1. Introduction

Emergency Overview

On August 14, 2021, a 7.2 magnitude earthquake struck Haiti at 8:30 AM local time, about 80 miles west of the capital Port-au-Prince, in the department of Nippes. An estimated 1,941 people lost their lives in the disaster, and thousands were injured. The numbers are likely to increase as search and rescue efforts continue. Families and community members continue to feel aftershocks.

The earthquake destroyed homes, infrastructure and businesses, and displaced tens of thousands of people throughout the "Grand Sud." While the earthquake was stronger and shallower than the catastrophic earthquake in 2010 that toppled buildings across Port-au-Prince and beyond, and claimed more than 220,000 lives, it struck in. While shallow quakes tend to be more damaging given the closer proximity of their seismic waves to the surface, this earthquake struck in a less densely populated area.

In the Grand'Anse, Nippes and South departments, dozens of public buildings—hospitals, schools, hotels, churches, companies—suffered significant structural damage or have collapsed. At least 52,953 homes are known to have been destroyed with tens of thousands more severely damaged. Landslides and damaged bridges have made roads impassable which, along with the deteriorating security, complicates the transport of critical relief supplies to affected areas. Communications remain interrupted due to damaged infrastructure or high demand. In addition, a tropical depression passed over southern Haiti on the afternoon and evening of August 16th, exposing affected populations to additional hazards and complicating the search and rescue efforts. The Government of Haiti has issued a state of emergency. The DGPC estimates that 40% of the population of the three most affected departments (more than 579,000 people), are in need of urgent humanitarian assistance.

2. Purpose and objectives of the Real Time Evaluation

The purpose of this TDR is to describe the tasks to perform a RTE of the emergency response activities following the August 13th earthquake which struck the southern area of the country. This RTE is to allow CRS to meet its commitment to assessing and improving the quality of its humanitarian programs and create space for the emergency response team to "step back" from its work.

The overall purpose of this RTE is to enable the response team to learn from implementing the program to date and to make improvements so that the program is effective in meeting the needs of disaster affected people. *This RTE will draw on learning from previous RTEs to determine if lessons from previous experiences were incorporated or not, and why.*

The objectives for this RTE are:

1. To review the response against established criteria and recommend immediate changes that can improve the emergency program.

2. To identify good practices to use more widely and lessons learned in this response.
3. To promote a learning approach within CRS and its partners.

4. Methodology

The assignment will be undertaken by an experienced team leader responsible for assessing a range of program performance and management issues and for producing the report. S/he will be supported by a team of CRS and partner staff who will bring a particular field of expertise based on their experiences and qualifications.

The team leader will be selected by experience rather than affiliation and be independent of the program, meaning not involved in its implementation in any way.

The RTE team will carry out the exercise as follows:

- Hold an initial discussion with the Country MEAL Manager, Emergency MEAL Manager and available members of the country team to ensure that all are clear on RTE expectations and outcomes. It will be also important to discuss the evaluation questions and methods and the emergency plan they are carrying out.
- Hold a short planning meeting with all members of the RTE team including translators and data collectors (if necessary), and if possible, the Country MEAL Manager, to review and, as needed, amend the questions, methods, any data collection tools, the stakeholders to be interviewed, logistic arrangements and the daily schedule for each member of the team. Draw on existing RTE reports (if, and when available) to maximize incremental learning from RTEs across the organization.
- Use the five criteria with sub-headings as set out below to structure the data collection and reflection sessions.
- Have discussions with relevant staff at various levels of CRS (within the country program), partners, and other stakeholders to reach conclusions against the criteria.
- Consult with the affected population, using participatory tools as far as possible when engaging with disaster affected people, and attempt to triangulate information.
- Consult with staff at various levels – management and field - to understand what enables them to achieve results as planned and what barriers are stopping them from achieving results
- Present and discuss findings with the emergency response team, partner staff and management in a reflection workshop before departure to discuss findings and give opportunities for the team(s) to further develop the findings and generate lessons learned and recommendations for this and future projects.
- Create an action plan, complete with the names of the person responsible and a timeline, for the project to start implementing immediately after the reflection session.

While seeking to obtain an understanding of the complex challenges facing CRS and partners in this operation, the RTE will seek to focus on the following *criteria. The questions added are simply examples. These should be modified by the team lead and the RTE team.*

- **Response relevance/appropriateness (are we doing the right thing?)**

- What is the scale of the overall response in comparison to the size of the disaster?
- How well is CRS' response meeting the needs of the affected population?
- How was the assessment carried out and were decisions on how to respond based on the findings?
- How are communities in disaster-affected areas involved in the assessment, planning, implementation, and monitoring of the emergency response and how is this involvement influencing decisions on the activities that are implemented and how they are done? (This question relates to the Sphere common standards.)
- What strategies were employed to coordinate and mobilize community resources to deal with the emergency? Were there any challenges and constraints faced during mobilization of the community in question?
- In what ways is the project flexible and changing to meet conditions and phases of the response?
- How appropriate were the technical aspects of programs to the situation (taking culture and socio-economic factors into consideration)? (This relates to relevant Sphere technical standards.)
- How can prior learning from previous in-country emergencies feed into this response?
- What could we have done differently in terms of this response?
- Should the response from here on be different? If so, how?

- **Response effectiveness (are we achieving what we planned?)**

  - How timely was the CRS response relative to other actors responding to the emergency?
  - What internal and external factors affected the speed of our response at country level including the contingency (preparedness) plan, access to CRS emergency funds, pre-positioning of relief items, staff deployment systems, and the local context?
  - How did the timeliness of the response help reduce the impact of the disaster for affected people?
  - How well is the program complying with Sphere and other international standards or demonstrating a commitment to do so? (Possible standards to review are the Sphere common standards, the Sphere technical standards; the INEE standards and the Red Cross Code of Conduct- select the most relevant ones.)
  - What challenges or good practices have arisen in working with vulnerable groups of people?
  - Are there any activities putting members of the population at additional risk? If so, what should CRS be doing to eliminate these risks?
  - Are any program activities creating conflicts within the population? If so, what should CRS be doing to reduce such conflict?
  - Do the communities involved in the program feel that their security has been jeopardized? If so, how should CRS be responding?
  - How satisfied are affected people with their level of involvement, with the information they receive on project activities and their ability to complain and get a response?

Management effectiveness

- How effective is the management structure (in CRS and partner agencies)?
- How well are essential program support functions operating and resourced (including finance, HR, logistics, media, and communications)?
- How well did staffing decisions support the emergency response, including those made at national level and those at regional and headquarters levels?
- How efficient were procurement procedures and what could have been done better?
- How well did funding mechanisms function at country office and or partner levels?
- How well did financial management systems operate to support this response?
- How well did internal and external communication processes operate to support this response?
- How well did the monitoring system support decision-making?
- How well did security plans or guidance support this response?
- How well are risks assessed, documented, and managed?

- **Connectedness and sustainability (do the response link to longer term programs and DRR?)**

- In what ways are program participant needs changing?
- How well is the program adapting to their changing needs?
- Are further assessments being conducted to understand how needs are changing?
- What evidence is there that communities were consulted about their longer term needs and how these can be addressed? (Sphere common standard.)
- How is the response building on local capacities and reinforcing positive coping strategies?
- What plans are being made for the next phase? How can the next phase meet immediate needs and link to existing development or DRR programs?
- What lessons learned and good practices from the initial response can inform the next phase of the response?

- **Response coverage (who and how many people are we reaching?)**

- How were decisions made regarding targeting (sub-groups of the population being reached and the locations where the response is carried out)?
- How well have we ensured complementarity with other humanitarian actors?
- Who and how many different groups of people are targeted and how effectively are they being reached?
- Were targeting decisions based on an adequate understanding of target group needs?
- Are targeting methods equitable and transparent?
- How well has the program addressed the differing needs of men, women, children, the elderly, and the disabled?

- **Coordination (How well are we working with others?)**

- What coordination plans were in place and how well were they followed?
- How effective is coordination between CRS, CI partners and other local partners both in country and at regional and headquarters levels and what could be improved now?

- How effective and coherent is management, leadership, and decision-making between CRS and partners?
- How well do CRS and partner plans complement those of other NGOs and or government?
- How effective is coordination with other NGOs, and UN and government authorities?
- What coordination meetings and cluster groups are attended and how well is this engagement used?
- Have CRS or our partners been able to influence what other NGOs or government agencies are doing or will do?

5. Presentation and documentation of findings and recommendations

The RTE team will debrief with the field teams and senior representatives of the affiliates on its main findings at a Day of Reflection workshop, and the team leader will complete a draft report for comments upon return to their base. A final report should be produced ideally within the following week. The report should be brief, not exceeding 15 pages plus some short annexes containing the Terms of Reference and a timeline of the response. The final report will be signed off by the commissioning manager noting their agreement or not with the action plan and posted on CRS Global. The country program office and partner agencies will be responsible for taking forward the action points and recommendations relevant to them. *[Include provisions for debriefing meeting with the regional office, and/or HQ emergency operations to share learning, if feasible.]*

6. Ownership, resourcing and timing

The country representative is the RTE commissioning manager, though this task may be delegated to another individual. The evaluation team will be accountable to the commissioning manager. *[Add the name of the commissioning manager and details regarding schedule for this RTE and administrative and logistical support to be provided by the country office and field office (if relevant) or note that this will be agreed and planned in detail prior to the arrival of the RTE evaluation team.]*

7. Assumptions and requirements

- Evaluators will have access to all documentation and can take part in relevant meetings and field trips.
- Evaluators will have access to key staff i in-country CRS office and/or, partner offices for conducting interviews.
- All members of the evaluation team will have access to members of the affected population for conducting interviews.
- Evaluators will take confidentiality and objectivity into consideration during the process.

8. Time Frame

To be determined

9. Key Working Relationships

The TDY will primarily work with the Emergency Coordinator, Michael Augustin. In addition, s/he will coordinate with:

- Beth Carroll, HoP
- MEAL Coordinator
- Haiti CP Emergency Response PMs, MEAL staff, Operations

10. Place of Performance

The place of performance will be CRS Haiti's les Cayes office with travel to the field

Please send documentation to this address: kerlyne.lucien@crs.org