



---

## Ayiti Pi Djanm

---

Midterm Evaluation



## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>OBJECTIVES &amp; EVALUATION QUESTIONS</b>	<b>2</b>
TABLE 1: ILLUSTRATIVE MIDTERM EVALUATION QUESTION MATRIX	3
<b>METHODS DESIGN</b>	<b>5</b>
PARTICIPANT SELECTION	6
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS:	6
<i>Primary Data and Information collection</i>	6
<i>Desk Review</i>	6
VERIFICATION WORKSHOP	7
STAKEHOLDER DEBRIEFING	7
<b>TIMELINE AND DELIVERABLE</b>	<b>7</b>
FINAL REPORT COMPONENTS	8
MTE TEAM QUALIFICATIONS	8
MTE TEAM MEMBERS' ROLES	9
PROJECT RESPONSIBILITIES	10
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY	10
ETHICAL GUIDELINE	11
<b>ANNEX I – RECOMMENDED OUTLINE FOR MTE REPORT</b>	<b>12</b>

## List of Acronyms

---

<b>APD</b>	<b>Ayiti pi Djanm</b>
<b>BBS</b>	Beneficiary Based surveys
<b>BHA</b>	Bureau of Humanitarian Assistance
<b>CLA</b>	Collaborative learning and Adaptation
<b>CRS</b>	Catholic Relief Services
<b>FLC</b>	Farmer Learning Communities
<b>FGD</b>	Focus Group Discussion
<b>FY</b>	Fiscal Year
<b>GBV</b>	Gender Based Violence
<b>HH</b>	Households
<b>ICG</b>	Integrated Care Groups
<b>ICT4D</b>	Information and Communications Technology for Development
<b>IEE</b>	Initial Environment Examination
<b>IPTT</b>	Indicator Performance Tracking Table
<b>KII</b>	Key Informant Interview
<b>MARNDR</b>	Ministère de l'Agriculture des Ressources Naturelles et du développement Rural
<b>MAST</b>	Ministère des Affaires Sociales et du Travail
<b>MEAL</b>	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
<b>MIS</b>	Management Information system
<b>MPCE</b>	Ministère de la planification et de la coopération externe
<b>PIRS</b>	Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<b>PSE</b>	Private Sector Engagement
<b>RDQA</b>	Routine Data Quality Assessment
<b>RFSA</b>	Resilience Food Security Activity
<b>RY</b>	Refine Year
<b>SBC</b>	Social Behavior Change
<b>SILC</b>	Savings and Internal Lending Communities
<b>SLA</b>	Strategic Learning Advisor
<b>SOW</b>	Scope of Work
<b>TOC</b>	Theory of Change
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development

## Introduction

Ayiti Pi Djanm (“a Stronger Haiti”) is a five-year multisectoral project that is reaching nearly 105 000 participants and more than 18,300 households across 12 communes in the Sud and Nord-Est departments of Haiti. The project purposes are to restore and build absorptive and adaptive resilience capacities at the household and community levels, as well as transformative capacity at structural levels through integrated management of natural resources by farmers and communities, improved consumption, and utilization of nutritious foods among vulnerable populations, and development of profitable livelihoods.

Recognizing that families exist in a large social environment, the project aims to assist families in working together towards their goals by utilizing the unique skills of each member. To achieve this, the project is focusing on three main activity groups: farmer learning communities (FLCs), Care Groups, and youth entrepreneurship and leadership activities. While participants are encouraged to join multiple activities, these three serve as the primary touchpoints. The project is also incorporating other key interventions such as cash transfers, food vouchers, and SILC groups.

To promote sustainable change, ApD employs a community-based Social Behavior Change strategy. This approach leverages community networks to stimulate collective action towards shared goals for wide-ranging social change. The objectives of this strategy include transforming gender norms, encouraging the adoption of climate-smart agriculture practices, and promoting sustainable micro-entrepreneurship practices. Additionally, ApD features an innovative market system approach that will use Title II commodities to promote private sector investments. This, in turn, will help to develop locally produced foods and create new agricultural livelihood opportunities.

Among new and innovative approaches implemented, APD introduced household dialogues, farmer learning communities and private sector engagement with Title II commodities to reach its objectives. Though these models are piloted in Haiti, the MTE prioritizes FLCs for deeper analysis based on its significance, potential impact, or relevance to the project resilience objectives. For the remaining piloted activities, internal learning and evaluation activities are ongoing to document progress, results and issues related to the implementation of such activities.

APD is implementing a robust Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) system to provide timely evidence for decision-making and quality reporting. This system is based on the BHA policy and guidance for M&E and CRS MEAL Policies and Procedures (MPPs). Throughout the implementation, the MEAL team conducts routine monitoring, monitoring surveys (PDM, CAP), qualitative monitoring and studies, joint field visit monitoring, community meetings to collect data. Reflection and learning events are organized to disseminate and leverage information for adaptive management.

The operating context in Haiti has continued to be challenging, with pervasive insecurity, governance disruption and chronic gas shortages. In August 23 all areas of the Sud and Nord-Est departments were

classified as Phase 3 according to the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) of acute food insecurity<sup>1</sup>. Acute food insecurity persists in Haiti due to insecurity, sociopolitical instability, and economic factors. Sporadic protests, recurring clashes between rival gangs in the capital, and kidnapping cases form the backdrop of the current sociopolitical crisis. These armed groups seek to expand their territorial control by unlawfully establishing toll stations on major roads, thereby causing massive population displacements, and disrupting market operations, affecting income-generating activities.<sup>2</sup>

## Objectives & Evaluation Questions

The mid-term evaluation aims to investigate the quality of project inputs, implementation, and delivery while considering contextual change that may have occurred since the inception. The key users of the evaluation results are the project implementation partner and BHA. The results will be chiefly used for learning, operational planning, adaptive management, and decision making.

The objectives and evaluations questions are presented below:

### **Objective 1: Assess the quality of project inputs, implementation, and outputs.**

**Evaluation question:** To what extent has each intervention adhered to the initial technical standards, approach, implementation plan, outputs, and participant targets included in the initial technical narrative?

- How well have the interventions met planned schedules and outputs? What are the main successes and challenges encountered during the implementation process, and how were the challenges managed by the consortium?
- To what extent did project activities meet the needs of the participants? To what extent did the activity achieve its intended behavior change outcomes in households?

### **Objective 2: Identify strengths of and challenges, factors that enhance or detract from the quality, acceptability, and effectiveness of the implemented interventions.**

**Evaluation questions:** What are the strengths of and challenges to the selected intervention implementation so far? What factors promoted or inhibited adherence to the quality implementation of the intervention? What is the impact of insecurity, governance disruption, gas shortage, and migration on the quality and effectiveness of project implementation? What have those impacts been and how have they influenced intended program results?

### **Objective 3: Provide recommendations to enhance program quality.**

**Evaluation questions:** Based on the findings, how could the activity be adjusted to improve its acceptability and effectiveness?

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://www.ipcinfo.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/ipcinfo/docs/IPC\\_Haiti\\_Acute\\_Food\\_Insecurity\\_Aout\\_2023\\_Juin\\_2024\\_Report\\_Francais.pdf](https://www.ipcinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ipcinfo/docs/IPC_Haiti_Acute_Food_Insecurity_Aout_2023_Juin_2024_Report_Francais.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://fews.net/latin-america-and-caribbean/haiti/food-security-outlook/february-2024>

- How effectively does it address key factors contributing to resilience, and what recommendations can be provided to enhance its capacity to build resilience within the target communities?

**Table 1: Illustrative Midterm Evaluation Question Matrix**

Areas of focus	Aspects to consider	Illustrative methods of investigation/evaluation
To what extent has each intervention adhered to the initial technical standards, approach, implementation plan, outputs, and participant targets included in the initial technical narrative?		
Adherence to planned schedules and targets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start dates and rates of expansion of coverage for each intervention.</li> <li>• Numbers and timeliness of planned beneficiaries and Outputs including:</li> <li>• Formative research, gender, and youth analysis</li> <li>• All planned trainings: FLC training, ICG volunteers training, IAE training, SBC training</li> <li>• progress of community action project</li> <li>Distribution of cash and food voucher</li> </ul>	<p>Use secondary data aggregate in IPTT, ARs, quarterly report, AAR, accountability report to compare planned and actual start dates, numbers of Outputs, and other targets, noting differences in achievements. according to location, recipients, or sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare across locations, participant groups, activity administrative units, etc. to identify factors associated with differing degrees of achievement.</li> <li>• Interview members of activity staff at various levels about factors that delayed or interrupted interventions and Outputs, and how problems were identified and managed.</li> </ul> <p>Ask groups and individuals from different stakeholder groups at locations of greater and lesser achievements considering intervention quality and acceptability.</p>
To what extent did project activities meet the needs of the participants? To what extent did the activity achieve its intended behavior change outcomes in households? To what extent was the activity implemented following the causal pathways between behaviors, factors, influencers, and activities?		

Changes observed or reported	Differential change among participants representing different population sub-groups.	<p>Use secondary data aggregate in IPTT, qualitative monitoring report, Monitoring survey report.</p> <p>Interview community members (participants and non-participants) and project staff to gain perspectives about: changes they have made themselves, observed in others, or observe in the social, economic, or physical environment; factors that promoted the changes; barriers to changes intended by the activity;</p>
<p>What factors promoted or inhibited adherence to the quality implementation of the intervention? What is the impact of insecurity, governance disruption, gas shortage, and migration on the quality and effectiveness of project implementation? what have those impacts been and how have they influenced intended program results?</p>		
Activities managements	<p>Strengths and challenges of the activity work plan and schedule</p> <p>Evidence that management has explored and implemented new and/or innovative ideas and approaches.</p> <p>Changes and challenges in the operating context and how management responded.</p>	<p>Review the activity work plan and schedule to assess how completely and clearly, they define the work needed to meet objectives, when, and by whom. Is the schedule feasible?</p> <p>Interview members of management about Outcomes of work plan reviews and how they handled changes and challenges that were presented.</p> <p>Use secondary data from other stakeholders' sources such as FEWSNET and CNSA to better understand the security and socio-political context of the intervention.</p> <p>Ask groups and individuals from different stakeholder groups at locations of greater and lesser achievements about factors they believed inhibited or promoted efficiency and efforts have been made to overcome barriers.</p> <p>Interview management about the impact of external factors such as gas shortages,</p>

		governance disruption, insecurity, and migration on overall implementation
Based on the findings, how could activity be adjusted to improve its acceptability and effectiveness? How effectively does it address key factors contributing to resilience, and what recommendations can be provided to enhance its capacity to build resilience within target communities?		
Findings from questions above	<p>Observed and perceived strengths and weaknesses of the implementation so far</p> <p>Factors in the implementation, and context the affect the efficiency and acceptability of the processes, Outputs, and Intermediate Outcomes</p> <p>Factors in the implementation that contribute to resilience.</p> <p>Potential actions to advance project outcomes</p>	<p>Identify factors that contribute to resilience.</p> <p>Use the results of inquiries to the questions above to form conclusions and recommend concrete actions to help improve activity performance and results.</p> <p>Prioritize the recommendations and identify the actor(s), the purpose for change, and anticipated benefits. All recommendations should be directly related to stated conclusions and based on evidence presented as findings.</p>

## Methods Design

The evaluation will use a mixed methods approach, which should include analysis of existing quantitative data from the M&E system in place (e.g. routine monitoring and survey) and collection and analysis of primary qualitative data. Evaluation team members may, at their discretion, conduct quantitative analyses of secondary data (e.g., M&E reports, and annual beneficiary survey reports). Data collection methods will attempt to ensure the reliability, validity, and adequacy. The review will exert maximum effort to ensure the data and information collected meets high quality standards.



## Participant selection

The main method for collecting qualitative data will be through Key Informant Interviews (KII) and Focus Group Discussions, tailored to the specific type of respondents and activities. These will be translated into Creole for implementation. The primary informants will include:

- Intervention participants (beneficiaries and intermediaries) considering people representing the different population subgroups to ensure that all population subgroups are benefiting either directly or indirectly from an activity appropriately and to capture unintended Outcomes positive and negative for different population subgroups.
- Implementing staff including consortium partner, government, and private sector partners to capture implementation success, challenges and factors that may hinder implementation quality.
- Non-participants gather information necessary to coverage of intended participants (inclusion and exclusion errors) and get outsiders' impressions of the interventions' implementation and relevance.

## Data Collection and Analysis:

The Mid-term Evaluation team will use both primary and secondary data to address the MTE questions.

### Primary Data and Information collection

Primary data will entail the following:

- Key Informant Interviews (KII) with program staff, volunteers, local government officials (mayors, CASEC, ASEC), representatives of government ministries at the department level (MPCE, MSPP, MAST, MARNDR, DGPC), members of community platforms, direct participants, and non-participants.
- Focus group discussions with program participants (both household and institutional) to determine program benefits, service delivery quality, perception of the communities of goods and services delivered, unanticipated consequences and possible areas of modification and design of the ApD to ensure relevant and effective program delivery.
- Direct observations of learning sessions, and service delivery sessions through site visits to assess technical practices and quality of outputs, verify recorded outputs, and assess the likelihood of achieving outcomes considering the outputs delivered and other contextual factors.

### Desk Review

The Evaluation Team will begin with a desk review to gain an in-depth understanding about the activity design, implementation, and the food security situation in the area which include the following:

- Review of program and organizational documents from primary and secondary sources to assess the quality and effectiveness and institutional strengthening activities. These include the ApD design documents (proposal, theory of change, the Indicators Performance Tracking Table (IPTT) Performance Indicators Refence Sheet and Qualitative Inquiry Planning Steet
- ApD will assemble and transmit the program proposal, activity and study reports (gender analysis, barrier analyses, other special studies), annual reports, guides, and manuals produced by the projects, and other relevant qualitative and quantitative information to the lead evaluator 2 months before the fieldwork starts.

## Verification Workshop

After completing the data collection phase, the MTE team will host a verification workshop. During the workshop, they will use interactive and participatory methods to share initial observations and a wide range of preliminary recommendations. The aim of this workshop is to ensure that the observations made are accurate, and that the recommendations provided are appropriate and feasible. The workshop also will serve as an opportunity to collaborate with implementing staff to refine the recommendations based on their feedback. Additionally, the MTE team will identify any additional data collection or information required during the workshop.

Two major outputs are targeted for the workshop: 1) agreement on the validity of the key observations assembled so far from the evaluation, and 2) refinement of the recommendations being considered for the remaining life of the program. At the end of the workshop, workshop participants provide additional information to facilitate the prioritization of recommendations, as described in more detail in the section below.

This workshop will provide ApD with early insights to start developing an action plan for applying MTE recommendations.

## Stakeholder Debriefing

The final stage of the field activity involves conducting a debriefing session to gather feedback from various stakeholders. The purpose of this session is to discuss the set of priority recommendations and highlight evaluation findings. Leaders from the implementing partner's national office, private sector partners, representatives from Ministries, local government, community organizations, technical partners, and BHA or USAID mission will attend the session. During this session, the evaluation findings and recommendations will be refined and summarized.

## Timeline and deliverable

Timeframe	Activity	Deliverable
<b>July</b>	Pre-planning: -meeting with partners, -reviewing the evaluation plan and questions	Draft Detail research protocol to be reviewed and approved by CRS
<b>August</b>	Planning: -Desk review, - Protocol development -Instruments development -Protocol revision and finalization based on comment from BHA and CRS	Final Detailed research protocols including data collection instrument, sampling plan, quality assurance plan
<b>September</b>	Implementation: -Field work, - Data processing and analysis - Participatory reflection event involving APD, and partner staff to identify lessons learned and recommendations - Stakeholder Debriefing including leaders from APD, USAID BHA representatives, private sector, local government, and community organization	Lists of sites visited with types and numbers of informants at each, and transcripts of interviews and discussions.  Deidentified cleaned and transformed data set, syntax for data analysis and variables transformation.  Final briefings

<b>October</b>	Reporting: Submission of a draft report to CRS for comment Draft MTE report should include i). Executive Summary 2 - 3 pages, ii) main report between 20 –30 pages which includes findings and analysis, excluding executive summary, appendices, and attachments.	Final report, action plan including all annexes
<b>November</b>	Final reporting A final MTE report reviewed and approved by CRS APD CoP and BHA	

## Final report components

The MTE report must clearly separate in different sections the evidence (i.e., raw data) collected by the evaluation team, the conclusions and recommendations that are based on the presented evidence. Sources of all evidence must be identified; conclusions must be based only on evidence presented in the report; and recommendations must directly correspond to the conclusions. The report must adhere to USAID’s evaluation policy, which includes having a strengths and limitations of the evaluation methods section and clarifying how and to what degree these the strengths and weaknesses influenced the process and findings of the evaluation. Once approved by the ApD AOR, the evaluator must submit the report and related deidentified data sets to CRS within 15 days.

- I) An executive summary of the final MTE report providing a summary of purpose of the MTE, methods, key findings, conclusions, and recommendations. (see recommended outline in Annex I)

## MTE Team Qualifications

The MTE team will typically consist of a team leader who is an evaluation specialist, plus one or two technical specialists who bring expertise and practical experience in one or more of the activity’s technical sectors and interventions in addition to strong qualitative research skills and experience. The team may include a data analyst experienced in analyzing and relating data across various technical sectors.

- Every team member’s resume must show substantial application of qualitative research skills in developing countries.
- The team leader must have significant formal education in a field relevant to evaluation (e.g., program evaluation, statistics, economics, agricultural economics, anthropology, applied research, organizational development, sociology, or organizational change) at a post-graduate or an evaluation professional continuing-education level.
- The team leader must have extensive experience in evaluation using mixed methods of investigation (qualitative and quantitative) in developing countries. Knowledge of the conceptual framework of food security and experience evaluating food security programming is highly desirable.
- At least one member of the team must have substantial demonstrated experience in gender integration.
- The MTE team should comprise technical expertise from all activity sectors and activity management.
- No member of the MTE team should have had any prior input to the activity’s design or implementation.
- Having conflict sensitivity expertise on the MTE team is also desirable, particularly when an MTE will be undertaken in a context that is prone to violent conflict.
- Knowledge and experience with reviewing TOC and Logframe are highly desired.

## MTE Team Members' Roles

**Team Leader:** Organize and lead the overall evaluation; ensure a thorough review and analysis of activity monitoring data and other available secondary data by the appropriate team members; lead the selection of a purposively selected sample of implementation sites and Outputs for primary data collection; ensure an MTE plan that includes adequate triangulation and validation of evidence collected in all sectors; lead the collection and analyses of primary and secondary data to evaluate the activity's M&E processes and the integration of activity sectors and interventions; ensure that final report presentation is logical and presented in a way that clearly separates the evidence collected, conclusions, and recommendations in different sections of the report, and conclusions and recommendations are based only on the evidence presented in the report; lead writer who ensures the evaluation report is written clearly and concisely, organized and has a uniform voice; interact, on the part of the MTE team, with ApD .

**Technical Specialists:** Lead the collection and analyses of primary and secondary technical data related to his/her field(s) of expertise, document findings, and draw conclusions and form recommendations for the sector(s); evaluate the general aspects of the implementation of all interventions related to his/her sector(s). While the team leader will likely be tasked as the primary investigator for the activity management overall, a technical specialist must consider management aspects of the implementation of interventions in his/her technical sector and the interaction between his/her technical sector and other activity sectors by examining: staff and material resources; communication, both internal and external; community involvement; participant targeting (especially overlap/consistency with other sectors); management of food and non-food commodities; transfers of entitlements (food, non-food, cash); branding; partnerships and linkages; consortium management; routine monitoring and data quality assurance for all interventions; exit/sustainability strategies; gender integration; environmental protection; and draft the report sections assigned by the team leader in the specified format.

The team is aware of potential biases in this evaluation process. Though it is impossible to eliminate bias, efforts to minimize it include the following:

- 1) Defining objective and measurable criteria upon which the project will be evaluated. Using qualitative insights to support existing quantitative data should help consider both tangible and contextual factors. The methods will include reviewing project documents (including IPTT) to determine specific milestones achieved, adherence to timelines, etc.
- 2) Encouraging a diverse evaluation team composed of individuals from diverse backgrounds, perspectives, and expertise. Varying levels of experience should help mitigate biases.
- 3) Ensuring MTE team members are trained on cultural sensitivity and awareness, and tailor their data collection methods appropriately.
- 4) Enabling community participation to gather input and feedback, and to validate findings, when possible.
- 5) Supplementing interview data with observational data, desk reviews and/or content analysis of project documents.
- 6) Conducting an intersectional analysis to consider how factors such as gender, age, and location may affect participants' experiences and outcomes.
- 7) Conducting regular check-ins to address any concerns the ET may have regarding the evaluation process.
- 8) Conducting a reflection activity on the evaluation process and outcomes.

**Pertinent Permissions, Approvals, Insurance, and Other Required Permits:** The MTE team will be responsible for obtaining all necessary permissions, approvals, insurance, and other required permits and for adhering to national formalities. These include required permits related to data collection from human subjects, including necessary approvals from the internal review board, health and accident insurance for MTE team members.

## Project Responsibilities

ApD team will be responsible for the following:

- Provide administrative, and logistics support to the evaluation team (schedule appointments with the stakeholders, coordinate with the consortium members or partners to facilitate the consultants in undertaking their assignment.
- Provide advice and support related to travel (international travel, travel routes, security conditions, local vehicles, and drivers for hire
- Provide consultants with all secondary data available to be reviewed prior to start of primary data collection such as:
  - Proposal and ApD Theory of Change.
  - Complete M&E plan including monitoring tools and reports, Program Monitoring Database and PowerBI report.
  - Annual and Quarterly report and PREPs.
  - Lists of intervention sites, identifying the type(s) of interventions at each location, with start dates of implementation, numbers of direct participants and indirect beneficiaries, quantities of commodities distributed, etc.
  - Food, voucher and cash, distribution reports that include location of distribution; type of distribution; and planned and actual quantities, ration sizes, and timing of distributions.
  - Locations of private sector facilities.
  - Commodity management tools and reports.
  - Baseline study report and reports from all research conducted for the activity's benefit (e.g., formative research, gender analyses, and market analyses).
  - A current organigram of activity staff (with names and phone numbers for incumbents and notation of vacancies) showing recipients organization. and supervision/management lines.
  - Technical overview for each intervention and identification of activity staff who use each.
  - Descriptions, dates, and numbers of participants of capacity building activities for recipients' staff and activity participants (individuals, groups, and communities).
  - IEE, EMMP, and all related reports.
  - Accountability summary report
  - SBC strategy

## Intellectual Property

CRS, BHA, and the firm hold the rights to intellectual property produced under the MTE. CRS will retain the rights, title, and interest to data that are first acquired or produced under the award. USAID reserves a royalty-free, worldwide, nonexclusive, and irrevocable right to use, disclose, reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute copies to the public, and perform publicly and display publicly, in any manner and for any purpose, and to have or permit others to do so.

CRS must be consulted, and prior per-mission secured. This must be adhered to, especially when the material is of a controversial nature and exclusively involves the private lives of the target population.

No review is final until it is presented to CRS, discussed with the review team in an open manner, clear understandings of all conclusions and any differing views are reached between the MTE team and CRS as reflected in the final document.

## Ethical guideline

Every member of the review team must adhere to ethical guidelines as outlined in the American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles for Evaluators. Here is a [link for a more detailed description](#). A summary of these guidelines is provided below.

- **Systematic inquiry:** Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries.
- **Competence:** The evaluation team possesses the education, abilities, skills, and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks proposed in the evaluation. Evaluators practice within the limits of their professional training and competence and decline to conduct evaluations that fall substantially outside those limits. The evaluation team collectively demonstrates cultural competence.
- **Integrity/honesty:** Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behavior and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
- **Respect for people:** Evaluators respect the security, dignity, and self-worth of respondents, activity participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders. Evaluators regard informed consent for participation in evaluation and inform participants and clients about the scope and limits of **confidentiality**.
- **Responsibilities for general and public welfare:** Evaluators articulate and consider the diversity of general and public interests and values that may be related to the evaluation.

## Annex I – Recommended Outline for MTE Report

1. Executive summary
2. Background
  - 2.1. Overview of program strategies
  - 2.2. Program history and operating context.
3. MTE purpose and objectives
  - 3.1. MTE methodology
4. MTE Findings and Discussion
  - 4.1. Purpose 1
    - 4.1.1. Brief description of interventions
    - 4.1.2. Service delivery strategies and approaches: quality, successes, and challenges.
    - 4.1.3. Implementation progress and achievement of results
    - 4.1.4. Meeting targets
    - 4.1.5. Other achievements
    - 4.1.6. Lessons learned and promising practices.
  - 4.2. Purpose 2
    - 4.2.1. Brief description of interventions
    - 4.2.2. Service delivery strategies and approaches: quality, successes, and challenges.
    - 4.2.3. Implementation progress and achievement of results
    - 4.2.4. Meeting targets
    - 4.2.5. Other achievements
    - 4.2.6. Lessons learned and promising practices.
  - 4.3. Purpose 3
    - 4.3.1. Brief description of interventions
    - 4.3.2. Service delivery strategies and approaches: quality, successes, and challenges.
    - 4.3.3. Implementation progress and achievement of results
    - 4.3.4. Meeting targets
    - 4.3.5. Other achievements
    - 4.3.6. Lessons learned and promising practices.
  - 4.4. SP X (Gender and Youth)
    - 4.4.1. Brief description of interventions
    - 4.4.2. Service delivery strategies and approaches: quality, successes, and challenges.
    - 4.4.3. Implementation progress and achievement of results
    - 4.4.4. Meeting targets
    - 4.4.5. Other achievements
    - 4.4.6. Lessons learned and promising practices.
  - 4.5. Program quality and cross-cutting areas.
    - 4.5.1. Partnership/consortium quality
    - 4.5.2. Targeting
    - 4.5.3. Integration
    - 4.5.4. Sustainability/exit strategies
  - 4.6. Implementation processes
    - 4.6.1. Monitoring and Evaluation
    - 4.6.2. Collaboration learning and adapting.
    - 4.6.3. Beneficiary Accountability and Protection
    - 4.6.4. Commodity management
    - 4.6.5. General management
      - a) Financial management
      - b) Human resource management

5. Recommendations (for each area of findings)
  - 5.1. Critical priority recommendations
  - 5.2. Other recommendations
  - 5.3. Conclusion
6. Appendices
  - 6.1. List of abbreviations and acronyms
  - 6.2. MTE SOW
  - 6.3. MTE plan and schedule
  - 6.4. MTE methods and tools (topical outlines and quantitative survey questionnaire)
  - 6.5. A brief report on quantitative results (if a quantitative survey is carried out as part of MTE)
  - 6.6. List of sites visited.
  - 6.7. List of key informants and communities visited.
  - 6.8. Summary tables on finance, commodities, and human resources