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1. **BACKGROUND**

On Tuesday October 4th, 2016, Hurricane Matthew, the strongest hurricane in almost a decade swept through Haiti with winds of up to 230 km/h causing widespread damage, flooding, and displacement across the island. The hurricane affected 175,000 people gathered in collective centers, and 806,000 people were in dire need of life-saving multi-sectoral assistance. It damaged and destroyed infrastructures and people’s homes and livelihoods, and disrupted basic social services, mainly in rural areas. Before the hurricane, humanitarian needs throughout the country were already quite significant, notably due to the cholera epidemic, the El-Niño-induced drought, the bi-national migration crisis, and the internally displaced persons (IDPs) following the 2010 earthquake. The hurricane added and exacerbated existing needs.

Since Hurricane Matthew hit parts of Haiti in October 2016, the ACT Alliance has assisted more than 500,000 people in 6 different departments in the country. Those affected have been provided with water, sanitation, shelter, livelihood support, DRR training and relief items such as cash, family kits or hygiene sets. Location for the ACT members’ response include: **Ouest** (Ganthier/Boen), **Sud** (Torbeck, Chantal, Camp- Perrin), **Grand Anse** (Jeremie), **Nord Ouest**, **Artibonite** (La Gonave), and the **Sud-Est** department.

Nearly 24 months after the passage of Hurricane Matthew, need for humanitarian aid persists; however approximately 1 million people received non-food items; 139 targeted schools and health facilities received drinking water and sanitation services; and over 517,000 people benefitted from food aid. Over 21,000 families received support in shelter, and activities were undertaken to support the re-establishment of livelihoods as well. Still the situation remains precarious. Only 10% of damaged houses were repaired and only 1% of destroyed homes have benefited to-date from reconstruction activities; only 46% of schools were rehabilitated or reconstructed following Matthew. In the meantime, 2 major hurricanes, Irma and Maria as well as torrential downpours, have affected Haiti, leading to considerable flooding and loss of life, assets and livelihood. The backdrop to the post Matthew context is one in which 37,667 people remain in camps since the 2010 earthquake, a total of 10,814 lives have been lost due to the ongoing cholera epidemic, 3 million people remain in IPC2 moderate food insecurity and 1.32 million in IPC crisis phase 3&4 (OCHA Humanitarian Update Report, Haiti 2018).

This evaluation aims to assess to what degree the joint ACT Appeal contributed to relief and recovery efforts post Hurricane Matthew in Haiti and the impact of these initiatives on target affected communities.

1. **ACT EMERGENCY RESPONSE**
   1. **Implementing ACT Members**

A preliminary appeal was issued on 12th October 2016and the full appeal was issued on 29 October 2016 with projects from CHRISTIAN AID (CA), DIAKONIE KATASTROPHENHILFE (DKH), LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION (LWF), SERVICIO SOCIAL DE IGLESIAS DOMINICANAS (SSID), CHURCH WORLD SERVICE (CWS), LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF (LWR), NORWEGIAN CHURCH AID (NCA), FINN CHURCH AID (FCA), SERVICE CHRÉTIEN D'HAÏTI (SCH) AND HILFSWERK DER EVANGELISCHEN KIRCHEN (HEKS). Based on funding received there were only 8 Haiti ACT forum members to participate in the Appeal while HEKS/EPER and LWR proposed projects were not allocated any funding and therefore did not take place within the context of the Appeal.

No coordinator was hired for the Appeal, instead a coordination committee was in place to facilitate and guide the appeal implementation led by Christian Aid, and included DKH, NCA and FCA.

Many ACT members work through national partner organizations such as MISSEH, KORAL, VETERIMED, FNGA, LFHH, FEPH and others. About 12 local organizations are involved with the work of ACT Alliance in this appeal. Size and capacity range from nationally renowned organizations to local cooperatives and community-based organizations.

Other key ACT members such as Church of Sweden (CoS), Lutheran World Relief (LWR) Interchurch Organization for Development Cooperation (ICCO) & Kerk in Actie and International Orthodox Church Charities (IOCC), Dan Church Aid have contributed to the ACT Appeal Response with staff, technical capacity, training and financial resources to support the work of ACT members in Haiti for this emergency.

The initial appeal budget proposed was US$ 9,693,176.91. Due to limited resources mobilized, the Haiti appeal was revised on two occasions with the final revised budget totaling $US 2,146,151.99 with a current project extension up to December 2018. With the current appeal ending in December 2018, an external evaluation is planned to start no later than January 2019 while the only remaining activities, construction activities, are to be finalized by the end of the extension period.

* 1. **Objectives and summary of ACT emergency response**

The ACT Haiti appeal aims to reduce the suffering of the hurricane affected people in the Sud, Grand Anse, Nippes, Nord Ouest, Artibonite and Ouest departments of Haiti through a coordinated humanitarian response by 11 Haiti Act Forum Members: CAID, DKH, FLM, SSID, CWS, LWR, NCA, FCA, HEKS/EPER, COS, MISSEH and SCH (later revised to 9 partners and 5 departments).

OBJECTIVE(S) OF THE EMERGENCY RESPONSE:

**Objective 1:** Affected women, men, boys and girls receive life-saving humanitarian assistance appropriate and relevant to their needs in the crisis phase of the emergency.

**Objective 2**: Affected men, women, boys and girls have access to permanent shelter.

**Objective 3**: Affected men, women, boys and girls have been provided access to safe and sustainable water and sanitation facilities and are enabled to practice good hygiene behavior and to prevent WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene) related diseases.

**Objective 4:** Affected women and men’s livelihoods are restored and resilient towards natural disasters.

All goals and outcomes detailed in the agencies’ log frames included in the full appeal proposal contribute to one or more of the above-mentioned objectives.

Summary of interventions by implementing member (up to February 2018):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACT member** | **Sector of work** | **Location of work** | **Number of people targeted (within the appeal)** | **Number of people assisted so far (within the appeal)** |
| **CA** | *Shelter* | Ouest/Sud/Grand Anse | 1635 | 1635 |
| *Livelihoods* | Ouest/Sud | 1000 | 1270 |
| *Cash* | Grand Anse/Sud | 500 | 610 |
| *Wash* | Sud | 265 | 400 |
| **CWS** | *Repair/reconstruction* | Northwest & Grand Anse | 125 | 150 |
| *Agriculture/seeds* | Northwest |  |  |
| **DKH** | *DRR* | Sud | 7,026 | 8,075 |
| *Shelter/NFI* | Sud and Grand Anse | 168 | 32 |
| *WASH* | Sud, Grand Anse, Sud-est |  |  |
| **FCA** | *Nutrition* | Sud, Grande Anse | 12500 | 12500 |
| *Education* | Sud (Les Cayes, Chantal, Coteaux)  Ouest | 704 | 743 |
| **LWF** | *IR/NFI/Hygiene kit* | Jeremie | 800 | 1000 |
| *Livelihood / CFW* | Jeremie | 450 | 450 |
| *Psychosocial activities* | Jeremie | 1500 | 32 (people trained to do the psychosocial activities) |
| *Food distribution* | Jeremie | 650 |  |
| **NCA** | *WASH* | Sud | 22,501 | - |
|  | Grande Anse | 16,000 | 4,995 |
|  | Ouest | 501 | - |
| *Livelihood* | Sud | 2,500 |  |
|  | Ouest |  |
| ***SCH*** | *Roof repair* | La Gonave island | 16 | 7 |
| *Agricultural input* | La Gonave island | 65 | 35 |
| *Livestock* | La Gonave island | 65 | 35 |
| ***SSID*** | Food security | Ganthier / Boen | 350 families =2,209 people | 50 families benefited with the delivery of vegetable seeds and cereals. |
| WASH | Ganthier / Boen | 450 families =2,840 people | 80 families benefited with the delivery of goats, sheep and pigs for breeding |
| Nutrition | Ganthier / Boen | 450 families =2,840 people | 450 families with hygienic kits y cloro |
| Non-food items | Ganthier / Boen | 450 families =2,840 people | 450 families benefited with food rations |
| Shelter and settlement | Ganthier / Boen | 16 families =100 people | 450 families with mosquito nets |

\*CA, DKH and NCA implemented a joint response project with implementing partner KORAL in the South and some beneficiary numbers are shared.

1. **DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT**
   1. **Objectives**
2. *Objective of the evaluation*

The evaluation is intended to promote learning and establish our commitment to accountability.

The main objective of this evaluation is to assess the overall impact and the quality of ACT humanitarian response in the Haiti Hurricane Matthew Response based on the following specific evaluation objectives:

1. Assess the achievement of results of the Haiti ACT Hurricane Matthew appeal in contributing to improving the living conditions of the target groups impacted by the hurricane and meeting priority needs
2. Assess the performance of the implementing organizations in the context of management, coordination, reporting, monitoring and evaluation, visibility, communication, value for money and dissemination of information and partnership with local actors.
3. Assess if and how the ACT response supported the local structures (state, local NGOs, CBOs churches) in such a way that they would be better prepared to respond should a disaster strike again.
4. *Objective of the lesson learned and good practice exercise:*

To identify lessons learnt and best practices which may benefit communities in their recovery and sustaining the impact of ACT appeal as well as enabling ACT members to improve future emergency response strategies.

It is expected that documentation and sharing of lessons learnt will provide a chance for communities in Haiti to retain lessons on good practices that can further build local capacity and contribute in supporting sustainability and conditions for recovery. The lessons learnt will also inform improvement in humanitarian action within ACT Alliance.

* 1. **Guiding questions for evaluation and documentation of lessons learnt and good practices**

1. *The evaluation will be guided by several questions including, but not limited to the set below:*

**Achievements:**

* To what degree were expected results achieved against set objectives and target results?
* How did implementation strategies, process and results meet or fail to meet high/satisfactory quality standards, guidance documents, and technical cluster requirements/recommendations (construction norms/standards, CHS principles, Do no harm, Protection and GBV sensitive approach etc.)?
* What promoted or undermined the achievement of results?

**Programme adjustments**

* What mechanisms have been planned and incorporated in the implementation to ensure further linking of relief to rehabilitation and to development?
* How was a GBV sensitive approach ensured?
* Was a functioning feedback mechanism in place?
* Was beneficiary feedback received shaping the implementation of the appeal response?

**Program design and implications for results**

* Did the design and implementation of the programme target the people who were most in need of support? Were procedures used for needs identification and targeting appropriate and transparent?
* To what degree did local populations participate in identifying priority needs, strategies and beneficiary selection within projects?
* Did a response analysis take place to determine the most suitable response modalities?
* Were the interventions relevant to the local context? Were the intervention choices the most appropriate in meeting the desired results, given the context? Did they meet the priority needs?
* Was the response well-coordinated with the UN cluster system (i.e. cash working group)?

**Programme implementation and implications for results**

* Was the response timely and did it employ the most efficient approach in achieving results?
* Did the affected population have adequate space for informed and adequate participation during the design and implementation stages?
* How did the programme adapt to the changing humanitarian conditions including other hurricanes and storms during the period? Were the strategies employed to respond to each and cross-emergency scenario(s) appropriate?
* How effective and efficient was the role of the ACT Secretariat and/or Regional Office in ensuring a well-developed and quick response to Haiti Hurricane Matthew Appeal?

**ACT policies, coordination and humanitarian principles**

* How effective was the ACT Secretariat in facilitating the response efforts?
* What positive impact did the programme realize? Were there any unintended benefits and/or harms resulting from the Haiti ACT response?
* Did the response take specific protection and GBV risks into consideration? Have all of those in need of protection received protection during the intervention?
* What actions have been taken to identify and address GBV cases and protection needs?
* How did ACT Haiti forum optimize the value of ACT Alliance’s joint appeal system to create greater impact? Were appropriate synergies, institutional platforms and existing national strategy used to leverage ACT response?
* Was coordination enhanced, supported and managed in a way that contributed to the effective and timely delivery of emergency support to affected population? How was the choice of modalities (cash for work vs. in kind) made? Were the modalities adequate?
* Were the needs and priorities of the affected population, ACT donors and policy standards of ACT Alliance met?
* What measures did the ACT Forum or ACT organizations put in place to ensure the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse?
* Was the ACT Appeal effectively coordinated at country level? Were local authorities and governance structures engaged during the planning and implementation process? Was there ACT member presence in coordination structures on the ground i.e. cluster groups and others.

**Capacities for implementation**

* Did implementing ACT members and partners have adequate technical expertise to match the complex humanitarian conditions of Haiti? How did capacity affect or influence implementation and impact? Were the issues of staff capacities identified and addressed appropriately?
* What impact did the Haiti response have on local capacities – local NGOs, churches and the state?
* Did the programme comply with the principles of the *Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief* (e.g. in terms of impartiality, non-discrimination, independence, participation) and the Sphere minimum standards? Were accountability[[1]](#footnote-1) issues (including CHS standards) given due consideration?

1. *The documentation of lessons and good practice shall be guided by the following aspects:*

The evaluator will identify and document key lessons and good practices with elaborate and concise explanations in a separate document of “lessons and good practice” of the Haiti Hurricane Matthew intervention. The identification of “lessons and good practice” shall explore on key learning points throughout project cycle management – from design to evaluation, in relation, but not limited to, the following key areas:

***Wider humanitarian environment***

* *Unique implications of large-scale humanitarian disaster/response on ACT’s approach*
* *Strategies for linkages: crises to post-crises, recovery, rehabilitation and development*
* *Political and wider humanitarian space: leveraging ACT response*
* *Complex emergency condition from earthquake to cholera: strategic review, ACT response flexibility and implications for capacity and resources*
* *Gender Mainstreaming in responses to natural disasters*

***ACT policies and humanitarian practices***

* *Opportunities and challenges for strengthening compliance to key humanitarian principles and code of conduct*
* *ACT visibility in a multi-actor ACT response: strengths, weaknesses and opportunities*

***Replication and adaptation***

* *Ability to consistently chose and prepare for the most appropriate modality for the different phases of the response (Response Analysis)*
* *Learning on beneficiary preference and capacity to implement a response through different modalities (Cash, voucher, in kind services)*
* *Ability to learn and replicate past lessons in emergency response*
* *Significance of adaptation to changing humanitarian conditions*
* *Funding flow and funding levels*
* *Implications for project design and planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation*
* *Inter-sectoral linkages and synergies*
* *Learning on emergency vs efficiency and effectiveness*
* *Managing partnership in challenging context and in some cases limited capacity*
* *Impact of ecumenical approach in a large-scale multi-actor emergency response*

The issues of good practice and lessons will be simultaneously drafted and finalized along with the evaluation report.

* 1. **Methodology**

1. *Evaluation:*

The evaluation will use the following OECD/DAC evaluation criteria to establish the overall performance and results of ACT response in Haiti humanitarian emergency:

* *Relevance, Appropriateness, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability*

The evaluation will assess the individual implementation of ACT members and their partners as well as their collective results of Haiti ACT appeal. The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner through a combination of methods including a review of the key project documentation and relevant Haiti Country Strategy guidelines, interviews with different stakeholders/counterparts, beneficiary consultation and site visits to the ACT members’ project sites as sampled by both the evaluator and the implementing members.

Based on the understanding of this ToR, the evaluation team shall propose in the inception report the approach, design, methods and data collection strategies to be adopted for conducting the evaluation.

The team should triangulate and validate information, assess and describe data quality in a transparent manner. Data gaps and shortfall in evaluation design should also be highlighted in the evaluation report. ACT guidelines for evaluation report shall be used for reporting.

While the evaluation is intended to promote learning and establish our commitment to accountability, to benefit from the many lessons learned and positive experience of the ACT Haiti earthquake emergency response, the evaluator will have the task to specifically identify lessons and good practice for documentation and facilitate two lessons learnt workshop.

***Overall, the evaluation will employ the UNOCHA cluster-based objectives in the assessment of results and ALNAP Quality Proforma to ensure coherence with assessment and reporting of humanitarian practice (copy available at ACT Secretariat).***

1. *Lessons and good practice*

The process for documenting and sharing lessons and good practice will involve both the evaluator and the staff, with the later playing a crucial role in fleshing out lessons and illuminating lessons and best practices together with the community. This shall be guided with a process plan and simple tools for capturing learning information.

Lessons and good practice information shall be presented in the most appropriate manner aimed at utilization. Excerpts, pictures and verbatim shall be used to reflect lessons more clearly. The consultant shall package this information to allow for both analytical discussion and practical discussion in the follow-on learning workshops for partners, communities and other stakeholders.

Two workshops will be held with different audiences and focus. The first workshop will focus its learning on strategic humanitarian issues, funding as well as broader quality and accountability issues and attended mainly by funding and implementing agencies, ACT Secretariat, UN agencies and other organizations in Haiti. The second meeting, on the other hand, will be attended by partners, communities and implementing members and the focus on learning will be on more practical operational issues. The consultant will coalesce the feedback from the two workshops into a lessons and good practice document as well as for finalizing the evaluation report.

Lessons and good practice document will be completed for broader sharing with ACT members and partners.

**Stakeholders for evaluation debriefing and learning workshop**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Main workshop (1 day)* | *Follow-on workshop (1 day)* |
| * ACT implementing members * Few implementing partners * ACT funding members for Haiti appeal * Government representatives * UN and INGO representatives | * ACT implementing members * Implementing partners * Community leaders * Beneficiary representatives |

* 1. **Main steps for the assignment**
  + Briefing with the review management team
  + Preparation of Inception report
  + Literature review -

Given the floods of evaluations and related studies conducted by various agencies in Haiti, the consultant and the Forum shall ensure only a few pertinent selections for literature review

* + Development of evaluation and documentation tools
  + Field work
  + Analysis
  + Draft report and draft “lessons and good practice” document
  + Main evaluation debriefing and learning workshop (1 day)
  + Follow-on evaluation debriefing and learning workshop (1 day) with partners and communities
  + Incorporating comments on draft report and draft document on “lessons and good practice”
  + Final report and final document on “lessons and good practice” document
  1. **Evaluation and learning exercise outputs**

Both the evaluation report and “lessons and good practice” document shall be simultaneous outcomes of

the evaluation and the consultant will present/facilitate the discussion of these 2 main documents in a

debriefing meeting and learning workshop respectively. Specifically, the evaluation and learning process

shall deliver the following results:

1. Inception report
2. Evaluation report
3. Lessons and Good practice document
4. Learning Workshop – with external stakeholders (facilitating)
5. Learning workshop – with implementers and communities (facilitating)
6. **TIMEFRAME AND KEY DATES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19 - 28 December | Selection of consultants |
| 14 - 31 January | Evaluation field work and lessons/good practice documentation |
| 1-25February | Draft Evaluation Report  Draft “lessons and good practice” document |
| 5 March  6 March | Main evaluation debriefing and learning workshop  Follow-on evaluation debriefing and learning workshops with partners and communities |
| 7- 20 March | Final evaluation report (with updated implementation figures)  Final “lessons and good practice” document |

1. **CONSULTANT’S PROFILE**
2. **Skills and experience**

The evaluation of this multi-sector and multi-actor ACT response to Hurricane Matthew will require a team of well-balanced national and/or international evaluators, with at least one being a highly experienced evaluation team leader. The evaluators must, collectively, have:

* Extensive experience in monitoring and evaluation of emergency projects, especially in natural disaster settings.
* Desirable experience or sound understanding of mixed modality programmes or cash transfers
* Must have strong facilitation and diplomatic skills
* The team leader should have at least 10 years of relevant experience, with a minimum of a master’s degree
* A broad understanding of the issues concerning the humanitarian response with a sound knowledge of Humanitarian Principles, Red Cross Code of Conduct, Sphere standards and humanitarian accountability mechanisms.
* Strong ability to stimulate and guide participatory processes
* Excellent report writing skills
* Capable of representing what ACT stands for: an international church-based humanitarian joint action
* Be politically, religiously and culturally sensitive
* Proficiency in English and good level of French – both written and spoken for International consultants; Good level of English both written and spoken for local consultants in addition to French and Creole
* Familiarity with Haiti local condition is considered an important asset

1. **Application**

To manifest interest please submit your CV, at least two references and a proposal which includes a planned methodology, timeline, financial offer, and any and all support needs to the addresses below by **Wednesday December 19th, 2018**. The proposal should not exceed 5 pages, **not** including CV and references.

Questions, clarifications and applications should be emailed to the address below by 18th December 2018:

Victoria Jean-Louis [VJean-Louis@christian-aid.org](mailto:VJean-Louis@christian-aid.org)

Rosa Matamoros [Rosa.Matamoros@actalliance.org](mailto:Rosa.Matamoros@actalliance.org)

1. Refer to basic aspects of CHS Accountability framework [↑](#footnote-ref-1)