

Mid-term Evaluation of Project “Integrated Programme for Climate Change Adaptation in the Department of Nippes-Haiti (CCA-Nippes) (BMZ IKU 215.360)

Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Evaluation Consultant

The Haitian Red Cross with the support of the German Red Cross wants to recruit a consultant to conduct a Mid-Term Evaluation of the Project: “Climate Change Adaptation in the Nippes region”

Expected competencies and skills of the Consultant:

GRC is looking for a Consultant with a strong record in conducting evaluations, particularly in the Caribbean/Haitian context. The consultant will have an excellent knowledge of monitoring and evaluation in theory and practice, and a good understanding on Climate Change Adaptation. The consultant should have the following skills and competencies:

- Demonstrable experience of producing high-quality, credible evaluations ;
- Demonstrable knowledge of Climate Change Adaptation and experience on Disaster Risk Reduction will be an asset
- Demonstrable experience with participatory methodologies;
- Excellent communication and analytical skills;
- Ability to write concise, readable and analytical reports;
- Excellent writing and verbal communication skills in English and good working knowledge of French;
- Experience of working with Red Cross will be an asset;

Duration of contract: 18 days of work (Expected starting date: September 5th 2016)

Mode of application: All candidates must apply through the German Red Cross Office in Port au Prince-Haiti. Applications must be sent via email to: drk.jonas.bolt@gmail.com / drk.javier.escobedo@gmail.com

Deadline of application: 29 August 2016

Applications should include Curriculum vitae (CVs) and related experiences (a sample of previous evaluations is also required)

1. Introduction

The CCA project forms part of a broader Integrated Community Development Programme ICDP phase II, being implemented in the Communes of Petit Trou de Nippes, Plaisance du Sud and Baradere in Nippes Department; the project is funded by the German Ministry of Cooperation (BMZ) and it started in January 2015; it will run until December 2017.

Project Context

Haiti is characterized by complex and recurring crisis situations. The country’s extremely high degree of vulnerability to natural disasters and to the impact of climate change is accompanied by a very low level

of capacity for crisis management and adaptation, largely owing to the structural development problems of the country. A large proportion of the population is permanently exposed to the risks posed by tropical storms/hurricanes, periods of drought and other hydro-meteorological hazards as well as earthquakes. At the same time, the intensity and frequency of extreme weather events are increasing due to climate change. The main risk facing the people is that their limited financial and material resources will be put under even greater strain. The enormous structural challenges make the country prone to food crises. This is one of the main problems in both acute and chronic terms for the extremely poor rural households. Haiti was ranked 168th in the most recent Human Development Report in an analysis of 187 countries. The indicators regarding unequal distribution of income, access to basic health care, drinking water and sanitary facilities, and minimum standards in hygiene rarely spell out the extreme fragility of the people, who have lost so much resilience. The far-reaching ecological crisis contributes to the particularly high level of susceptibility to the impact of climate change and can lead to further consequences/crisis in people's living. Moreover, poor women have limited mobility and voice in community and household decision making and are more vulnerable than men to the effects of climate change.

According to the SPCR "Strategic Programme for Climate Resilience in Haiti" (*Comité Interministeriel pour l'aménagement du territoire*– CIAT- 2012), natural disasters and in particular those linked to Climate Change and extreme weather, are numerous in Haiti. They cause damage and entail serious consequences, particularly economic ones, from which the country struggles to recover. Hurricanes, floods and droughts are disasters related to climate change and the increase of extreme weather events (NAPA - *Plan d'Action National pour l'Adaptation*, 2006).

The institutional setting for the climate change in Haiti

Different ministries and government institutions manage the climate change agenda. Approaches to the subject have proliferated as well as the technical units required implementing programs and related projects addressing climate risks. Nevertheless, such a proliferation did not lead to a systematization and organic review of climate change at governmental level. The difficulties of putting in place a systemic and crosscutting approach for successful adaptation to climate change are aggravated by gaps and overlaps of institutional responsibility, insufficient collaboration between public sector entities, and a high degree of fragmentation in authority and roles within the vast range of environmental management bodies.

In 2009, the *CIAT* was established to define governmental policies about protection and management of watersheds, water management, sanitation and urbanization. Despite this, the existing policies, legal frameworks, institutional structures, and capacities are currently insufficient to implement climate-compatible development measures and adaptation strategies.

In 1992 Haiti has signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) which subsequently entered into force on 24 December 1996. In addition, Kyoto Protocol has been ratified by Haiti on 6 July 2005 to enter into force on 4 October 2005 and Haiti is now following the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030). The country has made and submitted its first National Communication to the UNFCCC in August 2001 and the second in October 2013. The Ministry of the Environment (MDE) is the focal point in the context of the UNFCCC. It develops and coordinates projects related to climate change.

The Haitian NAPA has been available since 2006; to date it has been the benchmark for embedding action to strengthen the country's climate resilience. The plan's objectives are to:

- Identify urgent needs for the country, in terms of adaptation, and communicate these needs to international organizations investing in environmental matters.
- Mobilize national efforts to protect the environment.
- Contribute to poverty reduction of vulnerable people with a view to improving local communities' capacity to adapt to climate change.
- Contribute to national development and, consequently, to regional and global ecological balance.

Priorities defined by the NAPA are still relevant today: management of drainage basins and conservation of soil; management of coastal zones; development and conservation of natural resources; preservation and strengthening of food security; protection and conservation of water; construction and rehabilitation of infrastructure; and waste management and environmental education and awareness-raising. Regrettably, the NAPA has still not been implemented.

Project objectives and components

Overall objective: To contribute to the sustainable security of the livelihood of the people and to reduce the negative effects of climate change on the particularly vulnerable population in selected communities in the Department of Nippes, Haiti.

Specific objective: The target communities and households as well as the employees and volunteers working for the Haitian Red Cross are more resilient and have the capacity to prepare effectively for extreme weather events, to lessen their impact, to make adequate responses, and to adapt to the consequences of climate change.

The Project consists of four major components (related to 4 expected results):

- The selected communities have increased knowledge, skills and resources to cope with natural hazards and the consequences of climate change and are familiar with the Community Action Plans.
- Selected households have improved access to clean drinking water and adopt better hygiene practices.
- The capabilities and structures for the identification and prevention of potentially threatening illnesses of epidemic proportions in selected communities are strengthened and the potential risk of vector-borne infectious diseases is reduced.
- CCA mainstreaming issues have been integrated in the action plan of the partner and HRC has improved abilities in advocacy and coordination in respect to CCA measures.

Stakeholders

Few national actors and even fewer international actors are currently present in the Department of Nippes. The table below gives an overview of these actors:

Actor	Sectorial Priorities
<i>Haitian Red Cross (office based in</i>	HIV Prevention, disaster risk reduction, organizational development, community health

Anse-á-Veau)	and WASH
Ministry of Environment (MDE) in cooperation with United Nations Development Programme (offices	Projects in CCA, Natural Resource Management and Policies
Ministry of Environment (office of Minagoane)	Natural Resource Management and Policies
CSO platform for climate change (office based in Port au Prince)	Climate change adaptation
DINEPA (office based in Miragoane)	Water and sanitation
Ministry of Interior (MICT). Civil Protection office based in (Miragoane)	Coordination mechanisms
Ministry of Health (MSPP)	Health, Epidemics, Hygiene

2. Evaluation purpose and users

2.1 Purpose

The general purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the progress and achievements of the project as required and set up in Project document; and to provide recommendations for strategies, approaches and/or activities to improve project effectiveness, achieve expected outcomes and meet objectives within the project timeframe. The mid-term evaluation constitutes therefore a learning tool in order to possibly re-plan and adapt project implementation in the remaining period.

2.2 Users of the evaluation

The mid-term evaluation is primarily intended for:

- GRC Project management and M&E (at local and Head Quarters level);
- Haitian Red Cross;
- German Cooperation (BMZ);
- Key relevant stake holders.

3. Task descriptions

3.1 Evaluation scope

Mayor issues to be covered during the mid-term evaluation will be:

- Assess overall performance against the project objective and outcomes as set out in Project Document and other related documents (this includes assess whether the project design is clear, logical and commensurate with project timeline and resources available);
- Assess Project outputs to date and review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall outcomes of the Project within the timeframe
- Assess the substantive effectiveness and efficiency of the Project, including office structure and modus operandi.
- Assess Project relevance to national and HRC priorities including the extent to which the project is a meaningful response to Climate Change adaptation needs to reduce vulnerabilities and enhance resilience of targeted communities in the Nippes;
- Analyse the implementation and management arrangements of the Project;
- Provide guidance for the future Project activities and, if necessary, for the implementation and management arrangements;
- List and document initial lessons concerning Project design, implementation and management
- Provide recommendations to strengthen the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, implementation and sustainability.

By analysing the extent to which project implementation staff and institutional partners have progressed toward key indicators, the Consultant will identify practical measures to guide human, material and financial resources in its further implementation and the 2017 exit strategy.

Consultant will do field visits to project areas of Baraderes, Plaisance du Sud and Petit Trou de Nippes (Communities to be selected in the first meeting with the consultant considering time constraints and accessibility).

3.2 Evaluation criteria

The Evaluator should follow the guidelines (**IFRC - OECD-DAC**) to conduct mid-term evaluation which includes the following questions:

a) Relevance / Appropriateness

- *Project is relevant to the development priorities of Haiti and to increase the adaptation capacity and resilience to climate change?*
- *Given the outcomes of the project, appropriate institutions have been involved?*
- *The outcomes and outputs of the project were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with observable success indicators?*
- *To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?*
- *Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?*
- *Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?*
- *Are the outputs/outcomes consistent with the beneficiary actual needs?*

b) Effectiveness

- *To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved?*

- *What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?*
- *To what extent could the intended target group be reached?*
- *The Project's Monitoring Tool currently used by the project in monitoring helps the Project effectiveness?*

c) Efficiency

- *Cost-effectiveness of activities*
- *Were objectives achieved on time?*
- *Under the prevailing conditions of Haiti, is the project implemented in the most efficient way?*

d) Impact

- *Asses the first effects of the project, including the social, economic, technical, and environmental effect on individuals, groups, communities, and institutions*
- *What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries so far?*
- *In how far had the intervention influence on the resilience of the beneficiaries?*
- *How many people were reached?*
- *What would have happened without the action?*

e) Sustainability

- *To what extent did the benefits of the project continue after donor funding ceased?*
- *In how far were activities linked/ connected to other future action and actors?*
- *Is the contribution to resilience of beneficiaries sustainable?*
- *Which measures were implemented to achieve sustainability?*
- *What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?*

d) Coverage

- *Who was supported and why (Project target beneficiaries included or excluded in the action and differential impact on these beneficiaries)*
- *Has aid been provided proportionate to the existing needs (regional)?*
- *Reasoning why this specific support was provided in this specific area (regional)?*

e) Coherence.

- *To what extent were national policies of different concerned CCA actors in the intervention complementary or contradictory?*
- *Have the 7 RCRC principles been respected during the implementation?*
- *Are there any political consequences following the action that were not intended?*

f) Coordination

- *Where project activities coordinated with partners including but not limited to: HRC, UNDP CCA projects, Government counterparts (DINEPA, Civil Protection, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Environment); as well as those stakeholders listed in the project document?*

4. Evaluation design and methodology

The Consultant should use a qualitative and participatory approach, including all key stakeholders, Government representatives, Regional and Local Committees of HRC, communities, field staff, HRC volunteers, Community Intervention Teams (CITs), farmers groups and individuals. There will be significant involvement from project staff, HRC governance, GRC Project Manager and GRC Country Representative in all aspects of evaluation including sharing project documents, reports and KAP survey, answering questions, sharing successes and challenges, recommending changes, validating data collected by the Consultant, help interpreting the results, and reviewing draft reports.

The consultant will use the available secondary data for analysis. In addition, s/he should use qualitative assessment tools and techniques for primary data collection. These could include:

- Key informant interviews with key project personnel and stakeholders (HRC local committees, relevant government ministries, local community committees and selected community participants)
- Direct observations through field visits to assess technical practices, quality of activities, sensitization sessions
- Focus group interviews with the project participants
- Interview Regional and Local Committees of HRC, HRC volunteers and project staff to determine the quality of service delivery and level of knowledge on CCA

The choice of methods will have to be presented and described by the Evaluator and will be approved by GRC in the kick-off meeting in Haiti. The IFRC standards for evaluation should be respected and are the framework and basis for the Mid-term evaluation¹.

5. Evaluation process with timetable and reporting

5.1 Timetable

Task	Responsible person	Working Days/person
Introductory meeting with GRC Country Representative and Project Manager	GRC and consultant	1

¹ IFRC Framework for Evaluation (<http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/monitoring/IFRC-Framework-for-Evaluation.pdf>)

Review of existing reports and relevant documents, develop an evaluation plan and preparation of inception report	Consultant	2
Kick-off meeting	GRC and consultant	1
Implementation of evaluation in-country	Consultant	7
Preliminary report delivery	Consultant	2
Workshop report validation	Consultant	1
Final report preparation	Consultant	3
First draft Report reception and final discussion	Consultant and GRC	1
Total		18

5.2 Reporting

5.2.1 Inception report

After a first study of the existing project documentation. An inception report will be presented by the Evaluator to clarify ToR and Methodology. This is the point where the evaluator, based on the information from the secondary data, can clarify open questions and possibly change as well the content or direction of the evaluation. The inception report should be delivered before the evaluation starts and not be longer than 5 pages. It should contain:

- Feedback / Amendment of the ToR – suggestions for ToR amendments if necessary
- Status of the evaluation preparation (participants, timetable, distribution of tasks, reporting)
- Evaluation design: Chosen methods, approach, steps for their implementation.
- Tools for their implementation (questionnaires, data processing and analysis etc.)
- A draft implementation plan for the evaluation

The inception report will be discussed with GRC. Any changes of the ToR need an agreement of both parties.

5.2.2 Preliminary report

All findings, conclusions and recommendations including the evaluation methodology should be described and presented by the evaluator in a short preliminary evaluation report. The results of the preliminary report will first of all be discussed with GRC and the partners and will serve as basis for the preparation of the evaluation workshop. The report will be presented by the evaluator in the evaluation workshop.

5.2.3 Evaluation and validation workshop

Representatives of stakeholders and the evaluator will come together in the evaluation workshop. The workshop will be organized in order to discuss and validate findings, lessons learned and recommendations proposed by the Evaluator. Stakeholders might formulate additional recommendations if necessary. Possible content of an evaluation workshop:

- Presentation and discussion of the preliminary evaluation report

- Validation of lessons learnt and recommendations by all stakeholders
- Collection of additional observations or recommendations

It is expected, that the Evaluator presents a structure for the workshop as part of the preliminary report. GRC and partners are responsible for the workshop preparation and all related logistics.

5.2.4 Final report

The final Mid-term evaluation report should consider the validation of the stakeholders during the final workshop and the first draft has to be delivered 4 days after the workshop. All consultant works, inception-, preliminary- and final report should be delivered in English (with a French summary).

The consultant will give his/her recommendations but should incorporate the validation process during the workshop in the final report. The final report should include the following elements:

- Key data of the evaluation (from the inception report)
- Executive summary (in English) – a tightly drafted, to-the-point , free standing document (about 5 pages max) with the following, fixed structure:
 1. Short project description
 2. Key questions of the evaluation
 3. Key findings -along the OECD DAC criteria
 4. Lessons learnt
 5. Major recommendations
- Introduction – with purpose of the evaluation, scope, key questions, short description of the project and relevant framework conditions.
- Evaluation design and methodology
- Key findings with regard to the questions pointed out in the ToR
- Lessons learnt
- Conclusions and Recommendations based on evidence and analysis
- Recommendations
- Annexes (ToR, list of consulted persons/organisations documentation, literature, etc.)

Key findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a clear and transparent way, possibly put next to each other in a table to demonstrate the logic.

The report can be extended by the evaluator/s by additional points if necessary.

GRC HQ, the project team and the partner will analyse the final report, especially the feasibility of the recommendations proposed by the evaluator.

Final draft and edited document should be presented no later than one week after the final discussion.

6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards

The evaluator should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in

a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organisational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluator should adhere to the evaluation standards of the IFRC.

The final report will be evaluated by GRC based on a checklist of criteria. The evaluator will receive feedback from GRC before the final payment of the consultant contract is approved.

6. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application

The following organisations will receive the final report: HRC and GRC (Haiti and Berlin).

The follow up should be organised and a respective plan should be developed and implemented in an agreed timespan, to ensure the application of the recommendations by the user group of the evaluation.

8. Abbreviations

BMZ – Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (Bunderministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung)

CCA – Climate Change Adaptation

CIT – Community Intervention Team

CSO – Civil Society Organisation

DAC – Development Assistance Committee

DINEPA – Water National Authority (Direction Nationale de l’Eau Potable et de l’Assainissement)

GRC – German Red Cross

HIV – Human Immunodeficiency Virus

HRC – Haitian Red Cross

IFRC – International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies

IKU – International Climate and Conservation (Internationaler Klima und Umweltschutz)

MDE – Ministry of Environment (Ministère de l’Environnement)

MICT – Ministry of Interior and Local Communities (Ministère de l’Intérieur et des Collectivités Territoriales)

MSPP – Ministry of Health (Ministère de la Santé Publique et de la Population)

NAPA – National Plan for Adaptation

OECD – Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

RCRC – Red Cross Red Crescent

SPCR – Strategic Programme for Climate Resilience

UNFCCC – United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

WASH – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene