Real Time Evaluation: Project EARLI Niger

RTE Team Lead:

Heather Dolphin, West Africa Regional Technical Advisor for M&E

CRS-Niger RTE Team:

Abdourhimou Adamou, CRS-Niger Manager Monitoring and Evaluation
Alto Oumarou, M&E Officer Global Fund R10 TB
Boubacar Saidou, M&E Officer CRS Program EARLI

Table of Contents

Executive Summary *i*
Background 1
Objectives 2
Status of the Program the Week of the RTE 2
Methodology 2
Findings 3
I. Appropriateness and Relevance *3*
II. Management Effectiveness *7*
III. Connectedness and Sustainability *12*
IV. Coverage *13*
Conclusions 14
Recommendations 16

Annex 1. Action Plan 17
Annex 2. SPHERE Standards Review 20
Annex 3. ABC Targeting Approach 23
Annex 4. List of persons interviewed 24
Annex 5. Itinerary 25
Annex 6. Terms of Reference for RTE 26
Annex 7. Data Collection Tools 32
Annex 8. Photo Gallery 74

Table of Figures

Table 1: Data Collection Methods 2
Table 2: Challenges & Good Practices 8
Table 3: Good Practices cont. 9
Table 4: Action Plan 17

Acronyms

CRS	Catholic Relief Services
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
Project EARLI	Emergencies Agricultural Recovery and Livelihoods Intervention in Niger
RTE	Real Time Evaluation
SOS	SOS Sahel International
ToR	Terms of Reference

Executive Summary

CRS-Niger and partner SOS Sahel International are currently intervening in Tillabery and Ouallam departments of Tillabery Region via Project EARLI (*Emergency Agriculture Recovery and Livelihoods Interventions in Niger*) to provide assistance to households in the form of cash for work and improved seeds through seed fairs. Project EARLI began in April 2012 and will continue until March 2013. This Real Time Evaluation examines the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, management, sustainability and scope of the response in an effort to provide information quickly that will benefit the remaining months of the project.

Relevance/ Appropriateness

Cash for work through land recuperation and seed fairs are providing for the immediate and intermediate needs of vulnerable residents of Tillabery Region. Cash provides food needed immediately; seeds and recuperated land will provide food in the next season. Currently there is no assistance planned for planting season so the search for financial support is underway. If this is agreed to by the donor, one pre-condition for participation in the next phase would be to first use the half-moon technique in participants' own fields in order to benefit from assistance.

The work provides equal opportunities to both men and women but women do not have the same capacity to do the work. Women must work longer hours usually when it is hotter. Because it takes women longer and there are limited tools for the work, men use the tools first and leave them for women to use later. Women reported returning in the evenings in order to complete the required number of half-moons. Project participants all agree that the cash for work activities are appropriate given their socio-cultural context with the exception of a group of Peulh women who find the work degrading to women. In response to this, participants should be reminded that this activity is not obligatory if there are other income earning opportunities available to them (this community is close to the river in Tillabery Department, which could provide alternatives).

In terms of project management processes, a regular payment schedule has not yet been achieved due to challenges with the bank and other internal processes. The quality control mechanism overseen by the extension service has not been put in place. CRS will waive its normal administrative processes to ensure the extension services have the resources they need to mobilize.

Program Management Effectiveness

To effectively secure payment to project participants, CRS has arranged to pay workers in each village in the location of their choice. CRS has contracted the services of Bank of Africa and has put in place an internal tracking system to ensure the proper documentation that will facilitate payment every other week. This internal system is not yet known by agents in the field and needs reinforcement. The bank itself is also in the process of perfecting its systems to ensure the security of its own agents and resources. The single BoA payment team for the first payment was insufficient for the number of villages and therefore payments were behind schedule. This is a concern for CRS and partner, SOS Sahel International as community members had been waiting and their reputation is a valued asset. The complaint mechanism is also just being set up and further messaging about its use are needed.

SOS is a strong partner in terms of their programming (including Cash for Work) experience. Its finance systems needed reinforcement when CRS and SOS worked together on a previous project but since then SOS has demonstrated its capacity to meet demands of CRS' finance department. Overall, the project's

response time has been rapid due in large part to the authorization from OFDA to use $300,000 to begin project activities before they made their first disbursement. CRS and SOS both were able to count on available staff who had worked on similar projects in the same zone so limited training time was required. Additional best practices are detailed in this report. Coordination at all levels and essential program support have been exceptional. M&E is a very important component so many suggestions are made in this report for tracking important information on targeting methods, spending patterns, price data and additional lessons learned. The functionality of the M&E system also needs revision to make daily and weekly data available at least every other week. CRS is taking its security protocol seriously in order to manage risk in this changing environment.

Connectedness and Sustainability

EARLI has not needed to make any programmatic changes as participants' needs have remained the same since the proposal was written. The only changes noted have been participants' increased access to credit as a result of beginning work. Once they are paid, participants will be able to meet their daily food needs. To meet their intermediate food needs, EARLI is providing seeds to provide an adequate harvest in 2012. Men and women heads of household will receive the seeds.

Land recuperation activities also provide support to meet intermediate needs for regenerative techniques to communal land. Land recuperation activities provide a measure of intermediate support by providing 1) protective measures to the environment and 2- productive measures for men and women. These measures must be communicated and communities should be encouraged to develop plans for how they will equitably use recuperated land and inputs to provide the greatest benefit to all, including the most vulnerable community members.

The cyclic nature of the disasters in this region make it clear that emergency interventions are not sufficient to bring about sustainability therefore they must be complemented and seek to complement development projects already operating in the zone. EARLI can improve by linking to such development projects in the intervention zone. CRS can advocate with state and other humanitarian actors to establish well-designed development projects in the area that address the root causes of the cyclic food emergencies.

Coverage

To determine the intervention area, CRS systematically reviewed national harvest data and collaborated with regional and departmental partners to choose villages with at least an 80% cereal deficit to benefit from the cash for work activities. Each village was allowed 100 beneficiary households regardless of the size. This has meant in small villages, everyone might benefit while in large villages, less than 10% might benefit. Households were selected using a transparent, participatory, process (See ABC Approach in Annex 3) however, some communities visited during the RTE explained how they are reaching additional households using a system of mutual aid within the villages. More information is needed about the targeting methods communities applied after using the ABC Approach. While solidarity systems are to be encouraged, if ration sizes are not large enough to provide a measure of food security, this finding should serve as a call to all stakeholders (GoN, donors, INGOs etc) to invest in a longer lasting strategy that addresses the root causes of this crisis because emergency responses are not sufficient.

Conclusion

EARLI provides a relevant response to 2600 households in Tillabery and Ouallam for both immediate and intermediate needs. Certain measures are needed however to provide more appropriate activities to

households whose members cannot perform the work without certain health risks. EARLI's coordination with project stakeholders has been excellent to date so the delay in paying the extension service to validate CFW results should be quickly resolved. Solidarity systems within communities mean that EARLI is benefiting more than 2600 households but it is not clear how much the ration sizes are being divided to benefit additional households. The M&E system should be improved to be able to capture more information on this as well as the targeting methods used in other communities, how households are spending their money and who is making the decisions on what to purchase.

Recommendations

The most time sensitive recommendations include:

- Resolve the obstacles posed by the BOA-lead payment system preventing timely payment to participants
- Integrate a witness system during each payment activity
- Provide means for transport so extension service can provide quality control of CFW activities prior to payment
- Communities must develop plans for equitable use of recuperated land and inputs, providing the greatest benefit to all, including the most vulnerable community members
- Finalize rollout of complaint mechanism and make communities aware why it exists and how to use it
- Document complaints for improving the program
- Increase interest of the population in adopting land recuperation techniques in their own fields
- Provide masks and first aid kits to protect participants from dust and potential injuries
- Find financing to 1-Cover more needs (ensure cash transfer for those without capacity to do CFW); 2-provide assistance (unconditional cash transfer) during the planting season ; Those who are eligible will be those who have installed half moons in their fields
- Communicate with OCHA regarding an evaluation delegation to determine the effects of aid to the region to date
- Prepare and implement post-distribution surveys with pertinent questions regarding targeting and use of cash

Recommendations that are important in preparation for the next phase are to:

- Increase donor's awareness of the need to have alternative activities for older residents whose health may be at risk by carrying out land recuperation activities in the month of April in Niger
- Increase the awareness of the State to take this into consideration in their national policy
- Collect information on development projects in the zone and design the next project with these links in place.
- Develop long-term development projects in Tillabery and Ouallam departments

Background

Cyclical droughts and dependency on traditional cultivation methods leaves much of Niger's population prone to food insecurity. In 2010, over half of Niger's population faced the worst food crisis in 30 years from which they have not fully recovered. A November 2011 statement from the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) highlighted that despite overall improvements in agriculture production, the consequences from the food and nutrition crisis in 2010 – in particular livestock losses, household debt levels and weakened purchasing power – have reduced the capacity of rural populations to cope with this year's production deficit, especially in the Tillabéry Region.[1]

A late start, irregular rains, and pests negatively impacted crops and pasture from June-August 2011, exposing millions to food insecurity (25% as of September).[2] The cereal production deficit is 519,639 metric tons (MT), or 13.9% of national consumption needs. The Tillabéry Region has the greatest deficit at -191,296 MT, producing only 61.9% of its 6-year average (2005-2010).[3] Ninety percent of the region's land is degraded or eroded;[4] 80% of the population is considered poor;[5] and annual rainfall is 200-300mm[6] compared to 541mm nationally.[7] The situation is exacerbated by high grain prices and lower remittances in 2011 due to sociopolitical situations in neighboring countries which increases the vulnerability of low-income households. Agro-pastoral households in this region have had to begin depending on markets to meet consumption needs without the support of normal household income.

The Government of Niger (GON) initiated an Intermediate Support Plan in October 2011, at an estimated cost of US$84.2 million. This plan was aimed to support vulnerable populations that fall victim to food insecurity as part of a national emergency response to the 2011 production deficit. The GON originally estimated that while US$21 million was currently available, another $60.7 million USD is needed to fully address the crisis.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) Niger has therefore intervened via Project EARLI to provide assistance to households in two departments in the Tillabéry Region following the 2011 drought. EARLI provides Cash-for-Work (CFW) activities for 2,600 households to recuperate degraded communal land. Activities are currently taking place and will continue through June. Beginning at the end of May, EARLI will also provide improved varieties of seeds to 7,000 households for planting. This RTE took place during the 6th week of the project and is designed to respond to evaluation questions posed regarding the Cash for Work activities in particular. Since the RTE could only be scheduled once during the project, it was determined that the Cash for Work activities were more interesting as CRS already has extensive experience and expertise with seed fairs and the previous RTE conducted in Niger responded to questions posed regarding voucher fairs.

[1] All Africa, "Niger: Half of Villages Face Food Shortage, UN Says," 18 November 2011.
[2] September 2011 National Crop Assessment.
[3] The average from 2005-2010 was 721,991MT ; this year, the region produced 446,899MT according to GON.
[4] SIG du projet PASP, GTZ 1998
[5] PDES, 2000-2004
[6] Etude sur l'Approfondissement du Diagnostic et l'Analyse des systems de Production Agro-Sylvo-Pastoraux dans le Cadre de la Mise en Oeuvre de la Strategie de Developpement Rural: Region de Tillabéri. 2004.
[7] http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=NIGER

Objectives

This evaluation has 4 objectives:

1. Document the results achieved as of the data collection date ;
2. Provide a project review and recommendations for improving implementation
3. Identify good practices and lessons learned in this response to use more widely.
4. Promote a learning approach within CRS by reporting and communicating the outcome of the RTE beyond CRS Niger to the agency worldwide and to partners.

Status of the Program the Week of the RTE

At the time of this evaluation, Project EARLI was in the 6th week of a 12 month project, focused on the Cash for Work activities. Work had begun two weeks earlier and the first payment was scheduled to take place during data collection. Although data collection would ideally have been done after the first payment, the RTE was able to make certain observations that were not already obvious to the EARLI team. In addition, the RTE was still able to respond to questions posed in the TOR related to the project's relevance, management, sustainability and targeting. Project EARLI management plans to use the results of this evaluation to improve the cash for work activities that continue through June 2012.

Methodology

The RTE is designed to provide rapid feedback to the program implementers, permitting learning and improvements to take place in the response operations. This RTE was planned and carried out based on questions presented in the terms of reference. The main areas of inquiry were: Relevance/ Appropriateness, Program Management Effectiveness, Sustainability and Relationships and Coverage. Tools were developed to answer these questions and a sampling method was established for the various data sources. The RTE team collected qualitative data from project participants, non-participants, community leaders, the extension services for the Department of the Environment, the local Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), the CRS Emergencies Coordinator, the M&E and finance officers for EARLI, and the EARLI Coordinator and M&E Officer from partner, SOS Sahel International. Following data collection, RTE members shared preliminary data with CRS and SOS staff in a half day workshop at which time the recommendations were agreed upon. The action plan was generated following the workshop.

In addition to addressing the questions posed in the Terms of Reference, the RTE also responded to supplemental questions posed by the CRS Emergencies Coordinator related to the guarantee of payment for project participants, the security of funds, the capacity of partner organization SOS Sahel International, the effectiveness of the CFW training and whether the number of households targeted was actually attained. Results of that review are integrated into this evaluation report.

Table 1: Data Collection Methods

Method	Respondents	#
Focus Group Discussions	Women Participants	5 groups
	Men Participants	5 groups
	Non- Participants (Men and Women)	5 groups
Direct Observation	Dai-Kaina Payment Site, Tillabery Department	1 payment site
Key Interviews	UN Representative, Office for the Coordination of	1 official

	Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Tillabéry	
	Village Chiefs	5 authorities
	Extension Service, Dept. of the Environment, Tillabery	1 official
Staff Interviews	CRS Staff	2 staff
	SOS Sahel International Staff	2 staff

Sample Selection Methods

Villages and village chiefs were chosen based on an initial random selection of Project EARLI villages in each department. Six villages were identified, 3 in the department of Ouallam and 3 in Tillabery. The 3 villages identified in Tillabery however did not pass a security clearance so another random selection was done after all insecure locations were eliminated. The following 3 villages were retained: Sona-Bella, Djadja Peulh and Dai-Bery. In Ouallam, the following 3 villages were selected: Guinao-Bongou, Guineao Kokarba and Tollo. Due to the travel time required, visits to only two villages in Ouallam were possible, however the villages retained were the two that were furthest from each other and were supervised by two different supervisors in order to ensure some heterogeneity in the data. Men and women project participants were randomly selected from the list of eligible households. Non-participants were selected from available household members residing in every neighborhood or in diverse sections of the village.

Findings

Relevance/Appropriateness

Food insecurity in Ouallam and Tillabery has resulted in first, a critical need for food for nourishment and to prevent out-migration and second, a critical need for improved seeds to provide a sufficient harvest in 2012. The project was conceived based on secondary data from the 2011 Agricultural Campaign Report, coordination meetings with the Regional Coordinating Food Crisis Cell and analysis supplied by the Office for Disaster Assistance (OFDA). According to all stakeholders, EARLI's interventions provided an appropriate response.

According to the community leaders interviewed, EARLI is relevant because 1) it satisfies food needs as well as provides training in the Essential Nutrition Actions which have kept children nourished and in school 2) men have returned or not migrated 3) it will permit production of land when the rains begin in May and 4) the recuperation of degraded land could be designated for women's supplementary production.

All respondents including project participants, community leaders, the local UN representative have agreed that Project EARLI has responded to the most critical needs. Had this RTE happened later in the life of the project, it would have provided some analysis of prices in the area following cash payments to determine whether CFW activities are contributing to price hikes and if so to what extent? This should be part of the project's on-going M&E system.

EARLI's response provides the required caloric intake for 2600 households but is insufficient given the remaining needs and remaining vulnerable population. CRS is part of a larger coordination effort to mitigate gaps and duplications, but still, more resources will be needed to sustain the work required for planting when the Cash for Work activities end.

While the project's design is precisely appropriate for the needs, its implementation can improve to better meet participants' needs. In particular, a regular schedule for payment needs to be established and respected. The first payment was delayed due to a number of factors: 1) the bank had not resolved concerns about security prior to scheduled payment dates and prevented its timely delivery. 2) A single team from the bank is not sufficient to cover 26 villages on schedule; 3) The bank did not fully appreciate that delays in the payment schedule had serious ramifications for project participant satisfaction and to the image of CRS and SOS Sahel; 4) SOS agents did not have a clear process to follow for submission of necessary support documents to ensure timely payment.

This payment delay is an important issue because a 2 week wait prior to payment is already long for people who are hungry and who are doing hard labor. Although some participants were unsatisfied with a 2 week payment schedule, others felt that waiting 2 weeks had the advantage of a large enough payment to purchase a significant quantity of provisions, whereas a single week's payment would not. Regardless, at a minimum, the first payment should take place after the first week of work and continue on a bi-monthly basis after that.

Although some project participants were unsatisfied with the amount of the payment, it is in line with government standards. More messaging is needed to communicate that the project provides assistance, not employment.

The RTE team found that certain communities are 7-10 km from a market where they can use their cash payments. For better access to markets, EARLI can encourage communities to advocate that local leaders facilitate an effective transport solution that either permits a group purchase for an entire village or group of villages and affords community members access to government subsidized cereals or offers a link with communities that have cereal banks and who would sell to EARLI participants.

Flexibility

EARLI has demonstrated its flexibility to meet needs identified during project conception and implementation. For example, the project is prepared to change the payment from cash to vouchers if securing cash proves too difficult. Also, in the planning stage, electronic payment options were considered but discarded when analysis revealed that the costs were prohibitive. Finally, after learning from past experience that the traditional varieties cannot meet the same need, SOS now ensures the use of improved seed varieties in its interventions.

CFW Training

The Dpt. of the Environment provided a single day training to CRS, SOS and the (26) Management Committees on the different types of land restoration techniques. It was a practical learning exercise on the same site where the project participants would restore land. Each participant plotted and made half-moons with the correct depth dimensions. SOS staff and committee members were then prepared to teach and supervise others. Project participants received a step down training from the Management Committee members on the land conservation technique and have been supervised by committee members and SOS staff since work began the first week of April. Non participants have also learned the technique by observing participants work. The Dept. of the Environment has made just one single visit after the training to each site but has not returned to know whether their guidance has been followed. Payments were made to participants even though their work was not approved by an extension officer.

In order to ensure the extension officers are performing their supervisory tasks within the EARLI project, CRS needs to make available the funds needed for the Dept. of the Environment to mobilize. CRS

requires partners such as the extension service to solicit funds separately from CRS but in this case, since they have not yet solicited the funds, CRS needs to be proactive in providing them.

SPHERE Standards

EARLI has met most standards set by SPHERE: See ANNEX 3 for details on how well EARLI met each relevant SPHERE standard. The discussion that follows presents the areas where more improvement is needed.

Core Standard 6: Aid worker performance

Humanitarian agencies provide appropriate management, supervisory and psychosocial support, enabling aid workers to have the knowledge, skills, behavior and attitudes to plan and implement an effective humanitarian response with humanity and respect.

The agents intervening on behalf of the project have been trained within the respective CRS and SOS training formats in collaboration with the extension services, which are competent on all necessary aspects of the project implementation for which the agents will be responsible. Extension services are also expected to monitor these activities. There is however a lack of resources on the part of extension services (Dept. of the Environment- Tillabery) to ensure the necessary supervision of the sites since the beginning of the project. This situation is due to the fact that they have not made the administrative request as CRS' procedures require. However, it is CRS' responsibility to ensure that the project functions appropriately and therefore CRS' responsibility to ensure each partner has the necessary resources.

Food security and nutrition assessment standard 1: Food security

Where people are at increased risk of food insecurity, assessments are conducted using accepted methods to understand the type, degree and extent of food insecurity, to identify those most affected and to define the most appropriate response.

The initial assessment of food insecurity was done based on secondary data that came from the 2011 Agricultural Campaign Report, coordination meetings with the Regional Coordinating Food Crisis Cell and analysis supplied by the Office for Disaster Assistance (OFDA). The triangulation of national and regional data from multiple sources including national and international stakeholders assured national consensus around the issue. What was not carried out was a discussion at the local level to identify the most appropriate response. Although the Cash for Work is accessible, it is not the most appropriate for those in poor health or with limited capacity.

To identify those most affected, a targeting exercise was carried out at a department level with technical partner, the extension service and again at the local level using participatory methods to ensure transparent and inclusive targeting by the communities themselves with support from their local community leadership.

Food security – Cash and voucher transfers

Standard 1: Access to available goods and services

Cash and vouchers are considered ways to address basic needs and to protect and re-establish livelihoods.

Cash permits a response to essential needs for food, however the quantity is very insufficient to cover the needs of the targeted communities.

Food security – Livelihoods Standard 1: Primary production

Primary production mechanisms are protected and supported.

Land restoration will effectively benefit agricultural activities however there isn't a policy within the project that links the emergency response to development projects currently underway.

Food security – Livelihoods Standard 2: Income and employment

Where income generation and employment are feasible livelihood strategies, women and men have equal access to appropriate income-earning opportunities.

EARLI'S income generating activities (land recuperation) are rightfully accessible to men as well as to women. However, the physical capacity of women makes the work more difficult for women compared to men. Note that April in Niger is the hottest month of the year when the land is most compacted and difficult to dig. At the work sites visited by the RTE team, certain men go to the site and finish early. Most people observed on the sites in the heat of the day were women. They told us that because the work is more difficult, women work longer hours and may need to return in the afternoon when the temperature has decreased in order to finish digging the same number of half-moons as the men. There are no alternative jobs for women, regardless of their physical condition. Women may work longer than men but receive the same pay. Both donors and the GoN need to consider how to provide appropriate work for women that gives them equal pay for the time worked.

Food security – Livelihoods Standard 3: Access to markets

The disaster-affected population's safe access to market goods and services as producers, consumers and traders is protected and promoted.

From a geographic point of view, the market access varies by locality. Certain villages are far from a market and without appropriate transportation infrastructure making market access difficult without paying a significantly higher cost. The cost is considered too high even in locations where food is accessible.

Socio-Cultural Context

Community leaders, CRS' partner, SOS Sahel International and the majority of project participants have indicated that EARLI's activities are acceptable within their socio-cultural context. Peulh women represent the minority voice that find hard labor for women to be degrading and contrary to their social norms. In response, SOS staff note that Peulh are a minority in a zone where Cash for Work has been used for years. The response from the Peulh women may be an indication that there are alternative income generating activities accessible to them, due to their geographic location near the river. This may indicate the need to reinforce messages to communities that these activities are only designed to assist them during this period of drought and that they are not obliged to accept the assistance.

In another instance, CRS has analyzed the socio-cultural context related to the question of gender norms and in this case rejected a proposition to designate women to receive payment for work done by another member of her household. Even though a woman may make decisions about what to buy in the market, if she did not earn it but collects the money, this could create conflict within the household. Therefore this RTE highlights other opportunities to promote women's development through trainings in

essential nutrition actions and land recuperation techniques. Each of these topics can improve livelihood and nutritional outcomes at the household level. The project can also promote planning at the community level for equitable access to recuperated lands for production activities by women.

Program and Management Effectiveness

Security of Resources

In order to secure the cash payments and to avoid this additional management task, CRS chose to use a bank rather than its own staff to distribute payments. To ensure the safety of project participants, CRS has arranged for payments to take place in every village where the community has designated the payment location. However, the bank has not been confident of its own security measures since payment have begun in Tillabery region which has become increasingly insecure. This concern was not identified and remedied prior to the payment delivery date so it has caused a delay while the bank considers how to increase security for themselves and for the funds. The number of teams making payments is also insufficient for the number of villages that receive payments. CRS is now considering changing banks or adding another bank in order to ensure the payments are made reliably and on schedule. CRS is also considering returning to vouchers if it turns out that securing cash is too problematic.

Guaranteed Payment

In order to guarantee payment to project participants, SOS agents supply to the SOS Project coordinator a payment sheet with the names and amounts owed to each eligible project participant within 24 hours of the last day worked. The SOS coordinator delivers the lists to CRS who in turn provides the lists and a check to the bank within 48 hours before the payment date. The payment distribution team from the bank is accompanied by CRS agents to the villages. Once all project participants in a given village are paid, the bank representative provides CRS the list of project participants who have received payment. Although the data collection tools are not yet finished, CRS will begin conducting surveys immediately following the payment to assess the payment activity including the level of project participant satisfaction.

Another challenge related to ensuring payment is the confusion on the part of SOS agents regarding the process and timeline for processing the paperwork necessary to ensure project participants were paid. Communities were also misinformed by SOS agents about payment dates. As a result, they were left waiting for a number of days at a time. This is a serious problem for CRS' and SOS' image in the communities. The payment process should be documented and disseminated for all agents.

SOS Capacity

SOS Sahel International fights against desertification and works to increase production. SOS has substantial experience in food security and environmental protection. While doing an evaluation of possible partner organizations, CRS identified SOS as one capable of carrying out Cash for Work programs. Programming expertise in general is their strength.

Overall SOS enjoys employee satisfaction in terms of logistics, human resources and finance operations. SOS staff appreciate the flexibility of SOS' administrative policies that ensure financial, human resources and logistics support is provided in short time. The program coordinator and field agents also note the excellent support they receive from their superiors to identify solutions to the challenges they face in the field.

SOS and CRS previously partnered together on another CRS food security intervention, VOICE. At that time, CRS found the need to provide additional orientation and support to SOS's finance team regarding meeting CRS' requirements, such as how to justify expenses. SOS has responded well to this orientation and has not had additional problems meeting CRS' finance expectations. In addition, SOS has a full time accountant dedicated to the project. CRS will carry out a new orientation session for Project EARLI with SOS. The M&E Coordinator will schedule this in collaboration with CRS and SOS Finance. Overall, SOS has the experience and expertise necessary to carry out activities in the field. Areas for improvement include documentation and communication of procedures related to payments however SOS depends on CRS for an orientation on the global payment procedure.

Factors Contributing to a Fast Response

CRS was able to implement quickly as a result of a number of factors: 1) CRS received authorization from OFDA to begin using $300,000 of the $1 million grant to initiate project activities. 2) Qualified staff were available who had worked on similar projects implemented by CRS (ADVANCE, VOICE) and SOS (VOICE) in the same zone, so less time was required for orientation and training. Since staff were familiar with the activities and with the organizations, their activities had greater value sooner. 3) As SOS has experience working in the zone, they have developed relationships with the departmental and local level authorities which greatly facilitates their support in terms of technical support from extension services and access to populations through local and traditional authorities. 4) Planning undertaken by CRS and SOS has facilitated a smooth project start-up; 5) Communication between CRS and SOS has been open, fluid and effective. 6) Collaboration with the Extension Service (Dept. of the Environment) has also been effective.

Factors Preventing a Faster Response

CRS might have signed 2 weeks earlier had there been better communication between CRS and SOS. At the moment the contract was ready for SOS's signature, the SOS representative had just left Niger for 2 weeks. With the exception of this delay, no other set-backs were reported.

Table 2 : Challenges and Best Practices

Challenges	Best Practice
1) The needs are extensive. While the project provides for caloric needs, health-related and other needs are not addressed by this project. 2) The number of vulnerable people the project can assist leaves many others unassisted and vulnerable.	1) As resources are limited, systems of solidarity should be encouraged. 2) Always provide a cash transfer to a small percent of the population who are not able to work (elderly and disabled residents).
3) For some, available work activities are too strenuous	3) Alternative tasks should be available that are reasonable and appropriate for the capacity of both men and women, including those with limited physical capacity.
4) Unclear destination use of recuperated land	4) Identify with communities the most strategic, long-term benefit of recuperated land given significant investments made to date.
5) For an undernourished person	5) When designing the next cash for work project, arrange to

who is doing hard labor, 2 weeks is a long time to wait before receiving the first payment.	provide the first payment after 1 week of work to provide sustenance for those who are critically undernourished and who are performing hard labor.
6) Compared with those who dig half-moons, committee members work longer hours and have more responsibility to verify work competed and to prepare the following days work.	6) Because this is community led work and because the national policy does not permit some members to be paid more than others regardless of the nature of the work, it is important to recognize the dedication, the additional hours worked and the community service spirit of committee members in a public forum like a general assembly. At the same time, this serves to motivate others to be leaders in their own domain.
7) Certain project participants do not follow quality standards when performing the work and don't accept direction from the management committee members.	7) Increase the awareness of project participants regarding the role of committee members to verify the quality of the work. If participants do not want to provide the required level of quality work, they can be excluded from the project.
8) Insufficient tools for efficiently carrying out the land recuperation activities.	8) The solidarity between participants is a good practice that should be reinforced. 9) Beyond a minimum amount of tools, it is up to the community to optimize their use and organize their schedules in a way that will facilitate access to the appropriate tools at needed times. More message reinforcement is needed to explain that this project is facilitating nutritional sustenance through natural resource recuperation, not to supply communities with tools.
9) Some villages are so remote that CRS and SOS need guides to visit them.	10) When this is required, the project should consider finding the appropriate budget to cover these costs.
10) Insufficient number of masks to protect against dust and no first aid kits for injuries.	11) CRS will make these available.

Table 3: More Best Practices

More Best Practices
12) CRS' ABC targeting method: This approach provides an open, transparent, participatory process for identifying the most vulnerable households in a community. This RTE found multiple cases in which the communities altered the method by adding less vulnerable families into the most vulnerable category, reducing the rations overall. This should not be discouraged as this access to support through community redistribution activities helps to re-establish individual and community self-respect and identity, decrease vulnerability and enhance resilience. 13) Assess results using M&E tools It is important however to use M&E tools to learn how widespread this is and how this has impacted households. It is also a call to the government and all humanitarian actors that the solution offered

is insufficient and until the real causes are addressed, emergency assistance will continue to be insufficient.
14) Assume a leadership role in the coordination effort among humanitarian actors in the zone.
15) Capitalize on the availability of trained and experienced staff through volunteer arrangements that keep them linked to the organization and flexible staffing procedures that uses current CRS staff to cover temporary (2 week) staffing gap
16) Budget for the perdiem expenses for supervisors before they move into the field
17) Create separate budget lines by Strategic Objective for future OFDA projects
18) Capitalize on the CFW opportunity to deliver longer-lasting educational messages on relevant topics such as land recuperation techniques and Essential Nutrition Actions that can contribute to lasting solutions to the problems addressed through the project.
19) Effective field organization through knowledge of the zone and active support to activities and staff in the field.

Complaint Mechanism

The process to set up the complaint mechanism is not yet finished. Information was beginning to be shared with the 26 sites on Thursday April 19. When data collection began two days later, only 2 villages out of the 5 visited understood that communities have the possibility of voicing their dissatisfaction with the project activities. However this is because such a mechanism existed in other previous projects. When it is functional, the complaint mechanism will consist of CRS staff, unrelated to project EARLI who will take calls and meet on a regular basis to decide how to resolve complaints. For now, the information about the existence of this complaint mechanism and how it works must be shared. It will be critical that the complaints mechanism documents the complaints and how they are addressed so that the results can be shared in and outside CRS and used to improve project designs throughout the sector.

Essential Supports

All CRS and SOS staff interviewed are confident that there is sufficient staff who are capable and well trained to effectively implement the project. CRS is particularly satisfied to have found temporary staff within CRS to count vouchers during the seed fairs. This will not require additional hiring while preserving the budget. In terms of logistics, there are also sufficient motor scooters for the agents to carry out their work and reasonable criteria for determining the agents who are eligible to receive them. There is sufficient staff and budget to carry out the communication and branding activities for the project. T-shirts and hats were available for the RTE team during data collection. Although the (2) signs had been produced, they had not yet been installed in the field.

In terms of budget, there is a need to resolve a shortage of funds for gas to permit both the SOS Coordinator and M&E Officer to more effectively carry out monitoring tasks. To resolve this issue, a conversation with CRS should take place in the near future. The second issue is related to CRS' administrative procedures. SOS has found they present seemingly unnecessary obstacles when trying to resolve urgent issues in the field. SOS would like to better understand these procedures and possibly make some suggestions to CRS on how their systems might be improved.

Coordination

A coordinated process was followed among state and humanitarian actors to ensure that there was no duplication of services by intervening actors. EARLI's intervention also corresponds with the National Coordination Framework which provided direction on the appropriate interventions in designated

months of the year. (June- Sept 2011: Cash transfers; February- May 2012: Unconditional food/cash transfers (CFW, FFW); February-September 2012: Sales of cereals at moderate prices). OCHA has called CRS a leader in terms of coordination of emergency responses.

The Dpt. of the Environment's extension service has also noted appreciation for the fact that CRS has respected their role as technical service coordinator to ensure effective coverage of gaps and management of the work being carried out by all partners (Dept. of the Environment, the governor, Red Cross, and NGOs). The RTE did however, find a gap in services provided by the extension services. They have not yet completed CRS' administrative procedures to receive financial support from CRS in exchange for carrying out the quality control of the work sites every 2 weeks. Therefore, CRS needs to provide the necessary resources to facilitate their mobilization. However, this will require additional follow through to ensure there are no additional obstacles preventing them from acting. They report having the human resources to do the supervision and it is believed that it is at the administrative level where there are certain obstacles.

CRS' Emergencies manager notes that coordination within the project is also working well. CRS and SOS Sahel meet every 2 weeks and more frequently if needed; CRS participates with 4 other INGOs who coordinate the advocacy of humanitarian actions so CRS is aware of all humanitarian interventions at a national level. Because CRS also participates in the food security cluster, they can be sure they know who is doing what where to avoid duplication. In terms of coordinating the services provided to project participants, the project was designed to provide CFW to villages who hadn't received it previously and seed fairs to those that had already received CFW in the past.

SOS notes excellent communication as well with all its partners including CRS, local authorities including the governor, mayor, Canton and Village Chief. These excellent relationships ensure that when there are problems at the village level, authorities do not hesitate to keep SOS informed.

However there is a large gap—support to 2,600 households doesn't begin to cover the need. In addition to the vulnerable, the crisis has made even "well-off farmers" vulnerable. Those who generate revenue through activities other than agriculture are less affected by the crisis but since 90% of the population depends on rain-fed agriculture for their nutritional needs, this group is in the minority. To cover the gap, CRS has found $500,000 from Caritas Australia, and continues to look for additional funds to permit residents to stay in their villages and cultivate their fields once the planting season begins.

M&E

EARLI has sufficient M&E staff (1 officer for both SOS and CRS), agents (15 for 26 sites) and supervisors (2 per department (4 total)) to provide the required project monitoring. A package of tools has been developed and was reviewed by the RTE team. With a few small modifications, these tools meet the initial data collection needs.

For the M&E tools that are not yet developed, adding specific questions will be of significant value. Post-distribution surveys can find out about the targeting method applied in the remaining villages, were the participants satisfied with the alternate targeting methods and from their perspective were the most vulnerable members chosen? Also important is, who in the household spends the cash? Who decides what to buy and what is purchased? In addition, data should be collected on market prices before and after the payments to determine the extent to which CFW is increasing food prices in the region.

Monthly reporting formats can capture additional lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the course of the project. Data collection tools for the seed fairs are also under development.

A data collection and analysis plan exists for EARLI. Although data are collected daily and synthesized weekly, they are not available to CRS except on a monthly basis. Given the need to know completion rates in order to make payments every two weeks, this data should be available at a minimum every 2 weeks.

Risk Management

The zone of intervention is located along the border with Mali which is currently experiencing a rebellion in which armed bandits often attack the population suddenly. CRS therefore has taken the following precautions to ensure the security of personnel and project participants: 1) Payments to beneficiaries are assured by a bank rather than by CRS personnel to protect against bandit attacks; 2) CRS agents must respect security instructions that are given by the Security Committee of the UN system; 3) In the intervention zone, CRS and SOS agents must collaborate with and follow instructions provided by GoN security forces; 4) CRS and SOS agents must respect the authorized hours of circulation: 7am-6pm. In addition, project managers should remain vigilant and stay up to date on the latest information and updates from the counsel of the Security Cluster of the UN System.

Sustainability and Relationships

The evaluation asked whether EARLI was responsive to the changing needs of project participants. According to beneficiaries, the only change in their needs is that since they have started working, they can now purchase with credit. However, the delay in payment without any information to communities raises concern about discouraging project participants and tarnishing CRS' image.

Since project participants' needs have remained the same as when the project was designed, the intervention is still entirely appropriate. People have returned from migration once they learned that Cash for Work would be available and students have been able to stay in school. Once planting season begins and Cash for Work activities end, the seed fairs will provide seeds for planning. At that point, project participants' time will be consumed with planting activities so ending Cash for Work activities will be appropriate. At that point the challenge for the population will be how to support themselves until they are able to harvest the seeds they plant. To cover this future gap, funding is needed to provide a cash transfer intervention.

Link to Development

EARLI precisely meets the immediate needs of the population, and also provides for the intermediate needs by providing seeds for an adequate 2012 harvest. Men and women heads of household will receive the seeds.

Land recuperation activities also provide a measure of intermediate support by providing 1) protective measures to the environment, notably grasses for pasture and erosion control and 2- productive measures, including high-value grasses for livestock pasture and provisions for production by women. All of these inputs will hasten the fertility process. Communities however were unaware of these planned inputs. Therefore this must be communicated and they should be encouraged to develop plans for how they will equitably use recuperated land and inputs to provide the greatest benefit to all, notably for the most vulnerable community members.

Finally, there is not a link to development projects that could help end the cycle of emergency responses. This is the second RTE to make the same observation to CRS Niger regarding interventions in the same area. Still, more consistent, strategic interventions in the area are needed to address the root causes of the crisis. EARLI still has the opportunity to link land recuperation activities to longer-term development activities through its partnerships with the state and other NGOs .

Coverage

The decision about the location of the intervention was determined based on the 2011 Agriculture Campaign Report issued by the government of Niger. Tillabery was the neediest region with a gap in cereal production of -191,296 MT, producing only 61.9% of its 6-year average (2005-2010).[8] To identify the beneficiary villages, CRS first coordinated with the Regional Food Crisis Cell to identify the villages where other NGOs were not already working. Next, a team of CRS, SOS Sahel and Dept. of the Environment members identified the villages that had at least an 80% production deficit and where a common land recuperation site was available. Two thousand six hundred project participants were targeted and 26 land recuperation sites were identified and are currently participating in CFW activities and payment. To keep things simple, it was decided that each site could benefit 100 households. However this decision did not take into account the size of the village. If a village only had 96 households, more than everyone would benefit while a village with 1000 households would only assist 10% of its residents. According to Mr. Diambeidou Biga, the OCHA representative in Tillabery, resources are insufficient to cover the needs of this crisis. Therefore a better method would be to choose a uniform percentage of people eligible in each village to more effectively diminish gaps in aid. CRS is aware that this was not the correct choice but was not able to change the designated number per community because communities had already chosen eligible households.

In order to select which 100 households would benefit, CRS trained SOS staff to use a participatory household targeting approach called the ABC Approach (See Annex 3). This is an open transparent, participatory process for identifying the most vulnerable households in a community. There are a couple weaknesses in the system, particularly if the list used to select beneficiaries is not updated to include non-permanent residents and exclude households that live too far away to arrive to the site each day and work. It must also be noted that regardless of the village visited, the RTE team found community-initiated self-help mechanisms that effectively re-distributed aid so that more people will benefit with smaller proportions of CRS' assistance. In one community, for every household selected, a neighbor's household was assigned who would also work on the site and receive half of the payment. In another community, the cash is equally distributed among all residents. More investigation is needed into the targeting method used in the other villages and participants' satisfaction with it. For the communities visited as part of the RTE, it seems that the rations calculated for each person were not followed. While this is important to verify, it is also worthwhile noting that support to the community's own self-help mechanisms is an important aspect of promoting community resiliency. The SPHERE standards recognize self-help as a cross-cutting theme for humanitarian sector interventions to bear in mind:

> "Community-led initiatives contribute to psychological and social well-being through restoring dignity and a degree of control to disaster-affected populations. Access to social and financial (…) support through (…) community activities helps to re-establish individual and community self-respect and identity, decrease vulnerability and enhance resilience."

[8] The average from 2005-2010 was 721,991MT ; this year, the region produced 446,899MT according to GON.

If community-wide re-distribution happens consistently in all villages, that would mean that few beneficiaries actually consume the ration sizes intended for them by the project design. However, rather than discouraging the mutual support that solidarity systems provide, this finding should be interpreted as a call to the government and all humanitarian actors that the solution offered is insufficient and until the real causes are addressed, emergency assistance will continue to be inadequate.

Assets and Needs of all groups

The targeting system described above met with the satisfaction of all project participants as well as non participants with whom we spoke. All agreed that the most vulnerable have not only been targeted but they are receiving assistance. We asked participants to identify the assets and needs of each group in the community (men, women, children, elderly and disabled) to find out if the project is responding to the priority needs of vulnerable groups as well. With the exception of children and the elderly, who have specialized needs for more nutrient dense foods (including CSB for infants) essentially, everyone shares the same priority need for food. The intervention is therefore responding effectively to all groups, since cash gives them the possibility of purchasing the foods that meet households' special requirements. Each community identified different assets but they were complementary to the kinds of assistance that is being provided: project participants supply the fields, garden beds, tools, labor, water in some cases, but lack the nourishment for today and the seeds for tomorrow. Some mentioned also a need for more half-moons! Others cited a water source.

Conclusions

EARLI's response is targeted to the priority needs of the population. Cash meets the current need for sustenance while land recuperation activities serve the population's intermediate term needs for more productive land for planting. Improved seeds to be provided beginning at the end of May will likewise meet the population's next most immediate need for food following the 2012 harvest. The priority needs of not just men and women but also infants, the elderly and disabled are addressed using a cash for work and cash transfer intervention (3-5% of the rations are reserved for cash transfer to beneficiaries who cannot work). With cash, households can purchase the unique kinds of food required for the members of that household who may have special diet requirements. Children have been able to stay in school as a result of the intervention and there is the possibility that the recuperated land could provide productive land for women. Communities must next develop plans for how they will equitably use recuperated land and inputs to provide the greatest benefit to all, including the most vulnerable community members.

All participants agreed the work is more strenuous for women, taking them longer to complete the work than men. Some older women and women with hypertension said the work is too strenuous, others said they were quite capable. Special considerations need to be made for both men and women whose health conditions make them incapable of doing the work. Donors and the GoN need to revisit the requirements of 3 half-moons for 1000f/ day. For some members of the communities, participating in the project represents a risk to their health however alternative tasks such as trash clean up would bring important value to the community. While only 3-5% of the population is eligible to receive assistance without working, alternative tasks that bring value to the community should be provided to community members who cannot safely perform the land recuperation activities or the number of half moons per day might be adjusted for those with exceptional health conditions. To assist, the project will supply the sites with first aid kits and masks for workers. However, no additional tools are recommended. Since the objective of the project is to increase access to food, not tools, messages to communities should be to improve coordination for optimum use of available tools. The complaint mechanism available to

participants was not functional during the week of RTE data collection but its existence was being announced in each community. Documenting the complaints and how they are resolved will be valuable not only to ensure participant satisfaction but also for future project design.

The extension service is not currently performing the quality control measures required prior to payment. CRS will facilitate the administrative process in order to ensure they have the resources they need to take on their assigned responsibilities immediately.

There exists a concern for certain communities that live far from a market and who may have to incur additional transport costs. This creates an opportunity for community leadership to find collective solutions to bring cereals to the community at a reduced cost. There is also an opportunity to increase recognition of the efforts of management committee members. Some committee members have asked for a larger stipend due to the longer hours and greater responsibility they have in preparing and validate others' work. Since this is not possible without contradicting National Cash for Work guidelines, more work can be done to recognize their efforts in lieu of payment such as public appreciation in a general assembly for example.

The two week payment period is long for those who are malnourished and performing hard labor. While this is manageable after the participants have received their first payment, it is more difficult initially. Fortunately, many have benefitted from credit in their community from merchants who trust CRS will pay them. However this obligation to repay the credit makes the late payments particularly troublesome for CRS and its partner, SOS Sahel International, as it threatens the NGOs' images. Resolving the problems that have created delays in payment are a top priority. Some of the solutions include selecting a different bank, supplementing the current bank with another, or perhaps CRS taking on the task. Each possibility is currently under review. Finally, there is a need to clarify for SOS agents the internal payment procedures to make sure all necessary documentation is in order to facilitate payment by the bank.

The process of selecting the intervention locations was well coordinated and used as its basis state directives and a systematic review of secondary data, triangulated with data on regional and departmental level gaps. The number of households targeted in each village was not however proportional to the size of the village, resulting in an uneven distribution of assistance within villages in which everyone in a small village benefitted while only a small percentage of vulnerable people in a large village did. To select households, a participatory and transparent approach was used (ABC Approach, see Annex 2). However, even though the most vulnerable households were reported to CRS and SOS, many communities in fact used a system of solidarity which allows more than 100 households per village to benefit from the assistance.

While this means that individuals are not receiving the ration sizes intended for them, it also means that more than 2600 households are benefiting. It also should be interpreted as an indication that reflects what the state and OCHA have also said, which is that large gaps exist in the coverage of this food crisis in this region. The 2011 Agriculture Report shows clearly the enormous deficits in production in this region. With the exception of the urban center of Niamey with its high population and only marginal production, Tillabery represents the region with the largest production gap. While seeds represent an intermediate solution and women's access to productive land could provide some relief from food insecurity in the medium term, what is called for is a long-term strategic plan. It is important to note that this is part of a cyclic pattern. Ouallam department has had a food deficit for 14 out of the past 14

years. Tillabéry has had food deficits for 11 years out of the past 14[i9]. Emergency interventions are not sufficient to resolve the causes of the production deficits in the region. Longer term, strategic thinking is needed on a national scale.

There is excellent coordination among both partners and all stakeholders and they recognize CRS' leadership in this area. SOS Sahel is also recognized for their programming expertise. Weaknesses in finance has been overcome since VOICE although additional discussion is needed between CRS and SOS regarding a budgetary issue related to monitoring and clarifying and possibly improving CRS' administrative procedures. The authorization from OFDA to begin spending up to $300,000 greatly facilitated a fast response.

The M&E tools were reviewed and modified and suggestions provided for capturing important information on participant perception of targeting methods, how cash is spent by who and overall project satisfaction. Data should also be collected on market prices before and after the payments to determine the extent to which CFW is increasing food prices in the region. Finally, the data collection and analysis system needs to be agile enough to provide synthesized data at least every 2 weeks.

Recommendations

(See also Annex 1 Action Plan below.)
The most time sensitive recommendations include:

- Resolve the obstacles posed by the BOA-lead payment system preventing timely payment to participants
- Integrate a witness system during each payment activity
- Provide means for transport so extension service can provide quality control of CFW activities prior to payment
- Communities must develop plans for equitable use of recuperated land and inputs, providing the greatest benefit to all, including the most vulnerable community members
- Finalize rollout of complaint mechanism and make communities aware of why it exists and how to use it
- Document complaints for improving the program
- Increase interest of the population in adopting land recuperation techniques in their own fields
- Provide masks and first aid kits to protect participants from dust and potential injuries
- Find financing to 1-Cover more needs (ensure cash transfer for those without capacity to do CFW); 2-provide assistance (unconditional cash transfer) during the planting season ; Those who are eligible will be those who have installed half moons in their fields.
- Communicate with OCHA regarding an evaluation delegation to determine the effects of aid to the region to date
- Prepare and implement post-distribution surveys with targeting and use of cash questions

Recommendations that are important in preparation for the next phase are to:

- Increase donor's awareness of the need to have alternative activities for older residents whose health may be at risk by carrying out land recuperation activities in the month of April in Niger
- Increase the awareness of the State to take this into consideration in their national policy

[9] Real Time Evaluation Project ADVANCE Niger. Dolphin, Heather; Abderahamane Bamba, Pape Said Coly. October, 2010

- Collect information on development projects in the zone and design the next project with these links in place
- Develop development projects in Tillabery and Ouallam

Action	Person Responsable	Due date
Payment		
• Resolve the obstacles posed by the BOA-lead payment system that are preventing timely payment to participants	CRS Pgm Mgr	Now
• Identify a regular schedule that allows participants to plan their activities, motivate communities and preserve the image of CRS/SOS.	CRS Pgm Mgr	7 May
• Formalize a written payment procedure and share with all actors	SOS Pgm Manager	7 May
Integrate a witness system by community leaders and management committee members during each payment activity.	CRS Pgm Mgr/ Supervisors	Next payment
• Provide workers payment in the order they arrive rather than the order of the list.	CRS Pgm Mgr/ Supervisors	Next payment
Niveau Communautaire		
• Help community advocate with their leaders to facilitate access to markets that provide moderately priced cereals • Identify links to organizations that support cereal bank interventions that could provide access to moderately priced cereals • By making a large cereal purchase order with an agent who can provide transport for multiple villages who are far from markets	CRS Pgm Mgr/ SOS Pgm Manager	7 May
• To address the complaint that 1000f is not enough, reinforce the message that EARLI is not a job, but social assistance.	Agents CRS/SOS	30 April
• Communities must develop plans for equitable use of recuperated land and inputs, providing the greatest benefit to all, including the most vulnerable community members	Agents CRS/SOS	30 April
• Increase community members' awareness of the role of management committee members to validate the quality of their work. If workers do not want to provide the required level of quality work, they can be excluded from participating. • Recognize the work of management committee members in a general assembly (the hours they work, their dedication to the community, their spirit of community service) and at the same time, motivate other members of the community to also assume leadership roles where useful to others.	Agents CRS/SOS	30 April
• Increase awareness that tools available on the work sites should be efficiently managed and work schedules planned accordingly. EARLI intends to alleviate food insecurity, not supply communities with tools.	Agents CRS/SOS	30 April
• Finalize the rollout of the complaint mechanism and make communities aware of why it exists and how to use it.	Agents CRS/SOS	Now
• Increase interest of the population in adopting land recuperation techniques in their own fields.	Agents CRS/SOS	30 April
Program and Management Effectiveness		
• Coordination meetings among project managers	CRS/SOS	Continue
• Begin monthly M&E coordination meetings	CRS /SOS M&E	Beginning 15 May
• Examine in the budget the possibility of paying guides when needed to visit hard to reach villages.	CRS EARLI PM	30 April
• Find financing to 1-Cover more needs (ensure cash transfer for those without capacity to do CFW) 2-provide assistance (unconditional cash transfer) during the planting season; Those who are eligible will be those who have put installed half moons in their fields.	CRS Emergencies Manager	Now
• Provide masks and first aid kits to protect participants from dust and potential injuries.	CRS Pgm Mgr/ SOS Pgm Manager	7 May
• Document complaints for improving the program	Complaint	30 April

• Develop the tool/form to do it.	committee CRS CRS S&E	
• Document the advantages (through this RTE and elsewhere) that the authorization to use the $300,000 provided. This can be used with other donors	RTA S&E	10 May
• Discuss between CRS and SOS regarding • How SOS can more effectively carry out their project monitoring tasks • Better understand CRS' payment authorization procedures and reflect on how to make them more agile during emergencies.	CRS Pgm Mgr/ SOS Pgm Manager	7 May
• Communicate with OCHA regarding their recommendation to carry out an evaluation by a delegation that includes the Regional office for Livestock, Regional office for Agriculture and the Regional Food Crisis Coordinating Body. Advise them to have the Regional Food Crisis Coordinating Body lead the evaluation rather than OCHA to ensure that the results are taken seriously by all stakeholders. Regardless, CRS would definitely participate.	CRS Emergencies Manager	Now
• Schedule a meeting to provide SOS with an orientation on project requirements in terms of finance and others.	Abdourhimou with Moussa CRS Finance	Semaine de 30 April
• Complete M&E Tools • In the monthly report formats, include questions for managers to capture lessons learned and best practices	Boubacar Seidou	15 May
• In the post-distribution surveys, ask participants • The targeting method used in their communities • Whether they are satisfied with the targeting methods • Whether the most vulnerable people were chosen • How people spend their money • Who makes decisions about what to buy • Data should also be collected on market prices before and after the payments to determine the extent to which CFW is increasing food prices in the region. • Modify the monitoring plan to make daily and weekly data available at least every 2 weeks if not sooner.	Boubacar Seidou	Next payment : 6 May
• Remain vigilent listening to information and advice from the Security Cluster of the UN system.	CRS Pgm Mgr	Now
• Provide the means for transport so the Extension service can provide the quality control of the CFW activities prior to payment dates	CRS Emergency PM	15 May
• Use military escorts in Ayorou Zone	CRS Program Manager	A partir de
• Strategize how recuperated land will be used. If it is used for grasses, it will not be available for productive use by more vulnerable members	CRS Program Manager	30 April

Next Projet		
• Collect information on development projects in the zone and design the next project with these links in place. • Develop long-term development projects in Tillabery and Ouallam departments	CRS Emergency Manager	Now
• Increase donor's awareness of the need to have alternative activities for older residents whose health may be at risk by carrying out land recuperation activities in the month of April in Niger • Increase the awareness of the State to take this into consideration in their national policy	CRS Emergency Manager	Next meeting with the regional cell for food security crises
• Rather than choosing the same number of beneficiaries in each village, choose a percentage of people in each village for there is a better proportionality of assistance to more effectively diminish gaps in aid.	CRS Emergency & Pgm Manger	Next projet
• Provide payment after the first week before changing to a twice monthly payment schedule due to the difficulty of such labor without adequate nourishment	CRS Emergency Manager	
• Budget for the perdiem expenses for supervisors before they move into the field	CRS Emergency & Prgm Manager	
• Create separate budget lines by Strategic Objective for future OFDA projects	CRS Emergency & Prgm Manager	

ANNEX 2: SPHERE Standards

Core Standard 1: People-centered humanitarian response

People's capacity and strategies to survive with dignity are integral to the design and approach of humanitarian response.

1) *The agricultural interventions of EARLI (recuperation of land for agricultural production and seed provision) make up the livelihood customs of the population*

2) *The success of effective targeting and functional management committees depend on the full involvement and decision making by community representatives from each land recuperation site.*

Core Standard 2: Coordination and collaboration
Humanitarian response is planned and implemented in coordination with the relevant authorities, humanitarian agencies and civil society organizations engaged in impartial humanitarian action, working together for maximum efficiency, coverage and effectiveness.

1) *CRS participates in the national organizational cluster which coordinates humanitarian actors (GoN, UN, NGOs and the Red Cross) dedicated to issues of food security. Therefore, CRS is informed about who does what where so as to avoid duplicating services.*
2) *Within the project, CRS facilitates the coordinates among Extension Services, CRS and SOS.*
3) *SOS facilitates the coordination with local authorities and Extension Services*

Core Standard 3: Assessment
The priority needs of the disaster-affected population are identified through a systematic assessment of the context, risks to life with dignity and the capacity of the affected people and relevant authorities to respond.

EARLI was conceived based on secondary data from the 2011 Agricultural Campaign Report, Coordination meetings with the Regional Coordinating Food Crisis Cell and analysis supplied by the Office for Disaster Assistance (OFDA). What was not carried out was a discussion at the local level to identify the most appropriate response. It seems that while most are capable of performing the work, there are no alternative tasks available for those with limited capacity.

Core Standard 4: Design and response
The humanitarian response meets the assessed needs of the disaster-affected population in relation to context, the risks faced and the capacity of the affected people and state to cope and recover.

As a result of a poor agricultural harvest, the first priority is to identify a source of income to support the basic needs of the population until the harvest comes in. Cash for Work responds precisely to this need. The other important concern of the population at the beginning of the rainy season is accessing seeds for planting which is the objective of the seed fairs. Note that the primary cause of vulnerability of the population is the increasing degradation of the land. The recuperation activity therefore in the context of the project contributes in the medium term to an improvement of their situation. Nevertheless, the

interventions currently underway in the area are far from covering the needs due to the enormity of the needs and the very high prices of food.

Core Standard 5: Performance, transparency and learning
The performance of humanitarian agencies is continually examined and communicated to stakeholders; projects are adapted in response to performance.

CRS is an agency with a long experience in humanitarian aid. CRS' performance in this area is recognized based on previous collaborations on similar interventions. CRS' continually monitors its performance using supervisor's monthly work plans, staff performance plans, and monthly reports.

Core Standard 6: Aid worker performance
Humanitarian agencies provide appropriate management, supervisory and psychosocial support, enabling aid workers to have the knowledge, skills, behavior and attitudes to plan and implement an effective humanitarian response with humanity and respect.

The agents intervening on behalf of the project have been trained within the respective CRS and SOS training formats in collaboration with the extension services, who are competent on all necessary aspects of the project implementation for which the agents will be responsible. Extension services are also expected to monitor these activities. There is however a lack of resources on the part of extension services (Dept. of the Environment- Tillabery) to ensure the necessary supervision of the sites since the beginning of the project. This situation is due to the fact that they have not made the administrative request as CRS' procedures require. However, it is CRS' responsibility to ensure that the project functions appropriately and therefore CRS' responsibility to ensure each partner has the necessary resources.

Food security and nutrition assessment standard 1: Food security
Where people are at increased risk of food insecurity, assessments are conducted using accepted methods to understand the type, degree and extent of food insecurity, to identify those most affected and to define the most appropriate response.

The initial assessment of food insecurity was done based on secondary data that came from the 2011 Agricultural Campaign Report, Coordination meetings with the Regional Coordinating Food Crisis Cell and analysis supplied by the Office for Disaster Assistance (OFDA). The triangulation of national and regional data from multiple sources including national and international stakeholders assured national consensus around the issue. What was not carried out was a discussion at the local level to identify the most appropriate work tasks. Although the Cash for Work is accessible, it is not the most appropriate for those in poor health or with limited capacity.

To identify those most affected, a targeting exercise was carried out at a department level with technical partner, the extension service and again at the local level using participatory methods to ensure transparent and inclusive targeting by the communities themselves with support from their local community leadership.

Food security – Cash and voucher transfers
Standard 1: Access to available goods and services

Cash and vouchers are considered as ways to address basic needs and to protect and re-establish livelihoods.

Cash permits a response to essential needs for food, however the quantity is very insufficient to cover the needs of the targeted communities.

Food security – Livelihoods Standard 1: Primary production
Primary production mechanisms are protected and supported.

Land restoration will effectively benefit agricultural activities however there isn't a policy within the project that links the emergency response to development projects currently underway. For example if seeds of productive value were available to plant in the recuperated land, this would add greater value to the restoration activities currently underway.

Food security – Livelihoods Standard 2: Income and employment
Where income generation and employment are feasible livelihood strategies, women and men have equal access to appropriate income-earning opportunities.

EARLI'S income generating activities (land recuperation) are rightfully accessible to men as well as to women. However, the physical capacity of women makes the work more difficult for her compared to the men. Note that April in Niger is the hottest month of the year when the land is most compacted and difficult to dig. At the work sites visited by the RTE team, men go to the site early, and because it is not hot and the work is easier for men, they tend to finish early. Women go to the site after she prepared the morning meal and works later when the temperature has increased. Because the work is more difficult for her, she works longer hours and may need to return again in the afternoon when the temperature has decreased in order to finish digging the same number of half-moons as the men. There are no alternative jobs for women, regardless of their physical condition. Women may work twice or three times longer than men but receives the same pay. Both donors and the GoN need to consider how to provide appropriate work for women that gives them equal pay for the time worked.

Food security – Livelihoods Standard 3: Access to markets
The disaster-affected population's safe access to market goods and services as producers, consumers and traders is protected and promoted.
From a geographic point of view, the market access varies by locality. Certain villages are far from a market and without appropriate transportation infrastructure making market access difficult without paying a significantly higher cost. The cost is considered too high even in locations where food is accessible.

ANNEX 3
Methodology ABC :
Participatory Project Participant Targeting

Project EARLI used the ABC participatory method to choose households within villages.

1. A general Assembly is called to inform the population how the project participants will be selected
2. Use the same list of village households that is used for tax collection
3. Ask for 5 key informants who know everyone on the village (Imam, village chief, others ?)
4. Share with them the process of determining the criteria for classifying households in the Category (A) for Least Vulnerable; Category B (Semi-Vulnerable); and Category C (Most Vulnerable) Other NGOs have started to use the category (D) for Extremely Vulnerable, but CRS only uses A-C.
5. The group of key informants determines the criteria of the three categories (A, B and C). (Each village will have unique criteria.)
6. The key informants categorize each household into one of the three categories.
7. A general assembly is held to validate the results with community members who have the chance to contest the results and come to consensus regarding an alternative proposition.

Ouallam Department

Guinao-Bongou

(10)Men and (9) Women participants
Men and Women non-participants (7)
Djibo Oumarou, Chef de village

Tollo

(10) Men and (6) Women participants
Men and Women non-participants (10)
Djibo Baouna, Chef de village
Yayé Hassoumi, Adjoint Chef de village

Tillabéry Department

Sona-Bella

(12) Men and (10)Women participants
Men and Women non-participants (8)
Younoussa Mounkaila, chef de village
Yqcouba Ibrahim, Adjoint Chef de village

Djadja Peulh

(10) Men and (11) Women participants
Men and Women non-participants (6)
Soumana Larabou, Chef de village
Abdoulaye Moussa, Conseiller élu

Dai-Bery

(10) Men and (5) Women participants
Men and Women non-participants (9)
Boubacar Mohamed, Chef de village
Moussa Goronfo, SGcomité de gestion

CRS

Mahaman Souradja, Head of Emergency Department
Boubacar Saidou, M&E Officer, Project EARLI
Lawel Mahamane Moussa, Finance Manager, Project EARLI

SOS Sahel International

Mariama Issoufoudiorim , Coordinator Project EARLI
Ali Djibey, M&E Officer

Extension Services

Mr. Mohomadu Saley, Dept. of the Environment, Tillabery

OCHA, Tillabery

Mr. Diambeidou Biga, OCHA Bureau Tillabery

Itinerary RTE Project EARLI						
Sunday	**Monday**	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**	**Saturday**
	16	17 RTA travels to Niamey	18 CRS-Niger debrief Meeting Evaluation Planning Tool refinement	19 Evaluation Planning Tool refinement	20 **Niamey** Evaluation Planning Tool refinement Individual Interview CRS	21 **Ouallam** (2 villages Guineo-Bangou, Tollo) Village Chief/non participants
22 **Tillabery** Group focus Sona-Bela Dai-Bery Djadja Peuhl **+** Village Chief/non participants	23 **Tillabery** Interview Individuelle –1) OCHA-Cellule de Coordination Interview avec SOS- M&E Saisir les donnes	24 **Tilabery** Services Technique (Tilabery) Site de Paiement (Dai-Kaina) Interview avec CRS-Finance	25 Interview avec SOS-M&E Officer Workshop Prep	26 Interview avec SOS- Coordinator Workshop Prep	27 Workshop ½ day	28 Team departs

Termes de Référence pour l'évaluation en temps réel

CRS/Niger, Réponse aux urgences 2012

Projet EARLI

1. Introduction

La production agricole 2011 n'a pas répondu aux attentes des populations qui tentaient lentement à sortir de la mauvaise récolte 2009.
L'enquête sur la vulnérabilité à l'insécurité alimentaire de décembre 2011 fait ressortir des résultats très inquiétants pour beaucoup de ménages qui se trouvent en situation d'extrême vulnérabilité. Ces ménages n'ont pas produit et ne disposent pas de moyens permettant d'accéder aux produits vivriers sur les marchés. Parmi ces zones classéEs en situation de vulnérabilité, la région de Tillabéry se classe en tête avec les départements de Tillabéry, Ouallam et Filingué.
Le gouvernement à travers le Dispositif National de Gestion des Catastrophes et Crises alimentaires a élaboré un plan de contingence visant à aider les populations vulnérables à travers les partenaires qu développement.
Pour répondre à cet appel du Gouvernement du Niger, CRS/Niger a élaboré une proposition pour venir en assistance aux populations vulnérables de la région de Tillabéry au niveau des départements de Tillabéry et de Ouallam.
Le projet EARLI (Emergency Agriculture Recovery and Livelihoods Interventions in Niger) permettra d'assurer de l'assistance à environ 2600 ménages à travers le Cash For Work (CFW) et des semences à prêt de 7000 ménages à travers les foires aux semences.

2. But et objectifs de l'évaluation en temps réel « Real Time Evaluation »

L'évaluation en temps réel est une approche particulière de l'évaluation qui permet de suivre la performance d'une intervention à un stade assez précoce, offrant ainsi la possibilité de corriger des lacunes dans «temps réel». Cette approche est particulièrement importante pour les interventions humanitaires car elle est différente des évaluations finales qui constate les faits à la fin du projet. Une évaluation en temps réel se consacre sur le processus de mise en œuvre d'un projet plutôt que de son impact ou résultat final.

Eu égard à cela, on peut dire que le but global de cette étude est de permettre à CRS/Niger de tirer les leçons du processus de mise en œuvre très tot afin de satisfaire aussi bien que possible aux besoins des bénéficiaires du projet.

Les objectifs de cette RTE sont :

5. Documenter les réalisations atteintes jusqu'à la date de collecte ;
6. Faire une revue de l'intervention pour sortir des critiques et recommandations afin d'améliorer la mise en œuvre ;
7. Identifier les bonnes pratiques utilisées et les leçons apprises à travers ce projet ;
8. Promouvoir les approches d'apprentissage de CRS/Niger pour rapporter et communiquer à travers toute l'agence de CRS et les partenaires.

3. Méthodologie

La mission sera principalement dirigée par la conseillère régionale en suivi et évaluation de CRS pour l'Afrique de l'Ouest. Elle pourrait être appuyée au niveau local par le chef de département suivi et évaluation de CRS/Niger, du chef de département des urgences et de l'équipe du projet (PM, M&E, superviseurs du projet). Tout autre partenaire du projet pourrait être amené à faire membre de l'équipe en fonction des besoins.

Le chef de département suivi et évaluation de CRS/Niger identifiera les agents enquêteurs expérimentés qui pourront assurer la traduction des questions lors de la collecte des données sur le terrain.

Les dispositions d'ordre logistique seront également prises pour la bonne marche des activités sur le terrain.

L'équipe de l'évaluation en temps réel conduira ce travail à travers les points ci-dessous :

- Tenir une première séance de travail avec l'équipe du projet et le personnel de CRS impliqué dans la mise en œuvre afin de s'assurer sur la compréhension des termes de référence de l'étude (but et résultats attendus) d'une part et d'autre part pour mieux comprendre le projet et les niveaux atteints jusqu'ici ;

- Tenir une rencontre avec rencontre avec tous les membres de l'équipe de l'évaluation afin de finaliser tous les outils de collecte, les sujets à interroger, la logistique et un plan de travail provisoire ;
- Avoir des discussions avec les agents relevant de tous les niveaux de l'agence (CRS/Niger, WARO et HQ), les partenaires et tout autres parties prenantes afin de ressortir des critiques et recommandations pertinentes;
- Discuter avec les populations affectées avec une approche participative afin de trianguler les informations ;
- Discuter avec les agents charges de la mise en œuvre pour savoir les contraintes et difficultés pouvant entraver l'atteinte des résultats du projet;
- Créer un plan d'action avec les dates buttoirs et les noms des personnes responsables que le projet pourra rapidement utiliser afin d'éviter tout retard dans la mise en œuvre.

L'évaluation en temps réel sera conduite pour analyser les résultats initiaux et mettre un accent sur l'effectivité et l'appropriation des activités, les mécanismes de ciblage et l'implication des communautés dans les activités du projet.

L'évaluation en temps réel sera conduite au même moment ou les payements des bénéficiaires des activités de CFW auront lieu permettant ainsi à l'équipe de mise en œuvre d'ajuster les lacunes pour améliorer les activités du projet sur le terrain pour les prochaines activités et payements.

Les 4 critères ci dessous seront évalués pendant le RTE à travers les questions relatives aux réponses d'urgences.

<u>Pertinence/appropriation</u>

1. Comment est ce que la réponse de CRS coïncide avec les besoins des populations affectées ?
2. Est-ce que les décisions sur la manière de répondre ont été basées sur les conclusions des donnes secondaires utilisées pour justifier cette intervention ?
3. Est ce que les normes et standards de Sphère ont été atteints ?
4. De quelle manière le projet sera fexible pour assurer les conditions et engagements de la réponse ?
5. En quoi les normes et standards techniques de sphere permettent de prendre en compte le contexte socio culturel dans la zone d'intervention ?

<u>Program and management effectiveness</u>

1. Quels sont les facteurs internes ou externes qui affectent la rapidité de notre intervention au niveau national ?
2. Comment est ce que la planification des activités pourrait permettre d'atteindre les résultats prévus ?
3. Quels défis ou bonnes pratiques peut on retenir en travaillant avec les populations vulnérables?
4. Dans quelles measures les populations affectées pourraient se plaindre des activités du projet à partir des informations qu'elles reçoivent ? (Si cette committee existe…)
5. Les supports essentiels du programme (including finance, HR, logistics, media and communications) ont recu suffisamment des ressources et fonctionnent bien?
6. Comment fonctionnent les mechanisms de collaboration au niveau de CRS et des different partenaires (SOS, services techniques, chef de canton/village/maire)?
7. Le système de suivi a la potentiel a renseigner CRS comment il peut améliorer le programme?
8. Comment les risques (par exemples crise malienne, arrivée des refugiés, et autres…) sont évalués, documentés et gérés ?

Durabilité et relations

1. De quelle manière les besoins des parties prenantes sont en train de changer ?
2. Dans quelle mesure le programme s'adapte à ce changement de besoin des bénéficiaire ?
3. Comment EARLI peut répondre aux besoins immédiats et faire un lien avec les programmes de développement existants ?
4. Quelles sont les leçons apprises et les bonnes pratiques de la réponse initiale qui peuvent etre utile pour le suite du projet ?
5. Qu'est-ce que les beneficiaries du projet envisage au niveau de terrre recoupere au cours de la mise en aeuvre ?

Couverture (qui et combien de personnes peut-on atteindre?)

1. Comment est-ce qu'on a pris les décisions en ce qui concerne le ciblage (des sous-groupes de la population ; les endroits où la réponse est effectuée ; Est-ce que les méthodes de ciblage sont équitables et transparentes ?
2. Avons-nous assure une complémentarité avec les autres acteurs humanitaires, et dans quelle mesure? (OCHA (Tillaberi)
3. Qui et combien de groupes différents sont ciblés et dans quelle mesure sont-ils atteints, avec quel niveau d'efficacité?

4. Présentation et documentation des conclusions et recommandations

L'équipe de RTE fera le point avec les équipes sur le terrain et des hauts représentants des affiliés sur ses conclusions principales lors d'une journée de réflexion, et le chef d'équipe va terminer un rapport préliminaire qui sera soumis pour observations. Un rapport final doit être publié idéalement dans les jours suivants. Le rapport doit être bref, ne dépassant pas 15 pages, plus les annexes courts contenant les termes de référence et un calendrier de la réponse. Le rapport final sera signé par la gestionnaire de mise en service, notant leur accord ou non avec le plan d'action, et le rapport final sera affiché sur le CRS global. Le bureau de programme de pays et les partenaires seront responsables de faire avancer le plan d'action et des recommandations pertinentes pour eux.

5. Ownership, resourcing and timing

Le chef de département suivi et évaluation sera la personne ressources pour l'équipe de l'évaluation en temps réel. Le tableau ci-dessous décline les rôles des acteurs dans le cadre de cette évaluation.

Name	Title	Role	Email
Abdourhimou	M &E Manager, CRS/Niger	Commissioning Manager	Adamou.abdourhimou@.crs.org
Heather Dolphin	RTA M&E	RTE team leader	Heather.dolphin@crs.org
Souradja Mahaman	Emergency Coordinator, CRS/Niger	RTE team member	Souradja.mahaman@crs.org
Jessica Garrel	Intern, CRS/Niger	RTE team member	Jessica.garrel@crs.org
Anaroua Fodi	EARLI PM	RTE team member	Anaroua.fodi@crs.org
Saidou Boubacar	EARLI M&E Assistant	RTE team member	Saidou.boubacar@crs.org

6. Les hypotheses et les exigences

- Les évaluateurs auront accès à toute la documentation et peuvent prendre part aux reunions pertinentes et visites au terrain ;
- Les évaluateurs auront accès au personnel clé à la réponse dans le bureau du pays et/ou les bureaux des partenaires pour mener des entrevues ;

- Tous les members de l'équipe d'évaluation pourront poser des questions directement aux bénéficiaires ;
- Les évaluateurs auront la confidentialité et l'objectivité en considération durant le processus.

7. Programme de mise en œuvre des principales activités et déliverables

Date	Activité	Lieu	Responsable	Deliverables
17 avril	RTA/M&E arrives	Niamey	Abdourhimou	
17-20 avril	Séance de travaux de l'équipe (revue documentaries, élaboration questionnaires, planning des activités)	CRS/Niger Office Niamey	Abdourhimou, Souradja; Anaroua, Jessica, Saidou	Méthodologie de collecte, fiches finalisées,
21-23 avril	Collecte des données	Ouallam, Tillabery	Heather; Abdourhimou, Saidou	Fiches remplies
24-28 avril	Exploitation des fiches collectées	CRS/Niger Office Niamey	Heather; Abdourhimou, Jessica; Saidou	Les grandes lignes, premiers constats
28 avril	Restitution des premiers résultants à CRS/Niger	CRS/Niger Office Niamey		
28 avril – 10 mai	Finalisation du rapport du RTE	Au niveau des bureaux respectifs (échanges mails, skype)	Heather; Jessica; Abdourhimou, Saidou	Rapport final

CRS/SOS

Couverture *(Qui et comment nous avons ciblé les bénéficiaires ?)*

1. Comment est-ce qu'on a pris les décisions en ce qui concerne le ciblage ?

……
……
……
……
……..

a. Les endroits où la réponse est effectuée ? (La zone d'intervention du projet)

……
……
……
……
……..

b. Les sous-groupes de la population ? (Le choix des bénéficiaires au niveau de la zone du projet)

……
……
……
……
……..

2. Avec quelles procédures les populations les plus vulnérables ont été ciblées ?

……
……
……
……
……..

3. Quelles sont les forces et faiblesses de ces procédures ?

……
……
……
……
……..

4. **Etes-vous satisfaits par la transparence et l'équité de vos efforts ?**

……
……
……

Annex 7: Data Collection Tools

Real Time Evaluation: CRS Project EARLI

……
……..

5. Quels sont les critères utilisés pour le choix des bénéficiaires ?

En général, les ONG utilisent les critères suivants pour classer les ménages:

1. Ménages ne disposant pas de moyens de subsistance (animaux, biens divers, manque de transferts de revenus auprès d'autres parents) ;
2. Ménages pauvres dirigés par des personnes âgées, femmes ou handicapées ;
3. Ménages pauvres ayant beaucoup de membres ;
4. Ménages pauvres ayant trop de personnes inactives (enfants de moins de 5 ans surtout) ;
5. Ménages ayant perdus leur capital suite à un retour forcé suite aux crises ressentes en RCI, Lybie, Nigéria.

……
……
……
……
……
……

6. **Qu'est ce que vous aurez aimé faire différemment ?**

……
……
……
……
……..

Pertinence et adaptation

7. Quelles sont les parties prenantes ayant participé à la conception de l'idée du projet en CFW et Foires aux semences améliorées ?

……
……
……
……
……
……

8. Comment est ce que la réponse de CRS coïncide avec les besoins des populations affectées ?

Groupes	**Moyens**	**Besoins**	Comment est ce que la réponse de CRS coïncide avec les besoins des populations affectées ?	**D'où avez-vous trouvé cette information ?**	**Comment est-ce que ces besoins évoluent depuis le démarrage du projet ?**

Hommes					
Femmes					
enfants					
personnes âgées et handicapes					

9. **Quelles sont les dispositions prises pour rendre le projet flexibles face aux choses inattendues dans le déroulement du projet pour assurer les conditions et engagements de la réponse ? Pouvez-vous donner un exemple ? Et comment vous avez répondu ?**

……
……
……
……
……

10. **Est-ce que les décisions relatives au type d'intervention ont été basées sur les conclusions des données secondaires utilisées pour programmer les activités du projet ? (A compléter aussi par une revue documentaire)**

……
……
……
……
……

11. **Comment est ce que le contexte socio culturel du milieu a été pris en compte dans la conception du projet ?**

……
……
……
……
……

12. **En quoi le travail des terres contre l'argent est il approprié selon vous ?**

……
……
……
……
……

13. **Comment assurez-vous que la disponibilité des vivres est garantie sur les marchés de la zone ?**

……
……

……
……
……..

Management du Programme et efficacité

14. Quels sont les critères pour choisir les agents de terrain ?

……
……
…….

15. **Expliquez nous brièvement votre programme de formation des agents de terrain ?**

Formation	**Durée**	**Thèmes**	**Contenus importants**

16. **Comment CRS/SOS évalue la performance de leurs agents de terrain ? Quels sont les critères de la bonne performance ?**

……
……
……..

17. **Quelles sont les mesures disciplinaires de CRS/SOS Sahel pour les agents de terrain qui ne suivre pas les codes de conduite ?**

……
……
……..

18. **Base sur vos échanges, interactions, expérience comme partenaires avec (CRS/SOS Sahel), comment évaluerez-vous leur capacité en termes de connaissance de CFW, foires de semences leur agilité, réactivité, leadership, pour mettre en œuvre ce projet ?**

……
……
……..

19. Quels facteurs internes et externes qui ont affecté la rapidité de notre réponse au niveau du pays ? Y compris le plan de contingence, accès aux fonds d'urgence de CRS, système de déploiement de personnel, contexte local et autres ? Identifiez et prioritisez les facteurs qui affectent la rapidité de la réponse de CRS.

	Facteurs qui ont affecté la Rapidité de la Réponse	Comment ils ont affecté cette rapidité	Ampleur de l'impact sur la rapidité de la réponse
Internal			
Plan de contingence			

Accès aux fonds d'urgence de CRS			
Système de déploiement de personnel			
Autres			
External			
Contexte Local			
Partenariat			
Autres			

20. Comment est ce que la programmation des activités du projet pourrait permettre d'atteindre les résultats prévus ?

Qu'est-ce qui a bien marché dans la planification qui a permis d'atteindre les résultats prévus?	Qu'est-ce qui n'a pas bien marché ?	Qu'est-ce qu'on peut faire pour améliorer ?

21. Dans quelles mesures les populations affectées pourraient se plaindre des activités du projet à partir des informations qu'elles reçoivent ?

……
……
……

22. Les supports essentiels du programme (incluant finances, HR, logistiques, médias et communications) ont reçu suffisamment des ressources et fonctionnent ils bien?

	Identifier les supports essentiels du programme	**Qu'est-ce qui a fonctionné exceptionnellement bien?**	**Quels domaines ont besoin d'amélioration?**	**Quelles recommendations feriez-vous?**
Finances				
HR				
Logistiques				
Media et communications				
Autres?				

23. Comment fonctionne ce système de suivi? (Qui est consulte lors du suivi des activités et avec quelle fréquence ? A quelle niveau les supervisions se font et avec quelles fréquence ?)

……
……
……

24. **En quoi le système de suivi peut contribuer à améliorer le programme et comment il peut contribuer à la prise de décision ?**

……
……
……

25. **Avez-vous le documentation pour déterminer si le nombre des ménages prévues dans la proposition ont été atteints déjà?**

……
……
……

(SOS) Comment évaluerez-vous le formation par le services technique sur les activités de creuseur les demi-lunes ?

……
……
……

Risques

26. Quelles sont les mesures envisagiées pour assurer la sécurité de votre personnel du projet dans la zone ?

……
……
……

27. Comment est ce que la sécurité des bénéficiaires est garantie pour rentrer chez eux après les payements ?

……
……
……

28. Comment vous avez envisage le guarantee des payment des beneficiares ?

……
……
……

29. Comment vous avez envisage le securization de ressources ?

……
……
…….

30. Avez-vous identifié d'autres risques pour le projet ?

a. Si oui, quels risques ont été évalués ? b. Comment on-t-ils été documenté et gérés ?

Risques evalués identifiés	Comment on-t-ils été documentés et gérés (résultats)?

Connectivité et Durabilité

31. Comment est ce que le projet EARLY peut répondre aux besoins immédiat et faire un lien avec les programmes de développement existants ?

1. Comment EARLY répond aux besoins immédiats ?	2. Quels sont les liens avec les programmes de développement existants

Coordination

32. Comment fonctionnent les mécanismes de collaboration au niveau de CRS et des différents partenaires ?

……
……
……..

Synergie

33. **Avez-vous constaté des quelconques duplications au cours de la mise en œuvre du programme telles que le Cash For Work / distribution des semences?**

……
……
……..

34. **Avez-vous constaté des quelconques écarts dans le service au cours de la mise en œuvre du programme ?**

……
……
……..

35. **Quelles dispositions avez-vous prises pour assurer une complémentarité avec les autres acteurs humanitaires ?**

……
……
……..

Leçons Apprises

36. Lister tous les défis dans le travail avec les personnes vulnérables. Quelles leçons avez-vous apprises de ces défis ? Quelles sont les bonnes pratiques que vous voudrez suggérer aux autres ?

Défis	Leçons Apprises	Bonne Pratiques

GUIDE CONDUITE

FOCUS GROUPE AUPRES DES LEADERS COMMUNAUTAIRES DU PROJET

Présenter l'équipe, l'objectif de la rencontre et les rôles de chaque membre de l'équipe. Nous avons 2 heures pour faire cette discussion. Chaque personne est libre de donner son avis sur les questions posées. C'est très important de savoir vos impressions sur le travaille de SOS et CRS parce que les informations que nous allons recevoir de vous vont nous aider à améliorer notre projet pour les parties prenantes qui aussi expérimentent l'urgence. Est-ce que nous pouvons commencer maintenant la discussion?

Identification de la localité

Région : |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Département : |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Commune : |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Village : |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Nom de Leader :_____

Role :_____

1. Est ce que l'activité de creusage de demi-lunes est acceptée par vos réalités socioculturelles (tradition, religion, organisation coutumière) ?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

2. Pensez-vous que les femmes et les hommes ont tous les mêmes droits et capacités d'accéder aux activités créatrices de revenus menées dans ce projet ?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

3. Si non dites nous les raisons.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. Avez-vous eu suffisamment d'informations sur le projet et les agences qui le conduisent (CRS et SOS)?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

5. Si oui par qui et avec quel moyen ?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. Quelles sont les structures communautaires impliquées dans la mise en œuvre du projet

Structure	Rôle	Nb réunions

7. Existe-t-il une structure chargée de recevoir et traiter les plaintes relatives à la mise en œuvre de ce projet ?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

8. Que pensez-vous du comportement des agents de SOS/CRS travaillant avec vous sur ce Projet? Quels sont leurs forces ? Faiblesses ?

……
……
…….

9. En marge de la mise en œuvre de ce projet, quelles sont les initiatives d'entraide entreprises pour faire face à cette crise alimentaire dans votre communauté

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

10. Parmi les agents de terrain intervenants dans ce projet, pensez qu'il y ait des fonctionnaires qui font du travail que des ressortissants de votre communauté pourraient aussi bien faire ?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

11. Est-ce que tous les bénéficiaires du projet jouissent d'un accès sûr et sans restriction aux biens, services et systèmes du marché pendant toute la durée du programme

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

Couverture (qui et combien de personnes peut-on atteindre?)

Comment est-ce qu'on a pris les décisions en ce qui concerne le ciblage (des sous-groupes de la population ; les endroits où la réponse est effectuée) ?

En général, les ONG utilisent les critères suivants pour classer les ménages:

6. **Ménages ne disposant pas de moyens de subsistance (animaux, biens divers, manque de transferts de revenus auprès d'autres parents) ;**
7. **Ménages pauvres dirigés par des personnes âgées, femmes ou handicapées ;**
8. **Ménages pauvres ayant beaucoup de membres ;**
9. **Ménages pauvres ayant trop de personnes inactives (enfants de moins de 5 ans surtout) ;**
10. **Ménages ayant perdus leur capital suite à un retour forcé suite aux crises ressentes en RCI, Lybie, Nigéria.**

1. Sur quelle base les différents bénéficiaires du projet ont été sélectionnés ?
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
2. Est-ce que les personnes choisies sont les personnes plus nécessiteuses ?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)
3. Si non avez-vous de meilleurs critères de sélection à proposer ?
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

4. Pensez que les critères de sélection aient été respectés au moment du choix des beneficiares ?

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

De quelle manière les besoins des parties prenantes au projet ont changés ? Dans quelle mesure le programme s'adapte à leurs besoins de changement ?

Groupes	**Moyens**	**Besoins**	Comment est ce que la réponse de CRS coïncide avec les besoins des populations affectées ?	**Comment est-ce que ces besoins évoluent depuis le démarrage du projet ?**
Hommes				
Femmes				
enfants				
personnes âgées et handicapes				

1. Lister tous les défis dans le travail avec les personnes vulnérables. Quelles leçons avez-vous apprises de ces défis ? Quelles sont les bonnes pratiques que vous voudrez suggérer aux autres ?

Défis	**Leçons Apprises**	**Bonne Pratiques**

Remerciez les participants pour leur participation!

GUIDE CONDUITE

FOCUS GROUPE AUPRES DES BENEFICIAIRES DU PROJET

Présenter l'équipe, l'objectif de la rencontre et les rôles de chaque membre de l'équipe. Nous avons 2 heures pour faire cette discussion. Chaque personne est libre de donner son avis sur les questions posées. C'est très important de savoir vos impressions sur le travaille de SOS et CRS parce que les informations que nous allons recevoir de vous vont nous aider à améliorer notre projet pour les parties prenantes qui aussi expérimentent l'urgence. Est-ce que nous pouvons commencer maintenant la discussion?

Identification de la localité

Région : |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Département : |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Commune : |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Village : |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Composition du groupe de discussion

SEXE	Hommes	FEMME	Total
JEUNES <18			
Adultes ≥ 18 ans			
TOTAL			

Pertinence/appropriation

12. Quels étaient les besoins les plus prioritaires de vos foyers avant le début du projet?
    - o _____
    - o _____
    - o _____
    - o _____
    - o _____
    - o _____

13. Avant la mise en œuvre du programme EARLI, comment avez-vous satisfait ces besoins?
    - o Travail journalier
    - o Transfer de fonds de provence des parents de l'exterieur
    - o Autres programmes d'aide humanitaire?
    - o Ventes des biens?
    - o Acheter à crédit?
    - o Recevoir une aide des autres dans la communauté?
    - o Autres? (préciser) : _____

14. Maintenant, avec le programme EARLI, arrivez-vous à subvenir à ces besoins plus prioritaires? (après paiement seulement)

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

15. Avez-vous participé aux séances de sensibilisation le jour de paiement?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

16. Si Oui quels sont les messages dont vous vous souvenez?
    - o Lavage des mains
    - o Allaitement maternel exclusif
    - o Aliment de complément

- Vaccination
- Consultation pré et post natale
- Hygiène alimentaire
- Autres (préciser) : _____

17. Avez-vous participé aux séances de formation sur les techniques de confection des demi-lunes?

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

18. Si Oui qu'est-ce que vous a appris ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

19. Avez-vous pu appliquer ces pratiques ?

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

20. Si oui où est ce les avez-vous mis en pratique ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. Si non pourquoi vous ne les avez pas mises en pratique ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. Est ce que l'activité de creusage de demi-lunes est acceptée par vos réalités socioculturelles (tradition, religion, organisation coutumière)?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

23. Pensez-vous que les femmes et les hommes ont tous les mêmes droits et capacités d'accéder aux activités créatrices de revenues menées dans ce projet ?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

24. Sinon dites nous les raisons.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

25. Avez-vous eu suffisamment d'informations sur le projet et les agences qui le conduisent (CRS et SOS)?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

26. Si oui par qui et avec quel moyen ?

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

27. Quelles sont les structures communautaires impliquées dans la mise en œuvre du projet

Structure	Rôle	Nb réunions

28. Existe-t-il une structure chargée de recevoir et traiter les plaintes relatives à la mise en œuvre de ce projet ?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

29. En marge de la mise en œuvre de ce projet, quelles sont les initiatives d'entraide entreprises pour faire face à cette crise alimentaire dans votre communauté

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

30. Parmi les agents de terrain intervenants dans ce projet, pensez qu'il y ait des étrangers qui font du travail que des ressortissants de votre communauté pourraient aussi bien faire ?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

31. Est-ce que tous les bénéficiaires du projet jouissent d'un accès sûr et sans restriction aux biens, services et systèmes du marché pendant toute la durée du programme

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

32. Que pensez-vous du comportement des agents de SOS/CRS travaillant avec vous sur ce projet? Quels sont leurs forces ? Faiblesses ?

Durabilité et relations

De quelle manière les besoins des parties prenantes au projet ont changés ? Dans quelle mesure le programme s'adapte à leurs besoins de changement ?

Groupes	**Moyens**	**Besoins**	Comment est ce que la réponse de CRS coïncide avec les besoins des populations affectées ?	**Comment est-ce que ces besoins évoluent depuis le démarrage du projet ?**
Hommes				
Femmes				
enfants				
personnes âgées et handicapes				

33. Les paiements par quinzaine vous convient-il ?

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

34. Justifier ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Couverture (qui et combien de personnes peut-on atteindre?)

Comment est-ce qu'on a pris les décisions en ce qui concerne le ciblage (des sous-groupes de la population ; les endroits où la réponse est effectuée) ?

En général, les ONG utilisent les critères suivants pour classer les ménages:

11. **Ménages ne disposant pas de moyens de subsistance (animaux, biens divers, manque de transferts de revenus auprès d'autres parents) ;**
12. **Ménages pauvres dirigés par des personnes âgées, femmes ou handicapées ;**
13. **Ménages pauvres ayant beaucoup de membres ;**
14. **Ménages pauvres ayant trop de personnes inactives (enfants de moins de 5 ans surtout) ;**
15. **Ménages ayant perdus leur capital suite à un retour forcé suite aux crises ressentes en RCI, Lybie, Nigéria.**

35. Sur quelle base les différents bénéficiaires du projet ont été sélectionnés ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

36. Est-ce que les personnes choisies sont les personnes plus nécessiteuses ?

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

37. Si non avez-vous de meilleurs critères de sélection à proposer ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

38. Pensez que les critères de sélection aient été respectés au moment du choix des beneficiare ?

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

39. Avez-vous des suggestions pour améliorer la mise en œuvre du projet ?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

40. Y a-t-il de choses que vous remarquez dans la mise en œuvre du projet qui sont particulièrement utiles, que le projet doit continuer à faire dans les autres interventions CRS au Niger comme celui-ci ? Si oui, expliquez

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Remerciez les participants pour leur participation!

GUIDE CONDUITE

FOCUS GROUPE AUPRES DES NON- PARTICIPANTS DU PROJET

Présenter l'équipe, l'objectif de la rencontre et les rôles de chaque membre de l'équipe. Nous avons 1 heures pour faire cette discussion. Chaque personne est libre de donner son avis sur les questions posées. C'est très important de savoir vos impressions sur le travaille de SOS et CRS parce que les informations que nous allons recevoir de vous vont nous aider à améliorer notre projet pour les parties prenantes qui aussi expérimentent l'urgence. Est-ce que nous pouvons commencer maintenant la discussion?

Identification de la localité

Département :

Commune :

Village :

Composition du groupe de discussion

SEXE	Hommes	FEMME	Total
JEUNES <18			
Adultes ≥ 18 ans			
TOTAL			

Pertinence/appropriation

1. Quels étaient les besoins les plus prioritaires de vos foyers avant le début du projet?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Comment avez-vous satisfait ces besoins depuis la crise alimentaire?

   - Travail journalier
   - Transfer de fonds de provence des parents de l'exterieur
   - Autres programmes d'aide humanitaire?
   - Ventes des biens?
   - Acheter à crédit?
   - Recevoir une aide des autres dans la communauté?
   - Autres? (préciser) :

3. Connaissez-vous le projet mis en œuvre dans votre village par SOS International ?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

4. **Si OUI**, A quoi consiste ce projet ?

……
……
……..

5. Avez-vous des connaissances sur les techniques de confection des demi-lunes ?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

6. **Si OUI**, expliquez brièvement ces techniques ?

_____

_____

_____

7. Par quel canal avez-vous appris ces techniques ?

_____

_____

_____

8. Avez-vous déjà mis en pratique ces techniques ?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

9. Si non pourquoi vous ne les avez pas mises en pratique ?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

10. Est ce que l'activité de creusage de demi-lunes est acceptée par vos réalités socioculturelles (tradition, religion, organisation coutumière)?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

11. Pensez-vous que les femmes et les hommes ont tous les mêmes droits et capacités d'accéder aux activités créatrices de revenues menées dans ce projet ?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

12. Sinon dites nous les raisons.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

13. Quelles sont les structures communautaires impliquées dans la mise en œuvre du projet ?

Structure	**Rôle**	**Nb réunions**

14. Existe-t-il une structure chargée de recevoir et traiter les plaintes relatives à la mise en œuvre de ce projet ?

    |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

15. En marge de la mise en œuvre de ce projet, quelles sont les initiatives d'entraide entreprises pour faire face à cette crise alimentaire dans votre communauté ?

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

_____

_____

_____

16. Parmi les agents de terrain intervenant dans ce projet, pensez qu'il y ait des fonctionnaires qui font du travail que des ressortissants de votre communauté pourraient aussi bien faire ?

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

17. Que pensez-vous du comportement des agents de SOS/CRS travaillant avec vous sur ce projet? Quels sont leurs forces ? Faiblesses ?

……
……
…….

Couverture (qui et combien de personnes peut-on atteindre?)

Comment est-ce qu'on a pris les décisions en ce qui concerne le ciblage (des sous-groupes de la population ; les endroits où la réponse est effectuée) ?

En général, les ONG utilisent les critères suivants pour classer les ménages:

16. Ménages ne disposant pas de moyens de subsistance (animaux, biens divers, manque de transferts de revenus auprès d'autres parents) ;
17. Ménages pauvres dirigés par des personnes âgées, femmes ou handicapées ;
18. Ménages pauvres ayant beaucoup de membres ;
19. Ménages pauvres ayant trop de personnes inactives (enfants de moins de 5 ans surtout) ;
20. Ménages ayant perdus leur capital suite à un retour forcé suite aux crises ressentes en RCI, Lybie, Nigéria.

5. Sur quelle base les différents bénéficiaires du projet ont été sélectionnés ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Est-ce que les personnes choisies sont les personnes plus nécessiteuses ?

|___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

7. Si non avez-vous de meilleurs critères de sélection à proposer ?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

8. Pensez que les critères de sélection aient été respectés au moment du choix des beneficiare ?

   |___| (1 =oui, 2 =non)

Remerciez les participants pour leur participation

Questionnaire : services techniques

1. Est-ce que vous êtes au courant du projet mis en œuvre par SOS/CRS ?

☐ OUI ☐ NON

2. Si oui, est ce que vous êtes impliqués dans la mise en œuvre ?

☐ OUI ☐ NON

3. Quel est votre rôle principal dans le cadre de ce projet ?

……
……
……

4. Que pensez du partenariat avec SOS ?

Points forts

……
……
……

Points faibles

……
……
……

Recommandations

……
……
……

Synergie

5. Est-ce qu'il existe un cadre de concertation efficace entre les différents acteurs intervenant dans le même domaine au niveau de votre localité ?

☐ OUI ☐ NON

6. Si oui, comment marche t il ?

_____
_____
_____

7. Est-ce que les ouvrages réalisés cadrent avec votre plan de développement en matière de gestion des Ressources Naturelles ?

   ☐ OUI ☐ NON

   Expliquez : _____
   _____
   _____

8. Expliquez nous brièvement les différentes formations faites pour les comités de gestion ?

Formation	Durée	Thèmes	Contenus importants

Entretien avec OCHA

1. Parler nous de la situation que le déficit agricole 2011 a entraine dans la région de Tillabéry

2. Quelles sont les zones plus affectes ?

3. Quel son les besoins plus prioritaires ?

4. Pouvez-vous nous faire un aperçu de la carte humanitaire des interventions des ONGs dans la région ? Qui faire quoi Ou ? (3W)

5. Que pensez-vous de la coordination des interventions dans la région ?

6. Il y a une synergie d'action ? C'est-à-dire que les duplications et ou les omissions sont évitées ?

7. Que pensez vous de la réponse CRS/SOS ? Est-ce que l'intervention répondre à la zone qu'il faut répondre la zone qu'il fait et au type d'appui qu'il faut ?

8. Autres informations d'ordre général ?

9. Sécurité dans le région-

Recommandations :

Evaluation du projet EARLI

GUIDE POUR OBSERVATION DIRECTE DU PAIEMENT DES BENEFICIAIRES

1. Le Lieu du payement est il adapté: |___| (1=oui, 2=non)

Commentaire :_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. La séance est –elle bien organisée (aiguillage, respect de l'ordre d'arrivé) :|___| (1=oui, 2=non)

Commentaire :_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Quel était le temps moyen d'attente des bénéficiaires : |___|___| : |___|___|

Commentaire :_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Présence de service de sécurité sur le site de paiement. |___| (1=oui, 2=non)

Commentaire :_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. La Méthodes d'identification de la personne payée est sécurisante (pièce d'identité, témoignage…) ? |___| (1=oui, 2=non)

Commentaire : _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Autres commentaire : _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Questions aux participants :

7. Les bénéficiaires avaient-ils reçu l'information sur le paiement : |___| (1=oui, 2=non)

Commentaire :_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Si oui depuis combien de temps ? |____| jours

Commentaire : _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Est-ce que le rendez-vous a été respecté ? |___| (1=oui, 2=non)

Commentaire :_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Quelle appréciation faites-vous du temps d'attente ? |__| (1=Long. 2=Moyen, 3=Court)

Commentaire : _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Combien de temps mettez-vous pour arriver au niveau du site de paiement |___| : |___|

Commentaire : _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Le montant que vous avez reçu correspond au travail que vous avez fait ? |___| (1=oui, 2=non)

Commentaire : _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Difficultés, remarques et suggestions

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. Appréciation globale de l'observateur(points positifs)

Annex 8: Photo Gallery

Real Time Evaluation: CRS Project EARLI

Woman digs a half-moon at a land recuperation site near mid-day. Guinao-Bongou, Ouallam Abdourhimou Adamou

Man begins digging a half-moon at a land recuperation site. Guinao-Bongou, Ouallam, Abdourhimou Adamou

Payment Day Dai-Kaina, Tillabery, Heather Dolphin