

2. METHODOLOGY

21. As part of the preparation for this evaluation, a briefing took place in Brussels with the various persons involved in the Haiti programme. The list of projects (see ANNEX I) and essential background documentation (see ANNEX VIII) were also provided at this meeting. In addition, the team attended a security briefing for Haiti on May 4th, 2005 by ECHO's Security Advisor.

22. In Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, the team had ample discussions with the head of the ECHO Office for the Caribbean, as well as with the technical and administrative assistant. The team was also provided with all documents about the ECHO operations of 2004. After this, the team departed to Port-au-Prince, Haiti, where interviews were held with the staff of the NGOs and IOs concerned, as well as with the EC Delegation in Haiti.

23. In view of the diverse operations of ECHO in Haiti, the evaluators approach was to get a broad picture of ECHO's activities by visiting as many projects as possible, instead of getting a detailed view of only a limited number of projects.

24. The evaluators visited projects in the towns in northern Haiti (Gonaïves, Ennery, Port-de-Paix and Cape Haitian), the central region (Saint Marc, Mirebalais and Hinche), as well as the south-west (Mapou) and in Port-au-Prince itself (see ANNEX V). In total, the team evaluated 12 health, two nutrition, and 10 water projects. Some projects, OCHA 3004; IFRC 4001; ICRC 3002; ID 4006; and MDM 5002, were not site-visited as nothing was left and interviews with the organisation's representatives were held instead. In view of the time constraints, the projects ECHO/HTI/BUD/04011 and ECHO/CR/BUD/1002 were not evaluated, as they were very small. For further details, please see ANNEX III and IV.

25. In the evaluation meeting with ICRC in Port-au-Prince, little could be learned about the project from the staff available for interviews. The copy of the final report for the ICRC 3002 project was neither available from the ECHO Office for the Caribbean in Santo Domingo, nor from the office in Port-au-Prince at the time of the evaluation interview. The Haitian office notified the International Committee of the Red Cross and Red Crescent (ICRC) External Resources Department, and Headquarters (HQ) in Geneva, but information regarding the whereabouts of the reports on this project became available only after this evaluation report was duly completed. Also, despite various requests, the Spanish Red Cross did not send project documents (RC-ES 5004) to the evaluation team.

26. The field visits proved to be extremely useful, since community leaders, beneficiaries, local authorities, and local NGOs could be interviewed. The technical quality of the construction paid by ECHO could also be inspected. Most important was the assessment of the local situation in the towns where the intervention had taken place. It should be noted that the situation could have changed between the time of the emergency and the field visits, since most projects were completed several months before the visits of the consultants.

27. The last days in Haiti and Santo Domingo were spent with the preparation of the summaries and debriefing to the EC Delegation and ECHO, and the partner NGOs and IOs (including those not site-visited). Back in Europe, the team studied background information on the political situation and development issues in Haiti. In addition, a brief questionnaire was submitted to the NGOs/IOs to assess the impact of the OCHA 3004 and IFRC 4001 coordination and communication projects.