



Terms of Reference for External Contractor

Mid Term Evaluation of the GNPD Program, American Red Cross, Haiti

<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Mid Term Evaluation (Formative mid -term with focus on future strategic directions)
<b>Expected evaluation methodologies</b>	Qualitative methodologies – desk reviews, interviews, focus groups, and observations and site visits
<b>Number of evaluators</b>	One lead evaluator consultant One local evaluator consultant
<b>Expected start/end dates, number of work days</b>	Expected start date: 3 November 2014 Expected work days for lead evaluator: 25 Expected work days for local evaluator: 17
<b>Dead line for Application</b>	11:59PM EST, 5 September 2014

1. Description of the Program to be Evaluated

1.1. Background and Objectives of the Project

On January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010, shortly before 5.00pm, a 7.0 earthquake – one of the most powerful to hit Haiti in over 200 year’s struck 10miles southwest of heavily populated Port-au-Prince. The collective impact of earthquake was the most devastating disaster in Haiti’s history. It caused incalculable human and material losses, destroying much of Port-au-Prince, including poorly constructed dwellings common to Haitian shantytowns as well as better constructed residential, hospitals, banks and government buildings. The disaster worsened the precarious situation that hitherto existed before the earthquake. Haiti is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere<sup>1</sup> where 80% of the population live below less than \$2 per day, with only 50% of children having access to school, 90% of Haitians do not have running water and 80% lack adequate sanitation.

The American Red Cross (ARC), through its partner the Haitian Red Cross (HRC) has had a presence in Haiti since 2004, growing and diversifying its programming areas to support the most vulnerable Haitian population in an effort to reduce the effect of disaster, shock and stress. In the aftermath of the earthquake of the January 12, 2010, ARC became an active partner with HRC, IFRC and other international agencies to deliver life-saving emergency response programs for earthquake victims in camps. Four years after the devastating earthquake and in line with its strategic priority, ARC is transitioned from response to recovery and longer-term programing with an emphasis on integrated approach to sustainable development, while supporting the Haitian Red Cross to build its own capacity.

ARC in consultation with HRC has jointly developed the North Community-Based Integrated Program (known in creole as “Gran No Pi Djanm” (GNPD) – “More resilient Greater North”). Following are the goals and objectives of the Program;

**Goal:** “Targeted communities in the North of Haiti have increased resilience, stronger capacity and reduced exposure to external shocks”.

**Pillar 1 Objective:** HRC and local authorities have improved their organizational and technical capacity sufficient to support and manage program implementation

**Pillar 2 Objective:** Targeted communities and households have increased their resilience through improved knowledge, practices and assets

**Pillar 3 Objective:** Targeted communities have reduced their exposure to external shocks and local hazards through improved physical infrastructure and mitigation measures.

These Pillars will be achieved through a number of objectives and outcomes as detailed in section 2 below.

<sup>1</sup> Human Development Report 2013



The Haitian Red Cross (HRC) implements the core programs of Gran No Pi Djamn i.e. Disaster risk reduction, health and hygiene with technical and financial support from ARC. ARC also works with local line ministries and other external partners to implement program components such as WatSan, Construction and livelihoods. The program which officially started in December 2012 is planned to be implemented through May, 2016 – a total duration of 3.6 years.

**1.2. Scope and reach of the program**

The Program adopts an integrated approach of development that supports delivery of range of activities to the beneficiaries, to meet their diverse and most urgent needs. It is expected to reach a total population of 174,247 people with a total of USD 12.5 million funds available for the Program. See Table No. 1 below which provides an overview of the target areas by commune and communal sections, as well as the demographic data of the North, Northeast and Northwest. The program thus covers three departments and 10 communal sections.

**Table No.1 Estimated population data of the GNPD target area**

Department	Communes	Population	Communal section	Target Population
North	Borgne	60,860	Petit Bourg	11,998
North	Bahon	21,145	Bailly	12,033
North	Ranquitte	25,195	Cracaraille	5,597
North	La Victoire	9,587	La Victoire	9,587
North East	Ferrier	13,315	Bas Maribahoux	13,315
North East	Ouanaminthe	96,515	Haut Maribahoux	96,515
North East	Caracol	7,015	Champin	4,713
North East	Caracol		Glaudine/Jacquesil	2,302
North West	Baie de Henne	24,812	Citerne Remy	3,204
North West	Port-de-Paix	185,494	Mahotiere	20,607
<b>Total</b>		<b>418,743</b>		<b>174,274</b>

Source: *Source: Haiti National Statistics 2010*

**1.3. Program management**

During the initial stage up to a year of implementation, the program is supposed to be co-implemented by both HRC and ARC, with ARC gradually handing over the implementation responsibilities to the HRC. This design is made mainly due to the fact that HRC Regional Committee offices at present have minimal capacity to implement projects and this capacity is supposed to grow with financial and technical support from ARC over the program period.

The program is supported by ARC team based in Cap-Haitien, Fort Liberte and Port-de-Paix led by a Program Manager Delegate. One Branch Capacity Development Delegate is supporting HRC to develop and implement plans of capacity development for the HRC Regional and Local Committees. In order to strengthen the program, HRC has appointed a Program director who will oversee the program in all three departments, in liaison with ARC Program Manager. Each HRC Regional office has its own staff led by a Field Team Manager who is working under the leadership of HRC Program Director and the guidance of the Regional Committee President and the Local Committee Coordinator; and the technical supervision of ARC concerned staff.

The program builds on steering, consultation and coordination platforms at several levels to ensure that the guidance of ARC and HRC leadership are fully considered, the best approaches are taken into account, the available expertise is consulted and that all stakeholders have aligned their thoughts. The main objective of this approach is to combine and consider the skills of all edges in the implementation of the program but also to facilitate the development of synergies between stakeholders to improve efficiency both in the implementation and the impacts of the program. The most significant mechanisms are highlighted below:

- **High-Level Steering Committee Meetings:** These meetings are held at a quarterly basis to review the progress on decisions taken previously by the committee, the implementation progress and main challenges. The committee consisted of HRC National, Regional and Local leadership; ARC Sr. Management; and the GNPD ARC and HRC Program Managers.
- **Multilevel Weekly Coordination Meetings:** Each GNPD Departmental Office (North, Northeast and Northwest) holds its weekly review and planning meeting every Friday; the GNPD Regional



Technical Team holds its weekly review and planning meeting every Monday Morning; and the GNPD ARC/HRC Sr. Team (Program Managers, Branch Capacity Development Delegate, Finance Managers, Operations Managers, AtB Manager and Communication Manager) holds its weekly meeting every Monday afternoon to address the main challenges (including the ones of the Departmental and Technical teams) and provide guidance on the way forward.

- **Monthly Progress Meetings:** On a monthly basis the AtB and Communication Managers hold monthly meetings with beneficiaries (HRC Committees and community leaders and members) to highlight the implementation progress, share the plan for the following month and get feedback.
- **Quarterly Review and Planning Meetings:** The ARC/HRC GNPD teams in the three departments (except the Admin/Log Assistants, the Field Team Supervisor Assistants, the Team Leaders and Promoters) are meeting on a quarterly basis to review the implementation progress, develop quarterly plans and align thoughts about main challenges.
- **Departmental Advisory Committee Meetings:** An Advisory Committee had been established in each of the three departments. The committee that consisted of key government stakeholders (local line ministries of Health, Agriculture, etc.; DPC; mayors of target communes; etc.) is meeting at a quarterly basis to advise the program on the implementation mechanism and mechanisms to overcome challenges.

#### 1.4. Previous evaluation activities

The program has not conducted Mid Term Evaluation in the past. However, a number of baseline surveys both at household and school level are conducted in all the target areas of the GNPD. Reports will be made available for the study.

## 2. Evaluation Overview

---

### 2.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the current program management, planning, implementation and monitoring of the GNPD Program, and finds strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and provides recommendation to the ARC and HRC for adjustments on the program implementation during the remaining years.

### 2.2. Objectives of the evaluation

- Assess the ARC and HRC partnership's coordination, capabilities and structure of program implementation and describe the current procedures, challenges, opportunities and issues
- Assess and describe the current ARC and HRC program management structures, procedures and processes, and find strengths and gaps in tune with the GNPD stated objectives to deliver the program.
- Assess and describe the progress made so far in terms of program planning, management, implementation and monitoring of activities and their contribution to achieving the programs' intended Objectives and Outcomes (as stated in the Log frame)
- Based on findings, provide recommendations and lessons learned that help strengthen the management and program implementation for the GNPD Program.

### 2.3. Main audience of the evaluation

GNPD Program and its stakeholders, HRC, ARC-HAP Delegation, ARC-Headquarter

### 2.4. Coverage of the evaluation

The evaluation is intended to cover all functions, structures, and offices related to GNPD Program. In particular, it will cover ARC and HRC GNPD management body in Cap Haitian, HRC Regional Branch Offices, Local Committees, and HRC and ARC PaP-based technical units. It will cover all program implementation sites for site visits (based on random selection), and activities implemented and monitoring so far.



2.5 Evaluation criteria and questions

Criteria	Evaluation questions
<b>1) Program Management and Coordination</b>	
<i>Coordination between HRC and ARC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What coordination mechanisms exist and how effective are they to develop and ensure smooth coordination of program between ARC and HRC?</li> <li>• How efficient and timely are these coordination mechanisms to provide clarity on program planning and implementation aspects to the program staff and stakeholder?</li> <li>• What strengths and gaps are seen and realized by the stakeholders and what can be done to improve further?</li> </ul>
<i>Program Implementation mechanisms and structures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the program implementation procedures and mechanisms clear to both HRC regional branches, and ARC staff?</li> <li>• How effective are the organizational structure to help achieve the stated objectives and program activities of the GNPDP?</li> <li>• Are program implementations staffs of both agencies clear how they should coordinate, collaborate and implement the programs?</li> <li>• Are the established management structures of implementation clear to all key major staff and HRC committees?</li> <li>• Are they found effective and efficient enough to meet the objective of GNPDP program by its remaining period?</li> <li>• What are the strengths, gaps and what needs to be done to improve further?</li> </ul>
Clarity on role and responsibilities between HRC and ARC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the program implementation strategies of ARC (to be implemented by both for certain period) clear to HRC and its staff, and ARC staff?</li> <li>• Are they clear on their roles and responsibilities along the phases of the program? Is there any duplication of roles?</li> <li>• Do HRC Regional and Local Committees understand what they are supposed to implement and what roles they have to play in relation to GNPDP program?</li> <li>• Are the regional committee and the local committee fully play their role to facilitate GNPDP team to work towards the project objectives?</li> <li>• Is the regional committee actually appropriates the project GNPDP?</li> <li>• How effective are the policies and accountability mechanism of ARC and HRC developed and or understood so far in relation to program implementation?</li> <li>• What are the strengths, gaps and what can be done further to improve the situation?</li> </ul>



Criteria	Evaluation questions
<p>HRC Regional Committee' absorptiveness, capacity and motivations in relation to GNPD Program Implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What strengths and or capabilities have the regional committee developed so far to implement the GNPD program? What do they think they can and what not?</li> <li>• What are their main motivations to implement this program and how they are moving forward (or not) to translate the motivation into action?</li> <li>• To what extent the Committees are receptive of the ideas, concepts and decisions of GNPD program? What are the programmatic areas that are not considered absorbed or received well by them and what are the areas that seem easier to follow for them? Why?</li> <li>• Do the regional committees have developed/organized sufficient capacity to implement the planned program activities of GNPD? What can they do as per their present capacities and what not?</li> <li>• What are the key strengths and gaps in HRC Regional Committees in terms of capacity to plan, implement, motivation and commitment to the GNPD program? What can be done further to improve the situation?</li> </ul>
<p>Coordination and communication among HRC Committees, GNPD HRC project staff, and the Local Committees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the regional committee coordinate, guide and supervise the staff and the program? What role do they play?</li> <li>• Are the GNPD, HRC staff clear on their roles and responsibilities, reporting line and their relationship with Committee members?</li> <li>• Are there structure in the regional committees that ensures effective communication of decisions, information and directives to the staff and vice versa?</li> <li>• How local committees participate in the program planning and implementation of the GNPD program together with regional committees?</li> <li>• Are Local Committees clear and on the same page with ARC and HRC regional committees in relation with their roles and responsibilities in the GNPD program?</li> <li>• What are the current strengths and gaps and what needs to be improved in terms of Coordination and communication among the three parties?</li> </ul>
<p><b>2) Program Planning and Implementation</b></p>	
<p>Program Relevancy 1) Program design 2) Consistency of Log frame</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the program design, its objectives and outcomes appropriate and relevant to meet the needs and goals of beneficiaries in their present context?</li> <li>• Are the intervention activities that are designed to meet the program outcomes, and objectives appropriate, relevant and sufficient? What are the strengths and weaknesses?</li> <li>• Are there others activities that could enable the program to achieve the goals?</li> <li>• Are there any changes needed to make the program more suitable in terms of the interventions for the Beneficiaries? If yes, what should be improved?</li> <li>• What are the key area of interventions the program should focus on for its remaining period to make it more suitable to the needs of the beneficiaries and to meet its intended objectives?</li> <li>• Is logical framework logical hierarchy, its inherent logics and statements are suitable and fit to the intent of the program design and context?</li> </ul>



Criteria	Evaluation questions
<p>Program Effectiveness</p> <p>1) Program Planning 2) Quality standards 3) Target setting and beneficiary selection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are activities being implemented as planned and in scheduled time? What gaps are present?</li> <li>• Are there any quality standards, guides or protocols developed for key activities? How are they helping in the implementation? If not developed, what else should be developed to ensure quality of the programs?</li> <li>• Do implemented activities demonstrate quality in terms of delivery, products and in improving the knowledge and aspirations of beneficiaries? What are the strengths and gaps?</li> <li>• Are there any activities that need to be scaled up or widely implemented, given the context and scope of the target beneficiaries? If yes, which ones and what evidences do they demonstrate to do so?</li> <li>• What are the key strategic directions for the program to deliver quality services effectively for the remaining period?</li> <li>• How target communities and beneficiaries are being selected? What criteria are being developed, followed or implemented? Are there evidences of selecting beneficiaries and target communities following established criteria?</li> </ul>
<p>Program efficiency and outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the key examples of management efficiency in the program that played or are playing roles in achieving the intended objectives on time and within allocated resources?</li> <li>• What are the key management inefficiencies that played role in not achieving or delayed achieving the intended objectives/outcomes/ or activities (in terms of procurement, contractual delays, time management, staffing issues, unclear plan etc.)</li> <li>• Are there significant and noticeable inefficiencies that impacted the overall program achievements? How, and what are they?</li> <li>• What are the future strategic directions for the program to mitigate inefficiencies, if any, and improve further?</li> <li>• Is the program heading in the direction for achieving its intended objectives and outcomes, as outlined in its log-frame and proposal? How?</li> <li>• What key milestones or outcomes are being achieved in terms of both program implementation and managing the program? What contributed to their achievements? What could not be achieved?</li> <li>• What strategic direction should the program take to achieve its outcomes in the remaining period?</li> <li>• Are there any unintended, positive or negative, Outcomes and impacts being achieved? What are they, if any? What contributed to achieving them?</li> <li>• What positive outcomes and impacts that Program can build on and scale up over the remainder of the Program?</li> </ul>



Criteria	Evaluation questions
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the key lesson learnt at the mid -term point of Program that would help inform future program direction for ARC and HRC?</li> </ul>
Sustainability of program by HRC and ARC Exit Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How likely HRC will be able to sustain all or part of the program in future? What should be done by HRC to ensure sustainability?</li> <li>Is there any exit plan, discussion or thinking around how ARC should exit the program? What steps does ARC need to take to develop and implement an effective exit strategy for the Program?</li> </ul>

**3. Scope of Work and Evaluation Design**

**3.1. Scope of work**

The evaluator (s) will be responsible for the following:

1. To procure the necessary travel documents and visa(s) in the country of origin (visa fee will be reimbursed) and insurance if required (ARC does not pay for insurance)
2. To bring a working laptop
3. To print the necessary soft copies of the desk review materials while in the country of origin (cost will be reimbursed)
4. To manage the local assistant consultant during the evaluation and assign roles and responsibilities

The evaluator (s) will not be responsible for the following:

1. To hire local facilitator /translator, as needed
2. To arrange transportation for the field visit and to and from hotel and airport
3. To arrange accommodation while in Haiti

**3.2. Methodologies**

The evaluation team will use qualitative techniques such as interviews, focus group discussions and desk review. The following is a list of methodologies that are considered applicable, and the consultants are free to suggest /revise in their inception report.

1. Desk review of key program and strategy documents, such as proposals , PMP, and other strategic and management related documents
2. Review of program progress reports, policies and program management and operations related literatures, as available
3. Interviews with key ARC Sr. Management, PaP-based technical staff, GNPD Managers and staff
4. Interview with Key GNDP HRC officials, and staff
5. Interviews /FGD with HRC Leadership, Regional and Local Committees, and HRC PaP-based technical staff
6. Focus groups and key informant interviews of the beneficiary population, as required.

**3.3. Submission of Inception report**

Prior to conducting the evaluation, the Lead Evaluator will prepare and submit to ARC an inception report detailing the methodologies and work plan of the evaluation. ARC will provide an inception report template for this purpose. The inception report will be discussed with ARC/HRC staff and will be subject to approval prior to the start of field activities.

**3.4. Reporting relationship**

The lead evaluator will report to the Sr. AMEL Delegate, who is the designated evaluation manager, for all technical and contractual issues, and the GNPD Program Manager for managerial and administrative issues of the evaluation.



**3.5. Ethical Guidelines**

It is expected that the evaluation will adhere to ethical guidelines as outlined in the American Evaluation Association’s Guiding Principles for Evaluators. A summary of these guidelines is provided below, and a more detailed description can be found at [www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesPrintable.asp](http://www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesPrintable.asp).

1. *Informed Consent*: All participants are expected to provide informed consent following standard and pre-agreed upon consent protocols.
2. *Systematic Inquiry*: Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries.
3. *Competence*: Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.
4. *Integrity/Honesty*: Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behavior, and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
5. *Respect for People*: Evaluators abide the ARC Security Plan; guarantee the integrity, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders. It is expected that the evaluator will obtain the informed consent of participants to ensure that they can decide in a conscious, deliberate way whether they want to participate.
6. *Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare*: Evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of general and public interests and values that may be related to the evaluation.

**3.6. Use of data**

All collected data will be the sole property of the American Red Cross. The contractor shall not use the data for their own research purposes, nor license the data to be used by others, without the written consent of the American Red Cross.

**4. Expected Activities and Deliverables**

---

**4.1. Expected activities**

Activities	Number of days /Lead Consultant	Local Consultant	In/Out Haiti
1. Desk review and study	3	1	Out
2. Develop and submit inception report (methodology document) for approval, and development of data collection tools)	2		Out
3. Planning and preparatory work (with key ARC staff)	2	2	In
4. Interviews/FGDs/Site visits	10	10	In
5. Preparation and presentation of preliminary findings to ARC team before departure.	1	2	In
6. Submission of draft report to ARC for comments and finalization of report	8	2	Out
<b>Total expected work days:</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>17</b>	

Note: Above days are to be used for official working days especially when at Haiti Delegation. During weekends while in Haiti, consultants are paid accommodation and agreed daily allowances only.





4.2. Deliverables

Deliverables	Expected deadline
1. Inception report (with data collection tools)	By 10Nov 2014
2. Presentation of key findings to the senior management team of ARC and HRC , and GNPd Sr. staff (before leaving the field )	TBD
3. Draft report	TBD - within 15 days of completion of field work
4. Final report (with properly filed/archived copies of transcripts of all work documents, e.g. field notes)	Within a week after receiving comments

5. Required Qualifications

The following are the desired qualifications of the **Evaluator Consultant**:

1. Strong analytical thinker and skilled report writer in English
2. Master or PhD degree in sociology, management, economics or in relevant field from recognized university
3. Demonstrated experience in leading evaluations of large integrated programs, rural development programs.
4. Prior experiences in evaluating partnership management, program and management evaluations and similar nature
5. Demonstrated professional experience in post-disaster/humanitarian environments
6. Demonstrated experience in qualitative data collection and analysis
7. Demonstrated experience in leading focus group discussions and conducting interviews with a wide range of stakeholders
8. Professional work experience in Haiti preferred
9. Exposure of Red Cross and Red Crescent works
10. Fluency in English and French is required, and knowledge of Creole preferred

The following are the desired qualifications of the Local Evaluator Consultant. The local evaluation will report to the lead evaluator.

1. Master degree in sociology, rural development , project management , economics or relevant field
2. Demonstrated experiences in the humanitarian field, development program management and implementation in the context of Haiti
3. Demonstrated experiences in program and project evaluation and writing reports
4. Exposure to Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement works in Haiti.
5. Demonstrated experience in qualitative data collection and analysis
6. Demonstrated experience in leading focus group discussions and conducting interviews with a wide range of stakeholders
7. Fluent in French and English languages. Native speaker of Creole language.

6. Application and Selection Details

6.1. Application materials

The proposal should include the following six items. Please note that any proposal which does not contain all six items will be rejected.

1. **Summary of experience (1 page maximum)**
2. **Example of one evaluation report of a similar nature**
3. **Detailed CVs** of professional (s) who will work on the evaluation. If there is more than one contractor on the proposed evaluation team, please attach a table describing the level of effort (in number of days) of each team member in each of the evaluation activities.
4. **Professional references:** please provide three references from your previous clients.
5. **Daily rate:** please mention the proposed daily rate for each contractor in USD.

6.2. Summary of experience

This document should be no more than one page and should include the following information:



Criteria	Details <i>(this column can be deleted for more space)</i>	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2 (if applicable)
Experience in leading large scale program/program evaluations/program management evaluations	Number of evaluations led (with dates, locations and names of organizations); number of evaluations served as team member		
Experience in qualitative methods	Numbers of years of experience; Tools/methods used in past		
Experience with integrated programs, with focus on health, livelihoods, DRR and water and sanitation	Number of years of experience; Titles of positions held; Countries worked in; Organizations worked for		
Experience in post-disaster / humanitarian context	Number of years of experience; Countries worked in		
Professional experience in Haiti	Number of years of experience; Organizations worked for		
Language proficiency	Proficiency in English, French and/or Haitian Creole		

**6.3. Application procedures**

Interested individual candidates or evaluation firms should send their applications to [amrc.evaluation@gmail.com](mailto:amrc.evaluation@gmail.com). Please put the following in the subject line: "Application for GNPD Mid Term Evaluation - Local Consultant /and or Lead Consultant". The position(s) is open to both qualified national and international consultants, except where specifically "local consultant" is stated. Joint application of Lead and local consultant or a firm as well as individual interested in specific position can apply.

A complete application will be one with all materials listed above in one single file in either Word or PDF format. The title of this file should be the last name of the Evaluator (e.g. if the Evaluator is named Jon Snow, the title of the application document should be "Snow").

Applications received after the deadline and incomplete applications will not be accepted.

**6.4. Deadline for applications**

11:59PM EST, 5 September 2014