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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASA</td>
<td>Ammunition Storage Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVR</td>
<td>Armed Violence Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXO</td>
<td>Abandoned Explosive Ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Battle Area Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLO</td>
<td>Community Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG/DRC</td>
<td>Danish Demining Group/Danish Refugee Council (DDG/DRC),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD</td>
<td>Explosive Ordnance Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERW</td>
<td>Explosive Remnants of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSD</td>
<td>Swiss Foundation for Mine Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNC</td>
<td>General National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Handicap International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>Humanitarian Mine Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR</td>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMACT</td>
<td>Joint Mine Action Coordination Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPB</td>
<td>Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices, Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMAC/LIBMAC¹</td>
<td>Libyan Mine Action Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Mines Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTT</td>
<td>Multi-Task Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPA</td>
<td>Norwegian People’s Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>National Safety Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Risk Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMAS</td>
<td>UN Mine Action Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSMIL</td>
<td>UN Support Mission in Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UXO</td>
<td>Unexploded Ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VfM</td>
<td>Value for Money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The mine action center in Libya originally named itself the LMAC, but upon releasing the abbreviation conflicted with the already established Lebanese Mine Action Center its was changed to LIBMAC.
Key Recommendations

Working in a challenging and restrictive operational environment, the Libya programme has shown it is capable of deploying and initiating operations in a conflict zone. It has managed to remain relevant and coherent with international policies, its own and those of the Dutch Government. Further, it has demonstrated good relations and coordination with national authorities, strived to cooperate and assist them wherever possible and worked towards cost-effectiveness. Areas of consideration include the need to:

- Regularly reassess the alignment between DCA, donor and national partner priorities.
- Remain open to cooperation with LIBMAC and other interlocutors.
- Maintain focus on the link with development and socio-economic impact and seek avenues for further synergies.
- Strengthen focus on gender, including gathering disaggregated gender data.
- Strengthen institutional memory at country and greater DCA level. This could include, systematic use of computer-based record keeping, In-country meetings, workshops (including lessons-learned sessions), intra-programme visits/exchanges and staff pre-deployment training meetings,
- Take opportunity for lessons learned vis-a-vis technical training curricula/packages developed in support of Libya - transfer into institutional knowledge base.
Executive Summary

DanChurchAid (DCA) has been providing mine action support since 1999 and has established itself as a competent and conscientious operator in the sector. In 2012, DCA applied for and won grant support from the Dutch Government as part of its published tender Call for proposals: Humanitarian Mine Action and Cluster Munitions. The multi-country programme emphasises three key elements, to improve human security, to reduce the risk for the affected populations and to assist in building long-term national capacities.

In July 2014, Tana Copenhagen was commissioned to evaluate DCA’s Dutch funded mine action programme. The first part of the evaluation was initiated on August 1st, 2014 and ran to the end of September 2014. The evidential core consisted of preliminary document review which was enhanced by pre-deployment meetings and interviews at DCA HQ in Copenhagen August 6th, 7th and 8th. This was followed by visits to Lebanon and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Libya, though planned for September was not initiated until November 15th due to security concerns.

DCA’s “Humanitarian Mine Action Programme in Lebanon, Libya and the Democratic Republic of Congo” is a contrast in the realities of mine and explosive remnants of war (ERW) contamination; all three countries being quite distinct in degree of national capacity, programme ownership, quality of governance and commitment to development. Respecting these differences, the evaluation has strived to measure the impact of the programme on mine/ unexploded ordnance (UXO) affected communities, its contribution, directly and indirectly, to promoting sustainable livelihoods, and its attempts to develop national institutional capacity. It has done so from the perspective that it should be a lessons-learnt exercise, intended to assist DCA Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) develop and improve.

Key Findings

Mine action activities by international operators are severely restricted due to the political turmoil in Libya, the sensitivity of local authorities and militias to allowing access to some affected areas, as well as of general insecurity. Consequently, DCA has not been able to implement the programme in the way it was intended.

Such constraints also affected the evaluation efforts and the evaluation team’s ability to visit activities, meet beneficiaries and gather evidence.

In spite of this, DCA has demonstrated the ability to deploy and operationalize an HMA programme in an emergency context. It has further shown, it can align with best practice in terms of engagement in fragile states, remain flexible and adapt to changing conditions. The evaluation found the Libya programme to have continuously strived to establish strong work relations and coordination with partners. While important institutional instability has not always allowed this, DCA has endeavoured to cooperate and assist them wherever possible.

The team found that overall DCA’s efforts to analyse and adapt to a fluid and insecure environment have ensured the relevance of the programme throughout the period under consideration.

Application of a human rights based approach, consideration of gender and vulnerability dimensions, have been limited. While this is largely related to the challenging context, the organisation should continue to strive to apply it and follow-up on a number of existing opportunities.

The Libya programme has focussed its operational capacity development on IED (Improvised Explosive Devices) Awareness, Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) and medical training of a primary national partner. In doing so it has done a commendable job of developing the necessary relationships and trust. The effectiveness of these efforts, though
hard to measure, varies across outcomes with most effectiveness noted in the area of clearance. DCA’s ability to carry-out community liaison/RE in Libya has been severely limited due to the ever-changing political/social/security landscape.

DCA has recently modified its *modus operandi* in most of its areas of activity. While the likelihood of effectiveness of these new approaches, in light of the remaining timeframe and the overall operational constraints, is remains to be seen, the connectedness of this programme with the upcoming EU programme enhances likelihood of effectiveness in the long run.

Efficiency is challenged by a number of factors, yet there are no indications that DCA activities are any less efficient than any other organisation in Libya. Operational efficiency has figured centrally in DCA’s operational perspective.

The Team’s inability to move freely, its limited access to key interlocutors and the relatively recent timing of interventions (the NSA support activities in particular), severely restrict a first-hand assessment of the programme’s impact. The effort taken to develop ongoing partnerships with local organisations in a chaotic and volatile environment will be a key feature in promoting sustainability.
1 Introduction

1.1 Evaluation Background and Context
In July 2014, Tana Copenhagen was commissioned by DanChurchAid to evaluate their Dutch funded mine action programmes in Lebanon, DRC and Libya. Though not a specific donor requirement, DCA nevertheless incorporated an evaluation exercise into the programme as an effort to articulate and share lessons learned. The evaluation will form part of DCA’s next planning cycle.

1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation

*DCA’s “Humanitarian Mine Action Programme in Lebanon, Libya and the Democratic Republic of Congo”*, though ostensibly one over-arching programme is actually comprised of three very different national contexts that have either the legacy of old wars, are recently post-conflict, or are currently in the midst of conflict. These three distinct operational environments also exhibit widely different cultures, government capacity and donor environments. These different contexts also materialize in different outputs at programme level. Accordingly, the evaluation has approached the process as essentially three separate country programmes.

Through the examination of the challenges, good practices and lessons learned, the evaluation has specifically endeavoured to assess:

1. The relevance and coherence of the programme vis-à-vis:
   a. DCA policies
   b. Dutch policies
   c. National policies
   d. Beneficiaries
2. How effective the programme has been in translating its inputs into relevant outputs. *i.e.*, clearance targets, MRE/Training targets, etc.
3. The operational efficiency of the programme regarding cost saving measures, human resources, reporting and communications.
4. The overall impact of the programme, especially vis-à-vis stated outcomes. This includes:
   a. Impact of Clearance
   b. Impact of Community Liaison/Survey/MRE
   c. Impact of Capacity Development (internal and external)
5. The sustainability of different outputs in accordance with outcomes. This on three fronts:
   a. The sustainability of outcomes for beneficiaries,
   b. The sustainability of the capacity development efforts,
   c. The sustainability (longevity) of the operational programme as a whole.

The Team has endeavoured to approach the evaluation as an opportunity to document current practice, both negative and positive from each of the country programmes in order to:

- Make suggestions that might improve performance in-country,
- Publicise lessons learned for the benefit of both DCA’s mine action programmes as well as mine action at large,
- Add to DCA’s mine action knowledge base and bolster institutional memory,
- Feed into DCA’s ongoing planning cycle.

The overall purpose of the evaluation has been to measure the achievements of the programme against the logframes and original project proposal. Further, as a lessons learned exercise it is intended to develop recommendations for future project development and improvement. In doing so the evaluation is also intended to confirm that the programme has been in adherence with the Netherlands Development Cooperation’s policy objectives.²

² See Annex 2 for the evaluation Terms of Reference
2 Methodology

2.1 Evaluation Management
The Team Leader and the Humanitarian Expert have in tandem been responsible for developing methodology, interview guidelines and schedules, while the Tana Project Manager has ensured that the overall contractual requirements were met. In addition, the quality assurance (QA) Expert has played a vital role in ensuring the delivery of an evaluation document that meets the specific needs of DCA in terms of size, format, scope, tone and usability.

Figure 1: Evaluation Management Structure

2.2 Research Workflow
Field work in Libya was originally scheduled to take place in late September, contiguous to the work done in the other two countries operating under the Dutch grant, however security concerns forced its postponement until November 17-25, 2014. The evidential core consisted of a preliminary document review which was to an extent, enhanced by pre-deployment meetings and interviews at DCA HQ in Copenhagen that took place between August 6 and 8, 2014.

2.3 Data Collection
The evaluation team applied a mixed methods approach centred on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria\(^3\) and relied most heavily on qualitative data.

Desk Review
An initial desk review was undertaken on the most relevant available background material to ensure that the team had a full and up-to-date understanding of the strategic context for the mine action programme, its objectives and activities, its outputs to date and the recommendations from any previous reviews. Please refer to Annex 3 for an overview of the documents reviewed for Libya.

Consultations were held at headquarters and field level which included face-to-face, telephone and Skype interviews depending on preference/logistical considerations.

Headquarters Meetings
In the finalisation of the evaluation methodology, DCA decided that the originally proposed inception workshop was not required. Therefore, following the preparatory and background activities, the evaluation proper began with initial meetings in Copenhagen between the Evaluation Team and key management, operations and support staff at DCA.\(^4\)

\(^3\) i.e. relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability
\(^4\) Following-on from the decision not to convene a formal Inception Workshop, Tana has not developed a stand-alone Inception Report. Any information gathered or key points addressed during the initial, pre-deployment phase have been captured in the main body of the evaluation report.
In-Country Field Work
The field portion of the evaluation has accounted for the bulk of the data generated and has been key in covering the DCA programme activities, outputs and outcomes, as well as giving the team the opportunity to consult with key stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Field work in Libya began on November 17th and primarily entailed meetings with the DCA Staff in both Tripoli and Misrata, representatives from the NSA, Diplomatic Police and UNMAS. Attempts to see the Libya Mine Action Center (LIBMAC) were not successful. Nor was it possible to speak directly with beneficiaries. Also included were visits to the completed BAC tasks in Dafniya and Al Kareem outside of Misrata.

A verbal de-brief of the mission’s preliminary findings and recommendations was held with the Libya Programme Manager and other relevant staff prior to the team’s departure. This was both an opportunity to give feedback to the programme and validate findings.

Evaluation Team

Field
1. Eric Filippino, Director, Mine Action Resources, Team Leader and Mine Action Expert
2. Dina Sinigallia, Tana Copenhagen - Humanitarian Expert

Copenhagen
4. Maria Bak, Project Manager, Tana Copenhagen

2.4 Limitations of the Evaluation
Libya as an operational context presents a host of serious challenges due to the ever-changing political and security situation. The team appreciates that conducting a programme evaluation in the midst of a country wide crisis is less than ideal. As such, the Evaluation Team has strived to remain flexible; however, not surprisingly, the team did encounter certain unavoidable obstacles that affected its ability to carry out the evaluation as originally planned:

- Reduced freedom of movement,
- No activities to be monitored at the time of the visit,
- Very limited access to non-DCA interlocutors, including Libyan government representatives, donor representatives, beneficiaries and in particular, women; Inability to meet with the Libya Mine Action Center,
- No in-country presence of other major NGO operators (FSD, MAG, and HI) at the time of the evaluation,
- UNMAS Staff, available, only deployed in country a few days prior, other staff either no longer on contract or out of country,
- No Libyan normative references or data available: i.e. Standards, SoPs, strategy documents, etc.,
- No verifiable victim data.

It must again be noted that that these obstacles were beyond DCA Libya’s control and they did make every reasonable effort to surmount them.

3 General Programme Background
On March 15th, 2012, DCA submitted a proposal for some €14.7 million to the Dutch Stability Fund (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) to carry out humanitarian mine action (HMA) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Lebanon and Libya. In June 2012, the organisation was awarded approximately €8.5 million. Funding was granted for four years, though at country level, it

Start Date of Dutch Funded Activities
- Lebanon: July 2012
- Libya: September 2012
- DRC: February/May 2013
covers different periods: four years in Lebanon and two years in DRC and Libya. The two latter requested no cost extensions for various reasons, expending their activities into 2015.

The programme has been built around three outcomes:
1. To improve human security and establish the conditions for safe and sustainable livelihoods for war-affected populations in DR Congo, Lebanon and Libya through clearance and survey of land contaminated by ERW.
2. To reduce the risk for the affected populations in DR Congo, Lebanon and Libya through Community Liaison and Risk Education activities.
3. To assist in building long-term national capacities for mine action though support for national clearance plans and capacity building of national Mine Action Coordination Centres and partners.

These three outcomes materialise in different sets of outputs and activities at the country level.

4 Libya

4.1 Libyan context

The Qaddafi regime was toppled in mid-2011 and replaced by a transitional government. In July 2012 the country's first free national elections in six decades were organised.

Libya is however currently characterized by insecurity and instability. Tensions between nationalists and Islamists have hindered attempts to produce a stable government. In 2014, the country was riven by fighting between rival militias and suffered from a chronic absence of security. Central government collapsed.

“There are now two governments in Libya. One is in the eastern city of Tobruk, backed by the rump of the elected parliament, the House of Representatives (HOR). The other, based in the capital, Tripoli, has taken de facto control over ministries, relying on a handful of former members of the HOR’s predecessor, the General National Congress (GNC), to provide a veneer of legitimacy. Each is associated with a coalition of militia forces: those supporting the rump parliament have dubbed themselves Operation Dignity; those opposing it go by Operation Dawn. And each is flush with cash, heavy weaponry, and support from outside powers”.\(^5\)

Benghazi, the second city of the country and headquarters of the 2011 Revolution, is largely in the hands of Islamist fighters, some with links to al-Qaeda. There are daily assassinations of officials, journalists and social activists. Misrata, the third city and main port, for its part, is loyal to the Tripoli authorities. Its militias keep them in power.

Analysts stress that in such an environment, “restoring stability in Libya and building a unified security structure will be difficult if not impossible without broad-based political reconciliation”\(^6\).


4.2 Mines and Unexploded Ordnance (UXOs)\textsuperscript{7}

Mine and UXO Contamination in Libya
Libya has been subject to different phases of mine and unexploded ordnance (UXO) contamination yet the exact extent of contamination remains unknown. No nation-wide survey has ever been conducted.

Libya is contaminated by mines,\textsuperscript{8} cluster munitions remnants and unexploded ordnance from World War II, as well as from wars with Egypt (1977) and Chad (1980–1987). Libya furthermore emerged from the 2011 conflict with extensive contamination by a wide array of unexploded ordnance and abandoned explosive ordnance (AXOs), although the precise extent is unknown.\textsuperscript{9} Reports indicate that tens of thousands of mines\textsuperscript{10}, as well as cluster munitions were used.

Since the fall of Col. Qaddafi, Libya has been in a state of civil war, with a multiplication of armed groups and high availability of small arms among the population. It should furthermore be noted that, as the Qaddafi government progressively lost control of the country in 2011, massive weapon and munitions depots containing mines, cluster munitions and other weaponry were abandoned by government forces and left unsecured.

The timeline presented in Annex 5 is aimed at providing an overview of events in Libya set against DCA’s operations. Notable events include the deterioration of the situation in Benghazi, the armed up-rise in Bani-Walid in October 2012, the isolation law in May 2013, banning Qaddafi-era officials from holding public office, and the institutional instability as of early 2014 and the culmination as of June.

Mine Action Actors
Under the former regime of Col. Qaddafi, the Ministry of Defense and the Civil Protection Unit, located within the Ministry of Interior and Justice, each had responsibilities for various aspects of mine action. The Ministry of Defense reportedly cleared areas serving either a military or civilian development purpose. The Civil Protection Unit is said to have carried out clearance in affected communities.

Since the change of regime, mine action has been affected by wider political turmoil as well as competing mandate-claims by various institutions including:

- The Libyan Mine Action Center (LMAC/LIBMAC), mandated by a decision of the Minister of Defense in December 2011 to coordinate mine action, support efforts to control ammunition storage areas (ASAs), and decommission weapons. LMAC has its head office in Tripoli and regional branches in Benghazi, Zintan, Misrata, and Sabha. Its role became more prominent for HMA in the course of 2012 though the extent of its reach is unclear.
- The Office of the Chief of the General Staff of the Army has jurisdiction over arms and ammunition and a role coordinating a range of operations.
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ National Programme for Demining and Rehabilitation of Lands was set up in 2004 and revived by the ministry after the change of regime.
- The Ministry of Interior’s National Safety Authority (NSA), which before the revolution was responsible for EOD.

Legal Framework in Libya
- Not acceded to AP Mine Ban Convention (APMBC)
- Not party to Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM)
- Not party to Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW)

\textsuperscript{7}This section is to a great extent based on the Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor country profile of Libya.
\textsuperscript{8}Minefields are said to exist in desert, port, and urban areas.
\textsuperscript{9}Heavy contamination by UXO or AXO has been reported around towns that became battle grounds between pro- and anti-Qaddafi forces stretching from the western Nafusa mountains to Zintan (southwest of Tripoli); in and around Misrata, Zlitan, and Bani Walid to the east and southeast of Tripoli; Sirte, Ras Lanuf, Brega, and near Ajdabiya, all along the coast of the Gulf of Sidra; as well as Benghazi and Tobruk near the border with Egypt.
\textsuperscript{10}The first reports of pro- Qaddafi forces using mines emerged in late March 2011 in the east of the country, then in the Nafusa mountain range in the northwest, and finally around Tripoli and coastal towns in the west.
Attempts were reportedly made in 2013, with the help of UNDP, to develop a Libyan mine action plan/strategy. As of the time of writing, however, no document or Libyan official was available to verify this\textsuperscript{11}.

There are a number of international demining organisations in various states and stages of operation in country:

- **NGOs:** DanChurchAid (DCA), Danish Demining Group/Danish Refugee Council (DDG/DRC), Handicap International (HI), MAG, Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) and the Swiss Foundation for Mine Action (FSD).
- **UN:** The UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS) began its work in Libya in April or May 2011 and then transitioned to become the Arms and Ammunition Advisory Section of the UN Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL).
- **Commercial:** MECHEM, Minetech, the Santa Barbara Foundation.
- **Other:** ICRC was also involved in risk education temporarily suspended activities after the killing of a senior staff in June and evacuated from Libya in July 2014.

At the time of writing it is unclear how many of these partners are still operational.

From March 2011 to the end of June 2012, international NGOs and the UN partnered to form the Joint Mine Action Coordination Team (JMACT), working together to "present a coordinated response to the threat that arose in Libya following the 2011 conflict".

**Casualties – Victim Assistance and Risk Education**

The total number of casualties from mines and other ordnance in Libya is not known; all available estimates pre-date the 2011 conflict. While the ICRC assisted the LMAC to establish a casualty data management system, this information is not shared with other actors. Victim assistance systems were also seriously disrupted since the 2011 conflict. There is no national plan for victim assistance.

In July 2011, UNICEF and HI began providing mine risk education in internally displaced persons camps. A variety of NGOs have since engaged in risk education.

### 4.3 DCA in Libya

Libya is a relatively new operation for DCA. The organisation arrived in country in May 2011 when the country was still in turmoil. Having first arrived in Benghazi, DCA progressively moved to Misrata and Tripoli as the situation stabilised. DCA has sought to maintain a consistent presence in country, only evacuating by necessity and returning swiftly. DCA continues to have a presence in the three main cities of Tripoli, Misrata and Benghazi.

Both DCA development and DCA HMA are present in Libya and merged into a single management structure in October 2013.

As illustrated by the box above, DCA has seen important staffing changes. Between 2012 and June 2014, DCA operated three Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)/Multi-Task Teams (MTTs), which worked in Zliten, Misrata, Dafniya, and Bani Walid conducting battle area clearance (BAC) and spot clearance. Some spot tasks were also carried out initially in Tripoli. The teams later concentrated in and around Misrata. Since June 2014, DCA has suspended its BAC activities and let go its MTTs. Reasons include the restrictions put on humanitarian space.

\textsuperscript{11} Email exchange with Stephen Bryant, former UNDP CTA in Libya.
The Dutch Grant
While DCA was awarded the Dutch grant in June 2012, implementation in Libya only began in September 2012 after the closing of a Danida grant on which this programme was based.

The results framework and related budget presented in the proposal were revised on a number of occasions to adapt to the volatile environment on the ground. Annex 6 and 7 provide an overview of the budget and logframe changes respectively.

While the programme should initially have been completed by the end of 2014, DCA submitted a request for a no cost extension, including a slight (re) revision of the results framework. Activities should now continue until March 2015. In brief, activities can be broken down into three categories:

1. BAC and EOD spot tasks using 2 MTTs based in Misrata. In the last revision DCA has suspended its BAC/EOD activities altogether and replaced them by support to the NSA (as well as manual demining).
2. Risk education. In the last revision DCA suspended its risk education activities and replaced them by support to civil society organisations.
3. Building long-term capacity for mine action in Libya initially through the training of a national NGO partner, later with a focus on the NSA (and LIBMAC).

Note on Humanitarian Space
Mine action activities by international operators were restricted due to the political turmoil in Libya, the sensitivity of local authorities and militias to allowing access to some affected areas, as well as of general insecurity. In Misrata for instance, the Military Council is central in giving authorisation to operate and has limited DCA’s margin of manoeuvre.

This lack of humanitarian space has affected DCA’s operations and forced it to adopt a low visibility approach. The organisation has had to suspend activities on two occasions, most recently (and longest) between July and September 2014. Insecurity has also affected its ability to carry out field visits or mentor the NSA. DCA international staff is based in Tripoli and can visit Misrata with caution. DCA only has a minimal presence in Benghazi and no international staff can visit. The organisation also has been the victim of the theft of 6 vehicles (5 of which were Dutch funded) as well as computers.

Note on Institutional Instability
DCA has invested much in developing and maintaining relationships with different stakeholders. As mentioned above and illustrated in the timeline in Annex 5, there has however been great institutional instability in Libya since the revolution. This affected not only the overall political and security environment DCA is operating in, but also its direct interlocutors and partners. Examples include:

- Resignation of the Minister of Interior 08/2013 whom DCA (and the Dutch embassy) had been trying to approach to discuss the NSA,
- The Isolation Law (05/2013) led to changes in personnel of the NSA.
- Since arriving in country, DCA has met at least six different heads of the NSA.

---

12 DCA did not conduct mine clearance in Libya, though it was asked to verify an area of Zlitan where volunteers had cleared a large mine belt.
5 Analysis against Evaluation Criteria

5.1 Relevance and Coherence

- To what extent have the objectives of the DCA Mine Action Strategy been delivered in the mine action programme results?
- Is the DCA mine action programme in DR Congo, Libya and Lebanon coherent with the objectives of the Dutch MFA Mine Action Strategy?
- Is the DCA approach to mine action in Libya based on a coherent evidence based framework?
- To what extent do the objectives of the interventions fit the requirements of the beneficiaries?

Relevance and coherence are assessed against DCA’s vision and plan, human rights based approach as well as, to some extent, vis-à-vis the future orientation of Safer Communities. They are also assessed, to the extent possible, against Dutch priorities (global and in Libya). Relevance vis-à-vis the Libyan level of contamination and the issue of whether the programme responds to people’s needs, in line with DCA’s focus on the most vulnerable, will be considered as well.

While DCA consulted with various stakeholders in the process of defining the programme under consideration, it has had to adapt outputs on a number of occasions in order to maintain its relevance. To a great extent, DCA did what it could do (what it was given the authorization to do, where it was safe enough to do it) within the broad priorities defined at the output level. The initial assumption that “Libya is currently in a stabilization phase under the transitional government” indeed proved overly positive.

Relevance to and Coherence with DCA Priorities

The Dutch programme is generally coherent with DCA’s Vision and Plan especially its objective to work towards “the right to protection against the negative effects of landmines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war”.

The programme is relevant to and coherent with DCA’s HMA aims in Libya as expressed by the DCA HMA Programme Document especially with regards to reducing or removing threats to the civilian population posed by ERW and small arms. Furthermore, the programme is increasingly coherent with other aspects of DCA’s work in Libya such as DCA’s active citizenship programme with the new focus on working through the latter’s civil society organisations for risk education. Complementarity between DCA programmes in Libya furthermore ensures the relevance to and coherence with the Safer Communities approach.

DCA policy stresses the importance of creating synergies and linkages between development and humanitarian response. This is explored in the Libya programme where for instance civil society capacities will be strengthened through involvement in risk education. Libya still being an emergency context, the focus on socio-economic factors is limited for the time being. While this is largely related to the sweeping restrictions under which DCA operates, it should remain a key point of attention. It is important to stress that this however does not mean that there is no socio-economic impact of activities (BAC in particular).

DCA’s HMA policy states that DCA shall intervene in post-conflict as well as conflict situations. The early intervention in Libya is hence coherent with DCA policies. It has however posed serious challenges to DCA’s work both from a security and operational perspective. DCA has engaged in risk and context analysis, which it also shares with headquarters and partners. This analysis is essential and should continue to feed into the

13 DCA, full application, p.19.
cost – benefit analysis of remaining engaged, where DCA’s principle of “response to the very acute needs of people”\textsuperscript{14} is a central element in addition to staff security and staff welfare.

DCA’s policies, including its human rights based approach stress a commitment to human rights, accountability, transparency, participation and a focus on the world’s most vulnerable. As a result of the challenging environment, DCA has had to make some decisions compounding some of these principles. Indeed, insecurity has compelled DCA to adopt a low visibility approach (including no logos on cars, no sign posts on sites etc.) and to limit its movements and interactions.

Restrictions imposed by local authorities, such as preventing DCA from carrying out formal risk education sessions further limit participation.

Within the limited margin of manoeuvre it has had, DCA has strived to promote its HRBA principles. This is illustrated by the risk education sessions carried out with migrant workers, as well as efforts towards adapting training to the needs of illiterate participants, awareness of discrimination based on age and area of origin in institutions etc.

The team understands the opportunity to involve women is severely restricted and that DCA has to make sure not to put beneficiaries (especially women) at risk should they involve them further. DCA’s plans to bring it’s active citizenship (i.e. women’s empowerment) and risk education activities closer together by involving the active citizenship’s partner civil society organisations (CSOs) in risk education is a positive outlook in this regard. The CSO’s members are both women and men, and issues dealt with include gender and human rights.

DCA repeatedly analysed the situation and its position with a focus on coherence with humanitarian principles and “do no harm”. Unlike others, DCA chose not to clear ammunition storage facilities, voicing doubts about the potential re-use of this ammunition in the absence of a clear mandate to dispose stock. In a volatile environment such as Libya, it is essential that DCA continues its analysis regarding humanitarian principles and “do no harm”. As mentioned below (see impact) the question of institutional engagement should be part of this analysis.

Relevance to and Coherence with Dutch Priorities

The programme falls under the policy priority Security and Rule of Law, in particular the objective of “improving human security”. The Libyan programme is relevant to this priority. With regards to “contributing to legitimate government with sufficient capacity”, DCA’s intervention is in principle relevant. DCA indeed seeks to support, to the extent possible, authorities in their efforts and priorities. Given the lack of clarity with regards to institutional mandates when it comes to HMA, this question is however further discussed in the section on impact. The team would like to highlight the new focus on the NSA (instead of a local NGO partner) as a highly relevant approach especially in the long term; this does however not preclude continuously exploring avenues to supporting LIBMAC as well.

The Netherland’s priorities with regards to Libya after the 2011 revolution were twofold: i. Promotion of bilateral trade and ii. Strengthening of political dialogue, in particular through the Matra cooperation programme. HMA, while directly managed by the Hague, was the biggest component of Dutch activities in Libya. Its relevance unfolded during the course of the programme in terms of political dialogue and contacts (including commercial) with the Libyan Ministry of Defence.

Relevance to and Coherence with Libyan Priorities

Given the current situation in Libya and in particular its institutional landscape, this question is difficult to answer. Who are the authorities? What are their priorities? There is no national

\textsuperscript{14} DanChurchAid’s Policy in Humanitarian Mine Action, October 2001, p. 6.
strategy and no sector plans. The team hence chose to look at this question more from a relevance to the contamination level in country.

As described above, the contamination level in Libya is high and many different actors, including the UN have called for concerted efforts to deal with this challenge. A number of institutions whose mandate would be to deal with UXOs do exist, but their capacity and resources are very limited. This is an emergency situation where clearance and risk education are to be carried out along-side ongoing acts of contamination.

DCA’s programme is hence relevant to the country’s needs. The shift in focus from mine clearance to EOD/BAC was also in line with the side-lining of mine contamination as a priority in the face of more pressing matters (and restrictions to carrying it out).

Relevance to Beneficiaries
In principle, the programme is highly relevant to beneficiaries. Indeed, contamination in 2011 and since poses a direct threat to the Libyan population, more so than residual contamination from WWII or other conflicts mentioned above. DCA carried out spot tasks under important restrictions, including in terms of access. Principles of participation and transparency could thus only be partially followed.

The volatility of the situation has been highlighted on a number of occasions. DCA has made important efforts to remain well informed of the security and political situation. It will need to continue analysing the situation in order to remain relevant. Stabilisation and return of IDPs would have implications for the programme as would, on the other hand, further conflict and use of weapons.

5.2 Effectiveness

This section will mostly focus on achievements at output level, which is also where most of the organisation’s reporting focus lays. Considerations about achievement at outcome level will be taken up under the section on impact. The question of women and girls has been touched upon in the section on relevance and coherence.

When looking at effectiveness, we make a distinction between effectiveness to date (effectively until June 2014) and likelihood of effectiveness for the remainder of the programme.

The team only had access to formal reporting for year one and two. No compiled data was available for 2014, a year which moreover, was interrupted by a two months suspension of activities. Table 1 below provides an overview of the realisation rate at the end of 2013 as indicated in the annual reports.
Table 1: Rate of achievement against outputs, (as reported by DCA)\(^\text{15}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>1: Mine and Battle Area Clearance, Pre/Post Clearance Assessments</th>
<th>2: Community Liaison/risk education</th>
<th>3: Support to National Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1: 2012 (3 months)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="On track" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lower than planned" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Significantly lower than planned" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2: 2013</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="On track" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lower than planned" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Significantly lower than planned" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidenced by the table above, DCA’s effectiveness varies between outputs. DCA changed its activities on a number of occasions in order to remain relevant, effective and efficient, though certain areas remained very challenging throughout.

### Flexibility and Changing the Results Framework

Best practice in terms of engagement in fragile states\(^\text{16}\) prescribes flexibility, taking the local context as a starting point and recognising the links between political, security and development objectives, amongst others. It is evident that DCA made important efforts to analyse the situation, develop a comprehensive understanding and enter into dialogue with a number of stakeholders. DCA furthermore applied a flexible approach in terms of its activities and geographical scope (pulling out from insecure areas). Adapting the results framework accordingly, in agreement with DCA HQ as well as the donor, is an important step in terms of transparency and accountability.

As illustrated by Annex 7, DCA revised its results framework twice. Table 1 above shows the change in indicators and activities, which make it difficult to assess performance systematically and against original targets. The first revision is mostly related to adapting work to the conditions in the field; it includes actually an increase in clearance targets in light of the type of tasks carried out. The second revision on the other hand is a change in approach all together.\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^\text{15}\) The difference in indicators (coloured boxes) between year 1 and 2 is due to the fact that DCA adapted the results framework.


\(^\text{17}\) That being said, DCA should be cautious about potentially appearing to adapt the results framework as an ex-post adaptation of targets to results, as the latest revision of clearance targets could possibly lead one to think.
UXO Clearance

DCA revised the level of its outputs and activities under this outcome on a number of occasions (see Table 2 below). Most importantly, DCA closed its clearance activities entirely (and related tasks) in June 2014 and replaced them with support to/mentoring of the NSA.

**Table 2: Outcome 1 Revisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logframe 07/2012</th>
<th>11/2013 revision</th>
<th>12/2014 revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800,000m² of land cleared and released</td>
<td>2,900,000m²</td>
<td>2,224,129m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,000 beneficiaries (direct/indirect).</td>
<td>150,000 benef.</td>
<td>150,000 benef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 tasks/ year</td>
<td>75 tasks / year</td>
<td>75 tasks / year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 MMCs</td>
<td>2 MTTs</td>
<td>Support to NSA (clearance and medical staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 MTTs</td>
<td>medical staff trained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical staff trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.2 - Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EOD team demolitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.2 - Activities</strong></td>
<td>Training and preparation for impact assessments/deployment</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Support to NSA (impact assessments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness to date:** while DCA initially foresaw working on mine clearance, it worked exclusively on EOD/BAC in two locations (Dafniya and Al Kareem) out of its Misrata base.

In the absence of a well-established national coordination system, formal tasking has not existed so far in Libya. DCA was allocated areas to work in and was then free to carry out BAC independently. This contributed to a high result in terms of square meters cleared and tasks accomplished and DCA significantly surpassed the targets initially set. In the November 2013 review, the organisation more than tripled the target it set for the programme.

DCA’s ability to work was however seriously affected by its principled decision not to engage in ammunition storage areas, considering this not to be a humanitarian task, thereby, to some extent, antagonising authorities who were key to ensuring DCA could operate.

The team could unfortunately not observe DCA’s work in the field. We read with interest the Dafniya post impact assessment which provides anecdotal evidence of working procedures and effectiveness. The team could not look further into the way the number of direct/indirect beneficiaries is defined. While no residents could be seen at Al Kareem, DCA’s assessment of beneficiaries (some 35-40,000 individuals) includes future returnees, traders using the main road as well as the surrounding farms and factories.

As DCA suspended activities due to insecurity in July 2014, it had achieved the following results (Table 3):
Table 3: Results (Outcome 1) as reported by DCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Square meters</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Impact assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 (Sept-Dec)</td>
<td>959,921</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,224,129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>5,991</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (Jan-May)</td>
<td>800,628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,984,678</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likelihood of future effectiveness: DCA revised this outcome regarding clearance to focus on training of the NSA. While supporting a national actor makes sense, especially in the long-term, the effectiveness of this shift in the short-term cannot be determined. Unfortunately, the stakeholders within the NSA with whom the team met were unable to give precise information. Nor could the team see records of the analysis carried out to assess the likelihood of effectiveness of this re-directed support, especially given the very short time frame ahead.

A number of challenges can be mentioned in this regard:
- Mandate uncertainty as to who is in charge (will be in charge) of clearance at the institutional level,
- Actual capacity of NSA to carry out its work,
- DCA capacity to actively support NSA (including security restriction around accompanying NSA in its work).

Risk Education (RE)
DCA revised the level of its outputs and activities under this outcome as well (see Table 4 below). DCA struggled to implement risk education for a number of reasons and now foresees carrying it out using its network of civil society organisations.

Table 4: Outcome 2 Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logframe 07/2012</th>
<th>11/2013 revision</th>
<th>12/2014 revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.1</td>
<td>RE provided in 8 communities</td>
<td>4 communities</td>
<td>Deliver RE through local CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Meetings with LMAC</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td>Coordinate RE provided by CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and deployment of teams</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td>Train and equip CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2 - Activities</td>
<td>KAPB max one year after session</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness to date: DCA was not given the possibility by the Libyan authorities to carry out risk education, which consequently is under target. In response to the imposed restrictions, DCA adopted a flexible approach, using the community liaison officer (CLO) to interact with individuals in areas where clearance activities were being carried out and to share risk education messages. DCA’s efforts faced a number of challenges including recruitment of CLOs and staff quality. Also, while DCA did attempt to recruit a female CLO, it did not succeed (the organisation had one for a limited period of time) and hence had very limited success in reaching out to women and girls.

Another way DCA chose to try and mitigate operational limitations imposed upon it was to approach migrant workers (men only) and share RE messages with them. DCA reached out to 313 individuals this way. While this initiative is valuable given the likely risk behaviour of this group, the team could not measure its effectiveness in the absence of interlocutors.
Lack of documentation compounded the evaluation team’s efforts to measure effectiveness of this outcome. Though KAPB assessments were carried out, the team did not see the reports and hence could not assess the effectiveness of the RE activities.

**Likelihood of future effectiveness:** DCA has decided to use the relationships built with its nine partner CSOs (UK FCO funding) to carry out risk education. This is a positive new approach as working through local actors may provide more manoeuvrability to carry out RE; it should also allow a further reach across the country (including to Benghazi) and inclusion of other groups (including women).

In light of the short remaining timeframe key questions include:

- Can the organisations’ capacity be built rapidly and to a sufficient standard in order to carry out risk education (especially in light of past experience with these organisations)?
- Can the existing support material be adapted (changing the phone numbers on the flyers) rapidly enough to the new strategy?
- Which institution has the mandate to coordinate this new effort?

The team is aware that this strategy has been carried over to DCA’s new programme with the EU, which will greatly aid future effectiveness.

**Support to National Capacity**
DCA revised the level of its outputs and activities under this outcome on a number of occasions (see Table 5 below).

**Table 5: Outcome 3 Revisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 3.1</th>
<th>Logframe (07/2012)</th>
<th>11/2013 revision</th>
<th>12/2014 revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training of national partner (demining and EOD)</td>
<td>NSA and LMAC national capacities to coordinate and respond to ERW contamination</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activities**

- Identify national partner
- Train national partner
- Train/mentor (EOD) NSA
- Support the development of national standards
- On the job training/mentoring of NSA
- Monitoring of progress removed

**Effectiveness to date:** DCA had initially set-out to identify a national NGO partner and in the first 6-8 months of the project three organisations were explored: 3F, the Zlitan Demining Commission and Salema. Only 3F had an active demining/BAC capacity. DCA chose not to proceed with any of the three due to engagement elsewhere of the identified partners, doubts about their humanitarian character and administrative capabilities. In November 2013 DCA hence decided to adapt its approach and to focus on established institutions, especially the NSA. At the time of writing, the team has no information at its disposal to measure the effectiveness of this effort.

**Likelihood of future effectiveness:** Of the two Libyan entities concerned with mine action, DCA has thus far concentrated mostly on the NSA. This has included both providing the NSA with formal trainings (including some provided through EU funding) as well as working hard to establish trust and a cooperative working relationship. In addition to the staff turnover issues mentioned above, recent incidents have also seriously affected the NSA (their training centre has been ransacked for instance) and trainings by DCA have been put on hold until NSA staff feel secure enough to be seen as benefitting from an international NGO’s support. The limited capacity of DCA to actually carry out on the job training (especially outside of Tripoli and Misrata) is another complicating factor.
5.3 Efficiency

- To what extent do the country programmes efficiently apply resources?
- To what extent have capacity guiding initiatives led to greater operational efficiency?
- What is the value for money/cost effectiveness embedded in the delivery mechanisms?

As with effectiveness, when looking at efficiency, we draw a distinction between efficiency to date (effectively up until June 2014) and the likelihood of efficiency for the remainder of the programme.

Making a concrete assessment in regards to operational efficiency in Libya is tenuous at best. The lack of staff/interclocutors with which to speak and relative lack of documentation representing the whole of the programme life-cycle (i.e. initiation/start-up, ongoing operational reporting and post-activity reporting) complicate matters as do the many reasons mentioned previously; such as insecurity, interruptions and institutional instability.

While not wishing to underplay the challenges represented by external factors, it is however important to stress that a number of steps could be taken in order to ensure an institutional memory and the systematic gathering of data and documentation – with positive impacts on efficiency. The team notes that DCA has updated its database and should now be able to access information more easily. It is important that the information and knowledge lies with the organisation and not individuals.

That being said, there is nothing to indicate DCA activities are any less efficient than any other organisation in Libya, all of whom struggle with the chaotic conditions at hand including the need to suspend activities and pull out staff due to insecurity.

Operational efficiency as a goal is foremost in DCA’s operational perspective, and clearly part of the programme’s ethos and thinking. This can be seen, for example, in the programme’s efforts to harmonise in-country activities through the merging of DCA development and DCA HMA as well as the complementarity between programmes (e.g. Armed Violence Reduction and Dutch). It is also a very important aspect that the programme has worked hard to maintain continuity between the Danida – Dutch – EU programmes which has positive implications for overall efficiency, value for money and sustainability as the same activities and interventions have the possibility to be carried out over a long period of time.

Institutional/Interlocutor Relationships

Though time consuming, the importance of creating relationships and managing stakeholders in Libya, where as much is based on patronage as it is on qualification, cannot be overstated. In the volatile Libyan environment, DCA has invested considerable time and energy in pursing such relationships. Several interlocutors reiterated the importance of this as a lesson learned and that time allocated to this activity should not be underestimated.

Despite DCA’s commitment, the near constant institutional turn-over – be it at the NSA, UN or even NGOs has seriously affected its effort to operate efficiently.

Staff turn-over

Turn-over of key players has not been restricted purely to Libyan interlocutors. Among DCA’s own staff, a steady movement has also been a factor as there have been no less than six different Operations Managers/Explosive Ordnance Clearance advisors over the grant period; one position, in particular, was staffed by three different persons. Important staff turn-over was also noted in other sections of the organisation, including the training team.
With each change in personnel, renewed introductions and confidence building efforts with national partners are required— a time consuming exercise that impacts negatively on efficiency.

UXO Clearance

**Efficiency to date:** As noted, a formal prioritisation or tasking process does not exist in Libya, thus the sites in Dafniya and Al Kareem were “self-tasked”. In doing so, DCA applied principles in keeping with its own policies to determine the suitability of the two chosen sites. The need to release agricultural land for production, allow for reconstruction/rehabilitation of infrastructure and improved access/freedom of movement along a major economic/trade corridor. The sites have also, quite naturally, been advantageous from an operational perspective. Evidence of which can be seen in the strong clearance numbers recorded. That being said, the political/security situation in Misrata severely limited the number and type of areas in which they were permitted to work, in effect leaving them with little choice.

**Likelihood of future efficiency:** In 2015, the next iteration of the Libya plan for the Dutch grant does not call for clearance/deployment of the MTTs. However, the EU grant due to begin March 2015, combined with a change in the political/security landscape may allow for renewed clearance activity which, by definition, will build upon the experience, work, and personal developed under Dutch funding thereby contributing to efficiency.

Risk Education

**Efficiency to date:** Severe operational restrictions combined with a steady stream of staff turn-over (one international CLO advisor came and went on short missions and an international CL/RE officer later stayed for the first six months of 2014. DCA had at least five national CLOs for two positions) have coupled to leave the question of efficiency of RE negligible.

**Likelihood of future efficiency:** The last few months of the programme (and its move to EU funding) paint a brighter picture as the newly designed approach that includes its network of civil society organisations should create greater efficiency and impact.

Support to National Capacity

DCA’s choice to focus its capacity development efforts on the NSA is logical and, of the options available, likely to be more efficient over the long-term. From operational reports, as well as training plans and curricula, it is evident that DCA’s capacity development efforts have rightly focussed on the necessary technical skills including IED Awareness, EOD Level I qualification, medical and other field focused operational skills.

**Efficiency to date:** Anecdotal reports indicate that the training support given to the NSA has been of a high standard\(^\text{18}\). The trainings conducted by DCA are professional and well organised, though they too are at the mercy of the Libyan operational context. The DCA training team must schedule, cajole, and re-schedule on an almost continuous basis never knowing for sure until the last minute if a seen or unforeseen obstacle may cancel a scheduled training. In one respect, this supreme level of responsiveness is both necessarily and commendable, though on another, it has undoubtedly led to missed opportunities and delayed or at least drawn-out the overall package of support.

In the initial plan of training services to be provided to the NSA it was originally thought to begin by developing a rapport and clearer understanding of the training needs required and then initiate training with higher, management level themes. It was thus originally planned to recruit one expatriate to focus on these aspects and then a second to follow-up on some of the management systems developed and add technical training support as identified. Due to

---

\(^{18}\) The IED search training of the Diplomatic Police in support of Ban-Ki Moon’s visit may also be mentioned though the team could not meet with the diplomatic police or the diplomatic corps.
a number of issues, in particular the institutional challenges in Libya, the work done to identify and address higher management themes have been deferred.

**Likelihood of future efficiency:** The same instabilities and uncertainties will likely plague the programme until March 2015. However, as Dutch funding segues into EU funding, for what will essentially be the same activities vis-à-vis the NSA, DCA will have more time to provide the necessary support services to the NSA and be able to benefit from existing resources.

**VfM**
Though the evaluation was not a financial audit as such, certain anecdotal evidence of cost reducing initiatives and operational arrangements to do represent value for money. For instance, the Libya programme has worked to share resources across donors (Danida/EU/UK FCO) and cooperate internally with DCA more development focussed activities.

**5.4 Impact**

- To what extent have outcomes of the project been achieved as intended, in particular the project planned objectives. Have those outcomes:
- Been facilitated/constrained by external factors
- Produced any unintended or unexpected impacts and if so how have these affected the overall impact.
- Have been facilitated/constrained by project/programme management, by co-ordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders
- Have contributed to economic and social development
- Have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, good governance, conflict prevention etc.

When looking at impact, the team again draws a distinction between impact to date (effectively up until June 2014) and likelihood of impact for the remainder of the programme.

Challenges in documentation/maintaining institutional memory have created some gaps in information. Some of this rests with DCA while much rests with the national authority. Either way, without accurate survey, victim and/or beneficiary numbers (before, during and after clearance activity) it is virtually impossible to develop a picture of impact.

**UXO Clearance**

**Impact to date:** As mentioned, there is very little documentary evidence for Libya. Further, there were no beneficiaries present or at the disposal of the Evaluation Team (conflict is still on-going and people have not yet returned to all areas cleared by DCA), thus only anecdotal indications of positive economic impact through the clearance performed along the major Misrata trade axis and the adjacent ceramics factory in Al Kareem are present.

**Likelihood of future impact:** The next iteration of the Libya plan for the Dutch grant does not call for direct clearance by DCA/deployment of the MTTs. The EU grant, due to begin March 2015, combined with a change in the political/security landscape may allow for renewed clearance activity. Should conditions change, the MTTs could be re-hired/redeployed within DCA or potentially merged with another operational entity.

The impact of NSA's clearance work on the other hand, be it current or for the future, is hard to assess.

**Risk Education**
**Impact to date:** For all of the aforementioned reasons, RE failed to really materialise in Libya. The attempt to provide some safety information to migrant workers was a notable and conceptually sound effort; however it is essentially impossible to measure given the high mobility of migrant workers and the informal nature of the sensitization.

**Likelihood of future impact:** Again, during the last few months of the programme, as it attempts to work through its network of civil society organisations, the groundwork for a revised intervention model may be established which, if continued under EU funding could bear fruit over time.

**Support to Capacity Development**

**Impact to date:** The approach to work exclusively almost with the NSA was recently adopted and though positive indications do exist, there is no concrete data to reference. Anecdotal evidence gained from the NSA themselves attest to higher levels of motivation, confidence and the ability to speak more openly (both domestically and international) regarding their skills and role in Libya’s UXO risk mitigation process.

In the long run of course, the NSA may provide a risk management service to the people of Libya though it is perhaps too early to properly measure the impact of those efforts.

It should be noted that in light of the confusion about institutional mandates with regards to mines and UXOs, selecting a single partner (NSA) for capacity development runs a number of risks, all the more since other international actors, such as the UN, have focused their attention on LIBMAC. We have mentioned above the current sensitivity expressed by NSA around being seen as benefitting from international support. This is one example. Targeting one’s assistance exclusively may also lead to tensions between institutions, though on the other hand, division of labour between international actors is a positive approach. This type of support consequently requires regular assessments.

An unexpected impact that has come about as a result of the training packages DCA has developed is that they can (and will) be used by other organisations working in the Libyan context as well as by other DCA offices and programmes (South Sudan for instance). This is a very positive development and strengthens DCA and other’s capacities and resource base.

**Likelihood of future impact:** The team believes the training and mentoring support given to the NSA is likely to have an impact in the future, but this cannot be measured now nor will the impact be measurable in the life time of the Dutch project. Plans for project activities initiated under the Dutch project to transition seamlessly to EU funding (March 2015 – for 18 months), are key to this realisation.

**Complementarity with other DCA Interventions**

As mentioned on a number of occasions, DCA’s efforts to ensure the complementarity and continuity between programmes have been a key element contributing to the organisation’s impact. While the Dutch programme has been challenged by numerous factors, the fact that it builds on a Danida funded programme, feeds into the up-coming EU project and furthermore more has clear complementarities with the armed violence reduction programme are positive elements.

19 **Note:** The NSA is a key actor, but the LIBMAC also figures largely in the mine action landscape. Any institutional support in an environment such as Libya can be perceived as a political statement. Something DCA is aware of, but must also remain vigilant of in order to re-assess the situation on a continual basis.
5.5 Sustainability

- To what extent are the benefits provided sustainable over time?
- To what extent is the capacity developed, internally and externally sustainable over time?
- The extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?); whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially.

DCA has chosen to focus much of its attention on the NSA and if a stable functioning government is formed in the near to mid-term, the NSA will surely have a mine action role to play in it. Thus, the choice of the NSA as an operational partner is a logical step for DCA. Capacity development support to national mine action centres, while of course vital, has traditionally been the domain of the UN, be it UNMAS or UNDP, and focusses on establishing their role as a coordination body rather than an implementing one.

NGOs have proven to be better suited at supporting the development of technical, clearance capacities and emphasising this effort within an existing Civil Defense/Civil Protection structure is a forward thinking approach that should be encouraged. In the long-term as the LIBMAC gains experience and authority it will play an important coordination role, while the NSA with its long history of dealing with civil protection issues such as fire, natural disaster and of course residual ERW contamination, will undoubtedly maintain an operational role in the mine/UXO risk mitigation process.

Sustainability of Clearance Benefits Provided
Clearance of land already achieved is sustainable given no new contamination occurs, area is stable and ownership is not contested.

Sustainability of Capacity Developed
The prognosis for sustainability of capacity development assistance given to the NSA is difficult to quantify given the unstable political situation. However, as mentioned, the choice of the NSA as a partner is valid and all things being equal represents a strong probability of success in the long-term.

By all accounts DCA’s MTTs were well trained and professional operators. Though dismissed at the end of the project (June 2014), they undoubtedly retain their hard earned skills and experience. The longer they are out of action however, the more their skills and interest will dissipate.

Sustainability of the Programme as a Whole
It goes without saying that given the volatile nature of Libyan politics any conclusions regarding sustainability of the programme as a whole are subject to change. That being said, the seamless transition from the finalisation of Dutch project and the initiation of the EU project will aid greatly in this regard.

6 Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations

Working in a challenging and restrictive operational environment, the Libya programme has demonstrated its ability to deploy and operationalise an HMA programme in an emergency context, a dilemma HMA often faces. It has managed to remain relevant and coherent with both its own policies, those of the Dutch Government and the local context. It has kept a focus on international principles including those pertaining to human rights and do no harm. It has demonstrated good relations and coordination with national authorities, strived to cooperate and assist them wherever possible and worked towards cost-effectiveness.
The programme has been most effective in the area of clearance while DCA’s ability to carry-out community liaison/RE in Libya has been severely limited due to the ever-changing political/social/security landscape.

Efficiency was challenged by a host of external security, political and institutional factors largely beyond DCA’s control and there are no indications that DCA activities are necessarily any less efficient than any other organisation operating in Libya. This of course also applies to the programme’s impact. The effort taken to develop ongoing partnerships with local organisations in a chaotic and volatile environment will be a key feature in promoting sustainability as will the seamless transition from Dutch funding to EU funding.

The lack of reliable documentation with which to monitor, plan strategically and assess progress has been a complication for the Libya programme. As mentioned, much of this is due to the situation in Libya and the lack of a coherent national mine action coordination process or policy, but also to some extent to the internal DCA data and document management processes which could be strengthened.

Table 6: summary of assessment and recommended action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance &amp; Coherence</th>
<th>Current Assessment</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Coherent with DCA’s Vision and Plan</td>
<td>▪ Relevant to and coherent with DCA’s HMA aims in Libya</td>
<td>▪ Increase coherency with other aspects of DCA’s work (active citizenship and safer communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Some synergies and linkages between development and humanitarian response though challenged by context.</td>
<td>▪ Work in the Libyan conflict situation poses a number of challenges to DCA yet it is line with policies</td>
<td>▪ Maintain focus on link to development and socio-economic impact and seek avenues for further synergies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Mixed results regarding coherence with human rights based approach because of Libyan context.</td>
<td>▪ Nature of activities limits the opportunity to focus on the most vulnerable</td>
<td>▪ Continue to seek opportunities to strengthen participation and transparency without compromising staff or beneficiary security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Little evidence of focus on gender.</td>
<td>▪ Future work through CSOs is a positive outlook</td>
<td>▪ Explore further opportunities to engage with the most vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Focus on humanitarian principles and “do no harm”.</td>
<td>▪ Relevant to Dutch priorities though lack of clarity regarding national HMA mandate complicates effort</td>
<td>▪ Strengthen focus on gender including gathering gender disaggregated data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Relevant to the contamination level, prioritisation of needs and humanitarian space available.</td>
<td>▪ Relevant to beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Current Assessment</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ DCA flexibility, efforts to analyse/understand the local context and engage with stakeholders in line with best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>Ability to work affected by decision not to engage in ASAs, yet overall effective (high clearance rate, challenge to measure beneficiaries).</td>
<td>Should DCA clearance activity resume, strengthen assessment related to beneficiaries (including gender dimension).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Critically under target; important challenges New focus positive though likelihood of effectiveness under the current programme limited.</td>
<td>Use current phase of RE as opportunity to build foundation for future EU programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Limited ability to measure effectiveness within the project period.</td>
<td>Very dependent on Libyan context, little DCA can do about it. Remain realistic, open to engage and make sure contextual analysis remains up to date - avoid risk of being perceived as biased/do harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Adapting targets/activities is in line with best practices of operating in fragile states.</td>
<td>Importance of setting realistic and achievable targets and analyse likelihood of effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Challenges with institutional memory High staff turn-over High investment in relationship management</td>
<td>Continue strengthening institutional memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>Ability to work affected by decision not to engage in ASAs, yet overall efficient (high clearance rate, challenge to measure beneficiaries). No new clearance activity planned under Dutch Grant.</td>
<td>Re-examine clearance of ASAs if operating conditions/restrictions change and come more in line with DCA principles. EU supported activity (March 2015 and beyond) could make use of assets/personnel and skills developed under Dutch grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Unable to operate. Anecdotal indications of positive economic impact New focus positive though likelihood of greater efficiency under the current programme unclear.</td>
<td>EU supported activity (March 2015 and beyond) could make use of assets/personnel and skills developed under Dutch Grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Professional technically accurate training packages/support. Staff on constant stand-by mode necessary in one sense, inefficient in another.</td>
<td>Opportunity for lessons learned vis-a-vis the training curricula/packages developed in support of Libya transferred into institutional knowledge base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VfM</td>
<td>Worked to share resources across donors (Danida/EU/UK FCO), internal cooperation with DCA’s more development focussed activities. Seamless transition between successive donors for same activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Two large BAC sites cleared, however ability to do further work was affected by decision not to engage in ASAs. No new clearance activity planned under the Dutch Grant.</td>
<td>Continue to re-examine clearance of ASAs if operating conditions/restrictions change and come more in line with DCA principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>• Unable to operate.</td>
<td>• Potential opportunity to reassess DCA institutional approach to RE – lessons learned from Libya experience transferred into institutional knowledge base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
<td>• Evidence only anecdotal, though indicates the potential for positive impact over the long-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>• Land already cleared is sustainable given no new contamination occurs, area is stable and ownership is not contested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>• New focus: positive</td>
<td>• Potential opportunity to reassess DCA institutional approach to RE – lessons learned from Libya experience transferred into institutional knowledge base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
<td>• Capacity development of NSA in its infancy, but on the right track.</td>
<td>• Continue to monitor political situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme’s “life expectancy” tied to Libya’s security/political situation.</td>
<td>• Remain open to cooperation with LIBMAC and other interlocutors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for lessons learned vis-a-vis the training curricula/packages developed in support of Libya - transferred into institutional knowledge base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1 – List of interlocutors

Denmark

07/08: Copenhagen
1. Signe Normøse, Head of Support, Programme Coordinator Libya, DCA Mine Action
2. Claus Nielsen, Head of Operations, DCA Mine Action
3. John Montgomery, Training Manager/Security Officer, DCA Libya

30/08: Copenhagen
4. Craig McDiarmid, Programme Manager, DCA Mine Action

Libya

17/11: Tripoli and Misrata
DCA Staff:
5. Knut Furunes, Programme Manager
6. John Montgomery Training/Development Manager
7. Mark Humphries, Training Adviser
8. Bouchra Doueih, Women’s Rights/Active Citizenship
9. Asma Ali Gargoum, Finance Assistant, Misrata
10. Hamza Sassi CLO (former), Misrata

18/11: Tripoli
11. DCA Tripoli Staff

19/11: Tripoli
18. DCA Tripoli Staff

20/11: Tripoli
12. Colonel Mohamed S. El Shibi, National Safety Authority
13. Colonial Abdul Karim, Diplomatic Police

21/11: Tripoli
14. Lance Malin, Programme Manager, UNMAS Libya
15. Bridget Forster, Legal Adviser, UNMAS Libya
16. Douglas Felix, RE Officer, UNMAS Libya

22/11: Tripoli
17. DCA Staff

23/11: Tripoli
18. DCA Staff

26/11: Brussels
19. Francesca Varlese Programme Manager, Crisis Prevention & Response/Migration Management EU Delegation Tripoli

26/11: Home Base
20. Skype - Michel Deelen, (former) Acting Ambassador, Netherlands Embassy-Tripoli
21. Email exchange - Stephen Bryant, former UNDP CTA Libya
Annex 2 - Evaluation Terms of Reference

BACKGROUND INFORMATION
DCA has been implementing a four-year programme in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Lebanon and Libya titled “DCA Humanitarian Mine Action in DR Congo, Lebanon and Libya”. This programme has included mine action, risk education, and training and development of government actors. This ToR is in reference to the external evaluation of the programme. The external evaluation will be conducted in August 2014. The four-year programme (01 July 2012 to 01 July 2016) received approval from the Dutch Government in June 2012 and started operations from July 2012.

The projects under evaluation are implemented to benefit the population of DR Congo, Lebanon, and Libya.

Monitoring: Programme-level monitoring is conducted in Tripoli, Beirut and Bukavu through the DCA Programme Manager in each country, and coordinated at HQ level by the Programme Coordinator. All countries conduct monitoring operations and submit regular reports to HQ (on a monthly basis) and the donor (annually); the latter will be available for the consultant.

Partners and Stakeholders: DCA Democratic Republic of Congo is operating via direct implementation, with key stakeholders including the government of DRC, the provincial governments of Eastern DRC, UNMACC, village leadership, local communities, beneficiaries, schools and school inspectors, and other NGOs working in Eastern DRC. DCA Lebanon is operating via direct implementation, with key stakeholders including the Lebanon Mine Action Centre (LMAC-Lebanon), local authorities in Lebanon and other NGOs working in Lebanon. DCA Libya is operating via direct implementation, with key stakeholders including the Libyan Mine Action Centre (LMAC-Libya), the police and army, the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of the Interior in Tripoli, the Military Council of Misurata, the Civil Defence of the National Safety Authority and other NGOs working in Libya.

CONTRACT OUTCOMES
The programme has the following outcomes:

1. To improve human security and establish the conditions for safe and sustainable livelihoods for war-affected populations in DR Congo, Lebanon and Libya through clearance and survey of land contaminated by ERWs.

2. To reduce the risk for the affected populations in DR Congo, Libya and Lebanon through Community Liaison and Risk Education activities.

3. To assist in building long-term national capacities for mine action though support for national clearance plans and capacity building of national Mine Action Coordination Centres and partners.

OBJECTIVES OF THE CONSULTANCY
The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the achievements of the project outcome where stated in the project proposal and Logframe, and give recommendations for future project development and improvement in mine action, risk education and local capacity development. In addition, the evaluation should confirm adherence to policy objectives of the Netherlands Development Cooperation policy and the objectives outlined in the Call for Proposals published on December 15th 2011.

In addition, the external evaluation will document lessons learned, challenges and good practices of project implementation. Specifically, the external evaluation aims to:
1. Assess the Relevance of the programme outcomes for the beneficiaries and stakeholders,
2. Assess the relevance of the outputs for achieving the outcomes
3. Assess the effectiveness in converting inputs to outputs
4. Evaluate the sustainability of the different outputs in accordance with the outcomes.
5. Make a record of lesson learned, challenges, successes, positive and negative experiences etc.

**SCOPE OF THE SERVICES**
The external evaluation shall comprise but not necessarily be limited to the following:

1. Assess the effectiveness of the programme and component projects in reaching the stated outcomes and outputs, including an analysis of possible constraints.
2. Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the different strategies, with a view to assessing whether the interventions met the needs of the intended beneficiaries in the area of operation. Analysis should consider gender and the differential impacts on women and men.
3. Assess the technical quality of the program activities and the effectiveness and appropriateness of methodologies and approaches applied.
4. Assess the synergy/cooperation achieved at different levels between the different project areas.
5. Review the quality and appropriateness of the monitoring and reporting system.
6. Assess the degree to which financial resources (funds, expertise, time etc.) have been converted into outputs.
7. Review the degree of cooperation and collaboration with organizations and government agencies / offices, including collaboration and networking mechanisms in the implementation of the program.
8. Review the degree of beneficiary participation in programme design and implementation and the programme's overall accountability.
9. Recommend strategies, modifications and improvements for future projects pursuing similar goals.
10. Identify major concerns related to the sustainability of the program.
11. Identify good practices within the program.

The Consultant(s) liaison from DCA will be Signe Nørnose Head of Support based in DCA HQ in Denmark, who will provide support for day-to-day administrative, logistic and program clarifications. The consultant(s) liaison in-country will be Charlotte Billoir, Programme Manager in Democratic Republic of Congo, Craig MacDiarmid, Programme Manager in Lebanon, and Knut Furunes, Programme Manager in Libya. They will be the focal points for administrative and logistic clarifications in relation to each country, and for programme clarifications relating to each country’s part of the programme.

**TIMING, LOGISTICS AND FACILITIES**
The Contract duration will be 50 days between 01 August 2014 and 19 September 2014. The field visits are expected to take place during the month of August. During the field visit elements of the contract, the contractor will be based in, Beirut, Bukavu and Tripoli with significant travel to project implementation sites in DR Congo, Lebanon and Misurata. The Contracting Authority will provide office accommodation (desk and internet).

The consultants should expect to visit all three project locations and plan for at least three weeks of time in the project locations in total.

Practical considerations:
DCA can assist with the local part of visa arrangements for Libya
If required, DCA can assist with booking of hotels and travel.
DCA can arrange travel by road to field sites and local travel. Security will be managed by DCA in each country.

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The questions are intended to guide the consultant(s) in addressing the objectives of the external evaluation:

**Relevance** - The analysis of relevance will focus on the following questions in relation to the design of the project:

1. the project's coherence with broader strategies e.g. national clearance and development priorities
2. the quality of the problem analysis and the project's intervention logic and logical framework matrix, appropriateness of the objectively verifiable indicators of achievement;
3. the extent to which stated outcomes correctly address the identified problems and social needs, clarity and internal consistency of the stated outcomes;
4. the extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified have changed
5. the extent to which outcomes have been updated in order to adapt to changes in the context;
6. the degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances;
7. the quality of the identification of key stakeholders and target groups (including gender analysis and analysis of vulnerable groups);
8. the stakeholder participation in the design and in the management/implementation of the project, the level of local ownership, absorption and implementation capacity;
9. the quality of the analysis of strategic options, of the justification of the recommended implementation strategy, and of management and coordination arrangements;
10. the realism in the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human and administrative resources)
11. the analysis of assumptions and risks;

**Effectiveness**

The analysis of Effectiveness will therefore focus on such issues as:

1. whether the planned benefits are being delivered, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including women and men and specific vulnerable groups);
2. if the assumptions and risk assessments at output-level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly management has adapted to ensure that the outputs would still achieve the purpose; and how well has it been supported in this by key stakeholders
3. How unintended outputs have affected the benefits received positively or negatively and how could have been foreseen and managed.
4. whether any shortcomings were due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation;
5. whether the programme complemented other initiatives (by other NGOs, national organisations, local government)

**Efficiency**

The assessment of Efficiency will therefore focus on such issues as:

1. To what extent was the programme implemented in a cost effective manner? Could the outcomes have been achieved with the use of fewer resources? Or could the outcomes have achieved greater outputs with the same resources?
2. operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs), and management of the budget (including cost control and whether an inadequate budget was a factor);
3. whether management of risk has been adequate, i.e. whether flexibility has been
demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances;
4. relations/coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors;
5. the quality of information management and reporting, and the extent to which key
stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project activities (including
beneficiaries/target groups);
6. Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use
made of it; adequacy of baseline information;
7. Did any unplanned outputs arise from the activities so far?

Impact
At Impact level the final evaluation will make an analysis of the following aspects:

1. Extent to which the outcomes of the project are likely to be achieved as intended, in
particular the project planned objectives.
2. whether the effects of the project:
3. have been facilitated/constrained by external factors
4. Have produced any unintended or unexpected impacts and if so how have these
affected the overall impact.
5. have been facilitated/constrained by project/programme management, by co-
ordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders
6. have contributed to economic and social development
7. Have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality,
environment, good governance, conflict prevention etc.

Sustainability
1. Are the benefits from the project likely to continue after the project has ended? Why
and why not?
2. Has the programme provided policy support and have donor and national policy been
aligned?
3. The extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; whether
the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the
project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and
equipment?); whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over,
technically, financially and managerially;
4. the adequacy of the project budget for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects;
5. socio-cultural factors, e.g. whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of
needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local
power-structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those,
how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well
it is based on an analysis of such factors, including target group/ beneficiary
participation in design and implementation; and the quality of relations between the
external project staff and local communities.

METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH
The evaluation will draw on existing sources of information including monthly reports and
interim reports, proposal, budget, and proposal and budget amendment, as well as field
visits and interviews with beneficiaries, DCA staff and government officials.

The Consultants are free to choose whatever methods are necessary to fulfil the evaluation
objectives. However, it is expected that, wherever possible, participatory approaches should
be adopted. The Consultants should collect qualitative as well as quantitative data.
The evaluation approach will at a minimum include:

1. **Desk review**
   - A review and analysis of project proposal, revisions and reports in order to analyse to what extent outcomes and outputs have been reached.
   - A review of other related documents such as project research materials, manuals, activity reports, mid-term evaluation reports, etc.

2. **Interviews with key stakeholders including project beneficiaries, government officials and DCA.**

3. **Visits to project sites in Libya, Lebanon and DR Congo (security permitting).**

4. **Focus group discussions with key stakeholders (project beneficiaries, government officials, EU delegation).**

5. **Other methodologies as proposed by the evaluator.**

**REPORTING**

The debriefing workshop prior to the Consultants’ departure should present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations. The purpose is to inform DCA and other stakeholders of the Consultants’ observations, and to gather feedback to improve the final report.

The external evaluation report should be produced after incorporating feedback from DCA and their partners. The final report should not exceed 29 (1-3-25) pages (excluding annexes). A draft report should be sent to DCA by e-mail for comments within ten days after the debriefing workshop. The final report should be delivered to DCA, both as a hard copy and as a PDF file.

The evaluation report should be in DCA’s 1-3-25 format, namely:

- 1 page of recommendations for future action
- 3 page (maximum) executive summary
- 25 page (maximum) report. The report should include:
  - Introduction (Objectives, Methodology, ToR, etc.)
  - Context analysis, Background, History
  - The evaluated project
  - Findings
  - Conclusions
  - Lessons learned

- Annexes and case studies may be included
Annex 3 – Document review

Prior to field deployment, the team relied most heavily on the following data sources:
1. The Dutch MFA Mine Action Tender,
2. The initial and revised DCA bids,
3. DCA monthly and annual narrative reports,
4. DCA Safer Communities policy,
5. DCA’s Vision and Plan.

At country level the following documentation was added:
6. EU Libya Evaluation
7. DCA Libya Country Strategy documents,
8. DCA Libya donor reports and sit-reps,
9. DCA Libya project log frames,
10. DCA post clearance assessment reports,
11. DCA Libya Monthly Reports,
12. DCA security updates,
13. DCA training plans/training completion reports.
## Annex 4 – Mission Itinerary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon 17-11-2014</td>
<td>02:00</td>
<td>Collection from Airport</td>
<td>Mitiga Airport</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:00 – 1530</td>
<td>Security Briefing</td>
<td>Tripoli Office</td>
<td>Training/Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16:00 – 19:00</td>
<td>Travel to Misrata</td>
<td>Misrata Office</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 18.11.2014</td>
<td>0900-1500</td>
<td>Daphnia LMAC</td>
<td>Misrata</td>
<td>PM, Finance Assistant, CLO (former)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0900-1500</td>
<td>Al Karimi</td>
<td>Misrata</td>
<td>PM, Finance Assistant, CLO (former)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Travel to Tripoli</td>
<td>Tripoli Office</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 19.11.2014</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Programme Brief</td>
<td>Tripoli Office</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Programme Brief</td>
<td>Tripoli Office</td>
<td>Training/Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur 20.11.2014</td>
<td>09:30-10:00</td>
<td>National Safety Authority</td>
<td>NSA Offices, Tripoli</td>
<td>Training/Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td>Diplomatic Police</td>
<td>Police HQ</td>
<td>Training/Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 21.11.2014</td>
<td>09:50</td>
<td>Dina Departure</td>
<td>Mitiga Airport</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15:30 - 17:00</td>
<td>UNMAS</td>
<td>Corinthia Hotel</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 22.11.2014</td>
<td>All day</td>
<td>DCA Staff</td>
<td>Tripoli Office</td>
<td>PM, Training/Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 23.11.2014</td>
<td>All day</td>
<td>DCA Staff</td>
<td>Tripoli Office</td>
<td>PM, Training/Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Rights/Active Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 24.11.2014</td>
<td>09:50</td>
<td>Eric Departure</td>
<td>Mitiga Airport</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 5 – Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>May-11</th>
<th>Jun-12</th>
<th>Jul-12</th>
<th>Aug-12</th>
<th>Sep-12</th>
<th>Oct-12</th>
<th>Nov-12</th>
<th>Jan-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libya - context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCA ops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCA arrives in Libya</td>
<td>DCA awarded Dutch grant</td>
<td>DCA starts implementation under Dutch Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OC 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dafniya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-18: internal training in demining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OC 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No formal RE (CL work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OC 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No capacity development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

07/2011: National Transitional Council (NTC) recognised as the legitimate government of Libya
08/2011: Col Gaddafi goes into hiding
10/2011: Col Gaddafi captured and killed.
01/2012: Clashes between former rebel forces in Benghazi
02/2012: Clashes in Al-Kufra
03/2012: NTC officials in Benghazi launch a campaign to re-establish autonomy for the region

3/11/2011: DCA Accident (Dafniya)
02/2012: DAC MTTs withdraw from Bani Walid (incidents: teams were stopped by unidentified armed personnel)
31/03/2012: DCA accident (Dafniya)

02/2011: violent protests in Benghazi, spread to other cities
03/2011: UN Security Council authorises no-fly zone over Libya and air strikes to protect civilians; NATO assumes command.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb-13</td>
<td>Isolation Law: banning Gaddafi-era officials from holding public office =&gt; Chairman of GNC announces resignation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>GNC elects Nuri Abu Sahmein chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-13</td>
<td>Rebels begin months-long blockade of oil terminals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-13</td>
<td>Prime Minister Ali Zeidan briefly abducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>Clashes between army and the Ansar al-Sharia armed Islamists in Benghazi (9 people killed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td>Theft of 12 (5 dutch funded) vehicle and equipment (Misrata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-13</td>
<td>DCA HMA and DCA development merge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-13</td>
<td>DCA logframe revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-13</td>
<td>Car bomb attack in Benghazi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other trainings (not Dutch funded) include:**
- IED awareness 03/2014
- EOD IMAS level 1: 11/2012 and 02/2014
- basic search: 08/2012, 11/2012, 02/2013
- advanced search: 09/2013
- manual demining: 11/2012
- first aid: 11/2012, 03/2013, 03/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feb-14</th>
<th>Mar-14</th>
<th>Apr-14</th>
<th>May-14</th>
<th>Jun-14</th>
<th>Jul-14</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sep-14</th>
<th>Oct-14</th>
<th>Nov-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libya - context</strong></td>
<td>Protests bcoz of GNC's refusal to disband itself after its mandate officially expires</td>
<td>GNC sacks Prime Minister; elects Ahmed Maiteg as prime minister.</td>
<td>&quot;Libyan National Army&quot; renegade general Khalifa Haftar launches military assault against militant Islamist groups in Benghazi; tries to seize parliament</td>
<td>Prime Minister Maiteg resigns after supreme court rules his appointment illegal. New parliament (low elections turn out)</td>
<td>security situation deteriorates: UN staff, embassies, foreigners evacuate. Tripoli international airport put out of action by fighting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon visits; parliament based in Tobruk as Islamist and pro-government &quot;Zintan&quot; militias fight over Tripoli, Benghazi and other cities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA ops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCA requests extension of &quot;grant-validity&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IED awareness course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14/07: DCA evacuates 25/09: DCA returns to Libya
## Annex 6 – Libya Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column1</th>
<th>TOTAL Initial 2012 (€)</th>
<th>TOTAL July 2012 revision (€)</th>
<th>TOTAL 11/2013 revision (€)**</th>
<th>Total 11/2014 revision (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME 1</td>
<td>3,223,213.89</td>
<td>1,074,433.04</td>
<td>1,755,166.00</td>
<td>1,645,477.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 1.1</td>
<td>3,016,571.19</td>
<td>1,668,883.94</td>
<td>1,423,540.00</td>
<td>1,417,877.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 1.1.1</td>
<td>1,839,602.57</td>
<td>915,694.45</td>
<td>232,476.00</td>
<td>228,873.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 1.1.2</td>
<td>578,855.98</td>
<td>663,944.05</td>
<td>899,074.00</td>
<td>894,287.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 1.1.3</td>
<td>598,312.64</td>
<td>289,245.44</td>
<td>291,990.00</td>
<td>294,717.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 1.2</td>
<td>117,312.92</td>
<td>45,333.11</td>
<td>247,076.00</td>
<td>194,017.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 1.2.1</td>
<td>82,992.35</td>
<td>41,466.66</td>
<td>211,956.00</td>
<td>148,772.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 1.2.2</td>
<td>34,320.57</td>
<td>3,866.45</td>
<td>35,120.00</td>
<td>45,245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 1.3</td>
<td>89,329.78</td>
<td>57,270.99</td>
<td>247,076.00</td>
<td>33,583.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 1.3.1</td>
<td>71,070.89</td>
<td>53,404.69</td>
<td>28,805.00</td>
<td>22,927.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 1.3.2</td>
<td>18,258.89</td>
<td>3,866.30</td>
<td>5,745.00</td>
<td>10,656.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME 2</td>
<td>222,724.77</td>
<td>165,227.94</td>
<td>240,756.00</td>
<td>327,054.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 2.1</td>
<td>171,997.91</td>
<td>136,134.45</td>
<td>183,625.00</td>
<td>274,501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 2.1.1</td>
<td>22,447.37</td>
<td>45,398.15</td>
<td>55,331.00</td>
<td>39,036.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 2.1.2</td>
<td>149,550.54</td>
<td>90,736.30</td>
<td>128,294.00</td>
<td>235,465.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 2.2</td>
<td>50,726.86</td>
<td>29,093.49</td>
<td>57,131.00</td>
<td>52,553.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 2.2.1</td>
<td>16,389.97</td>
<td>12,173.71</td>
<td>44,218.00</td>
<td>26,201.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 2.2.2</td>
<td>34,336.89</td>
<td>16,919.78</td>
<td>12,913.00</td>
<td>26,352.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME 3</td>
<td>910,523.17</td>
<td>351,450.50</td>
<td>449,358.00</td>
<td>410,600.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 3.1</td>
<td>910,523.17</td>
<td>351,450.50</td>
<td>449,358.00</td>
<td>410,600.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 3.1.1</td>
<td>56,074.49</td>
<td>25,569.79</td>
<td>7,915.00</td>
<td>12,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 3.1.2</td>
<td>739,747.01</td>
<td>205,957.13</td>
<td>342,502.00</td>
<td>119,851.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACTIVITY 3.1.3</td>
<td>114,701.67</td>
<td>119,923.58</td>
<td>98,941.00</td>
<td>278,569.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,356,461.83</td>
<td>2,488,166.48</td>
<td>2,395,280.00</td>
<td>2,383,131.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 11/2014 exchange rate

** slight differences between the budget in the "approved revised budget for 2014" as presented in the letter to the Dutch for budget extension report and the 2013 Annual financial progress
Annex 7 – Libya Logframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Log-frame (03/2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As suggested in Proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>07/2012 adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(due to Dutch request to reduce budget)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11/2013 revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11/2014 revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Outcome 1: To improve human security and establish the conditions for safe and sustainable livelihoods for war-affected populations in DR Congo, Lebanon and Libya through clearance and survey of land contaminated by ERWs. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>875,000m² of land in areas assigned by the LMAC cleared and released through survey, Battle Area Clearance, Manual Demining and EOD spot task activities in coordination with the LMAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 800,000m² | 2,900,000m² | 2,224,129m² |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Annually 218,750 square meters of high or medium impact land is released through clearance and/or survey activities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annually, up to 75,000 people benefit directly and indirectly form the clearance and release of land conducted by DCA;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annually, 50 EOD tasks executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• By the end of the programme period, all tasks given to DCA by the LMAC have been cleared and reporting for IMSMA is completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Year 1, 343,000 square meters of high or medium impact land is released through clearance and/or survey activities, Year 2: 457,000 square meters of high or medium impact land is released through clearance and/or survey activities |
| Year 1, up to 60,000 people benefit directly and indirectly form the clearance and release of land conducted by DCA; Year 2: 90,000 people benefit directly and indirectly form the clearance and release of land conducted by DCA |
| Annually, 100 EOD tasks executed |
| By the end of the programme period, all tasks given to DCA by the LMAC have been cleared and reporting for IMSMA is completed |

| Activity 1.1.1: Two Manual Mine Clearance (MMC) teams trained, equipped and operational in Libya throughout the project period |
| Activity 1.1.2: One EOD/BAC response teams trained, equipped and operational in Libya |
| Activity 1.1.2: Two multitask teams trained, equipped and operational in Libya throughout the project period |
| Activity 1.1.1: Two Manual Mine Clearance (MMC) teams trained, equipped, and operational in Libya throughout the project period |

| Activity 1.1.2: Two multitask teams trained, equipped and operational in Libya throughout the project period |
| Activity 1.1.3: Support the National Safety Authority (NSA) in carrying out Battle Area Clearance, Manual Demining and EOD spot task activities in coordination with LIBMAC |
| Activity 1.1.3: Support the NSA medical staff |

Activity 1.1.1 aborted
throughout the project period

**Activity 1.1.3:** Medical staff trained, equipped and operational with the teams throughout the project period

| Output 1.2: Safety and security enhanced in all communities in the DCA area of operation by the number of mines and UXO items destroyed through clearance activities |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of items (mines and UXOs) found and destroyed by DCA clearance teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ERW related incidents in DCA’s area reduced by at least 50 percent compared to 2011 baseline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Activity 1.2.1: EOD response team carry out regular demolitions of found items |
| Activity 1.2.2: Completion reports finalised and official handover conducted with local authorities and land owner post-clearance |

| Output 1.3: Pre and post-clearance assessments conducted documenting the socio-economic impact of the clearance in areas tasked by the LMAC and shared with relevant national and international development partners |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annually, at least 15 pre-clearance assessments conducted and five post-clearance reports shared with relevant development partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-clearance impact assessment survey reports are produced for prioritisation, planning, and documentation of demining tasks and shared with other development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| when operational with the NSA clearance teams |

<p>| Activity 1.2.1 Support the NSA EOD response teams in carrying out regular demolitions of found items |
| Activity 1.2.2 Support the NSA EOD teams in finalising completion reports to local authorities post-clearance |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Activity 1.3.1:** Training and preparation for impact assessments and deployment of staff throughout the project period  
**Activity 1.3.2:** Participation in meetings with national and international development partners

**Activity 1.3.1 Support the NSA in carrying out impact assessments of cleared areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2: To reduce the risk for the affected populations in DR Congo, Libya and Lebanon through Community Liaison and Risk Education activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.1: Risk Education provided to 20,000 beneficiaries per year in communities affected by landmines and other ERWs in Libya.</th>
<th>8 communities</th>
<th>4 communities</th>
<th>Output 2.1 Deliver Risk Education in conflict affected areas, through local civil society organizations, thus reducing the risk to the population of accidents involving ERW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Risk Education message delivered to at least 20,000 people per year in affected areas of Libya, thus reducing the risk to the population of accidents involving ERW  
• Community Liaison activities result in survey and reporting of EOD spot tasks in DCA area of operation | | | |
| **Activity 2.1.1:** Conduct regular meetings with LMAC coordination of Risk Education activities  
**Activity 2.1.2:** Teams trained equipped and deployed to conduct area and environment | | | |
| | | | **Activity 2.1.1 Coordinate the dissemination of Risk Education messages to conflict affected areas through local civil society organizations**  
**Activity 2.1.2 Train and equip civil society** |
| | | | **Activity 2.1.1:** Conduct regular meetings with LMAC coordination of Risk Education activities  
**Activity 2.1.2:** Teams trained equipped and deployed to conduct area and environment |
| | | | **Activity 2.1.1 Coordinate the dissemination of Risk Education messages to conflict affected areas through local civil society organizations**  
**Activity 2.1.2 Train and equip civil society** |

- Risk education to 10 teachers in 4 communities  
- 5000 child friendly risk education pamphlets distributed in schools within DCA’s area of operation  
- Risk education delivered to personnel conducting reconstruction of abandoned communities, including migrant workers  
- ERW risk awareness sessions conducted at all police stations within DCA’s area of operation  
- Ad-hoc risk education carried out by CLO directly to ‘at risk’ personnel, i.e. landowners with their extended families, farm workers, returning IDPs and security personnel  
- Community Liaison activities result in survey and reporting of EOD spot tasks in DCA area of operation
specific Risk Education in coordination with local authorities | | organizations to conduct area and environment specific Risk Education

**Output 2.2:**
KABP survey reports conducted no later than one year after Risk Education session was performed, documenting improved knowledge, attitudes, behaviour and practices of the populations living in close proximity of ERW in after having received Risk Education by DCA staff

**Indicators:**
- KABP reports document improved knowledge, attitudes, behaviour and practices of the communities
- LMAC accidents reports shows no or a decline in ERW related incidents in the areas where DCA has been operating

**Activity 2.2.1:** KABP assessment conducted for Risk Education beneficiaries
**Activity 2.2.2:** Conduct follow-up Risk Education based on KABP reports

**Output 2.2 and the proposed activities will be removed/cancelled.**

**Outcome 3: To assist in building long-term national capacities for mine action though support for national clearance plans and capacity building of national Mine Action Coordination Centres and partners.**

**Output 3.1:**
Training of national partner organisation identified by LMAC and DCA in all aspects of demining procedures and basic EOD. Partner organisation in compliance with national and international mine action standards and capable of independent clearance operations.

**Indicators:**
- By the end of 2012, a comprehensive capacity building plan developed for technical, managerial and administrative competences for partner organisations
- By the end of March 2012, key staff has

**Output 3.1:**
Libya has through the NSA and LMAC, national capacities to coordinate and respond to ERW contamination using national standards developed in accordance with international standards for mine action and can report and manage information on clearance priorities and activities

**Indicators:**
- By the end of 2013, a comprehensive capacity building plan developed for technical, managerial and administrative competences in coordination with NSA
- By the end of 2014, NSA has obtained
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 3.1.1: Identify national partner in cooperation with LMAC and develop joint plan for capacity development</th>
<th>Activity 3.1.2: Training of national partner at technical, management and administrative level</th>
<th>Activity 3.1.3: Monitoring of progress and retraining of partner organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of 2014, national partner has obtained organisational accreditation from LMAC</td>
<td>By the end of 2014, a number of personnel from several branches from all region received training on EOD, First aid and emergency minefield extraction.</td>
<td>Activity 3.1.1 aborted mid 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the end of 2014, national partner clearing tasks under limited supervision by DCA</td>
<td>By 2014, personnel trained in EOD and relevant reporting support the national mine action authorities in data gathering as part of a national mine action/ERW survey</td>
<td>Activity 3.1.2: On the job-training and mentoring of the EOD response capacity at Civil Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By mid-2016, national partner organisation implements mine action activities independently</td>
<td>By the end of June 2013, training of demining and medical staff from partner organisation has commenced</td>
<td>Activity 3.1.3: removed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

been identified within the partner organisation and on-the-job training has commenced
- By the end of June 2013, training of demining and medical staff from partner organisation has commenced
- By the end of July 2013, national partner organisation commences operations under DCA supervision
- By the end of May 2014, national partner has obtained organisational accreditation from LMAC and is capable of implementing mine action activities independently
- operational procedures and reporting routines in accordance with national standards
- By the end of 2014, a number of personnel from several branches from all region received training on EOD, First aid and emergency minefield extraction.
- By 2014, personnel trained in EOD and relevant reporting support the national mine action authorities in data gathering as part of a national mine action/ERW survey
- Two EOD response teams trained and fully equipped in accordance with NSA strategy
- Civil Defence reporting findings of suspected hazardous, hazardous area and clearance to Libya Mine Action Center
- Libya mine action center has developed national standards for clearance of ERW
- Libya mine action center provides quarterly and yearly progress reports on clearance of ERW

Activity 3.1.1 aborted mid 2013
Activity 3.1.2: Training and mentoring of the EOD response capacity at Civil Defence.
Activity 3.1.3: Support in development of national standard for mine action and ERW clearance and the establishment of institutional operational procedures and reporting formats in accordance with relevant standards and technical hand books.