

that improved community infrastructure were selected via community consultation. They were environmentally friendly, feasible and had a positive impact on the local economy (road rehabilitation improved access to markets), and on the public health environment (clearance of draining canals avoids flooding in Cape Haitien and insect breeding sites). However, the impacts listed have been very short lived especially as the project activities were not complemented by a longer-term strategy to tackle underlying causes of food insecurity in these disaster-prone areas.

## 1.2 Purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation of the livelihood projects in Mapou and Cape Haitien was part of a collective learning space that aimed at bringing together specific experiences from the Oxfam GB Humanitarian Scale-up in Haiti. The objectives of the evaluation included:

- To evaluate the impact of the Oxfam food security projects in Mapou and Cape Haitien and to examine how and if the project objectives, accountability to stakeholders and expected results were achieved. This would be done with reference to Oxfam GB annual impact reporting tool in emergencies responses.
- To contribute to the Learning Workshop on the Humanitarian Scale-up in Haiti by creating a space for learning in which concepts, experiences, and perspectives around humanitarian responses could be exchanged. This would foster a common regional reference for emergency project scale-up in the CAMEXCA<sup>1</sup> region.
- To contribute to the finalization of Oxfam Cash Transfer Guidelines, by providing a case study and lessons learned from the vouchers and cash for work experiences.
- To document successful experiences that would help Oxfam surmount donor reservations on cash transfer programmes in Haiti and in the Caribbean.

## 1.3 Methodology

The methodology included the following stages:

1. Reading key documents available (initial assessments, project proposal and final reports, interim or final evaluations), and preparation of the field visits (this included 2 days in Port au Prince).
2. Meeting with OGB Haitian team and partner organisations. Local partner CROS and local Community Based Committees were met during field trips in Mapou and Cape Haitien.
3. Field visits to Mapou and Cape Haitien. Two days field visits were conducted in the both project areas, with local partners in Mapou and Oxfam national staff in Cape Haitien accompanying the evaluation team. Unfortunately, it was not possible to meet or contact OGB project managers or officers for both projects. The field visits included meeting local partners, implementing committees, focus group discussions with key informants and household interviews.
4. Participating in the Learning Forum. Preliminary evaluation results were shared with OGB and OI staff in a day that was dedicated to a presentation of evaluation findings followed by an open debate between staff attending the Learning Forum.

---

<sup>1</sup> CAMEXCA – One of the Oxfam GB regions that includes Central American and Caribbean countries.

## 5. Preparation of the final report.

The limited time and resources available for field visits and most importantly, the failure in contacting relevant OI staff involved in project implementation restricted the evaluation methodology used. The evaluation findings are mainly based on secondary information, household and focus group discussions, observations and meetings with the local implementing partners. The overlap with the Learning Workshop provided the opportunity to share findings, experiences and ideas, but considerably limited the time and resources dedicated for the evaluation. A more in depth evaluation would require more time and experienced staff accompanying the evaluators to the field.