



MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

of the Disaster Risk Management programme – funded
by the Hong Kong Red Cross from its inception in July
2012 to October 2013

By Marie F. Baptiste, Consultant
Contact: mbaptiste@ayitiforward.com

December 2013

Acknowledgement

The Evaluation Team is grateful for the collaboration of all individuals and institutions who contributed in various ways towards the success of the evaluation exercise. Our special thanks to Jerry Niati, *DRM Technical Movement Coordinator* and Mununuri Musori, *PMER Coordinator* of the IFRC, Kepler Coicou, *DRM Field Coordinator* at the Haitian Red Cross who made the staff available for questions and coordinating the field visits.

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

CEWS	Community Early Warning Systems
CIT	Community Intervention Teams
CCPC	Communal Committee of Civil Protection
DPC	Civil Protection Directorate
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
HRC	Haitian Red Cross
DGC	Disaster Management Directorate of the HRC
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Executive Summary

This mid-term evaluation assesses the progress of the disaster risk management project titled “Strengthening capacities to cope with disasters” in Haiti. Its purpose is to measure the progress towards achieving the desired outcome and provide relevant recommendations on the future orientation of the project for the remainder of the implementation period, currently projected for December 2014.

The methodology for this evaluation used a variety of approaches to ensure data collection from all actors. This included a desk review of relevant disaster risk management documents produced by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), site visits around Port-au Prince, La Gonave in the West department and Jacmel in the Southeast department; stakeholder interviews with the project management staff of the Haitian Red Cross (HRC) and IFRC project managers and senior leadership, and field partners i.e. Civil Protection Department (DPC) and the Red Cross Regional Committees in La Gonave and Jacmel. The IFRC and international criteria of evaluation guided this process and the development of tools such as the evaluation matrix, performance assessment plan and questionnaires.

The review was not without its limitations. Time constraints, logistical challenges and weather did not allow planned focus groups interviews meant to document the perception of project beneficiaries; no visits were made to the warehouse storing the prepositioned emergency stock.

The desk review revealed weaknesses nationally and regionally in disaster risk management approaches. Generally, people have some information on potential risk but the public lacks concrete guidance on how to lower/manage their risk within their communities. In addition, the leadership in disaster risk management are not sufficiently trained or have enough knowledge to make informed decisions yielding the most effective results within their context. The project reports did confirm the collaboration between the project and the national government and changes were made to respond to the evolving policy environment. For example the government changed its view on the “protected schools” and in response since HRC is part of the working group on mass education, it was able to advocate for the retention of its capacity for awareness raising activities in schools while leaving the rehabilitation/infrastructure work to the government.

The field visits and various interviews revealed many problems hindering the project’s implementation. Meetings with the partners indicated a lack of understanding of the project, its objectives, and the expectations from the partnership. Interviews with CITs in West and Southeast departments highlighted a lack of association between their activities and that of the DPC, the project’s partner and leading government agency in disaster interventions, uncertainty in the standard operating procedures/protocol during and after disasters, all CIT don’t have clear plans for material management that avoid material placed and managed in private homes among other notable problems. The HRC is understaffed and unable to provide proper field support to CIT, the Regional Red Cross Committees and generally supervise field activities.

The project and its activities remain very relevant in the Haiti context that frequently faces emergencies. However to become more effective, there must be adjustments in the training of CITs and their activities, the partnership with the Red Cross Regional Committee must be strengthened and the DPC be

supported to have greater visibility as the local representatives of the national government's response in DRM. All those elements would contribute to make the project more effective and sustainable.

As a result of these observations, the following recommendations were made:

- A communication plan to educate partners i.e. the DPC and regional committees on project objectives, expected roles and results.
- A work plan or calendar of activities for each CIT
- A review of standard operating procedures linking all resources including government via DPC, the HRC, the project to deal with mitigation activities and post disaster interventions
- More frequent monitoring visits to gather and collect data to facilitate measuring project's progress and outcomes
- More simulation exercises to ensure all stakeholders understand their role during and after emergencies
- Reinforcement for HRC Headquarters (DGC)
- Reinforcement for regional committees

The evaluation is an excellent step in reviewing the program design and start the process of drawing a new roadmap for modifying the project with the objective to achieve its stated goal to reduce the strengths and impacts of disasters at community level through strengthening the Haitian Red Cross.

Introduction

On 12 January 2010 an earthquake measuring 7.0 on the Richter scale struck Haiti. The earthquake's epicenter was some 15km south-west of the country's capital, Port-au-Prince, and close to the city of Leogane. According to statistics from the Government of Haiti, over 200,000 people died, 300,000 people reported injuries, and 1.5 million people were displaced by the earthquake and the subsequent aftershocks that occurred during the weeks that followed. A cholera outbreak in the country 10 months later worsened the humanitarian situation in the country and has claimed more than 8,000 lives as of March 2013. Three years after the earthquake, the number of individuals still remaining in displaced persons camp sites continues to decrease. From an initial 1.5 million in July 2010, an estimated 81,348 households (320,051 individuals) still remained in 385 internally displaced population (IDP) sites as of March 2013 according to the IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM). The decrease is attributed to the various return projects including relocation and reconstruction activities of the government and humanitarian actors in the country. As the construction of temporary shelters ended, the humanitarian actors in shelter continue to complement government efforts in relocation and resettlement of the IDPs with focus on alternative shelter solutions such as rental and relocation options for camp dwellers. Many of the IDPs who still remain in camps are faced with forceful and violent evictions by owners of land on which the camps are sited in recent time. Many of them express their willingness to relocate to safer shelter and permanent solutions if they could access such opportunities.

In 2012 the hurricane season adversely affected Haiti more than it had since the earthquake. Two powerful storms (Tropical Storm Isaac and Hurricane Sandy) made their effects felt on territory of Haiti and surrounding islands. Hurricane Sandy hit Haiti during the month of October and caused human and material damages including the death of more than 50 persons and several others injured and missing, as well as destruction of houses and schools. The impact prompted the government to declare a national state of emergency during the period. The impacts of Hurricane Sandy in October 2012 and Tropical Storm Isaac in August 2012, on agricultural production have exposed about half of the country's population and mainly the rural population to acute food insecurity.

In December 2011 the Haitian Red Cross has presented the 2012-2015 Plan of Action for Disaster Risk Management at national level. The perspective reflected in the plan is to have a National Society strengthened to improve the capacities of coping with disasters in the communities all over the Country. Main focus applied is the strengthening of the Haitian Red Cross regional branches in terms of functionality, structures and prepared human resources (volunteers and employees): the aim of the PoA is to build up a more prepared National Society to be able to provide trainings, equipment and organizational strength to the local communities and civil protection.

The aim of this project is to reduce the risks and impacts of disasters (mainly earthquakes and floods) at community level by strengthening the capacities of the Haitian Red Cross (HRC) and communities in disaster risk management. This will be done through the establishment and training of Community Intervention Teams (CITs); by putting in place Community Early Warning Systems (CEWS) as well as by strengthening evacuation centres and HRC branches. The project is being implemented in Nippes, South East and West departments.

Literature Review

This evaluation started with a literature review of relevant document provided by the IFRC staff, below is a list of documents reviewed:

- § Pledge based report: Interim report, January to September 15, 2013
- § IFRC: Disaster Risk Management Concept Note
- § Contextual Analysis and Trends for 'Pro-Poor Resilience Building' in Latin America and the Caribbean Summary Report
- § Strengthening capacity to cope with disaster
- § Méthodologie: "Equipes D'intervention Communautaires" au milieu urbain
- § Document de capitalisation sur la création de EIC de Croix des Bouquets
- § Plan Familial d'urgence
- § Bilan de la mise en Place des EIC
- § Méthodologie Pilote EIC
- § Rapport SIMEX de Delmas: Exercice de préparation aux Catastrophes communes de Delmas
- § M&E plan January 2013- December 2014 (Strengthening capacities to cope with disasters in 3 Haitians Department: Nippes, South East, and West)

Based on documented experiences in DRR, some conclusions are drawn that have region-wide implications in emergency response as the best approach to help reduce the effects of the aftermath of a disaster. While the public receives some information on natural threats but very few know how to respond in an emergency, little has been done to date to provide the public about how to lower vulnerability in their own environment.

While disaster management responsibility is increasingly being transferred to local government agencies such as Department of Civil Protection in Haiti (DPC), the efficacy of such management varies and in some instances is quite limited. Local governments and agencies like the HRC generally lack the resources needed to execute DRR effectively, especially in more remote areas.

The literature review revealed that an obstacle to appropriate disaster risk management (DRM) is the limited training available to the decision makers throughout the various stages of the process. Community awareness is another key component in successful DRM as they often must rely on themselves until help arrives from their government and their partners. In response activities were designed to address these challenges by training local members to work together to manage disasters. Therefore 8 CITs were created in different areas of Haiti, Four are based in South East department (Lafond, La Gosseline, Coq Chante and La Montagne), two in West Metropolitan zone (Siloe-Delmas 33 and rue Titus-Carrefour) and two in La Gonave Island (Pointe a Raquettes and Anse a Galets) as part of West department.

The Disaster Risk Management Training Programme was aimed at defining a series of indicators for gauging the principal factors that determine a better strategy for Haiti's emergency response. The results of this component have been published in a general report and a series of accompanying documents.

Evaluation Objective

This mid-term evaluation assesses the progress of the disaster risk management project titled “Strengthening capacities to cope with disasters” in Haiti. Its purpose is to measure the progress towards achieving the desired outcome and provide relevant recommendations on the future orientation of the project for the remainder of the implementation period, currently projected for December 2014.

Evaluation Scope and Key Questions

The evaluation focused on three key areas of inquiry: on the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation of disaster risk management and the potential to increase community resilience to future disasters. Thus the priority was to:

- Identify the major problems, constraints and challenges in the implementation of activities
- Assess the results of the trainings aimed at the community intervention teams (CIT)
- Review the partnerships deemed essential to the project’s successful implementation
- Review the resources both financial and human resources being invested into the project
- Make recommendations to resolve identified challenges to reduce their negative impacts of the project, identify opportunities to leverage resources while enhancing the project results

Methodology and Approach

The methodology for this evaluation used a variety of approaches to ensure data collection from all actors. This included a desk review of relevant disaster risk management documents produced by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), site visits to the West and Southeast departments; stakeholder interviews with HRC and IFRC managers, and field partners i.e. DPC and the Red Cross Regional Committees.

The evaluation considered all activities implemented thus far highlighting issues requiring immediate decisions and actions, presents initial lessons learned on project design, implementation and management, and make recommendations for partners, stakeholders to improve future results.

Based on numerous discussions with stakeholders and literature review, especially the reports documenting modifications in the project’s activities, special attention was given to the following:

Community intervention team – their capacity to respond and perform according to expectations

Field partners – the interaction of field partners like the DPC and the Red Cross Regional Committees with the HRC and the CIT

Potential strategies to integrate partners in the project and build linkages between CITs and partners

The evaluation is compliant with international and IFRC standards of evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact, accountability and coordination. Those principles were integrated into the tools developed, namely: Evaluation Matrix, Performance Assessment Plan, and Questionnaire.

Evaluation Matrix: As part of the start-up phase, an evaluation matrix based on the evaluation scope presented in the TOR, and the review of the key project documents was developed. This matrix was structured along the seven evaluation criteria and included all evaluation questions. It provided overall directions for the evaluation, provided a basis for structuring the evaluation report and the recommendations.

Performance Assessment Plan: The project achievements were rated on a scale relying on the following criteria:

- Excellent - All objectives were achieved, positive outcome and results are sustainable
- Good – Not all objectives achieved, problems identified but already solved and positive outcomes anticipated
- Satisfactory – some preparations and problems solved and some results achieved
- Unsatisfactory – Some preparations made but not yet implemented
- Poor – insufficient preparation in the way of research, anticipation,
- Not applicable – A criteria or result that is not applicable to the evaluation

Questionnaire: Based on the evaluation matrix, a questionnaire guide was developed to solicit information from the stakeholders. It was also used for interviews to be conducted by phone when needed.

Limitations

Initially, there were plans to have focus groups but that was changed due to time constraint, low activity from CITs and weather. In La Gonave, the consultant arrived late afternoon despite arriving early in the morning at boat station. Boats only leave for the island at dawn and well after 1pm. Upon arrival and meeting the CIT in La Gonave, it was confirmed that very few community activities were already conducted. During the visit to the Southeast town of Jacmel, there were delays on the road caused by an accident and population protest. The roads only cleared after nearly a 2 hour delay. CIT in Jacmel was more active however late arrival coupled with threatening rain eliminated the opportunity to conduct interviews with community members. Neither were there visits to the warehouse storing

Findings

The consultant conducted site visits and interviewed key stakeholders in West and Southeast departments. Below is a summary identifying the sites and roles of those interviewed:

West Department

- CITs located at Silo, Delmas 33, Titus, Carrefour and Anse-a-Galets, La Gonave
- DPC representatives: five members of the DPC in Anse-a-Galets, La Gonave
- Red Cross Regional Committee: three of the five members of the committee

Southeast Department

- § CIT in La Montagne commune
- § DPC representative: 1 member, Technical Advisor
- § Red Cross Regional Committee: 1 member, the President by phone

In addition to project documents, interviews were also conducted with the project leader/managers at the HRC, IFRC, lead for project M&E and IFRC senior manager. The findings below were based on information gathered from all the above interviews, visits and project documents.

Relevance/Appropriateness of disaster risk management activities: To what extent are the objectives of this program still valid? Are the activities and outputs of the program consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?

The project is highly relevant to the environmental context in Haiti. The tropical country bears the effects of increasingly erratic weather patterns as evidenced by hurricanes Jeanne, Gustav, Isaac, Sandy to name a few and torrential rains. Historically, deadly earthquakes have struck especially in the Northern and West departments. Environmental degradation due to severe deforestation, lack of waste management and physical infrastructure throughout the country leaves Haiti vulnerable to sporadic crisis linked to health, sanitation, shelter, etc.

The recent emergencies, especially the earthquake of 2010 and the cholera epidemic made the institutional fragility of the state apparatus more evident. The government agencies have low human and financial resources, causing significant delays in the deployment of support to areas in need. Programs that support the state in providing services to its citizens until its institutions have the capacity to deliver services are critical for survivors of disasters. The communities are very aware that they are their own best resource in the face of emergencies until help arrives.

The activities planned and outputs such as the establishment and training of 8 CITs, community based early warning systems and the translation of training documents into creole are all relevant towards achieving the stated goal of reducing the risk and impact of disasters at the community level. The adjustments made in the project implementation such as shifting the focus from construction to the soft trainings on the “Te Male” game and evacuation plan shows the adaptability of the project to changing context as the government is taking the lead in the designation of protected schools. Although the trainings are taking place, it is critical the training plan is adjusted to accommodate the capacity of the members. More specific comments on the training are in the effectiveness section.

However the approach to the reinforcement of the HRC and its regional branches need further revisions. Now that sister Red Cross organizations are taking over the infrastructure rehabilitation portion of the Disaster Management Operations Centre in Nippes and evacuation center in Southeast, resources were reallocated to equipping those centers but the modification could also extend to further capacity building of HRC. Those new buildings once completed and equipped will need personnel for management, although HRC is an independent organization, its resources, especially human resources are quite limited. To maximize the return on the support extended to HRC, it must be accompanied by managerial support because the organization is unable to devote the time needed to supervise the additional activities.

Interviews reveal that regional committees and HRC managers are overwhelmed with the current load of activities/expectations. The unexpected contributions from the sister organizations present an opportunity to leverage resources and provide HRC with additional support to strengthen the regional committees in the field especially in their collaboration with the CITs.

Such modifications would ensure that activities and outputs accommodate the realities of the field. The desired impact of strengthening communities to respond to disasters can be achieved with the planned activities but the results would be amplified and become more sustainable through a modification in the approach.

Efficiency: Were activities cost-efficient? Were objectives achieved on time? Was the program or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

Discussions with project managers and leaders revealed project launch was delayed due to competing emergencies, and administrative delays within the IFRC administration causing the start date to move to March 2013 instead of July 2012 as planned. Adjustments were made and currently the project is close to its modified schedule. As the project context has changed i.e. sister organizations now financing portions of the planned activities and the government's intervention in the designation of projected school, and its late start makes it very difficult to measure its financial efficiency.

The project has modified its scope in the wake of additional resources from sister red crosses and resisted the urge to expand the number of CIT. As this is a pilot project, it is imperative that the model is fully tried and perfected before considering expansion. The communities tend to live in remote areas with low accessibilities and any additional team would require additional resources in logistical expenses.

The changes in the context since the project approval have not only programmatic implications but financial ones as well. There are opportunities for a results oriented modification of the budget. The programmatic modifications cited above have financial effects on the allocation of resources in the project budget. An official donor approved budget modification may be needed (I understand that modifications exceeding 10% of budget categories requires such approval). The funds previously committed to infrastructure work ought to be realigned with new relevant activities to maximize the use of available resources to achieve project results.

Effectiveness: Are the DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT (DRM) objectives likely to be achieved? To what extent have the program objectives been achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of these objectives?

The project strategy of collaboration with regional committees and DPC field representatives is commendable. Despite the good strategy, many problems exists that threatens the project's outcomes and eventual impact.

CIT: Many of the members have an inconsistent understanding of their roles, do not fully understand the chain of communication in case of emergency and their relationship with the DPC. Throughout the interviews conducted with the CITs in both departments, it was very clear there was very little association between themselves/their activities and DPC. This may be due in part to the fact the CITs have not yet been introduced to the DPC as planned. However open ended questions like "what is your relationship with DPC?" and further probing questions like "what do you know of the DPC in your community?" met with mostly blank stares. The only exception was for the few members who were simultaneously volunteers of the DPC, for all other CIT members, there was no awareness or association of DPC with their activity.

In addition, the CIT trainings need reinforcement of the most fundamental functions of members. They must be clear on their role during a disaster and the chain of communication to follow when that occurs. Members were clearer on their actions post disaster such as the need for needs assessment and their potential ability to intervene using the materials they received in the project.

Especially in rural areas, CIT members were not very clear on who was their first point of contact in case of emergency. There are challenges in training members in rural areas as that group have lower literacy level and greater difficulty in absorbing new information, proper allowances must be made in the training approach. For members to become effective in their role, the trainings must include greater emphasis on what to do in case of common emergencies like flooding members are from their own communities.

The project does not clearly outline and measure activities for the CIT. Perhaps this is due to the fact that CITs were projected to mobilize only in the face of emergencies according to some of the literature. However, disaster mitigation is essential to successful DRM. The project as of now, cannot measure the effectiveness of the CIT on the field

Because there is no clear plan on their activity, their calendar and their output. Planning for and documentation of disaster mitigation activities would help determine the effectiveness of the approach.

It is also important to note that the project recruited both sexes in the CITs to ensure gender was integrated into the project strategy. The ratio hovered around 70% male to 30% female. This is significant as women, especially those with children, are very vulnerable during disasters and to ensure that DRM activities also focus on their needs, it is a critical that women become more involved. The CITs provided an excellent opportunity for women to take leadership roles, especially in rural areas in Haiti where such opportunities are scarce. Women rarely have leadership roles in local/municipal government, are often underrepresented in the local DPC consequently their priorities are routinely ignored and marginalized.

Regional RC Committee: They are a resource in disaster management in their departments and must become a resource for this project. They have a good relationship with the CITs and are an ideal partner in the support of CIT because they are closer geographically to the CIT, are familiar with the challenges/risks of their areas and are a key partner in decentralizing the disaster management. However, it is not clear what their concrete contribution is in the field in relation to the CITs. Interviews reveal they attend the opening and closing ceremonies, and sign the training certificates. In the meantime, CITs are very new elements in DRM in Haiti, thus is in need of support and the RC must play an expanded role in that process.

Though project result #3 is “to improve capacity of HRC at regional level regarding risk management”, there is not clear capacity building activity included in the project plan beyond infrastructure and materials. The infrastructure element no longer exists. To really maximize potential impact and sustainability, the project must find ways to reinforce the committees and enable them to be part of the support system for the CIT. Although the latter is to be independent, the novelty of the approach requires extensive support in the initial phase until it can stand independently.

Sustainability/Connectedness: What are the major factors, which would influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the program or project?

Independence of CIT: The project has an excellent approach to encourage community ownership from the initial phase of the implementation. Members were selected thru local leaders, materials given for their autonomous management, and their T-shirts are free of RC branding. Those elements will contribute positively to the sustainability of the CIT.

DPC: The government local agency are aware of RC interventions in their zone and generally activities have their blessing. DPC does not have a clear knowledge of the activity or approach, they are unaware of this new strategy and therefore could not offer any meaningful comments.

RC committee: Lack of capacity and resources from the committee threatens the activity. If not supported, the committees cannot act as the resource sorely needed to support the CIT in their maturation process to become assets to their community.

HRC: Human resources are limited at the organization. The new Disaster Management Operations Centre in Nippes and the evacuation center in Southeast once built require human resources for management. HRC, as currently staffed, is likely unable to assume the additional responsibility. Understanding that donors cannot offer unlimited support, with a clear and executable plan, that investment will not achieve its objective because HRC will be unable to use the additional resources as intended.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this mid-term evaluation, the following recommendations for the second half of the project are made; they are in no particular order:

Communication Campaign for Partners to Understand Project Fundamentals

Interviews with DPC revealed the government representatives were unaware of the project. Although they know HRC is active, were informed of the trainings but no particular attention was drawn to the context of the individual activities. The approach of reinforcing communities to manage disasters is fairly new to the country and its community actors must be trained on the concept. RC committee and DPC must be brought into the strategy to increase the success and sustainability of community disaster management.

Action

A formal presentation by HRC staff to DPC together with RC committee explaining project, its goal and associated activities. This also presents the opportunity to stress to leadership the reasons for not expanding number of CITs at this stage.

Integration of DPC and HRC into the CIT trainings would make those two partners more active participants/supporter of CIT. Although time constraints may not allow participation in all trainings, but

it is essential that the first training include a timeslot for partners' presentations. CIT members would also be introduced to the roles filled by the two partners from the initial phase of CIT establishment.

In the field, the CIT and the DPC volunteers should plan and execute at least one activity together during the year. This will help the CIT members become familiar with DPC work and contribution in the field and builds a relationship outside of the emergency context so that they can work together more effectively during emergencies.

Incorporate Work Plan or Calendar of Activities for CIT

CITs are meant to be independent to encourage community ownership. The project does not have clear activities for them and therefore the CITs are left without any performance indicators. It will be impossible to measure their success and identify weaknesses without a clear work plan or a calendar of activities. Those activities are opportunities to complete more disaster mitigation activities, essential to minimize the effects of frequent disasters like flooding.

Action: with support from RC committee, the CIT should develop a calendar of activities and meetings. The activities will increase their visibility in the community, give them the practice of working together and prepare them to intervene more effectively during disasters'.

The M&E plan should incorporate indicators to capture those activities to provide explicit documentation of the CITs performance. This model as a new approach in the country must have clear data to measure its effectiveness and later justify expansion, if needed.

More frequent monitoring visits and Data Collection

CITs are made up of volunteers and we know their goodwill should not be stretched. More frequent visits from project staff is a way to keep motivation high, provide support and encourage the completion of planned preventive activities. The visits are also opportunities for the project to support the RC committee in their activities.

Action: To capture the data from the CIT activities, regular monitoring visits should be made by the RC regional committee to the CIT. An agent, preferably from the regional committee, compensated with a stipend, should be tasked to supervise scheduled activities, record and report data to the committee.

Reinforcement of RC Regional Committee

The RC regional committee is essential in the supervision of field activities. Although recent elections have had an effect on committee performance, there is still a need to become more involved and that requires proper support.

Action: HRC need full understanding of CIT strategy and receive clear guidance on how to support their activities. HRC should organize the training and provide committee with materials needed to fulfill their tasks.

More Simulation Exercise

Simulation exercises provide critical information on the understanding of partners like the CITs, DCP, and the regional committee on their roles and responsibilities during emergencies. The simulations are great learning tools that help all the entities in identifying their own strengths and weaknesses and can serve as a motivator to participate in future trainings and activities. We understand the cost of the simulations may be high, but if the project is to be effective, all project actors and beneficiaries must have a way to assess their readiness in DRM.

Action: Additional simulation exercises, especially in rural areas where capacity is low and vulnerability high. Understanding the simulation exercises are costly, if/when full simulation is not possible, then targeted exercises may be considered. For example an exercise measuring communication between CIT, DPC and regional committee, with the aim to assess the understanding of the communication protocol during emergency can be conducted.

Reinforcement of the HRC (Headquarters)

HRC has very limited resources to supervise the field activities. Each new project create an opportunity to extend support to the field, but HRC as it currently stands cannot manage all the demands. Limited human resources mean less or inexistent field supervision, resulting in less than successful implementation and reduced impact.

Action: Add a technical expert tasks with providing support to regional committees and CIT so those elements become more central to the project and help achieve the result of improving the capacity of the HRC at the regional level in DRM.

Review of training

There are a number of trainings planned for the CIT to reinforce their skills but the low literacy in rural areas require more practical elements to ensure understanding. During discussions with CITs, there was a noticeable difference between the level of understanding in urban and rural areas. Although that is not surprising, it means that more practice opportunities should be created to concretize lessons learned.

Overall Partnership and sustainability

Partnership, more specifically institutional strengthening is key to successful implementation of DRM activities in Haiti and the sustainability of donor funded activities. HRC has the potential to be a leader in DRM, however it needs reinforcement beyond the fulfillment of this project's objectives to achieve that goal.

Action: An institutional development plan to be created with active participation from HRC that recognizes its current gaps, responsibilities and the leadership it must assume going forward. Based on that context the plan must provide a roadmap with clear milestones addressing courses of action for successes and improvement opportunities.

This plan should reinforce HRC project and financial management, specifically enabling HRC to fully understand project cycle management, improve management of administrative burdens while respecting programmatic work plan; develop internal resource mobilization capacity and enable the organization to assume the leadership expected in DRM.

Conclusion

The project fills a need in the DRM strategy in Haiti and the collaboration at the national level expresses a clear willingness to adjust interventions to fit the evolving DRM national strategy and the resources made available complement previous investments. However, programmatic modifications are needed to due to changing context, the allocation of resources by other donors especially from other Red Cross societies and to apply lessons learned throughout the project implementation the past few months. The adjustments will ensure more judicious use of donor funds, produce documented results, and create the outcome and impact desired.

Annex 1.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN				
5=Excellent 4=good 3=Satisfactory 2=unsatisfactory 1=Poor 0=Not applicable				
Expected Output	Planned Activities	Results/Indicator of activity	Assessment	Explanation
Indicator 1.1.1: # of community Intervention Teams established and equipped by the first half of the project .	1. Established: The teams are formed and its members trained in Early Warning System, Family Contingency Plans, Disaster Risk Reduction, First Aid, Mitigation, Social Micro-projects, Emergency Shelters Management, Floods, Protected School, and Triage	# of CITs established	3=Satisfactory	the team are established but only 1 training completed thus far, next training date not yet decided 9 months into the project implementation
	2. Equipped: CITs provided with water coats, gloves and helmets, shovel, pickaxe, megaphones, manual battery radios, lamps, whistles, covers, stretcher, first aid rucksack, saw, tarpaulin, rope, fluorescent vests	# of CITs equipped	3=Satisfactory	CIT received partial materials, procurement and distribution of materials still ongoing, material storage could be improved as CITs in La Montagne and Carrefour store materials at members' home so vulnerable to becoming personal possession
Indicator 1.1.2: # of community Based Early Warning Systems are in place by the end of the project	CEWs in place: strategically placed and visible to community members	# of CEWs set up	0=Not applicable	
Indicator 1.1.3: # of "Protected School" trainings to be conducted in schools.	2. Trainings to be conducted in schools:	# of evacuation plans developed 2. # of drills completed in schools 3. # of Risk Awareness activity using TE MALE game	0=Not applicable	Infrastructure no longer in protected school approach, project to focus on trainings that have not yet begun

Indicator 1.1.4: # of "Protected School" kits to be distributed in schools.	1. Protected schools kits packaged: TE MALE game, evacuation plans posted	# of school kits packaged	0=Not applicable	Activity not yet begun
	2. Kits to be distributed per school: TE MALE game, school evacuation plans posted	# of kits distributed	0=Not applicable	Infrastructure reinforcement no longer included, activity not yet started
Indicator 2.2.1: # of existing modules translated (From Spanish into Creole and French), adapted, edited and graphic designed	Translated modules: 7 modules will be translated. They include (1. Education, Organization, Preparation for Risk Reduction; 2. Community First Aid; 3. Risk children paint book; 4. Community Shelter Management; 5. Social Micro projects; 6. Flooding children paint book; 7. Protected School children paint book	# of existing modules translated	3=Satisfactory	Translation into French and Creole completed for some materials, others are scheduled to complete printing throughout the life of the project
Indicator 2.2.2: # of methodological guide translated (Spanish into Creole and French), adapted, edited and graphic designed	Methodological guide	# of methodological guide translated	3=Satisfactory	translation into French completed, Creole translation is still pending
Indicator 2.2.3: # of new modules translated (Spanish into Creole and French), adapted, edited and graphic designed	new modules translated: 3 new modules will be translated. They include (1. Family Preparedness; 2. Flooding; 3. Protected School).	# of new modules translated	2=unsatisfactory	None of the materials translated yet into Creole or French

Indicator 3.3.1: # of Community Evacuation Centres strengthened in West Department and South Department	1. Community Evacuation Centres: These are centres where community members can be evacuated in an event of a disaster for their safety	# of community evacuation centres strengthened	0=Not applicable	physical infrastructure being done by sister red cross, project to purchase equipment once construction completes and was not part of the evaluation
	2. Strengthened		0=Not applicable	see comment above.
Indicator 3.3.2: A Regional Disaster Management Operations Centre has been established in the Nippes department (infrastructure and equipment)	1. Regional Disaster Management Operations Centre: In case of a disaster, this centre will have the capacity to support the contingency needs in the Nippes department		0=Not applicable	Infrastructure not part of this project, will depend on coordination with other RC partners, project will only purchase equipment once construction completes
	Established: Building is in place and well equipped to be used during operations		0=Not applicable	for this project, only equipment portion
Indicator 3.3.3: The structure of the Haitian Red Cross branch for the Nippes and La Gonave Island is strengthened	The structure of HRC Branches	# of HRC branch structures strengthened	0=Not applicable	if construction related, its not applicable for this project
	Strengthened	1. Clear procedures written for disaster response 2. Staff knows procedure 3. results in simulation exercises	0=Not applicable	
Indicator 3.3.4: West Department HRC branch is established in Port au Prince	Léogâne Branch to be established		0=Not applicable	not part of evaluation

Indicator 3.3.5: # of national trainings held for Haitian Red Cross and Civil Protection volunteers on « Advanced First Aid»	1. National trainings	1. # of TOT national trainings held for HRC and CPV on Advanced First Aid 2. Trainings held for volunteers	2=unsatisfactory	Neither TOT nor other trainings completed
Indicator 3.3.6: # of national trainings held for Haitian Red Cross and Civil Protection volunteers in aquatic search and rescue	Aquatic Search and Rescue Trainings	# of national trainings held for HRC and CPV in aquatic search and rescue.	4=good	2 trainings planned, one already completed
Indicator 3.3.7: # of advanced first aid kits procured for HRC volunteer use	Advanced first aid kits procured	# of advanced first aid kits to be procured.		
Indicator 3.3.8: # of families to be reached by prepositioned emergency stocks in West Department (Port au Prince)	Families receiving aid from stock	# of families to be reached by available stocks (site visits)	0=not applicable	not included in evaluation
	Replenishment of warehouses where distribution took place	# of warehouses replenished	0=not applicable	not included in evaluation

Annex 2

EVALUATION MATRIX					
	Evaluation component	Sub questions	Indicators	Sources	data collection method
1 Criteria: Relevance - How does the project relate to the main objectives					
	To what extent are the objectives of this programme still valid?	1. how do the activities support the current objectives of IFRC? 2. How do the activities support the objectives of the HRC? 3. How do the objectives support the national disaster management strategy?	1. Level of coherence between IFRC objectives and project objectives 2. Level of coherence between HRC objectives and project. 3. Level of coherence between National strategy and project activities	Project Documents, HRC documented strategy and National Policy	Document analysis and interviews with stakeholders
	Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?	Do the activities and outputs achieved fit into the objectives of IFRC, HRC and National objectives?	Level of coherence between the activities and the objectives of IFRC, HRC and National strategy	Project Documents, HRC documented strategy and National Policy	Document analysis and interviews with stakeholders
	Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?	Are the activities and outputs reinforcing the DM capacity of HRC?	1. change in managerial capacity 2. change in infrastructure 3. change in existing plan 4. change in capacity of information management, methods of collecting data, procedure for mitigating risk in communities 5. change in community capacity to manage disaster, awareness, understanding of procedures	Documents from HRC and community leaders	Document analysis and interviews with stakeholders like HRC and DPC and community intervention teams
2 Criteria - Effectiveness To what extent are the interventions likely to achieve its intended results? Where activities done in a timely manner?					

Are the DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT (DRM) objectives likely to be achieved?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the project effective in building community capacity FOR DRM? 2. Same for HRC? 3. Are the Early Warning systems being implemented 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CIT formed and trained in all project territories 2. Communities are aware of CIT as resource 3. HRC infrastructure and managerial capacity strengthened 4. systems management improved 	Project documents, policy document from HR, key stakeholders	Document review, interviews with HRC staff, interview with community leaders
To what extent have the program objectives been achieved?	What progress have been made to achieve the objectives?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. achievement on performance indicators 2. time left to achieve remaining outputs/outcome 	Project documents, key stakeholders	Document review, interviews with HRC staff, interview with CITs, Interview with DPC
What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of these objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Positive and negative factors in the environment? 2. Are the communities receptive? 3. Does HRC have the human resources needed? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CIT formed and trained 2. HRC reinforced 3. communities level of awareness 	project document and key stakeholders	document review, interviews with HRC staff and CIT

3 Criteria - Efficiency This measures the outputs in relation to the inputs. Efficiency is regarded as an economic term which signifies that the interventions use the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. Efficiency looks at the extent that results have been delivered in the least costly manner possible

Were activities cost-efficient?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the outputs/outcomes satisfactory in comparison to the inputs? 2. Are actual cost in line with budgeted cost? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. difference between budgeted vs actual expenses 	financial reports	Review financial reports
Were objectives achieved on time?	was the work plan calendar respected?	Progress on benchmarks/outputs	work plan and project reports and key stakeholders	Review project plan, report, interview stakeholder
Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What alternatives ways could project outputs/outcome be achieved? 2. Is the implementation approach the most cost effective? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change in project design/implementation due to changing context 2. delivery mechanisms 3. leveraging of funds from other donors or projects 	project documents, financial reports, project report	Review project document, interview with stakeholders

4 Criteria - sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Are the benefits of these interventions likely to continue once donor input has been withdrawn

<p>What are the major factors which would influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>1. How were sustainability issues integrated into the project design and implementation? 2. What resources are present that HRC and CIT will not have available at the end of project? 3. What measures are included to minimize impact of donor support</p>	<p>1. Sustainability approach in project design 2. Steps taken in project implementation to ensure sustainability</p>	<p>Project document, key stakeholders</p>	<p>Interview with stakeholders, document review</p>
<p>Criteria - Impact These are the positive and negative changes produced by the intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators</p>				
<p>What has happened as a result of the programme or project?</p>	<p>1. what are the impact of the project for HRC? 2. For the communities? 3. Is project achieving the objective of Strengthening capacities in communities and HRC in disaster Risk Management?</p>	<p>1. communities are aware of risk 2. communities are aware of preventive mitigation measures 3. communities know what to do in case of disasters especially flood and earthquakes 4. HRC has higher capacity demonstrated by training documents in French, additional infrastructure, evidence of information management, clear procedures on how HRC is to manage disasters and scores in simulation exercises</p>	<p>Project document, procedural manuals, key stakeholders</p>	<p>Documentation review, Interview of stakeholders</p>
<p>• What real difference has the programme made to the beneficiaries?</p>	<p>1. How has project added to beneficiaries lives? 2. What tools/information was previously inexistent that became? 3. What knowledge or service provision system was reinforced?</p>	<p>specific examples of changes</p>	<p>community members, HRC staff, DPC staff</p>	<p>Focus groups, semi structured interviews with CITs and HRC, interviews with benefiting communities</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many people have been affected? 	who benefited from project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> number of CITs number of CIT membership number of communities members reached by awareness activities staff at HRC, staff at DPC 	project reports, key stakeholders at HRC and DPC	project document
--	---	----------------------------	---	--	------------------

6 Criteria: Coordination - It is the role of the International Federation to coordinate the activities of Red Cross Red Crescent partners

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was this role been fulfilled and was it adequate and constructive 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project strengthened the HRC and the communities as desired? Was the support included in the project sufficient? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Change in HRC capacity level Change in community capacity for DRM Opportunities to improve/gaps 	key stakeholders	Focus groups, semi structured interviews with CITs and HRC, interviews with benefiting communities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How adequate was DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT (DRM) coordination with non-Red Cross Red Crescent actors, i.e. clusters, in terms of both the information contributed and the information received through the available mechanisms? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Did project coordinate with other projects? What resources were leveraged both financial and infrastructure? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> number of partnerships formed number of changes made to leverage resources from other partners number of meetings with other donors/projects to harmonize activities 	project document and key stakeholders	semi structured interviews with HRC and CIT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What can we learn from this experience? 	lessons at all phases of project			

7 Criteria: Accountability - Beneficiary engagement in the planning and implementation of activity

To what extent were beneficiaries involved in the planning, design and implementation of the project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What were the beneficiaries' input in the design and implementation process? Was HRC and community invited to take part in process? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Written request from HRC for assistance Request from community for assistance in DRM 	project proposal document, correspondence	document review and interviews
Extent to which there was meaningful participation of beneficiaries/project participants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What were the beneficiaries' input in the design and implementation process? Was community invited to take part in process? 	Request from community for assistance in DRM	project proposal document, correspondence	document review and interviews

Annexes 3

Questionnaire for site visits

For this questionnaire, each answer will be a short answer for more accuracy. Each group will have basic foundational questions to answer for references and testimonies.

Foundational questions for team leaders, DPC or Government Partners

FOUNDATIONAL QUESTIONS (All interviewees, by category)

All beneficiary interviewees are asked same foundational questions:

- What is your name? Where are you from? How old are you?
- What services do you receive through [specific facility or community group]?
- When did you start receiving the services?
- What was it like before you had access to these services? [Ask multiple follow-up questions to really tease out a vivid answer.]
- What are things like now that you have access to [service]? How have things changed for you? Your family? In terms of disaster preparedness and Emergency Response? In other areas of your life?
- What is your hope for the future?
- Anything else to add?

First group

Community Intervention Team(s)

Foundational questions (Listed above)

1. Why did you participate in this training?

Response:

2. What have you seen, heard, or experienced during the training that you found most puzzling or confusing?

Response:

3. What immediate steps/actions during a disaster will you take as a result of this program?

Response:

4. How do the advantages compare to the disadvantages of participating in this project?

Response:

5. What are the main barriers you confront when carrying out these activities?

Response:

6. What is your role in the project?

Response:

7. What are you doing today in your community that you did not do prior to this educational program?

Response:

8. What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Response:

Second group

Direction Protection Civil or Government Partners

Foundational questions (if not already asked)

1. Earthquake impact
 - What was the immediate impact on your facility?
 - How did you and your team respond?
 - How did IFRC respond or support your team's response?

How long until the facility was able to offer services normally (or close to normally)?

2. How does this project fit into the overall design of the Government

Response:

3. What are the relationships between Red Cross and the local authorities?

Response:

4. How is the general situation with emergency response in the project areas now? Is it getting better or worse?

Response:

5. What result(s)/impact(s) do you expect in this partnership with the Red Cross?

Response:

6. What lessons do you think could be learned to date in terms of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?

Response:

7. How is the communication between DCP or Government partners with the Red cross?
Strongly effective -----Very effective----Somewhat effective ----A little effective ---No effective
8. What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Third group

Community opinions and Focus groups

1. What is your knowledge of emergency response during a disaster? Are you aware of the Community Intervention team in your community?

Response:

2. Are you aware of the local emergency plans in your community?

Response:

3. What was your response to the Earthquake, hurricane Sandy Or Isaac?

Response:

4. Do you believe the people in your town are aware of all potential disasters that could occur in your community?

Response:

5. In the event of an emergency, do you know where you should go?

Response:

6. What percentage of your residents do you believe are adequately prepared for a major emergency in your community?

Response:

7. Does the Red Cross operate according to a shared vision in your town?

Response:

8. What are their activities?

Response:

9. During what periods do they do their activities? Give a brief overview of their realizations.

Response: