

**EVALUATION OF UNICEF'S L3 RESPONSE IN HAITI**

**Inception Report**

***MAY 2024***

## TABLE DES MATIERES

### Table des matières

1.	<del>5</del> INTRODUCTION	<del>6</del>
2.	<del>6</del> Country context and L3 Response	<del>6</del>
2.1.	<del>6</del> COUNTRY CONTEXT	<del>6</del>
2.2.	<del>7</del> UNICEF L3 RESPONSE	<del>7</del>
3.	<del>8</del> OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION	<del>8</del>
3.1.	<del>8</del> UNICEF L3 RESPONSE HAITI	<del>8</del>
3.2.	<del>9</del> PURPOSE	<del>9</del>
3.3.	<del>11</del> SCOPE	<del>9</del>
3.3.1	SECTORAL SCOPE	9
3.3.2	SECTORAL SCOPE	10
3.3.3	Chronological Scope	10
3.3.4	Geographical Scope:	10
3.4.	<del>12</del> EMERGING FINDINGS	<del>11</del>
3.4.1	INCEPTION INTERVIEWS AND PRELIMINARY DOCUMENT REVIEW	11
3.4.2	LESSONS learnt	11
4.	EVALUATION DESIGN	14
4.1	INTRODUCTION	14
4.1.1	Evaluation DESIGN	15
4.1.2		15
4.1.2	Formative and summative approach	15
4.1.3	Participatory and use-oriented approach	16
4.1.4	Gender equality and human rights approach	16
4.2	EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTION	17
4.2.1	Evaluative criteria	17
4.2.2	Evaluation criteria and Evaluation Questions	17
5.	<del>22</del> METHODOLOGY	<del>22</del>
5.1	Methods and sources for data collection	22
5.2	Evaluation phases	22
5.3	Data collection methods	23
5.3.1	DATA COLLECTION INTRODUCTION AND ALTERNATIVE	23
5.3.2	Document review	23
5.3.3	Individual semi-structured interviews	23

5.3.3. Focus Group Discussions	27
5.3.5 Observation	27
5.3.6 Debriefing workshop	27
<b>STAKEHOLDER GROUPS</b>	<b>28</b>
6. <del>32</del> SAMPLING	<del>29</del>
6.1 Sampling for field data collection	29
6.2 Non-probability and purposive sampling	29
6.3 Geographic sampling	29
7. <del>33</del> ANALYSIS	<del>30</del>
7.1 Descriptive and explanatory analysis	30
7.2 Qualitative analysis	30
7.3 Quantitative analysis	30
7.4 Triangulation	30
8. <del>Error! Bookmark not defined.</del> Expected users of the evaluation	<del>31</del>
<b>Expected Users</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Expected Uses</b>	<b>31</b>
9. <del>34</del> ETHICAL CONSIDERATION	<del>32</del>
10. <del>37</del> EVALUATION LIMITS	<del>35</del>
11. <del>38</del> evaluation planning	<del>36</del>
10.1 Different steps planning	36
10.2 Preliminary Field Work Planning	37
Annex I: Evaluation matrix	40

AAP	Accountability to affected population/people
ALNAP	Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance
AMP	Annual Management Plan
ASC	Agents Santé Communautaires
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCC	Core Commitments for Children in humanitarian action
CEAP	Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure
(D)CL	(Dedicated) Cluster Lead
CMT	Country Management Team
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
CPD	Country Programme Document
CPE	Country Programme evaluation
CWD	Children with disabilities
DAC	Development assistance committee
DGCA	Division of Global Communication and Advocacy
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
EMOPS	UNICEF Office of Emergency Programmes
EMT	Emergency Management Team
EO	Evaluation Office (UNICEF HQ New York )
EPP	Emergency Preparedness Procedure
EQ	Evaluation Question
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FO	Field Office
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GoH	Government of Haiti
IASC	Interagency Standing Committee
HAC	Humanitarian Action for Children
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers
HCO	Haiti Country Office
HQ	Headquarters
KII	Key Informant Interview

OECD	Organization for Economic Development and cooperation
RC	Resident Coordinator
RP	Response Plan
RTE	Real Time Evaluation
SBC	Social and Behavioural Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNSDF	UN Sustainable Development Framework
UNSDCF	UN Strategic Development Country Framework
PaP	Port au Prince
PSEA	Prevention of sexual discrimination and abuse
PWD	People with Disabilities
LACRO	Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office
RC	Resident Coordinator
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
WASH	Water sanitation and Hygiene
ZMPAP	Zone Métropolitaine de Port au Prince

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

Following the activation of the UNICEF ‘Level 3’ Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure (CEAP) to scale up the response to the crisis in Haiti in April 2023 in compliance with the corporate requirement to evaluate every UNICEF L3 response, the EO intends to support the Organization (Country Office, Regional Office and Headquarters) in generating solid evidence on the appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, connectedness, coherence and coverage of the L3 response in Haiti thus far. The evaluation is expected to leverage as much as possible the lessons generated from prior evaluations of the UNICEF emergency response in the country<sup>1</sup> as well as during more recent strategic conversations with and missions led by other in-house Divisions (Office of Emergency Programmes-EMOPS; Division of Global Communication and Advocacy- DGCA, and more).

## 2. COUNTRY CONTEXT AND L3 RESPONSE

---

### 2.1. COUNTRY CONTEXT

---

Haiti has suffered devastating human and economic losses over the past decade following two major earthquakes, four hurricanes, a cholera epidemic and the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. The President was assassinated in 2021. Armed and civil unrest and protracted socioeconomic and political crises continue, coupled with high rates of violence, urban crime and insecurity as gangs expand control over regions and infrastructure.

After two years of continuous crisis in Haiti and repeated calls for the intervention of an international force, the Security Council approved the deployment of a security mission to Haiti through [Resolution 2699](#) in October 2023. The Multinational Security Support mission is mandated to support the restoration of security and pave the way for democratic elections. Despite the arrival of the international force in early 2024, protection concerns about their expected area of work are already being considered. And urban populations are still trapped by armed violence, families are displaced due to conflicts, marginalised communities outside the capital suffer from food insecurity and repatriated migrants face numerous challenges. As of 2024, approximately 5.5 million Haitians are dependent on humanitarian protection and assistance. In Haiti, at least 200,000 people are internally displaced, with 25 per cent living in spontaneous sites and 75 per cent in host communities<sup>2</sup>. This includes many unaccompanied children who are exposed to abuse, exploitation and violence. An ongoing cholera epidemic is aggravating existing disparities and further heightening the vulnerability of already marginalised populations: as of September 2023, more than 64,400 suspected cases had already been reported, almost half of them among children under the age of 14 years<sup>3</sup>. The healthcare system remains challenged by limited human resources that strain the running of public health facilities. And precarious sanitation conditions and limited access to drinking water open the way for waterborne diseases. Armed group activity in and around schools has further reduced access to education, exposing children to an increasing risk of being recruited by armed groups or being the victim of social exclusion and gender-based violence, particularly sexual and physical abuse. Approximately 3.4 million people require water and sanitation, more than 1.6 million people need emergency protection services, more than 100,000 children under age 5 require treatment for severe wasting and 1.2 million children require support to access education in 2024<sup>4</sup>. The southern part of the country, which is particularly vulnerable to natural hazards, is

---

<sup>1</sup> The design of this evaluation will build on the Formative Evaluation of UNICEF Haiti country programme 2017-2023, the Real-Time Evaluation (RTE) of UNICEF’s response to the Haiti 2021 earthquake and the 2022/2023 L2 response Learning on the Go exercise. The design and planning of the evaluation will factor in the diverse magnitude of the crisis in Haiti (including access, insecurity and displacement crisis).

<sup>2</sup> International Organization for Migration (IOM), As displacement soars, Haiti requires USD 21 million for emergency shelter, protection services, press release, IOM, Port-au-Prince, 10 October 2023.

<sup>3</sup> Haiti Ministry of Public Health and Population, Cholera National Sitrep, Port-au-Prince, 1 October 2023.

<sup>4</sup> Preliminary sectoral estimates for the 2024 Humanitarian Needs Overview for Haiti in different programmatic sectors, calculated by OCHA and humanitarian partners, including UNICEF

experiencing a new crisis as increasing numbers of internally displaced persons arrive in the area after fleeing violence in the capital. Meanwhile, northern Haiti is facing growing spillover effects of conflict and cholera, with reported expansions of armed groups, an increasing number of internally displaced persons and a rise in suspected cholera cases. Haiti must also begin investing in recovery readiness, because responding to the complex needs of the affected populations will require a comprehensive, multisectoral approach, beyond immediate life-saving aid, to support recovery and resilience.

In March 2024 a surge in gang violence has further deteriorated the security situation. While the Prime Minister was out of the country, prisons and police facilities have been assaulted, the airport closed and the state of emergency imposed in the Ouest department (ZMPAP). The situation remains volatile and delicate, while essential humanitarian and programmatic activities have resumed outside PAP..

## 2.2. UNICEF L3 RESPONSE

---

As of mid-2022, Haiti was still struggling to recover from the devastations caused by the earthquake and floods that had struck the country back in 2021. Despite the efforts to bounce back from such egregious occurrences, a cholera outbreak in October 2022 further deteriorated the existing humanitarian situation, thus triggering the activation of the Level 2 CEAP in October 2022. It was then that UNICEF activated its internal loan mechanism, allocating US\$3.5 million from its Emergency Programme Fund (EPF) to the launch of a humanitarian response, which combined the distribution of medical and WASH supplies with the ramping up of resource mobilisation efforts.

In order to shape up the response strategies that seemed the most effective and efficient, the Haiti CO held an internal learning exercise in December 2022, in collaboration with the RO. Two months later (February 2023), the Regional Director (RD) visited the country and, following a series of consultations with in-country stakeholders recommended the scale up of all operations as well as of the strategic and programmatic approaches. Likewise, six members of the IASC emergency directors Group undertook a mission in country in March 2023 and concluded that a) the crisis in Haiti is above all a protection crisis (with murders, kidnappings, sexual violence and other threats caused by the 300-armed groups that operate in the country); and b) the humanitarian community is lagging behind in terms of coordination, alignment of access strategies and resource mobilization (as attested by the limited attention demonstrated by donors and member states to this specific crisis).

Following the spiral of the violence, UNICEF activated its Level 3 Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure (CEAP) Scale-up Phase for Haiti on 20 April 2023. The announcement made by the Executive Director (ED) on April 17<sup>th</sup> stated that a tailored scale-up was urgently needed, centred around actionable benchmarks including:

- Scaling up UNICEF programmes in the capital, particularly in WASH, Nutrition and Protection, with an emphasis on the access component;
- Putting a greater focus on HR needs, namely for WASH, Child Protection and Nutrition, reprofiling the CO office, and on national staff duty of care;
- Strengthening coordination in sectors where UNICEF has a global commitment; and
- Leading high-level advocacy with key Member States and greater resource mobilisation.

To take stock of all the lessons generated in the course of all these missions, the CO organized a follow-up learning in June 2023 (see in 3.2 table for a comparative overview of learning exercises)

That notwithstanding, the situation on the ground did not seem to improve. As of October 2023, Haiti's economic and social context continued to be marked by a host of challenges: the political instability lingering

in the aftermath of President Moïse back in 2021, the lower-than-expected results of the reconstruction and recovery efforts undertaken since the 2021 earthquake, several cholera outbreaks as of October 2022, severe food insecurity impacting on the already egregious malnutrition rates, growing armed groups violence resulting in unprecedented insecurity in the whole of the country; an ongoing fuel crisis and, lastly, the country's increasing vulnerability to natural hazards (e.g., the floods affecting severely the West and Northwest Departments in early June 2023) . Overall, Haiti has been in constant crisis for years with frequent spikes caused by natural hazards, cholera outbreak and insecurity.

In 2024, the humanitarian situation in Haiti continues to be marked by the expansion and intensification of violence by armed groups and civil defence groups, leading to record-high numbers of homicides, kidnappings and cases of sexual violence against children and women. The number of homicides and kidnappings has reached unprecedented figures, increasing by 115% and 244%, respectively, compared to the same period in 2022. In 2024, 5.5 million Haitians are estimated to be in need of humanitarian assistance including 3 million children.

On January 9<sup>th</sup> 2024 the ED approved the recommendation made by the LACRO RD and endorsed by EMOPS Director that Haiti transition to L3 "Sustain Phase" from 15 January 2024 to 14 July 2024.

In March 2024 the situation further deteriorated while the Prime Minister was out of the country: the state of emergency was declared in Ouest Department and humanitarian operations were limited to life-saving and essential ones. Ports and airports have been closed, and shortages of food and essential supplies for the health sector are threatening the population. In May 2024 UNICEF's essential activities were resumed through operational arrangements in Port-Haïtien, supporting Artibonite and Les Cayes FOs, while PaP remained unsafe.

### 3. OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

#### 3.1. UNICEF L3 RESPONSE HAITI

---

The Evaluation will cover the UNICEF response in Haiti from the L3 CEAP in March 2023 until the time of data collection

As a reminder, the UNICEF Response Plan (RP) stated the following strategic priorities:

1. Rapidly scale up the humanitarian response to save lives.
2. Establish flexible and agile infrastructure and capacities capable of supporting an intensive and effective humanitarian response/nexus at least over a period of 18 to 24 months.
3. Mobilize all stakeholders for coherent and comprehensive action to address the root causes of Haiti's humanitarian needs, restore confidence and restore security, peace and democracy

The response has established sectoral priorities through specific objectives and benchmarks, building from the ones established in the CEAP, as follows:

1. Benchmark 1: Development and operationalization of UNICEF strategies to scale up its humanitarian action in Haiti including through increased field presence and relevant enablers
2. Benchmark 2: Key HCO surge is requested and key positions are recruited
3. Benchmark 3: Strengthened humanitarian coordination through clusters
4. Benchmark 4: Resource Mobilization and Advocacy strategy
5. Benchmark 5: National capacity building and retention
6. Benchmark 6: Develop and roll out a national communication and community engagement strategy aimed at the Haitian society
7. Benchmark 7: Enhance Preparedness

The humanitarian response has been tailored to different target groups, namely:

1. Families in armed groups-controlled areas
2. IDPs and host communities found in the proximity of armed groups-controlled areas
3. Vulnerable families outside PAP
4. Repatriated migrants in border areas

### 3.2. PURPOSE

---

Like all UNICEF evaluations, this L3 evaluation will fulfil two different purposes:

- Accountability (both to donors and affected populations) on the extent to which the response has achieved its intended objectives and created some unintended results; and
- Learning for programmatic and strategic improvements.

With these two purposes in mind, the evaluation will inform the learning and decision-making among several key evaluation stakeholders. For more details, please see the table below on envisaged users and uses.

<b>Expected Users</b>	<b>Expected Uses</b> (to what end the different evaluation stakeholders will use the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations)
<b>UNICEF CO/FO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance programming decisions, targeting, and prioritization to ensure that the needs of the most vulnerable are being met, and that UNICEF's value proposition is being maximized</li> <li>• Strike better balance between efficiency, risk appetite/mitigation (no regrets approach) and quality</li> <li>• Make the response fit-for-purpose for the rapidly evolving context</li> <li>• Use evidence to enhance their resource mobilization, advocacy, coordination with stakeholders, negotiation for access in country.</li> </ul>
<b>UNICEF LACRO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced one's own accountability for its support to and oversight of the CO</li> <li>• Mainstream good practices and lessons learned in future programming and technical assistance work</li> <li>• Improve policy, procedure and practice in emergency response</li> </ul>
<b>UNICEF HQ</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance UNICEF's accountability for the effectiveness of a corporate L3 response vis-à-vis the affected populations, donors, the Executive Board and mutual accountability as 'One UNICEF'</li> <li>• Mainstream good practices and lessons learned in future programming and technical assistance work</li> <li>• Improve policy, procedure and practice in emergency response</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify lessons learned and best practices for RM efforts in a complex and challenging context. Enhance L3 resource mobilization efforts from HQ to the CO, where applicable.</li> <li>• Improve practice and implementation of the Emergency Procedures for future response in public partnerships and resource mobilization.</li> </ul>
<b>Other agencies, donors and interested Member States</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build upon the lessons learned and replicate the good practices identified in the course of the evaluation in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of their own work as well as of that of other local actors' work in humanitarian action</li> </ul>
<b>UNICEF Executive Board</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inform its future orientations and budget allocations of respective Member States' allocation to this area of work in the future</li> </ul>
<b>Funding Partners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inform their future programming and respective budget allocations in their effort to support the overall response to the crisis in Haiti</li> </ul>
<b>Members of the Affected Population</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evaluation will contribute to engage affected populations in the different levels of emergency response, from planning to implementation and evaluation. Affected population will provide critical information to the evaluation and will eventually benefit and participate in the recommendations</li> </ul>
<b>Host Government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build upon the lessons learned and replicate the good practices identified in the course of the evaluation in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of its own work as well as of that of other local actors' work in humanitarian action</li> </ul>

### 3.3. OBJECTIVES

This evaluation will provide a comprehensive assessment of UNICEF's overall response after 15 months since the L3 activation (March 2023) and after a deterioration of the security and institutional environment since March 2024. It is expected to generate strategically and operationally relevant learning for the improvement of the response, as it unfolds. The more specific objectives of the evaluation include the following:

- Gauge UNICEF's response to Haiti's 2023 L3 emergency according to seven evaluation key criteria: appropriateness/relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, sustainability/connectedness, coverage and cross-cutting issues.
- Measure the extent to which UNICEF has meaningfully taken gender, equity, AAP, PSEA, disability and climate change into consideration and had put vulnerable groups affected by the emergency (e.g., communities in hard-to-reach areas; people with disabilities; separated, unaccompanied children etc.) at the center of the response;

- Identify lessons learned and generate actionable recommendations;
  - Assess the extent to which lessons learned in the past (including the ones emerged during the L2 earthquake response and the cholera response evaluations as well during the missions lead by HQ and RO missions in June-July 2023) have been applied and what impact they have had.
  - Why some lessons learnt have not been used by the UNICEF CO?
- Assess not only to what extent the HQ/RO support contributed (if in any way) to the enhancement of response but also to what degree the different missions organized by HQ and RO led to relevant recommendations that were implemented and improved the effectiveness of the response

### 3.4. SCOPE

---

The L3 evaluation will cover all the activities implemented by UNICEF developed in the Emergency Response Plan as follow:

#### 3.3.1 THEMATIC SCOPE

---

- **Sectoral interventions** in such areas as (1) Education, (2) Social Protection, (3) Nutrition, (4) Health/HIV, (5) Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in health structures, cholera care centers, schools and in communities affected by cholera but also with a high prevalence of malnutrition, (6) communication for social and behavioural change (SBC)/Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) and (7) child protection; and (8) including gender-based violence and Protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA). While the evaluation will attempt to cover as many sectors as possible, a certain prioritization among them will be proposed depending on a number of criteria, including: level of scale, degree of complexity and level of volume of activities/performance; and magnitude of the information needs expressed by key evaluation users. However, **based of the literature review, specific attention will be paid on WASH, Child Protection, GBVIE, PSEA and Cholera.** The evaluation will pay special attention to intersectoral integration, at planning stage or through implementation of integrated activities. The specific interventions and locations will be defined with the HCO sections and M&E. In addition, given the nature the crisis, the evaluation will assess the level of mainstreaming of protection components in all the response activities;
- **Operations:** The evaluation will assess the availability and management of supplies (e.g., in response to the identified need to scale up cash transfers and in light of the existing bottlenecks to bring and transport supplies), human and financial resources (including resource mobilization efforts made in this area) and partnerships which feed into the response;
- **Key crosscutting drivers:** The evaluation will cover among others the (1) Leadership and (internal and external) coordination of the response; the (2) Planning, monitoring and evaluation including the generation and use of strategic learning; the (3) Communication/Advocacy, (4) Security and Access.; and, lastly, (5) Internal and External Coordination. The level of preparedness of the response to the crisis will be examined as well.

#### 3.3.2 CHRONOLOGICAL SCOPE

---

The period covered by the evaluation will go from March 2023 (the month preceding the declaration; this will allow better assessing the level of preparedness before the actual response started) until June 2024, expected date of the data collection mission to the country. Covering a period of more

than one year will allow UNICEF to gain a more in depth understanding of the effectiveness (preliminary results) of the overall response through its different phases, besides focusing on the processes underlying the response. The recent events in Haiti in March 2024 will be also covered by the evaluation. With respect to the latest phase of the response (March-June 2024) the evaluation will assess the capacity of UNICEF CO to adapt the response in light of the recent intensification of the crisis. In this vein, and since the Haiti L3 has entered in a transition to L3 “Sustain Phase” in Haiti from 15th January 2024 until 14 July 2024, the evaluation will combine its summative dimension (with respect to the first 6-9 of the response) with a formative dimension, providing an analysis of the emergency response so far, and clear lessons and recommendations to be adopted during and after the sustain phase.

### 3.3.3 GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE:

Although the evaluation program document review will cover L3 UNICEF’s response in the whole country, the envisaged data collection will focus on a selected number of departments and sites to be agreed with the members of the Evaluation Reference Group, based on programmatic and operational priorities, while considering access conditions. In the current context limiting access to Port au Prince metropolitan area, the field work will take place in Artibonite and Les Cayes departments. The fieldwork is also expected to cover the departments in the south of the country (affected by a number of cholera outbreaks, floods and seismic movements between in 2023) to the largest extent possible. AS the operational hub is currently in Cap Haitien, it is expected that relevant data and information will be collected there, as well.

The situation in the field is still very volatile and unpredictable. Specific decisions will have to be adopted in light of the feasibility on the ground. The evaluation has defined its criteria for sampling (see later) and will arrange to the extent possible to evaluate interventions addressing the 4 target groups: (i) Children and families living in gang-controlled areas; (ii) IDPs in spontaneous settlements or in host communities; (iii) vulnerable children and families outside PaP; and (iv) Returnees in facilities near the border.

## 3.4. EMERGING FINDINGS

Since the early start of this evaluation, the evaluation team has held a number of preliminary interviews with key UNICEF staff in order to better understand stakeholders’ information needs and interest and identify any important issue that may not have been adequately described in the ToR (see annex for the list of key informants interviewed during the inception phase).

Overall, based on preliminary document review and interviews, the evaluation team has already highlighted a few issues that are worth evaluating further during the data collection phase:

- Challenging nature of the Haitian context: the country is prone to disaster, institutions as well as the economy have collapses, armed violence is widespread and so is corruption, international cooperation seems to have failed
- Late L3 Declaration
- Lack of a clearly articulated strategic vision for the L3 (especially in the aftermath of the declaration)
- Longer-than-expected duration of the process leading to the development of the L3 Response plan (RP)

- CEAP initial focus on scaling up programmes in the capital (ED statement April 17) and the gang-held areas where access was severely constrained with subsequent costs of inaction incurred by UNICEF
- Late decision reflected in the RP (May 2023) - consistent with some of the earlier UNICEF HCO-led learning exercises- to focus the L3 response on addressing the needs of 4 specific vulnerable groups: i) children and their families in armed groups controlled areas; ii) IDPs and host communities; iii) Vulnerable families outside PaP; and iv) Repatriated migrants in border areas;
- Pre-existence of factors (inherent to HCO) contributing to the crisis : these included “structural issues”, such as ongoing staff drain, chronic lack of funding, donor fatigue;
- Staff shortages both in HCO and within the larger aid community in Haiti: Insecurity has led to a movement abandoning the country affecting experience, knowledge and capacity functions of most agencies and the GoH.
- Host of unresolved issue during the L2 continuing during the L3 response: 6 months into the L2 response, there were still significant needs for surge staff and key coordination staff (cluster leads) when L3 was declared;
- Large funding gap: US\$197.6 million, equivalent to 80 % of the 2023 appeal totaling US\$ 245,9 million (November 2023).

#### 3.4.1 LESSONS LEARNT FROM PAST UNICEF EVALUATIONS

Two out of five of the objectives of the evaluation pertain to the lessons learned during the implementation of the response. On the one hand, the aim is to identify the key lessons of the current L3 response, and on the other, to analyse the extent to which past lessons have been applied. Indeed, many lessons have been learned from past UNICEF evaluations, studies and initiatives in Haiti. In this first phase, the evaluation team produced a preliminary synthesis of the main lessons learned as a starting point to better contextualise and frame the current L3 response given that, according to the ToRs, its design has been informed by these past lessons. This summary is based on the review of the following documents:

- a) Formative Evaluation of the UNICEF Country Programme (CPE) in Haiti (2017- 2021)
- b) L2 response Learning on the Go exercise: Haiti (December 2022)
- c) Regional Director's visit. Key recommendations (February 2023)
- d) Real-time Evaluation (RTE) of UNICEF's response to the Haiti 2021 earthquake (September 2022)
- e) Strategic Moment of Reflection in Haiti (September 2022)
- f) Haiti Learning Event (June 2023)

Below an initial comparative analysis of lessons from the different sources:

Criteria/ Related themes	Lessons Learned/ Recommendations	Documents Consulted					
		CPE 2017- 2021	Learning on the Go Exercise Dec.2022	Regional Director's visit Feb.2023	Haiti RTE Sep.2022	Strategic moment of reflection Sep.2022	Haiti learning event Jun.2023
Effectiveness	<b>Flexibility and adaptation</b> are crucial for effective programming in complex and changing contexts.	X				X	
Relevance/evidence-based programming	Establishing <b>reliable data and evidence</b> in favour of <b>children's rights</b> .	X				X	
Response to needs/ Effectiveness/ localisation	Working with <b>decentralized structures</b> and <b>strengthening national capacities</b> (i.e., in response and data collection) pays off and ensures access and response to needs. Strengthen <b>UNICEF field presence</b> and develop UNICEF's <b>localisation agenda</b> .	X	X	X	X	X	X
Impact, coordination	Ensure (internal/external) <b>cross-sectoral collaboration and coordination</b> from the outset for systemic change.	X	X		X	X	
Impact/coordination/ RO/HQ support	Use and capitalize <b>'One UN Plan' (system-wide scale up)</b> for more scalable impact. Intensify collective presence and strengthen strategic UN planning and cluster coordination.	X	X	X	X		
Impact	Scaling up <b>innovative interventions</b> to	X					

	ensure change in the situation of children.						
<b>Relevance/ adaptation/ preparedness</b>	Ensure <b>readiness with a multi-hazard approach</b> for a relevant adapted response (i.e., cyclone season).		X	X	X		X
<b>Relevance/ adaptation/ preparedness/ RO/HQ support</b>	Ensure systemic incorporation of <b>risk-informed development programming</b> as requested by CCC for a relevant adapted response. Update CO Risk Management Plan with RO/HQ support.		X		X		X
<b>Effectiveness/coverage</b>	<b>Targeted scale up</b> focused on programme critical activities (i.e., cholera-nutrition, protection linked to 'back to school' activities & DR returns).	X	X				
<b>Relevance/coverage/ access</b>	Focus on the <b>most vulnerable</b> people, even with difficulty to <b>access</b> . Systematize & document the process of guaranteeing access to high-risk zones.		X	X			

## 5. EVALUATION DESIGN

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

---

The evaluation will be a rather light and agile exercise, consisting of a mixed methods approach which combines both qualitative and quantitative data. Following the evaluation purpose and objectives, **the evaluation will be both summative and formative, and will rely on the use of a realist-based and utilization-focused approaches.**

#### 5.1.1 EVALUATION DESIGN

---

Different approaches will be combined to undertake this evaluation which intends to be both formative and summative. Overall, the evaluation will rely on a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods (mixed-methods) and will be utilization-focused with a strong gender equality and human rights dimension.

In order to address the different evaluation questions, the evaluation will use of a variety of participatory methods. In addition, given the complexity of the environment of where the response took place and the multiplicity of the actors involved in the response (UNICEF, Implementing partners, other UN agencies, and government/local civil servants partners),

**The implicit logical framework for UNICEF's emergency response is derived from the Core Commitments for Children (CCC) of UNICEF in Humanitarian Action<sup>5</sup>.** In this vein, of particular interest to the evaluation is to understand the extent to which the information flow, monitoring and reporting have been able to assess progress of the response against the CCCs benchmarks and facilitate/inform decision making. Communication strategies with affected communities and accountability mechanisms to affected populations are also key aspects which the evaluation will shed some light. Beyond the core commitments to children, the evaluation also seeks to compare UNICEF's performance and approaches with other key benchmarks such as the Sphere standards, the Convention on rights of the child, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the Red Cross Code of Conduct for Humanitarian Organisations.

Aspects of the inter-agency response (particularly in relation to sectors co-led by UNICEF) and the scale of the integrated UNICEF program response, as recognized in the CCCs, are also particularly relevant for this evaluation.

The assessment uses the CCCs as a primary reference, and, where appropriate, cross-referenced with accepted conceptual frameworks, such as the IASC Guidelines for the Protection of People in Situations of conflict and violence, the IASC Guidelines on mental health and psychosocial support and recent guidelines for integrating gender-based violence interventions into humanitarian action. We also refer to the [UNICEF's Ethical Research Involving Children \(2014\)](#), the Guidance note on adolescent participation in UNICEF monitoring and evaluation (2019) and the UNICEF Guidance on Gender Integration in Evaluation (2019)

In line with the objectives, the evaluation will establish evidence-based conclusions regarding the overall response, its adequacy, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, integration and long-term effects. Conclusions

---

<sup>5</sup> The Core Commitments for Children (CCC) constitute a comprehensive framework, developed by UNICEF in collaboration with its partners, to protect the rights of children affected by the humanitarian crisis, cover program and operational commitments, include interventions for nutrition, health, water and sanitation, child protection, and focus on action in the critical first eight weeks of the humanitarian response. These commitments also make it possible to provide guidance for actions beyond these first weeks, in order to progress towards defined standards.

will be based on detailed findings at the strategy and program component level. Lessons learned and gaps will be identified for learning purposes, along with examples of good practice.

#### 5.1.2 FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE APPROACH

This evaluation intends to be fundamentally formative, but also presents summative dimensions, hence the need to combine formative and summative approaches. The summative approach will make it possible to determine the performance of the UNICEF L3 response in Haiti, identifying and analysing the results of the implementation of the response and the various factors that influenced these results, until the time of data collection. The formative approach will be used to identify information and lessons learned that will feed into and inform the design and implementation of the next phase of the emergency response (currently in L3 sustain phase) and the eventual nexus approach.

#### 5.1.2 PARTICIPATORY AND USE-ORIENTED APPROACH

The formative dimension of this evaluation and the need to ensure ownership and use of the evaluation results imply that the evaluation team adopts a utilization-focused and participatory approach. Given the circumstances, this evaluation will also include a real time evaluation approach, intended to assess as rigorously as possible the ongoing processes put in place by UNICEF to respond to the extraordinary operational and security challenges currently affecting the country. Moreover, the ET will attempt to engage in constructing a participatory ToA (Theory of Action) in order to better understand how the use of the different resources and specific procedures of the L3 activation has facilitated (or not) progress towards objectives<sup>6</sup>

Through the different phases of the evaluation, the team will involve primary and secondary users, as well as key UNICEF stakeholders to ensure that the evaluation maintains its relevance in the evolving context, meets their needs and priorities. To sustain this approach a stakeholder mapping was developed and is presented below. It contributes to clarifying expectations and needs of the various stakeholders and allows for the development of an adapted methodological approach.

#### 5.1.4 GENDER EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS APPROACH

By applying this approach, the evaluation team will examine to what extent and how the L3 UNICEF Haiti response to the crisis and its different sectors of intervention have integrated the principles of gender equality and human rights, particularly the rights of the child, in their design, implementation, and monitoring (example: principles of non-discrimination and equality, participation and inclusion). The evaluation team will also seek to determine, to the extent possible, whether UNICEF interventions have had different impacts on women and men, girls and boys. The evaluation will also examine whether interventions have had effects on inequalities and the structural causes of the problems facing children in Haiti, particularly the most disadvantaged girls and boys. Furthermore, the proposed assessment methodology will be gender sensitive, ensuring the participation of different stakeholders, particularly women and men, and will ensure that rights holders and duty bearers are consulted. Ultimately, the methodology will ensure transparency of the entire evaluation process, while ensuring that data collection and analysis is disaggregated by gender, wherever possible. Additionally, the evaluation team will make deliberate efforts to ensure that women's voices and the perceptions/ experiences of adolescent girls and adolescent boys will substantially inform the evaluation's findings and conclusions. This will be done via targeted FGDs conducted at the community level. UNICEF's organisational commitments to gender (inclusive of GBV/PSEA), human rights and equity (age, disability, and other vulnerabilities) will be assessed as cross-cutting themes throughout the four streams, using the UNICEF Guidance on Gender Integration in Evaluation<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> A Theory of Action is a method organizations use to plan their work around the outcomes and impact they want to achieve: <http://actionevaluation.org/resources/capacity-building-resources/>

<sup>7</sup> [https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/1226/file/UNICEF%20Guidance%20on%20Gender%20\(Full%20version\).pdf](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/1226/file/UNICEF%20Guidance%20on%20Gender%20(Full%20version).pdf)

The evaluation approach will also consider the L3 response into three streams:

1. The L3 mechanism, which refers to the ‘whole-of-organisation response’ processes and mechanisms needed to scale-up a response. This will provide data to assess whether the L3 mechanism and its processes at all levels were applied and fit for purpose to ensure timely and effective scale up (for example, resource and partnership mobilisation, procedure application, and support functions).
2. UNICEF’s operational response, referring to the ‘in-country response’ and how response strategies were aligned to relevant policy/strategy, and how they were implemented. Here, the evaluation aims to understand to what extent UNICEF operationalized its mandate and corporate commitments to children in humanitarian response (for example, alignment and coherence with the interagency response, coordination, and leadership, and achieved results).
3. The evaluation will assess the response from the angle of the ‘geographic focus’ and whether and how UNICEF’s humanitarian action extended across the different areas affected by the crises (i.e., urban/rural, areas of displacement, relocation, resettlement, and hard-to-reach areas).

## 5.2 EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS



### 5.2.1 EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

---

The evaluation framework is based on the evaluation criteria spelled out in the ToR (as defined by ALNAP and OECD/DAC: relevance (including consistency with humanitarian principles), effectiveness, efficiency and connectivity/sustainability), as well as other criteria and ‘angles’ suggested by the evaluation team, which are specific to evaluations of humanitarian action. These include: appropriateness, coordination/coherence, coverage, equity, security, to evaluate UNICEF’s.

### 5.2.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

---

The questions as proposed in the evaluation ToR have been fine-tuned during the inception phase, with a view to further clarify the scope of the evaluation, and are presented in the evaluation matrix. The detailed matrix developed by the evaluation team is available for review in annex.

<b>Evaluation Criteria 1: Relevance/appropriateness( the extent to which the response was in line with local needs/priorities and international commitments )_</b>	
<b>EQ 1 To what extent is UNICEF’s response aligned with the needs on the ground, with global standards and commitments for humanitarian action and agile in adapting to Haiti’s complex and volatile context?</b>	<p>EQ1.1 Preparedness and Scale-Up: To what extent has the UNICEF response been consistent with UNICEF preparedness procedure and minimum preparedness standards?</p> <p>EQ 1.2: To what extent did the L2 activation acted as a driver for further preparedness for the L3 declaration?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">E.Q. 1.2. a To what extent were the L2 fast track procedures, surge staff mobilization and fund raising and advocacy related L2 activities conducive to a better preparedness for the L3 activation?</p> <p>EQ 1.3: To what extent have the Response plan and the HAC complied with the relevant standards applicable to humanitarian action? (including the CCCs, humanitarian principles, Human rights framework more widely, gender and PSEA mainstreaming, conflict sensitivity, centrality of protection)?</p> <p>EQ1.4: To what extent have rigorous and pertinent needs assessments underpinned programme design and response planning?</p> <p>EQ 1.5 How agile and appropriate has been the process of defining the adequate strategic targets to be addressed? To what extent are the proposed targets coherent with the identified needs? How sector and thematic priorities have been defined? How and to what extent intersector integrated response has been addressed?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">EQ 1.5.1 To what extent were different community members (women, men, girls, boys, elderly, persons living with disabilities) involved in decision-making around design, implementation and monitoring of UNICEF’s response to the crisis?</p> <p>EQ 1.6: To what extent were planning and implementation of the response adapted – If in any way at all- to the changing needs on the ground?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">EQ 1.6..1 What mechanisms are in place for an adaptive response?</p> <p>EQ 1.7 How has the planning of the response and its eventual nexus adapted to the institutional collapse in Haiti?</p>
<b>Criteria 2: Effectiveness (the extent to which the response not only achieved its intended objectives but also produced unintended outcomes)</b>	
<b>EQ 2 To what extent has the response on the ground achieved its expected objectives?</b>	<p>EQ 2.1: To what extent is the UNICEF response addressing the needs on the ground in an unstable and continually evolving situation?</p> <p>EQ2.2: To what extent has UNICEF progressed towards promoting and achieving the CCCs benchmarks? Precisely through the following dimensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EQ2.2.1.: Achieving outputs: To what extent has UNICEF been able to attain the scale-up targets so far? (CCC benchmarks per sector, disaggregation per gender, disabilities, vulnerabilities). How significant and accurate are the monitoring mechanisms in place in providing relevant data to gauge progress?</li> <li>- EQ 2.2.2 What was the quality and what are the results (if any) produced by the political advocacy activated through the response?</li> <li>- EQ 2.2.3 To what extent have the response strategies supported the achievement of the envisaged objectives?</li> </ul>

	<p>- EQ 2.2.4 Resource mobilisation: To what extent have the resource mobilised to fund the response been a) Proportional to the needs? and b) strategically used to support the Has the achieved resource mobilisation been proportional to the needs and has effectively supported the response so far?</p>
	<p>EQ2.3 To what extent UNICEF has established an intersectoral integrated response, linking child protection with nutrition, education, WASH and HCT and vice versa?</p> <p>EQ 2.4: To what extent has AAP being integrated in the response (including through the set-up of complaint and feedback mechanisms, the follow up on the feedback received and the availability of mechanisms allowing affected populations to contribute to the planning and monitoring of the response activities on the ground)?</p>
	<p>EQ2.5 What are the factors (internal and external to UNICEF) that are contributing to or hindering the effective implementation of the response?</p> <p>- EQ 2.5.1 What are the main risks affecting the effectiveness of the response that the Haiti country office (HCO) is facing and to what extent is HCO effectively managing them, also with the support from HQ and RO?</p>
	<p>EQ 2.6: What are the response's unintended outcomes (positive or negative). Which could be avoided (negative) or replicated further (positive) in the future? To what extent have related lessons been built upon?</p>

**Evaluation Criteria 3: Efficiency:** Efficiency measures the outputs — qualitative and quantitative — in relation to the inputs: how economically inputs (such as funds, supplies, expertise) were converted to output in a timely manner

<p><b>EQ 3 How efficiently have the resources been used and managed?</b></p>	<p>EQ3.1 To what extent is the response allocating financial resources, human resources (including surge and repurposing of staff) and physical resources (goods/supplies) that are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sufficient in number?</li> <li>adequate in quality?</li> <li>timely in deployment/distribution?</li> <li>correspond to CO's identified priorities?</li> </ol> <p>(The above dimensions disaggregated by sector of intervention)</p>
	<p>EQ 3.2: How adequate in quality, content and costs has been the support of HQ and RO specialists to the HCO resource mobilization and capacity to respond to the needs? Are there gaps identified? Are there lessons learned?</p> <p>EQ 3.3 How the role and capacity of field offices has facilitated the efficient use of resources? To what extent FOs have been efficient in ensuring the timeliness of the contracting procedures and in providing technical support to IPs?</p> <p>EQ 3.4: How adequate in quality, content and costs has the support from HCO sections to field Offices been?</p>
	<p>EQ 3.6 To what extent have the L3 simplified procedures been adequately rolled out? What are the identified bottlenecks (if any) the hinder the timely implementation of contractual procedures with partners and staff?</p>
	<p>EQ 3.7. How sound and fit-for-purpose are the response monitoring mechanisms in place? To what extent the reporting provided adequate in view of the situation on the ground and the progress of the response?</p>

	<p>EQ 3.7.1 To what extent has the participation of affected communities been ensured in the monitoring mechanisms, and AAP tools duly managed?</p> <p>EQ3.8 To what extent is the availability of funding affecting operational priorities and influencing the timeliness or cost of interventions?</p>
<p><b>Evaluation Criterion 4: Coverage:</b> The need to reach major population groups facing life-threatening risk wherever they are, providing them with assistance and protection proportionate to their need and devoid of extraneous political agendas</p>	
<p><b>EQ 4 -To what extent is the response reaching the most vulnerable population groups?</b></p>	<p>EQ 4.1 In what ways have access and prevailing security constraints affected coverage to communities in need? What are the measures adopted (if any) to ensure or improve access?</p> <p>EQ 4.1.2: To what extent there are specific mechanisms and strategies in place to ensure access to the most vulnerable? (including disabilities (PWD), pregnant women, chronic patients, IDPs, etc)</p> <p>EQ 4.2 How adequate and useful has been the coordination with other actors (if present in the country) to improve access? (Including UNDSS, Cluster leads and co leads, GoH technical partners)</p> <p>EQ 4.3 Were there established negotiation mechanisms to address access limitations? How useful have been?</p>
<p><b>Evaluation Criterion 5: Coordination and coherence:</b> Coordination looks at the extent to which the interventions of different actors are harmonised with each other, promote synergy, avoid gaps, duplication, and resource conflicts. Coherence: The need to assess security, developmental, trade and military policies as well as humanitarian policies, to ensure that there is consistency and, in particular, that all policies take into account humanitarian and human rights consideration</p>	
<p>EQ 5 How effectively has UNICEF established a functional corporate mechanism to <b>collaborate and coordinate both internally and with external partners</b> in responding to the emergency?</p>	<p>EQ5.1 To what extent are HQ, LACRO and the Haiti CO coordinating with each other both horizontally (among their respective division/sections) and vertically (across different levels of the Organization) towards the successful implementation of the response?</p> <p>EQ5.2 To what extent is UNICEF operational coordination (including at cluster level, with other IASC partners) working adequately?</p> <p>EQ 5.2.1 How comprehensive has been the engagement of UNICEF as Cluster lead agency for Nutrition, Child Protection, WASH and Education?</p> <p>EQ5.3 In the context of collaborating with implementing partners, what are the main strengths and weaknesses by UNICEF?</p> <p>EQ 5.3.1 To what extent has UNICEF reinforced the capacity of sector partners to ensure the CCCs in the response?</p> <p>EQ 5.3.2 How adequate and useful has been the coordination with GoH agents?</p> <p>EQ 5.4: How did UNICEF address the institutional collapse and the lack of policy references in order to articulate the response? How these challenges have been managed and to what extent coordinated between humanitarian actors?</p>

Evaluation Criterion 6 – Connectedness/sustainability; Connectedness refers to the need to assure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer term and interconnected problems into account.'	
EQ 6: To what extent is the UNICEF response, beyond addressing the <b>immediate humanitarian needs</b> , contributing to the achievement of conditions for an adequate context to address the structural shortcomings that perpetuate vulnerabilities and risks for children in Haiti?	EQ6.1 To what extent is UNICEF's response to the Haiti crisis contributing to strengthening the preparedness and response efforts among in-country actors?  EQ 6.1.1 To what extent are strategic partnerships being fostered with national NGOs, international NGOs and local communities/community-based organization so as to enhance the successful continuation of the response activities on the ground over time?
	EQ6.2 To what extent has the response included a nexus approach and/or envisaged linkages with the upcoming recovery and stabilization process?  EQ 6.2.1 To what extent the intersectoral response has been integrated, both in the emergency response and within the nexus paradigm?
	EQ 6.3 In what ways does the current situation and the prolongation of the L3 affects the roll out of the CPD?  EQ 6.4 To what extent lessons learned on preparedness, risk programming and enhancing capacity for emergency response have been informing (or are likely to) the upcoming programming cycle?
Evaluation Criterion 7: Cross Cutting Drivers	
EQ7: Gender, AAP, PSEA, disability, climate change	EQ7.1 To what extent are equity, gender, AAP, PSEA and disability dimensions as well as climate change considerations systematically and meaningfully integrated in the needs assessment, planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of the response?
	EQ7-2 To what extent are these cross-cutting themes being considered (or likely to be considered) in view of recovery planning efforts in the future?

## 5. METHODOLOGY

### 5.1 METHODS AND SOURCES FOR DATA COLLECTION

The evaluation team will adopt a mixed methods approach, consisting in the combined use of qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection and analysis, and the triangulation of data and information from different sources or different fields (lines of inquiry). During the inception phase the evaluators used document review and semi-structured interviews (see list in annex) to help design and fine-tune the evaluation approach. These same methods, including remote interviews with key informants at HQ and RO level, as well as former UNICEF staff (e.g. surge staff; on rotation etc.), will be used during the data collection phase, in combination with focus groups discussion with relevant communities, staff of implementing partners and non-participant observation. The evaluators will also analyze quantitative data such as those relating to internal UNICEF program monitoring and budgetary data. The use of mixed methods has the advantage of increasing the reliability of evaluation results and ensuring that the resulting conclusions and

recommendations are grounded in sound evidence. Details on each of these methods and instruments and how they will be used in this evaluation are described below.

The methodology pays specific attention to minimising bias and prioritizes that findings and lessons learned are, to the maximum extent, evidence-based and validated. The recommendations will be co-created with relevant stakeholders, concisely formulated, , nuanced, and action-oriented.

## 5.2 EVALUATION PHASES

---

The evaluation process includes three main phases: (a) inception phase, (b) data collection, (c) data analysis and reporting.

### 5.2.1 Inception Phase:

During the inception phase the ET will establish the evaluation framework in coherence with the ToR and the EQ proposed. The initial document review will be consolidated in the Inception report, providing a first analysis of the object to be evaluated, the methodology, including the evaluation matrix, the data collection tools, and the evaluation plan.

When this inception report is approved following the Evaluation Reference Group endorsement and EO clearance, the evaluation team will proceed with the in-depth document review and data collection, as per the provisions detailed in the evaluation matrix (please see annex). All relevant information collected will be categorised based on the evaluation questions. At the same time, the evaluators will work closely with the UNICEF team in Haiti to prepare the data collection mission.

### 5.2.2 Data collection phase:

The data collection activities are expected to take place from May 29 to June 9. During the fieldwork the evaluation will hold quick touch base with the Evaluation Office and the Haiti CO evaluation focal point every three days to discuss some of the preliminary findings as well some logistic issues to be addressed. At the end of the field data collection phase, preliminary findings will be discussed during a debriefing with the UNICEF team before the team leaves the country. Follow-up consultations after the field mission may also be carried out for different reasons: not only to gain additional perspectives on themes emerged during the data collection but also to gather additional documents. While the team will start analysing the data in real time (that is, in the course of the field work).

### 5.2.3 Data analysis and reporting:

Although the team will engage in a real-time data analysis during the fieldwork, more in-depth analysis, triangulation of findings and synthesis of the data will be undertaken after the fieldwork with the aim of further stress-testing emerging evidence, and formulating conclusions and recommendations. To this end, at least two ‘sense making session’ will be organised with relevant colleagues at HQ, RO and CO level to discuss the findings and unpack any issues that the evaluation team might require more clarity on, prior to submitting the draft evaluation report. A co-creation recommendation workshop is also envisioned, in order to ensure the relevance and actionability of the final recommendations. A preliminary evaluation report will be produced and circulated with the EO for quality assurance and, subsequently, with reference group members and relevant UNICEF staff for feedback. Based on these comments, the evaluation team will draft a final evaluation report. A final presentation will be organized at the end of the process. It is important to remember that up to four rounds of comment on the draft report may be needed until the draft report is deemed of acceptable quality by the evaluation manager in EO.

## 5.3 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

---

### 5.3.1 DOCUMENT REVIEW

---

The documentary review is planned in two stages. A review of key documents has already been conducted in preparation for this inception report. At the start of the inception phase an initial set of key program and operational documents were provided to the evaluation team by UNICEF. The evaluation team also undertook a review of grey literature to further develop the methodology during the inception phase. An initial analysis of these documents informed the evaluation questions and evaluation framework.

UNICEF shared strategic, institutional, management and performance documents of the country program. The review of these documents allowed the evaluation team to first familiarize themselves with the key aspects of the UNICEF L3 response in Haiti (its design and implementation) and to analyze its evaluability. It also made it possible to develop and refine important evaluation tools such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments from stakeholders, including interview and focus group protocols. Then, once the inception report has been approved, the evaluation team will undertake a comprehensive review of all available documents, with the aim of answering the evaluation questions. Relevant data and information collected will be organized according to the evaluation criteria and associated questions and compiled into an evidence matrix). The same procedure will also be used to organize data from other sources, which will facilitate systematic sorting, analysis and triangulation of data.

Over the course of the evaluation process, the team leader will continue to feed documents into the document library. In addition, the team will consult grey and academic literature relevant to Haiti context.

### 5.3.3 INDIVIDUAL SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

---

The evaluation team will conduct semi-structured interviews to gather the views of stakeholders involved in the design and/or implementation of the country program. An initial series of KII were conducted during the inception phase to further inform the evaluation scope, identify priority learning areas, and enhance the teams understanding of the assignment (the list of people consulted is presented in Annex).

During the data collection phase, semi-structured individual and group interviews will be conducted with a wide range of UNICEF Haiti program stakeholders and relevant staff from RO and HQ. Interview guides have been developed to guide these discussions (see Annex). As many interviews as possible will be conducted face-to-face; however, remote interviews may be conducted, as appropriate, depending on availability of participants. The list of specific staff and organizations to be consulted will be completed jointly with the support of the country office, based on the proposed and approved sampling. The inception phase has already enabled the evaluation team to prepare a list of internal and external stakeholders of the UNICEF country programme. The selection will be made from this list, using the purposive sampling technique. All these interviews will be guided by interview protocols whose questions are based on the questions contained in the evaluation matrix.

➤ Stakeholders to be interviewed:

The evaluation team plans several moments of iterative exchanges with stakeholders, notably through their comments on the inception report and the preliminary evaluation report, as well as during virtual presentations of the various deliverables. In particular, throughout the evaluation process, the team will work closely with the evaluation managers on the UNICEF side and with the evaluation reference group. The preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented to these stakeholders with the aim of validating them and/or collecting additional information as well as prioritising them.

This list has been developed on the basis of the list sent by the country office, and has to be completed and confirmed in light of the current situation. It's not exhaustive. However, interviews with section heads could not take place as planned due to the state of emergency, so this list still needs to be refined. In addition, the UN agencies that have been active in the L3 framework should also be added.

Implementing Partners (IP)
Consortium pour la promotion de la santé de l'enfant
MSPP Unité d'appui à la décentralisation sanitaire
Direction nationale de l'eau potable et de l'assainissement
Directions départementales Educations
Directions départementales Sanitaires
Directions départementales assainissement
Office de la Protection du citoyen
Adventist Development and Relief Agency
Plateforme des organisations de femmes de la Commune de gros Morne
Direction Générale Protection civile
ACTION PASTORALE POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT HUMAIN APADEH
AVSI
MEDICOS DEL MUNDO
GOAL
CARITAS
PLAN Haiti
SOLIDARITES INTERNATIONALES
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM
FEDERATION HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL

- List of UNICEF Haiti Country office persons to interview:

Staff Name	Post Title
Bruno Maes	Representative
Emmanuel Ngalaba	Deputy Representative Operations
Ruben Um Bayiha	Chief WASH
Jeremy Lukamba Otoko	Human Resources Manager
Francois Kampundu	Deputy Representative
Gilles Raharinandrasana	Communication for Development Manager
Safiatou Safi Kane	Child Protection Manager
Abdoulaye Gueye	Chief Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation
Lalaina Andriamasinoro	Chief of Communication
Roger Sodjinou	Chief Nutrition
Jean Bosco Hulute	Chief Health
Sansan Hien	Social & Behavior Change Specialist
Inge Vervloesem	Chief Education
CHARLES MENYA	Chief Supply and Logistics
Dorica Tasuzgika Phiri	Chief Emergency
Jean-Jacques Suhene Inchi Mumbere	Nutrition Cluster Coordinator
Souleymane Sow	WASH Cluster Coordinator
Gilbert Kasereka Muyisa	Education Cluster Coordinator
Francesca Bonomo	Chief of Artibonite
REMÉGIE NZEYIMANA	Chief FO Les Cayes (OIC)
Justin Kaseke Kilubi	Child Protection AoR Coordinator
Lea Louise Blanche Manuel	Donor Relations Specialist
Rose Nathalie Coicou	Staff Counsellor

<b>LACRO (Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office)</b>	
<b>Staff member's name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Gerry Corneille	Regional Director
Michele Messina	Regional Emergency Advisor
Carlos Rodríguez-Ariza	Regional Evaluation Specialist

<b>HQ</b>	
<b>Staff member's name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Ted Chaiban	Deputy Executive Director Humanitarian
Manuel Fontaine	EMOPS Director & GEC (former)
Lucia Elmi	EMOPS Director
Malene Jasnsen	OED Communication chief
Paul Farrell	EMOPS Principal Security Advisor
Anne Carlson	EMOPS Deputy security advisor
Laurent Dutordoir	EMOPS HPS Chief
Ernesto Granillo	EMOPS HPS (Protection)
Pablo de Pascual	EMPOS Emergency Specialist (Desk Officer for Haiti)
Sarah Bordas Eddy	Chief of Humanitarian Field Support Section
Lana Wreikat and Hazel de Wet	EMOPS Deputy Directors (NY based and Geneva-based respectively)
Nisar Syed	EMOPS GCCS chief
Ndeye Marie Diop	Programme Group
Claire Mariani	Programme Group (Cash)
Brigid Kennedy	Programme Group (Child Protection)
James McQuen Patterson	Programme Group (Health)
Guillaume Sauval and Mary Li	PPD Emergency team
Olivier Mulet	Supply Division
Shameza Abdulla	EMOPS Senior ERT
Patrick Konan Nguessan	EMOPS PME ERT
Zihahirwa Nalwage	EMOPS Child Protection ERT
Saa Eric Dentor	EMOPS GBV ERT

Sonia Sukdeo	EMOPS Executive Assistant
Annabelle Bodmer Roy	Global Communications and Advocacy chief
Boris Lizassou	Human Resource chief

Following the approval of this inception report, the evaluators will develop, in collaboration with the section heads of UNICEF Haiti, a detailed agenda, identifying the specific people to meet at the central and regional level, as well as the timing and the place of these meetings.

### 5.3.3. FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Focus groups will be conducted with a selected number of informants. The selection of groups of informants will be finalized with the contribution of the UNICEF country office and FO. FGDs will be conducted by the team during the field visits and aim to collect rich insights from those affected by the humanitarian crisis (excluding children), local NGOs, Civil Society Organisation (CSO), UNICEF community volunteers, Community-Based Organisations (CBOs), community leaders. Discussions will be led by a team member supported by a translator (when necessary) and a note taker. The latter will produce FGD notes (consulting the audio recordings of each FGD, if consented by all members of the group) that will be used in the analysis process. Around 8 FGD could be organised: 2/3 in Artibonite, 2 in PaP, 2/3 in the South, including community health workers, teachers, women groups. A FGD with the field office staff could be also organised.

### 5.3.4. U-report

UNICEF has established the U-report platform in Haiti, and has a high turnover of participation. The ET, jointly with the U-report staff, will design a limited number of questions adapted to the format, in order to capture views and opinions of young people and even achieve an age and sex disaggregation that can enrich the data collection. Questions through this format will ask about the key issues affecting the participants, perceived threats, the perception on relief measures provided by UNICEF, perspectives for the future, etc. U-report has a great potential for participatory processes and can be useful in the context of the evaluation.

### 5.3.5 OBSERVATION

The team will visit the regions and municipalities selected according to the sampling strategy described in section below. Field visits will present opportunities for evaluators to observe, in a non-participatory and unstructured manner, the environment in which UNICEF teams and their partners work, as well as the concrete results created by the interventions. The evaluators will take notes (in an observation grid) and collect evidence that illustrates the results of the program. A field visit schedule will be developed with the support of the country office.

### 5.3.6 DEBRIEFING WORKSHOP

At the end of the data collection phase and before the drafting of the evaluation report, the evaluation team will organize a validation/ co creation recommendation workshop with the UNICEF Haiti country office team. The aim of the workshop will be to present (validate) the preliminary results of the evaluation, and to generate reflection around potential recommendations. The results of these discussions will allow the

evaluators to further develop the preliminary findings, lessons learned and recommendations that will be presented in the evaluation report.

In the following table the ET proposes further linking stakeholder interest with different methodologies in the framework of the participatory nature of the evaluation. Due to the current circumstances in Haiti we advance that engagement of institutional stakeholders will be problematic, although we cannot rule out engaging local and departmental figures with institutional responsibilities.

	TOPICS	KII	Work shop	FGDs
<b>Cat I:</b> UNICEF HQ, LACRO, CO, FO, Surge staff	Coordination of response, decision making, technical support and guidance, strategic inputs	X	X	X
<b>Cat Ia:</b> Implementing partners NGOs CSO, Government counterparts	Enabling factors for an effective response and constraints, coordination, technical support and guidance	X	X	X
<b>Cat II:</b> UN: Resident Coordinator (RC), OCHA, UN country Team (UNCT), WHO, World Food Programme (WFP), International Organisation of Migration (IOM), UN Development Programme (UNDP), UN Populations Fund (UNFPA), UN women, Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) Red Cross Government: INGOs: Donors/Development partners:	Sectoral/pillar coordination and leadership, synergies of strategic and sectoral outputs, perceptions on UNICEF's response, activities benefitting the HDP Nexus thinking	X	X	
<b>Cat III:</b> CBO, COMMUNITIES LEADERS, HEALTH VOLUNTEER, ...	Aims to gather information on collaboration, coordination, and results.	X		X
<b>Cat IV:</b> Members of the Affected population, in particular women, adolescents, and PWD, affected communities, students	Aims to provide information on the organisation's response to the priority needs of affected populations, including the assessment of Accountability to Affected Populations.			X

## 6. SAMPLING

---

## 6.1 SAMPLING FOR FIELD DATA COLLECTION

---

Given the complexity of the UNICEF L3 response in Haiti and light of its country-wide implementation, the evaluation team determined a sampling strategy for data collection in the field. This sample makes it possible to focus on a reduced number of interventions and on a few regions with a view to carrying out in-depth analyses. The sampling techniques and levels used as well as the criteria considered are described below.

## 6.2 NON-PROBABILITY AND PURPOSIVE SAMPLING

---

A sample of the entire country program (sectors, interventions, regions, partners, etc.) will be identified in a non-probabilistic (or non-random) manner. This purposive sampling technique is the most appropriate given the focus of this evaluation on understanding the lived experiences of a selected number of population groups and not of the population as a whole. This implies that the number of interventions, regions, and stakeholders on which the evaluation will focus will be chosen according to the criteria set in advance, in particular by taking into account the expectations expressed by the people consulted during the Inception phase.

## 6.3 GEOGRAPHIC SAMPLING

---

This evaluation covers all sectors of UNICEF intervention in Haiti (WASH, health and nutrition, child protection and education and social protection). Thus, the evaluation team will have to answer evaluation questions about the program as a whole and not only in relation to these sectors.

However, the team determined a geographic sampling strategy for field data collection, allowing for in-depth analysis of individual cases. The preliminary review of documents and data obtained through meetings with UNICEF staff in Haiti, and taking into consideration the security situation and the resumption of UNICEF activities after the turmoil of March-April, indicates, as the more feasible and appropriate approach, to focus in activities in Artibonite and the South, where there is UNICEF presence and roll out of programmes, and also in the East, where communities of returnees are stranded and targeted by the response. As the access to the country will take place through the North, Cap Haitien, where operations and supply have provisionally been established, that area will also be visited. The ET cannot exclude visiting other places if additional information (from IPs) supports additional specific field visits.

The analysis so far has already allowed the team to identify a certain number of criteria to take into account in order to determine the departments and municipalities to visit during the data collection phase.

The criteria selected are as follows:

- Convergence of different sectors
- Nexus opportunities
- Interagency presence
- Accessibility and support from UNICEF

For more details on the final sites retained for the fieldwork, please see the final mission schedule in annex.

## 7. ANALYSIS

---

The evaluation team will combine descriptive and explanatory (qualitative and quantitative) analytical approaches. Details on each of these approaches and how they will be used are provided below.

## 7.1 DESCRIPTIVE AND EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS

---

It will be used initially to describe and understand the context in which UNICEF Haiti carries out its interventions, how these are structured, as well as the level of performance achieved by the implementation of these interventions, before moving on to more interpretive approaches. This analysis will allow the evaluation team to make general findings regarding the main evaluation questions (including relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, coverage and connectedness and coordination) as well as trends in data. Secondly, the analysis will seek to identify and explain the determining factors for any observed performance trends.

## 7.2 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

---

Reviewed documents, interview notes, and group discussion notes will be subjected to qualitative content analysis to identify common trends and themes that emerge from the data. Interpretive content analysis will be used in particular to identify divergent points of view and opposing trends on certain issues in relation to the evaluation questions.

## 7.3 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

---

This analytical approach will be used to capture and analyze relevant information (such as financial data), and trends related to the results of the UNICEF L3 response in Haiti, as well as to produce evidence based on the data collected during document review and interviews.

## 7.4 TRIANGULATION

---

Using these analytical approaches will allow evaluators to triangulate the data and information collected by the evaluation team, which will ensure the credibility of the evaluation findings and conclusions. Triangulation will be done in several ways, in particular: (a) by cross-referencing data from different data collection methods (examples: documentary review, interviews, focus groups), (b) by cross-referencing data obtained from different sources (examples: UNICEF, government, implementing partners, families and communities), and (c) by cross-referencing the different types of data obtained (qualitative and quantitative). The greatest possible effort will be made to ensure that any question will be answered by at least three different methods. The evaluation team will adopt an evidence matrix that will incorporate findings from different methods and sources linking them to each EQ, in order to allow for a solid triangulation and reinforcement of evidences for each EQ, This allows as well to identify weaknesses or gaps that can be addressed in order to reinforce the chain of evidences.

## 4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

---

In line with established evaluation frameworks<sup>8</sup>, the evaluation team will conduct this review “in an ethical and legal manner, with regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the action”<sup>(9)</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> UNEG Norms and standards for evaluation, 2017

<sup>9</sup> International Federation of the Red Cross. (2011) Framework for Evaluation

Given the vulnerability of the affected population, ethical considerations are of the utmost importance. The evaluation team integrated human rights and gender perspective, as well as standard ethical considerations and those specific to the crisis context.

The design of the evaluation avoids explicitly including children in the data collection process. While their views are crucial we judge that in order to avoid their exposure in this type of exercise, the information related to the adequacy and effectiveness of the support provided to them can be obtained with enough reliability from parents, teachers, or young adults or other family members.

The assessment aims to collect data from population groups affected by a complex multifaceted crisis. We will access this affected population from different angles and with different tools, and ethical considerations and consent will always be applied. The evaluation will attempt to capture views and opinions from beneficiaries of UNICEF activities, including women, young adults, teachers, health and education staff and community workers. Consent forms (in annex) will be provided for signature to participants of interviews and discussion groups and will be adequately explained. Copies of the consent forms will be kept for the record.

The evaluation team will always inform on the nature of the activities when collecting information in order to obtain their consent for the sharing of personal information, as well as an undertaking not to disclose the information. The evaluation team respects the right of individuals to provide confidential information and made participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. The evaluation team will ensure that ethical considerations will be strictly respected, taking into account accepted standards and ensuring, at all stages of the process, the application of the principles of respect, particularly during consultations on field. The team follows the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations System, the Ethical Standards for United Nations Evaluations<sup>10</sup> and the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, evaluation,<sup>11</sup> data collection and analysis, which will guide the entire evaluation process.

The evaluation team is required to strictly respect the confidentiality of information obtained by any means, with the sole exception of the case where a participant reveals to the evaluation team a risk of immediate harm or sexual exploitation. A specific protocol will be designed for such cases.

Throughout the evaluation, the team will apply the principles of informed consent, voluntary participation, assurances of anonymity and confidentiality, rigorous data protection protocols, and “do no harm”. Evaluation consultants will have completed a UNICEF approved PSEA course before conducting field level research. All consultants have prior experience working with vulnerable groups and have done so according to the Inter-Agency Standing Committee’s (IASC) guidelines<sup>(12)</sup> for working with and for young people in humanitarian and protracted crises and at all times will adhere to the following principles and ethical guidelines for reporting on children<sup>(13)</sup>.

### **Ensuring Anonymity/ Data Protection**

---

<sup>10</sup> UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

<sup>11</sup> UNICEF PROCEDURE ON ETHICAL STANDARDS IN RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS (2021)

<sup>12</sup> Inter-Agency Standing Committee. (2023) IASC Guidelines on Working with and for Young People in Humanitarian and Protracted Crises. <https://www.corecommitments.unicef.org/kp/iasc-guidelines-on-working-with-and-for-young-people-in-humanitarian-and-protracted-crises.url>. Accessed 23 October 2023.

<sup>13</sup> United Nations Children's Fund. (2023) Ethical guidelines for reporting on children.

<https://www.unicef.org/montenegro/en/ethical-guidelines-reporting-children#:~:text=In%20interviewing%20and%20reporting%20on,potential%20of%20harm%20and%20retribution>. Accessed 3 January, 2024.

The evaluation team will provide subject anonymity by ensuring the evaluation cannot link individual responses with participants' identities. The evaluation team will maintain the confidentiality of information collected from evaluation participants: only the five core team members who will be collecting/ analysing data will be able to identify the responses of individual subjects. The following practices will be implemented to ensure a high level of confidentiality:

- Each key informant will be deidentified and assigned a Unique Identifier Code (UIC). A separate document that links the code to subjects' identifying information will be stored in a separate password protected folder.
- Access to data is restricted to the core evaluation team only, and access to data files is provided via a centralized process.
- ~~Face sheets containing identifiers of FGD participants will be removed from FGD notes before the notes are uploaded and coded.~~
- Data stored on paper will be either be scanned and destroyed, or kept together in a safe, secure location away from public access.
- Data will be protected from access by outside/ unauthorized WiFi networks via network-based firewalls.
- Computers used by the evaluation team have regularly updated anti-virus protection; up-to-date versions of all software and media storage devices will be maintained.
- All identifiable study data will be destroyed or deleted two weeks after the Final Report is officially approved by UNICEF's Evaluation Manager.
- All data is stored on access-restricted MS Teams; any data that is transported or transferred during the field visit will be kept on a password protected device (e.g., USB/ hard drive).
- All data documents will be maintained on access-restricted secure server.

All KIIs, FGDs results will be de-identified. Codes will be retained by the lead consultant to ensure an audit trail. Verbal informed consent will be obtained from all people involved in the evaluation, based upon advice about how information will be recorded and used.

Formal ethics approval will be required prior to the data collection. The Inception report, as well as the methodological aspects and evaluation tools, will be reviewed by an independent "Ethical Review Board", and has to be cleared as being consistent with the procedures of UNICEF for ethical standards in research, evaluation, data collection and analysis. The process will ensure the rights and well-being of all participants are protected, and that the results of the evaluation are trustworthy, valid, and reliable.

## 5. EVALUATION LIMITATIONS

Limitations	Mitigation Strategies
<p>Staff rotation: Since the start of the CEAP L3 the rotation of staff has been increased by the mobilisation of surge staff for periods of limited duration, the needed increase of R&amp;R requirements, and in some cases by the resignation of some staff leaving the country for personal or security reasons</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ET will establish a strategy to locate key staff who worked on the L3 although they are no longer in Haiti (e.g., specially surge staff), and arrange distant meetings with them to address the EQ</li> </ul>
<p>Access to the Port au Prince Metropolitan Zone (ZMPAP): the situation on the ground prevents the access to the ZMPAP, where needs are acute and affecting different population group. Moreover CO premises are located there, where apparently the management of the CO follows the situation and provides guidance for operations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ET will establish frequent remote contact with chiefs of section during the field visits and with CO management before, during and after the field mission.</li> </ul>
<p>Security: The situation on the ground, even in the areas planned and agreed upon in North, Artibonite and Sud, is volatile, and access to sites, to beneficiaries or simply the mobilisation of staff and key informants can be affected</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security analysis, UN security measures and protocols will be applied in order to overcome these limitations. In case of key informants not being accessible for security reasons, distant interviews will be arranged</li> </ul>
<p>Availability of primary data: Sources and reliability of data may be affected by the breaks in reporting or the constraints to ensure quality control and adequate Monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All means to access primary data available will be put in place, including field visits, reliance on Third-Party Monitoring (TPM), and actively looking for access to alternative sources (NGOs, CSO etc). Gaps in data will be clearly mentioned in the report</li> </ul>
<p>Evaluation fatigue: HCO staff and partners are under stress, assessments and evaluations are multiplied during an emergency response, staff may be reluctant to fully provide the necessary support or information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ET will take carefully into consideration staff fatigue and distress and will always plan and propose evaluation tools (KII, FGD, Observations) after ensuring adequate conditions for participation. The evaluation design envisages a light footprint during the mission,</li> </ul>
<p>Evolution of the response over time: the scope of the evaluation (one year after the L3 declaration somehow overlaps with the actual implementation of the response). To gauge what was done at early stages may prove challenging while the operation is ongoing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The evaluation team will clearly establish the time scope of the evaluation and will always construct evidence on the basis of data analysis of the period evaluated. Lessons and possible applicability of conclusions to the ongoing response are envisaged</li> </ul>
<p>Logistic limitation: Haiti is a country devastated by decades of conflict and neglect, roads, communication and infrastructure are deteriorated beyond the current security context, affecting communications and mobilisation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sampling and field visits will be decided jointly with HCO, RO and HQ taking into consideration these limitations and ensuring an adequate representativeness of the sites and activities to be analysed</li> </ul>
<p>Cultural limitations: language, cultural norms and attitudes can limit adequate communication with beneficiaries and communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cultural aspects of the populations to meet will be taken into consideration in the design of the tools, cultural mediators and translators will be mobilised to explain the nature and purpose of the exercise. Evaluation tools and consent forms will be translated to local language</li> </ul>

## 6. EVALUATION PLANNING

### DIFFERENT STEPS PLANNING

Activity (by phase of the evaluation process)	Tentative Date
<b>Inception Phase</b>	
1. Submission of the draft inception report by the team of consultants	May 15, 2024
2. RG submit their comments to the evaluation team	May 21, 2024
3. Submission of the revised inception report by the international consultant based on the Reference Group comments	May 23, 2024
4. Ethical Clearance obtention	May 24, 2024
<b>Data Collection</b>	
5. Field work data collection mission	May 25 to June 9
6. Debriefing (at the end of the field work in): a debriefing will be organized to share the key preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations.	June 8 2024
<b>Data Analysis and report write-up</b>	
7. Data analysis and submission of draft evaluation report: will be produced within 3 weeks from the completion of the fieldwork.	June 30, 2024
8. Submission of revised evaluation report + final presentation	July 30, 2024

## PRELIMINARY FIELD WORK PLANNING

---

Field planning has not yet been completed. The ET proposes the following schedule for a field visit between 27th May to 8th of June

We intend to visit areas accessible at this moment: Cap Haïtien, the Southern Region (Les Cayes) and Artibonite. Port-au-Prince will be done remotely.

At this stage we do not have information of the location of main UNICEF partners, neither of the UN agencies and the UNCT. Depending on the situation on the ground distant interviews will be arranged.

Thanks to preliminary information from Artibonite FO and Les Cayes, we can already figure out some field visits.

		<b>Activity</b>	<b>Persons to be met</b>	<b>UNICEF Focal Point (for info/help)</b>
Friday 24/05	AM 10 :00- 12 :00	Remote Interview with Chief of Field Office Gonaives FO and the Grand Nord	Francesca Bonomo ( <b>teams</b> )	Francesca/ Abdoulaye
Saturday 25/05	09:00	Departure from home base		
Sunday 26/05	10 :00	Arrival in <b>Cap Haitien</b>		
Monday 27/05	08 :00	Meeting <b>UNICEF health and nutrition specialists</b> Briefing on Nord-Nord Est	Health and Nutrition specialists	Joane Fredelyne Alfred Gloria/Dorothee/Ben
	09 :00	Visit <b>Direction departementale de la Sante'</b> (Nord) – Discussion on UNICEF support to health, nutrition and immunization, SGBV in the Grand Nord Installation of <b>cold chain/cold room</b> working with <b>solar energy</b>	Dr Jasmin Robert, Directeur departemental, 37211935	
	10 :00	Visit <b>Justinien hospital</b> in Cap Haitien Visit neonatology, paediatric ward, Service de Nutrition and discuss with staff on UNICEF support. Hospital identified as target for the GN strategy.	Dr Jean Getro Dube, Dr Jory Desir, 36702438/ 33742489	
	11 :30	Visit <b>EFACAP school</b> in Cap Haitien – meet/interview U-reporters, children and teachers.	Directeur Fritzner Charles 37205182	Geslet/Gilles or Evdjina
	13:00	Visit <b>MFK – factory (nutrition commodity)</b> Partner to UNICEF and WFP	contact	Ben
	16:00	Meeting <b>UNICEF Dep Rep Operations/Chief of Supply</b> on supply, logistics, operations, ICT, HR etc	Emmanuel Ngalaba, Deputy Rep Operations Charles Okoth Menya, Chief of Supply unit	Charles/Emmanuel
Tuesday 28/05	08:00- 10:00	Travel Cap Haitien - <b>Ouanaminthe</b> (border with Republica Dominicana) Response to the protection crisis		Geslet, Joane, Dorothee, Ben
	10:30	Visit <b>Ouanaminthe transit center</b>	IBERS contact	Geslet
	11:30	Visit ( <b>Grabek</b> ) <b>shelter for deported children (including victims of rape)</b>	Bertil Jocelyn Coordonateur GRABEK	Geslet

			40712850	
	12:30	Visit <b>Direction departementale de la Sante' (Nord-Est)</b> – Discussion on UNICEF support to health, nutrition and immunization, SGBV in the Grand Nord. (Fort liberte') Visit cold room. Installation of <b>cold chain/cold room</b> working with <b>solar energy</b>	Dr Jean Denis Pierre Tel : +509 36 61 09 30 / 32 73 00 00 / 35 95 45 45	Joane, Dorothee, Ben
	13 :30	Visit <b>hospital in Fort Liberte'</b> Hospital identified as target for the GN strategy. UNICEF Nut and Vaccination with supplies + needs assessment and technical support (Hospital chosen for GN strategy)	Dr Isnelle Decome, 37789564/32880000	
Wednesday 29/05	07:00- 13:00	Travel Cap – Haitien / <b>Gonaives: By land (rent a car?)</b>		
	14:00	Meeting <b>Wash team</b> Interventions in Artibonite and Grand Nord	Ruben Bayiha, Yves Bertrand, Koffi Messou, Makan Konate, Reginald Claveus, Fataou Salami.	Rwoodmayer S. St-Fleur
		Visit SAEP ( <b>WASH system rehabilitation</b> ) de Hatte Rocher( Gonaives)	Nesly Gelin ( DR. OREPA-Centre) Tel : 509 37 63 36 33  Emerson SAINT-LOUIS ( URD_ Gonaives) Tel : 509 32 34 24 89	
	16:00	Meeting <b>Child Protection team</b> Interventions in Artibonite and Grand Nord	Jean L., Bilal, Antoine, Shumway, Geslet, Evdjina	Geslet
	17:00	Meeting <b>SBC team</b> Interventions in Artibonite and Grand Nord	Gilles Evdjina	Gilles
Thursday 30/05	08:00- 09:00	Meeting <b>Direction departementale de la Sante' (Artibonite)</b>	Dr Henock Savain (DSA) Tel: 509 47 00 44 40 Noel Oriol (HPG) Tel : 509 3373 4924	Rwoodmayer S. St-Fleur (WASH)
	09:00- 10:00	Visit activities at <b>K-Soleil hospital</b> : prevention and response to malnutrition in vulnerable neighborhood (Hospital chosen for GN strategy)	Contact tbc	Joane, Ben, Dorothee, Belyse
	10:00- 11:00	Visit hospital de <b>la Providence</b> : supported by UNICEF with supplies (nut, vaccination) Cholera Treatment center CDAI (warehouse for Nut supplies)	Contact tbc	Joane, Ben, Dorothee, Belyse

		(Hospital chosen for GN strategy)		
	13:00-16:00	In depth meeting with U-reporters on youth engagement for children in Artibonite schools and communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cholera prevention</li> <li>- Behavioral change for the healthy and protective environment</li> <li>- Technical Support to schools</li> <li>- Others?</li> </ul>	Village des dattes	All staff
Friday 31/05	07:00 – 09:00	Gonaives - <b>St. Michel de l'Attalaye</b>		Steve- Geslet/Shumway/ Gilles
		Visit Centre de prise en charge children victimes of violence	Centre de Prise en charge PFSML Mme Isalene Meus 34021324	
		Child Friendly Space Plan International	Maxo Celus CFS St Michel Officier de Protection PLAN 48397833	
		Visit school . École Nationale Fondamentale Complète de Calvaire PM* Interview children, teachers U-reporters Humanitarian Cash (scholarships for Artibonite students) <a href="#">School chosen for the GN strategy</a>	Adresse : rue Calvaire , Saint Michel de l'Attalaye *Directrice* Michélie MICHEL  Téléphone : +50941753616	
Saturday 01/06	08:00-10:00	Meeting at UNICEF, partners collaborating on <b>sexual violence</b> (prevention/response) Sexual Violence in Bas Artibonite UNICEF Response/Other response	UNFPA, UNICEF, OCHA, MSF	Geslet, Gilles, Claudy, Rwoodmayer, Belyse
<b>(Dedicated to Bas Artibonite)</b>	10:00-11:30	Meeting <b>Hôpital Albert Schweitzer</b> Haiti ( <b>remote</b> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNICEF support to HAS hospital for the children of Verrettes et Liancourt</li> <li>- Cholera prevention/response</li> <li>- Malnutrition prevention and response</li> </ul> <a href="#">(Hospital chosen for GN strategy)</a>	Jessica Laguerre Chief Operating Officer Hôpital Albert Schweitzer Haiti Deschappelles, Haiti 509.44.99.71.14 509.42.69.82.56	Rwoodmayer, Ben, Belyse, Michel

	11:30-12:30	Meeting <b>National Red Cross (remote)</b> - UNICEF support to Red Cross to reach children in La Chappelle and St. Marc - Cholera prevention and response	Frantz Pierrelus (tbc)	Rwoodmayer, Michel
	12:30 – 14:30	Meeting <b>partners collaborating on Access</b> in Bas Artibonite	Claudy with, Flavio Signore OCHA Guerline WFP	Rwoodmayer and Claudy
	14:30	Meeting <b>Caritas on Cholera prevention</b> in Bas Artibonite	Dézulmé Junior Coordonnateur Caritas Diocésaine des Gonaives Phones: 509 4833-2178 / 4115-7732 email: dezulme.junior25@gmail.com	Rwoodmayer
	16:30	Meeting on <b>Humanitarian Cash Transfers for Artibonite</b> students. Briefing by Education specialist, Chief Education and Chief social policy	Shumway, Inge, Gael	Shumway
Monday 03/05		Gonaives – <b>Gros Morne</b>		
		<b>Hospital Alma Mater</b> Nutrition, Immunization, Sante Supported by UNICEF <a href="#">Hospital selected for the Grand Nord strategy</a>	contact	Joane, Dorothee, Belyse, Ben, Geslet
		<b>AFADM</b> Association for the protection of women and Girls victims of violence Supported by UNICEF	Nalda ODEUS  Coordonnatrice  33518364	Geslet
		<b>École Nationale Ex-Ferme de Gros-Morne</b> – Protective Learning Environment  <a href="#">School selected for the Grand Nord strategy</a>	École Nationale Ex-Ferme de Gros-Morne (AM/PM) Jacqueline Avantout Directrice (PM) Téléphone : 32087480	Shumway
	11:30	<b>Child Friendly Space</b> Plan International/UNICEF	Maxo Celus CFS St Michel Officier de Protection PLAN 48397833	Geslet

	13:00	Meeting with GRET and the community members targeted by <b>Cholera prevention</b> supported by UNICEF – Cholera Prevention OD	GRET Contact tbc	Rwoodmayer
Tuesday 04/05	09:00- 11:30	Visit Gonaives school K-soleil (xxx) Use of school as platform for health and protection (demo) <a href="#">School selected for the Grand Nord strategy</a>  Discussion with the Mayor on partnership with UNICEF for children	DDS, DDE, IBERS, Mayor of Gonaives  (Contact school)	Geslet, Joane, Belyse, Ben
	12:00- 12:30	Briefing on Preparedness to Cyclone season Support to Civil Protection and other actions		
	12:30- 17:30	Travel Gonaives- <b>Cap Haitien</b> by car (rent a car?)		
<b>Mercredi, 05/06</b>	<b>tbd</b>	<b>Vol Cap Haitien - Les Cayes</b>  <b>Arrivée à l'aéroport aux Cayes</b>	-	<b>Marie Dona</b>
	tbd	Rencontrer l'officier de santé à l'UNICEF		Dr Therloune Guerrier
	tbd	Installation à l'hôtel Flaming		Marie Dona
	tbd	Visite de courtoisie à la direction sanitaire départementale du Sud	Dr Février, directeur	
	tbd	Visiter le service de néonatalogie de l'hôpital HIC des Cayes	Directeur de l'hôpital	
Jeudi 06/06	tbd	Visiter l'Ecole de Miserne, Route de l'aéroport des Cayes	Directeur/Enseignants/élèves	Wadler Raymond/Reginald William
	tbd	Organiser un focus groupe dans la communauté de xxx (choléra) – à préciser	Membres de la communauté	Floraine Decembre
	tbd	Organiser un focus groupe des Agents de Santé Communautaire Permanent (ASCP) – à préciser	Membres de la communauté	Floraine Decembre
Vendredi, 07/06		Visiter le Safe Park/Sud, Sortie Sud de la ville		Jean Guerson Alexandre
		Départ à l'aéroport des Cayes Vol : Les Cayes-Cap Haitien		
Saturday 08/06		Cap Haitien : Wrap up and debriefing		

Sunday 09/06	10:00	Travel to home base		
-----------------	-------	---------------------	--	--

## ANNEX I: EVALUATION MATRIX

---

Evaluation questions	Sub questions	Indicators	Data collection methods	Data sources	Data analysis
<b>Relevance/appropriateness : The extent to which the response was in line with local needs and priorities</b>					
<p><b>EQ 1 To what extent is UNICEF's response aligned with the needs on the ground, with global standards and commitments for humanitarian action and agile in adapting to Haiti's complex and volatile context?</b></p>	<p>EQ1.1 Preparedness and Scale-Up: To what extent has the UNICEF preparedness procedure and minimum preparedness standards informed the UNICEF response?</p>	<p>Level of implementation of the Preparedness guidance: % of items adopted and updated by CO</p> <p>% of updates of the EPP achieved by HCO</p> <p>Level of reference of the preparedness in place in the Response Plan, sector disaggregation</p>	<p>Document/literature review</p> <p>Access to internal UNICEF Preparedness platform (EPP)</p> <p>KIIs UNICEF staff</p>	<p>Minimum Preparedness Actions and Minimum Preparedness Standards for Country Offices (COs), Regional Offices (ROs) and Headquarters (HQ).</p> <p>Emergency Procedures and Preparedness Guidance documents.</p> <p>Emergency preparedness procedure system</p> <p>Response plan, contribution by sector to preparedness procedures</p> <p>KII of UNICEF staff at CO, RO and HQ</p>	<p>Comparative analysis of different sources</p> <p>Analysis of relevant files</p> <p>Triangulation and validation of sources</p> <p>Evidence matrix</p>

<p>EQ1.2 What was the level of preparedness at the calling of the CEAP L3? How this translated into pre-positioning of supplies, pre-established PCAs with key partners?</p>	<p>Level of reference of the preparedness in place in the Response Plan, sector disaggregation</p> <p>Existence and proportion of prepositioned supplies at L3 declaration</p> <p># pre-established PCAs for emergency response at L3 declaration</p> <p># L2 surge and supplies carry over to L3</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Supply section database</p> <p>HR and IP contracts review</p> <p>KII, UNICEF staff at CO, RO and HQ level. UNICEF HCO DepRep, head of operations and HR manager</p> <p>KII with IP</p>	<p>L2 monitoring reports and supply and surge staff matrices</p> <p>PCAs and other contracting instruments with IP since L2 was established. PCAs matrix</p> <p>Database of pre-established PCAs for emergencies with selected partners</p> <p>Supply section documents and matrices</p>	<p>Comparative analysis of L2 and L3 contracting procedures, analysis of continuity.</p> <p>Comparative analysis of deadlines and delays in procurement and IP contracts, L2 versus L3, continuity versus non-continuity</p> <p>Validation and triangulation of sources</p>
<p>EQ 1.3: to what extent the L2 activation acted as a driver for further preparedness for the L3 declaration? Where L2 fast track procedures, surge staff mobilization and fund raising and advocacy related L2 activities conducive to a better preparedness for the L3 activation?</p>	<p>L2 surge staff and prepositioning of supplies carried over to L3</p> <p>Gaps in surge staff and critical posts (CL and IM) not covered during L2 transferred to the L3</p> <p>Advocacy and fundraising strategies continuity (or lack of) from L2 to L3</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII with UNICEF staff</p> <p>KII with UN partners, IASC cluster co-leads</p>	<p>L2 monitoring reports</p> <p>L3 activation documents, requirements of staff and supplies already covered through L2 procedures as in relevant spreadsheets and data bases</p>	<p>Analysis of L2 to L3 procedures, requirements of staff, resources and supplies over the two processes</p> <p>Analysis of gaps and synergies</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>

<p>EQ1.4: To what extent have the lessons learned identified in this area been acted upon and, if not, why?</p>	<p>Evidence of the use and reference to previous evaluations</p> <p># Lessons incorporated from LL exercises, from comparative analysis of LL exercises as in the IR</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII, UNICEF staff at CO, RO and HQ level.</p>	<p>LL exercises' documents as in IR. LL previous workshops</p> <p>KII with UNICEF staff at CO, RO and HQ level</p> <p>Debriefing and workshops during data collection process</p>	<p>Analysis of different sources, triangulation</p>
<p>EQ 1.5: How aligned has been the response formulation (Response plan, HAC) with the relevant standards applicable to humanitarian action? (Including the CCCs, gender and PSEA mainstreaming, Human rights, conflict sensitivity, centrality of protection)?</p>	<p># integration and references to CCCs, HR CP in the Response plan, disaggregation of benchmarks by sector of intervention including relevant standards</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII UNICEF staff, gender focal point</p>	<p>Response plan, AWP, monitoring frameworks</p> <p>KII UNICEF staff, gender focal point</p>	<p>Thematic analysis</p> <p>Comparative analysis by sector</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>

<p>EQ1.6: To what extent have needs assessments underpinned programme design and response planning?</p>	<p>Evidence of needs assessments carried out to inform the response</p> <p>Timeline of the needs assessments</p> <p>Evidence of affected population participation</p> <p>Sector priorities included in the Response plan (Benchmarks) (y/n)</p> <p>Operational arrangements foreseen in the RP: definition of geographical areas of intervention (y/n)</p> <p>Access strategies adopted</p> <p>Evidence of affected population participation, AAP tools (complaints analyses), U report</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>AAP tools</p> <p>KII with UNICEF staff IP partners, CSO</p> <p>AAP tools in place</p> <p>KII and FGD with affected population</p>	<p>Needs assessments documents (HNO)</p> <p>UNICEF staff</p> <p>U report</p> <p>IPs, CSO</p> <p>Affected population</p>	<p>Analytical framework for qualitative enquiry</p> <p>AAP feedback/complaint forms analysis</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>EQ 1.7: How agile and appropriate has been the process of defining the adequate strategic targets to be addressed? Are the proposed targets coherent with the identified needs?</p> <p>How sector and thematic priorities have been defined?</p> <p>How and to what extent intersector integrated response has been addressed?</p> <p>EQ 1.7.1 To what extent were different community members (women, men, girls, boys, elderly, people living with disabilities) involved in decision-making around design, implementation and monitoring of UNICEF's response to the crisis?</p>	<p>Response plan processes, drafts and validation</p> <p>Formulation of strategic approaches over time, definition of key areas/targets over time since L3 activation</p> <p>Evidence of sector integration: Common objectives and indicators, or absence of</p> <p>Sector priorities included in the Response plan (Benchmarks) (y/n)</p> <p>Operational arrangements foreseen in the RP: definition of geographical areas of intervention (y/n)</p> <p>Access strategies adopted</p> <p>Evidence of affected population participation, AAP tools (complaints analyses), U report</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII with UNICEF staff IP partners, CSO</p> <p>AAP tools in place</p> <p>KII and FGD with affected population</p>	<p>Response plans evolution over time</p> <p>UNICEF staff IP partners, CSO</p> <p>EMT meeting minutes</p> <p>AAP tools in place</p> <p>Ureport</p>	<p>Thematic analysis of coherence between targets and needs</p> <p>Qualitative analysis framework</p> <p>Quantitative analysis (UReport)</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
--	--	--	--	--

	EQ 1.8: How and when the planning and implementation of the response has been adapted to changing needs? What mechanisms are in place for an adaptive response?	Evidence of adaptation of RP over time  Evidence of adaptation to changing situation  Evidence of adapted benchmarks and targets, per sector of intervention.	Document review  KII with UNICEF staff and IP  3 <sup>rd</sup> PM  FGD with CSO and IP	RP matrices and benchmarks; AWP evolution over time  KII with UNICEF, IP and CSO  3 <sup>rd</sup> party monitoring reports	Thematic analysis  Comparative analysis of sources,  Triangulation, evidence matrix
	EQ 1.9 To what extent was the UNICEF response aligned with GoH and other actors (UN, IASC, OCHA)? How has the planning of the response and its eventual nexus adapted to the institutional collapse in Haiti?	Level of coherence with International Humanitarian agencies (HRP; HCT) response and GoH priorities  linkages with the CPD, coherence with the HRP  Level of coherence with UNSDCF and other overarching policy frameworks for >Haiti (upcoming)	Document review  KII, UNICEF, UN, OCHA, UNCT, HC	Policy formulations from the GoH  Policy and programmatic references from UN, Donors, and main partners ( OCHA, UNCT, HC, main donors)  KII, UNICEF, UN, OCHA, UNCT, HC/RCsurvey	Thematic analysis  Triangulation, evidence matrix
Evaluation questions	Sub questions	Indicators	Data collection methods	Data sources	Data analysis
<b>Effectiveness: The extent to which the response achieved its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen based on the outputs</b>					

EQ 2 To what extent has the response on the ground achieved its expected objectives?	<p>EQ 2.1: To what extent is the UNICEF response addressing the needs on the ground in an unstable and changing situation?</p> <p>EQ2.2: To what extent has UNICEF progressed towards promoting and achieving the CCCs benchmarks? Precisely through the following dimensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EQ2.2.1.: Achieving outputs: To what extent has UNICEF been able to attain the scale-up targets so far? (benchmarks per sector, disaggregation per gender, disabilities, vulnerabilities). How significant and accurate are the monitoring mechanisms in place in providing relevant data to gauge progress?</li> <li>- EQ 2.2.2 Through political advocacy How effective has been the political advocacy activated through the response?</li> <li>- EQ 2.2.3 Strategic positioning: How effectively the strategic choices retained have supported the response?</li> </ul>	<p>Proportion (%) of benchmarks formulated in relation to needs</p> <p>Evidence of progress to Benchmarks (% of progress)</p> <p>Disaggregation by sector, age, gender, vulnerabilities</p> <p>HACT: %of planned implementation, timeline</p> <p>Timeline of progress</p> <p>Financial flows over time since L3</p> <p># HR recruitment, over time and per sector</p> <p># Advocacy actions completed</p> <p># Strategic documents adopted</p>	<p>Document review, response plans documents, AWP</p> <p>KII, UNICEF staff (HCO, RO, HQ), RC, UNCT members, GoH partners, CSO</p> <p>Focus groups discussion with beneficiaries, implementing partners (CSO)</p> <p>Ureport</p>	<p>IPs Monitoring reports</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Party monitoring reports</p> <p>EMT progress meetings</p> <p>Key actors (UN, CSO, IP, GoH)</p> <p>Key UNICEF staff at CO, RO and HQ (EMOPS)</p> <p>HR and funding tracking matrices</p> <p>HCT processes, achievements, partners, challenges</p> <p>social media (UReport)</p>	<p>Analysis of benchmarks formulated against established needs</p> <p>Quantitative analysis of benchmarks as reported</p> <p>Analysis of advocacy actions, analysis of strategic options retained</p> <p>Analysis of success of advocacy and strategic positioning over the L3 in 2023</p> <p>Evidence matrix, triangulation</p> <p>Analysis of financial flows, donors, earmarking etc</p>
--	---	--	---	--	---

<p>- EQ 2.2.4 Resource mobilisation: Has the achieved resource mobilization been proportional to the needs and has effectively supported the response so far?</p>				
<p>EQ2.3 To what extent UNICEF has established an intersector integrated response, linking child protection with nutrition, education, WASH and HCT and vice versa?</p>	<p>Evidence of integrated planning between sections, from emergency to recovery</p> <p># of shared indicators per section, if any</p> <p># of PCAs with multisector activities</p> <p>% Progress to targets by sector, intersector related targets</p> <p>Proportion of geographic integration of different sectors</p> <p>Timeline of progress</p>	<p>Document review,</p> <p>KII with UNICEF M&amp;E, Heads of section</p> <p>KII with IPs</p> <p>FGD with IP</p>	<p>response plan, AWP</p> <p>geographic coverage of the different sections</p> <p>logframes per sector</p> <p>integrated log frames, if any</p> <p>AWP</p> <p>PCAs documents</p> <p>M&amp;E reports</p> <p>UNICEF and IP staff</p>	<p>Analysis of integrated objectives and or activities, programmatic or geographic</p> <p>Analysis of integrated progress to shared objectives</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>

EQ 2.4: To what extent participatory mechanisms of affected communities are ensured? How effective are the tools established for AAP?	# AAP tools established and active  % of complaints treated  Evidence of two way communication mechanisms	Document review  Field visits, observation  KII IPs  Ki CSO  FGD :Focus groups discussion with beneficiaries, implementing partners  Ureport	Complaint forms  Ureport surveys  Discussion groups with affected population  Discussion groups with IPs  social media (UReport)	Analysis of AAP tools, use and relevance  Analysis of qualitative information, opinions and expectations  Triangulation, evidence matrix
---	---	--	--	--

<p>EQ 2.5 What are the factors (internal and external to UNICEF) that are contributing to or hindering the effective implementation of the response?</p> <p>- EQ 2.5.1 Which are the main risks affecting the effectiveness that the Haiti country office (HCO) is facing and to what extent is HCO effectively managing them, also with the support from HQ and RO</p>	<p># Internal Factors identified affecting the response</p> <p># additional factors preventing UNICEF from adequately managing the identified hindering factors</p> <p># Reporting of constraints</p> <p>Existence of memos from RO and HQ on challenges for the implementation of the response</p> <p># and typology of risks identified</p> <p>Mention and analysis of risks and constraints in coordination documents/meetings</p> <p>Evidence of measures taken</p>	<p>Document review, programme documents, memos, meeting minutes, IPs implementing reports</p> <p>Minutes of EMT meetings</p> <p>KII</p> <p>Focus groups discussion with beneficiaries, implementing partners</p>	<p>Monitoring reports</p> <p>EMT progress meetings</p> <p>Lessons learned exercises</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Party monitoring</p> <p>KII with UNICEF management</p> <p>KII with UNCT and RC</p> <p>KII with IP</p> <p>KI with RO and EMOPS staff</p> <p>KII with GoH officials</p>	<p>Analysis of factors identified, validation</p> <p>Analysis of lessons learned and measures adopted</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
---	---	--	---	---

	EQ 2.6: Have there been identified any unintended outcomes of the intervention? (Positive or negative). In case, which ones? Could be avoided in the future? Have related lessons been built upon?	Evidence of unintended outcomes  Evidence of measures adopted	Document review  KII with UNICEF staff  KII with IPs  FGD with affected population	Monitoring reports  Memos  IP and AP information	Analysis of different unintended effects raised  Qualitative analysis of KII and FGD  Validation through triangulation and evidence matrix
Evaluation questions	Sub questions	Indicators	Data collection methods	Data sources	Data analysis

**Efficiency:** Efficiency measures the outputs — qualitative and quantitative — in relation to the inputs: how economically inputs (such as funds, supplies, expertise) were converted to output in a timely manner

EQ 3 How efficiently have the resources been used and managed	<p>EQ3.1 To what extent is the response allocating financial resources, human resources (including surge and repurposing of staff) and physical resources (goods/supplies) that are:</p> <p>a. -sufficient in number?</p> <p>b. -adequate in quality?</p> <p>c. -timely in deployment/distribution?</p> <p>d. corresponds to CO's identified priorities?</p> <p>(The above dimensions disaggregated by sector of intervention)</p>	<p>Analysis of funding flows</p> <p># of human resources incorporated,</p> <p>Timeline of surge staff and recruitments (HR fast track sheet)</p> <p>Match of priorities established with recruitments provided</p> <p>Adequacy of the staff recruited</p> <p>% Supplies provided against requested</p> <p>Sector specificities in terms of staff and resources mobilized against requested</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII</p>	<p>HR L3 Fast Track matrix</p> <p>Surge staff spreadsheet</p> <p>Supplies reports and stock management reports</p> <p>KII with UINICEF operations staff</p> <p>KII with heads of section</p> <p>KII with IPs</p>	<p>Analysis of sources, establishing a timeline of mobilization of resources</p> <p>Triangulation of sources, evidence matrix</p>
---	--	--	-----------------------------------	--	---

	<p>EQ 3.2: How efficient and adequate has been the support of HQ and RO specialists to the HCO resource mobilization and capacity to respond to the needs? Are there gaps identified? Are there lessons learned?</p>	<p>Evidence of support from RO and EMOPS to the roll out of L3-CEAP</p> <p>Evidence of Financial support</p> <p>Supplies: Evidence of support from RO and Supply Division</p> <p># requests of technical support from CO sections</p> <p># Memos and mission's records from RO and HQ to support the emergency response, management, Section's specialists, Emergency, Gender mainstreaming and PSEA support, Operations, partnerships,. etc</p> <p># workshops and LL exercises</p> <p># surge staff mobilized</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII</p>	<p>Response plan formulation and strategic documents iteration between CO-RO-EMOPS</p> <p>Responses to requests of support, visits, memos</p> <p>LL exercises and workshops</p> <p>Operational and financial support, RMTF documents</p> <p>KI from EMOPs, HQ, RO, Supply Division</p> <p>KI CO: Operations, HR, Sections DepRep</p>	<p>Analysis of sources, categorization of support provided (Technical, financial, supplies, fund raising, communication, strategic..)</p> <p>Validation, triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
--	--	---	-----------------------------------	--	---

<p>EQ 3.3 How the role and capacity of field offices has facilitated the efficient use of resources? To what extent FOs have been efficient in ensuring the timeliness of the contracting procedures and in providing technical support to IPs?</p>	<p>Analysis of field office reinforcement and timelines</p> <p># PCAs activated per field office</p> <p>Staff turnover, gaps at FO level</p>	<p>Doc review</p> <p>KII</p> <p>FGD</p> <p>Field visits to FO</p>	<p>FO operational and programmatic plans</p> <p>PCAs contracts tracking and M&amp;E</p> <p>KII with head of FO, section chefs of HCO, DepRep</p> <p>FGD with IPs</p> <p>FGD with FO staff</p>	<p>Analysis of information, categorization of quantitative and qualitative evidence</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
<p>EQ 3.4: How efficient and adequate has been the support from HCO sections to field Offices?</p>	<p>Evidence of capacity building plans for FO</p> <p># missions from CO to FO of technical staff</p> <p># gaps identified</p>	<p>field visit, observation</p> <p>FGD</p> <p>KII</p>	<p>Field visit to FO</p> <p>FGD with FO staff</p> <p>KII with head of FO</p> <p>KIII with sections chefs of HCO</p>	<p>Analysis of sources</p> <p>Categorization of the support provided, identification of gaps</p> <p>Triangulation/evidence matrix</p>

	<p>EQ 3.5 To what extent is the current operational model (CO structure and budget) adequate given that the crisis is likely to continue/worsen for next 18-24 months, and the unstable and crisis prone context of Haiti?</p>	<p>Evidence of HCO staffing and gaps</p> <p>Evidence of FOs capacity (staff and budget)</p> <p>Evidence of recovery plans including adaptation of the operational capacity of HCO</p> <p>Staff turn over</p> <p>Analysis of strengths and weaknesses</p> <p>Level of staff well-being</p>	<p>Doc review</p> <p>KII: head of FO, Dep Rep</p> <p>FGD with FO teams</p>	<p>CO organigram</p> <p>FO operational and programmatic documents</p> <p>Staff participation in FGD and KII</p>	<p>Analysis and validation of information</p> <p>Triangulation</p> <p>Evidence matrix</p>
--	--	---	--	---	---

	<p>EQ 3.6 Have the L3 simplified procedures adequately rolled out? Are there bottlenecks in the efficient implementation of contractual procedures with partners and staff?</p> <p>EQ 3.6.1 Has had been some sort of carryover of procedures for contracting staff and IP partners from L2 to L3? Has this transition been problematic in any dimension or has been an opportunity for synergies?</p>	<p>Timeline of L3 procedures</p> <p>Factors identified playing against the implementation of the simplified procedures</p> <p># of surge already mobilized for L2, # surge mobilized for L3</p> <p>#PCAs established during L2 continuing to L3, # PCASs specific for L3 resposne</p> <p># surge vacant from L2 to L3</p>	<p>Doc review</p> <p>KII : HCO DepRep, RO, EMOPS</p> <p>KII IP</p> <p>KII surge staff, CL</p>	<p>Timeline of fast track applied, HR fast track matrices, surge tracking matrix</p> <p>PCAs matrix, deadlines</p> <p>KII: HR, Supplies, DepRep. Operations</p> <p>From L2 to L3 processes: lessons and challenges</p>	<p>Analysis of information, validation</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

	<p>EQ 3.8. How adapted and efficient have been the monitoring mechanisms in place? Is the reporting provided adequate in view of the situation on the ground and the progress of the response?</p> <p>EQ 3.8.1 Has the participation of affected communities been ensured in the monitoring mechanisms, and AAP tools duly managed?</p>	<p># monitoring reports of the L3 response</p> <p>2way communication mechanisms in place</p> <p># U report surveys related with emergency resposne</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII: Unicef CO staff, sections and M&amp;E,</p> <p>KII IPs</p> <p>KII CSO, affected population</p> <p>FGD</p>	<p>M&amp;E activities supported by HCO, office, including the studies, evaluations and research.</p> <p>Monitoring reports from IPs</p> <p>Feedback from IPs, CSOs, affected population</p>	<p>Analysis of different sources, validation and triangulation</p> <p>Evidence matrix</p>
	<p>EQ3.9 To what extent is the availability of funding affecting operational priorities and influencing the timeliness or cost of interventions?</p> <p>EQ 3.9.1 How and to what extent have donors influenced the response? (earmarking, conditioning, etc)</p>	<p>Funding requested/Funding raised</p> <p>RM action plans: level of achievement</p> <p>Funding sources</p> <p># donor reports in time</p> <p># advocacy meetings with donors</p>	<p>Funding matrix</p> <p>Fundraising documents</p> <p>KII: RM staff, RO, EMOPS</p> <p>KII donors (USAID)</p>	<p>RMTF action plans</p> <p>Resource mobilization task force memos</p> <p>Donor reports</p>	<p>Analysis of financial flows, donors, earmarking etc</p> <p>Triangulation of sources, evidence matrix</p>
Evaluation questions	Sub questions	Indicators	Data collection methods	Data sources	Data analysis

**Coverage:** The need to reach major population groups facing life-threatening risk wherever they are, providing them with assistance and protection proportionate to their need and devoid of extraneous political agendas

<p>EQ 4 - <b>To what extent is the response reaching the most vulnerable population groups?</b></p>	<p>EQ 4.1 In what ways have access and prevailing security constraints affected coverage to communities in need? What are the measures adopted (if any) to ensure or improve access?</p> <p>EQ 4.1.2: To what extent there are specific mechanisms and strategies in place to ensure access to the most vulnerable? (including disabilities (PWD), pregnant women, chronic patients, IDPs, etc)</p>	<p>Evidence of access constraints</p> <p>Mapping of difficult to reach areas. Change of access constraints over time</p> <p>Record of security incidents</p> <p>Evidence of measures adopted</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Monitoring reports</p> <p>KII</p> <p>UReport</p>	<p>Needs assessments, HRP</p> <p>Response plan, AWP</p> <p>Monitoring reports, IP reports, 3<sup>rd</sup> party monitoring reports</p> <p>UReport</p> <p>Security reports, UNDSS</p> <p>DTM (IOM)</p> <p>KII with UNDSS security staff, IOM</p> <p>KII IP, CSOs</p> <p>KII UNICEF Operations DepRep</p>	<p>Analysis of sources, validation</p> <p>Quantitative and qualitative analysis</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
---	---	--	--	---	---

	<p>EQ 4.2 How adequate and useful has been the coordination with other actors to improve access? (including UNDSS, Cluster leads and co leads, GoH technical partners)</p> <p>EQ 4.2.1 3 Were there established negotiation mechanisms to address access limitations?. How useful have been?</p>	<p># security coordination meetings</p> <p>Evidence of participation and of measures adopted</p> <p>#incidents recorded</p> <p># security data bases</p> <p>Records of negotiation and related procedure</p>	<p>Doc review</p> <p>KII</p>	<p>Coordination meetings minutes</p> <p>Incidents tracking tool</p> <p>KII with UNDSS</p> <p>KII With Unicef Operations and DepRep</p> <p>KII with UNCT, RC, CLs</p> <p>KII with IP</p>	<p>Analysis of sources, validation</p> <p>Quantitative and qualitative analysis</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
Evaluation questions	sub questions	indicators	data collection methods	Data sources	Data analysis
<p><b>Coordination and coherence: Coordination and coherence:</b> Coordination looks at the extent to which the interventions of different actors are harmonised with each other, promote synergy, avoid gaps, duplication, and resource conflicts. Coherence: The need to assess security, developmental, trade and military policies as well as humanitarian policies, to ensure that there is consistency and, in particular, that all policies take into account humanitarian and human rights consideration</p>					
EQ 5: How effectively has UNICEF established a functional corporate mechanism to <b>collaborate and coordinate with partners</b> in responding to the emergency?	EQ5.1 To what extent are HQ, LACRO and the Haiti CO coordinating with each other both horizontally (among their respective division/sections) and vertically (across different levels of the Organization) towards the successful implementation of the response?	<p>Evidence of corporate mechanism in place</p> <p>#coordination meetings at different levels with relevant actions, including follow up measures and information management</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII</p>	<p>Meeting minutes, coordination memos</p> <p>KII EMOPS, RO</p> <p>KII HCO DEpRep, section chefs</p>	<p>Validation of information from different sources</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>

<p>EQ5.2 To what extent is UNICEF external coordination (including at cluster level, with other IASC partners) working adequately?</p> <p>EQ 5.2.1 How comprehensive has been the engagement of UNICEF as Cluster lead agency for Nutrition, Child Protection, WASH and Education?</p>	<p>Evidence of staff (DCL and IM) deployed in relevant clusters</p> <p>coordination meetings, schedule and minutes</p> <p>coordination processes in place: Including coordinated planning, coordinated response, and information sharing,</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII: Cluster leads</p> <p>RC</p> <p>KII Cluster co-leads for education, CP, WASH and Nutrition</p>	<p>Meeting minutes</p> <p>Cluster plans and documents</p> <p>KII</p>	<p>Validation of information from different sources</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
<p>EQ5.3 In the context of collaborating with implementing partners, what are the main strengths and weaknesses by UNICEF?</p> <p>EQ 5.3.1 To what extent has UNICEF reinforced the capacity of sector partners to ensure the CCCs in the response?</p> <p>EQ 5.3.2 How adequate and useful has been the coordination with GoH agents?</p>	<p>Evidence of PCAs signed for the response</p> <p>Time for signature</p> <p>Evidence of technical support provided by sections</p> <p>Evidence of CCCs benchmarks in active PCAs</p> <p>Meetings and technical support to GoH partners</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII</p> <p>FGD</p>	<p>PCAs processes matrix.</p> <p>PCAs content and CCCs frameworks included</p> <p>Meeting minutes and content of capacity building activities</p> <p>KIIs with UNICEF staff, sector specialists</p> <p>KII with IP</p> <p>Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with a sample of partners</p> <p>KII with GoH partners</p>	<p>Analysis of sources, validation</p> <p>Quantitative and qualitative analysis</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>

	EQ 5.4: How it has been addressed the institutional collapse and the lack of policy references in order to articulate the response? How these challenges have been managed and to what extent coordinated between humanitarian actors?	Evidence of internal procedures  Evidence of risk sensitive planning  Evidence e of criticality assessments in place  Staff well being measures in place	Document review  Field visits observation  KII  FGD	Contingency plans, risk sensitive plans criticality procedures  KII with head of operations and DepRep  FGD with IP	Information categorization and analysis, qualitative and quantitative sources  Triangulation, validation, evidence matrix
Evaluation questions	Sub questions	Indicators	Data collection methods	Data sources	Data analysis
<p><b>EQ 6 – Connectedness/sustainability</b> Connectedness refers to the need to assure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer term and interconnected problems into account.’</p>					

<p>EQ 6 To what extent is the UNICEF response, beyond addressing the <b>immediate humanitarian needs</b>, contributing to the achievement of conditions for an adequate context to address the structural shortcomings that perpetuate vulnerabilities and risks for children in Haiti?</p>	<p>EQ6.1 To what extent is UNICEF's response to the Haiti crisis contributing to strengthening the preparedness and response efforts among in-country actors</p> <p>EQ 6.1.1 To what extent are strategic partnerships being fostered with national NGOs, international NGOs and local communities/community-based organization (CBO) so as to enhance the successful continuation of the response activities on the ground over time?</p> <p>EQ 6.1.2 To what extent a transfer of capacities to institutions and CBO is being envisaged?</p>	<p>Evidence of engagement with UNSDCF processes</p> <p>Evidence of support provided to technical bodies of the GoH (MoE, MoH, MoSocial support etc)</p> <p>Links (or absence of) between the ERP and the AWP/CPD</p> <p>Existence of a roster of partners to ensure continuity of capacity building. Mapping of partnerships</p> <p>Evidence of capacity building activities and programmes</p> <p># orientations and trainings to IPs and CBOs carried out</p> <p>Access of IP and CBOs to digital platforms and e-tools</p>	<p>Document review.</p> <p>KII</p> <p>FGD</p>	<p>Strategic Plan for the Development of Haiti 2012–2030</p> <p>United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), 2023–2027</p> <p>CPD versus UNSDCF coherence</p> <p>Meetings and workshops documents, PPT, minutes, with technical counterparts of the GoH</p> <p>Emergency Response Plan, AWP linkages</p> <p>PCAs over time, key partners</p> <p>Training support' documents and evaluation tools</p> <p>KII: Unicef partnership specialist, IP/CBO</p> <p>FGD with selected IPs</p>	<p>Categorization of information, quantitative and qualitative analysis</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
---	--	---	---	---	---

	<p>EQ6.2 To what extent has the response included a nexus approach and/or envisaged linkages with the upcoming recovery and stabilization process?</p>	<p>Evidence of links between the ERP with the CPD</p> <p>Indicators of processes defining AWP for the CPD, integration of the L3 in 2024</p> <p>Evidence of sustained benchmarks identified for the medium term</p> <p>Evidence of a post crisis recovery plan in the process of being elaborated with the participation of all stakeholders, including adaptation of the operational capacity of HCO</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII</p>	<p>Document review including CPD, eventual recovery plans drafts.</p> <p>Internal UNICEF adaptation processes</p> <p>KII of key management staff of HCO</p> <p>KII at RO and HQ</p>	<p>Document analysis and qualitative analysis of KII</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>
	<p>EQ 6.3 In what ways does the current situation and the prolongation of the L3 affects the roll out of the CPD?</p> <p>EQ 6.3.1 To what extent lessons learned on preparedness, risk programming and enhancing capacity for emergency response have been informing (or are likely to) the upcoming programming cycle?</p>	<p>Evidence of planning processes on hold</p> <p># lessons learned exercises and conclusions available</p> <p>Evidence of the review and update of previous risk programming</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII</p>	<p>Review of CPD in light of the evolution of the situation</p> <p>EMT meeting minutes</p> <p>Update of EPP</p> <p>KII with Rep, DepRep</p> <p>KII with RO and HQ' key staff</p>	<p>Document analysis, qualitative and quantitative categorization of findings</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>

Evaluation questions	sub questions	indicators	data collection methods	Data sources	Data analysis
<b>Cross Cutting</b>					
EQ7: Gender, AAP, PSEA, disability, climate change	EQ7.1 To what extent are equity, gender, AAP, PSEA and disability dimensions as well as climate change considerations being systematically and meaningfully integrated in the needs assessment, planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of the response?	<p>Evidence of GBV prevention and case management related activities integrated in the needs assessments and subsequent planning of the response</p> <p># cases GBV managed and reported</p> <p>Evidence of AAP mechanisms in place (hot line, Ureport, complaints tools)</p> <p>Evidence PSEA prevention and monitoring mechanism in place</p>	Document review KII	<p>Emergency response plan, sector benchmarks, level of inclusion of cross cutting dimensions.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> party monitoring reports</p> <p>IP implementation reports</p> <p>Complaints forms' management and feedback processes</p>	<p>Data analysis, categorization of sources and findings</p> <p>Triangulation, evidence matrix</p>

	<p>EQ7-2 To what extent are cross cutting dimensions being considered (or likely to be considered) in view of recovery planning efforts in the future?</p>	<p>Evidence of inclusive recovery plans</p> <p>Evidence of cross cutting attention in the CPD</p> <p>Linkages and coherence with the UNSDCF and GoH upcoming planning and recovery formulations</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII</p>		<p>Prospective analysis, triangulation of sources</p>
--	--	---	-----------------------------------	--	---

