectedness of the assistance provided by the five bilateral donor organisations in the overall context of the Afghanistan and in relation to the perceived needs of IDPs, returnees and remainees. The IDP aspect should provide an Afghanistan case perspective for the multi-country, multi-donor IDP Framework exercise and will provide an opportunity to ascertain the degree to which the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement¹⁴⁹ (adopted in 1998) have been followed and met in this case.

The evaluation will identify lessons for improving the response to the humanitarian, reconstruction and nation-building needs (and also those of the IDPs) by the five bilateral donor organisations in future complex security, humanitarian, rehabilitation and development situations. By virtue of the variety of approaches represented by these five organisations, the evaluation should provide a basis for a more generalised understanding of approaches by bilateral donor organisations to relief and reconstruction needs in countries emerging from prolonged periods of conflict and instability. As such, the evaluation will explore a number of issues that appear to be highlighted by the experience so far in Afghanistan, including:

- The factors contributing to the response by the international community to the emerging reconstruction needs in Afghanistan and the extent to which bilateral donors have learnt from earlier experiences in the provision of post-conflict reconstruction and development assistance in other contexts such as Cambodia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Rwanda and East Timor.
- The extent to which bilateral donors took into account the experience and capacity established through provision of assistance to Afghanistan during the years **prior** to September 2001.
- The ways in which the security context affects, and is affected by, assistance provision and the extent to which assistance provision is able to combine the roles of addressing humanitarian needs at the same time as supporting nation-building objectives.
- The relative role of aid supported and indigenous recovery processes and the extent to which external assistance has supported and amplified the indigenous recovery processes.
- The overall impact of external assistance provision and how it is perceived by the Afghan population.
- The relative performance, effectiveness and efficiency of the different channels (bilateral, Trust Funds, UN, NGO, etc.) available to, and used by, bilateral donor organisations.
- The impact of the rapid increase in staff in already established organisations as well as the arrival of a large number of new aid organisations on provision of assistance in general, and on coordination efforts in particular.
- The impact of repatriation on assistance policies.
- The extent to which IDPs were 'visible' to bilateral donors as a group with particular needs from the needs assessments and in the funding proposal submitted to them.

149 <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu2/7/b/principles.htm> (viewed 24.06.2004).

- The extent to which the needs of IDPs have been addressed in the Afghanistan context by the five donors in particular and by the international community in general and the degree to which the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement have been met and adhered to.

Though the 'Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship' endorsed in Stockholm in June 2003¹⁵⁰ emerged after the start of the period to be considered by the evaluation, they provide a useful normative framework for the assessment of the assistance provided by the five bilateral donor organisations. It is hoped that use of the Principles during this evaluation in turn will enable an assessment of their relevance and application in this particular case.

3.3 Intended Users of the Evaluation

The evaluation is intended for use by the following audiences:

- The five bilateral donors participating in the evaluation;
- The organisations and agencies participating in the wider IDP Framework exercise;
- The Afghanistan Transitional Administration (and the Government of Afghanistan that emerges from the elections planned for October 2004 and April 2005);
- The wider assistance community, providing support to Afghanistan and to other countries emerging from prolonged conflict and instability.

In addition, the evaluation can be expected to make a valuable contribution to the wider literature on the provision of humanitarian, reconstruction and nation-building assistance by the international community. Finally, it is likely to be used by a wide range of policy makers and scholars.

3.4 Evaluation Questions

Relevance

Was the humanitarian and reconstruction assistance provided to Afghanistan in line with the policies of the five donors as well as the needs and priorities of Afghanistan? To what extent did the assistance correctly identify and respond to the needs, priorities and rights of IDPs in Afghanistan?

Main Evaluation

- What were the policies of the five donors towards Afghanistan immediately prior to September 2001 and how have they evolved since?
- Have all five donors shared the same interpretation of the situation in Afghanistan, or have there been variations in emphasis?
- In what ways have these interpretations mirrored or differed from those of the UN, the multilateral development banks and the ATA?
- How did the donors regard the humanitarian and reconstruction needs assessments undertaken by the UN and the multilateral development banks?
- To what extent did they seek to complement such assessments with their own assessment and/or assessments undertaken by their operational partners?
- To what extent were assessments informed by political analysis (including analysis of conflict, power relations and rights violation)? Did appropriate vulnerability assessments of different groups take place?
- Were the underlying assumptions about the Afghan economy appropriate?

150 <http://www.sida.se/content/1/c6/02/18/82/Meetingconclusions.pdf> (viewed 24.06.2004).

- What levels of need were regarded over time as the ‘trigger’ for the provision of humanitarian assistance? Did needs assessments take into account the humanitarian principles of impartiality and humanity?
- How is targeting being carried out by the operational partners in Afghanistan? For example, is it being done according to pre-determined categories of vulnerable people (e.g. separating out returning refugees, single heads of households, elderly people, IDPs etc.), and/or is it being done according to a comparative assessment of need? How appropriate and relevant is this approach to targeting?
- To what extent did the repatriation of refugees from neighbouring countries impact on assistance policies and strategies?
- Have issues of gender and generation been adequately addressed in the provision and distribution of assistance to Afghanistan?
- To what extent were target groups consulted about their needs and about appropriate response? To what extent do they feel that the assistance has been relevant?
- How does the scale and role of external assistance compare to and interact with indigenous recovery processes? What were the underlying perceptions about the nature and dynamics of Afghan society in the development plans of the UN, the multilateral development banks and the bilateral donors? To what extent did the five donors identify and seek to amplify indigenous recovery processes?
- By what process and using which criteria have the five donors translated their policies and interpretations of the need assessments into the allocation of funding for Afghanistan?
- What were the decision-making processes within the five donors that led to the selection of particular channels and particular projects? To what extent did concerns for national profile or other domestic policy considerations influence decision-making?
- What programmes have been funded, directly as well as through the Trust Funds, and what were their objectives? For those that have been completed what were their achievements? What lessons have been learnt from the implementation of these programmes and how have these fed into subsequent programme designs?
- Was the assistance provided proportionate to the overall humanitarian and reconstruction needs of Afghanistan? Is the ATA justified in its view that there has been an overemphasis on humanitarian assistance relative to reconstruction assistance and the development of the capacity of state apparatus?
- To what extent have the five donors learnt from their experience in earlier complex emergencies and nation building interventions? How does the degree of learning differ between the five organisations and what lessons can be drawn about the most effective ways of translating lessons from previous cases into actual practice?
- To what extent have the five donors sought to incorporate lessons learned and experience gained from provision of assistance through NGOs and the UN during the decade prior to September 2001?
- How does the approach of the five donors and the assistance they have provided compare to the Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship endorsed in Stockholm in June 2003?

IDP Theme

- To what extent were the needs, priorities and rights of IDPs identified by the humanitarian and reconstruction needs assessments undertaken by the UN and multilateral development Banks? Were the underlying causes of vulnerability and displacement in Afghanistan taken into account? How has this understanding of the

vulnerability of IDPs affected provision of assistance and how appropriate is this to the context and needs of IDPs in Afghanistan?

- If IDPs are being targeted as a separate category of vulnerable people, is there any evidence that this is at the expense of other vulnerable groups, or is it proportionate to the vulnerability and needs of other vulnerable groups in Afghanistan?
- Are the programming choices of operational partners appropriate to the needs and rights of IDPs in Afghanistan? To what extent have issues of protection been addressed (directly or through advocacy)? Do programmes and projects combine an appropriate mix of material assistance and other protective activities, e.g. lobbying, advocacy, etc? Do they promote durable solutions for IDPs?

Effectiveness

To what extent has the humanitarian and reconstruction assistance provided by the five donors achieved its purpose? To what extent has it succeeded in addressing the needs, priorities and rights of IDPs in Afghanistan?

Overall Evaluation

- How clearly stated were the overall objectives and desired outcomes of the strategies and programmes for responding to the needs and priorities of Afghanistan on the part of the donors and the ATA?
- Has progress towards achieving the objectives and outcomes been carefully and consistently monitored informing subsequent modification of programming? Who was involved in monitoring and impact assessments, if any, and were appropriate indicators used?
- What has been the interplay between security and aid effectiveness given the involvement of both civilian and military actors?
- Has the humanitarian and rehabilitation assistance been provided to vulnerable people including IDPs and returnees in Afghanistan in an effective and timely manner? To what extent have the protection needs as well as the material relief needs of the population been met?
- How quickly have the pledges and commitments at Bonn and Tokyo been translated into actual disbursements and implementation on the ground? What have been the principal factors affecting the speed of aid provision and how have any delays in the provision of assistance affected the overall efforts on the international community and the ATA?
- What has been the role played by the Trust Funds in supporting the ATA? Could the effectiveness of the Trust Funds have been greater and if so how?
- To what extent have donors and operational partners taken the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief¹⁵¹ into account?

IDP Theme

- Did operational partners have access to IDPs within and outside conflict zones, and if so, how was it secured?
- To what extent have operational partners the Sphere standards¹⁵² into account in their interventions?

¹⁵¹ <http://www.ifrc.org/publicat/conduct/code.asp> (viewed 24.06.2004).

¹⁵² *The Sphere minimum standards in the sectors water, sanitation and hygiene promotion; food security; nutrition and food aid; health services; and shelter, settlement and non-food items were developed and adopted by a coalition of European and North American NGOs. <http://www.sphereproject.org/> (viewed 24.06.2004).*

Impact

What changes (positive or negative at the macro or micro-level) may be attributed to the assistance provided by the five donors and their operational partners? Were the needs of IDPs, returnees and remainees specifically addressed, what have been the outcomes and how have the indicators of material and protection needs of these groups been altered?

Main Evaluation

- What changes (positive or negative) in socio-economic, political or security conditions have occurred at the macro level since October 2001? To what extent have these resulted from externally supported and/or indigenous recovery processes?
- To what extent is it possible to identify the routes and degrees to which the assistance provided by the external assistance has influenced the changes identified? Are there instances where assistance provided by the five donors (individually or collectively) directly contributed to changes at the macro level?
- What changes (positive or negative) in socio-economic conditions and the protection of target populations occurred at the micro level in areas directly benefiting from assistance provided by the five donors? In what ways might the assistance provided have contributed to these changes?
- What has been the impact of the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in terms of their objectives and effect on other aid activities going on in the same areas? Have the approaches, composition and operating styles of different PRTs had a discernible effect on security and on the effectiveness of aid provision in their respective areas?
- To what extent has the assistance promoted human rights and gender equality?
- To what extent has the assistance supported the livelihoods of the affected/target populations?
- To what extent has the assistance resulted in improvements in the functioning of the public sector on the national as well as provincial level?
- How do the different types and channels of assistance used compare in terms of their ability to reach out and benefit the target population?
- How is external assistance and the role of the international community perceived by the Afghan people? Does the affected/target population feel that their lives have improved as a result of the assistance provided? Do such views differ by socio-economic group, sex, age, ethnicity or geographic location?
- What lessons can be drawn about maximising the impact of external assistance? What approaches and conditions are most likely to achieve an impact?

IDP Theme

- What are the implications of the choices of operational partners for channelling funds to address the needs of IDPs in Afghanistan?
- Were the needs of IDPs and returnees specifically addressed? What have been the outcomes and how have the indicators of material and protection needs of the IDPs been altered?
- What have been the effects of the provision of assistance to IDPs on relations between IDPs and other vulnerable groups? For example has it resulted in exacerbating or reducing conflicts?
- Has the assistance resulted in durable solutions for IDPs and returnees?

Efficiency

Were the financial resources and other inputs efficiently (i.e. most economically) used to achieve results?

Main Evaluation

- What has been the comparative performance of the different channels (e.g. bilateral, Trust Funds, UN, NGO, Red Cross etc.) and modes of delivery through which assistance was provided?
- How efficient have the different channels been in terms of their use of resources to achieve results? How do staff, administration and transport costs compare between the different channels? What steps might be taken to increase their efficiency of resource use?
- Where civil and military channels were used to achieve very similar objectives (e.g. rehabilitation and reconstruction projects), how did their performance and efficiency in the use of inputs compare? What conclusions can be drawn about their comparative advantage?

IDP Theme

- Where material and protection assistance was provided directly to IDPs, how does the efficiency of resource use compare between different projects? What lessons might be drawn for the provision of similar assistance in future operations?

Connectedness

To what extent has the assistance provided taken into account the specific context in Afghanistan with its longer-term and interconnected problems? To what extent have the material and protection needs of IDPs been addressed on a basis that is sustainable in the longer term?

Main Evaluation

- To what extent has the assistance provided taken into account the specific context in Afghanistan with its longer-term and interconnected problems?
- To what extent have the material and protection needs at the start of the period been addressed on a basis that is sustainable in the longer term?
- Has capacity building of local structures and organisations been part of the interventions? If so, to what extent has capacity been built?
- To what extent has external funding had positive or negative impact on the capacity of local organisations?
- To which extent has a transfer of ownership of assistance efforts to ATA effectively taken place? To the extent this has happened, what has been the impact on aid effectiveness?
- To what extent have interventions exacerbated, or reduced the likelihood of violent conflict?

IDP Theme

- Has the design of interventions by operational partners taken into account and attempted to minimise the potential negative impact on vulnerability of IDPs in Afghanistan in the longer-term?
- Have the five donors attempted to address the root causes of displacement and vulnerability? Have they sought to ensure that short, medium and long-term objectives of assistance has been geared towards creating lasting solutions for IDPs?

Coherence

Are the policies and programming of each of the five donors coherent with those of other donors and with those of the ATA, whether in relation to overall needs of Afghanistan and the specific needs of IDPs?

Main Evaluation

- To what extent has there been a shared assessment of the needs and a common strategy for Afghanistan among the international community? Where there have been differences in needs assessment and strategy, how have they influenced the effectiveness of the overall response? What steps have been taken to overcome such differences?
- To what extent have the aid, military and diplomatic instruments (including PRTs) been used coherently and effectively to address the needs of Afghanistan? To what extent have the different aid instruments been used coherently and effectively to address the needs of Afghanistan?
- What lessons can be learned about undertaking reconstruction and nation building activities in a context of poor security and ongoing operations against 'spoiler' groups such as the Taliban and al Qa'ida?
- What has been the relation between the civil and military mandates and implementation strategies in the light of the overall objectives of the international community and the ATA?
- To what extent did the five donors take into account the position of and situation in Pakistan and Iran, in particular with regard to Afghan refugees? To what extent were issues such as the scope of repatriation and the absorption capacity of Afghan society factored into overall planning of assistance?

IDP Theme

- To what extent have different aid instruments (i.e. humanitarian and development aid) been used coherently and effectively to address the needs of IDPs in Afghanistan? Have there been any gaps?
- Are operations on the ground consistent with the donors' policies on IDPs and the Guiding Principles?

Coordination

How effective has co-ordination been in Afghanistan at the macro level and at the micro-level – in general and in relation to IDPs?

Main Evaluation

- To what extent has coordination mechanisms been in place to guide the provision of assistance to Afghanistan? Have they linked all relevant stakeholders – i.e. the ATA, donors, UN agencies, Multilateral Development Banks and NGOs – in a balanced manner? What was the role and functioning of UNAMA in this regard? What were the principal gaps or weak points in the various mechanisms?
- To what extent were operational partners encouraged to engage with co-ordination mechanisms and processes? Was there an appropriate level of coordination between operational agencies at the Provincial and project level? How might any problems have been overcome?
- To what extent have weaknesses in donor coordination contributed to atomistic behaviour of implementing partners?
- To what extent the rapid increase in and turn-over of staff in already established organisations as well as the arrival of a large number of new aid organisations has impacted on coordination efforts and through that on provision of assistance in general.

- What has been the impact of PRTs on coordination arrangements in those Provinces where they have been deployed? How does this compare to coordination arrangements in other Provinces? In those Provinces where they were deployed, how effective was the coordination between the PRTs, the Provincial authorities and aid agencies in the area?

IDP Theme

- How have donor agencies engaged with mechanisms and processes to achieved coordinated response to the material and protection needs of IDPs?

4. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation of assistance provided by the five bilateral donor organisations coupled with a special focus upon their response to the needs of IDPs will cover a broad range of activities and operational partners. It will be necessary to select a sample of programmes and partners to assess for the main evaluation and for the special focus on IDPs.

Main Evaluation

The sample frame will include all humanitarian and reconstruction activities (sectors, programmes, Trust Funds, coordination mechanisms etc.) that have received support from the five donors. The following objectives and criteria will guide the process of selecting the actual sample of projects and programmes from within the sample frame:

- The mix of activities should be representative of the overall pattern of activities and sectors funded by the five donors. This will require the inclusion of projects and programmes from all relevant sectors of the Afghan National Development Framework (NDF). The NDF is based on the following sectoral structure: Refugee & IDP Return, Education & Vocational Training, Health & Nutrition, Livelihoods & Social Protection, Culture, Media & Sport, Transport, Energy, Mining & Telecoms, Natural Resources, Urban Management, Trade & Investment, Public Administration, Justice, National Police & Law Enforcement, Afghan National Army, Mine Action, as well as Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration. The mix of channels and partners will be representative of the overall pattern of channels and partners funded by the five donors.
- The mix of projects and programmes to be examined in detail will be as representative as possible of the overall geographical spread of activities funded by the five donors in the light of the prevailing security situation and restrictions on travel by the Evaluation.

Special Focus on IDPs

Due to the difficulty of knowing the extent to which IDPs were included as targets of certain interventions, it will be necessary to compile an inventory of programmes and projects supported by the five donors. This will serve as a basis for more accurately identifying those that did in fact specify IDPs within their target groups. The inventory will be compiled during the first phase of the evaluation by way of the construction of an activity portfolio for each donor and interviews/correspondence with key informants at their headquarters and country level offices.

Activities to be covered by detailed field analysis in Afghanistan in relation to both the main evaluation and the special focus on IDPs will be selected to represent a cross-section of the various types of interventions financed. Furthermore, they will have to be representative in terms of covering programmes and/or projects carried out by or channelled through UN-agencies and non-governmental organisations. In view of the

expected difficulties in gaining access to many parts of Afghanistan, activities located in two or three geographical areas will be selected. When choosing the sample, previous evaluations of specific programmes and projects should be taken into account as well. In sum, the selection of activities will not be statistically representative, but will be carried out in a way as to provide a sufficiently illustrative sample of the humanitarian and reconstruction activities funded by the five donors and a sufficiently illustrative sample of those involving IDPs.

5. Approach and Methodology

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the Danida “Evaluation Guidelines” (February 1999), “Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies” (OECD/DAC 1999) and the ‘Framework for a Common Approach to Evaluating Assistance to IDPs: Protecting Lives and Reducing Human Suffering’ (Danida, 2003). “Evaluating Humanitarian Action” (ALNAP, 2003) and “The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship” will provide normative reference frames for the evaluation.

Pre-Studies

To facilitate the evaluation, two preparatory studies will be undertaken whilst the tendering process for the main evaluation is underway: an Analysis of Aid Flows to Afghanistan and a Preliminary Study on IDP Assistance. In addition, a Public Expenditure Review by DCI will feed into the evaluation. The two preparatory studies will be separately contracted using a shortlist of candidates to be drawn up by Danida. The three pieces of work will be timed to ensure that they are completed before the main evaluation commences and all material collected through the two preparatory studies will be made available to the main evaluation team. To help ensure that the results of the studies are effectively transferred to the main evaluation team, time will be provided for those involved in preparing the studies to brief the main evaluation team.

Background Paper 1: An Analysis of Aid Flows to Afghanistan

This study will focus on the five bilateral donor organisations participating in the evaluation whilst seeking to locate their contributions in the overall flows of aid to Afghanistan. It will track the pledges, approvals, disbursement¹⁵³, implementation and reporting chain for all of the assistance provided after January 2001. It will identify the key individuals involved at each point and their current co-ordinates (including those that have since been re-deployed or left the organisation). It will attempt to analyse the performance of the donors in approving and disbursing funds to Afghanistan. This will involve comparison of the actual timing of the process with:

- a) Any timetables set out and agreed upon at the pledging conferences;
- b) Any statements made by the donors at the time the pledge was announced or the funding approved;
- c) The average elapsed time taken by other donors to approve and disburse comparable funds;
- d) The individual donors’ own original and possibly revised timetable.

Factors serving to accelerate or delay the process will be noted.

¹⁵³ “Disbursement” may be a rather unclear indicator. If funds are disbursed to ARTF there is no guarantee that they have been used within the intended time frame. The study should look at this aspect and suggest a valid approach for the main evaluation.

Furthermore, the paper will identify the geographic location and sector of programmes and projects undertaken by the Government, UN, NGOs and other operational partners funded by the five donors. All programmes and projects will be identified to the extent possible. The location will be identified as specifically as possible to the district level (in accordance with the list of district maintained by Afghanistan Information Management Service in Kabul). This information will assist the Evaluation identify and select the sample of programmes and projects to be visited.

This study will make use of the Donor Assistance Database maintained by the Development Budget and External Relations Unit within the Ministry of Finance in Kabul. It will therefore be necessary to assess the strengths and weaknesses of this database in terms of the quality of the data and the robustness of any analysis made of the data. A visit to Kabul by the person preparing Study 1 would be desirable.

The ToR for the analysis of aid flows is available as a separate document.¹⁵⁴

Background Paper 2: Public Expenditure Review by Development Cooperation Ireland (DCI)

This review has already been completed and includes a desk study of funding to all DCI partners in Afghanistan as well as findings from field visits to a limited number of partners. While the current donor joint evaluation has a larger scope than the review, the latter, however, is very relevant as it addresses the following in relation to the Irish assistance to Afghanistan: Relevance, effectiveness, cost efficiency, sustainability, key cross-cutting issues, management issues, performance indicators and lessons learnt. The review will be available in June 2004.

Background Paper 3: Preliminary Study of IDP Assistance

The Preliminary Study on IDP Assistance is intended to:

1. Prepare a case study on assistance to IDPs in Afghanistan as part of the wider IDP Framework Process that will be available for inclusion in the Synthesis Study to be prepared as the final stage of the IDP Framework Process.
2. Provide an overview of IDP assistance issues in Afghanistan and make a preliminary assessment of the approach and provision of assistance by the five bilateral donor organisations and their partners to addressing the material and protection needs of IDPs in Afghanistan.

It is envisaged that two researchers will undertake the Preliminary Study during the period July to September 2004. The work will involve a documentation review phase followed by interviews with key informants selected from within the five donors, their partner organisations and other organisations specialising in IDP issues. This will involve travel to the head offices of the donor countries, to Afghanistan and to selected organisations based in other locations. The Preliminary Study may undertake limited field visits to projects and programmes funded by the five bilateral donor organisations in Afghanistan if security allows.

The ToR for the Preliminary Study is available as a separate document.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ *Terms of Reference for An analysis of aid flows to Afghanistan, dated 24 June 2004*

¹⁵⁵ *Terms of Reference for a Preliminary Study of Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons in Afghanistan, dated 24 June 2004.*

Main Evaluation Phases 1-5

Phase 1 – Desk Study: Review of documentation and visits to Donor and Aid Agencies in Denmark, Netherlands, Ireland, Sweden and the UK

The Evaluation will review relevant documentation. A member of the Evaluation will visit the head office of each donor participating in the evaluation to undertake preliminary interviews and collect and review documentation. Evaluators should be allowed full access to relevant files. In the case of DCI the evaluators will meet with those involved in the Public Expenditure Review to be completed in May 2004. A member of the Evaluation will also visit the head offices of NGOs working in Afghanistan and receiving support from the donor. These visits coupled with the contact information generated by Pre-Study 1 will help identify key individuals to be interviewed and their current location.

Phase 2 – Visits to Head Offices of Key Operational Partners, interviews with key informants and elaboration of field study

Visits will be made to the offices of OCHA, UNHCR, UNDP, World Bank, ECHO, the Global IDP Project and other key informants/specialists on either Afghanistan or IDPs located in Geneva, New York/Washington, London, Paris and Brussels. Face to face or telephone interviews will also be undertaken with key informants on the principle programmes to be evaluated. The plan for the field study will be submitted to the five donors for comment by their staff.

Phase 3 – Field Study in Afghanistan

Field studies will be conducted in Afghanistan. The Danish NGO DACAAR will provide various practical support services during the field study as detailed below. Additional support will be provided by the Danish representation office and the Netherlands embassy in Kabul. Where applicable, fieldwork in Afghanistan may also be supported by the staff of agencies supported by the five donors. Time will be allowed for full interaction with the Afghan Research and Evaluation Unit in Kabul, which is a principle source of research studies on aid provision to Afghanistan. A workshop will be held for organisations funded by the five donors. The team will provide feedback on the preliminary findings of their analysis before leaving Kabul.

Phase 4 – Analysis and Production of Report

Following analysis of the findings resulting from the desk study, interviews and fieldwork, the Evaluation will produce a draft report. This report should be presented in English and be no longer than 40,000 words (approximate 80 pages), plus appendices. The Evaluation will respond to comments received on the draft report and a final report will be completed in MS Word and Acrobat (pdf) versions.

Phase 5 – Dissemination of findings

Three dissemination workshops are to be held as follows:

- A first workshop is to be held in Kabul upon completion of the field mission (expected in April 2005) with participation of key stakeholders, including the ATA, the UN, international financial institutions, NGOs, and the local offices of involved donors. The purpose is to discuss key findings of the Evaluation.

Another two workshops are to be held in Copenhagen once the final report has been completed.

- One is include representatives from the headquarters of involved donors and implementing partners as well as other authorities, networks, scholars with an engagement in respect of Afghanistan.
- The other workshop is to focus specifically on the findings related to IDPs and as such it is to gather representatives of all agencies involved in the IDP Framework process.

The structure of the report should be as follows:

- An executive summary with main findings and issues for consideration, max 6 pages;
- The main body of text should include the methodology and analytical approach used by the Evaluation, a description of the context of the Afghanistan since January 2001, a description of humanitarian and reconstruction interventions covered by the evaluation, coverage of the evaluation questions and issues to be addressed, and analysis and conclusions;
- Appendices, including the terms of reference for the evaluation, sample framework, overview of the humanitarian and reconstruction activities carried out in Afghanistan, statistics, references and bibliography.

6. Consultant input

The Consultant shall provide an evaluation team consisting of:

1. A team leader for 10 person months;
2. A team of evaluators (4-6) for a total of 16 person months;
3. Support staff as required up to 15 person months.

The organization of the team's work is the responsibility of the Consultants and should be specified and explained clearly in the proposal.

The team leader should be a permanent employee with the lead company of the Consultant and should have extensive experience from project management, preferably in the field of post-conflict rehabilitation and reconstruction. Furthermore, experience in conducting evaluations of aid provision (reconstruction and development as well as humanitarian) in the context of complex crises is required. In addition, the team leader should also possess knowledge about donor systems (including grants mechanisms and donor priorities etc.) and preferable have experience from assignments in Afghanistan. Fluency in English, orally as well as in writing, is required.

The team of evaluators (four to six as found appropriate by the Consultant) should have experience from conducting evaluations and should include personnel with professional background and extensive experience in:

- Humanitarian and reconstruction actions, preferably with IDPs,
- Evaluation of humanitarian, reconstruction and nation building activities,
- The work of national and international humanitarian and reconstruction agencies,
- Gender expertise,
- PRA/RAP techniques.

The Team of evaluators should furthermore cover experience from at least the following sectors:

- Food;
- Health;
- Education;

- Livelihoods;
- Water & sanitation;
- Shelter/housing;
- Multi-sector;
- Protection/human rights/rule of law;

Previous experience from Afghanistan is preferable. Fluency in English, orally as well as in writing, is required for all team members.

While the Consultant will have significant latitude in the design and organisation of the work, it is estimated that Phases 1 and 2 will require 6-8 person-months' work, Phase 3 10-12 person months' work, and analysis and reporting 6-8 person-months' work of the professional key staff. In addition support staff will be available within a total of maximum 15 person months.

The Consultant shall also provide the required home office support and quality assurance, including audits. Person months and cost for such services should be included in the consultant's overhead.

A native English-speaking copy editor shall prepare the final draft report as well as the final report. The expenses for the editor will be covered as a reimbursable cost.

The consultant will be fully responsible for the conduct and content of the evaluation and shall follow the Evaluation Guidelines by Danida. The evaluators shall also be fully responsible for the ensuring quality assurance (QA) of the Evaluation and shall in the inception phase set up appropriate QA mechanisms to be documented in the inception report. Quality control (QC) is the responsibility of the Evaluation Department.

7. Overall management and support

General supervision and management of the evaluation process will be carried out by the Evaluation Department of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs with the support of an external consultant. This may include oversight during field visits.

Furthermore, a Reference Group consisting of representatives from each of the participating donors will monitor the evaluation process, provide general guidance and support as appropriate, and comment on the draft versions of the team's reports.

The team of evaluators will have access to documentation and support as follows:

- a. The donors involved in the evaluation will be required to submit the following material (in both hard copy and electronic format) to the Evaluation Department of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs before the Evaluation commences its work:
 - Information on supported humanitarian and reconstruction activities in Afghanistan since 2000 including general information on these activities (objectives, organisations involved, financial data, progress reports and where relevant programme and project reviews);
 - Key documents on the donor's response to the humanitarian and reconstruction needs in Afghanistan in general, and – wherever possible – on the situation of IDPs in particular;
 - Contact details of key agency personnel both in headquarters, regional offices and at field level.

- b. The draft reports covering the Preliminary study of assistance to internally displaced persons in Afghanistan, Analysis of aid flows to Afghanistan, and the DCI Public Expenditure Review will be available to the team from the outset. This will be followed up by briefings, conducted by the team leaders responsible for the three studies.
- c. The participating donors will make all other relevant documentation available to the team of evaluators in a timely manner. To facilitate this, however, requests for documentation and meetings should preferably be submitted well in advance and in sufficient detail.
- d. Prior to Phase 1 being initiated, the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs will seek to inform the offices of relevant UN organisations, multilateral finance institutions and NGOs in Europe and the United States about the evaluation.
- e. Similarly, the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs will seek to ensure that key interlocutors in Afghanistan, including relevant embassies and donor offices as well as UN organisations and multilateral finance institutions are informed about the evaluation well in advance of Phase 3.
- f. During the field mission, the Danish NGO DACAAR will provide practical support services. The services will include the following (with approximate costs provided in brackets to facilitate budgeting):
 - Provision of vehicles with drivers (either DACAARs or rented, at USD 35 per day per vehicle);
 - Arranging the services of interpreters and other assistants, e.g. to arrange meetings etc. (USD 75 per day in Kabul, USD 85 per day outside the city);
 - Booking of hotel (approximately USD 75 per night, including breakfast, dinner and laundry);
 - Provision of limited office space, access to photocopying, booking of internal flights, and other similar practical arrangements;
 - Accommodation at DACAAR field offices or camps during field trips (USD 10 per person per night, including dinner and breakfast). It is expected that similar arrangements can be made with other NGOs outside DACAARs area of operation, if required.

DACAAR will charge an overhead fee amounting to USD 10 per day for the above services. All costs are based on the going rates as of August 2004 and therefore subject to change. DACAAR assistance (including provision of transport and accommodation in field camps) during field trips will be subject to security being satisfactory. The decision in this regard is made by the DACAAR Director.

8. Proposal

Consulting firms and institutions with considerable experience and expertise in the evaluation of humanitarian activities will be invited to tender for the evaluation, following Danida's Guidelines for Tendering and Award of Larger Contracts. Applications for the pre-qualifications will be open to all consultants and organisations irrespective of country of origin.

The proposal to undertake this evaluation should be responsive to the Terms of reference outlined above. It should also reflect awareness of and sensitivity to the complexities of the provision of humanitarian and reconstruction assistance in the context of Afghanistan.

The proposal should indicate clearly the methodological approach(es) to be used, along with the rationale for the overall evaluation strategy. It should also indicate clearly the evaluators strategy for involving the donors involved in the evaluation, the agencies implementing the humanitarian activities, Afghan institutions and beneficiaries in the evaluation.

9. Projected Timetable

It is anticipated that the evaluation will be initiated in December 2004 and completed by September 2005, as indicated below. Evaluators may include a revised timetable in their proposals, accompanied by a rationale for the modification of the proposed schedule.

Approximate Timetable

1) Circulation of invitations to pre-qualification	June 2004
2) Public Expenditure Review of DCI	
3) Pre-studies 1 and 2	July-September 2004
4) Invitation to tender dispatched	September 7, 2004
5) Draft pre-study reports available	September 20, 2004
6) Submission of tenders	October, 18, 2004
7) Meeting with and briefing of first ranked Tenderer	Late November/early December
8) Contract awarded	December 2004
9) Phase 1: Desk study and visits to donor and aid agencies in Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, United Kingdom and Ireland	January 2005
10) Phase 2: Visits to Head Offices of key operational partners; key informant interviews outside Afghanistan; submission of inception report, including plan for field study.	February 2005
11) Phase 3: Field study, concluded with a dissemination workshop with participation of key stakeholders, discussing key findings	March-April 2005
12) Phase 4: Analysis and report writing	April-May 2005
13) Submission of draft final report	June 2005
14) Submission of Final report	August 2005
15) Arrangement of two dissemination workshops in Copenhagen	September 2005

10. Other Conditions

The Consultant to conduct this evaluation shall provide proof that none of the proposed team members have any current or any previous assignment in relation to implementation of any projects and programmes on Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance to Afghanistan since 2001 funded by the five donors, incompatible with the requirements of full independence for this evaluation or any other relation that would create a conflict of interest.