



ROOM DOCUMENT 1.A

**JOINT DONOR EVALUATION OF PEACE BUILDING AND CONFLICT
PREVENTION ACTIVITIES IN HAITI**

This concept note has been prepared by Norway for consideration at the 7th meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 20 – 21 February 2008.

Concept note

Joint donor evaluation of peace building and conflict prevention activities in Haiti

This note presents the plans for a proposed evaluation of peace building and conflict prevention activities in Haiti. It is based on discussions during the recent planning meeting in Bern. It contains background information, a suggested focus for the evaluation and a managerial structure, as well as a suggested work plan.

Background¹

Norway invites other donors to join a planned evaluation of peace efforts in Haiti, in order to assess the cumulative effects of bilateral and multilateral assistance on the peace building process in Haiti.²

It is desirable to include in the evaluation some of the larger bilateral and multilateral actors involved in the peace efforts in Haiti to maximize relevance and strategic use of the evaluation. A coordinated effort is also in line with the spirit of the Paris declaration. It seems particularly relevant to involve the UN Mission and some key UN agencies in the evaluation, since they have such a central role in the peace efforts in Haiti.

The evaluation will be guided by the OECD DAC Guidance for evaluating conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities (2007), and feedback on its usefulness will be provided towards the end of the evaluation process.

Rationale for the timing

The rationale for the evaluation is to capitalize on the positive developments seen recently towards a reduction in armed violence and more (political) stability in Haiti (2006-2007).

Progress is vulnerable in Haiti and is frequently, as experienced through the history, followed by setbacks. It is therefore crucial that the key actors involved in supporting conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities learn lessons from the past with the view to sustain the progress currently seen.

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation could be to help the international community to learn from support to conflict prevention and peace building activities in Haiti and to inform future support.

Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation could be the following:

¹ There has been a steady increase in the number of peace-building interventions since the early 1990s. The complexity of these interventions has increased from mere peace keeping to include state- and nation-building- as well as regular development activities. After a decade of steadily increasing assistance from the International community to this type of activities (Sudan and Afghanistan are now the two countries receiving the largest amount of international assistance), a need for a more systematic assessment of what works and not in this field has arisen. Donors under the umbrella of OECD DAC have launched an initiative for more systematic evaluations in this field, to learn lessons and document what has worked and what is not working.

² Haiti has a poor human rights record and a violent political history with more than 30 military coups since its independence. The country receives considerable overseas development assistance (***) and has seen four UN peacekeeping missions come, and three go since 1990.

1. Determine how and if the international community has contributed to the recent improvements in the security situation.
2. Determine whether the bilateral and multilateral actors are on the right track to contribute to sustaining progress in Haiti.
3. Determine if there are lessons to be learnt from the previous and present peace-building experiences made in Haiti, especially concerning those by the UN, but also concerning the *interaction* between the major donors and the UN.

Scope

It is suggested that the main focus of the evaluation is interventions that are central to the conflict, as identified through a conflict analysis; a (peace-) needs mapping, and existing (if any) peace strategies. It will then be assessed how the key donors and agencies, in their interventions are relating to and contributing to these priority areas. The team should separate between short- and long term considerations and issues.

- Whether the scope should be delimited to specific priority areas deemed central to the conflict prior to selection of consultants, can be discussed as part of preparations of the ToR once donors and the UN (agencies) are on board.
- The period under evaluation could be from 2004-2008, during which the latest UN mission to Haiti was mandated by the Security Council (Resolution 1529), and significant changes in the (support to) Haiti have taken place. However, the main emphasis could be on the period from 2006 and onwards, when progress has been seen. The team could also identify lessons to be learned from the previous UN mission which was mandated in 1994 (to 1998?), to avoid repeating the same mistakes.
- Evaluation criteria³ to be used should include relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, as well as some of the additional criteria suggested in the Guidance: coordination, coherence, and coverage.
- Whether the international community pull in the same direction or whether it pulls in different directions should also be assessed through studying the various strategies and approaches of the different donors and agencies (including programme theories and underlying assumptions), as well as which coordination mechanisms are in place, and how they are being used.
- Assess what kind of M&E system is in place, and the need for adjustments to this.⁴ Recommendations should be provided regarding ways the international community contribute to conflict prevention and peacebuilding in the future.

It is assumed that several of the donors involved in Haiti have carried out evaluations of their programmes, projects and activities. An important part of the preparatory phase of the evaluation is to map existing reviews and evaluations to avoid duplication of efforts.

It can also be discussed whether a review of the portfolio of the various donors/agencies should be included in the scope of the evaluation. It could be included in the main evaluation report, or left to the individual donors/agencies to carry out if needed.⁵

³ With reference to the OECD DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management and the OECD DAC Guidance on evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding activities.

⁴ Reference could be made to Australia's experience with setting up a M&E system in Mindanao, Philippines, as presented at the OECD DAC meeting in Bern 21-22 January.

⁵ An assessment of the Norwegian engagement since 1998 will be carried out in conjunction with this evaluation but whether it will be done by the evaluation team hired to do the overall evaluation, or as a separate study, is yet to be determined.

Management arrangement

In order to manage the joint work required during the evaluation process, a mandate and a common set of principles is needed for the management of this proposed evaluation. A proposed structure for this work is outlined below.

Steering committee

Interested parties will be invited to join in a steering committee. The Steering Committee will then discuss and decide upon the Terms of Reference and the procedures to be used in the evaluation.

The evaluation could be organised in different ways. While a unitary evaluation project is to be preferred, due consideration will be paid to the needs and procedures of participating agencies. Different models could therefore be considered.

The Steering committee could also consider hiring specialised experts to provide consultancy services according to needs on evaluation methods, the Haitian context, or issues related to armed conflict.

One agency should be designated the lead agency of the evaluation. This agency's tasks include the management of the information flow during the process, organising and chairing the meetings, writing protocols from the meetings, etc.

Reference group

Donors or agencies that are involved in the peace efforts but who do not wish to commit to being a full joint member of the evaluation can participate in a reference group. Other stakeholders and involved parties whose views should be involved, such as the Haitian government, and actors subject to the evaluation could also be invited. The reference group will have an advisory mandate, and will be allowed to comment at certain stop-points in the process, such as when inception report, draft report and final report are submitted.

Proposed next steps/work plan

1. Circulation of revised ToRs⁶ to donors and agencies involved in Haiti.
2. Presentation of Concept note to donors and agencies present at the OECD DAC EVALNET-meeting in Paris 20 – 21 February 2008.
3. Telephone conference with interested parties following to the EVALNET meeting to firm up plans.
4. Scoping mission to Haiti to talk to donors, the government and involved agencies.
5. Finalise the ToR.
6. Selection of consultants, agreeing upon bidding and selection procedures.
7. Inception report.
8. Workshop on preliminary findings to ensure learning and quality control.
9. Final seminars to present the evaluation results.

⁶ Following to discussions held at the CPDC and EVALNET meeting in Bern 21 – 22 January.