

Manual for the evaluation of humanitarian aid



Table of contents

Foreword	3
Introduction	5

PART I - ECHO'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND WORKING PRACTICE

1.	<i>The creation and development of ECHO</i>	
1.1.	ECHO's origins	9
1.2.	The Madrid Declaration	10
1.3.	The Humanitarian Aid Regulation	11
1.4.	Linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD)	12
1.5.	Security of relief workers	13
1.6.	Gender issues	13
2.	<i>ECHO's working practice</i>	
2.1.	Organisation	15
2.2.	ECHO's financial resources	15
2.3.	ECHO's partners	16
2.4.	Global plans and single operations	16
2.5.	The Humanitarian Aid Committee (HAC)	17
	IN SHORT	18

PART II - ECHO'S EVALUATION METHODS

3.	<i>Regulatory and theoretical basis</i>	
3.1.	Regulatory basis	19
3.2.	Definition, principles and objectives of evaluation	20

3.3.	Varieties of evaluation	21
3.4.	The evaluator	22
3.5.	The terms of reference (TOR)	23
4.	<i>Conducting evaluations</i>	
4.1.	ECHO's Evaluation Unit	25
4.2.	Programming	25
4.3.	Working methods	26
4.4.	Guiding the evaluation	27
4.5.	The evaluation report	29
4.6.	Dissemination of results and follow-up	29
	IN SHORT	31

PART III - METHODOLOGICAL TOOLS

5.	<i>Standard terms of reference for the evaluation of a humanitarian aid operation</i>	33
6.	<i>Standard terms of reference for the evaluation of a global plan</i>	41
7.	<i>Evaluation questionnaire</i>	49

PART IV - ANNEXES

8.	<i>Glossary</i>	59
9.	<i>Council Regulation (EC) N° 1257/96 of 20 June 1996 concerning humanitarian aid</i>	63
10.	<i>The Madrid Declaration</i>	77

*« Un homme qui a commis une erreur
et ne la corrige pas
commet une autre erreur. »*

Confucius

*« The important thing is to
not stop questioning. »*

A. Einstein

Foreword

In 1996, ECHO produced its first evaluation manual to provide the methodological basis for its own evaluation process. The manual was widely distributed in the humanitarian world, including the Member States of the European Union and ECHO's partners. It gave rise to debate and exchanges of information and ideas.

As a major donor, ECHO has always wanted to promote the development of the humanitarian aid evaluation culture. This desire has highlighted the interest of ECHO's partners in this constantly evolving field, as well as the need to incorporate the evaluation of results and the associated debate into the partnership itself.

ECHO hopes all users will find this new version of the manual for the evaluation of humanitarian aid to be of value to them in their work.

ECHO
Evaluation Unit
1999

Introduction

- > This manual is a revised version of the manual published in 1996. It takes account of the following considerations:
 - the experience ECHO has accumulated in the area of evaluation,
 - the Council Regulation on humanitarian aid,¹
 - the Commission Communication on linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD),²
 - the Commission Communication on integrating gender issues in development cooperation³ and the Council Regulation on integrating gender issues in development cooperation,⁴
 - the Commission working document on security of relief workers and humanitarian space,⁵
 - the Commission Communications on evaluation,⁶
 - the guide on "Evaluating EU expenditure programmes".⁷

- > This manual is aimed at those working in the field of humanitarian aid: ECHO staff, ECHO's partners, the Member States and anyone interested in the evaluation of such aid.

- > Because there are so many works of theory on this matter, this manual concentrates on practice.

- > It is structured as follows:
 - Part I describes ECHO's historical background. It also provides a brief description of the way in which ECHO operates.

- Part II describes ECHO's own evaluation practice, and the regulations and theory which underlie it. It also describes ECHO's evaluation methods.
 - Part III contains three evaluation aids: the standard terms of reference for evaluating a humanitarian aid operation, the standard terms of reference for evaluating a global plan for humanitarian aid and an evaluation questionnaire.
 - Part IV contains Council Regulation n°1257/96 of 20 June 1996 on humanitarian aid, the Madrid Declaration of 14 December 1995 and a glossary of evaluation terms commonly used by ECHO.
-

- ¹ Council Regulation (EC) No 1257/96 of 20 June 1996 concerning humanitarian aid, OJ L 163, 2.7.1996.
- ² Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD), COM (96) 153 final/2, 13.11.1996.
- ³ Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on integrating gender issues in development cooperation, COM (95) 423 final, 18.9.1995.
- ⁴ Council Regulation (EC) No 2836/98 of 22 December 1998 on integrating gender issues in development cooperation, OJ L 354, 30.12.1998.
- ⁵ Commission working document on security of relief workers and humanitarian space, SEC (98) 797 final, 14.5.1998.
- ⁶ Evaluation. Concrete steps towards best practice across the Commission, SEC 96/659, 8.5.1996; Good practice guidelines for the management of the evaluation function. SEC (99) 62, 14.1.1999.
- ⁷ Evaluating EU expenditure programmes : a guide. Ex post and intermediate evaluation. First edition, January 1997. European Commission XIX/02

Part I »

ECHO's historical background and working practice

*ECHO's historical background
and working practice*

1 > The creation and development of ECHO

1.1. ECHO's origins

- > The big crises of the nineties (in Iraq, Bangladesh, Africa, the former Soviet Union, Albania, former Yugoslavia) required donors and relief organisations to put in an unprecedented and sustained effort. The European Commission played an important role in this concerted effort, and sought to learn from the experience it gained and from the problems it encountered.

- > Many of the problems that arose were caused by the Commission's structures and resources being ill suited to new requirements. In a bid to solve this problem, the Commission set up a dedicated department to manage all aspects of its emergency humanitarian aid from 1 March 1992. The department was called the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO), and was made responsible for "managing humanitarian aid for the benefit of the populations of non-Community countries affected by natural disasters or exceptional events requiring a rapid reaction and/or accelerated procedures".

- > The creation of ECHO was intended:
 - to bring under one administrative umbrella (and thus have uniform management of) the expertise needed to cope with emergencies and to put the appropriate procedures in place;
 - to expand the Community's presence in the field by building the capability to intervene at various stages: identifying needs, mobilising intervention teams and equipment, monitoring and verification and ex-post evaluation;

- to improve coordination with the Member States, other donors, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and specialised international agencies by encouraging combined operations and the signing of framework contracts;
 - to achieve easier mobilisation of the resources needed in large-scale crises.
- > By setting up ECHO, the Commission was also seeking to increase the European Union's visibility by making the public in the EU and other parts of the world better informed about EU humanitarian aid activities.
- > ECHO's responsibilities cover :
- emergency humanitarian aid for the inhabitants of non-Community countries;
 - emergency food aid for the inhabitants of non-Community countries;
 - mobilisation of relief and intervention teams;
 - disaster prevention and disaster preparedness;
 - coordination, information, financial matters and legal matters.

1.2. The Madrid Declaration

- > At the humanitarian aid summit held on 14 December 1995, representatives of the European Union, the government of the United States, the United Nations Organisation, the Red Cross and European and American NGOs adopted the Madrid Declaration, a statement of principles and options for humanitarian aid activities.

- > The Declaration sets out the signatories' priorities for humanitarian emergencies and appeals to the international community to use determination to find a solution to situations of crisis while remaining within the principle of impartiality in humanitarian aid. Humanitarian aid should never be a substitute for political action.
- > The summit reaffirmed a commitment to providing relief for the victims of natural or man-made disasters wherever possible, and to providing food and shelter, medical treatment and assistance with reuniting separated families.
- > The full Madrid Declaration can be found in Chapter 10 of Part IV of this manual.
- > ECHO seeks to make the priorities and principles set out in the Madrid Declaration part of its interventions. Respect for the priorities and principles of the Declaration should be verified during evaluations.

1.3. The Humanitarian Aid Regulation

- > On 20 June 1996 the Council of the European Union adopted Regulation (EC) No 1257/96 concerning humanitarian aid.
- > The Regulation entered into force on 5 July 1996 and provides the legal basis for most of ECHO's humanitarian aid interventions.

- > It sets out objectives and guidelines for humanitarian aid, plus implementation methods and procedures.
- > The full Regulation can be found in Chapter 9 of Part IV of this manual.

1.4. Linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD)

- > The Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD) stipulates that: "humanitarian aid will seek where possible to bear in mind and remain compatible with longer-term developmental objectives". Humanitarian aid must build on local capacities, reinforcing coping mechanisms and institutions. It is a basic philosophy that every possible step must be taken to prevent the beneficiaries of humanitarian aid from becoming dependent on it, and that self-sufficiency should be the goal.
- > Council Regulation (EC) No 1257/96 of 20 June 1996 concerning humanitarian aid takes account of these aspects, stating: "humanitarian assistance may be a prerequisite for development or reconstruction work and must therefore cover the full duration of a crisis and its aftermath; in this context it may include an element of short-term rehabilitation aimed at facilitating the arrival of relief, preventing any worsening in the impact of the crisis and starting to help those affected regain a minimum level of self-sufficiency. "

1.5. Security of relief workers

- > On 14 May 1998, the Commission (ECHO) put forward a working document on security of relief workers and humanitarian space. It is a first attempt to tackle this issue, and provides an analysis and recommendations.
- > The security of relief workers is an area which still needs to be worked on. However, this issue should already be covered by all evaluations.

1.6. Gender issues

- > In the wake of the conclusions of the World Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, 1994) and the fourth UN World Conference on Women (Beijing, 1995), the departments of the European Commission decided to integrate gender issues into all their programmes and activities.
- > In its Communication on integrating gender issues into development cooperation, the Commission stressed the need to tackle the obstacles to gender equality and ensure that all policies and programmes worked towards this goal.
- > Council Regulation (EC) No 2836/98 of 22 December 1998 on integrating gender issues in development cooperation is in line with this aim of integrating the gender dimension into policy.
- > This is another field which ECHO must consider in its activities and which must be covered by evaluations of humanitarian aid.

2 > ECHO's working practice

2.1. Organisation

- > ECHO is a specialised Commission department reporting directly to the member of the Commission responsible for Development and Humanitarian Aid.
- > ECHO has operational responsibilities such as the management and monitoring of humanitarian interventions, and horizontal responsibilities such as strategy, evaluation, financial matters, information, relations with NGOs and operational coordination.
- > ECHO has its headquarters in Brussels.
- > Besides, ECHO has correspondents working in virtually all the countries that are beneficiaries of humanitarian aid. They provide coordination between headquarters, the partners and local authorities, and supervise ECHO-funded humanitarian aid interventions in the field.

2.2. ECHO's financial resources

- > ECHO is one of the world's biggest humanitarian aid donors.
 - Most humanitarian interventions use funds from the general budget of the European Communities. Operations for African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries can also be funded under the "emergency assistance for ACP States" heading of the financial protocol of the fourth Lomé Convention – EDF (art. 254).

2.3. ECHO's partners

- > ECHO entrusts the implementation of humanitarian aid to its partners:
 - United Nations specialised agencies: Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (HCR), World Food Programme (WFP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA);
 - Non-governmental organisations (NGOs);
 - Organisations in the Red Cross and Red Crescent family: the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies.

- > Relations between ECHO and its partners are regulated by the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA). To date, over 150 organisations have signed such a framework agreement.

2.4. Global plans and single operations

- > ECHO uses global plans in most of its humanitarian aid interventions. Article 15 of Council Regulation 1257/96 concerning humanitarian aid sets out the objectives of the global plans: they are "intended to provide a coherent framework for action in a given country or region where the scale and complexity of the humanitarian crisis is such that it seems likely to continue". The global plans usually contain a series of operations entrusted to different partners.

- > In those situations where it doesn't seem necessary to draw up a global plan, it remains possible to finance single operations in response to specific needs.

2.5. The Humanitarian Aid Committee (HAC)

- > Article 17 of Council Regulation 1257/96 sets out the composition, remit and operating procedure of the Humanitarian Aid Committee (HAC).
- > The Committee is headed by a representative of the Commission and is composed of representatives of the Member States; it delivers its opinion on the measures ECHO proposes to take.
- > Once a year, the Committee receives from ECHO general guidelines for the humanitarian interventions to be undertaken in the year ahead.
- > General matters to do with humanitarian aid are referred to the Committee and discussed with the Member States.
- > The Committee is also notified of ECHO's intentions regarding the evaluation of humanitarian interventions.

IN SHORT

- > ECHO, the European Community Humanitarian Office, is one of the world's largest donors of humanitarian aid.
- > The European Community's humanitarian aid mandate is set out in Council Regulation (EC) 1257/96 of 20 June 1996.
- > ECHO works in partnership with NGOs, organisations in the Red Cross family and UN agencies; its relations with them are governed by the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA).
- > ECHO relies on global plans as its main means of programming.
- > The Humanitarian Aid Committee (HAC), which is composed of representatives of the Member States, delivers its opinion on the measures ECHO proposes to take.

Part II »

ECHO's evaluation methods

3 > Regulatory and theoretical basis

3.1. Regulatory basis

- > Evaluation is dealt with in Articles 4, 18 and 19 of Regulation n°1257/96 concerning humanitarian aid.
 - Article 4 states that one of the possible uses of Community aid is “preparatory and feasibility studies for humanitarian operations and the assessment of humanitarian projects and plans”.
 - Article 18 stipulates: “The Commission shall regularly assess humanitarian aid operations financed by the Community in order to establish whether they have achieved their objectives and to produce guidelines for improving the effectiveness of subsequent operations”, and “The Commission shall submit to the Committee a summary [...] of the assessment exercises carried out that it might, if necessary, examine. The assessment reports shall be available to the Member States on request”. It adds: “At the Member States’ request, and with their participation, the Commission may also assess the results of the Community’s humanitarian operations and plans”.
 - Article 19 states that the Commission’s annual report to the European Parliament and the Council “shall also include a review of any outside assessment exercises which may have been conducted on specific operations”.

3.2. Definition, principles and objectives of evaluation

- > The most appropriate way of summarising ECHO's view of evaluation is to say that an evaluation is an independent and objective survey of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and viability of a humanitarian intervention, in order to learn lessons from experience.

- > ECHO's main aims of evaluation are:
 - to improve the management of the interventions to achieve optimum use of funds and other resources;
 - to learn from experience in order to improve the results of humanitarian aid interventions;
 - to respond to the requirement for reporting and improve transparency.

- > ECHO uses the following key criteria for its evaluations:
 - **Relevance**: assessment of the objectives of an intervention, particularly regarding their justification in the light of problems and needs.
 - **Effectiveness**: the degree to which the objectives of the intervention are fulfilled.
 - **Efficiency**: a measure of how well the resources are used to produce achievements and results.
 - **Impact**: effects attributable to an intervention.
 - **Viability**: the degree to which the desired effects of an intervention last beyond its end.

- > Evaluation is intended to make it possible to learn from the experience of past interventions. Rather than being primarily a means of checking implementation, it should be an aid to decision making. It is an integral part of that process.

- > An evaluation is not :
 - a scientific study: **scientific studies** are the result of research which probes the extent of knowledge. It usually covers a very specific subject area.
 - an audit: **audits** are intended primarily to check that programme resources have been used according to the rules. Audits traditionally involve examination of accounts.
 - monitoring: **monitoring in the field** is a continuous process coinciding with the implementation of the programme and is intended to correct any deviation from the operational objectives. Monitoring will often yield information which can be used during evaluations.

3.3. Varieties of evaluation

ECHO focuses on the following varieties of evaluation :

- **Ex-ante evaluation**: an analysis of a situation which describes and quantifies problems in a particular area, sets out objectives and looks at the appropriateness of proposed measures and ways of translating them into action. This type of evaluation should propose indicators that can be used to gauge the success of an intervention. It is performed in the field by a partner, by ECHO's operational staff or by outside consultants with a mandate from ECHO's operational departments.

- **Intermediate evaluation**: an analysis of an intervention performed while it is being implemented. It focuses on the relevance of its operational objectives relative to its overall objectives, and on matters relating to implementation and management. It describes what the intervention has achieved and what its initial effects have been, using information available. This type of evaluation is carried out by outside evaluators recruited by ECHO.
- **Ex-post evaluation**: an evaluation carried out after an intervention has ended. It is designed to assess the intervention's results and consequences, and to see if any lessons should be learned. It too is carried out by outside evaluators recruited by ECHO.

3.4. The evaluator

- > The quality of an evaluation rides on the professional capabilities of the evaluator performing it. The choice of evaluator is a vital matter.
- > The following factors are considered:
 - operational experience of humanitarian aid;
 - expertise and experience in the evaluation of humanitarian aid;
 - independence from the parties involved;
 - ability to work in high-risk areas;
 - ability to work to tight deadlines.
- > The quality and credibility of the evaluation would be preserved by someone with these qualifications, coupled with common sense, impartiality and integrity.

- > ECHO's intermediate and ex-post evaluations are carried out by independent outside consultants.

3.5. The terms of reference (TOR)

- > 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 and the evaluator to have a clear idea of what is expected of him. Well-defined terms of reference are vital.
- > They should include the following :
 - the grounds for the evaluation ;
 - the future uses and users of the evaluation ;
 - a description of the intervention to be evaluated ;
 - the scope of the evaluation ;
 - the main issues to be covered by the evaluation ;
 - the methods to be used to gather and analyse information ;
 - the plan, structure and budget of the evaluation ;
 - selection criteria for outside evaluators ;
 - the proposed structure for the final evaluation report.
- > Chapters 5 and 6 in Part III of this manual contain standard terms of reference for the evaluation of a humanitarian aid operation and for the evaluation of a global plan.

4 > Conducting evaluations

4.1. ECHO's Evaluation Unit

- > ECHO has a unit specifically dedicated to evaluation. It has independent status within the organisational structure. The Evaluation Unit works in close collaboration with ECHO's operational units.

- > The Evaluation Unit's main functions are:
 - programming, preparation and organisation of evaluations;
 - enforcing, adapting and developing evaluation methods;
 - maintaining and updating a database containing information on consultants and firms specialising in the evaluation of humanitarian aid;
 - analysing and disseminating the results of evaluations; monitoring to ensure that these results are reflected in ECHO's interventions.

- > The Evaluation Unit performs intermediate and ex-post evaluations.

4.2. Programming

- > Evaluations carried out by ECHO generally target global plans. However, evaluation may also focus on single operations or on operations which are part of a global plan. Evaluations may also be confined to a specific field or sector.

- > Once a year, ECHO's Evaluation Unit draws up an evaluation programme for the year ahead. It may be added to as the year progresses.

- > The decision to carry out an evaluation may be provoked by one of the following considerations (non-exhaustive list):
 - any problem arising during implementation;
 - the need to take stock of a problem connected with humanitarian aid (e.g. gender issues, security of relief workers);
 - the need to analyse the operation of ECHO instruments like the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA).

4.3. Working methods

- > ECHO has conceived and evolved its own method of evaluating its interventions (operations and global plans). The method is dictated by ECHO's needs and working practices. Its main hallmark is flexibility. Evaluations can be performed on all varieties of ECHO-funded humanitarian aid, including disaster prevention and preparedness operations.
- > ECHO's evaluation method is based on the key criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and viability.
- > These key criteria have been incorporated into two sets of standard terms of reference. One set applies to operations, and the other to global plans. The standard models can be found in Part III of this manual. They are tailored to each evaluation.
- > Besides, a detailed questionnaire, structured in accordance with the standard terms of reference, has been developed. This questionnaire can also be found in Part III of this manual. Its purpose is to assist the evaluators. It is only a guide and is to be considered open-ended.

- > The terms of reference set out the methods that the evaluator must use to comply with them. These will usually include examination of documents, observation of effects in the field and interviews with individuals involved in the interventions.

4.4. Guiding the evaluation

ECHO's Evaluation Unit is responsible for guiding the course of the evaluation:

- The Evaluation Unit draws up the **terms of reference**. Standard terms of reference are tailored to each evaluation.
- The **choice of consultants** is made in the light of the specific characteristics of each evaluation, including the location of the interventions, familiarity with the sectors to be evaluated and particular linguistic knowledge.
- The Evaluation Unit is responsible for **providing the parties involved with information** on the implementation of the evaluation exercise. To that end, it dispatches the terms of reference and the consultant's CV to those parties (the relevant ECHO operational unit, other Commission departments where necessary, the partners responsible for implementing the intervention being evaluated, the ECHO correspondent and the Commission delegation).

- The evaluation begins with a **briefing** at ECHO's headquarters involving the Evaluation Unit, the consultant and the country or regional desk of ECHO (and other Commission departments, where appropriate). The meeting allows the consultant to clarify any doubts there might be about the scope of his mission.
- ECHO's Evaluation Unit ensures that the Commission delegation and the ECHO correspondent **in the field** do all they can to help the evaluation mission run smoothly. The consultant must refer to the Evaluation Unit any problems he has been unable to resolve on the spot.
- At the end of the evaluation mission, the consultant must supply ECHO with a **draft report** which will be distributed within ECHO itself, to the appropriate Commission departments and to the partner.
- ECHO's Evaluation Unit coordinates and chairs the **debriefing meeting** at which the evaluator presents the draft report to the parties involved in the evaluation. The partner can attend the debriefing meeting (at his own expense).
- The Evaluation Unit **distributes the final evaluation report** to all the parties involved.

4.5. The evaluation report

- > The evaluation report is of value to ECHO only if it reflects the evaluator's independent view. ECHO's greatest concern is to respect this independence.

- > Where the partners being evaluated disagree with the report's content, they can submit written observations. These will be attached to, and considered an integral part of, the report.

- > The report must cover scrupulously all the items in the terms of reference. It should be worded in a direct and non-academic style and follow a standard structure.

- > The report must contain a summary setting out the key points that the evaluator wishes to put across. This must be drafted in such a way that it can be understood without having to refer to the rest of the report.

4.6. Dissemination of results and follow-up

- > The evaluation report will be forwarded to:
 - ECHO's staff;
 - the partner;
 - the Commission delegation involved;
 - the ECHO correspondent;
 - other Commission departments involved;
 - anyone who requests it.

- > Information received as confidential must appear on a separate page of the report. This annex will not be distributed outside the Commission.
- > Copies of the report distributed outside the Commission must have the names of natural persons blanked out.
- > In line with Article 19 of the Regulation concerning humanitarian aid, after the end of each financial year, the Commission must submit an annual report to the Parliament and Council which includes a summary of all the outside evaluations performed.
- > The Humanitarian Aid Committee must be regularly informed of ECHO's evaluation work.
- > Acting on the conclusions and recommendations of evaluations is an important part of the decision-making process. In order to achieve this, ECHO's operational units take account of the results of evaluations when establishing global plans and other humanitarian aid interventions.

IN SHORT

- > The most appropriate way of summarising ECHO's view of evaluation is to say that an evaluation is an independent and objective survey of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and viability of a humanitarian intervention, in order to learn lessons from experience.
- > Evaluation is intended to make it possible to learn from the experience of past interventions. Rather than being primarily a means of checking implementation, it should be an aid to decision making. It is an integral part of the decision-making process.
- > The key criteria used to evaluate humanitarian aid are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and viability.
- > An evaluation is not :
 - a scientific study
 - an audit
 - a monitoring exercise
- > ECHO has a unit specifically dedicated to evaluation.

Part III »
Methodological tools

Methodological tools

**5 > Standard terms of reference
for the evaluation of a
humanitarian aid operation**

Terms of reference

for the evaluation of the humanitarian aid operation
in.....

ECHO/EVA/B7-210/....

Name of firm:

Name of consultant:

1. Operation to be evaluated

Name of partner:.....

Operational contract No.:.....

Amount:.....EURO

2. Introduction

3. Consultant's role

Evaluation of humanitarian aid is of great importance to the European Commission not only because of the considerable amounts of money earmarked for this purpose, but also due to its constant efforts to improve humanitarian operations and best utilise the funds placed at their disposal. During the course of the mission, whether in the field or while the report is being drawn up, the consultant must demonstrate common sense as well as independence of judgement. He must provide precise and direct answers to all points in the terms of reference, while avoiding the use of theoretical or academic language.

4. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is set out under points 4.1 to 4.8 below.

- 4.1. to assess the suitability of the operation and the level to which it has been carried out.
- 4.2. to assess the degree to which the objectives pursued have been achieved and whether the means employed have been effective.
- 4.3. to quantify the impact of the operation in terms of outputs.
- 4.4. to analyse ECHO's role in the decision-making process as well as in other activities for which Commission services are responsible.
- 4.5. to check ECHO's visibility in the regions benefiting from the aid as well as amongst partners and local authorities.
- 4.6. to analyse the link between relief, rehabilitation and development.
- 4.7. to check if the principles contained in the Madrid Declaration have been respected.
- 4.8. to formulate precise and concrete recommendations to improve the effectiveness of future operations.

5. Specific evaluation objectives

The evaluation report must cover the issues set out under points 5.1 to 5.14 below.

- 5.1. Brief description of the humanitarian operation to be evaluated and of its **context**: the needs identified, the political and social-economic situation and any possible disaster preparedness activities.
- 5.2. Analysis of the **relevance** of the operation's objectives, of the choice of the beneficiaries, and of the deployed strategy, in relation to the identified needs.
- 5.3. Examination of the **coordination** and **coherence**:
 - between the partner and other donors and international operators, as well as with local authorities;

- between ECHO's intervention and the possible interventions by other European Commission services in the same zone. The projects identified should be described with their cost and with the aid elements they include.
- 5.4. Analysis of the **effectiveness** of the operation in quantitative and qualitative terms.
- 5.5. Analysis of the **cost-effectiveness** of the operation.
- 5.6. Analysis of the **efficiency** of the running of the operation. This analysis should cover :
- the planning and mobilisation of aid ;
 - the operational capacities of the partner ;
 - the strategies deployed ;
 - major elements of the operation such as: staff, logistics, maintenance of accounts, selection of beneficiaries, suitability of the aid in the context of local practices ;
 - management and storage of merchandise and installations ;
 - quality and quantity of merchandise and services mobilised and their accordance with the contractual specifications (including packaging conditions, the origin of merchandise and the price) ;
 - the systems of control and auto-evaluation set up by the partner.
- 5.7. Analysis of the **impact** of the operation. This analysis should be based on the following non-exclusive list of indicators, bearing in mind that consultants might well add others :
- contribution to the reduction of human suffering ;
 - creation of dependency on humanitarian aid ;
 - effect of humanitarian aid on the local economy ;
 - effect on the incomes of the local population ;
 - effect on health and nutritional practices ;

- environmental effects ;
 - impact of humanitarian programmes on local capacity-building.
- 5.8. Analysis of the **visibility** of ECHO.
 - 5.9. Analysis of the integration of "**gender issues**" (social, economic and cultural analysis of the situation of both women and men) in the operation.
 - 5.10. Analysis of the measures taken to assure the **security of aid workers**, both expatriate and local : means of communication placed at their disposal, specific protection measures, emergency evacuation plan.
 - 5.11. Verification if the principles contained in the **Madrid Declaration** have been respected.
 - 5.12. Investigation of the **viability** of the operation, and notably of the feasibility of setting up development and/or co-operation policies which could eventually replace humanitarian aid as provided to date.
 - 5.13. Drawing up of operational **recommendations** on the future of the operation, on the needs of a humanitarian nature that might possibly be financed by ECHO in the area covered by the operation concerned, and opinions on the consequences in the event of cessation of funding by ECHO.
 - 5.14. Drawing up of "**lessons learned**" in the context of this evaluation.

6. Working methods

To accomplish his task, the consultant can make use of information available at ECHO, via its local correspondents, via the services of the local Commission delegation, via ECHO's partners at their headquarters and in the field, via the aid recipients and via the local authorities and international organisations.

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

7. Phases of the evaluation

- 7.1. **Briefing at ECHO** with the personnel concerned, for..... days at which all documents necessary for the evaluation will be provided.
- 7.2. **Briefing with the Commission delegation** at.....
- 7.3. **Mission to the area concerned**: the consultant must work in close collaboration with the Commission delegation in the field, the ECHO correspondent, the ECHO partner, local authorities, international organisations and other donors.
- 7.4. The consultant will devote the **first day of his/her mission** to the area concerned to preliminary and preparatory discussions with the correspondent and the local ECHO partner.
- 7.5. The **last day of the mission** to the area concerned will be devoted to a discussion with the correspondent and the ECHO partner on observations arising from the evaluation.
- 7.6. The **draft report** (in copies) should be submitted to the ECHO Evaluation Unit in Brussels days before its presentation and its discussion during the debriefing.
- 7.7. **Submission of the final report** which should take account of any remarks which may have been raised during the debriefing.

A visit to the partner's headquarters can be organized as needed, before or after the mission to the area concerned.

8. Consultant

This evaluation will be carried out by an expert with both considerable experience in the humanitarian field and in the evaluation of humanitarian aid. This expert must agree to work in high risk areas. Solid experience in the field(s) of..... is also required. Knowledge of the..... language(s) is obligatory.

9. Timetable

The evaluation will last..... days, out of which..... days will be in the field. It will begin on..... and end on..... with the submission of the final report.

10. Report

- 10.1. The evaluation will result in the drawing up of a report written in either French or English, of a maximum length of pages including the evaluation summary.
- 10.2. The evaluation report is an extremely important working tool for ECHO. The report format appearing below under points 10.2.1 to 10.2.5 must therefore be strictly adhered to.

10.2.1. Cover page

- title of the evaluation report : “ (partner, country, sector) ”,
- period of the evaluation mission,
- name of the evaluator,
- pointer that indicates that the report has been produced at the request of the European Commission, financed by it and that the comments contained therein reflect the opinions of the consultant only.

10.2.2. **Table of contents**

10.2.3. **Summary**

- partner's name,
- purpose of the operation evaluated,
- number of the operational contract,
- country of operation,
- length of the operation,
- aim and length of the evaluation,
- method used: documents analysed, visits realised, timetable of meetings, etc.
- principal conclusions, recommendations and " lessons learned " in order of priority, self-explanatory (4 pages maximum).

10.2.4. **The main body** of the report must start with a description of the method used and must be structured in accordance with the specific objectives formulated under point 5.

10.2.5. **Annexes**

- list of people interviewed and sites visited,
- terms of reference,
- abbreviations,
- map of the operation areas.

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

10.4. The report must be written in a direct and non-academical language.

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

10.6. The report shall be submitted with its computer support (diskette, format Word 6.0 or a more recent version) attached.

6 > Standard terms of reference for the evaluation of a global plan

Terms of reference

for the evaluation of ECHO's global plan

in.....

ECHO/EVA/B7-210/.....

Name of firm:.....

Name of consultant:.....

1. Global plan to be evaluated

Country or region:

Period covered:

Sectors to be evaluated:

Decision:

Amount:EURO

2. Introduction

3. Consultant's role

Evaluation of humanitarian aid is of great importance to the European Commission not only because of the considerable amounts of money earmarked for this purpose, but also due to its constant efforts to improve humanitarian operations and best utilise the funds placed at their disposal. During the course of the mission, whether in the field or while the report is being drawn up, the consultant must demonstrate common sense as well as independence of judgement. He must provide answers that are both precise and clear to all points in the terms of reference, while avoiding the use of theoretical or academic language.

4. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is set out under points 4.1 to 4.5 below.

- 4.1. to assess the suitability of the last global plan in favor of....., and the level at which the programme in the various sectors of activity concerned has been implemented.
- 4.2. to assess the degree to which the objectives pursued have been achieved and the effectiveness of the means employed.
- 4.3. to quantify the impact of the global plan.
- 4.4. to analyse ECHO's role in the decision-making process as well as in other activities for which Commission services are responsible.
- 4.5. to check ECHO's visibility in the regions benefiting from the aid as well as amongst partners and local authorities.
- 4.6. to analyse the link between relief, rehabilitation and development.
- 4.7. to check if the principles contained in the Madrid Declaration have been respected.
- 4.8. to establish precise and concrete proposals with a view to elaborating a new global plan in favor of..... and to improving the effectiveness of future operations. These proposals should be formulated per aid sector identified, and justification should be provided.

5. Specific evaluation objectives

The evaluation report must cover the issues set out under points 5.1 to 5.14 below.

- 5.1. Brief description of the global plan and analysis of its **context**: the political and social-economic situation, the humanitarian needs and, where existing, any local capacities available to respond to local needs.

The analysis of the country's present condition in political and socio-economic terms, should include an overview which puts in context the global plan financed by ECHO. This analysis should be both quantitative and qualitative and contain information on the various economic sectors such as social and economic policies in force, the levels of income and its distribution among the population, sanitation and medical policies, access to foodstuffs, etc.

The second part of the analysis should be devoted to identifying vulnerable groups and localising them, as well as giving an estimate of their needs by category.

The evaluation should also permit an appreciation of the capacities both of the local population and of local public authorities to deal with problems pinpointed.

- 5.2. Analysis of the **relevance** of the objectives of the global plan, of the choice of the beneficiaries, and of the deployed strategy, in relation to identified needs.
- 5.3. Examination of the **coordination** and **coherence**, for each of the sectors concerned, with:
 - the other donors and international operators, as well as with local authorities;
 - other European Commission services that might be operating in the same zone with projects that are similar or related to the global plan; the projects identified should be described with their cost and with the aid elements they include.
- 5.4. Analysis of the **effectiveness** of the global plan in quantitative and qualitative terms for each of the sectors.
- 5.5. Analysis of the **cost-effectiveness** of the global plan. The cost-effectiveness has to be established, notably, on the basis of the quantitative elements that have been identified under point 5.4.

5.6. Analysis of the **efficiency** of the implementation of the global plan.

This analysis should cover :

- the planning and mobilisation of aid ;
- the operational capacities of the partners ;
- the strategies deployed ;
- major elements of the global plan such as : staff, logistics, maintenance of accounts, selection of recipients, suitability of the aid in the context of local practices, etc. ;
- management and storage of merchandise and installations ;
- quality and quantity of merchandise and services mobilised and their accordance with the contractual specifications (including packaging conditions, the origin of merchandise and the price) ;
- the systems of control and auto-evaluation set up by the partners.

5.7. Analysis of the **impact** of the global plan. This analysis should be based on the following non-exclusive list of indicators, bearing in mind that consultants might well add others :

- contribution to the reduction of human suffering ;
- creation of dependency on humanitarian aid ;
- effect of humanitarian aid on the local economy ;
- effect on the incomes of the local population ;
- effect on health and nutritional practices ;
- environmental effects ;
- impact of humanitarian programmes on local capacity-building.

5.8. Analysis of the **visibility** of ECHO.

5.9. Analysis of the integration of " **gender issues** " (social, economic and cultural analysis of the situation of both women and men) in the intervention.

- 5.10. Analysis of the measures taken to assure the **security of aid workers**, both expatriate and local: means of communication placed at their disposal, specific protection measures, emergency evacuation plan.
- 5.11. Verification if the **principles contained in the Madrid Declaration** have been respected.
- 5.12. Investigation of the **viability** of the global plan, and notably of the feasibility of setting up development and/or co-operation policies which could eventually replace humanitarian aid as provided to date.
- 5.13. On the basis of the results of the evaluation, the consultant will draw up operational **recommendations** on the needs of a humanitarian nature that might possibly be financed by the European Community. These recommendations may also cover, if necessary, other domains than humanitarian aid, such as development co-operation.
- 5.14. A drawing up of "**lessons learned**" in the context of this evaluation must also be provided.

6. Working methods

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

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

7. Phases of the evaluation

- 7.1. **Briefing at ECHO** with the personnel concerned, for..... days at which all documents necessary for the evaluation will be provided.
- 7.2. **Briefing with the Commission delegation** at.....
- 7.3. **Mission to the area concerned**: the consultant must work in close collaboration with the Commission delegation on the spot, the ECHO correspondent, the ECHO partners, local authorities, international organisations and other donors.
- 7.4. The consultant should devote the **first day of his/her mission** to the area concerned to preliminary and preparatory discussions with the correspondent and the local ECHO partners.
- 7.5. The **last day of the mission** to the area concerned should be devoted to a discussion with the correspondent and the ECHO partners on observations arising from the evaluation.
- 7.6. The **draft report** (in copies) should be submitted to the ECHO Evaluation Unit in Brussels days before its presentation and its discussion during the debriefing.
- 7.7. Submission of the **final report** which should take account of any remarks which may have been raised during the debriefing.

A visit to the headquarters of the partners can be organised as needed before or after the mission to the area concerned.

8. Consultants

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

Knowledge of the..... language(s) is obligatory.

The team of experts, lead by, will be formed by persons who are responsible for the sectors mentioned here after :

Sector : Mr., team leader

Sector : Mr.

Sector : Mr.

9. Timetable

The evaluation will last..... days, out of which..... days will be in the field. It will begin on..... and terminate on..... with the submission of the final report.

10. Report

10.1. The evaluation will result in the drawing up of a report written in either French or English, of a maximum length of pages including the evaluation summary which should appear at the beginning of the report.

10.2. The evaluation report is an extremely important working tool for ECHO. The report format appearing under points 10.2.1 to 10.2.5 below must be strictly adhered to :

10.2.1. Cover page

- title of the evaluation report: ".....(global plan, partners, country, sectors) ",
- period of the evaluation mission,
- names of the evaluators,
- pointer that indicates that the report has been produced at the request of the European Commission, that it has been financed by it and that the comments contained therein reflect the opinions of the consultants only.

10.2.2. Table of contents

10.2.3. Summary

- name(s) of partner(s),
- purpose of the evaluated global plan,
- number of the decision,
- country of the global plan,
- length of the global plan,
- aim and duration of the evaluation,
- method used : documents analysed, meetings, visits, etc.
- principal conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned in order of priority, self-explanatory (4 pages maximum).

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

10.2.5. Annexes

- list of persons interviewed and sites visited,
- terms of reference,
- abbreviations,
- map of the areas covered by the operations financed under the global plan.

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

10.4. The report must be written in a direct and non-academical language.

10.5. Each report shall be drawn up incopies and delivered to ECHO.

10.6. The report should be submitted with its computer support (diskette, format Word 6.0 or a more recent version) attached.

7 > Evaluation questionnaire

Context :

- > **Analysis of the country's political and socio-economic situation** to the extent that this is needed to understand the emergency which the operation or global plan is seeking to cope with or the reasons for deciding to provide humanitarian aid.

Global plans require a wider analysis than single operations. The qualitative and quantitative assessment common to both should be included, but the global plan evaluation should add information on the economy, such as current social and economic policy, income level and income distribution, health and medical policy, access to food, etc.

- > **Needs assessment.** In the field of humanitarian aid, needs assessment is virtually the same as identifying problems. A needs assessment is necessary to find out what the needs are and were, how many people are involved, and where the need is. It should be indicated who has performed the needs assessment – a partner, the local authorities or local organisations (in case of medical interventions, hospitals or other healthcare facilities) – and which method the evaluator used. Did the beneficiaries (individuals or institutions) take part in determining needs? This is a vital question, particularly where disaster prevention and preparedness are concerned, because the involvement of the communities can be vital to the success of the intervention. In some situations (e.g. those requiring specialist equipment or involving rehabilitation) proof that the appropriate technical evaluation has been carried out and details of who performed it, is needed.

- > **Response capability.** Any humanitarian aid intervention should be dictated by local response capabilities in the face of crisis. Attention therefore needs to be paid to the matter of what kind of assistance is provided by the local authorities and inhabitants for the victims, and the degree to which a country is vulnerable to and prepared for particular kinds of disaster (natural or man-made).

Relevance :

- > **Objectives.** Objectives should be analysed to see if they have been/are valid in the light of the needs assessment, especially if operations began fairly late. Is the intervention a new one or a continuation of an existing one?
- > **Targeting.** This covers the issues of how the beneficiaries (individuals or institutions such as hospitals or schools) are chosen; whether the beneficiaries are a broad group or a smaller target group, how the groups were selected and what criteria were used; also whether the choice of beneficiaries was justified in the light of the needs identified.
- > **Strategy.** The issue is one of whether the strategies used were appropriate for the intervention in terms of duration, method of distribution, mode of transport, training activities and community involvement.

Coordination, coherence and complementarity :

The evaluator should find out if the intervention being evaluated is coherent, coordinated and complementary with the current (and short-term

future) plans of other donors like the Member States, the US, the World Bank, UN agencies and other Commission departments. He also needs to determine what the connection is between the evaluated humanitarian intervention and the policies being implemented by other Commission departments (LRRD).

Field coordination also needs to be examined: the relationship between the partners and the local authorities or the partners and the local contractors; whether the partners are working in coordination with UN agencies or international NGOs active in the region; whether the partners have direct contact with the beneficiaries of the aid; what relations exist between the partners and the Commission delegation and/or the ECHO correspondent. Also in need of examination is the coordination of the intervention with the local authorities during implementation.

Effectiveness :

- > **Achievements.** Examples would be " distribution of x tonnes of maize " ;
" establishment of x feeding centres ".

- > **Results.** These must be measured in terms of both quality and quantity. Was the aid suitable? Did it go to the intended beneficiaries? Was it of the intended quantity? In the case of disaster-preparedness projects (but not only in such cases) it is particularly important to see what structures were set up (for example, improving local management capabilities and thus making an essential contribution to reducing vulnerability).

- > **Constraints.** Any constraint beyond the partner's control which has hampered fulfilment of the stated objectives must be reported (e.g. capabilities of the local authorities, partners or local subcontractors in charge of implementation; problems due to corruption, local mafias or security issues).

Cost-effectiveness analysis :

The cost effectiveness of an intervention is assessed by comparing that intervention's cost with the cost of achieving the same objectives by other means. Because it is difficult to perform such an assessment for the whole of a humanitarian aid intervention, a realistic cost-effectiveness assessment tends to be confined to individual components such as the distribution of shipments of food or medicines, transport arrangements, etc.

Efficiency :

- > **Mobilisation.** An assessment of the date of delivery to the point of arrival (forecast versus actual) and the length of time required for distribution to the beneficiaries; any delays in the implementation of these measures.
- > **Partner's operational capabilities.** Does the partner have any experience of implementing operations of this kind and/or in this region? Did the office in the field receive from headquarters the documents it needed to be able to function? (e.g. medical manuals, logistical, administrative and financial information, instructions).

- > **Staff.** Does the partner have enough (or too much) staff (local and expatriate)? Are they efficient? What is the level of local staff pay, and how does it compare to local practice? How does the pay of the expatriate staff compare to that of other NGOs' expatriate staff? Is the expatriate staff familiar with local customs and culture (e.g. by knowing the local language)? Does the local and expatriate staff have the appropriate professional qualifications for the job?

- > **Organisation of the operation in the field.** How is the operation organised? Is there representation in the field (permanent or short-term)? Does the partner have the necessary communications and logistics equipment? Are its representatives in the field in a position to take immediate decisions in the light of circumstances, or do they have to await decisions from headquarters?

- > **Evaluation of storage and handling of goods; registration arrangements.** What registration arrangements are made for taking delivery of the goods and managing stocks? Are suitable forms used? Are there provisions for security, and are they appropriate?

- > **Storage facilities.** Where are the goods stored (warehouses, containers, etc)? To whom do the storage facilities belong? Are they suited to the quantity and type of goods involved? Have any losses occurred because of bad storage (too hot, too humid, in the open air, parasite infestation)? Were the storage arrangements cost-effective? How big are the reserves, and how long will they last?

- > **Suitability in terms of quality and quantity.** Were the goods or services suited to the country's diet and dietary habits? Did they match the contract specifications in terms of nature, content and quality? Did they meet quality standards? Were use-by dates adhered to? Did the quantity delivered to intermediate and final destinations tally with the quantity originally supplied? The suitability, quality and quantity of the goods must be checked with the beneficiaries.
- > **Packing.** Were the products packed properly and in line with the specifications, or were there losses due to inadequate packing?
- > **Labelling and marking.** Were the goods suitably labelled and marked?
- > **Purchasing and shipping.** How were the goods or services bought and what did they cost? Where did they originate? Were contract-award procedures followed throughout? How was shipping arranged? What did it cost? Was transportation in accordance with the terms of the tender? Was the method of transport used the most viable or practical in the light of the circumstances?
- > **Distribution.** How long did distribution take? On what dates did the goods enter the warehouses, go into intermediate distribution and go into final distribution? What was the actual duration compared to the expected duration?
- > **Distribution channels.** What channels were used between the point of arrival and the point of final distribution? What stages were involved (e.g. hospital to patient)? How was registration of beneficiaries organised? Was it efficient? Were gender issues considered?

- > **Cost-sharing.** Did the beneficiaries have to pay for the assistance or services received (e.g. for medical projects)? If they did, how did the institution involved record these sums?

- > **Monitoring.** Did the partner set up a system for monitoring the operations, and was it efficient? At what stages did monitoring take place? In the case of medical projects, for instance, did the partner monitor distribution to the end of the chain, i.e. the patient? Did the partner monitor the distribution of the aid properly? Did the partner monitor the management of stocks properly?

- > **Self-evaluation.** Did the partner set up a self-evaluation system? Did it measure efficiency and impact? If so, what impact indicators were used? Did the impact analysis take gender issues into account?

- > **Checks.** Did the partner establish efficient checking mechanisms (e.g. for stocks or quality)? Are the financial control arrangements appropriate and transparent?

- > **Reporting.** Is or was the partner adhering to the contract's reporting requirements (financial and narrative, for example)? Do the reports contain enough information on the progress made with implementing activities and on their results? Are they analytical?

- > **Outlook for the future.** What are the partner's intentions regarding the future, after the contract with ECHO has lapsed? Is it planning to ask for the operation to continue, to seek funding from other donors, to withdraw from the operation or to hand it over to the local authorities or other parties?

Impact of ECHO's assistance :

An impact analysis makes it possible to determine if the operation or global plan has made any difference to the situation (compared with what it was before the intervention). It would find out, for example, if the intervention had lowered malnutrition, morbidity and mortality rates by increasing the calorie value of food or through vaccination. Because interventions can have an effect on local, regional or national markets, their effects on the supply and prices of goods produced locally or in the region should also be examined. Interventions may often have unexpected tangible or intangible advantages or disadvantages. Though they are difficult to quantify, they should still be analysed. Examples of advantages of this kind: improving the capabilities of partners and local authorities so that they can cope better with disasters (natural or man-made). Examples of disadvantages: deterioration of the local environment due to deforestation caused by chopping down trees for heating fuel; discontent among the local population caused by a perception that refugees are better treated than themselves. In the case of large-scale and/or long-term food aid, impact analyses may consider measures to prevent long-term dependence on the aid. In the case of disaster-prevention projects, the most important impact yardstick is vulnerability, which the intervention should have reduced. This is difficult to gauge, because risk-reduction can be a long-term process. It should still be looked at, however, because it lies at the core of the project.

Visibility :

An important aspect of the evaluation is judging the visibility of ECHO-funded interventions, both within the regions receiving humanitarian aid and to the partners and local authorities.

Did the partner take steps to ensure that everyone knew that the activities were being funded by the European Union? Was the ECHO logo clearly visible on goods, trucks, warehouses, buildings, etc.? Were the local authorities and inhabitants aware of ECHO's presence and contribution? How did the inhabitants react to ECHO's role and presence?

Gender issues :

Were gender issues taken suitably into account when the global plans and operations were being drawn up or implemented?

Security of relief workers :

Did the intervention have contingency plans for emergencies (evacuation, security or communications equipment for staff, etc.)? What steps were taken to ensure the safety of relief workers (both expatriate and local)? What communications facilities did they have? Were provisions made for emergency evacuation?

Viability :

The purpose of examining this matter is to determine if and for how long the effects of the intervention are going to last once outside aid has ceased. In the case of disaster preparedness, viability is obviously a vital consideration.

Viability is a particularly important aspect of projects intended to encourage self-sufficiency, in other words, to make displaced persons or refugees respond actively to their situation. Viability may also be a consideration with rehabilitation operations. Other viability issues also exist: for example, the establishment of coordination arrangements that continue to operate after the intervention has come to an end.

There is another purpose to considering viability: to see to what degree the ground has been prepared for humanitarian aid to give way to a development or cooperation phase.

Part IV »
Annexes

Achievements

The goods and services generated by an intervention.

Coherence

A connection in terms of usefulness between various resources and interventions, focusing notably on the division of labour and on exploiting comparative advantages.

Cost-effectiveness analysis

A calculation of the relationship between the cost of an intervention and its effects, to make it possible to compare different ways of attaining the same objective.

Effectiveness

The degree to which the objectives of the intervention are fulfilled.

Efficiency

A measure of how well the resources are used to produce achievements and results.

Emergency

A situation endangering the life of people who have no means of providing for their own essential needs.

Evaluation

An independent and objective survey of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and viability of a humanitarian intervention, in order to learn lessons from experience.

Evaluation report

The document in which the evaluator responds to all the questions contained in the terms of reference.

Follow-up

The use of the information stemming from the evaluation in subsequent decision-making.

Humanitarian aid

An intervention to help people who are victims of a natural or man-made disaster meet their basic needs, such as adequate health care, water, sanitation, nutrition, food and shelter. (see also Article 1 of Regulation 1257/96)

Impact

A general term to describe the effects of an intervention. The impact can be positive or negative, and expected or unexpected. A distinction should be drawn between operational impact (achievements), initial impact (results) and longer-term impact (consequences).

Indicators

Quantifiable characteristics or attributes of an intervention which can be used to measure the effects of the latter. There are qualitative and quantitative indicators.

Intervention

A general term to describe the measures taken to help a target population meet its humanitarian needs. (global plan or operation)

Means

Human, material and financial resources put into implementing an intervention.

Needs

The socio-economic problems of a target population which an intervention aims to address.

Objectives

The desired effects of an intervention. A distinction should be drawn between general objectives – the desired effects of an intervention in terms of its consequences -, operational objectives – the desired effects of an intervention in terms of its achievements – and specific objectives – the desired effects of an intervention in terms of its results.

Relevance

An assessment of the objectives of an intervention, particularly regarding their justification in the light of problems and needs.

Target population

The expected beneficiaries (individuals, groups, etc.) of an intervention.

Terms of reference

A document setting out the evaluator's tasks, the issues to be tackled and the timetable to apply. The terms of reference allow those commissioning the evaluation to express their needs and the evaluator to have a clear idea of what is expected of him.

Viability

The degree to which the desired effects of an intervention last beyond its end.

**9 > Council Regulation (EC)
n° 1257/96 of 20 June 1996
concerning humanitarian aid**

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 130w thereof,

Having regard to the proposal from the Commission (1),

Acting in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 189c of the Treaty (2),

Whereas people in distress, victims of natural disasters, wars and outbreaks of fighting, or other comparable exceptional circumstances have a right to international humanitarian assistance where their own authorities prove unable to provide effective relief;

Whereas civilian operations to protect the victims of fighting or of comparable exceptional circumstances are governed by international humanitarian law and should accordingly be considered part of humanitarian action;

Whereas humanitarian assistance encompasses not only relief operations to save and preserve life in emergencies or their immediate aftermath, but also action aimed at facilitating or obtaining freedom of access to victims and the free flow of such assistance;

Whereas humanitarian assistance may be a prerequisite for development or reconstruction work and must therefore cover the full duration of a crisis and its aftermath; whereas, in this context, it may include an element of short-term rehabilitation aimed at facilitating the arrival of relief,

¹ *OJ n°C 180 of 14.7.1995, p.6.*

² *Opinion of the European Parliament of 30 November 1995 (OJ n°C 339 of 18.12.1995, p.60), Council common position of 29 January 1996 (OJ n°C 87 of 25.3.1996, p. 46) and Decision of the European Parliament of 21 May 1996 (OJ n°C 166 of 10.6.1996).*

preventing any worsening in the impact of the crisis and starting to help those affected regain a minimum level of self-sufficiency ;

Whereas there is a particular need for preventive action to ensure preparedness for disaster risks and, in consequence, for the establishment of an appropriate early-warning and intervention system ;

Whereas the effectiveness and consistency of the Community, national and international prevention and intervention systems set up to meet the needs generated by natural or man-made disasters or comparable exceptional circumstances should therefore be ensured and strengthened ;

Whereas humanitarian aid, the sole aim of which is to prevent or relieve human suffering, is accorded to victims without discrimination on the grounds of race, ethnic group, religion, sex, age, nationality or political affiliation and must not be guided by, or subject to, political considerations ;

Whereas humanitarian aid decisions must be taken impartially and solely according to the victims' needs and interests ;

Whereas close coordination between the Member States and the Commission both at decision-making level and on the ground constitutes the foundation for effective humanitarian action by the Community ;

Whereas the Community, as part of its contribution to the effectiveness of international humanitarian aid, must endeavour to cooperate and coordinate its action with that of third countries ;

Whereas, in pursuit of that same objective, criteria should be established for cooperation with non-governmental organizations and the international agencies and organizations specializing in the field of humanitarian aid ;

Whereas the independence and impartiality of non-governmental organizations and other humanitarian institutions in the implementation of humanitarian aid must be preserved, respected and encouraged ;

Whereas cooperation in the humanitarian sphere should be encouraged

between non-governmental organizations in the Member States and other developed countries and their equivalents in the third countries concerned ;
Whereas the very nature of humanitarian aid calls for the establishment of efficient, flexible, transparent and, where necessary, rapid decision-making procedures for the financing of humanitarian operations and projects ;
Whereas procedures should be established for the implementation and administration of humanitarian aid financed by the European Community from the general budget, with emergency aid under the Fourth ACP-EC Convention signed at Lomé on 15 December 1989, amended by the Agreement amending the said Convention, signed at Mauritius on 4 November 1995 remaining subject to the procedures and arrangements laid down in that Convention,
HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

CHAPTER I

Objectives and general principles of humanitarian aid

Article 1

The Community's humanitarian aid shall comprise assistance, relief and protection operations on a non-discriminatory basis to help people in third countries, particularly the most vulnerable among them, and as a priority those in developing countries, victims of natural disasters, man-made crises, such as wars and outbreaks of fighting, or exceptional situations or circumstances comparable to natural or man-made disasters. It shall do so for the time needed to meet the humanitarian requirements resulting from these different situations.

Such aid shall also comprise operations to prepare for risks or prevent disasters or comparable exceptional circumstances.

Article 2

The principal objectives of the humanitarian aid operations referred to in Article 1 shall be:

- (a) to save and preserve life during emergencies and their immediate aftermath and natural disasters that have entailed major loss of life, physical, psychological or social suffering or material damage;
- (b) to provide the necessary assistance and relief to people affected by longer-lasting crises arising, in particular, from outbreaks of fighting or wars, producing the same effects as those described in subparagraph (a), especially where their own governments prove unable to help or there is a vacuum of power;
- (c) to help finance the transport of aid and efforts to ensure that it is accessible to those for whom it is intended, by all logistical means available, and by protecting humanitarian goods and personnel, but excluding operations with defence implications;
- (d) to carry out short-term rehabilitation and reconstruction work, especially on infrastructure and equipment, in close association with local structures, with a view to facilitating the arrival of relief, preventing the impact of the crisis from worsening and starting to help those affected regain a minimum level of self-sufficiency, taking long-term development objectives into account where possible;
- (e) to cope with the consequences of population movements (refugees, displaced people and returnees) caused by natural and man-made disasters and carry out schemes to assist repatriation to the country of origin and resettlement there when the conditions laid down in current international agreements are in place;

- (f) to ensure preparedness for risks of natural disasters or comparable exceptional circumstances and use a suitable rapid early-warning and intervention system ;
- (g) to support civil operations to protect the victims of fighting or comparable emergencies, in accordance with current international agreements.

Article 3

Community aid referred to in Articles 1, 2 and 4 may be used to finance the purchase and delivery of any product or equipment needed for the implementation of humanitarian operations, including the construction of housing or shelter for the victims, the costs associated with the outside staff, expatriate or local, employed for those operations, the storage, international or national transport, logistics and distribution of relief and any other action aimed at facilitating or obtaining freedom of access for aid recipients.

It may also be used to finance any other expenditure directly related to the implementation of humanitarian operations.

Article 4

Such Community aid referred to in Articles 1 and 2 may also be used to finance:

- preparatory and feasibility studies for humanitarian operations and the assessment of humanitarian projects and plans,
- operations to monitor humanitarian projects and plans,
- small-scale training schemes and general studies in the field of humanitarian operations, to be phased out gradually where funding is over several years,

- the cost of highlighting the Community nature of the aid,
- public awareness and information campaigns aimed at increasing understanding of humanitarian issues, especially in Europe and in third countries where the Community is funding major humanitarian operations,
- measures to strengthen the Community's coordination with the Member States, other donor countries, international humanitarian organizations and institutions, non-governmental organizations and organizations representing them,
- the technical assistance necessary for the implementation of humanitarian projects, including the exchange of technical know-how and experience by European humanitarian organizations and agencies or between such bodies and those of third countries,
- humanitarian mine-clearance operations, including campaigns to increase awareness of anti-personnel mines on the part of the local population.

Article 5

Community financing under this Regulation shall take the form of grants. The operations covered by this Regulation shall be exempt from taxes, charges, duties and customs duties.

CHAPTER II

Procedures for the implementation of humanitarian aid

Article 6

Humanitarian aid operations financed by the Community may be implemented either at the request of international or non-governmental agen-

cies and organizations from a Member State or a recipient third country or on the initiative of the Commission.

Article 7

1. Non-governmental organizations eligible for Community financing for the implementation of operations under this Regulation must meet the following criteria:
 - (a) be non-profit-making autonomous organizations in a Member State of the Community under the laws in force in that Member State;
 - (b) have their main headquarters in a Member State of the Community or in the third countries in receipt of Community aid. This headquarters must be the effective decision-making centre for all operations financed under this Regulation. Exceptionally, the headquarters may be in a third donor country.
2. When determining a non-governmental organization's suitability for Community funding, account shall be taken of the following factors:
 - (a) its administrative and financial management capacities;
 - (b) its technical and logistical capacity in relation to the planned operation;
 - (c) its experience in the field of humanitarian aid;
 - (d) the results of previous operations carried out by the organization concerned, and in particular those financed by the Community;
 - (e) its readiness to take part, if need be, in the coordination system set up for a humanitarian operation;
 - (f) its ability and readiness to work with humanitarian agencies and the basic communities in the third countries concerned;
 - (g) its impartiality in the implementation of humanitarian aid;
 - (h) where appropriate, its previous experience in the third country involved in the humanitarian operation concerned.

Article 8

The Community may also finance humanitarian operations by international agencies and organizations.

Article 9

Where necessary, the Community may also finance humanitarian operations by the Commission or the Member States' specialized agencies.

Article 10

1. In order to guarantee and enhance the effectiveness and consistency of Community and national humanitarian aid systems, the Commission may take any measure necessary to promote close coordination between its own activities and those of the Member States, both at decision-making level and on the ground. To that end, the Member States and the Commission shall operate a system for exchange of information.
2. The Commission shall ensure that humanitarian operations financed by the Community are coordinated and consistent with those of international organizations and agencies, in particular those which form part of the United Nations system.
3. The Commission shall endeavour to develop collaboration and cooperation between the Community and third-country donors in the field of humanitarian aid.

Article 11

1. The Commission shall lay down the conditions for allocating, mobilizing and implementing aid under this Regulation.

2. Aid shall not be implemented unless the recipient complies with these conditions.

Article 12

All financing contracts concluded under this Regulation shall provide in particular that the Commission and the Court of Auditors may conduct checks on the spot and at the headquarters of humanitarian partners according to the usual procedures established by the Commission under the rules in force, and in particular those of the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities.

CHAPTER III

Procedures for the implementation of humanitarian operations

Article 13

The Commission shall decide on emergency action for an amount not in excess of ECU 10 million.

The following operations shall be deemed to necessitate emergency action:

- operations to meet immediate and unforeseeable humanitarian requirements generated by sudden natural or man-made disasters, such as floods, earthquakes and outbreaks of fighting or comparable situations,
- operations limited to the duration of the unforeseeable emergency response: the corresponding funds shall cover the response to the humanitarian needs referred to in the first indent for a period of not more than six months laid down in the decision on financing.

Where operations fulfil these conditions and are in excess of ECU 2 million:

- the Commission shall adopt its decision,
- it shall inform the Member States in writing within forty-eight hours,
- it shall account for its decision at the Committee's next meeting, in particular giving the reasons for its use of the emergency procedure.

Decisions to continue operations adopted by the emergency procedure shall be taken by the Commission, acting in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 17 (3) and within the limits set in the second indent of Article 15 (2).

Article 14

The Commission shall appraise, decide upon and administer, monitor and assess operations under this Regulation according to the budgetary and other procedures in force, and in particular those laid down in the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities.

Article 15

1. Acting in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 17 (2), the Commission shall:
 - decide on Community financing for the humanitarian-aid protection operations referred to in Article 2 (c),
 - adopt implementing Regulations for this Regulation,
 - decide to take direct Commission action or finance action by Member States' specialized agencies.
2. Acting in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 17 (3), the Commission shall:
 - approve global plans intended to provide a coherent framework for action in a given country or region where the scale and complexity of the humanitarian crisis is such that it seems likely to continue, and

the budgets for those plans. In this context, the Commission and the Member States shall examine the priorities to be established in the implementation of these global plans,

- decide on projects in excess of ECU 2 million, without prejudice to Article 13.

Article 16

1. Once a year the Committee referred to in Article 17 shall discuss general guidelines presented by a representative of the Commission for humanitarian operations to be undertaken in the year ahead and examine the whole question of the coordination of Community and national humanitarian aid and any general or specific issues concerning Community aid in that field.
2. The Commission shall also submit to the Committee referred to in Article 17 information on changes in the instruments for administering humanitarian aid, including the framework partnership agreement.
3. The Committee referred to in Article 17 shall also be notified of the Commission's intentions regarding the assessment of humanitarian operations, and, possibly, its timetable of work.

Article 17

1. The Commission shall be assisted by a Committee composed of the representatives of the Member States and chaired by the representative of the Commission.
2. Where the procedure laid down in this paragraph is to be followed the representative of the Commission shall submit to the Committee a draft of the measures to be taken. The Committee shall deliver its opinion on the draft within a time limit which the Chairman may lay down according to the urgency of the matter. The opinion shall be delivered

by the majority laid down in Article 148 (2) of the Treaty in the case of decisions which the Council is required to adopt on a proposal from the Commission. The votes of the representatives of the Member States within the Committee shall be weighted in the manner set out in that Article. The Chairman shall not vote.

The Commission shall adopt the measures envisaged if they are in accordance with the opinion of the Committee.

If the measures envisaged are not in accordance with the opinion of the Committee, or if no opinion is delivered, the Commission shall, without delay, submit to the Council a proposal relating to the measures to be taken. The Council shall act by a qualified majority.

If, on the expiry of a period of one month from the date of referral to the Council, the Council has not acted, the proposed measures shall be adopted by the Commission.

3. Where the procedure laid down in this paragraph is to be followed, the representative of the Commission shall submit to the Committee a draft of the measures to be taken. The Committee shall deliver its opinion on the draft within a time limit which the Chairman may lay down according to the urgency of the matter. The opinion shall be delivered by the majority laid down in Article 148 (2) of the Treaty in the case of decisions which the Council is required to adopt on a proposal from the Commission. The votes of the representatives of the Member States within the Committee shall be weighted in the manner set out in that Article. The Chairman shall not vote.

The Commission shall adopt measures which apply immediately. However, if these measures are not in accordance with the opinion of the Committee, they shall be communicated by the Commission to the Council forthwith. In that event the Commission may defer application

of the measures which it has decided for a period of one month from the date of such communication.

The Council, acting by a qualified majority, may take a different decision within the time limit referred to in the previous paragraph.

Article 18

1. The Commission shall regularly assess humanitarian aid operations financed by the Community in order to establish whether they have achieved their objectives and to produce guidelines for improving the effectiveness of subsequent operations. The Commission shall submit to the Committee a summary, which shall also indicate the status of the experts employed, of the assessment exercises carried out that it might, if necessary, examine. The assessment reports shall be available to the Member States on request.
2. At the Member States' request, and with their participation, the Commission may also assess the results of the Community's humanitarian operations and plans.

Article 19

At the close of each financial year, the Commission shall submit an annual report to the European Parliament and to the Council with a summary of the operations financed in the course of that year.

The summary shall contain information concerning the agencies with which humanitarian operations have been implemented.

The report shall also include a review of any outside assessment exercises which may have been conducted on specific operations.

The Commission shall notify the Member States, within no more than one month of its decision and without prejudice to Article 13 of this

Regulation, of the operations approved, indicating the amount granted, the nature of the operation, the people who have received aid and the partners involved.

Article 20

Three years after entry into force of this Regulation, the Commission shall submit an overall assessment of the operations financed by the Community under this Regulation to the European Parliament and to the Council, together with suggestions for the future of the Regulation and, as necessary, proposals for amendments to it.

Article 21

This Regulation shall enter into force on the third day following its publication in the Official Journal of the European Communities.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Luxembourg, 20 June 1996.

For the Council The President P. BERSANI

Official Journal n° L163 of 2.7.1996, p. 1-6

10 > The Madrid Declaration

We, leaders and representatives of prominent humanitarian agencies and donors, met this day, the 14th of December 1995, for a Humanitarian Summit.

Recalling :

- 1.1 That in response to ever-growing needs, global humanitarian assistance has increased many-fold in the past five years to exceed today 4 billion dollars. In 1994 an estimated 45 million people depended on humanitarian assistance. However, it is clear that humanitarian assistance is neither a solution, nor a panacea for crises which are essentially man-made. This is true in Rwanda and Bosnia, but also in many other parts of the world, such as Afghanistan, Northern Iraq, Liberia and Sierra Leone, Tajikistan, and the Sudan ;
- 1.2 That in line with our respective mandates and responsibilities, we remain committed to relieve the plight of victims of man-made and natural disasters when and where we can, and to support and encourage local and regional initiatives to address crises. We will provide assistance, in particular, to protect and feed the victims, to organise shelter, to provide medical care and counselling and to reunite children with their families. We will ensure we coordinate closely amongst ourselves and with our partners to achieve maximum impact to reduce suffering ;
- 1.3 That since the end of the Cold War, the world is torn by some 50 armed conflicts. A large number of civilians have been and are being brutally murdered, wounded or forced to flee their homes on a scale

unseen since the UN Charter was drawn up. Those who cannot flee, or have nowhere to go, have suffered untold misery and seen their lives traumatized and, in many cases, their existence rendered more fragile than ever. Basic principles of international humanitarian law are often disregarded; human rights continue to be trampled underfoot in many areas of the world;

- 1.4 That too often the causes of humanitarian disasters still lie deep in the social and economic injustice existing within and between nations. Power struggles, poor governance and competition over scarce resources are also related to widespread abject poverty, overpopulation, and social inequality;
- 1.5 That the work of humanitarian organisations is guided by the principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence;

We appeal to the international community at large for:

- 2.1 Determination to take whatever resolute decisive action may be necessary to resolve crisis situations and not to use humanitarian activities as a substitute for political action. The independence and impartiality of humanitarian assistance must be fully recognized and respected. This is indispensable for saving lives in crisis situations.
- 2.2 The development of a global system of proactive crisis prevention. Determination and political will are needed to address both the direct and indirect causes of conflict and other humanitarian emergencies. Early warning should lead to early action.

- 2.3 A new and imaginative commitment to development assistance. Crises are greatly exacerbated by the current decrease in development assistance, just at a time when it needs to be increased to reduce the severity of humanitarian crises. Poverty leads to vulnerability and forces people into survival strategies that can further hasten the onslaught of crises. As a result, crises become more likely and more deadly when they strike.
- 2.4 A global campaign against hunger which afflicts one out of every seven people on earth. Food security is one of the issues which must be singled out in view of the particular importance that food has in poor rural households in the developing world. Not only must food production and supplies be assured but also access at affordable prices for the poorest segments of society. Similar attention must be given to the supply of clean drinking water.
- 2.5 Greater stress on and support for preparedness measures, especially for natural disasters. Reluctance to fund local initiatives, carry out preparedness programmes and support self-reliance may not only cause human suffering when the crisis strikes but it will also lead to much larger costs for victims and donors alike.
- 2.6 Resources to bring relief and political solutions also to the many "forgotten" crises which do not hit, or quickly slip from, the international headlines. These crises, just like any others, threaten the survival of millions of people and can destabilise whole regions.
- 2.7 Urgent steps to address the deliberate targeting of civilians in

today's conflicts. Atrocities such as ethnic cleansing, torture and rape have become in many cases tools and objectives of warfare, in flagrant disregard for international humanitarian law. All parties to conflict should be held accountable. Impunity for human rights abuses must end. The International Criminal Tribunals for Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda must be enabled fully to carry out their mandates, with a view to the establishment of a permanent International Criminal Tribunal for the punishment of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity.

- 2.8 Measures to address the specific protection and assistance needs of the millions of people who have fled within their own countries as a result of conflict. Guiding principles must be formulated to improve their plight, and to safeguard their right to physical and material security. We also support the development by the UN of improved facilities to prevent human rights abuses in cases of internal conflict. Moreover, the right of refugees to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution must be upheld.
- 2.9 Urgent attention to be given to the needs and protection of all victims, with priority to women, children and the elderly, who are invariably the vast majority of all victims of armed conflict. The central role of women must be recognised and women must be reasserted in the planning, management and distribution of relief assistance, as the best way of ensuring that relief reaches the most vulnerable. Their reproductive health must be systematically taken into consideration.

Children, in particular, should not be deprived of their home and family, of their right to life, physical and psychological health and education, and to a peaceful existence.

- 2.10 Resources to remain available to meet the challenge of rebuilding war-shattered societies and thus consolidate a peace settlement and prevent the seeds of future disaster from being sown. The links between relief and development must be strengthened and local capacity to cope must be reinforced. Reconstruction involves not only water systems, bridges and roads but also civil society: the demobilisation of soldiers and the rebuilding of the judiciary and administration and of education and social services. Flexible mechanisms to provide more funding for emergency rehabilitation must be found. At the same time, relief must be managed efficiently in order to phase out humanitarian aid as soon as the emergency period is over, switching over rapidly to other forms of assistance.
- 2.11 All concerned to respect the humanitarian and non-political nature of our work, as well as our respective mandates, to give us full access to all persons in need, to ensure the safety of humanitarian personnel, and to provide us with a more secure basis for funding. In this connection we reaffirm international concern and commitment. The resourcefulness of human solidarity is enormous. Yet fatalism and compassion fatigue are real threats. Governments and leaders need to recognise that, in an ever more interdependent world, the vital interests of every nation in global peace and security can only be achieved through concerted international action.

The signatories of the Madrid Declaration:

> **Brian Atwood**

(USAID Administrator)

> **Carol Bellamy**

(Executive Director Unicef)

> **Catherine Bertini**

(Executive Director World Food Programme)

> **Emma Bonino**

(European Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid)

> **Agostinho Jardim Gonçalves**

(President Liaison Committee of Development NGOs to the EU)

> **Peter Hansen**

(UN Under Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs)

> **Sadako Ogata**

(UN High Commissioner for Refugees)

> **Doris Schopper**

(President Médecins sans Frontières)

> **Cornelio Sommaruga**

(President ICRC)

> **Julia Taft**

(President InterAction U.S.)



European Community Humanitarian Office
Evaluation Unit

200, rue de la Loi, B-1049 Brussels
Belgium

Tel. : +32.2/299.22.55

Fax : +32.2/299.11.73

Internet : <http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/echo>