



**GROUND TRUTH
SOLUTIONS**

WORLD HUMANITARIAN SUMMIT

FIELD SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

SURVEY OF AFFECTED PEOPLE & FIELD STAFF
IN HAITI

JUNE 14, 2017





CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
AFFECTED PEOPLE SURVEY	3
FIELD STAFF SURVEY	3
BACKGROUND	3
SECTION 1 - AFFECTED PEOPLE SURVEY	4
SUMMARY FINDINGS	4
READING THIS REPORT	5
Q1. AWARENESS	6
Q2. RELEVANCE	7
Q3. FAIRNESS	8
Q4. RESPECT	10
Q5. AWARENESS OF COMPLAINTS MECHANISMS	11
Q6. TRUST IN COMPLAINTS MECHANISMS	11
Q7. SAFETY	12
Q8. EMPOWERMENT	13
Q9. PROGRESS	13
DEMOGRAPHICS	14
SECTION 2 - FIELD STAFF SURVEY	16
SUMMARY FINDINGS	16
READING THIS REPORT	17
Q1. TRANSPARENCY	18
Q2. MANAGEMENT OF AID	19
Q3. LOCALISATION	20
Q4. FEEDBACK	21
Q5. PARTICIPATION	22
Q6. CASH	23
Q7. FLEXIBILITY	25
Q8. REPORTING TIME	26
Q9. COOPERATION	27
DEMOGRAPHICS	29
RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS	30
NOTE ON METHODOLOGY	30
BACKGROUND	30
SURVEY DEVELOPMENT	30
SAMPLE SIZE	30
SAMPLING METHODOLOGY	30
DATA DISAGGREGATION	30
LANGUAGE OF THE SURVEY	30
DATA COLLECTION	31

INTRODUCTION

Affected People Survey

This report includes two separate surveys. The first looks at data collected from 599 individuals in Haiti's North-West, Grand'Anse, South and Nippes departments – all of which have been hit hard by natural disasters, most recently by Hurricane Matthew. It provides a baseline on how affected people experience humanitarian aid by looking at performance against a set of themes related to the quality of services and engagement. These

performance dimensions link to affected people's views on progress towards the attainment of the goals set out in the Grand Bargain and other efforts intended to improve the effectiveness of humanitarian action. Subsequent surveys will track how perceptions evolve over time. Data collection took place April 9-13, 2017. Interviews were conducted face-to-face.

Field Staff Survey


This section analyses data collected from 75 humanitarian staff members working in Haiti for 11 UN agencies and international non-governmental organisations (INGOs). Each organisation participated in and distributed the

online survey among their staff. Data was collected using an online survey tool between 17 April and 18 May 2017. For more details, see the section on methodology and sampling at the end of the report.

Background

OECD donors and humanitarian actors made a series of commitments at the world humanitarian summit in May 2016 to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian aid. The OECD secretariat seeks to assess how policy changes in the global humanitarian space, including commitments made in the Grand Bargain, affect

the quality of humanitarian action. As part of this exercise, Ground Truth Solutions has been commissioned by the OECD, with the support of the German Federal Foreign Office, to track the way people affected by humanitarian crises and field staff experience and view humanitarian activities.





SECTION 1 - AFFECTED PEOPLE SURVEY

Summary Findings

Overall, the findings are quite negative and warrant further investigation and follow-up.

Humanitarian services

There is limited awareness of the kinds of aid that are available (Q1). People feel information about the distribution of aid is lacking. Most people who responded negatively say they need more precise and accurate information about when, where and who distributes what.

The majority of respondents do not feel that the aid they currently receive covers their basic needs (Q2). The most pressing unmet needs are housing, financial aid, and food. There is a prevalent sense that aid does not reach those who need it most, notably more vulnerable or frail members of the community (Q3).

Engagement

Respondents generally do not feel they are treated with respect by aid providers, with over half responding negatively (Q4). Those living in Nippes, North-West, and in rural areas are most critical of their treatment by aid providers.

Over two-thirds of respondents are unaware of existing complaint mechanisms (Q5). Again, this issue is most pronounced in Nippes and North-West and among people in rural areas. Practically no one in these locations knows how to make suggestions or complaints to aid providers.


In general, most respondents do not believe that their opinions are taken into account regarding aid provision (Q6).

Outcomes

Respondents do not feel safe (Q7). The lack of safety is particularly acute among homeless people.

Neither respondents feel that the support they receive will enable them to live without aid in the future nor do they see improvements in their lives (Q8/Q9). Those living in Nippes are the most negative.

Overview of mean scores per question





Reading this report

This report uses simple bar charts for both open and closed questions on the Likert scale. The bar charts show the distribution (in %) of answer options chosen for a particular question—with colours ranging from dark red for negative answers to dark green for positive ones. The mean or average score is also shown for each question on a scale of 1 to 5.

For each question, we indicate the main take-away or conclusion drawn from the data. We also indicate issues that require further exploration or inquiry. This can be done either by comparing the perceptual data with other data sets or by clarifying directly with people in the surveyed communities what lies behind their perceptions through, for example, focus group discussions, key informant interviews or other forms of dialogue.



SURVEY QUESTIONS


Q1. Awareness

Do you feel informed about the kind of aid available to you?

1 = Not at all
2 = Not very much
3 = I know about some services
4 = I am informed about most services
5 = I am well informed about the aid available
No opinion
Do not want to answer

(values in %)

Mean: 2.6




Respondents indicate a limited awareness about available aid, with only third feeling informed.

Scores vary significantly across departments. People interviewed in North-West and Nippes feel least informed. Respondents in Grand'Anse, who mostly live in urban areas, are the most informed, with 45% of respondents answering positively. According to OCHA's 3W map as of March 31, 2017 these are also departments with fewer operations on the ground.¹

Awareness is lowest amongst respondents in rural areas.

Older respondents feel better informed about available aid than younger respondents.




¹OCHA 3W Map, "Haiti: Aperçu de Qui fait Quoi et Où (3W). Du 20 février au 31 mars 2017."



Follow-up question to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q1:

What information do you need?




Respondents need more precise and accurate information about the date, time, and place of aid distribution.

Some people mention that maps and telephone numbers would make access to aid easier. People would like to be contacted by telephone or to receive information on the radio. These findings jibe with those in the Real Time Evaluation.²

The graph shows the most common responses to this open-ended question. The figures indicate the percentage/ number of people who gave this answer. Percentages do not total 100% because respondents could give multiple answers.

Q2. Relevance

Does the aid you currently receive cover your basic needs?




(values in %)

Mean: 1.7



Respondents indicate that the aid they receive is not sufficient to meet their basic needs.


Respondents in North-West and Grand'Anse are overwhelmingly negative about whether their needs are being met. Nippes is the only department with a notable number of positive responses.



² François Grünewald & Ed Schenkenberg, "Real Time Evaluation: Response to Hurricane Matthew in Haiti (RTE)". November-December 2016, p. 42.




Respondents in all areas experience difficulties covering their basic needs. Some 68% of respondents in rural areas are particularly negative on this question.



Follow-up question to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q2:

What are your most important needs that are not met?



**Other* includes security, seeds, coal, fishing tools, clothes and shoes for children.

Respondents identify housing, financial aid in the form of merchant and agricultural credit, and subsidies as their most important unmet needs. Nearly half feel food insecure. Hygiene kits and healthcare, especially for children, are also considered vital – but unmet – needs. Other unmet needs mentioned relate to employment, education, trade development, and business. Access to potable water, infrastructure, and sanitation remain important unmet needs.

The OCHA Situation Report No. 35 (November-December 2016), underlines that Food Security and Shelter/NFI sectors require additional support, while the Early Recovery sector is among the least funded, hindering access to credit and recovery of the local economy.³

The graph shows the most common responses to this open-ended question. The figures indicate the percentage/ number of people who gave this answer. Percentages do not total 100% because respondents could give multiple answers.


Q3. Fairness

Does aid go to those who need it most in Haiti?



(values in %)

Mean: 2.1




There is a prevalent sense among respondents that the aid does not go to those who need it most, with over half of the respondents answering negatively.

³ OCHA, "Haiti: Hurricane Matthew Situation Report No.35 (04 March 2017)".




Respondents from North-West are far more negative than those from Nippes on the fairness of aid distribution.

Respondents living in the same place as before the hurricane feel most strongly that aid does not reach those most in need.



Follow-up question to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q3:

Who is left out?



*"Other" includes adults, widows, peaceful people, children, and the strong.

Vulnerable and frail people widely considered as excluded from support. People in remote areas have special problems related to access – with the frail and vulnerable most disadvantaged.

The graph shows the most common responses to this open-ended question. The figures indicate the percentage/ number of people who gave this answer. Percentages do not total 100% because respondents could give multiple answers.



Q4. Respect

Are you treated with respect by aid providers?




(values in %)

Mean: 2.4




Most respondents do not feel that aid providers treat them respectfully.


Respondents in South, who mostly live in urban areas, feel more positive than those in Nippes and North-West, where 83% and 90% respectively responded negatively.



Respondents in rural areas are more critical of treatment by aid providers than those in urban areas.



Those who continue to live in the same place as before the hurricane view their treatment as slightly more positive than those who either lost their home and are living with friends or in a different home.




Half of the respondents aged 17 to 34 years do not feel they are treated with respect "at all," while older respondents are slightly less negative.






Q5. Awareness of complaints mechanisms (participation)

Do you know how to make suggestions or complaints to aid providers?



(values in %)




Knowledge about existing complaints mechanisms is very poor.


There seems to be a significant information gap about how to make suggestions and complaints in Nippes and North-West.

Respondents living in rural areas generally do not feel they have the ability or the opportunity to voice their opinions to aid providers.

Department



Area



Q6. Trust in complaints mechanisms (participation)

Do you feel aid providers take your opinion into account when providing aid?



(values in %)

Mean: 1.5



The overwhelming majority of respondents do not think that their opinions are considered regarding aid provision.



Perceptions among respondents in Grand'Anse and urban dwellers in South are less negative than those in Nippes and North-West.



Q7. Safety

Do you feel safe in your place of residence?




(values in %)

Mean: 2.2




Most respondents do not feel safe where they are currently living. Several respondents mention security as one of the most urgent needs in the follow-up to the question on whether their main needs are met (Q2).

There is a greater sense of safety among those living in North-West than in the other departments covered by the survey.



Respondents who became homeless and are living with friends or family feel less safe than those who live in their own homes, whether it is a different house or the same as before the hurricane.





Q8. Empowerment

Do you feel the support you receive prepares (empowers) you to live without aid in the future?

- 1 = Not at all
- 2 = Not really
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Mostly yes
- 5 = Yes, very much
- No opinion
- Do not want to answer

(values in %)

Mean: 1.3



Respondents do not feel that the support they receive will enable them to achieve self-sufficiency in the future. This trend holds across all departments and demographic breakdowns.

Q9. Progress

Overall, is life improving for those affected by natural disaster(s)?

- 1 = Not at all
- 2 = Not really
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Mostly yes
- 5 = Yes, very much
- No opinion
- Do not want to answer

(values in %)

Mean: 1.4



Most respondents do not have the sense that life is improving.

Respondents in North-West are slightly less pessimistic than those in other departments, while those in Nippes are particularly negative.


Department	Mean
Grand'Anse	1.4
South	1.4
Nippes	1.1
North-West	2.0




DEMOGRAPHICS

Overall, 900 individuals were interviewed, 33% of whom did not receive humanitarian support and hence, were excluded from the analysis.


Received aid/services



Gender




Affected by a major natural disaster




Age




Department




Department



Area




Accommodation*



*Same house as before the hurricane; homeless, living with friends and family; different house than before the hurricane, but own home



Communes





SECTION 2 – FIELD STAFF SURVEY

Summary findings

Humanitarian services

Q1/Q2. There is a general sense that funds are used where needs are greatest and that aid is managed well.

Some respondents identify challenges in reaching people in remote areas, providing shelter, coordinating aid, and offering long-term solutions. Those who see issues in management of aid point to a lack of coordination between local and international staff, a top down approach, and corruption.

Engagement

Q3. Over a third of respondents do not believe that local and national responders receive enough support.

Obstacles include limited funding, donor constraints, government constraints, and lack of local capacity. Suggested solutions are advocacy with donors, more direct funding to local actors, closer long-term cooperation between international and national responders, long-term relations and plans, and good governance.

Q4. The majority of staff members feel well informed about affected people's perceptions of aid programmes.

The few who do not point to poor feedback mechanisms, delayed implementation of community engagement programmes, and poor dissemination of information.

Q5. Half of the respondents feel that affected people are able to influence programme design. Those who perceive participation as limited mention top-down donor-oriented design, poor feedback mechanisms, time constraints, and lack of contribution from local actors.

Some suggest more effort in including people's input in programme assessment, design, and decision-making.

Outcomes

Q6. Almost a quarter of surveyed staff see no advantages in cash programming. The indicated problems are poor contextualisation, short-term support, and lack of sustainability. Staff believe that cash programmes could be more effective if they were better targeted, controlled, and monitored; coupled with other support; run in cooperation with local authorities and communities; and with more attention paid to the security of recipients.

Q9. Cooperation between humanitarian and development actors is seen as somewhat effective.

Negative perceptions relate to lack of coordination and shared goals, a lack of connection between the actors, and an absence of development projects. Suggested solutions include improving networking/coordination systems, focusing on sustainability, and increasing community involvement.


Donor related

Q7. Staff feel quite positive about the flexibility of programming. The reasons for negative perceptions are rigid donor demands and agreements with partners, top-down programming, and time constraints.

Q8. The amount of time spent on reporting is considered as mostly appropriate.



Overview of mean scores per question



Reading this report

This report uses bar charts for closed Likert scale questions. The charts show the distribution (in %) of answer options chosen for a particular question – with colours ranging from dark red for negative answers

to dark green for positive ones. The mean or average score is also shown for each question on a scale of 1 to 5. For each question we indicate the main take-away or conclusion drawn from the data.




Q1. Transparency

Do you feel aid funds go where they are most needed?

1 = Not at all
2
3
4
5 = Yes, I do

(values in %)

Mean: 3.9



Aid funds are regarded as well-managed and used where need is greatest. This trend holds across all demographic breakdowns.

Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q1:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Field staff indicate several problems of aid distribution:

Challenge of remote areas and limited funding:

"Remote rural areas have been neglected or marginalised by aid."

Respondents indicate that people in remote or inaccessible areas miss out on support and their needs are not currently addressed. Field workers don't have the means to meet the needs of all affected people, for example those who lost everything in Cyclone Mathieu.

"One tries to help the most vulnerable beneficiaries, but it's really hard to choose when the response is so limited." implement them."

Problems in the shelter sector:

"The most vulnerable are those with houses that were completely destroyed."

Funds in the shelter sector also do not cover the full reconstruction of houses, targeting only people whose houses were lightly damaged.

Need for a long-term solution:

"It is not enough to help people in need temporarily – what is more important is to find a way to get them out of their need once and for all. Otherwise, the same stories are repeated."

Coordination problems:

"It is not easy to understand the new way of working in terms of intersectoral and multisectoral actions."

Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

Field staff call for better targeting, increased funding, more cash programmes, long-term solutions, and cooperation with local committees and communities.

Better targeting:

"The support period was very short and all assistance went to accessible locations only. Donors should fund only hard-to-reach areas promoting local community responsibility and participation."

Cooperation with local committees and communities:

"Define the priorities with community leaders and the local authorities; improve coordination among cluster members and the intersectoral group."

Cash programmes:

"Give money for multipurpose cash so that people can buy food production materials instead of just food. Create Cash for Work projects with aid provided for disasters."


Long-term solutions:

"If, after a hurricane, food and hygiene kits are brought in and damaged roofs are covered, it does not solve anything. The key thing is to help people to have a home that can withstand another hurricane."



Q2. Management of aid

Do you feel that aid is managed well by the humanitarian community in Haiti?



(values in %)

Mean: 3.9



Staff interviewed are satisfied with the way aid is administered.

Field staff team leaders are less positive about aid management than other staff members.

Role in the field	Mean
Field staff team leader	3.7
3 10 10 62 14	
Field staff team member	4.1
5 5 67 24	
HQ staff	4.0
9 82 9	
Other	3.9
14 57 29	

Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q2:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Staff see several problems in aid management: exaggerated expenses, lack of coordination between local and international actors, top down funding, and corruption.

Lack of coordination:

“More money should be spent on capacity building of local actors. This would help break the cycle of dependence on international NGOs. Furthermore, many projects are designed without a clear understanding of the reality on the ground. Project design should be bottom up, not top down.”

“There is a profound lack of collective, collaborative approaches (government and non-government and private sector) to supporting the people most at risk or vulnerable. Reluctance of government to lead the initiative.”

Top-down approach:

“A lot of organisations tend to prioritise themselves; their priorities are not based on the needs of the people.”



Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

A better humanitarian response would include more knowledge of the community and situation on the ground, capacity building of local actors, and better cooperation between humanitarian actors.

More knowledge of the situation:

“Work with local leaders, have the criteria disseminated to the community.”

Better cooperation between humanitarian actors:

“Alignment of the humanitarian actors to the national strategy; good leadership by the government of Haiti.”


Capacity building:

“Invest in capacity building. Design the projects with a better understanding of the reality on the ground.”

“Capacity building of national response agencies. Improved public opinion of, and confidence in, leadership at local, regional and national level. International organisations need to step back.”

Q3. Localisation

Do you feel there is sufficient funding for local and national aid providers in Haiti?




(values in %)

Mean: 3.0




Opinions are divided as to whether local responders are adequately supported.


Respondents from INGOs are less convinced that there is enough support for local players than UN agency staff.



Field staff team leaders are less convinced than other staff about the sufficiency of support.



Staff who work with affected people in urban areas feel more positive about the support provided to local responders than those who do not.





Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q3:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Localisation of the response presents issues in terms of cooperation with local actors, limited funding, donor and government constraints, and lack of supply.

Donor constraints:

“Because of time pressure and donor constraints, there is not sufficient space to engage with local partners. The other problem is a lack of local partners with sufficient capacity, which can mean we need to have many small partners, which can be time consuming and inefficient when dealing with rapid response.”

Cooperation with local actors:

“There is a tendency to minimise the capacity of local aid providers. The narrative among humanitarian actors represents a threat for the local actors.”
 “The fact that we are involved at the same time as the local agencies reduces the funds that could be allocated to them. The trick would be to strengthen the local and national bodies so that they can respond effectively to any situation that would arise.”

Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

Suggested solutions to problems of localisation are advocacy with donors, more direct funding to local actors, closer long-term cooperation between international and national responders, and good governance.

Direct funding to local actors:

“Humanitarian partners need to work hand in hand with local and national aid providers; support local aid providers to improve their capacity; allocate a minimum of 15% of the humanitarian funding of the project to reinforce locals.”

Closer long-term cooperation between international and national responders:

“The existing community networks have more influence in the localities; using them would ensure sustainability of actions.”


Advocacy with donors:

“Donors should include a clause in their project making it mandatory for an international NGO to actively seek a partnership with a local organisation – for capacity building and to increase efficiency of the programmes.”

“Actively involving national actors in coordination, adapting international systems to national coordination context and realities.”

Q4. Feedback

Do field staff like you have enough information about the way affected people see aid programmes?




(values in %)

Mean: 3.9



Respondents feel well informed about people’s perceptions of aid programmes.

HQ staff lack information the most.





Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q4:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Lack of information among staff is due to lack of or inadequate feedback mechanisms, delayed implementation of community engagement programmes, and poor dissemination of information.

Delayed implementation of community engagement programmes:

“There is much more one-way communication between the populations and the aid workers. Some efforts have been made with the Internews project to improve it over the past three months. In spite of it all, OCHA, which has the mandate on CWC [communicating with communities], does not have enough capacity to move forward. There is an interagency group that has worked on a strategic document, but still there is not any effort ... to operationalise it.”

Lack of feedback mechanisms:

“Post-distribution monitoring is not sufficient to gather this [people’s perceptions of aid programmes] information. The survey done by Internews to help support this effort was not helpful, in my opinion, because information was simply collected and reported without placing it into context or checking its veracity. Thus, overall, there is a lack of credible and reliable information about how aid is perceived and why.”

Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

Gaps in the feedback loop can be closed by two-way communication, community engagement policies, and contextualisation of current feedback.

Two-way communication:

“OCHA should act on its CWC mandate. Partners need to have feedback mechanisms in place to have two-way communication with the population.”

Contextualisation of current feedback:


“The effort from Internews was a good start, but needs to be complemented with a second layer of questioning to better understand why people say what they say and to provide some context for the veracity of the statements so they are more useful in adjusting our approach.”

Engagement with communities:

“Closer engagement with affected populations and more effort on communication with communities in all activities.”

Q5. Participation

Do affected people have enough say in the way aid programmes are designed and implemented?




(values in %)

Mean: 3.3



Respondents feel that affected people are to some extent able to influence programme design. However, nearly one third of them do not believe they are.

Respondents from UN agencies are less convinced that affected people have a say in how programmes are run than INGO staff.





Respondents who work with people in urban areas feel more optimistic about the involvement of the population than those who do not.



Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q5:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Staff see poor involvement of affected populations because of top-down, donor oriented design, poor feedback mechanisms, time constraints, and lack of contribution from local actors.

Top-down approach:

“Beneficiaries are only concerned with design and implementation of activities that are pre-decided, and not concerned with deciding on what exact intervention is needed.”

Time constraints:

“We often have 24 hours to prepare a proposal. This does not allow for any consultation.”

“Projects are designed regarding donor’s strategy and aid providers ... do what donors are prepared to fund.”

Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

Include people’s opinions in programme design:

“Representatives from affected people to be consulted on operational set-up, delivery mechanism, etc. - which would require a very fast activation of the mechanism (within days) which will be a challenge.”

Inform affected people about the programmes:

“Informing the beneficiaries about their data, quantities, coverage, etc.”

Consult with communities during design and assessment stages:

“Better attention to detail when assessments are made, not pre-prepared cookie cutter, one-size-fits-all approaches... Better relations with people in the community.”

Set up inter-sector complaint mechanisms:


“Consider an inter-agency/inter-sector complaint or feedback mechanism.”

“Do post-distribution monitoring to know what beneficiaries think and this will lead to improvement.”

“Articulation between donor strategy and government strategy; flexibility of donors regarding programmes.”

Q6. Cash

Do you feel that cash programmes contribute to better outcomes than other kinds of aid?



(values in %)

Mean: 3.4



While nearly half of the respondents feel that cash programmes lead – to varying degrees – to better outcomes, almost a quarter do not consider cash a more effective practice.



Respondents from UN agencies are less convinced in higher effectiveness of cash than INGO staff.

Type of organisation	Mean
INGO	3.5
UN agency	3.2

Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q6:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Some staff criticize cash transfer programmes for their lack of contextualization, short-term nature, and lack of sustainability

Lack of contextualization:

“I like cash, as it gives people autonomy to make needs-based decisions, but it requires a sound understanding of their context. In some places it just doesn’t work (and we ignore that).”

“In the case of cash distributions, there are more disorders, thefts, and violence against beneficiaries. Even when the distribution location is safe, there is the danger that when a person returns home, he or she may be attacked. The people most at risk are the elderly and women. It is like putting people’s lives at risk by helping them.”

Short-term nature:

“The temporary distribution of money for the populations is ineffective because the beneficiaries channel their expenditure in consumption. There is a need for sustainable projects which will benefits the whole community.”

“The other forms of distribution are good, but if we organised a kind of microcredit for the people affected, it would have been very profitable.”

Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

Staff believe that cash programmes can be more effective if they are better targeted, controlled and monitored; coupled with other support; run in cooperation with local authorities and communities; concerned with security of recipients, and implemented in a sustainable manner.

Focus on security of recipients:

“The cash distribution can always be done, but instead of giving appointments to targeted people in places that will be seen by other people (because there will always be intruders), it could be done door to door, to every household, without attracting the attention of those who are not affected. It would be much better. It should also be ensured that the target audience will be present on the chosen date, and increase the number of reliable agents or distributors.”

Better targeting, control, and monitoring:

“In my opinion, more reliable control mechanisms must be found, involving local authorities and community leaders in the targeting and validation of beneficiary lines. Then ensure online crediting via an operator and the operator will go into the communities to ensure payment in front of the authorities and the leaders who had validated the lists of beneficiaries beforehand.”


Sustainable programming:

“People need to be recovered. The agricultural sector needs to be reboosted [sic.] and the enterprises need to be recovered through subventions as well. The other aspect is related to disaster risk preparedness. There is a great need to have actions for mitigating future negative impact on the population. Nothing has yet really been done in terms of recovery except cash and cash for work just for ten days. How ten days of work for 300 gourdes can recover the population? It is a bandage but the real causes are not even questioned.”




Q7. Flexibility

Do humanitarian organisations have the flexibility to adjust their projects and programmes when things change?




(values in %)

Mean: 3.7




Most of the staff are quite positive about the flexibility of programming, although 18% are not.

Respondents involved in management and M&E functions are more concerned than other staff members.



Those not working with affected people in urban areas feel they have more room for programme adjustments.



Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q7:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Staff mention a lack of flexibility because of rigid donor demands and agreements with partners, top-down programming, and time constraints.

Rigid donor demands:

“This is a big issue. All partners in our sector are complaining that donors are stuck on their programme and they almost cannot do anything to adjust their programmes because they have requirements and objectives. They need to follow donors’ requirements. There is a big need to work on this.”

Top-down programming:

“Many partners are limited in the way they can adapt their projects. This is because the projects are not designed at the grassroots level.”

“Very often, humanitarian organisations have project models, experimented in other countries and they come to apply them in Haiti without realising that Haiti has its own specific issues.”



Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

More flexibility could be reached if it is included in the agreements, and based on community feedback and changing needs.


Needs-based programming:

“Demand-driven models in which the project/programme needs are driven by realistic needs in the field (and not pushed down from HQ) I suspect some are donor driven and this is a compromise on decision-making.”

“We know that after a disaster, the situation changes in a fast and progressive way. Organisations should have the right to adjust their project according to the evolution, of course with evidence of the change in support.”

Q8. Reporting time

Do you feel the amount of time you spend on reporting is appropriate?



(values in %)

Mean: 4.1



The amount of time spent on reporting is seen as mostly appropriate. There is no significant difference among the staff groups.

Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q8:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Negative responses on reporting time are based on:

Time and crisis constraints:

“This depends on the structure set up at the time of the emergency. But often, the priority is to push ahead with the distributions and there is almost no time to produce true and well-developed reports on the operation.”

“In an emergency set up, reliable data needs to be registered and analysed but the amount required often overwhelms NGOs and has either an impact on time spent on actual programming or quality of data.”

High requirements of reporting:

“Certain donors have ridiculous levels of reporting and documentation required for projects executed in difficult and improvised circumstances.”

Lack of follow-up on reports:

“I don't know who is reading the report and what they do with the information they receive. Reporting is good if there is a structure to process the information and act upon it.”

Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

Problems with reporting could be solved by:

Identifying goals of reporting and its purpose:

“Recognise the role of reporting and how it is linked to improvement.”

“Coordination needs to be more strategic instead of taking time writing reports and more work in the field to understand the issues is needed.”

Adjust report requirement to the situation:


“Donors need to relax certain requirements or recognise when relaxation is required under certain conditions.”

“UNICEF would require weekly reports on data and send an inappropriate number of emails about it when the emergency was at its greatest and most teams were cut off from any communication means and electricity.”



Q9. Cooperation

Do humanitarian and development actors work together effectively in Haiti?



(values in %)


Mean: 3.4



While half of the respondents see effective cooperation between humanitarian and development actors, almost one-quarter do not.


Respondents from UN agencies are less positive than INGO staff.

Type of organisation



Staff working with affected people in urban areas are less convinced the two parties work well together.

Work with people affected in urban areas



Follow-up to those who responded 1, 2, or 3 to Q9:

Please explain why you answered that way.

Negative perceptions are explained by:

Lack of coordination/shared goal:

“Attendance is low at coordination meetings. Lack of government leadership.”

“Each of the actors have their priorities. There is no common ground on that.”

“Sometimes they all act in the same field and with different strategies.”

“There aren’t mechanisms in the coordination between humanitarian and development programmes.”

Lack of connection between the two:

“Humanitarian responses are not articulated in such a way as to prepare recovery operations.”

Absence of development projects:

“We have very little development projects.”

“Some regular programmes were suspended.”



Please give 1 or 2 examples of how this could be improved.

Cooperation could be improved by:

**Organising better networking/communication/
cooperation:**

"The UN agencies have a much better coordinating structure through OCHA; they are able to make the necessary coordination and agreement required to avoid duplications in the actions to be carried out at the field level."

"Parallel coordination fora are in place, synergies need to be created."

Focusing on sustainability:

"Include Development/Recovery in the Intersectoral meetings."

"Invest in sustainable development."

Including communities:


"Implementation of projects directly with the communities without the association of emergency humanitarian actors, no visible realisation of the development as the emergency tends towards its end."




DEMOGRAPHICS

The graphs below depict the demographic breakdown of the 75 respondents. Each graph includes percentages, as well as the frequency in parentheses.


Gender



Role in the field



Area**



*"Other" includes consultant engineer, coordination specialist, field security adviser, gender inclusion and protection, logistical cargo tracking, staff support service.


**Respondents could choose multiple answer options, therefore percentages do not total 100%.

*"Other" includes coordination, community liaison, early recovery, risk management, CMO, ICT support, management, and telecommunication.


Age




Department



Type of Organisation



Type of services provided**





RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The following next steps are suggested for consideration by humanitarian organisations in Haiti:

a) Dialogue. Agencies should discuss the main findings with their staff and partners to verify and deepen the analysis. These "sense-making" dialogues should focus on areas where the data suggests that further attention or course correction may be necessary.

b) Advocacy. Consider sharing the feedback with other agencies working in Haiti to see how, together, the

humanitarian community can address concerns or bridge gaps.

c) Close the loop. Encourage field staff to close the feedback loop by communicating changes or informing affected people about how services are being adapted to take their feedback into account.

Ground Truth would be happy to discuss these next steps and offer advice about how to move things forward.

NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

Background

OECD donors and humanitarian actors made a series of commitments at the WHS in Istanbul to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian aid. The OECD secretariat seeks to assess the policy changes in the global humanitarian landscape as well as whether the commitments made in the Grand Bargain are having the intended impact. As part of this exercise, Ground Truth Solutions has been commissioned to track the way people affected by humanitarian crises and field staff experience reforms set out in the Grand Bargain. The objective is to inform implementation of the Grand Bargain and, ultimately, to improve the effectiveness of humanitarian aid.

Survey development

Ground Truth developed two survey instruments - the affected people survey and the field staff survey - to measure the implementation and the effects of the Grand Bargain commitments. The goal of the first survey is to gather feedback from affected people on the provision of humanitarian aid and track how perceptions evolve over time. The second survey, meanwhile, collects feedback from field staff on the implementation of Grand Bargain themes and provides a baseline to track progress on implementation and impact of the commitments. Closed questions use a 1-5 Likert scale to quantify answers.

Sample size

Affected people survey

Interviews were conducted with 599 people across four departments in Haiti targeting people affected by recent natural disasters who have received humanitarian support.

Field staff survey

Online surveys were conducted with 75 field staff team members, team leaders and M&E, programme and technical specialists from iNGOs and UN agencies. Twenty-nine percent of respondents were female and 71% male.

Sampling methodology

Affected people survey

At least 100 people were randomly selected in each of four departments in Haiti. The objective was to have representative samples from each of the four most affected regions, spread across urban, rural, and coastal communities, split evenly between males and females. Participants were randomly selected and interviewed in public places in 14 different communes.

Field staff survey

Twelve organisations were approached and asked to participate in the survey. Eleven organisations participated and distributed the online survey using a convenience sample of their staff. Organisations participating were: UN agencies and international organisations (OCHA, UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, IOM); INGOs (CARE, CRS, IFRC, Mercy Corps, Oxfam); and one local responder J/P HRO.

Data disaggregation

Affected people survey

Data is disaggregated by department, area, age and type of accommodation.

Field staff survey

Data is disaggregated by type of organisation, role in the field and work with affected people in different areas. The analysis in the report includes any significant difference in the perceptions of different demographic groups. It does not, however, show the full breakdown of responses according to these categories.

Language of the survey

Affected people survey

This survey was conducted in French and Haitian Creole.

Field staff survey

This survey was conducted in English, French, and Haitian Creole.



Data collection

Affected people survey

Data was collected between 9 and 13 April 2017 by Le Fonds de Parrainage National, an independent data collection company contracted by Ground Truth.

Field staff survey

Data was collected between 17 April and 18 May 2017 using an online survey tool.

For more information about Ground Truth surveys in Haiti, please contact Nick van Praag (Nick@groundtruthsolutions.org), Michael Sarnitz (Michael@groundtruthsolutions.org), or Valentina Shafina (Valentina@groundtruthsolutions.org).