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_UNCHS (Habitat) Guidelines for the Evaluation of Post Disaster Programmes_
Almost on a daily basis, we are reminded of the threat posed by natural disasters. No one is impervious to the forces of nature. While we may not be able to prevent most natural disasters from occurring, we must urgently prevent the escalating loss of life, property and productivity.

The challenge has never been greater. Cities and towns have grown without proper planning or regard for the natural and physical environments upon which their sustainability depends. The poor are the most vulnerable, often having little choice but to establish spontaneous settlements in hazardous areas. In city after city, the full extent of the tragedy has been exacerbated by the problems of poorly managed urbanisation.

After a disaster, the heroic efforts made to rescue and care for survivors of calamities feature prominently in the media. But headlines typically pay little attention to preventive measures or the underlying causes. Once the humanitarian crisis fades, local communities often find themselves without the capacity to manage the process of rehabilitation without perpetuating unsustainable practices.

This guide is part of a series that draws upon UNCHS (Habitat)’s experience in the field of post disaster management and local governance. It provides a resource tool for local authorities to successfully manage and implement post disaster programmes in order to minimise the effects of future catastrophes. We at Habitat are convinced that empowering communities in human settlements everywhere is the surest way to overcome the destructive cycle of disasters.

Anna Kajumulo Tibaijuka  
Executive Director  
United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)
This resource guide has been prepared by the UNCHS (Habitat) Risk and Disaster Management Unit (RDMU). The RDMU was established in collaboration with the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) to address the demands of disaster-prone communities by increasing UNCHS (Habitat)'s ability to support countries and communities in their disaster prevention, mitigation and rehabilitation interventions in human settlements. These activities include:

- housing rehabilitation and protection;
- settlements infrastructure, services and public facilities;
- resettlement of displaced persons and returnees;
- restoring local social structures and economy for and through settlements development
- settlements planning and management for disaster prevention, mitigation and rehabilitation;
- strengthening and rebuilding institutions and co-ordination mechanisms for disaster and settlements interventions.

RDMU builds on the experience and capacity already available in other operational agencies and aims at supporting their activities on human settlements issues through collaborative arrangements.

RDMU approach to its operations gives emphasis to the understanding of the root causes of disaster and emergency situations prior to action. The social, economic and environmental context in which communities face disaster mitigation or rehabilitation will determine the way the communities affected by conflict and other disasters are approached and brought to the path of development.

This guide is intended to provide a resource to local groups working in these post-disaster situations to enable them to better monitor and evaluate their programmes for rehabilitation and long-term development.
Mission of the Resource Guide

Disasters, either natural or human-made, wreak havoc on every level of a society. The role of local authorities in post-disaster situations is one of the most important, and most difficult, for reconstruction and rehabilitation.

The strategies undertaken to rebuild after a disaster will shape the rehabilitation process and will impact its level of success. Accurate assessment of these strategies and their impact on the post-disaster situation provides a guide for successful post-disaster programmes in the future.

This resource guide seeks to assist practitioners, local governments and community organisations to meet the challenges of post disaster reconstruction with the best possible understanding of the different issues in post-disaster planning, and of the methods for developing evaluation tools. This guide will help local practitioners incorporate evaluation strategies into programme design and carry out successful evaluations.

Part of the goal of this resource guide is to demonstrate that post-disaster projects have far-reaching effects on the sustainable development of societies. In preparing post-disaster programmes, it is crucial to keep in mind that disasters create opportunities as well as costs.

Why is this important? With proper evaluation techniques, project staff and local authorities can gain a better picture of whether or not a particular project is having the desired effects. This may sound simple enough, however, the collection and analysis of data in the field can in many cases be extremely difficult, and as a result, many projects are not thoroughly assessed.

The resources available to local authorities in disaster prone areas is limited at the best of times, and even more so in post-disaster circumstances. Thus, the accurate assessment of these projects is particularly important to ensure that the resources are being put to maximum use. In order for practitioners to learn from the mistakes and successes of other projects to best allocate these scarce resources, this guide will provide a basis for the understanding of programme evaluation techniques.
How to Use the Resource Guide

This guide can be used as a background tool for learning about programme evaluation strategies as well as a general reference guide for practitioners in the field. This guide will outline the steps of building and implementing a useful evaluation strategy as part of the programme design.

Part A discusses the problems at hand - why projects fail or succeed - and how to address this - better evaluation strategies.

Part B is a brief introduction to the concepts of evaluation.

Part C will move step by step through the process of designing and implementing evaluations. Each step will include useful tools to assist in putting these ideas into practice.

Naturally, the most useful way of using this guide is to follow the steps from beginning to end. However, it has been designed so that each section can be read, understood, and used independent of the others.

Who is this resource guide designed for?
There are a number of different groups who can benefit from this resource guide (local and international NGO's, community based organisations, UN agencies) however, it has been designed specifically targeting the needs of local authorities in post-disaster situations.
PART A

Issues in

Post Disaster Programming
What Affects Programme Success?

Why is it that so many post-disaster programmes are not successful? This is an important question to ask, since the failure of so many of these projects means that huge amounts of resources—both financial and human power—are being misallocated.

Therefore there is a need to determine the various reasons why these projects are not doing what they set out to do so that mistakes are not repeated.

Conversely, how can these same factors help to ensure a programme's success? Having a clear understanding of the prevailing situation, of the power dynamics involved and the specifics of the local economy, for example, could help a project to avoid such situations.

It is easy to say that programmes do not succeed because they are badly designed. But how instructive is that statement? There are certain components of the design that have a major impact on the programme’s success. Below is a discussion of the key factors affecting project success.

1. Responding to the local needs: The overriding principle of any project must be that it deals with the needs of the people who have been affected by the disaster. Often programmes are implemented without first consulting with local populations about what they feel their needs are. Without a clear understanding of the needs of the affected population, the relevance of the programme will be limited.
2. Understanding the situation dynamics: This is especially important in post-conflict circumstances, but relates to all post-disaster situations. The situation in which a project is going to be implemented is not a static thing, it is always changing. There will be many factors affecting the project - both directly and indirectly - its design, implementation and outcomes. Mapping out all of these specifics - what the issues are, who the main actors are, what power dynamics exist between them, and so forth - is a crucial exercise when planning any post-disaster project.

3. Misallocation of resources: Resources in post-disaster situations are precious, and it is therefore serious when funds and manpower are diverted into projects that do not succeed. Many post-disaster projects become extremely expensive, much more so than is necessary. The result is a lack of resources for other important post-disaster relief and rehabilitation projects.

4. Short-termism: Another factor affecting the success of projects is negligence in placing the specific project in the broader context of post-disaster rehabilitation. Often, in post-disaster situations, the focus of the project can be very specific - for example, the provision of shelter or the rebuilding of roads. However, these specific issues are connected in the broader environment of the post-disaster situation and the long-term development of the area. To put it another way, a project cannot exist in a vacuum. It will affect, and be affected by, the broader context of post-disaster rehabilitation.
The role of local authorities in the long-term development and rehabilitation of their communities after disaster is central. The pressure on them to enact short-term solutions to deal with the effects of the disaster need to be tempered with an understanding of the longer-term issues and strategies.

5. Dependency vs. Capacity: This point leads to the fifth factor affecting project success in post-disaster situations. The issue of building capacity rather than dependency is particularly acute in post-disaster cases. Many projects bring important resources (funding or expertise) necessary for the emergency relief phase after the disaster, however once the emergency need has been met, the funding or expertise is gone. This perpetuates a dependence of the affected communities on aid and relief projects, rather than fostering the development of local capacity so that the affected community may become self-sufficient.

Working with local partners to improve capacity not only benefits the affected communities, but also lessens the burden on aid organisations working in the region.

6. Accountability: The issue of accountability is closely linked with the first factor affecting project success - addressing the needs of the local communities - however it does bear separate examination. When projects are not connected to the area in which they operate - i.e. they are not staffed by local people, they do not use local resources, etc - they also do not have to be accountable to the local populations regarding their impact.
This distance helps to perpetuate the cycle of failed projects, as the lessons from each project are not passed on to the next. The view of the affected groups as passive recipients of aid also impacts the level of accountability, as they are not seen as partners to whom the project must answer with regard to its success or failure.

Accountability to the local population engenders a feeling of ownership of the project, which is a key factor for project sustainability.

7. **Quality Assessment**: This final factor is most directly connected to the solutions examined in this resource guide. Without built-in assessment mechanisms, these projects cannot learn from their past mistakes and determine where they have gone wrong.

In addition, this disconnects the web of post-disaster projects generally - not just from the local groups - but from other projects, as they cannot learn from other project mistakes if the lessons are not being examined and recorded.
How Can These Issues be Addressed?

**EVALUATION**: By building evaluation processes into project design, and by carrying them out both during and at the end of the project, the problems identified above can be overcome.

Using proper evaluation techniques will help to continually clarify the needs of the affected population - through the use of indicators and the continual assessment of the project’s relevance. Evaluation will help to ensure ongoing re-examination of the situation dynamics as they relate to the project and will help ensure that resources are being allocated responsibly. Determining the level of capacity building and the long-term sustainability of the project will also depend on good evaluation techniques. Finally, evaluations make a project more accountable to the local population, and ensure that projects are being accurately assessed.

By making a project evaluation-centred, the project will be in a continuous cycle of assessment. It will be more closely connected to the post-disaster environment as a whole, and will be better equipped to recognise problems as they arise, and to learn lessons and modify objectives and outputs accordingly throughout the cycle. A focus on evaluation also creates a legacy of useful lessons for future projects.

Evaluation in post-disaster situations is not a simple task. The situations are dynamic and quick to change. In order to have an accurate evaluation that can deal with the obstacles discussed above, it is necessary that the evaluation be designed at the outset of project planning.
Guidelines for Post Disaster Programming

Based on these factors, below are a number of guidelines for the preparation of post-disaster programmes:

1. More than just houses...

There is a tendency after a disaster to focus on the tangible costs and to try to employ concrete solutions. Counting the houses destroyed and planning emergency shelter for that number of families may seem like a logical and measurable first step to take when facing a post-disaster situation. However, there are many more intangible issues closely linked to the provision of shelter that must be addressed.

For example, the erection of emergency shelter often occurs away from the disaster area, in housing that has no bearing on the cultural traditions of the people. In instances where such housing has been built, the occupancy rates have been alarmingly low, considering the amount of resources put into the effort. Often people affected by disaster opt to stay with relatives, or to erect temporary shelter of their own using scavenged materials from the disaster site.

The emergency shelter, though addressing the physical needs of the population, did not take their psychological needs into consideration. The psychological impact of the disaster is an incredibly important consideration in post-disaster programming. There is often a need for families to remain close to home, to stay in familiar surroundings, and to have some role in the rebuilding process rather than being mere spectators. This is as true in short-term responses such as the emergency housing issue, as it is in longer-term rehabilitation strategies.
2. All Issues are Interrelated.

The importance of understanding the interrelated nature of post-disaster issues is described as:

action on any front alone is not likely to work. For example, addressing economic inequalities without widening access to political participation, or conversely, or attempting to ‘educate’ people to change their views of identity with changing the underlying inequalities among groups.1

This guideline builds on the first, as it is clear that all of these issues affect, and are affected by, one another. Therefore, a project cannot be designed in a vacuum. Rather, it must be built with an understanding of the entire situation, and the different factors involved. The evaluation techniques employed should reflect this, and assess both the broader relevance of a project as well as its specific impact.

3. Emergency is Saving Lives, Rehabilitation is Saving Livelihoods:

Using resources to administer immediate relief without consideration of the long-term effects of the disaster not only misallocates resources, but ignores the interrelated nature of the post-disaster issues. As discussed above, there is often too much emphasis placed on the need for emergency housing without an accurate understanding of the needs of the survivors and of the long-term consequences of building emergency shelter.

Studies have shown that victims list land, employment, infrastructure, and access to the means of reconstruction as their key priorities. Thus the needs identified by the affected groups point to more long-term strategies of rebuilding, and of the creation of capacity for their involvement in the post-disaster rehabilitation. Studies also show that the involvement of local organisations and government, and the empowering of the affected communities, is much more effective than the transplanting of outside organisations to deal with the problems. This is also closely connected to the concern over the creation of dependency on the donors in the affected society. The building of capacity, through
the involvement of the affected groups in their long-term rehabilitation must be a guiding principle in any post-disaster reconstruction programme.

4. Disaster = Opportunity

In the wake of the trauma of war or natural disaster, it is characteristic to focus on the costs of the crisis, and overlook the opportunities that arise in times of upheaval. The crisis may bring together different groups previously at odds with one another. It may allow for women to play roles in the society that were previously off limits to them.

For example, in post-conflict situations, many widow’s groups come to play a prominent role in the rebuilding of their communities, and in so doing, increase the status of women in their societies. It may allow for groups to develop preventive measures for future disasters such as the building of earthquake resistant housing, or building of capacity among local authorities to address such crises in the future.

5. Build Capacity not Dependency

The issue of post-disaster programming must be viewed within the context of development programmes more generally. It is therefore crucial for both the sustainability of the projects, and the long-term recovery and development of the affected populations that any programmes undertaken are done so with a clear mission of capacity-building.

For example, to come into a post-earthquake situation and repair housing and shelter, without teaching local groups how to build earthquake resistant structures, does little for the long-term preventive capacity of the community.
Capacity, in the long-term, not only ensures the sustainability of the projects, and enhances development opportunities of the communities, but it will prove cost-effective as well. As communities become more and more able to deal on their own with the bulk of the post-disaster issues, the costs incurred by donors will diminish.
GUIDELINES

This page is designed as a pullout for reference throughout this guide, and when designing programming in the future. At each step ask the questions from each guideline to make sure that they are being followed.

1. MORE THAN JUST HOUSES...
   - Are both tangible and intangible costs being addressed?
   - Will there be a positive impact on the psychological well being of the affected populations?

2. ISSUES ARE INTERRELATED.
   - How does each factor affect the others?

3. EMERGENCY IS SAVING LIVES, REHABILITATION IS SAVING LIVELIHOODS
   - How does the project impact the long-term development goals of the area?

4. DISASTER = OPPORTUNITY
   - What opportunities can be found?

5. BUILD CAPACITY, NOT DEPENDENCY
   - Are the projects and activities enhancing the capacity of the local populations?
PART B

Concepts of Evaluation
What is an Evaluation?

The OECD/DAC definition of evaluation highlights the following key points:

- It is a systematic and objective assessment of a project (either ongoing or completed).
- It assesses the project design, implementation and results.
- The goal is to determine the project’s relevance, achievement of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.
- It should provide credible, useful information that will enable the lessons learned from the project to be incorporated into the programme or project.

Evaluation also provides a basis for accountability, including the provision of information to the public.

Evaluation vs. audit: Regardless of who carries out an evaluation, it is important that the evaluation not be viewed as an audit, or a ‘judgement from above’ on the project or the staff involved. The usefulness of an evaluation lies in the re-examining of the assumptions underlying the current project and policies, and exploring how they need to change or evolve in light of the evaluation. An evaluation is part of the overall learning process of a project, and as such, a participatory approach is important.
Evaluation vs. monitoring: Monitoring refers to a continuous process throughout the project cycle. Similar to evaluation, monitoring assists managers in assessing early signs of positive impact of problems in the project. Evaluation, on the other hand, though closely linked with monitoring, is more structured, and is carried out at specific intervals during the project cycle. Evaluations tend to place value on the achievements of a project, while monitoring is usually not judgement based.

Evaluations are therefore more selective and are geared to determine specific criteria - relevance, success and performance of the project.
Why is Evaluation Important?

For local practitioners involved in post-disaster programmes, evaluation can provide an invaluable guideline for the project.

Helps to determine project relevance:
Making evaluations of technical projects can be relatively simple: if the desired aim of the project was to rebuild a series of roads, it is straightforward enough to determine whether those roads were, in fact, rebuilt. Yet in post-disaster situations the project scope and impact are rarely so simple. For example, if a project was undertaken to rebuild these roads, there must first be an examination of whether the repair of the damaged roads is necessarily of the most benefit to the affected community. If the roads that are being repaired are not used regularly by the local populations, perhaps it is more useful to use the resources to build access roads into the villages.

Helps assess project impact:
Evaluating issues such as the impact of a project on the capacity of municipal authorities to enhance emergency preparedness is not so easily measured. To look back at the end of a project without knowing what capacity existed at the beginning of the project will make it all but impossible to accurately assess the project’s impact. It is therefore important that mechanisms for evaluation are built into the project at its inception.

Helps in project management:
It is also important to view evaluation as part of the ongoing process of a project, rather than merely a final step. Ongoing evaluations are vital to maintaining the relevance of a project and ensuring that the surrounding environment has not changed so much so as to render the project ineffective. As such, evaluation is a crucial part of the project cycle. It must be considered during the design phase, and should be employed on an ongoing basis throughout the life of the project to ensure that the project’s objectives and outputs remain relevant and their impacts positive. Finally, it should be used at the end of the project cycle to determine the project’s degree of impact and to help programmers and local partners learn from the project’s successes or failures.
end of the project cycle to determine the project’s degree of impact and to help programmers and local partners learn from the project’s successes or failures.

Structured method of assessment:
The way in which an evaluation is structured is also very important. The results of the evaluation must be either quantitatively measurable, or, if it is dealing with qualitative data, the indicators must be clearly comprehensible in order to facilitate the widest possible use of the results. Providing a systematic method of evaluation helps create a consistent structure which ensures that the assessments can be compared on a longitudinal basis rather than being helpful only in the immediate context.

**Box One: Evaluation Guidelines**

**Transparent** - Transparency in evaluation is important in order to retain an open participatory approach to the evaluation that involves all the actors and increases the sense of ownership in the project. Transparency ensures that the evaluation is not perceived as a top-down judgement.

**Independent** - The objectivity of an evaluation is central to its credibility and ultimately, its usefulness. Independence does not necessarily mean that an outside party must perform the evaluation. However, when performed by project staff, the issue of an independent perspective must be a top priority.

**Consultative** - A successful evaluation is a participatory process and therefore must be held in consultation with project staff and local partners. Evaluation methods used should be consultative (i.e. utilising the deductive/inductive and participatory approaches).

**Relevant** - The overarching question that an evaluation is trying to assess is the relevance of a project. Is the project addressing the needs of the affected communities?
PART C
Steps in Evaluation
Steps in Evaluation

The following steps will outline the process of evaluation in post-disaster programming. For quick reference, the steps are summarised below:

- Step 1: Preparing an Evaluation Plan
- Step 2: Developing Indicators
- Step 3: Structuring Indicators - A Methodology
- Step 4: Undertaking the Evaluation
- Step 5: Learning from the Evaluation

Now that the concepts of evaluation have been explored, the process of evaluation can be discussed step-by-step. In so doing, it is important to remember the five post-disaster guidelines:

1) More than just houses
2) All issues are interrelated
3) Emergency is saving lives, rehabilitation is saving livelihoods
4) Disaster = Opportunity
5) Build capacity not dependency
For an evaluation to be successful, the mechanisms for evaluating must be built into the project design. The companion guide to this one, Guidelines for Operational Programme Formulation in Post-Disaster Situations provides an in-depth examination of project design strategies. The following section summarises some of the basics of programme design that will assist in building in effective evaluation mechanisms.

There are two key steps in successful programme design, the building of a situational overview and the identification of programme objectives.

Creating a Situational Overview:

When designing evaluation strategies, it is imperative at the outset to have a clear and complete picture of the current situation. With this understanding, a programme can be designed that will have the best chance of success. There must be an understanding of the territory, the actors, the dynamics, the opportunities and the challenges of the particular situation. This assessment should be as specific and complete as possible, and should be constantly referred to and updated as the situation changes.

The overview will act as the foundation for programme strategies, and for the evaluation tools - particularly indicators - to be used both during and after the project cycle. It is therefore crucial that the overview give a complete picture of the post-disaster circumstances so that project impact can be accurately assessed at a later date.

In preparing a situational assessment of a post-disaster case, it is important to be as thorough as possible. In post-disaster circumstances, many of the assumptions that would normally be accurate may no longer apply.
Infrastructures have been eroded or destroyed, social networks are in a state of flux, and the dynamics of the situation are much less predictable than in non-disaster circumstances.

Thus, a situation map will also have to be a flexible framework that allows for change as the situation alters. The map will be a reference tool to be used throughout the project design, implementation and evaluation. As it is designed to function as something of a touchstone for the project, ensuring that the project objectives remain relevant etc, it is important that it remains up to date.

There are a number of steps involved in creating a complete situational overview:

- Assessing the Disaster
- Mapping of the Territory
- Identification of Key Actors
- Institutional Mapping
- Assessment of Needs

In combination, these steps will help to build a framework of the situation that will instruct the next step, the identification of programme objectives.

Identification of Programme Objectives:

The programme objectives will serve as the benchmark for the evaluation of the programme at later stages. It is therefore extremely important that the objectives are clearly defined, realistic and relevant to the post-disaster situation.

Based on the situation overview, it must be asked, what should this project, realistically, achieve? What are the broader results that would be desirable?

*For example, if designing a programme to re-establish basic infrastructure for affected populations after an earthquake, it would be necessary to lay down what the desired effects of the project would be. These can range from providing access to safe drinking water for all affected communities to ensuring that the project is sustainable and builds upon local resources.*
When determining the programme objectives, there is a need to lay these out in a clear format, not only to ensure that the objectives are recorded and understood by the project staff, but to create a usable record for the local population, which will encourage transparency and accountability in the project. This is crucial as a good relationship between the different groups involved in a project will have a serious impact on the project’s success. This also helps to avoid any unrealistic expectations on the part of the local communities.

Evaluation in the Post-Disaster Project Cycle:

Having an understanding of the programme objectives and a situational overview also helps to conceive the application of evaluation throughout the project cycle. This is important, as the evaluation is an ongoing process that will impact the project throughout its stages of both design and implementation.

Evaluation will serve as a key step in the process, helping to determine the direction of the project in each post-evaluation phase.

Below is a table outlining the role of evaluation in the project cycle.
Table One: Evaluation as Part of the Post-Disaster Project Cycle

**Project Design Phase**

- Post-conflict/post-disaster assessment
- Define overall objectives, examine possible indicators
- Define Specific Objectives
- Define Specific Indicators
- Identify Primary Output
- Assess the needs of the affected populations
- Assess Technical Options for reconstruction and rehabilitation

**Project Implementation Phase**

- Implementation of post-disaster project
- EVALUATION
- Redefinition of Objectives
- Reassessment of the relevance of specific outputs
- Implement Necessary Changes
- Re-evaluate at a later stage
- Cycle continues
- End of Project
- Final Evaluation
Step One: Preparing an Evaluation Plan

Once the project has been outlined and the design stage is underway, it is necessary to design a separate plan for the project evaluation. Such a plan outlines both the practical format of the evaluation as well as the purpose guiding the evaluation.

An evaluation plan is important to answer a number of key questions about the evaluation:

- Why is the evaluation being undertaken?
- What is the evaluation expected to achieve?
- How will the results be used and by whom?
- Who will conduct the evaluation?
- What type of evaluation is most suitable?
- How will the follow-up be carried out?

Each of these questions is discussed briefly below:

Why is the evaluation being undertaken?
The general reasons for an evaluation have already been examined however each project evaluation will serve a more specific purpose in the particular context. It is crucial to understand both the broader reasons for evaluations as well as the more specific needs that inform each individual evaluation. It is important that these reasons are laid out clearly and are understood by all members of the project staff and local groups involved with the project.

What is the evaluation expected to achieve?
This is related to the first question as it builds on the purpose of the evaluation, yet it also points to the expected outcomes of the evaluation. Is the evaluation to help determine the future direction of the project? Is it to determine the level of impact at the end of the project cycle? What is being sought as a result of the evaluation will inform what type of evaluation is undertaken.

How will the results be used and by whom?
The way in which an evaluation is carried out will be informed greatly by the way in which the results are intended to be used. Are they for internal examination only? Are they to be used as a means for public scrutiny of the project? Will they help to determine the continuation of the project or projects like it in the future?
Who will conduct the evaluation?
There are three main categories when deciding who will conduct an evaluation.

- **Self-evaluation** - These are often carried out at several different stages and have a number of particular advantages. Conducting self-evaluations teaches project staff analytical and assessment skills. It also increases the level of participation and ownership of the project by the staff. It is a quick, low-cost method of evaluating and can be undertaken with relatively little warning whenever the situation warrants it.
- **Outside evaluation** - Outside evaluations are used when there is a need for an impartial evaluator, someone that is not directly connected to the project.
- **Joint evaluations** - It is also possible to conduct an evaluation in tandem between an outside evaluator and the project staff. This is an especially useful method as the staff can learn a great deal about evaluation strategies, and the outside evaluator can benefit from the insight they will bring through their close connection to the project. Joint evaluations between two or more agencies can also be useful as this can help give a better overall picture of the situation and the projects’ impact on it.

---

**Box Two: Evaluation Troubleshooting**

The preparation of an evaluation plan can also prove helpful for evaluation troubleshooting as it provides an overall view of the evaluation that lends a better perspective for predicting possible problems.

One key issue to be kept in mind is the misuse of evaluations and evaluation results. Often the success or failure of a project can have political implications in the area, or on the balance of power between certain groups.

The creation of an evaluation plan lends clarity and transparency to the process and helps to eliminate possibilities for misuse of the evaluation process.
What is the scope of the evaluation? Evaluations can range in scope from the very specific to a very broad evaluation of policy, and everything in between.

In summary, the main levels of evaluation are:

- **Policy Evaluation** - Deals with the relevance and direction of the organization's programming in general, not just specific projects.
- **Programme Evaluation** - Assesses the performance more broadly of programming in a particular area.
- **Project Evaluation** - Assesses the practical impact of a specific project.

A specific project evaluation, for example, would focus on the performance of a project with the broader policy framework, but would not evaluate the actual relevance of the overriding policy framework. For example, if evaluating a sanitation project that was designed to re-establish sanitation services in a particular town or area, the evaluation would focus on the number of people who had access restored as a result of the project, how cost and time effective the project had been, whether it had been successful in developing local capacity to deal with such issues in the future, and so forth. It would not examine whether the policies that guided the project, the reasons behind undertaking such projects in the first place, were sound or in need of revision.

A broader policy evaluation might assess the mandate of an agency, as well as its ideologies and institutions (i.e. the operational set-up of the agency). It will often compare one agency with another to determine whether its current mandate and set-up is the most effective. This type of evaluation would include comparative system evaluations of UN agencies, etc.

In between these two there are many different types of evaluations. For example, a programme evaluation may encompass a number of specific projects, but it is not going as far as to evaluate the overarching policies. A thematic evaluation may focus on all projects (or programmes) dealing with a certain issue (for example children or refugees) but again, it is not evaluating the whole system, just a part of it.
In the past, evaluations of humanitarian assistance have tended to focus on project evaluations rather than on policy evaluations. Donor organisations were generally more comfortable evaluating the projects through which a policy was implemented, rather than the assumptions which lay behind a particular policy. Put another way, donors preferred to judge the nuts and bolts of a programme without having to question whether it was the policy that led to the project that needed to be re-evaluated. This is linked with the problem of not placing projects within the broader context of post-disaster rehabilitation identified in the introduction.

Given the range of policy questions currently confronting those involved in the provision of humanitarian assistance (how best to provide protection to civilians in an ongoing conflict, how best to move from relief to development, etc.), there are strong arguments for more direct consideration of policy issues in the evaluation process. All evaluations will generally involve a mix of policy and project evaluation techniques. However, the precise balance between the two will depend on the scope of the evaluation. In any event, single project studies cannot simply ignore the context in which operations take place. The evaluation of humanitarian assistance programmes and projects - the most common form of evaluation - involves a degree of both project and policy evaluation techniques.

What type of evaluation is most suitable?
This is a key step in evaluation planning, as the time and resources needed for an ad hoc evaluation will be very different from an overall or lessons learned evaluation.

- **Ad Hoc Evaluations** - Ad hoc evaluations refer to the ongoing evaluations that are built into a project from the outset, and are carried out at intervals as the project progresses. These are generally self-evaluations, undertaken by the project staff in order to determine if the project is having its desired impact and moving in the appropriate direction.

- **Lessons Learned Evaluations** - Lessons learned evaluations generally come at or near the end of the project cycle. They will focus on an overall assessment of the project and its achievement of the stated objectives. Such evaluations are particularly useful as references for other post-disaster projects.
Case Study: Programme Evaluation - The Case of Water and Sanitation in Iraq

Background: The UNCHS (Habitat) shelter and resettlement programme in Iraq is directed at supporting the efforts of permanent resettlement of internally displaced people in their villages of origin, families resettled or willing to resettle in rural centres, and essential infrastructure of growth centres, internally displaced persons living in temporary shelters, and townships which are acting as supportive bodies for rural resettlements.

The Water and Sanitation (WATSAN) component of the Iraq programme is crucial for the successful resettlement of these communities. WATSAN comprises approximately 14% of the total operating budget of the UNCHS (Habitat) programme in Iraq.

What did the programme evaluation look like? The evaluation of the WATSAN programme was based on a study of the available documentation of the projects; discussions with UNCHS (Habitat) staff involved in the implementation of the programme; discussions with other UN field staff operating in the area; field visits to project sites; and focus group discussions with selected families among the affected communities.

One of the main limitations of the evaluation, as identified in the evaluator’s report, was the lack of relevant indicators in the programme design (see next section for further discussion on indicators).

The assessment was conducted by an outside evaluator, with the purpose of determining whether the WATSAN programme was reaching the target number of communities, and having the desired level of impact.

The results were primarily for the use of UNCHS (Habitat) staff in implementing the WATSAN programme. The evaluation was geared towards improving the ongoing programme, and was therefore undertaken partway through the project cycle.
Evaluation Plan Format

The format of an evaluation plan must be clear and accessible to all project staff and local project partners. It must address the key questions:

- Why is the evaluation being undertaken?
- What is the evaluation expected to achieve?
- How will the results be used and by whom?
- Who will conduct the evaluation?
- What type of evaluation is most suitable?
- How will the follow-up be carried out?

In addition, it must give a detailed breakdown of the specifics of the evaluation - budget, timeline, responsible actors and so forth.

What follows is a sample planning form for designing an evaluation plan.
Evaluation Plan

1. Implementing Organisation: ________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________

2. Partner Organisation(s): ________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________

2. Programme Summary: ________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________
   ________

4. Indicators for Evaluation and Collection of Data:
   ____________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________

5. Funding Sources for the Evaluation: ________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________

6. Evaluation Schedule: ________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________

7. Type of Evaluation:
   a) Evaluating agent(s): ________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________________
   b) Evaluation scope: ________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________________
8. Evaluation Methodology:

a) Data collection: ___________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

b) Literature review: _________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

(c) Interviews:
   i) Project Staff: ____________________________________________
      _________________________________________________________
      _________________________________________________________

   ii) Affected Populations: _______________________________
       _________________________________________________________
       _________________________________________________________

(d) Other: __________________________________________________
         _________________________________________________________
         _________________________________________________________
         _________________________________________________________
Step Two:
Developing Indicators

Once a map has been created of the prevailing situation, and the overall objectives of a programme have been decided, and an evaluation plan has been drawn up, a number of indicators must be determined to use as evaluation yardsticks.

Indicators are the signs that show changes in certain conditions or results from specific interventions. They provide a measurement of the progress of programmes or project activities in the attainment of their objectives. Before the type of indicators that will best suit an individual project can be determined, there must be a clearer understanding of what an indicator is.

**WHAT IS AN INDICATOR?**

Indicators are signposts of change. These indicators will serve as road signs on the map, to guide the programme in assessing whether it is in fact achieving the greatest possible impact on the situation.

As stated in the UNDP Evaluation Report of results-based programming in Pakistan:

*Performance indicators are used to monitor a state of affairs, which is compared with desirable conditions, or goals laid out in principles. An “indicator” is a quantitative or qualitative variable which can be measured or described and which, when observed periodically and analysed, demonstrates trends towards more or less change.*

The report goes on to say that:

*These are pieces of easily understood information that provide insight into matters of larger significance and render perceptible trends that may not be immediately detectable. Stated less technically, indicators help us to understand where we are, which way we are going and how far we are from where we want to be.*

Thus, indicators are road signs through the project cycle that help to demonstrate where the project is and in what direction it is going. But they are more than that, they show how effectively the project is travelling, and if the project is progressing in the right direction.
Post-disaster programming is not a scientific process. It is not possible to control the environment to ascertain that the results being achieved are absolutely precise. Therefore, indicators are not expected to yield precision in the measurement of change in these projects. What is important in the use of indicators is the credibility of the information received. They are used to observe the changes in various key factors, and as a result, an assessment can be reached as to the level of success of a particular intervention.

The Importance of Indicators:
The importance of indicators in project design and evaluation cannot be underestimated. The relevance of the indicators chosen will have a direct impact on the accuracy of the evaluation and the success of the project.

For example, if a project is designed to supply food in a time of famine, one indicator would naturally be a measurement of the tonnage of food delivered to the country. What this fails to measure however, is whether that food was actually received by those people most in need. If the relief is being channelled through a corrupt regime and the most needy are being denied aid because of ethnic discrimination or local political rivalries, this must be addressed in the evaluation. Therefore, the indicators designed to evaluate such a project must be able to track both the delivery of food to the country and the receipt of that food by the affected populations.

Thus, indicators are important as they:

- help project staff to take informed decisions based on accurate information;
- help to diagnose problems with the project and effect quick remedies;
- help the project staff to learn from experiences and integrate the lessons into the project and into future programming;
- make the project objectives clear for the project staff and local partners;
- create a standard framework for discussion of project performance and impact;
- make clear the causal links between project inputs, outputs and outcomes.
Categorising Indicators:
Developing indicators is a difficult process, however categorising the indicators based on what aspects of the project they are meant to measure can make indicator development easier.

For example, developing indicators to assess the sustainability, the relevance, the personnel or the impact of the project helps to break down the project indicators into more workable sections.

The following table illustrates a useful format for categorising indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEASURING</th>
<th>JUSTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement of immediate objectives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The input has reached the target group</td>
<td>Yes/No/Partly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The client and beneficiaries are satisfied with the outputs</td>
<td>Yes/No/Partly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology is operational</td>
<td>Improving/Declining/Status Quo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Socio-economic situation</td>
<td>Improving/Declining/Status Quo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political situation</td>
<td>Improving/Declining/Status Quo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental impact</td>
<td>Improving/Declining/Status Quo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation, Argument, Analysis, etc…
Indicators in Practice:
Now that the nature of an indicator has been established, it must be asked: what does it mean in practice? The first question to be examined is where indicators fit into the post-disaster project cycle. It is important to include indicators at every stage of the project. Though indicators will be present all through the life of the project, they will be most evident when evaluating impact. Below is a chart showing the use of indicators in the project cycle of an Internally Displaced Persons (IDP’s) resettlement project:

Table Two: Indicators in the Project Cycle

As seen above, indicators are present at every stage of the project cycle. They are generally subtle signs of change, and therefore it is important to identify them at the outset of the project.
Each phase of the project cycle will affect or be affected by the indicators chosen to evaluate the project. What follows is an examination of the project cycle and how indicators fit at each stage.

Project Design: At the design stage, indicators must be established to help clarify the logical framework of the programme or project. The development of this framework should occur with the input of all actors involved to ensure a common understanding of the framework of indicators and the terminology used. The selection of indicators will be based on a broad range of criteria in the project set-up, from the scope of the project, to the project objectives.

Project Implementation: This stage has a number of sub-stages, so it will be broken down into several sections.

- Inputs: The kind of inputs that are allocated to a project will have an impact on the type of indicators that can be used in the project evaluation. Inputs refer to the type of resources allocated to a project in order for the project activities to be carried out.

  For example, if a project were designed to reconstruct public buildings in an area, the necessary inputs would include the materials for the rebuilding (lorries, bricks, etc), and the labour to carry out the rebuilding.

- Outputs: The outputs are the concrete products that result from the project (reports written, staff trained, etc.) and as such will provide basic information for the indicators.

  For example, if a project was designed to re-establish sanitation services in a post-disaster area, the outputs would include the number of staff trained to carry out the sanitation services.

- Outcomes: The outcomes of the project will be one of the key phases where indicators are being used to gather the information that will be used in the evaluation. The outcomes are the actual changes in the prevailing situation that have arisen as a result of the project. Therefore, many of the indicators will stem directly from these outcomes.
For example, in a project designed to rebuild roads for the resettlement of IDP's, the main outcome would be the number of IDP's who have returned home as a result of the rebuilding of the access roads.

- Impacts: Impacts assess whether the outputs and outcomes of a project have in fact affected the situation in the way outlined in the project’s objectives. Therefore, the use of indicators is key in this phase of the project cycle.

It is important that the indicators selected are able to accurately assess the impacts of the project in light of other outside factors.

For example, if a set of indicators are designed to measure resettlement of refugees, they must be designed in such a way that they will account for the returning of refugees for reasons unrelated to the project (a drought or other crisis in the host country for example) and differentiate between those effects and the impact of the project.

Project Evaluation: In the evaluation phase of the project, the indicators will be the most important component. The evaluation will be based on the information provided by the various indicators.

If the indicators are not understood by all those involved in the project, they will be of little use, as the evaluation process should be a participatory one, which encourages input from all those affected by the project.

Conclusions:
The use of indicators throughout a project, as seen above, requires a clear understanding of the project’s overall objectives, goals, inputs and outputs. Relevant indicators cannot be chosen unless the objectives, inputs, and outputs are explicit and understood. Therefore, it is crucial to employ a clear strategy when designing the programme. The companion resource guide to this one, *Guidelines for Operational Programme Formulation*, outlines one such method that serves as a useful tool in designing programmes with performance indicators in mind.
Indicator Format:
The following table is designed to maximise the effectiveness of indicators. It lists the indicator, how it will be verified, who will be responsible for its verification, and so on. This is a useful layout to ensure that all project staff and partners have a full understanding of the indicators, how they will be used, and what each person’s role is in the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Verification source</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After one year, 90% of displaced populations will be living in semi-permanent or permanent housing</td>
<td>Project reports, visual assessments, field visits</td>
<td>Percentage of affected population</td>
<td>Time of Impact: 3 months, 6 months, One year</td>
<td>Project management staff of local implementing agency</td>
<td>Results will be compiled in the format of a report held simultaneously by implementing and donor agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Developing Project Specific Indicators:
It is important to have an understanding of how to develop and implement indicators on a project by project basis. How can it be determined which indicators will be most useful for a particular project or programme? The following questions are a useful guideline to follow in determining relevance:

1) Does it measure the intended result accurately with respect to quality, quantity and timing?
2) Will it remain relevant if the intended result changes?
3) Can the information from the indicators be gathered in a timely manner?
4) Is the indicator relevant to the local community? (i.e. does it address the needs of the local population?)
5) Will this set of indicators monitor all the components of the programme?

Box Three:
SMART - What an indicator should be
This quick reference is an easy to remember guide to the main guidelines when determining indicators. They should be:
S - specific
M - measurable
A - achievable
R - realistic
T - trackable

Source: Development and Application of Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: Experience of UNDP Pakistan, March 1999
Developing indicators is a difficult process, and will vary depending upon the project itself. This tool is designed to assist in developing the indicator into a useful tool once it has been identified.

Each indicator will depend upon a number of components for its accuracy - how often it is assessed, for example. How the indicator is verified and how the data is stored will also impact how useful the indicator will be in the overall evaluation.
### Indicator Table (blank format)

Below is the table discussed in the step as a useful format for determining and categorising indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format for Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Objective One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Verification source</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Step Three:
Structuring Indicators - A Methodology

The development of indicators, as examined in the previous section, will depend upon the particular project being undertaken. However, UNCHS (Habitat) has developed a series of indicators that can be used generally for most post-disaster programmes and projects.

Indicators - A Listing:
Developing indicators is not an easy task. Therefore, this table has been provided of general indicators developed by UNCHS (Habitat) based on their usefulness in post-disaster situations. These will serve as a helpful reference point when designing project-specific indicators.

The table breaks down indicators into three sections, which correspond with the breakdown in the scope of evaluations discussed in Step One: policy level, programme level and operational level indicators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES:</th>
<th>OUTCOME INDICATORS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY LEVEL RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Promotion of Governance                     | ♦ Political, legal security and civil society structures are equally representative of and supportive to the needs and interests of all groups, including women.  
♦ In the absence of fully functioning government services, external actors (e.g., UNCHS (Habitat)) adhere to standards, norms, customs and habits germane to the socio-economic fabric of the country served.  
♦ Transparency processes, institutions and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them. |
| 2. Enable/Empower Communities                  | ♦ Communities concerned by the programme/project are consulted and capable of expressing views regarding programme design and objectives.  
♦ Communities are in a position to intervene actively in programme inspired activities.  
♦ Communities are encouraged to come to a full understanding of their situation  
♦ Communities are encouraged and put in a position to continue and replicate programme inspired activities.  
♦ Programme contains elements conducive to emboldening communities to take action for the betterment of their situation. |
| 3. Capacity Building of Stakeholders/Partners   | ♦ Capacity building defined as the transfer of knowledge, technology and appropriate coping mechanisms mutually agreed upon.  
♦ Efforts made and documented to promote the capacity of stakeholders/partners through training, information sharing, scholarships, and access to financial resources. |
| 4. Promotion of Equity/Poverty Reduction        | ♦ Recommendations of international agreements and covenants relevant to equity and poverty reduction respected and adhered to.  
♦ Local institutions entrusted with the promotion of equity and poverty reduction can serve as an entry point to pursue objectives. |
| 5. Improve Access to Shelter and Services | ♦ Financial policy conducive to improving access to shelter and services is in place (credit, mortgages etc.)
♦ Unemployment rate of former refugees, those formerly displaced, ex-combatants, war disabled, widows and others economically dislocated by disaster.
♦ Strategies in shelter delivery systems are geared to ensure equitable and economically sound access to housing (regulation of land tenure).
♦ National partner enabled to reinforce and regulate the housing market |
| 6. Attention to Particular Needs of Women, Children and Vulnerable Groups | ♦ Community Based Organisations (CBO's) and co-operating partners consulted and findings incorporated into design and implementation strategy.
♦ Programme recognises and reflects the changing roles of women as a result of the disaster: women as widows, heads of households, refugees, displaced, disabled etc. and builds on the empowerment which can result from increased participation in social/political/military/economic life during times of conflict. |
| 7. Promotion of Improved Disaster Management in Human Settlements | ♦ Policies and standards for good practices developed and circulated.
♦ Adequate technical support provided |
| 8. Enable Transition from Relief to Development | ♦ Sensitivity developed and understanding of the relief-rehabilitation-development cycle reached in consultation with beneficiaries.
♦ Mechanisms are built into post-disaster rehabilitation to attend to the needs of an emerging administration (revenue collection, reconstruction).
♦ Donor funding allows for humanitarian assistance, rehabilitation and development, as applicable. |
| 9. Promote Reconciliation and Peace Building | ♦ Programme inputs and outputs contribute to the peaceful resolution of conflict.
♦ Programme inputs and outputs contribute to a resurgence or continuity of warfare.
♦ Programme activities and timing are commensurate with the absorbing capacity of former parties to conflict.
♦ Programme is sensitive to sources of tension arising from real and perceived inequalities and seeks to promote social, economic and political equality. |
<p>| 10. Focus on Cities | ♦ Programme /Project objectives have proven to be consistent with established National strategy, or, in their absence, with UN caretaker mandate. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Develop Skills on Disaster Management</td>
<td>♦ Active discussion and reciprocal exchange of technical standards with local partners for the prevention, mitigation and response to disasters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12. Setting up Policies and Standards of Good Practice | ♦ Assessment of ongoing projects thoroughly with the aim to gauge their replicability  
♦ Programme pays attention to ongoing endeavours in human settlements and concludes as to their replicability |
| 13. Promote International Consensus on Disaster Management and Human Settlements | ♦ Network relevant to disaster management and human settlement, inclusive of a decision making capacity, established, fostered and followed up upon  
♦ Programme involves other actors in disaster management  
♦ Programme contributes to share experience and best practices in disaster management |
|   |   |
| **PROGRAMME LEVEL PERFORMANCE** |   |
| 14. Level of Achievement of Objectives | ♦ Number of new refugees, IDP's, and others dislocated by disaster, who are resettled in a community - whether old or new - and having access to housing.  
♦ Number of physical structures useful to reintegration, which have been assisted by programme/project.  
♦ Percentage of households directly connected to water, sewage, electricity and telephone.  
♦ Quantity of rehabilitation interventions completed (by sq. km, sq. m, etc.)  
♦ Productivity and quality of locally produced building materials improved.  
♦ Level of awareness reached with regard to the previous and/or ongoing disaster.  
♦ Women to participate actively in the decision making of programme implementation  
♦ Quality and quantity of services attributable to programme/project improved. |
| 15. Adequacy/Relevance of Original Objectives | ♦ Objectives are still unilaterally agreed upon by all stakeholders involved.  
♦ Objectives correspond to the felt needs of the target group.  
♦ Objectives are consistent with a realistic assessment of the situation on the ground.  
♦ Objectives give due consideration to the cultural and social fabric of the country served. |
16. Changes of Objectives During Execution
   - Objectives have been altered, whether documented or not.

17. Flexibility in Formulation of Original Objectives
   - Programme makes provisions for adjustments and revisions to original objectives
   - Revisions and modifications occurred due to the flexibility built into the project approach.

**OPERATIONAL LEVEL EFFECTIVENESS**

   - Overheads generated through the programme can meet administrative costs in full
   - Budget allocations allow for flexibility indispensable in the execution of post-conflict rehabilitation programmes/projects
   - Overheads generated through programme contribute adequately to overall costs of organisation

19. Promote Co-operation with other Partners
   - Programme contributes to co-ordinating bodies
   - Funds obtained from variety of donors
   - Number and volume of subcontracts entrusted to other partners

20. Proportion of Outputs Produced
   - Percentage of stated outputs reached within a given time frame
   - Outputs produced, which had not been planned for in project design.

21. Degree of Compliance with Delivery Schedule
   - Timeliness of delivery per item
   - Equity of delivery among components reached

22. Adequacy of Original Budget and Schedule
   - Original budget allows for timely procurement, whether international or national
   - Original budget and its allocation are commensurate with the requirements and contingency situations.

**EFFICIENCY**

23. Budget/Funding
   - Funds are sufficient
   - Funds are allocated in due time
   - Funds are allocated in due form and shape

24. Cost per Unit of Output
   - Cost per unit commensurate with/above/below locally, regionally, nationally or internationally established standards

25. Cost per Beneficiary per Type of Output
   - Ratio of total budget committed to beneficiaries reached

26. Cost as Percentage
   - Administrations
   - Operations
   - Overheads
### 27. Adequacy in Mobilisation of Inputs

- Human Resources Management proven to be adequate for project requirements
- Continuity of project inputs is unhindered by financial constraints (stop and go effect)

### 28. Adequacy in Type of Inputs (quality and quantity)

- Design and planning of inputs match local absorptive capacity
- International and national staff selected form coherent team with regard to:
  - consultative process
  - continuity
  - reliability
  - loyalty
- International and national staff is adequate in quantity and quality
- Project staff is utilised according to their potential
- Equipment is appropriate for the project and suitable for local conditions
- Equipment is significantly utilised
- Equipment is properly maintained

### 29. Funding

- Funds are sufficient
- Funds are allocated in due time
- Funds are allocated in due form and shape

### 30. Adequacy in Type of Activities (quality and quantity)

- Activities are consistent with project goals and objectives
- Activities are respectful of local customs and traditions
- Activities are target-oriented
- Activities are mindful of environmental and gender issues
- Activities take into account existing potential and opportunities

### PROGRAMME/PROJECT IMPACT

### 31. Reaching the Target Group

- Number of beneficiaries living permanently and lawfully in settlements provided or assisted by programme
- Returnees and IDP's have access to essential services
- Returnees secure their livelihood
- Employment and income generating activities created, which will outlast the duration of the programme/project.
- Managerial and technical capacity enhanced in revenue collection, cost recovery, other post-disaster related areas
- Women have a sense of ownership over the resettlement and post-disaster rehabilitation process, over identification of problems and the search for solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **32. Satisfaction of Clients/Beneficiaries with Outputs** | ♦ Beneficiary is co-operative in project implementation, resource mobilisation and evaluation of project  
♦ Beneficiary is supportive and contributes to the continuity of the project  
♦ Target groups participate in and contribute to project activities  
♦ Donors (clients) express approval of project performance  
♦ Donors uphold or increase funding to same implementing agency  
♦ External actors (other agencies, journalists, scientists etc.) express appreciation of the project  
♦ Programme management is sensitive to results and impact of project and has a clear picture of the satisfaction prevailing among beneficiaries and clients. |
| **33. Generation of Complementary Activities** | ♦ Complementary activities to the project/programme are reported in writing, orally and visually. |
| **34. Mobilisation of Additional Resources**  | ♦ External funds are secured  
♦ Local funds are secured  
♦ Additional human resources join the project  
♦ Additional resources in kind made available |
| **35. Capacity for Replication**             | ♦ In-roads made allowing co-operating partners to share and benefit from project experiences.  
♦ Local norms, standards and salary scales adhered to.  
♦ Cost per unit and per beneficiary in accordance with local economic and financial possibilities. |
| **36. Execution of Follow-up Activities by Partners** | ♦ Activities emanating from and emulating the project and its objectives take place. |
Step Four:
Undertaking the Evaluation

Once the indicators have been decided upon and incorporated into the project design and the project has been implemented, it is time to start thinking about undertaking the evaluation.

Evaluation Methodology:

Below are a number of different methods for evaluation, which can be used in combination or on their own, depending upon the particular aspects of a programme to be evaluated.

1) Data Collection - The collection of data in post-disaster situations can be extremely difficult. Some outputs, such as the rebuilding of roads, or the tonnage of food delivered to a refugee camp can be relatively straightforward. However, the more intangible effects such as capacity building, gender awareness or community participation are much more difficult to measure. Even in projects that allow for concrete data, such as tonnage of food delivered, there will be other less tangible impacts connected to this data, and therefore, if this method is used for evaluation, it is best used in combination with one of the other following methods. It is important when collecting data to establish the methods for data collection at the outset of the programme to allow for comparisons to be made between different evaluations.

For example, if evaluating a project providing food to a refugee camp, it must be determined whether the amount of food that was projected did in fact arrive at the camp, and whether it arrived within the timeframe set out for the project. However, in order to have a true understanding of the impact of the project, issues such as whether the type of food delivered was the most useful to the refugee population, what type of distribution problems there were once the food arrived in the camp, if there were obstacles transporting the food in time, what were they and how could they be avoided, what impact (if any) the food supplies had on the power balance of groups within the camps, must also be examined.

In light of these other questions, it becomes clear that measuring the amount of food that arrived at the camp alone only gives a partial picture of the impact of the project. Unfortunately, the collection of data on issues such as the power dynamics within a refugee camp is not a simple task. Instead, much of that information is gathered through observation and discussion, interviews with local actors, etc.
The collection of data can also become politicised, where often the figures are exaggerated by different actors to suit personal agendas. A key example of this is illustrated by the problems encountered in many relief efforts where local governments have misrepresented the magnitude of the disaster in order to qualify for a higher amount of aid. Therefore, it is important to have a clear picture of the overall situation when evaluating.

2) Attributing Impact - Analysing the impact of a project involves more than merely determining whether or not the stated objectives have been reached. The degree to which the outcomes achieved have arisen as a result of the project itself must also be examined. The main question that must be kept in mind when determining impact is “Would this result have been achieved in the absence of this project?”

Assessing the level of impact also requires an assessment of the various levels that the programme may be operating on - that is, nationally, municipally and locally. This requires an analysis, not only of what has happened, but also what would likely have happened in the absence of the intervention. This is a difficult task, however it is possible to include mechanisms within a project in order to make such evaluation easier. There are several different methods of measuring impact:

i. The Scientific Approach: This approach is generally favoured by those wishing to generate quantitative data on information that is more easily analysed and packaged, such as the tonnage of food to a refugee camp, or the repair of roads. This is therefore similar to the first method of evaluation - data collection. This information, as discussed above, is generally only one component of post-disaster projects and therefore this approach is less useful in assessing impacts than the following methods.
ii. The Deductive/Inductive Approach: This method tends to employ a more anthropological approach to the gathering of data and to the general analysis. It relies heavily on interviews with key actors, visual observation in the field and comparable lessons from past projects. It does not require a statistically valid ‘proof’ of impact, but seeks to provide a narrative interpretation of any plausible links between an intervention and any impacts. It understands that there are often several ways of interpreting impact, and that interpretation requires a balanced approach. The validity of a specific report has to be judged by the reader on the basis of the logic and consistency of the arguments, the strength and quality of the evidence provided, and of the degree of cross-checking of findings. It should draw upon academic and operational research and the development of a conceptual framework that enhance understanding of how humanitarian assistance and post-disaster rehabilitation interventions work.

For example, if a project aiming to re-establish water and sanitation services in a post-earthquake situation was to be evaluated, interviews with the project staff and site visits to the rehabilitated areas, combined with an understanding of past comparable projects would constitute a deductive/inductive approach to the evaluation.

iii. The Participatory Approach: This method of measuring impact depends, to a greater or lesser extent, on obtaining the views of those most directly affected by the programme. In this approach the evaluation exercise itself is empowering: it does not only seek to measure the attainment of objectives, but it is one of the processes by which such objectives are obtained. It should be noted that the genuinely participatory approach, involving beneficiaries, is complex and time consuming, and subject to a range of difficulties. While it is essential for evaluators to talk to beneficiaries, there are often significant limitations to what they can say about overall programme strategies.

Community meetings are a useful tool for evaluation, as well as an empowering exercise for the local population.
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For example, if evaluating a sanitation project, the direct impact - i.e. does the affected population have access to sanitation services - could be ascertained through interviews and discussion with beneficiaries. However, assessing whether there had been an improvement in the local technical capacity in a sustainable manner would be difficult to determine through such interviews.

In light of these three, rather different strategies, which is the most suitable for evaluating post-disaster projects? The answer to this will depend very much on the nature of the particular project, though a combination of the three, with particular emphasis on the deductive/inductive and participatory models is likely to be the most useful for post-disaster projects. The decision of what method of evaluation will also help to determine the type of indicators used.

**Box Four: Evaluation Questions**

The following questions are helpful to remember when undertaking an evaluation:

1) Was the project effective?
2) Was the project efficient?
3) Is the project relevant?
4) Is the project sustainable?
5) What impact has the project had?
6) What is its cost effectiveness?
7) What (if any) are the unanticipated consequences?
   (barriers, opportunities)
Designing an evaluation report:

The format of the evaluation report will depend greatly on the type of evaluation undertaken. However, there are a few guidelines that are particularly important to keep in mind when drafting an evaluation report.

Many organisations prefer to utilise a particular report form, which helps to standardise the evaluation information and ensures that it comes to them in a clear and usable format. However, a singular evaluation form also has its limitations, as each project and project situation will be different, each evaluation will differ as well.

An evaluation report should:
- clearly respond to the questions outlined in the box above.
- provide the reader with a sense of context of the project.
- provide the reader with a summary of the format of the evaluation - i.e. the scope of the evaluation, timeline, groups interviewed, evaluation methods.
- clearly outline whether the project has achieved its stated objectives, and if not, what changes could be effected (i.e. recommendations for improvement).
- include a preliminary post-evaluation action plan.
Terms of Reference:

Preparing the Terms of Reference (TOR) for a programme or project is an important process, not only because it clearly outlines the parameters of the programme, and provides this framework in a useful manner to the local populations, but it is also a useful exercise in clarifying the programme boundaries, objectives and strategies.

It is important to establish a set of guidelines for preparing TOR’s to ensure that the format remains consistent from project to project, thereby making it easier for different groups to reference past TOR’s and compare them with current projects.

TOR’s must be specific - statements such as “fulfilling development objectives” for example, are too broad. Instead, the TOR should focus the project objectives into a precise workable format.

The key issues and priorities of the project should be clearly stated in the TOR. This helps to outline the needs and expectations of the actors involved in the project.
The following is an example of the Terms of Reference of an evaluation contract from the UNCHS programme in Iraq:

**UNCHS (Habitat) ACTIVITIES IN THE THREE NORTHERN GOVERNORATES OF IRAQ UNDER SCR 986: SETTLEMENTS REHABILITATION, EDUCATION AND WatSan**

**Terms of reference**

[1 November 2000]

**INDEPENDENT THREE-YEAR TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

A. INTRODUCTION

**UNCHS (Habitat) field of responsibility**

UNCHS (Habitat) was called upon to assist in the implementation of the Settlements Rehabilitation component of SCR 986 in early 1997, in relation to the situation of internally displaced persons in the three northern governorates of Iraq, Dohuk, Erbil and Suleimaniyeh. SCR 986 (the “oil for food” agreement) allows for attention to be given to satisfy the humanitarian needs of the population affected by the conflict in the Gulf and the ensuing sanctions to Iraq. The Settlements Rehabilitation programme was designed to give particular attention to the needs of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and other vulnerable groups affected by the breakdown of services, infrastructure and shelter in the three northern governorates. It was estimated that there were 500,000 to 800,000 people under these conditions. Presently, the overall works for the provision of integrated packages of shelter, urban and rural services, and infrastructure benefit directly or indirectly practically most of the population in the three northern governorates through the improved access to facilities and the increased economic activity generated by the programme.

The settlements rehabilitation programme provides integrated packages of attention to IDPs and vulnerable communities to achieve four main goals:

- The resettlement and consolidation of rural villages,
- The attention to the needs of growth centres and towns,
- The rehabilitation of infrastructure and services in urban areas, and
- The attention to complementary humanitarian needs for infrastructure and services of the population.
The programme is now in its eight Phase of operation (Distribution Plan). UNCHS (Habitat) started the implementation of Phase I in April-May 1997. Planned allocations for Phase VIII were provided in September 2000. Phases are approved every six months. Given the nature of the construction works being implemented by UNCHS (Habitat) as well as the volume of allocations, the programmed delivery period for each phase now stands at 24 months.

In addition to settlements rehabilitation activities, resources were allocated for the execution by UNCHS (Habitat) of water supply and sanitation activities (WatSan) in Phase III, and Education (Schools’ rehabilitation) in Phases V to VIII.

The current total allocation of resources for UNCHS (Habitat) execution stands at US$463.4 million (under the so called “13% account”). All operational costs of the Programme (staffing, logistics, equipment, administration, etc.) are covered by a special budget provided by UN every six months (the “2.2% account”). US$15.5 million have so far been allocated to UNCHS (Habitat) under this account.

- **Objective of the review**

The ultimate objective of the review is to optimise the impact of the activities implemented by UNCHS (Habitat) in the three northern governorates in responding and addressing the situation of IDPs and vulnerable groups, and to improve performance in areas where this is shown to be possible. It is expected that the review will highlight achievements, shortcomings, constraints and areas for improvement with regards to the implementation of the UNCHS (Habitat) programme under all phases of the distribution plan. It should be clarified that the review is for the activities executed by UNCHS (Habitat), and not for a particular “sector” of activities. Thus, the review will need to cover implementation on “settlements rehabilitation”, “education” and “WatSan” and their relations/links with the situation of IDPs and vulnerable groups.

However, since activities are strongly conditioned by the provisions of SCR 986 and its interpretation by the various stakeholders in the programme, the technical review will need to consider sectoral, programme, and delivery issues, if its main objective is to be achieved, i.e. addressing adequately the needs of IDPs and vulnerable groups in the three northern governorates. In this regard, in relation with the identified main areas of concentration of its target groups, specific objectives of the review will be to assess and make recommendations on:

- **The settlements rehabilitation, education infrastructure, and WatSan sectors:**
  - Analysis of the sectors (needs/demands)
  - Local resources (material and management) and constraints for sectoral development
  - Recommendations for the development of the sectors
  - Scope for SCR 986 activities in the sectors and their priorities
  - Monitoring of sectoral evolution

- **The “programme” implemented by UNCHS (Habitat):**
  - Adequacy of the activities and resources in relation to the type and level of needs
  - Equity in geographical distribution and among IDPs as well as vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups
  - Quality of services delivered and sustainability of their operation
  - Efficiency in attention to humanitarian needs
Review of target groups and “humanitarian” criteria to be applied in programme implementation in light of programme evolution

Scope and adequacy of the co-ordination required with UNO HCI, other UN agencies, and the de facto local authorities. Recommendations for improvement.

Agency delivery:

The review will cover the technical and managerial capacity to implement the overall “project” cycle, pointing out at internal (staffing, expertise, budgeting, input-output ratio [productivity], etc.), as well as at external factors (contractors, local authorities, local human resources, inter-agency co-ordination [UNO HCI and other UN agencies], information, etc.) that condition delivery:

- Technical planning, strategy and programming
- Design
- Contract management (from tendering to commissioning)
- Procurement and distribution of imported supplies
- Management, quality control and supervision

External consultant

The Institute for Social Studies (ISS) of the Netherlands will be engaged to carry out the independent technical review. They will be assisted by other sectoral experts as required. ISS is a recognised international institution on the assessment and design of technical support and development programmes. It has recognised technical expertise on project appraisal as well as on the technical subjects covered by the review.

B. BACKGROUND

Overall situation since Phase I of the Distribution Plan

The assessment of settlements conditions at the beginning of the programme found that over 4,000 villages had been abandoned or destroyed in the three northern governorates as a result of the Gulf conflict and previous settlements policies. Thousand of families were moved to “collective towns” or displaced to urban areas and abroad. Many of these families were resettled in their villages of origin by external support programmes implemented before SCR 986. However, the resettlement needs of many other IDPs remained unattended.

Currently, IDPs are not a homogenous group. In addition to those described above, there are families displaced from the border with GOI controlled areas, as well as families displaced by inter-factional conflict in the three northern governorates. The diverse origin of IDPs and the political prospects of finding a permanent solution to their resettlement needs have conditioned the evolution of the programme and its capacity to reach the whole target group.
In the three northern governorates, the withdrawal of the central administration and the sanctions resulted in a dramatic reduction of the capacity of the local authorities to generate revenues to maintain and expand infrastructure and public services. Restrictions on the import of building materials, supplies and equipment led to the rapid deterioration of existing services. Collective towns, growth centres and urban areas were severely hit by the collapse of infrastructure and services, affecting particularly the lower income sectors of the population and vulnerable groups, including displaced families. The programme targeted from the beginning also these groups, taking into account that attention was provided in an equitable manner to target and surrounding communities.

The programme has aimed as far as possible at providing integrated packages of attention to the target communities (shelter, water, sanitation, access roads, school and health facilities, community centres, etc.), that is, for the resettlement of IDPs and the assistance to other vulnerable groups and the community to facilitate this process. Construction projects are not necessarily executed as packages but as units that facilitate technical and administrative management of the contracts.

Given the field capabilities developed for the delivery of construction activities, UNOHCI decided to allocate additional works for school rehabilitation to UNCHS (Habitat) starting in Phase V. Similar rationale was applied to the allocation of resources for WatSan activities in Phase III.

After three years of operation, the programme has delivered US$80 million in over 1,530 projects (distribution of projects: housing – 212, education – 483, health – 166, WatSan – 272, roads – 308, other services – 95). Out of this, 830 projects have been completed and handed over to the local authorities. An additional US$40 million worth in projects are currently under design and tendering. The economic impact of the programme is quite noticeable in the three northern governorates. The injection of resources in the local economy for construction activities, currently at US$4.5 million/month and scheduled for increase to over US$10 million/month by the end of 2001, has a noticeable multiplier effect on economic activities and social conditions. The social impact is also noticeable but not systematic assessment has been made in this regard.

Being the only UN agency executing such a large “cash component” (local works) due to the nature of construction activities, both the agency and the programme have to be constantly vigilant of the appropriate use of resources and contracting procedures.

Programme activities started with very limited and unreliable baseline data on needs. This made initial project targeting and the monitoring of its impact quite difficult. While this was not a serious restriction in the initial phases of implementation given the magnitude of the urgent humanitarian needs and the limited resources available, baseline data became necessary as allocations increased, both to define allocation plans and to establish a constructive dialogue with the local authorities whose project concerns were not always focused on areas of priority need.

To fill this gap, UNCHS (Habitat) in collaboration with UNICEF, UNOHCI, and the local authorities carried out a “District Survey” in the three northern governorates in 1997-1998. The survey identified settlements rehabilitation needs and defined priorities for attention. To update this survey carried out during Phase II, UNCHS (Habitat) is presently completing a “Survey of IDPs” (October 2000) that will be followed by a broader “Population Survey” of settlements rehabilitation needs to be completed in early 2001.
Criteria for the identification and design of projects within the context of SCR 986 were defined at the beginning of the programme. There have been recurrent differences of interpretation among programme stakeholders (local authorities, UNOHC, and OIP) regarding the type of activities to be executed under the settlements rehabilitation sector. Project selection criteria have been updated for this purpose and transmitted to the local authorities and UNOHC/OIP. The implementation of the programme is proceeding on that basis until formal guidelines from UNOHC/OIP are produced in this regard.

The programme, as well as the overall SCR 986 activities in Northern Iraq, is now at a watershed. Large allocation of resources to all sectors; the completion of the initial attention to urgent humanitarian needs; and the increased pressure from local authorities and communities to broaden the focus of the programme; makes it necessary to review the concept of humanitarian assistance and the needs of IDPs while keeping them within the general framework of SCR 986. The technical review will need to give particular attention to the degree to which project activities undertaken by UNCHS (Habitat) have addressed the main objective of its involvement in the programme, i.e. to address the needs of IDPs, vulnerable and disadvantaged groups by facilitating their reintegration in their communities of origin or of present residence.

Role of local authorities in sector activity

According to SCR 986, the United Nations is the sole responsible for the execution of activities in the three northern governorates. However, programme implementation is restricted by the fact that it has to implement activities in “consultation” with the de facto local authorities in the three northern governorates, while at the same time being unable to establish formal implementation arrangements with them as in a normal co-operation project.

According to the agreement between the Joint Committee of local authorities in the three northern governorates, UNOHC and UNCHS (Habitat) of early 1999, it was recognised that the local authorities would provide initial inputs for the planning process, maintain a roster of qualified professionals for project design, maintain a list of qualified contractors, inspect the works executed by UNCHS (Habitat), and accept them for operation and maintenance. It was also restated that programme implementation remains the sole responsibility of UN.

The stress caused by this ambiguous situation has marked the development of operational mechanisms for programme implementation. The relation of the de facto local authorities in the three northern governorates to project implementation has evolved during the programme. From an initial situation where UNCHS (Habitat) planned and defined practically alone the works to be done (Phases I and II), the programme evolved through practices where the local authorities presented a list of projects to be considered by UNCHS (Habitat) in the planning of each distribution plan (Phases III to VI), to the submission of a proposed distribution plan to UNOHC for further forwarding to UNCHS (Habitat) (Phases VII and VIII).

Admittedly, the planning capacity of the local authorities has improved along this process. However, this is still far from what is presently required to implement the programme.
Activities/projects in the Distribution Plan and implementation levels budgeted

- Funding allocation and progress in each phase of the distribution plan

The following table presents the total allocation of funds for programme execution under UNCHS (Habitat); the current progress achieved; and the overall level of disbursements. It can be seen from the information provided that the programme is within its programmed delivery targets. While completion of Phases VI and V will be delayed by 3 months, the cumulative disbursement of resources (works completed) is in excess of the total allocations to Phase V.
Evaluation Criteria:

The following table of evaluation criteria is another format for determining the impact of a programme.

Once the method of evaluation has been determined, there are still many questions that need to be addressed within the evaluation format. The choice of indicators will help to address many of these questions. This table, which builds upon the boxed text in Step 4, is a useful supplemental guideline when conducting programme evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Was the positioning of the programme appropriate in the local context?</td>
<td>• Was the programme efficient in its use of technical and financial resources to support rehabilitation and local development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the programme identify the means to effect rehabilitation and the local development?</td>
<td>• Was the programme able to create opportunities for the provision of inputs? Did it obtain results with this creation? Did the programme take advantage of opportunities to mobilise support from the social, political and administrative, and cultural actors in the territory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the programme identify and support the right actors?</td>
<td>• Was the programme able to obtain anticipated results in terms of access to goods and services, and strengthening service networks? What was the degree of effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there a synergy among local, regional and national initiatives?</td>
<td>• Was the programme able to address the urgent and key problems of its associates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the programme address the urgent and key problems of its associates?</td>
<td>• Did the programme identify the urgent and key problems at the regional and national levels and work to address these problems at the local level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the programme identify the urgent and key problems at the regional and national levels and work to address these problems at the local level?</td>
<td>• Was sufficient emphasis placed on strengthening local management, financial capacities and decentralisation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sustainability

- Did the programme's activities produce the desired results or effects?
- Were the programme's initiatives institutionally sustainable? Were budgetary commitments obtained from central governments? Were enduring pacts made between interested actors?
- Were the programme's initiatives socially sustainable? Did the initiatives try to recreate and reinforce confidence in and legitimacy of local institutions (for example, the mayor)? Did they try to generate active citizenship among the local actors by promoting discussions and participatory decision-making processes? Did they try to promote confidence in representative organisations (for example, traditional authorities)?
- Were the programme's initiatives organisationally sustainable? Was sufficient organisational and management capacity built among local actors to ensure economic and technological continuity for the programme?
- Were the programme's initiatives environmentally sustainable? Was the concept of satisfying present needs without jeopardising future generations understood and accepted by local actors? Was the concept incorporated into programme activities?
- Were the programme's initiatives culturally sustainable? Were local cultures and idiosyncrasies respected in the design, prioritisation and implementation of programme activities? Was the programme successful in developing local capacities through mechanisms for local management and decision making? Through the establishment of inter-institutional networks?

### Impact

- How did the programme reach its objectives?
- Were there any unintended or corollary consequences?
- What are the lessons learned for other programmes and projects? In the region or in other parts of the world? For other communities, civil society institutions, government bodies, and international organisations?
- Has the programme strengthened the peace process significantly?
Evaluation Report Form:

This evaluation form is a useful format to use when assessing the progress of a project through information collection from the actors involved in the project (the deductive/inductive approach).  

Ongoing Project Evaluation Report

Basic Project Information (to be provided by project management)

Project number and title:
_____________________________________________________________________

Executing agency:
_____________________________________________________________________  

Project starting date:
Originally planned: ______________ Actual: ____________________

Total budget: (US$)
Originally: ____________________
Latest signed revision: _______________

Period covered by evaluation: ________________________

Part I. Numerical Rating -

Rate the relevance and performance of the project using the following scale:
1. Highly satisfactory
2. Satisfactory
3. Unsatisfactory, with some positive elements
4. Unsatisfactory
X. Not applicable
Place your answers in the column that corresponds to your role in the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSTANTIVE FOCUS</th>
<th>TARGET GROUPS</th>
<th>PROJECT MANAGER</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How relevant is the project to the development priorities of the country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How relevant is the project to the promotion of sustainable human development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are appropriate beneficiary groups being targeted by the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the project address the gender-differentiated needs of the target groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Given the objectives of the project, are the appropriate institutions being assisted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Using the following indicators, rate the contribution of the outputs to the achievement of the immediate objectives.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. (Indicator 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. (Indicator 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. (Indicator 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Rate the production of target outputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Are the management arrangements of the project appropriate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Are the project resources (financial, physical and manpower) adequate in terms of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. quantity?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. quality?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Are project resources being used efficiently to produce planned results?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Is the project cost-effective compared to similar interventions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Based on its work plan, how would you rate the timeliness of the project in terms of:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. production of outputs and initial results?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. inputs delivery?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Prior to the distribution of the form, the indicators must be listed, as reflected in the project document or as agreed upon by the stakeholders.

Please indicate your overall rating of the project, using the following letters:
A Highly Satisfactory
B Satisfactory
C Unsatisfactory, with some positive elements
D Unsatisfactory
X Not applicable

Explain the basis of your rating, which need not be limited to, or which may be different from, the relevance and performance criteria rated above. For the last year of the project, the overall rating should include an assessment of the potential success of the project as well as its relevance and performance.
**Part II: Textual Assessment**

1. What are the major achievements of the project vis-à-vis its objectives during the period under review?

2. What major issues and problems are affecting the implementation of the project?

3. How should these issues or problems be resolved? Please explain in detail the action(s) recommended. Specify who should be responsible for such actions. Also indicate a tentative time frame and the resources required.

4. What new developments (if any) are likely to affect the achievement of the project results? What do you recommend to respond to these developments?

5. What are the views of the target groups with regard to the project? Please note any significant gender-based differences in the views.

6. To date, what lessons (positive and negative) can be drawn from the experience of the project?
7. If the project has already been evaluated, what is the implementation status of the recommendations made by the evaluators?

8. Do you propose any substantive revision to the project document? If yes, what are they? State your justification.

9. Provide any other information that may further support or clarify your assessment of the project. You may include annexes as you deem necessary.
Step Five: Learning from the Evaluation

Once a project has been evaluated, whether it was an ongoing or a final evaluation, the lessons taken from the evaluation must be incorporated, either as changes to the ongoing project, or as lessons learned for future projects. The evaluation itself is a process of learning that must be carried through in the way that projects are designed and implemented from then on. The purpose of the evaluation is to make a project better - more relevant, more cost effective, more sustainable etc. Once it has been decided whether the project has effected the changes outlined in the programme objectives, the lessons of the evaluation must then be implemented.

Full participation in the process outlined above is important in order to ensure that the changes are implemented, and the evaluation is felt to be ‘owned’ by the project staff, most importantly the local project partners.

Follow-up
It is important that the follow-up to the evaluation be as planned and structured as the evaluation itself. This helps dispel perceptions of the evaluation as an end unto itself. If lessons are not learned, and changes not made as a result of the evaluation, the evaluation has not succeeded.

Monitoring Follow-up
This can be an especially difficult phase of evaluation, as momentum can be lost once the assessment portion of the evaluation has been completed.

Preparation of a Post-evaluation Action Plan
This is a useful way of ensuring that the evaluation process does not end with the evaluation. Structuring the post-evaluation plan as clearly as the evaluation itself will help the project staff see the continuation of the process more clearly.
In preparing a post-evaluation action plan, it is important to maintain the same sense of structure that has been present throughout the project. Like the evaluation report, it can be useful to set out a standardised format for the post-evaluation action plan, though again, this does create limitations to the scope of the action plan.

The action plan should include a number of components:

- The key recommendations of the evaluation.
- The changes that should be implemented as a result of those recommendations.
- A timeline for the implementation of the changes.
- Mechanisms for the implementation of the changes.
- A breakdown of responsibility of project staff for the implementation.
- A reaffirmation of the existing programme objectives and any alterations that may have taken place as a result of the evaluation.
APPENDICES
Glossary of Terms

Accountability
Accountability refers to the level at which a programme or project is responsible to the local populations. For example, if their needs are not being met, to what extent will the programme be re-evaluated to address this change?

Capacity
The knowledge, resources and skills required to perform a particular task or function.

Capacity Building
The process through which individuals or organisations develop the knowledge resources and skills needed to undertake particular functions.

Development
The long-term growth, institution and capacity building of a community for the betterment of the quality of life of the population.

Disaster
A disaster is defined not by the event itself, but by the effect that it has on people’s lives. A disaster causes physical destruction, and both physical and emotional hardship for the affected population.

Disaster Mitigation
Disaster mitigation refers to the steps taken to minimise the risks of disaster.

Disaster Prevention
Disaster prevention refers to the elimination of risk from disaster, rather than a minimisation of risk.

Disaster Preparedness
Disaster preparedness refers to the building of readiness to deal with the disaster and the risks associated with it.

Effectiveness
The extent to which a programme achieves its stated objectives.

Evaluation
The process that seeks to determine as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, effectiveness and impact of activities carried out in light of their objectives.
**IDP's**

Internally Displaced Persons refers to populations that have been forced to relocate from their places of residence as a result of the disaster. They differ from refugees as they remain within their own country.

**Impact**

A measure of the changes in awareness, perception or situation brought about by the activity undertaken. In the immediate context, it refers to the extent to which the produced outputs are accepted and utilised by the intended users. In the longer view, it includes the effects of such utilisation on the problem addressed and on the intended beneficiaries.

**Indicator**

Indicators are signs measuring the changes resulting from a project or programme in order to determine the success of the project or programme.

**Inputs**

Goods, services, personnel and other resources made available for the purpose of producing an activity's outputs.

**Objectives**

The stated aims of a project or programme, the results that the programme seeks to achieve.

**Outcomes**

The results of a programme relating directly to the stated programme objectives, and resulting from the programme outputs.

**Outputs**

Outputs refer to the specific results yielded from the practical inputs to a project. The number of local staff trained, or number of reports written, would be examples of project outputs.

**Programme**

A programme differs from a project in that it is generally broader in scope, and may include a number of specific projects as part of the means to achieve its overall goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Cycle</strong></th>
<th>The project cycle refers to the life of the project, through its design phase, to implementation, evaluation and so forth.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rehabilitation</strong></td>
<td>Rehabilitation refers to the longer-term assistance in post-disaster situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which the programme targets the causal issues in a post-disaster situation and remains valid within the context of the post-disaster situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Results refers broadly to the effects of a project or programme. A composite of the outputs, outcomes and impact of a project or programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders refers to those groups directly involved with the project - beneficiaries, project staff and local project partners, for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>The sustainability of a project or programme refers to the ability of the institutions, systems and individuals benefiting from the project to continue to operate once the project ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Transparency refers to the sharing of information and conducting of the project or programme in an open and accessible manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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