

ANNEX E: TIP SHEETS

TIP SHEET #1: Collecting Signatures/Fingerprints from Program Participants

Collecting signatures/fingerprints from anyone participating in a program (program participant, vendor, etc.) is a routine aspect of program implementation. Since signatures/fingerprints are used to verify that something took place – a training, provision of ID, or receipt of cash or vouchers – it is imperative to collect them correctly.

If possible, collect signatures first. To collect signatures correctly:

Step 1: Ensure that you have a signature box large enough to accommodate signatures (or fingerprints). Print a sample copy and test a signature and large fingerprint in the signature space.

Step 2: Ensure the team has all the required supplies: several pens (in case they break/run dry) and a fingerprint pad and ink (for participants who cannot sign.) Blue and black ink are the preferred colors.

Step 3: Every participant who is able should sign their own name on the document. No one should sign on their behalf. Some illiterate people are able to sign their own name, but they usually will not sign their name in the same way more than once. To account for the slight variations in their signatures, a note should be made near their name or in a “Note to File” stating that “Participant #X is illiterate,” or “semi-literate.”

If participants are unable to sign their signature, fingerprints are a legitimate substitute. To collect fingerprints correctly:

Step 1: Provide clear guidance to participants on how to correctly complete the fingerprint process. Accuracy and efficiency improves when this happens.

Step 2: Use a thumb or finger, but be consistent (e.g., everyone in line uses their left thumb). If a participant is unable to use the same finger as everyone else (i.e., missing finger, scarred finger, etc.), they may use a different finger, but this should be noted near their name or in a “Note to File” each time it occurs.

Step 3: Make sure there is sufficient ink on the fingerprint pad. Too much ink will create an unreadable blob of ink on the document. Too little ink will make the fingerprint too faint or record only a partial print. Press the entire fingerprint gently onto the fingerprint pad, not just the tip of the finger. (The small circle made by the tip of the finger is not a permissible fingerprint). Gently roll the finger from left to right one time only. Rolling the finger more than once will collect too much ink.

Step 4: Gently place the participant’s inked finger in the correct signature box/line on the document and roll the finger from left to right one time only. **Do not press too hard** or the print will smudge.

Contingency Planning

Scenario 1: If a participant is unable to sign her/his name or provide a fingerprint,¹ a representative from their family or their community may sign or fingerprint on their behalf. This must be noted next to their name on the document or put into a “Note to File.” If a “Note to File” is made, the document and the participant in question must be identifiable, as well as the name of the person signing on the participant’s behalf and that person’s relationship to the participant.

For example, *“At X event on Y date, Participant Z was unable to remove her gloves for cultural reasons to sign the attendance document; therefore, her son, (son’s name), signed/fingerprinted on her behalf.”*

Scenario 2: Always carry sufficient ink in the event a fingerprint pad runs dry.

Scenario 3: If an event is running behind or where queueing causes security concerns, team members or community leaders may want to sign on everyone’s behalf to avoid delays. **This is not acceptable or appropriate and should be clearly communicated prior to the event.** Tardiness or security issues are never acceptable reasons to forgo collecting signatures. If security is an issue, the event may need to be rescheduled or moved to a more secure location.

Scenario 4: Similar to Scenario 3, when program participants are confused by how the signature/fingerprint process works, team members or community leaders may be anxious to speed up the process by signing on their behalf. Again, this is not acceptable or appropriate and should be clearly explained prior to collection.

Scenario 5: For whatever reason, signatures were not collected at the time of the event or signed sheets are lost. Do not sign on behalf of the participants after the fact; this is worse than not collecting the signatures or losing the document. Instead, prepare a “Note to File” to explain which event occurred and which signatures are unavailable. Include other documentation to demonstrate the event took place (monitoring reports from the event, photographs of the event, post-event monitoring, etc.).

¹ This may be the case with a woman who cannot remove her gloves for cultural reasons or a person missing a limb.

TIP SHEET #2: How Do I Handle Absences or Substitutions During Distribution?

Life happens. While the cash or vouchers we provide to program participants are critical for their households, participants may be unable to attend a distribution. People become ill, must travel for a family emergency, and receive offers of employment. How do you handle distribution when your carefully-laid plans hit a snag? Three potential solutions include:

- Registering alternates alongside program participants
- Creating a system to accept substitutes/alternates on the distribution day
- Conducting a smaller distribution, at a later date

Registering Alternates alongside Program Participants

If you know early on that program participants may not be able to attend every distribution, consider registering an alternate alongside them. All required information for the program participant is also required for the alternate, and the Participant Registration List must be adapted to include this. Alternates must also attend all required events for program participants (e.g., trainings).

During distribution, if the program participant is unable to attend, the alternate can accept the distribution on her/his behalf when the primary participant's name is called. The alternate must follow the same procedures as all other program participants (e.g., showing ID, etc.)

The advantage to registering alternates in advance is that all verification information is prepared prior to distributions. The primary drawback is that it may double the size of your Participant Registration List and any Distribution Forms. Collecting more data increases the chance of mistakes: for example, the program participant may be erroneously entered as the alternate. Monitoring efforts may also increase.

Allowing Substitutions on the Distribution Day

If participants unexpectedly need to miss a distribution, they may send a family member to the distribution in their place. To allow for on-the-spot substitutions, you must have created a process for handling substitutions prior to distribution.

Some potential approaches include:

- Instructing program participants to provide a signed letter to their substitute, as well as their ID, to show at the distribution.
- Having a community representative verify the relationship between the substitute and the program participant.
- Asking other program participants to verify the relationship between the substitute and the program participant and the reason for the program participant's absence (i.e., the program participant recently gave birth, is ill, etc.)

Any process you choose must include a way to positively identify the substitute and verify that s/he has permission from the program participant to collect the distribution on her/his behalf.

The advantage to this approach is that it is flexible and agile. The risk is that a person posing as a substitute may collect the program participant's distribution without her/his legitimate consent, since conclusive confirmation can only happen the next time the program participant appears.

Holding Make-up Distributions

If you are uncomfortable allowing substitutions or alternates on distribution day, you could choose to arrange a second, smaller distribution for those unable to attend the main distribution. Alternatively, participants who were unable to attend the primary distribution could arrange to pick up the distribution at a Mercy Corps office or from a team member when that person makes a site visit to their area. In either case, the original Distribution List would need to be collected from Finance to record participants' signatures, or a smaller Distribution List would need to be created for the make-up distribution.

Both options allow Mercy Corps team members to plan – either for a make-up distribution or subsequent meeting. However, in a program that is already administratively challenging – such as a voucher program – adding additional steps could be overwhelming for implementing teams.

TIP SHEET #3: How to Identify and Respond to Significant Market Price Increases

Regular market price monitoring is a crucial part of cash transfer programming (CTP). Once your monitoring procedures are established and data is regularly being collected and analyzed, how do you know if a price change is “significant”? When you investigate the causes for price changes, what are you looking for? How do you respond to those causes once they have been identified? This Tip Sheet will help you answer these questions.

Identifying Significant Price Changes

In many of the places we work, prices change frequently. Not every price change should be investigated, however. Price changes that *should* be investigated are major price changes in a single week/month¹ or any unexpected steady increases and decreases over time. This change may be for a single commodity, like beans or fuel, or for many or all commodities. If in one week/month, you notice a price change greater than 10-15%, you should investigate its cause, unless the change is normal for the area.

Let's explore two scenarios, one which would be considered a “significant” increase, and one which would not.

Scenario 1: In Market A, the average price of rice is \$2/kg and for the first three weeks, with a price change no greater than \$0.05 each of these weeks. In Week 4, the price increases to \$2.50/kg (a 25% increase.) This change is significant and should be investigated, since, previously, the price for rice in Market A fluctuated no more than 3%.

Scenario 2: In Market B, the average price of rice is \$2/kg, and for the first three weeks of monitoring, prices range from \$1.80 - \$2.75/kg. (This is normal for this market over the past 24 months.) In Week 4, the price increases to \$2.50/kg (a 25% increase as well.) While this change is large, it is not abnormal based upon historical price monitoring. In this scenario, the change would not be investigated.

During your baseline market price survey, you collected average high and low season prices. If you begin to see gradual increases or decreases over time, compare these prices to the seasonal averages. When you record higher prices heading into the lean season or lower prices during the harvest season, these fluctuations are likely normal and should not be investigated unless they are 10-15% higher/lower than the seasonal averages. If the price change is atypical for the season, it should be investigated.

You may see slight price increases immediately following cash or voucher distributions. This is something to monitor, but not necessarily a problem so long as the changes are not severe or prolonged. If price increases are unexpected or hold for a long period of time, they should be investigated to understand if they are a result of CTP.

Investigating Price Changes

If, based on the criteria above, you have determined the price changes are unusual, it is time to investigate them. There is no single method for investigating price changes. Your initial task is to understand whether the problems are supply-side or demand-side problems. Keep in mind that you will need to hold

¹ This will depend on how often you are monitoring price data (i.e. weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly).

conversations beyond those with vendors in your local market. You may want to speak to wholesalers at your marketplace, as well as those at regionally or at-source marketplaces. Local or regional authorities may also provide additional insight into the situation. For instance, if the price increases are caused by supply-side issues from a fire at the main port's warehouse, authorities may be able to tell you the government's contingency plan and when the port should be up and running again. If the problem is caused by skirmishes along the supply route, they may be able to tell you when they expect the road to be cleared for travel.

Supply-side problems - such as a price increase due to a shortage of goods – can be potentially harmful when implementing CTP. CTP could exacerbate these by increasing demand/competition for scarce commodities, increasing prices and potentially leading to inflation. Demand-side problems – such as a price decrease due to a lack of purchasing power and excess of goods – may benefit from the cash influxes provided by CTP. Keep in mind, however, that this benefit will only be felt in small markets. If a market is very large and your program is only a fraction of its total business, CTP will likely have little, if any, effect.

- **Supply-side Problems:** If there is a supply side problem in the market, you will likely observe a difference in the quantity of goods available in the market and on shop shelves. This is true whether it is a shortage for one commodity only (e.g., rice) or for all goods. If there is a significant price increase for only one commodity, rather than many, this likely indicates a supply-side issue, especially if the good in question is an essential good (e.g., food, water). Supply-side increases may be caused by secondary commodities, such a change in the price of fuel, transportation or storage costs, new taxes, etc., so it is important to consider this while investigating causes. Also investigate the goods' source when looking at supply-side increases. Price spikes may occur only for goods traveling long distances, across borders, or through conflict areas; while other, locally-produced goods experience no change in price or decrease in price. Changes in the source market, however, can permanently affect prices. In 2012, in South Sudan, almost all goods in northern South Sudan came from Sudan. When the Sudan-South Sudan border closed that year, the source market switched from Sudan to Uganda, permanently increasing prices overnight.
- **Demand-side Problems:** With demand-side problems, you may notice the same amount of commodities in the market, or an increase in commodities, but a reduction in the normal amount of shoppers in the marketplace. You may also notice that the price of essential goods remains the same, while prices for luxury goods decrease.

Keep in mind that supply-side and demand-side problems may occur at the same time. Prices for luxury goods may decrease while prices for essential goods spike.

Responding to Price Changes

You have investigated price changes and understand their cause. Now what? The answer is: it depends.

If price changes in the market were caused by demand-side issues (i.e., reduced incomes), then you likely saw prices falling. In this case, CTP can help support the local market by increasing demand, especially in markets recovering from a crisis.

If the price changes were caused by supply-side issues, then CTP may exacerbate the problem by increasing demand in a market with insufficient goods. In this case, carefully consider your program's effect or future effect on the market.

If your program operates in very large markets and/or the amount of money you are introducing to the market is a small fraction of the market's overall business, you may choose to proceed with CTP anyway, if you can meet your program's objectives and not do harm. You may also want to complement your CTP with activities which improve supply, if applicable. If supply-side problems are due to the secondary commodity market (fuel, transportation costs, etc.), you may choose to support these markets by implementing activities such as fuel vouchers, which may help stabilize prices and keep them manageable for both vendors and program participants. If the closure of trade routes has prevented the movement of goods, special transport permits for essential items may help open up transportation.

However, if your program operates in markets that are vulnerable or small, or if you will be introducing an amount of cash that is significant in relation to that market's total amount of business, you may consider switching to another methodology (such as in-kind distributions of goods purchased from another area) to avoid negatively impacting the entire community.

If both supply- and demand-side problems are affecting pricing, you may want to combine CTP support to households with supply-side market support to vendors to help markets recover and stabilize.

TIP SHEET #4: Conducting Final Evaluations of Cash Transfer Programs

Within Mercy Corps, we generally refer to an external evaluation as an evaluation led by an expert external to the agency, usually a private consultant. Team members and partners, however, often assist the external consultant in data collection and analysis, both for logistical reasons as well as to maximize learning. Please check your M&E Plan and donor requirements to determine which type of evaluation must be conducted for your program.

Any evaluation should use specific evaluation questions to address each of the standard evaluation criteria. The five evaluation criteria are: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. These criteria were created by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1991 as part of general evaluation principles. Together these five criteria are widely viewed as the cornerstones for quality evaluations of development programming, particularly for mid-term and final evaluations.

Each of the criteria covers multiple concepts and ideas which need to be addressed in the evaluation. The program team should develop project-specific evaluation questions under each of the criteria to ensure that all of the important concepts are covered. These evaluation questions are then used to design the evaluation methodology, draft the data collection tools, and structure the analysis of the findings. Examples of these evaluations questions are included on the next page. Note that these example questions are generic and should be made more specific to better fit your project's context.

Evaluation questions form the basis for the evaluation's Scope of Work (SOW). An evaluation SOW is a plan for preparing for, conducting, and following up on an evaluation. It conveys clear directions to the evaluation team, defines roles and responsibilities and includes details needed to develop the more detailed evaluation plan and methodology. It should be developed whether the evaluation is internal or external. An evaluation is like a mini-project. Good evaluations begin with a good evaluation design (or SOW). Refer to the MEL Tip Sheet: Evaluation Scope of Work for more information.

Almost all types of evaluations will involve an endline study, using the same tools as those used for the baseline study to compare results and determine to which changes the program has contributed. The choice of other evaluation methods will depend on the type of program, resources available, and the type of questions the evaluation is trying to answer.

In order for an evaluation to contribute to increased program quality, evaluations findings should be clearly documented and circulated broadly within Mercy Corps and among other stakeholders, as appropriate. The evaluation report should include a description of the evaluation methodology, findings, recommendations and lessons learned. The report should directly answer the evaluation questions and convince the reader with findings, quotes, numbers, and further interpretation and explanation as needed. In order to make the evaluation findings more accessible, identify creative ways to communicate findings and increase interest in reading the evaluation report. Consider circulating a one-page document with key findings that would be useful for different audiences or developing a short narrated presentation which can be circulated as an audio-visual complement to the report.

SCOPE OF WORK EXAMPLE: FINAL EVALUATION

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Program to be Evaluated: | Kenbe-La (Hang in there) Giving choices to earthquake survivors outside of Port-au-Prince |
| Donor: | USAID – Food For Peace |
| Location: | Haiti (Central Plateau, Lower Artibonite) |
| Timeframe: | SOW to be completed over the period of August 30th – November 15th, 2011; lump sum payment due once final report is submitted |
| Application Deadline: | ASAP |
| Contact: | Martina Bennett Design, Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist Mercy Corps Haiti mbennett@ht.mercycorps.org |

1) Program to be Evaluated:

Mercy Corps Haiti

Kenbe-La (Hang in there) Giving choices to earthquake survivors outside of Port-au-Prince

Funded by USAID – Food for Peace

Implemented between June 30th, 2010 and September 30th, 2011

2) Purpose of the Evaluation

This will be an end-of-program evaluation of Mercy Corps' "Kenbe-La (Hang in There): Giving choices to earthquake survivors outside of Port-au-Prince" program in the Center and Lower Artibonite Departments of Haiti. Kenbe-La is a Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) program, funded by USAID Food for Peace, and focuses on meeting the urgent food security needs of 20,000 internally displaced households and host households in Artibonite and Central Plateau by providing vouchers redeemable in local markets for basic food commodities. The program distributes vouchers worth \$50 per month over a period of 8 – 9 months to buy their choice of the following staple foods including rice, beans, oil and maize. They can purchase from local vendors, who must be formally registered with the government to participate. Mercy Corps also piloted an innovative mobile money program in collaboration with private phone and banking companies, which allows for people to easily transfer funds to vendors in a safe and fast manner.

The intention of the evaluation is to assess to what degree the program and methodology have been successful in achieving the established results and specific objectives; evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of cash transfer programming; and compare the various cash transfer modalities (vouchers/m-money) implemented by Mercy Corps in the Center and Artibonite Departments of Haiti and within the objectives of USAID/FFP. Information gained will be used in order to establish better practice and help formulate new interventions. This evaluation is to serve as an opportunity for learning, growth and reflection for program staff and stakeholders. The evaluation should be participatory to maximize the learning opportunities of Mercy Corps in the review of program achievements, monitoring, logistics and strategic approaches.

More specifically, the evaluation should:

- 1) Determine the degree to which the program objectives and indicators as identified in the proposal were met. In other words, the principal objective of the evaluation is to determine the **effectiveness and the fulfillment of contractual obligations** as per Mercy Corps' agreement with USAID/FFP.
- 2) Evaluate the **efficiency of implementation** in terms of approach chosen and resources available and used (targeting criteria; cash transfer value; vendor selection; delivery mechanisms; monitoring system), and **compare the two modalities (vouchers and Mobile Money)** and evaluate the **appropriateness of the response**.
- 3) Determine the **impact of using cash transfers on the food security** of the displaced and host families in the Center and Lower Artibonite Departments in Haiti.
- 4) Evaluate the **wider impact** of the response in terms of the direct beneficiaries, wider communities and markets, **including as possible the 'multiplier effect'**.
- 5) Provide a clear **document of the lessons learned** with reference to the available program materials for both an internal audience and an external audience to include program stakeholders and donors.
- 6) Make **recommendations to future programming in the region including possible economic recovery programming**, focusing on the following areas: a) the ongoing food/livelihood insecurity situation in the Center & Artibonite Departments; b) response analysis in the Center & Artibonite Departments (including a review of context indicators, market conditions, response analysis and risk analysis); c) analysis of the conditions under which market-based, food voucher or cash transfer programming should be implemented again in order to have the intended effects.

3) Background:

In mid-February 2010, the Government of Haiti estimated that the January 12 earthquake killed 230,000 people, and left an estimated 700,000 displaced within the Port-au-Prince area, and nearly 600,000 more displaced to other parts of the country (including over 250,000 estimated to have arrived in Center and Artibonite). Mercy Corps carried out assessments in January and February 2010, which demonstrated that the international community, in the face of massive needs in and around Port-au-Prince, had largely ignored the needs of the host communities, which lie further afield but were nonetheless being overwhelmed by this influx of displaced people arriving with no resources or means of support.

Without proper assistance, many of the displaced may return to Port au Prince, where resources and opportunities are severely limited, while host families will suffer from depleted resources after assisting the displaced in the time of need. Anecdotal evidence suggested IDP returns to Port au Prince were already underway, making immediate support in host communities urgent to create an incentive for IDPs to decide against returning to what are likely to be more difficult living conditions in the capital.

A multiagency emergency market mapping assessment of the bean sector noted that the sudden drop in consumer income due to the earthquake quickly led to a drop in credit availability for merchants within the bean market chain, and identified the risk that producers would, in response to decreased demand, reduce their production quantities for the May/June harvest.¹ The assessment team recommended immediate interventions to support the recovery of food market chains. An assessment of host families in Bas Artibonite found that the majority of them have continued to rely on markets to obtain food after the earthquake, though many families are rationing consumption within the household to stretch limited resources.² Only ten percent of potential beneficiaries surveyed reported having received food aid to date. Meanwhile, markets were functioning in both Artibonite and Central Plateau, though their viability was being stretched as small-business owners struggle in the face of sharply decreased purchasing power. Mercy Corps' survey of retailers in the targeted areas found that most were able to receive replenishment stock within six days after placing an order, a timeframe consistent with before the earthquake, and can therefore meet increased demand without increasing prices.

Given these conditions, the use of a market-based voucher system was determined preferable to expanding direct in-kind food distribution. Vouchers would allow beneficiaries to access food through existing market actors, support the quick recovery of small businesses in the food market chain, and help spur local production by increasing the purchasing power of beneficiaries, in order to increase demand for locally produced goods. It also directly complemented the existing Mercy Corps USAID/OFDA-funded programming in Central Plateau, which assisted IDPs and host communities through cash-for-work opportunities and direct cash transfers for the most vulnerable host families. The design of the Kenbe-la program also specifically accounted for the coverage of food insecure populations by USAID/FFP-funded single-year and multi-year assistance programs already operating in the targeted areas.

Mercy Corps proposed nine months of food distributions to provide adequate time for participating households to transition into new livelihoods or find employment in their new communities. ACTED's study of displaced populations found that the majority of hosted families were working prior to the earthquake, and in some regions 80% are now unemployed in their host communities. Given the already high unemployment rates in the host communities, the loss of assets of IDPs and the trauma experienced, the transition would take time. In addition, Mercy Corps' field assessment in preparation for this proposal revealed that 33% of the targeted households had not planted this season leaving them unprepared to adequately feed the expanded households. Nine months also has the potential to create a pull factor and incentive for households to remain in Central Plateau which would reduce the stress on Port au Prince where conditions in displacement camps are overcrowded, insecure and where many camps risk flooding during hurricane season.

Mercy Corps targeted 20,000 beneficiary households (100,000 individuals) in two rural areas, lower Artibonite and Central Plateau, where high numbers of IDPs settled after the earthquake. The program also aimed to directly benefit 135 small business owners in local markets in the targeted areas.

The main project objectives can be seen below:

Objective 1: Increase household food security and incentive of IDPs to stay in host communities

1 http://www.fews.net/docs/Publications/Haiti_EMMA_Report_2010_beans.pdf, accessed 04 May 2010.

2 ACTED, *Diagnostic des Besoins des Populations D'accueil et Déplacées Du Bas Artibonite*, April 2010.

Objective 2: Support the quick recovery of small businesses in the food market chain, contributing to local employment

Objective 3: Spur local production by increasing the purchasing power of beneficiaries, thus increasing demand for locally produced goods, and not disrupting market prices for locally produced food items

In order to meet the project objectives, Mercy Corps distributed vouchers, redeemable from local stores, for US\$50 worth of grain, cooking oil and beans. Illustratively, this would allow a recipient to purchase 20 kg of rice, 4 kg of red beans and 1 gallon of oil every month. The quantity and value of vouchers was identical for all household units regardless of size and is based on Sphere standards for a family of five to purchase about 50 percent of monthly kilocalorie requirements.

The program also aimed to distribute vouchers once per month over a nine month period. Vouchers were to be disbursed weekly to households from various zones so that redemption is staggered to ensure that participating vendors are not overwhelmed. Recipient households were able to choose from among at least five participating vendors in their location, and a maximum of 25 merchants in larger, urban areas. This competition has ensured that affordable price points and quality levels have been maintained. Similarly, Mercy Corps sensitized the program with potential vendors through a series of open meetings in the three major population centers (Hinche, St. Marc and Mirebalais) and meetings in minor population centers along the Mirebalais and St. Marc corridor and the Mirebalais and Hinche corridor. Vendors were informed about the overall program, the role and responsibilities of the vendors, and Mercy Corp's criteria for selecting participating vendors. Vendors were then asked to sign an MOU understanding they will be liable for all government obligations and to participate in Mercy Corps organized monitoring and evaluation (M&E) efforts. On a bi-weekly basis, merchants have redeemed the used vouchers with Unibank. This schedule has ensured that merchants have had adequate cash flow to maintain on-going, adequate inventory.

In lieu of using printed vouchers in the Lower Artibonite Department, Mercy Corps has launched the use of mobile money through a partnership with Mercy Corps Haiti's Economic Recovery Program, Haitian telecommunication company, Voila, and the financial service provider, UNIBANK. Mercy Corps Haiti's Economic Recovery Program has received funding from USAID's Hi-Five program to provide technical support and develop programs, which experiment with the use of mobile money to bring financial services to the poor.

During the Kenbe-La beneficiary mobilization meetings, beneficiaries are explained the basic objectives of the program and then receive a Voila SIM card and telephone. Mercy Corps staff make an electronic transfer of credit on the Voila website to each of the beneficiary's unique SIM number. The beneficiaries learn how to set up their secret code to their account and how to make financial transactions with Kenbe-La mobile money vendors through an electronic messaging of secret codes and purchase amounts. Once the credit has been transferred and the transaction has been confirmed via an electronic message, the food products are exchanged. The vendor then proceeds to UNIBANK to cash out the credit on his mobile money account. This has proven to be a very innovative and efficient approach to exchange of goods in the context of a humanitarian aid project. Mercy Corps provides phones and SIM cards to each beneficiary and vendor. This adds value to the overall service as well as to improve communication and monitoring. Mercy Corps' approach aims to create minimal market disruptions while maximizing benefits at all levels of the value chain. FEWS NET and CNSA are monitoring market prices for staple commodities twice each week in major markets, including Hinche and Mirebalais in Central Plateau and St. Marc in Artibonite.

Mercy Corps had requested that FEWSNET train its team regarding monitoring practices so Mercy Corps can monitor smaller markets in addition the major markets. This monitoring has provided an independent and early warning system should prices increase.

4) Existing Sources of Program Information

- Grant Agreement
- Baseline Survey Reports (Central Department and Artibonite)
- Quarterly donor reports
- Program organizational chart and position descriptions
- Program detailed implementation plan
- Program database including information on program beneficiaries, distributions/transactions monitoring, monthly household monitoring surveys, vendor's surveys, complaints registries, etc.
- Program support folders that include forms used, documentation systems, and procedures
- Host Families and Shelter Working Group protocols and other relevant documents
- Market price data from FEWS NET (Famine Early Warning Systems Network, CNSA (National Coordination of Food Security)), and data collected on smaller markets by Mercy Corps Haiti.

5) Evaluation Questions

i) **To what degree were the program objectives and indicators as identified in the proposal met?**

- How successful was the program in meeting its Strategic Objectives? What achievements were made toward meeting indicator targets, as compared to the baseline?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program design and implementation, i.e. measured results and perceived outcomes vs the aims and targets of the Kenbe-La Program?

ii) **Was the implementation in terms of approach chosen and resources available and used (targeting criteria; cash transfer value; vendor selection; delivery mechanisms; monitoring system) efficient and appropriate of the response? Was the mobile money modality more efficient than voucher systems?**

- What were the advantages/disadvantages to the food voucher/mobile money approach chosen? Given local context - was the voucher/mobile money approach an appropriate modality for this intervention?
- What is the experience of the beneficiaries, including their preferences on modes of assistance delivery, i.e. did they prefer cash transfers via Mobile Money or vouchers, would they prefer to receive in kind?
- Was the time synchronization and coordination of the Kenbe-La program with other Mercy Corps interventions (CfW/Cash transfers, Market Fairs, Cholera Prevention) in the area appropriate to ensure highest possible impact?

iii) **What has been the impact of using cash transfers on the food security of the displaced and host families in the Center and Artibonite Departments, Haiti? Have the food rations**

impacted displaced beneficiaries' decision to stay in the project locations?

- Are families consuming, more, less or the same amount (and/or more nutritious mix) of food as prior to the earthquake?
 - During the time of the program, have families obtained means to ensure their longer-term food security?
- iv) **What are the secondary market effects of using cash-based voucher/mobile money programming as a recovery modality, with specific reference to market and multiplier effects? Who are the main beneficiaries of these secondary impacts and what are the potentially positive and negative impacts are on the market of such an intervention?**
- Are there any quantifiable secondary economic impacts that may be clearly attributed to the program? Have the markets been able to adequately respond to this rapid influx of cash?
 - How have prices changed in general in local markets? Were prices influenced by the program's restrictions (i.e. vendors' knowledge that beneficiaries have one month to redeem their vouchers)?
- v) **What are the secondary effects of using cash based voucher and mobile money systems as a recovery modality on the community and in terms of choice and dignity of the beneficiary?**
- Were there any negative impacts on the communities due to the voucher systems or other reasons attributed to the program (i.e beneficiary selection, ownership over purchased goods, targeting host versus residents families etc)
 - Are there additional direct or indirect benefits from cash based voucher projects that are not currently being captured?
 - Which improvements should be included for subsequent operations?

6) Evaluation Methods

This is an evaluation that will be led and facilitated by an external evaluation consultant. The consultant should define an appropriate methodology and analysis method to address the evaluation questions that may use the following tools:

- **Facilitated workshop** with key program staff to reflect on program implementation, challenges and successes;
- **Field visits** to the implementation areas;
- **Interviews** with key program stakeholders, including program technical advisors, private sector actors, community leaders, government officials and beneficiaries;
- **Focus group discussions** and interviews with field staff, sample beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries and with other stakeholders including private sector actors;
- **Observations**;
- **Quantitative questionnaires** for beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries and other stakeholders to serve as an End-Line Survey for which to compare to baseline results;

- **Documentation review** e.g. progress, monitoring reports, existing data and review of Mercy Corps' relevant systems.

Data will be entered into a database for analysis by the Consultant and Haiti evaluation team members. Preliminary findings will be presented for discussion with the program leadership and other interested staff and stakeholders of Mercy Corps' Haiti operations prior to the departure of the evaluator from Haiti to ensure the team feels ownership over the findings and can provide feedback. Resulting recommendations will be included in the evaluation report.

7) Team Composition and Participation

Mercy Corps is looking for an External Consultant with the following qualifications:

- At least a master's degree in planning, monitoring and evaluation, economics or social sciences
- At least 8 years of documented experience in evaluation of emergency programs, including food security, cash transfer programs and/or market-based programming
- Knowledge of cash transfer and food security programs in post emergency
- Knowledge of cost benefits analysis for cash transfer programs
- Extensive experience in working with governments, USAID, local authorities, beneficiaries
- Demonstrated analytical, writing and computer skills
- Excellent knowledge of English and French and/or Haitian Creole

The evaluation team will consist of an External Consultant (Lead Evaluator with expertise in cash transfer programs, monitoring and evaluation systems and methodologies), 2) Danielle de Knocke van der Meulen (Mercy Corps Haiti Deputy Country Director), & 3) Martina Bennett (Mercy Corps Haiti Design, Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist). The evaluation team will also include 11 field staff members, and a translator.

8) Procedures: Schedule and Logistics

| Deadline | Activity | Stakeholder |
|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| 9/6/11 | External Evaluator arrives in Haiti | Consultant |
| 9/7/11 | Facilitate orientation / meeting with organization's field office leadership and key staff: clarify expectations and desired outcomes, review and confirm activity and logistics plan, etc. Retooling of methodology and data collection tools if necessary. | Consultant |
| 9/8/11 | Field test survey tool | Consultant, Evaluation team |
| 9/9/11 | Train Enumerators/Surveyors on data collection instruments (Endline Survey) | Consultant, Evaluation team |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 9/10/11 – 9/22/11 | Implement Endline Survey (Enumerators continue with surveys for 12 days, led by M&E Officers) | Consultant, Evaluation team |
| 9/10/11 – 9/20/11 | Consultant spends 3 days in Mirebalais, 3 days in Hinche, and 3 days in Saint Marc doing focus groups and key informant interviews | Consultant |
| 9/21/11 – 9/22/11 | Consultant spends 2 days in Port-au-Prince conducting key informant interviews with other NGOs and MC staff | Consultant |
| 9/23/11 – 9/28/11 | Data Analysis and Preparation of Initial Findings | Consultant |
| 9/29/11 | Conduct debrief meeting with MC Staff, stakeholders/ partners to review preliminary evaluation findings and review first draft of evaluation report | Consultant, Country Staff |
| 9/30/11 | External Evaluator departs Haiti | Consultant |
| 9/30/11 – 10/31/11 | Prepare draft evaluation report outlining evaluation process, program achievements, constraints, lessons learned, recommendations, next steps/ action plan and submit for comments | Consultant |
| 11/15/11 | Final Report Due | Consultant |

9) Reporting and Dissemination Requirements

The final evaluation report will not exceed 35 pages, including annexes. Copies of the report will be provided to the in-country management team (Danielle, Viorica and Martina), the headquarters program support team (Amy Hause), the headquarters DME support staff (Gretchen Shanks), the Economic Growth and Market Development Technical Unit (Diane Johnson), the Food and Nutrition Technical Support Unit (Penny Anderson), USAID/FFP, and the digital library/Clearspace. The summary will be translated locally for program staff and a summary will be prepared for other program stakeholders.

The final evaluation report shall be structured in accordance with the following guidelines:

- **Cover Page w/ photo**
- **List of Acronyms**
- **Table of Contents** which identifies page numbers for the major content areas of the report.
- **Executive Summary** (2 to 3 pages) should be a clear and concise stand-alone document that gives readers the essential contents of the evaluation report, previewing the main points in order to enable readers to build a mental framework for organizing and understanding the detailed information within the report. In addition, the Executive Summary helps readers determine the key results and recommendations. Thus, the Executive Summary should include: major lessons learned; maximum of two paragraphs describing the program, summary of targets and intended outcomes; areas of meaningful

under or over achievement; and possibly a few lines describing the action plan developed to follow up on evaluation recommendations and how the evaluation report will be disseminated.

- **Methodology:** sampling method including strengths and weaknesses of method used, inclusion of stakeholders and staff, rough schedule of activities, description of any statistical analysis undertaken, including justification and software package used. The discussion of any random sampling used should include details on how the random respondents were identified and invited to participate. This section should also address constraints and limitations of the evaluation process and rigor. The methodology section should also include a detailed description of data collection techniques used throughout the evaluation.
- **Results:** Think about how best to organize this based on the evaluation questions. In some cases, it is helpful to organize the report against project objective, but in other cases it may make more sense to organize the report against evaluation questions.
- **Synthesis, Recommendations and Lessons Learned:** This is space for the evaluation team to think about the data and results, and make concrete recommendations for current or future project improvements/changes, pull out organization lessons learned, and generally comment on data and results. Everything presented in this section must be directly linked back to the information presented in the Results section of the report. Ideally, items discussed here will not be completely new to the reader, but rather will refer to previous discussions. Recommendations that are not directly tied to Results can be included in an Evaluator Comments section for the report.
- **Annexes:** data collection instruments in English and translation; list of stakeholder group with number and type of interactions; SOW, qualitative protocols developed and used, any data sets can be provided in electronic format, any required photos, participant profiles or other special documentation needed.

10) Follow Up

As laid out in the schedule in Section 8 of this SOW, Danielle, Amy and Martina will lead the program staff in the development of an action plan based on the findings and recommendations of the evaluation. Program staff participating in the evaluation will be responsible for presenting key findings and recommendations to the larger Mercy Corps staff and for summarizing results for informants and other stakeholders. Copies of all instruments and data used and gathered during this evaluation will be provided to Martina Bennett for use and dissemination among the Haiti team and to Gretchen Shanks for use and dissemination at headquarters.