

# CDAC Haiti Learning Review

## Final Report



CECILIA M. LJUNGMAN    MAY 2012

\*\*\*

This report was written by  
Cecilia M. Ljungman of Channel  
Research, with the support of  
Jethro Serome in Haiti.



**Route des Marnières 45B,  
1380 Ohain, Belgium**

**Tel +32 2 633 65 29**

**Fax +32 2 633 30 92**

**[www.channelresearch.com](http://www.channelresearch.com)  
[info@channelresearch.com](mailto:info@channelresearch.com)**

Any opinions expressed in this report are  
the author's own and do not necessarily  
reflect the opinion of CDAC Haiti, the  
global CDAC Network Secretariat,  
or CDAC Network Members.

\*\*\*

## Preface

This Learning Review was made possible as part of the generous support provided by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs' (UNOCHA) Emergency Relief Response Fund (ERRF) to CDAC Haiti.

The CDAC Network commissioned Channel Research to undertake the CDAC Haiti Learning Review, which was conducted between October 2011 and January 2012. Channel Research interviewed and met with 55 individuals from a variety of UN, INGO, NGO, Red Cross Movement, and media development organisations, as well as journalists and representatives of local media and officials from different Government of Haiti departments, in Port-au-Prince, London, Bangkok and New York.

The CDAC Network wishes to thank UNOCHA for its generous support, Channel Research for its professional work, and all CDAC Network members for their time and effort toward completing the Review. Special thanks go to CDAC Haiti staff, national and international, and to Internews in Haiti and at HQ level for its contribution and overall support to CDAC Haiti and this Review.

For further information on the Learning Review and the CDAC Network, please contact:

Rachel Houghton, CDAC Network Global Coordinator  
[rachel.houghton@cdacnetwork.org](mailto:rachel.houghton@cdacnetwork.org)  
[www.cdacnetwork.org](http://www.cdacnetwork.org)

## Acknowledgements

The Review team would like to extend its sincere gratitude to the staff of CDAC Haiti and Internews as well as the CDAC Global Coordinator who provided the team with excellent support and logistical arrangements throughout the evaluation period. The team would also like to thank the partners of CDAC Haiti who took the time to provide their insights and assessments.

# Foreword

The devastating earthquake that struck Haiti in January 2010 was the most destructive urban disaster in recent history. It killed 217,300 Haitians and disrupted the lives of 2.1 million more. In response, OCHA led one of the largest humanitarian relief operations ever mounted.

Just 10 months later, humanitarian actors faced a new crisis when a severe cholera epidemic spread rapidly across the country. The colossal humanitarian operation in response to the earthquake and the cholera epidemic has yielded some important achievements. It also exposed weaknesses that the humanitarian community is now addressing through a set of humanitarian reforms under the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Transformative Agenda.

As in all humanitarian responses, decisive action must be matched with critical reflection. What has the humanitarian community learned from its operations in Haiti? How responsive are we to the needs of people affected by crisis? What can and must be improved in the future? And what role do innovation and new partnerships play in our work? These are some of the questions this CDAC Network Learning Review seeks to answer.

CDAC Haiti's pioneering work, supported by Internews, OCHA and organizations such as the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, illustrates the power of new media, technologies and collaboration to enhance humanitarian response through better two-way communication with disaster-affected communities.

Modern technologies are facilitating innovative responses to humanitarian needs, fuelled by new cross-sector partnerships that put the people we seek to serve at the heart of our work and in greater control of their own recovery.

I want to thank the CDAC Network for commissioning this Learning Review. I hope this report is a milestone towards a future in which information is never an unmet need, and in which communication is seen as critical to the effectiveness, quality and accountability of aid.



*Gwi-Yeop Son is the Director of Corporate Programmes  
for the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.*

# Executive Summary

The Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC) Network is a unique initiative that brings together expertise from the humanitarian, media development and technology sectors in a new collaboration that recognises information and two-way communication as key humanitarian deliverables. It was formed in 2009 with a view to improving communication between aid actors and disaster affected populations.<sup>11</sup>

In the immediate aftermath of the January 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the CDAC Network undertook its first ever ground initiative. This initiative, which came to be known as CDAC Haiti, was funded largely through the OCHA's ERRF with some additional short-term funding in 2011 from the global CDAC Network and the World Health Organisation (WHO). In total, CDAC Haiti received US \$615,000.

This Learning Review aims to document CDAC Haiti's activities, assess achievements, and contribute knowledge about what worked, what didn't, and why. A key component of the Review is the identification of lessons from this 'new' area of humanitarian coordination that can be drawn for other emergency operations. The Review was conducted between October 2011 and January 2012.

## Phases of CDAC Haiti

CDAC Haiti began as an informal, short-term pilot initiative. From the beginning it aimed to provide a system-wide communication coordination mechanism – an unusual ambition for what was technically a stand-alone project. The objective

was to enable humanitarian operations to get life-saving information to affected populations and, of equal importance, to channel the affected population's voices back to aid actors.

In the early months, CDAC Haiti benefitted from a few committed individuals in both headquarters and in Haiti who had the vision to set sufficient groundwork in place for the future direction of CDAC Haiti and its secretariat. This meant that when secretariat staff were eventually recruited they had a strong foundation on which to build, and were able to carve out CDAC Haiti's role as a coordination mechanism, advocator and service provider in the area of communication with disaster affected communities relatively quickly.

By the time the cholera epidemic became fact in October 2010, CDAC Haiti had gained enough credibility to be requested by OCHA to become the 'communication sub-cluster' on cholera. CDAC Haiti found its stride in the three months that followed. Evidence suggests that its achievements in this period were widely regarded as filling an important gap and adding value to the humanitarian effort.

CDAC Haiti shut down for nearly three months when funding ended in January 2011. Having initially been conceived with a short-term perspective, CDAC Haiti and the global CDAC Network did not systematically seek a sustainable funding base. While CDAC Haiti was restarted at the end of April 2011, it never fully regained its former momentum.

In its last phase, CDAC Haiti continued to undertake what this review considers to be quality work. Its coordination function became much less pronounced as its focus centred on building capacity among its key government partners. The secretariat finally closed in November 2011, although most stakeholders in Haiti were in agreement that this was premature. They deemed that it would have had a critical role to play in the upcoming return and relocation of displaced populations.

<sup>11</sup> Initially this included the BBC World Service Trust (now BBC Media Action), British Red Cross, Internews, Irish Red Cross, Save the Children alliance and Thomson Reuters Foundation. OCHA was considered a member of the core group although it did not contribute financially in the early stages.

## Achievements of CDAC Haiti

The humanitarian response in Haiti represents one of the largest cross-agency commitments to communication ever seen in an emergency. The humanitarian community's capacity to communicate with affected communities reached new ground, and evidence suggests CDAC Haiti played a critical role in this overall achievement by mobilising partners toward appropriate, efficient and coherent communication with disaster affected communities.

In Haiti and elsewhere, efficient information sharing among humanitarian partners, identification of gaps and collective filling of those gaps, and efforts to minimise duplication and enhance effectiveness requires effective coordination. And to work successfully, a coordination mechanism requires credibility, information management systems and regular coordination meetings. It also needs the ability to lead strategically, integrate itself into the humanitarian system and to advocate. CDAC Haiti met most of these requirements as illustrated by the findings summarised below:

- Most stakeholders had a high regard for the competence, efficiency and dynamism of the CDAC Haiti secretariat staff. The secretariat acted as a neutral party, ran meetings in a democratic manner and was adept at building consensus among the range of different partners.
- Overall, most people considered the secretariat's regular coordination meetings useful. These meetings made it possible for partners to collaborate on: i) providing coordinated and relevant life-saving information to disaster affected populations, and ii) ensuring that feedback from affected populations was effectively channelled to the humanitarian community. Stakeholders maintained that the coordination effort was effective in avoiding duplication and filling gaps in the response. Without CDAC Haiti, they believed, many opportunities would have been missed and the quality of the response would have been diminished.

- The secretariat was particularly noted for being an efficient provider of reliable information. It digested and packaged information using different channels and formats to meet the needs of its constituency.
- The CDAC Haiti secretariat offered strategic leadership by playing a proactive and catalytic role. This included pitching ideas, bringing parties together, promoting synergies and coordinating joint initiatives that advanced the overall goal of communicating with disaster affected populations. Furthermore, the secretariat offered its advice and support to partners that saved them time and resources.
- The CDAC Haiti secretariat effectively integrated itself into the humanitarian system. It regularly liaised and networked with several clusters. Despite its lack of a formal coordination status and initial recognition within the system, because of its credibility and knowledge CDAC Haiti was invited to participate in the overall Inter-Cluster Coordination (ICC) meetings as if it were itself a cluster within the humanitarian system.
- CDAC Haiti made clear gains in raising awareness about two-way communication, listening to vulnerable people and taking their voices into account. Informants believe that the secretariat's persistent advocacy resulted in the CDAC Haiti message getting through to humanitarian organisations and relevant government agencies.

A particular strength that the secretariat developed over time was its ability to collaborate with government partners and connect the government with the NGO community in relevant ways. The employment of a Government Liaison Officer was an important asset in this regard. Evidence suggests that the systematic work to build capacity among the government partners enhanced connectedness and will result in tangible improvements with good prospects for sustainability.

Some areas that stakeholders thought should be considered in the context of a future CDAC-like initiative – but that CDAC Haiti did not address

sufficiently or at all – include: developing a policy document to guide communication work and help set priorities; funding pilot projects with partners that could be taken to scale; undertaking or facilitating more research and studies; providing more technical support to partners; contributing to systematic monitoring and evaluation of the effects of communication work; and involving programme staff more systematically in efforts to show the centrality of two-way communication to programme quality and effectiveness as well as accountability.

## Enabling Factors

For the purpose of learning and replicating, it is useful to examine the factors that enabled CDAC Haiti to undertake successfully its role as a coordination mechanism.

- To begin with, it benefitted greatly from **hard-working, skilled and committed individuals**. CDAC Haiti was conceived by global CDAC Network members who were committed to implementing, and learning from, a field initiative. It was subsequently run by dynamic, professional and agile staff who accomplished a lot with limited resources.
- Second, CDAC Haiti received **solid backing from the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and OCHA** (one of the CDAC Network founding agencies). The HC supported CDAC Haiti steadfastly from the start, fully concurred with CDAC Haiti’s overall principles and gave it the opportunity to lead the sub-group on cholera communication within the cluster system. OCHA also lent its support to CDAC Haiti by *inter alia* backstopping, defending<sup>2</sup> and funding the initiative. When needed, OCHA helped place CDAC Haiti on the agenda of different strategic meetings and gave it visibility. Furthermore, CDAC Haiti gained a measure of legitimacy by its association with OCHA. This allowed it to interact effectively with the cluster system and the ICC.
- Third, **Internews** (another of the founding agencies) **enabled CDAC Haiti**, not only as its host agency – a task it performed in a supportive manner – but also as an active member of the CDAC Haiti group. Internews ensured that part of CDAC Haiti maintained a solid footing in the media sector. Moreover, its audience research and analysis added significant value to the broader CDAC Haiti initiative, particularly since very few humanitarian organisations possessed this kind of capacity. Internews staff at their HQ also had a clear sense of the practicalities of running CDAC Haiti as key staff had already worked in Haiti from the beginning of the Haiti initiative for different periods of time.
- Fourth, the cholera epidemic presented CDAC Haiti with the space to prove itself – albeit under tragic circumstances. Given the enormous demands placed on their operational capacity, neither WHO/PAHO nor UNICEF had the capacity available to provide the lead in health communication coordination and asked CDAC for support<sup>3</sup> – a position it was able to assume as it had already gained credibility in the humanitarian system.
- Fifth, UNOPS and IOM’s engagement in CDAC Haiti proved invaluable, particularly in face-to-face communication initiatives and field research. This is because both these organisations had a large number of **community mobilisers** working at field level that meant that the voices of affected communities could be heard in CDAC Haiti meetings. This valuable resource also enabled critical joint field-level assessments. Information about these assessments can be found in the full report.
- Last, even though CDAC Haiti might have benefitted from an even broader membership base, there was **enough critical mass of each type of organisation** – UN agencies, media development organisations and organisations with social mobilisers – to create the balance the initiative needed to achieve its goals.

<sup>2</sup> As discussed in the full report, OCHA defended CDAC Haiti when the government and other stakeholders questioned its role and non-formalised status.

<sup>3</sup> This statement is based on evidence from the named stakeholders.

## Impeding Factors

Despite its achievements, CDAC Haiti faced a number of impeding factors:

- First, CDAC Haiti had **no formal status as a structure within the overall humanitarian coordination system**. In addition, it had several iterations of objectives. Many stakeholders regarded this as an advantage – indeed, CDAC Haiti made the most of its ambiguous status and varying objectives by freely manoeuvring to respond to emerging needs and opportunities and exploring what a communication coordination mechanism on the ground could potentially engage in and accomplish. Overall, however, the lack of formal status undermined accountability and predictability within the humanitarian system in Haiti. The running of CDAC Haiti was left to individuals to define and manage as opportunities and needs arose. If it were not for the commitment and drive of these individuals, informants claimed that CDAC Haiti would have collapsed early in its inception. It is doubtful that another country-level CDAC initiative could function as well without its status, role and objectives being clearly defined and articulated within the humanitarian system.
- Second, CDAC Haiti was encumbered by **not having a funding strategy, which undermined its sustainability**. It managed to survive, stumbling at times, and was disadvantaged by the inability to plan ahead and strategise.
- This issue is partly related to the third impediment, which was that CDAC Haiti did not receive enough **strategic guidance**. It was launched before the global CDAC Network was institutionally developed to possess the tools, processes and structures needed to manage this country-level operation. In a sense, 'the cart was put before the horse'. Furthermore, there was insufficient capacity for on-going strategic guidance at the global level as members had their own full-time jobs. As time passed, some members felt less ownership and/or were ambivalent towards the initiative in Haiti and began to regard it as a parallel structure. Meanwhile Internews, as host agency, played

a larger role than it initially envisaged that went beyond fiduciary and other hosting responsibilities.

- Fourth, the lines of **communications and accountability systems** involving the country level, the host agency and the global CDAC Network's Steering Committee were not well established. Over time, sub-optimal information exchange by all parties led to further reduced ownership of CDAC Haiti by the CDAC Network. This weakened the sense of accountability from the country level and led to even less communication.

## Overall Conclusions

CDAC Haiti was a highly relevant initiative that contributed to making the humanitarian effort in Haiti more effective, efficient and relevant to need. It succeeded in providing much needed services, coordination, strategic leadership, capacity building and advocacy for better communication with affected people. While a favourable context and propitious circumstances played a critical part, hard work and skilful decisions, along with OCHA's on-going support, also contributed to CDAC Haiti's success.

The CDAC Haiti experience shows what can be achieved through effective coordination of communication with affected communities. It also illustrates the dynamics that provide results and the potential pitfalls along the way. Furthermore, the experience underscores **the necessity of addressing governance systems, accountability, resource mobilisation and status issues** before any CDAC-like entity is deployed in the future.

## Recommendations

This Review has the following recommendations for the CDAC Network and the humanitarian community:

### Recommendation 1:

The international humanitarian community – in particular, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (ISAC) principals, NGOs and donors



– **should consider the coordination of two-way communication with disaster affected communities as a vital and standard component of emergency response.** It should explore ways to ensure a predictable, legitimate and sufficiently resourced coordination function with a clear mandate to *inter alia* address gaps and duplicative efforts in communication with affected populations. Since the communication needs of affected populations typically increase during the emergency phase, a CDAC-like coordination function will require a medium-term perspective.

#### **Recommendation 2:**

In its strategy formulation work, the **CDAC Network should consider the role it can play to support the humanitarian effort globally** in the area of communication with affected communities. The successes of CDAC Haiti offer the Network a new level of credibility to draw on for its critical advocacy role for communication with affected populations. It should use its unique position to build on the experience gained in Haiti to **further strengthen the humanitarian community’s capacity to address the communication needs of disaster affected populations** at the operational and policy levels. This includes sharing knowledge and skills by *inter alia* developing tools and guidelines; undertaking

innovative pilot initiatives; identifying good practice; conducting training; and backstopping the humanitarian effort on the ground.

#### **Recommendation 3:**

The CDAC Network should **engage with actors who are proponents of approaches that promote accountability, participation and human rights** (such as the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership [HAP] International, the IASC Sub-Working Group on Accountability with Affected Communities,<sup>4</sup> the Listening Project, Save the Children, Oxfam, etc).<sup>5</sup> Jointly, they should explore how communicating with disaster affected communities can be enhanced by integrating principles and approaches related to accountability; freedom of expression; and the right to information, to participate, and to be heard. Pilot initiatives and studies should be considered. Donor organisations that promote rights based approaches and accountability should be sought as partners.

<sup>4</sup> Since early 2010, the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator, Baroness Amos, has reinvigorated the debate on making accountability toward beneficiaries more vital and operational within the UN system. This includes a fresh look at information flows and communication in disasters through the recently launched Sub-working Group on Accountability to Affected Populations, chaired by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the World Food Program (WFP). This Sub-working Group is part of the IASC Task Team on the Cluster Approach. (The CDAC Network is already working with this group.)

<sup>5</sup> HAP and Save the Children currently sit on the CDAC Network Steering Committee.

# Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b>	ii	<b>4.3 Coordination Systems and Information Management</b>	19
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	ii	<b>4.4 Coordination Meetings</b>	20
<b>Foreword</b>	iii	<b>4.5 Diverging Views and Shortcomings of the Coordination Meetings</b>	21
<b>Executive Summary</b>	iv	<b>4.6 Strategic Leadership</b>	24
<b>Table of Contents</b>	ix	<b>4.7 Integration in Humanitarian Coordination System</b>	27
<b>Acronyms</b>	x	<b>4.8 Capacity Building</b>	28
<b>1 Introduction</b>	1	<b>4.9 Advocacy</b>	29
<b>1.1 Evaluation Approach</b>	2	<b>4.10 Adding Value</b>	30
<b>1.2 Limitations</b>	2	<b>5 Governance, Management and Funding</b>	32
<b>1.3 Clarifications</b>	2	<b>5.1 Governance and Strategic Management</b>	32
<b>1.4 Structure of the Report</b>	3	<b>5.2 Host Agency Model</b>	34
<b>2 CDAC Haiti's Objectives</b>	4	<b>5.3 Funding and Resource Mobilisation</b>	35
<b>2.1 Formal Objectives</b>	4	<b>6 Overall Conclusions</b>	37
<b>2.2 Evolution of Objectives and Functions</b>	5	<b>6.1 Objectives and Status</b>	37
<b>2.3 CDAC Haiti's Status</b>	7	<b>6.2 Achievements as a Coordination Mechanism</b>	37
<b>2.4 Assessment of the Review</b>	8	<b>6.3 Enabling Factors</b>	39
<b>3 The Phases of CDAC Haiti</b>	9	<b>6.4 Impeding Factors</b>	40
<b>3.1 Phase 1: Pre-Secretariat (January to May 2010)</b>	9	<b>6.5 Lessons Learnt and Recommendations</b>	41
<b>3.2 Phase 2: Newly-Established Secretariat (May to September 2010)</b>	11	<b>Annexes</b>	A-1
<b>3.3 Phase 3: Hurricanes, Cholera and Government Partnership (October 2010 to January 2011)</b>	13	<b>Annex 1 Terms of Reference</b>	A-1
<b>3.4 Phase 4: 'Coma' (February to April 2011)</b>	14	<b>Annex 2 List of Informants</b>	A-6
<b>3.5 Phase 5: Capacity Building and Exit (April 2011 to November 2011)</b>	15	<b>Annex 3 List of Documents Reviewed</b>	A-9
<b>3.6 Summary</b>	16	<b>Annex 4 Methodological Approach</b>	A-18
<b>4 Assesment of Key Results</b>	17	<b>Annex 5 Lessons Learnt from Hosting CDAC Haiti</b>	A-21
<b>4.1 Elements of a Coordination Mechanism</b>	17	<b>Annex 6 CDAC Haiti: January 2010 - November 2011</b>	A-24
<b>4.2 Credibility</b>	18		

# Acronyms

<b>ACF</b>	<b>Action Contre la Faim</b>
<b>AMARC</b>	<b>World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters</b>
<b>CAP</b>	<b>Consolidated Appeal Process</b>
<b>CCCM</b>	<b>Camp Coordination and Camp Management</b>
<b>CDAC</b>	<b>Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities</b>
<b>CTESP</b>	<b>Education and Public Awareness Thematic Committee</b>
<b>DINEPA</b>	<b>National Directorate for Water Supply and Sanitation</b>
<b>DPC</b>	<b>Civil Protection Department of the Ministry of the Interior</b>
<b>DPSPE</b>	<b>Direction de Promotion de la Santé et de Protection de l'Environnement</b>
<b>DRR</b>	<b>Disaster risk reduction</b>
<b>ENDK</b>	<b>(Enfòmasyon Nou Dwe Konnen (News You Can Use), Internews' radio show</b>
<b>ERRF</b>	<b>Emergency Relief Response Fund</b>
<b>GoH</b>	<b>Government of Haiti</b>
<b>HAP</b>	<b>Humanitarian Accountability Partnership</b>
<b>HP</b>	<b>Hygiene promotion</b>
<b>HQ</b>	<b>Headquarters</b>
<b>IASC</b>	<b>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</b>
<b>ICC</b>	<b>Inter-Cluster Coordination</b>
<b>IDP</b>	<b>Internally displaced person</b>
<b>IFRC</b>	<b>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</b>
<b>IMS</b>	<b>International Media Support</b>
<b>IOM</b>	<b>International Organisation for Migration</b>
<b>MINUSTAH</b>	<b>UN Stabilisation Mission in Haiti</b>
<b>MDM</b>	<b>Médecins du Monde</b>
<b>MSF</b>	<b>Médecins sans Frontières</b>
<b>MSPP</b>	<b>Ministère de la Santé Publique et de la Population (Ministry of Health)</b>
<b>OCHA</b>	<b>UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</b>
<b>PAHO</b>	<b>Pan-American Health Organisation</b>
<b>PaP</b>	<b>Port-au-Prince</b>
<b>RSF</b>	<b>Reportiers sans Frontières</b>
<b>SAKS</b>	<b>Sosyete Animasyon Kominikasyon Sosyal</b>
<b>ToR</b>	<b>Terms of reference</b>
<b>TWiG</b>	<b>Technical working group</b>
<b>UNOPS</b>	<b>United Nations Office for Project Services</b>
<b>WASH</b>	<b>Waste, sanitation and hygiene</b>
<b>WFP</b>	<b>UN World Food Programme</b>
<b>WHO</b>	<b>World Health Organisation</b>

# 1 Introduction

The Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC) Network is a cross-sector initiative that brings together expertise from the humanitarian, media development and technology sectors in a new collaboration that recognises information and two-way communication as key humanitarian deliverables. It was established in 2009<sup>1</sup> in response to a BBC Media Action policy paper, 'Left in the Dark'<sup>2</sup>, which showed that people affected by disasters are often excluded from the information and communication loop, with emphasis instead placed on reporting stories from disaster zones back to donor countries. The objective of the new Network was to substantially improve communication practices with affected populations in humanitarian response.

In January 2010, the CDAC Network established its first ground presence to coordinate communication with affected communities in the context of the emergency response in Haiti. CDAC Haiti, as it became known, was initially conceived as a short-term pilot. However, since many humanitarian actors in Haiti found the initiative relevant and useful, it continued to exist until November 2011.

CDAC Haiti was funded largely through the Emergency Relief Response Fund (ERRF) with some additional short-term funding in 2011 from the global CDAC Network and the World Health Organisation (WHO). As it developed over time and became clearer about the kind of function it could play, CDAC Haiti came to operate as a communication sub-group within the UN cluster system. It brought together humanitarian actors, media development organisations, local media and representatives of the Government of Haiti (GoH) in a collective effort to improve two-way communication between aid providers and the affected Haitian population.

During 2010 and 2011, much valuable 'good practice' was gained as a result of the operation of CDAC Haiti. A budget for this learning review was therefore included in the final project proposal (April-November 2011) to formalise learning about what worked, what didn't, and why, as well as to identify lessons that could be drawn for other emergency contexts. In line with the Terms of Reference (Annex 1), this learning review examines and assesses:

- CDAC Haiti's objectives
- The role of CDAC Haiti as a coordination mechanism, particularly with regard to its different types of partners
- The relationship of CDAC Haiti *vis-à-vis* UNOCHA, the cluster system and Inter-cluster Coordination
- The degree to which partners felt that CDAC Haiti strengthened their ability to coordinate and undertake more effective two-way communication activities
- Governance issues including: the role of Internews as 'host' of CDAC Haiti; the role and functioning of the CDAC Haiti secretariat; and the relationship with the CDAC Network at the global level
- Key activities undertaken by CDAC Haiti with its partners
- The management of CDAC Haiti fundraising activities

<sup>1</sup> Initially this included the BBC World Service Trust (now BCC Media Action), British Red Cross, Internews, Irish Red Cross, Save the Children Alliance and Thomson Reuters Foundation. OCHA was considered a member of the core group although it did not contribute financially in the early stages.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.cdacnetwork.org/sites/www.cdacnetwork.org/files/left\\_in\\_the\\_dark\\_0.pdf](http://www.cdacnetwork.org/sites/www.cdacnetwork.org/files/left_in_the_dark_0.pdf)

## 1.1 Evaluation Approach

The learning review was conducted between October 2010 and February 2011.<sup>3</sup> The overall methodological approach was qualitative, inclusive and transparent. It included interviews with more than 40 stakeholders in Haiti and 10 globally (Annex 2). The review also undertook desk research that involved studying reports, publications and websites related to CDAC Haiti's programme (Annex 3). To assess the data gathered, the team conducting the review applied an analytical framework that drew on the OECD/DAC criteria (Annex 4).

Given the experimental 'learning-by-doing' nature of CDAC Haiti, this review documents CDAC Haiti's efforts, results achieved, and how they were perceived by partners in terms of their relevance and usefulness. The review also analyses to what extent CDAC Haiti performed functions expected of a coordination mechanism, based on common standards for coordination. Effectiveness has been assessed in this light.<sup>4</sup>

The main findings and conclusions were first shared with the CDAC Haiti secretariat<sup>5</sup> and, following, this there was a presentation to the global CDAC Network Steering Committee in November 2011.<sup>6</sup> The CDAC Network Coordinator shared a preliminary draft report with the CDAC Haiti secretariat, Internews Haiti and 10 other stakeholders, primarily from the global Steering Committee. A second draft was circulated to the same group, as well as all Steering Committee members.

## 1.2 Limitations

Due to the large number of individuals involved at different points in CDAC Haiti's history, and the lack of a central repository of information, not all documentation about CDAC Haiti was identified until after the fieldwork had been completed. This may have limited the scope of the interviews. Neither had all activities and processes been documented. In addition, the turnover of staff in many of the organisations involved, combined with the limitations of memory, sometimes made it difficult to obtain a full perspective. Furthermore, some informants only had knowledge of CDAC Haiti from a specific period and their perspectives were not necessarily relevant to other phases of the initiative.

During the finalisation process of this report it became clear that global CDAC Network members had different interpretations and memories of CDAC Haiti and of their interactions with the initiative. This seems to have been due to sub-optimal communication and information sharing between CDAC Haiti and the global CDAC Network members which resulted in fragmented perspectives. This report has aimed to balance perspectives and triangulate them with the documentation available.

## 1.3 Clarifications

During the course of this study, the term 'CDAC' has been used by people in different ways. It has referred to what this report calls the 'global CDAC Network'; the secretariat of CDAC Haiti; and as an area of practice (i.e. 'cdac' in lower case – communicating with disaster affected communities). It has

<sup>3</sup> The work was led by Cecilia M. Ljungman with assistance from Jethro Sereme in Haiti.

<sup>4</sup> Assessing effectiveness in relation to stated objectives would have resulted in a skewed assessment since CDAC Haiti's formal objectives were formulated in a way that fell short of what CDAC Haiti aimed for and achieved in practice. Furthermore, CDAC Haiti over time worked with three different sets of formal objectives and several additional formulations of objectives. Please see Chapter 1 for a description and analysis of how the objectives of CDAC Haiti evolved.

<sup>5</sup> A full debrief with all those who were interviewed for the review in Haiti was originally planned. However, many key stakeholders were out of the country on the proposed date and interviewees also felt they had given enough time during the interview phase itself.

<sup>6</sup> A debriefing in Haiti of the preliminary findings included the CDAC Haiti Secretariat. Due to logistical reasons, a debriefing with other stakeholders could not be arranged. Furthermore, most stakeholders felt they'd given time during the review.

also been used to describe the group of 20-plus organisations in Haiti who came together to improve communication with the disaster affected population there. Although this group originally resembled a loose informal network, it later evolved into what for all intents and purposes became a de facto sub-cluster for cholera communication.

Some stakeholders felt that the CDAC Haiti group of organisations should not be referred to as a network (it never established any formal membership or a local governance structure) notwithstanding that many organisations in Haiti considered themselves to be ‘members’ and felt a strong affiliation with the group. Similarly, views diverged about CDAC Haiti’s role: some saw CDAC Haiti as a sub-cluster<sup>7</sup> of the humanitarian system, while others felt that CDAC Haiti should not be regarded as a sub-cluster since it did not meet some of the formal criteria and/or because this undermined the idea that CDAC Haiti was a cross-cluster service to all clusters.

To avoid contention, this report uses the following terms:

- CDAC Haiti/ CDAC Haiti group refers to the collective of collaborating organisations and individuals that regularly attended CDAC Haiti weekly meetings (a core of about 20 organisations)<sup>8</sup> and were committed to the coordination and collaboration process.<sup>9</sup>
- CDAC Haiti secretariat refers to the staff funded by the CDAC Haiti grant that coordinated, advocated and built capacity in the area of communicating with disaster affected people.

The names of informants have been protected and do not appear in the report. All quotes are presented in English. The author translated those provided in French.

## 1.4 Structure of the Report

This report consists of six chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 discusses CDAC Haiti’s objectives, how they evolved and its status in Haiti. Chapter 3 provides a descriptive overview of how CDAC Haiti developed during its 22-month existence. (An extended account of CDAC Haiti’s work is included in Annex 6 with the aim of documenting institutional memory.) Chapter 4 assesses CDAC Haiti as a coordination mechanism in relation to credibility; information management; strategic leadership; integration into the humanitarian system capacity building; and advocacy. Chapter 5 assesses CDAC Haiti’s governance, management and resource mobilisation. Chapter 6 presents conclusions and identifies factors that enabled/impeded CDAC Haiti’s endeavours that may facilitate learning from the CDAC Haiti experience.

<sup>7</sup> Although staff from some UN agencies and NGOs in Haiti referred to CDAC Haiti as the ‘communications cluster’.

<sup>8</sup> Over time, 50-plus organisations participated in these meetings; the 20 core organisations were not always the same over time.

<sup>9</sup> The term ‘group’ was used frequently in the first half of CDAC Haiti’s existence.

## 2 CDAC Haiti's Objectives

Although CDAC Haiti was initially regarded as a 'three-month experiment'<sup>10</sup>, it was operational for more than 22 months. This chapter presents how CDAC Haiti's stated objectives, roles and functions evolved over time, and discusses its status in Haiti's humanitarian structures.

### 2.1 Formal Objectives

Because CDAC Haiti was the CDAC Network's first field presence, there was no template for what role the CDAC initiative should play, or how it should function. The three funding requests to the ERRF are therefore best regarded as CDAC Haiti's *formal* objectives, since these are the objectives to which CDAC Haiti has been held to account. According to the first funding proposal, which covered the period from February 2010 until September 2010, CDAC Haiti aimed to:

1. Improve the post-earthquake, two-way flow of information between the UN Clusters and the affected population by *providing coordination between all actors* necessary to achieve that, with a focus on the more than 40 media assistance and humanitarian organisations either working under, or feeding into, the CDAC Haiti umbrella.
2. *Establish and maintain* through the immediate relief and early recovery period the most effective and *appropriate mechanisms and platforms for two-way information flows* between the UN Clusters, humanitarian relief community and the affected population.<sup>11</sup>(author's emphasis)

The proposal for the second funding period (October 2010 to January 2011) took into consideration the on-going 2010 hurricane season and the need for communication in the context of contingency planning and preparedness. It also recognised the role CDAC Haiti had carved out in the humanitarian coordination system and its emergent partnership with the GoH. Thus the objectives for the second funding proposal were stated as follows:

1. Support the lead role of the GoH in providing timely and accurate information to populations at risk with regard to disaster risk reduction, disaster preparedness, contingency planning and humanitarian response.
2. *Coordinate the flow of information* for affected communities with the GoH, the humanitarian clusters, the inter-cluster coordination, the larger humanitarian community, international media assistance organisations, local media, local relief organisations and others, *to ensure a two-way flow of humanitarian information* between affected populations and those who seek to assist them, and avoid duplication while reinforcing impact.<sup>12</sup> (author's emphasis)

<sup>10</sup> Minutes of Global CDAC meeting at SC-UK, 26 February 2010; and Imogen Wall with Yves Gérard Chéry, "Kite Yo Pale (let them speak) Best Practice and Lessons Learned in Communication with Disaster Affected Communities" (Draft) 2011.

<sup>11</sup> Taken from the interim report to the ERRF dated 15 July 2010.

<sup>12</sup> Proposal to ERRF "CDAC Haiti: Communicating with disaster affected communities – Supporting government leadership and reducing vulnerability of at risk communities" covering 1 October to 31 December 2010.

The final funding period (August to October 2011) specified CDAC Haiti's disaster communication approach (cholera, hurricane and earthquake), focusing on supporting the GoH's lead role in communication coordination. In line with decisions agreed within the global CDAC Network, the final set of objectives included an exit strategy, addressed capacity building, and committed CDAC Haiti to a review to learn from the experience in Haiti:

1. *Support the lead role of the GoH in coordinating and disseminating*, with all humanitarian actors in Haiti, a large scale emergency *life saving public information campaign* vital to the containment, prevention and early treatment of cholera.
2. *Coordinate the flow of life saving information and messages* and overall communication with affected communities, particularly with regard to the cholera epidemic, to the 2011 hurricane season, and also to the post earthquake reconstruction.
3. *Evaluate and coordinate with all partners a plan for an exit strategy* that corresponds to in-country needs and contingency and the principles of the CDAC Network and CDAC Haiti's activities, and support coordination of capacity building of beneficiary communications among the Ministère de la Santé Publique et de la Population (Ministry of Health or MSSP), the Civil Protection Department of the Ministry of the Interior (DPC), the Ministère de la Culture et de la Communications (Ministry of Culture and Communication or MCC).
4. *Conduct a review* to evaluate lessons learnt, impact, organisational benefits and limitations of the project, primarily to understand CDAC Haiti's role as a coordination mechanism. (author's emphasis)<sup>13</sup>

## 2.2 Evolution of Objectives and Functions

Although the formal objectives developed over time to reflect the expanding role of CDAC Haiti, they did not capture all of CDAC Haiti's actual functions. In addition to those already noted, CDAC Haiti was involved in advocacy, served as a knowledge resource, and aimed to provide some capacity building support to local media.

Aside from their mention in the funding proposals, the formal objectives were often not used in other CDAC Haiti documents. These objectives were not always regarded by the CDAC Haiti secretariat as sufficiently useful to easily convey to stakeholders what CDAC Haiti wanted to do. Thus, the different CDAC Haiti Coordinators prepared and updated separate objective statements that were included variously in minutes, emails and on the website in order to explain CDAC Haiti's changing function to partners over time. This is because it was important to elucidate to potential partners what CDAC Haiti aimed to achieve: as a new and unusual initiative, this was not always initially evident to many stakeholders. Evidence from its early phases in particular suggests that stakeholders often found that CDAC Haiti's objectives unclear.<sup>14</sup> Over time, this became less of an issue.

The global CDAC Network's 26 February 2010 meeting about CDAC Haiti defined CDAC Haiti as "a coordination and information sharing mechanism and collective support network that *itches itself as a service* and provides liaison services with the humanitarian system" (author's emphasis). At the meeting, it was also agreed that CDAC Haiti should act as a knowledge resource and undertake

<sup>13</sup> Proposal to the ERF "CDAC Haiti: Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities – Supporting Government leadership to save lives and reduce vulnerability of cholera-affected and at-risk communities, and increase community resilience and disaster preparedness". The objectives have been significantly shortened by the author for easier comprehension (the original is more than twice as long) but the content is the same.

<sup>14</sup> This is documented in the master's thesis by Ayako Tsujisaka, "Coordinating Communications in Emergencies: A Case Study of the 'Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities' (CDAC) Initiative in Post-Earthquake Haiti 2010" August 2010.



advocacy. Neither of these functions were included in the first set of formal objectives, and only the first part of this definition made its way into the formulation of objectives that were presented to partners in Haiti in the spring of 2010:

“CDAC’s central objective is to *provide a coordination service*, which allows the humanitarian operation to deliver vital information to affected populations and also channel the voices of affected communities to the humanitarian actors through local media and informal communication channels.” (author’s translation from French and emphasis)<sup>15</sup>

One set of minutes from this period said that “CDAC would like to be a *clearinghouse and a resource* for all communication-related endeavours.”<sup>16</sup> (author’s emphasis)

During the first months of its operations, a number of gaps and opportunities were identified that CDAC Haiti could address:

- The need for the CDAC Haiti secretariat to provide services to its members in order for them ‘to be effective’. This included gathering and mapping information related to both the humanitarian and local media landscape and establishing a website to facilitate information and knowledge exchange
- The need for CDAC Haiti to become an advocacy group
- The need for CDAC Haiti to connect with the different clusters
- The need for CDAC Haiti to connect with local media and humanitarian actors outside of the capital
- The opportunity of for CDAC Haiti jointly collaborating on research work – in particular, assessing the information needs of affected populations and monitoring the effect of communication activities<sup>17</sup>

When CDAC Haiti further defined its roles at a retreat in May 2010, some of these gaps and opportunities were taken into account and were refined and streamlined:

- Facilitate coordination;
- Undertake advocacy;
- Provide services to assist members;
- Support the local media in addressing the humanitarian relief effort, in part through capacity building.

By June 2010, the CDAC Haiti secretariat had formulated a new set of objectives that introduced the concept of ‘cluster’. This was included at the end of every email from the CDAC Haiti secretariat until November 2011:

“[The] CDAC initiative in Haiti is a *cross-cluster service* that brings together experts in outreach and communication and humanitarians in a collective effort to improve a two-way communication flow between the humanitarian community and affected populations. CDAC [Haiti] is a *source of expertise and advice, a community of practice* and an *advocacy platform* that aims at ensuring that the humanitarian sector *mainstreams [cdac]* and *local media play a vital role to maximise aid effectiveness, accountability and transparency* to affected communities.” (author’s emphasis)

<sup>15</sup> This explanation of objectives was included at the end of the minutes that were produced for every CDAC Haiti meeting for the first six months of its operation. It was also entered on the website and remains there today. The most recent CDAC Haiti Coordinator included a similar statement at the end of his emails that listed the global members and also included: “CDAC’s vision is to save lives, reduce vulnerability and maintain dignity amongst communities affected by disasters by promoting and adequately resourcing effective communication between those communities and those who aim to assist them.”

<sup>16</sup> Minutes, CDAC Haiti meeting, 23 February 2010.

<sup>17</sup> Minutes of Meeting of CDAC Haiti Working Group, 29 January 2010 and Summary Note from the CDAC Haiti Meeting Founding Agencies, 26 February 2010.

This final formulation of the objectives was the most elaborate and expansive. The concepts of ‘source of expertise’ and ‘community of practice’ were new additions, but did not go as far as to suggest capacity building.

It was in this formulation that the idea that CDAC Haiti was an advocacy platform was also formally introduced. The notion of ‘mainstreaming’ was also new, as was the use of the term ‘cdac’ as a process. Local media were mentioned – not as a channel, but as an actor that should play a role in maximising effectiveness, accountability and transparency of the humanitarian effort. Meanwhile, this formulation did not specifically mention government actors. Nor did this formulation explicitly use the word ‘coordination’, although the concept was invoked by the idea of ‘cluster’ and ‘collective effort’.

## 2.3 CDAC Haiti’s Status

By 29 January 2010, the CDAC Network’s group for Haiti agreed that:

“At present CDAC Haiti is a coordinating body not unlike a cluster (but certainly not a cluster which would be contrary to efforts to make beneficiary communication a cross-cluster activity), a place where people come together.”<sup>18</sup>

Members of the global CDAC Network agreed there was a need for ToRs for CDAC Haiti. Draft ToRs were prepared by OCHA (HQ) based on OCHA’s standard ToRs for sector lead agencies. However, the pace of the emergency, and the continuously evolving role of CDAC Haiti as opportunities and needs presented themselves, resulted in the finalisation of the ToRs falling by the wayside.

Although most informants had a general idea of what CDAC Haiti was, there was no consensus on its exact form and status. Technically, CDAC Haiti was a project. For a project to run a system-wide coordination mechanism is unusual and has rarely been seen in an emergency. Some informants believed that CDAC Haiti actually was a formal cluster; others said that for all intents and purposes it was a sub-cluster or sub-group (it was called a sub-group in the OCHA Bulletins), while some firmly stated that it was a platform.

“Is [CDAC Haiti] a forum, a support system, a cluster, a network or an implementer? Is it an advocacy institution? Should it run its own projects?”

Stakeholders said that without a formalised status it was unclear to whom CDAC Haiti answered. The running of CDAC Haiti was left to individuals to define and manage as opportunities and needs arose. Stakeholders said that if it were not for the commitment and drive of these individuals, CDAC Haiti would have collapsed early in its existence.

Despite its lack of a formal coordinating status, CDAC Haiti was invited to participate in sectoral clusters and the overall Inter-Cluster Coordination (ICC) meetings – which was for cluster coordinators only – as if it were a cluster structure of the humanitarian system. It was welcomed because its efforts, committed group and knowledge gave it credibility (see Section 4.2). The Humanitarian Coordinator’s early recognition and OCHA’s steadfast support further reinforced CDAC Haiti’s position in the cluster system.

<sup>18</sup> Minutes of a 29 January 2010 meeting of the CDAC Haiti Working Group, prepared by the Irish Red Cross.

Nevertheless, most informants expressed that if there are to be future communication coordination initiatives, they should take the form of a formal cross-cluster working group.

“CDAC [Haiti] needs to exist on the ground. But it should become a formalised entity; any future deployment will otherwise be a nightmare.”

Informants underlined that institutionalising 'cdac'-type work would be important for clarity, predictability and accountability.

## 2.4 Assessment of the Review

As a pilot with a short-term perspective, it was natural and desirable that CDAC Haiti developed its objectives and role as opportunities and needs emerged. While the objectives changed to meet evolving needs, gaps, and opportunities, they maintained the core concept of coordinating the two-way communication efforts of humanitarian actors. In this study's opinion, the formulation of objectives that best reflected CDAC Haiti's actual work was the final 'informal' version that was included at the end of each email (see Section 2.2).

In several instances CDAC Haiti's objectives were vague and insufficiently SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely). For example, regarding the objective to “establish and maintain the most effective and appropriate mechanisms and platforms for two-way information flows between the UN Clusters, humanitarian relief community and the affected population”; what were the 'mechanisms' and 'platforms' to actually consist of? How were the UN Clusters separate from the humanitarian relief community? And core coordination functions such as information management, leadership, joint initiatives and advocacy were either not mentioned or sufficiently defined.

All formulations fell short of providing sufficient clarity on the relationship between the CDAC Haiti secretariat and its constituency in the humanitarian community. Documents used terms including 'umbrella', 'platform' and 'cross-cluster service' (and, on a few occasions, a 'network'), but none of the different formulations clearly differentiated between the roles of the wider constituency (the 'network' or group) and the CDAC Haiti secretariat. On paper, this contributed to ambiguity; for example, was the CDAC Haiti secretariat or the wider group responsible for fulfilling the objectives?

It is curious that the concept of advocacy was never included in the formal objectives (despite being mentioned as an activity in the funding proposals), since this was clearly a core function of CDAC Haiti from the beginning. Perhaps this was because advocacy was regarded as a given or a means to end. It might also have been a result of CDAC Haiti's approach to advocacy, which prioritised providing useful services rather than launching advocacy campaigns.

Evolving sets of formal and informal objectives, and the lack of objectives that fully captured what CDAC Haiti undertook in practice, did not hamper CDAC Haiti in any significant regard. These factors were not, however, conducive to monitoring progress and results. Reports to donors were not structured according to the project log frame. This situation also challenged the measure of effectiveness for this review.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, as a pilot venture its ability to seize and adapt to opportunities as they arose was arguably more important than a satisfactory structure for results-based management.

Likewise, the flexibility and freedom that came with CDAC Haiti's non-status did not, for the most part, impede CDAC Haiti's work and was often an important advantage. As discussed in more detail in Chapter 1, this is largely because CDAC Haiti managed to deliver and gain the necessary credibility. However, the ambiguity was considered double-edged by many CDAC Haiti partners who would have preferred a formalised status to ensure clarity, accountability and predictability.

<sup>19</sup> As discussed at the beginning of Chapter 1, this Review has assessed effectiveness in relation to common coordination standards instead of in relation to stated objectives, which is the conventional approach included in the guidelines of ALNAP and DAC/OECD.

## 3 The Phases of CDAC Haiti

This section provides an overview of how CDAC Haiti evolved in practice, which stakeholders were involved and what the main activities were at each stage.<sup>20</sup> While CDAC Haiti went through three different funding phases, its 22-month existence is most logically divided into five distinct phases, which this review has called:

1. Pre-secretariat
2. Newly-established CDAC Haiti secretariat
3. Hurricane season, cholera crisis and government partnership
4. 'Coma'
5. Capacity building and exit

It should be noted that while the following sections identify participation by agency, this was sometimes more on the individual level: i.e., staff trying to drive the agenda of communicating with disaster-affected populations within their own organisations and looking to CDAC Haiti to support them to do so. Thus, CDAC Haiti group membership fluctuated when certain individuals left Haiti (especially if they were not replaced) or when others joined.

### 3.1 Phase 1: Pre-Secretariat (January to May 2010)

On 13 January 2010, the day after the earthquake in Haiti, the global CDAC Network held a teleconference during which it was agreed that an operation should be mounted to improve two-way communication in the humanitarian effort in Haiti. Several of the global CDAC Network members – Internews, OCHA, Thomson Reuters Foundation and IMS – arrived in Haiti shortly thereafter and began collaborating.

At the same time, a CDAC Network Working Group for Haiti was established at HQ level.<sup>21</sup> This group included most of the Steering Committee members – the BBC World Service Trust (now BBC Media Action), the Irish Red Cross, the British Red Cross, Thomson Reuters Foundation, OCHA, IMS and Internews. The Working Group held approximately a dozen conference calls in the six weeks after the earthquake, which were chaired by the CDAC Network's focal point for OCHA in Geneva with minutes provided by the Irish Red Cross. These calls were used to collate information from Haiti from CDAC Network members and other stakeholders to uncover gaps and develop plans for what would eventually become CDAC Haiti. The minutes reveal an action-oriented approach.

As the Working Group Chair, the focal point for OCHA in Geneva networked at HQ level to backstop CDAC Haiti. With information from Haiti, the OCHA focal point produced CDAC Haiti sit-reps every few days that were circulated widely. By 22 January, the work of the CDAC Haiti actors was being referenced in OCHA's global sit-reps.

<sup>20</sup> For a more detailed account, please see Annex 6.

<sup>21</sup> This group was called the 'CDAC Haiti Working Group' or 'CDAC Haiti Global'.

Meanwhile, Internews was chosen by the CDAC Network<sup>22</sup> to take the lead in establishing a CDAC presence in Haiti since it already had a substantial field presence pre-disaster.

Those global CDAC Network members active in Haiti had to develop the role for CDAC Haiti as work progressed. Initially, there was no secretariat in place to drive activities forward, although minutes at the global- and country-level reveal a sense of direction and strategic approach. A small group of staff at both Internews and OCHA took turns providing secretariat-like support to the emerging CDAC Haiti group. Significant practical and strategic groundwork was set for the future CDAC Haiti secretariat and the group of organisations engaged in the initiative. This included:

- Recruiting organisations to join the CDAC Haiti group: Fifteen UN, media and non-governmental organisations regularly attended the meetings and another 20 attended at least one meeting
- Gathering information, undertaking assessments of communication needs among affected populations, and establishing an overview of the communication environment
- Coordinating communication activities with affected populations among humanitarian organisations
- Promoting coordinated messaging to affected populations and establishing systems to ensure that cluster-approved content (related to, e.g., food distributions, safe water, vaccination campaigns, etc.) was made available and used as widely as possible by local media outlets
- Coordinating direct technical support to local media affected by the earthquake
- Establishing relations within the humanitarian coordination system (clusters, cross-cluster groups, etc.), advocating for two-way communication and explaining CDAC Haiti's aims
- Obtaining office space for CDAC Haiti

One activity that was developed during this phase that would become an important tool of CDAC Haiti in the future was Internews' *Enfomayson Nou Dwe Konnen (News You Can Use)* – a daily 15-minute humanitarian radio programme in Creole produced by a team of local reporters. Early on, the programme helped survivors know where and how to access aid, and how to help themselves. It was (and still is) carried by more than 30 stations.

<sup>22</sup> From minutes of the meeting at SC-UK, 26 February 2010.

**Table 1: Participants of CDAC Haiti Meetings January to May 2010**

	ATTENDED 5+ MEETINGS	ATTENDED 2-5 MEETINGS	ATTENDED 1 MEETING
Media-related NGOs	Thomson Reuters Foundation, Internews IMS, USHAHIDI, RSF	Liberation	Haiti Press Network, AMARC, PDG Communications
NGOs	CARE, Helpage	OXFAM, CECOSIDA	Action Aid, HAP, NCA, MSF, RFCG
Red Cross	IFRC (Shelter)		ICRC
Multilateral Agencies	OCHA, MINUSTAH, IOM, UNDP, WFP, UNFPA, UNICEF	WHO / PAHO, UNESCO	
Haitian Government		President's Office	MCC
Donor Government			USAID, US Embassy, DfID

### 3.2 Phase 2: Newly-Established Secretariat (May to September 2010)

In late May 2010, with funding secured from the ERF, the CDAC Haiti secretariat was officially established and staffed with a Coordinator, an Information Officer, a Media Liaison Officer and an accountant. Almost immediately, a retreat was organised and attended by the CDAC Haiti secretariat staff and representatives from 15 agencies including the UN, NGOs, media development organisations and two government entities.

This second phase of CDAC Haiti's development saw an increase in the number of those attending the weekly meetings to around 25 to 30 participants – the greatest number and variation of actors during CDAC Haiti's existence. The CDAC Haiti secretariat helped the initiative to grow and gain visibility by playing a proactive role. This was achieved in several ways.

First, CDAC Haiti began to consolidate itself as a platform for coordination for communication-related work. The CDAC Haiti secretariat produced a Haitian Media Directory<sup>23</sup> and a Media/Communication Services Directory for its members. It also began regularly participating in different cluster and the inter-cluster coordination (ICC) meetings. Further, it began to apply its coordination function in relation to the government and actors in the provinces.

<sup>23</sup> <http://cdac-haiti.org/content/annuaire-des-medias>

**Table 2: Participants\* of CDAC Haiti Meetings May to September 2010**

<b>Media-related NGOs</b>	Internews, IMS, USHAHIDI, RSF, RFI, Film Aid, Radio Boukman, Ticket, Radio CPAM, SAKS, AJH, Radio Utile, PQMD, Radio Shalom, RMEGA, ASHAPS, Knight Fellowship
<b>NGOs</b>	CARE, Helpage, MSF, IMC, OXFAM, CECOSIDA, IRC, GAPS, Save the Children, CRS, GFF, ACF, Thinking Development, JHAFF, HTD
<b>Red Cross</b>	IFRC, ICRC, Canadian Red Cross
<b>Multilateral Agencies</b>	OCHA, MINUSTAH, IOM, UNDP, WFP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNESCO, GBV Sub-Cluster, Shelter Cluster, UNOPS, UNAIDS
<b>Haitian Government</b>	President's Office, MCC, DPC
<b>Donor Government</b>	DfID, US embassy, USAID

\* The actual number of participants is likely to be greater than the list above. The minutes of some meetings are missing and some minutes do not include participant lists.

Second, CDAC Haiti involved itself in several activities. For example, CDAC Haiti provided coordination support to two multi-stakeholder (government actors, the local media, the UN and NGOs) campaigns promoting communication with affected populations. The first, led by the GoH and MINUSTAH and supported by FilmAid, consisted of bringing the World Cup to communities by providing big screens and using the opportunity to air public service announcements on national television. The second, initiated by the CDAC Haiti secretariat, consisted of a performance Caravan (*Koute Ayiti* - Listening to Haiti). This toured the affected parts of the country over a 2-month period, promoting dialogue and awareness on key issues (e.g. disaster preparedness, legal documentation, health, GVB, HIV etc.) through street drama, films and music. It also engaged GoH officials, humanitarian organisations and local media in public debate. The Caravan was seen as a flagship initiative that could also raise the profile of CDAC Haiti and attract more active engagement from different stakeholders.

Third, the CDAC Haiti secretariat engaged with local media. For example, a temporary press centre was established to facilitate the coverage of the six-month commemoration of the earthquake with support from some partner agencies. In mid-July 2010, the CDAC Haiti secretariat and members of the CDAC Haiti group partnered with the GoH to organise a live TV and radio talk show discussing the many and complex impacts of the January 2010 earthquake. With support from its members, the CDAC Haiti secretariat also organised a series of off-the-record 'Meet the Press' events in Port-au-Prince, Jacmel, Léogane and Petit-Goâve, in an effort to bridge the gap between humanitarian organisations and local media.

At the end of September 2010, CDAC Haiti's fund ran out. With no new grants yet secured (this is discussed further in Section 5.3), agencies involved in CDAC Haiti worked together to support CDAC Haiti at a meeting with OCHA (CDAC Haiti's main donor) and by writing more than 20 testimonials in support. A new grant was subsequently exceptionally provided by the ERRF, providing funds for an additional four months of CDAC Haiti activities until the end of January 2011.

### 3.3 Phase 3: Hurricanes, Cholera and Government Partnership (October 2010 to January 2011)

For CDAC Haiti, the period from October 2010 to January 2011 presented the greatest challenges and also the best opportunities to showcase what CDAC Haiti was capable of.

First, the remainder of the 2010 hurricane season still posed a particularly serious threat given that nearly a million Haitians were living in camp conditions that offered insufficient protection against the elements. Second, an outbreak of cholera, which had been unknown in Haiti for more than a century, rapidly spread after riverine contamination from a single human source.<sup>24</sup> By November 2011, there had been half a million cases of cholera and more than 6,600 people had died.<sup>25</sup>

When Hurricane Tomas threatened Haiti in early November 2010, CDAC Haiti maintained a 24-hour presence at the national Centre Operationnel d'Urgence National (COUN) to represent the communication dimension of the humanitarian community and to advocate for better media access to humanitarian information. It also promoted the national communication strategy among the humanitarian organisations. The CDAC Haiti secretariat deployed staff to the provinces to coordinate communication efforts among local authorities, local media, DPC, UN agencies and NGOs.

The widespread flooding from Hurricane Tomas helped to spread the outbreak of cholera, threatening to overwhelm the GoH and humanitarian community still reeling from the effects of the earthquake. Although the GoH was quick to react, it had limited capacity to coordinate the international humanitarian response. Stakeholders tell of a chaotic situation: humanitarian organisations in disarray, rushing off in separate directions to address the cholera outbreak without coordinated interaction between themselves or the government, resulting in gaps, duplications and contradictory messaging.

Interviewees widely acknowledged that there was no actor in the UN system (WHO, PAHO or UNICEF) willing or able to coordinate communication efforts to address the cholera epidemic. The Humanitarian Coordinator therefore asked the CDAC Haiti secretariat to lead. As the coordination mechanism of what became the *de facto* cholera communications sub-group of the humanitarian system in Haiti,<sup>26</sup> the CDAC Haiti secretariat tried to represent the common interests of the humanitarian response community in the area of communication with affected communities. This involved participating in five different coordinating bodies and relaying information between them.

An important initiative undertaken during this initial period of the cholera outbreak was the Cholera Baseline Survey, a collaborative effort among CDAC Haiti partners that proved to be a key tool for the cholera response. The survey was (jointly) designed to gather data on what people were retaining from broadcasts and other communication initiatives on cholera.<sup>27</sup> During this period, the community mobilisers (in particular those from IOM, UNOPS<sup>28</sup> and CARE) played a critical role and were used in an effective way to benefit the overall humanitarian communication effort.

24 The independent UN Panel investigating the cholera outbreak established that "outbreak was caused by bacteria introduced into Haiti as a result of human activity" (p 4). The evidence indicated one point source (p 28) and that the pathogenic strain of cholera was very similar to one common in Nepal (p 28). Nepalese peacekeepers were stationed Mirebalais (p 13) and "the sanitation conditions at the Mirebalais MINUSTAH camp were not sufficient to prevent faecal contamination of the Meye Tributary System of the Artibonite River" (p 3).

25 Sean Casey, "Cholera in Haiti: Still an Emergency," posted on The Guardian Poverty Matters Blog on 7 November 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/nov/07/haiti-cholera-still-emergency-donors>

26 See for instance, letter from Humanitarian Coordinator to DfID dated 29 November 2010; and OCHA Haiti Situation Report #13, 2010.

27 See *Audience Research In A Time Of Cholera: Focus Group & Survey On Haiti's Frontline*. Jennifer Mandel, Internews, 12 January 2011 (<http://www.internews.org/research-publications/audience-research-time-cholera-focus-group-survey-haiti-frontline>).

28 The team of UNOPS community mobilisers were hired under a technical project (related to buildings affected by the earthquake) that ran out of funds during mid-2010. CDAC Haiti and OCHA successfully advocated for an additional grant to keep the community mobilisers to support the humanitarian communication effort.



In order to understand the role that CDAC Haiti played during this phase, it is useful to look at its relationship with government actors. Up to this point, CDAC Haiti had had some interaction with the President’s Office (his media advisor attended several CDAC Haiti meetings), the MCC and the DPC. The DPC, however, had an unclear understanding of what CDAC Haiti actually was, what mandate it had and what role it was trying to play. It also felt that CDAC Haiti was not working in concert with government processes and procedures. When tensions increased, OCHA stepped in to mediate. After this, a fruitful relationship began to grow between the CDAC Haiti secretariat and the DPC.

**Table 3: Participants of CDAC Haiti meetings October 2010 to January 2011**

<b>Media-related NGOs</b>	Internews, IMS, RSF, Radio Boukman, CECOSIDA, AJH, MINUSTAH FM, Radio Tap Tap
<b>NGOs</b>	CARE, Helpage, MSF, IMC, Caritas, Concern, OXFAM, CECOSIDA, CRS, IMC, ACF, ACTED, MEDAIR
<b>Red Cross</b>	IIFRC, Haitian Red Cross
<b>Multilateral Agencies</b>	OCHA, MINUSTAH, IOM, UNDP, WFP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNESCO, GBV Sub-Cluster, Shelter Cluster, UNOPS, UNAIDS
<b>Haitian Government</b>	President’s Office, MCC, DPC, COUN, CTESP, MSPP, DINEPA, DPSPE

By December 2010, the CDAC Haiti secretariat had employed a Government Liaison Officer to help it and the CDAC Haiti group to engage with GoH actors. Participating in nationally-led responses to the cholera epidemic and the hurricane season strengthened CDAC Haiti’s relations with the Ministry of Health (MSPP), the national crisis response mechanism (COUN), the National Directorate for Water Supply and Sanitation (DINEPA) and Direction de Promotion de la Santé et de la Protection de l’Environnement (DPSPE). It also contributed to a more coherent overall communication response in Haiti. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 1.

### 3.4 Phase 4: ‘Coma’ (February to April 2011)

CDAC Haiti activities ceased on 31 January 2011 when financial support expired. Although the CDAC Haiti Coordinator was granted an extra 10 days to secure funding, all staff members were let go. According to stakeholders, the momentum was never fully regained.

With no funds left to pay his salary, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator, who felt deeply committed to the project, continued to work on a voluntary basis until the end of April 2011. He continued to gather and update information, search for funding, send out email updates and provide limited services on demand to participating agencies. He also began developing future activities related to capacity development and future handover to the GoH.

In March 2011, the global CDAC Network held its first strategy meeting in London with the newly-recruited CDAC Network Global Coordinator, the Network’s first. The CDAC Network agreed that the CDAC Haiti Coordinator should restart the operation to provide coordination support to the on-going cholera epidemic, disaster risk reduction planning in relation to the 2011 hurricane season, and devise, execute and learn from a transition and exit strategy.<sup>29</sup> At that time, based on funding expectations, continuation was envisaged as a maximum of six to nine months (until the end of 2011 at the latest).

<sup>29</sup> Meeting Report, CDAC Network Strategy Meeting 23rd and 24th March 2011.

### 3.5 Phase 5: Capacity Building and Exit (April 2011 to November 2011)

By the spring of 2011, Haiti was considered by the UN system and the GoH to be one year behind in its recovery from the January 2010 earthquake. Political instability, the cholera epidemic, land property issues, and an Interim Reconstruction Commission that could not deliver fast enough, meant that 650,000 Haitians remained in temporary camps. In addition, informal ‘illegal’ camps had sprung up around the Port-au-Prince (PaP) metropolitan area as some internally-displaced people (IDPs) left the formal camps due to the withdrawal of international NGOs, the fear of evictions and general insecurity.

The beginning of this phase involved restarting the CDAC Haiti secretariat, locating a new office, (re) hiring staff and securing funding. Initial plans were based on the expectation of a larger grant<sup>30</sup>, but had to be scaled back. Thus, resources were spread thinly between the on-going coordination functions, the formulation and consultation process related to the exit strategy and the final phase of the strategy.

The CDAC Haiti secretariat’s coordination efforts in this period focused on information management. Due to limited resources, coordination meetings were no longer held regularly. Instead, the CDAC Haiti secretariat liaised with partners individually,<sup>31</sup> gathered information from stakeholders and participated in different coordinating bodies (the clusters, ICC, the Humanitarian Forum, CTESP, the Humanitarian Country Team). The information from these meetings was digested and shared in emails. In terms of coordination tools, the CDAC Haiti secretariat updated its 3Ws (Who is doing What communication activities Where) and list of media actors, although not as frequently as before. A key component of the coordination involved connecting GoH, media and NGO actors and promoting collaboration among them in the different GoH-led communication coordination bodies – the CTESP and the Pool de Communication. Coordination was particularly intense during the preparation for and emergency response to Hurricanes Irene and Emily, during which the CDAC Haiti secretariat maintained a 24-hour presence at the Pool de Communication and diffused messages to the humanitarian community as soon as they became available.

Since this phase concerned handover and exit, the CDAC Haiti secretariat devoted more resources to working with the GoH to build capacity than to any other activity. This work was process-oriented technical assistance that centred on the DPC, the CTESP and the Pool de Communication. It involved workshops, developing templates, and establishing inventories and systems to promote effective emergency preparedness and response that took into consideration communication with affected communities. In addition to a Government Liaison Officer who was rehired in June 2011 to work fulltime with the GoH, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator also dedicated a large portion of his time to this effort.

Two significant initiatives during CDAC Haiti’s final phase were the Intentions Survey and the Technical working Group (TWiG) on Cholera Communications in Food Markets (see Annex 6). The Intentions Survey was a collaborative effort among several humanitarian actors with the CDAC Haiti secretariat coordinating, providing analytical inputs and helping to organise the process. The CDAC Haiti secretariat also diffused the results of the survey by presenting them to clusters, key donors and presidential advisors, and promoting its coverage in the media. CDAC Haiti group members went on nationwide interactive radio shows to respond calls from affected people to discuss the findings of the research (see Annex 6).

<sup>30</sup> Resources from both ERRF and ECHO: funds from the latter were only informally sought and never formally applied for.

<sup>31</sup> The partners in this period were more or less similar to those listed in Table 3.

The TWiG included GoH entities, UN agencies and NGOs aiming to jointly mitigate cholera by addressing food markets by: using an inter-sectoral approach to analyse physical market infrastructure (water, sanitation, vending stalls); studying risk behaviour and practices (of both vendors and shoppers); addressing infrastructural weaknesses; and devising appropriate messages to change behaviour and practices connected to both the (evolving) physical infrastructure and services provided.

Most informants in Haiti thought that CDAC Haiti was finishing its work prematurely, and that there was still important work to be done; with the coming months of return and relocation, effective communications with affected communities was considered critical.

### 3.6 Summary

Stakeholders who witnessed CDAC Haiti's growth from immediately after the 2010 earthquake until it finally ceased operations highlight the 'tremendous' evolution of the initiative. This can be likened to the flight of an aeroplane. The first phase resembled the take-off, in which a considerable amount of time and energy (fuel) was needed to get the plane off the runway. During this phase, essential groundwork was laid that set the tone for the rest of the initiative's life. Members of the global CDAC Network that formed the Haiti Working Group played an instrumental role in ensuring the initial 'lift'. The backstopping of OCHA at HQ level for the first couple of months helped provide visibility for the initiative and channel information at the global level. In Haiti, the efforts of Internews, with the support of the OCHA office and collaboration of IMS, the Thomson Reuters Foundation and new partners in Haiti, quickly gave CDAC Haiti a profile on the ground.

Phase two represented the gaining of altitude of the CDAC Haiti flight. With a secretariat in place, CDAC Haiti had lift under its wings: the group gained members; undertook ambitious joint initiatives; carved out a space in the humanitarian architecture; stepped up its advocacy; and helped buttress and expand what had become one of the largest cross-agency commitments to communication ever seen in an international humanitarian disaster response.

In the third phase, CDAC Haiti hit its cruising speed. With the 2010 hurricane season and cholera outbreak, CDAC Haiti rose to the occasion. CDAC Haiti was designated as the cholera communications sub-group by the Humanitarian Coordinator and became highly active in the cluster system. The CDAC Haiti secretariat served as a much-needed liaison between the humanitarian actors involved in cholera communication and the relevant GoH entities. Its partnership with the GoH became close and fruitful.

Phase four, when activities were closed down, is best likened to engine failure. The CDAC Haiti Coordinator acted as an auto-pilot, keeping the initiative in flight by voluntarily performing some of the CDAC Haiti secretariat's functions.

The fifth and final phase amounted to the landing of the initiative as the CDAC Haiti secretariat's coordination function became less dominant and capacity building, transfer of functions to the GoH and plans for an appropriate exit came to forefront.

## 4 Assessment of Key Results

This chapter assesses CDAC Haiti’s effectiveness in relation to the extent to which stakeholders found CDAC Haiti’s work useful and of added value, and the extent to which CDAC Haiti’s work met common coordination standards in humanitarian response as defined in documents and guidelines produced by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC)<sup>32</sup>, UNICEF, ClusterCoordination.org and the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition.<sup>33</sup>

Assessing CDAC Haiti’s effectiveness in relation these benchmarks – as opposed to assessing effectiveness in relation to achievement of its stated objectives<sup>34</sup> – allows for a more comprehensive assessment of CDAC Haiti, and for lessons to be drawn regarding future communication coordination mechanisms.

The chapter begins by outlining elements that a successful communication coordination mechanism would require. It then assesses the extent to which CDAC Haiti was able to incorporate these elements into its coordination work based on the evidence gathered and triangulated. The final section provides feedback from CDAC Haiti’s stakeholders on the added value of CDAC Haiti.

### 4.1 Elements of a Coordination Mechanism

Coordination of thematic/sectoral/cross-cutting areas in an international humanitarian response has been described as the “orchestration of efforts towards appropriate, effective, efficient and coherent delivery of humanitarian services”.<sup>35</sup> An effective coordinator leads and facilitates this process by mobilising partners to respond in a strategic manner. To successfully do so, coordination literature<sup>36</sup> points to number of required elements:

1. **Credibility:** There must be trust in the coordinating body and its competence. The coordination processes must be inclusive, democratic and based on honest brokering.
2. **Establishment and maintenance of appropriate coordination mechanisms:** There must be systems to coordinate among actors and to gather, manage and share information in timely and relevant ways.
3. **Strategic leadership:** A coordinating body must have a solid understanding of the sector/sub-sector/cross-cutting sector and an overall vision of how coordination can contribute to a more effective and efficient response. This entails understanding the complementarities of different agencies’ comparative advantages, the ability to identify possibilities for synergies and joint initiatives, and what assessments are needed.
4. **Integration with the existing humanitarian system:** A coordinating body in emergencies needs a firm grasp of the humanitarian system and its structures. It needs to interact and coordinate with other humanitarian sectors and actors.

32 The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) is an inter-agency forum of UN and non-UN humanitarian partners and primary method for inter-agency coordination.

33 IASC *Guidance Note on Cluster Approach*, 2006; UNICEF, *Education Cluster Handbook*, 2010; Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, *The Coordination of International Humanitarian Assistance in Tsunami-affected Countries 2006*; and ClusterCoordination.org

34 As discussed in Chapter 2, CDAC Haiti’s objectives were sometimes vague, changed over time and did not fully align with all of what CDAC Haiti actually undertook.

35 Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, *The Coordination of International Humanitarian Assistance in Tsunami-affected Countries 2006*.

36 Adapted from IASC *Guidance Note on Cluster Approach*, 2006; UNICEF, *Education Cluster Handbook*, 2010; Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, *The Coordination of International Humanitarian Assistance in Tsunami-affected Countries 2006*; and ClusterCoordination.org.

5. **Training and capacity building:** While not necessary for coordination *per se*, training and capacity building is sometimes performed by cluster leads. In a developing area such as communicating with disaster affected communities that has a significant new technologies component, this function would be relevant.
6. **Advocacy:** A coordinating body should provide a focus for joint advocacy.

## 4.2 Credibility

Most stakeholders interviewed for this review had a high regard for the competence and approach of the CDAC Haiti secretariat staff. Although there were a few personality differences over the nearly 22-month period that CDAC Haiti operated – a situation not uncommon in multi-stakeholder initiatives – most stakeholders assessed its secretariat staff as professional, deeply committed, flexible, efficient and dynamic. Secretariat staff were considered particularly agile at adapting to the situation as it evolved:

“[CDAC Haiti secretariat staff] learnt quickly and lots of improvements were made along the way.”

Those organisations and individuals who had worked extensively with the CDAC Haiti secretariat were especially appreciative of it. The technical expertise and knowledge of the staff were valued. Informants explained that the last CDAC Haiti Coordinator (September 2010 – November 2011) was particularly easy to approach and frequently supported partners by providing specific *ad hoc* advice or contacts. For example, when a UN agency needed knowledge of the media scene in a specific geographic area, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator provided information that would have taken days for the organisation to research and gather. In another example in October 2011, one agency contacted CDAC Haiti for communication advice when imposters were claiming that food recipients had to pay for their entitled food rations.

Over time, CDAC Haiti also gained credibility with GoH actors who also described their cooperation with CDAC Haiti in very positive terms and considered its secretariat staff to be professional:

“CDAC [Haiti] is one of our best partners.”

This, however, was not always the case. During the second half of 2010, the Civil Protection Department of the Ministry of the Interior (DPC) misunderstood CDAC Haiti’s intentions and questioned its role and non-formalised status. Following an intervention and mediation by OCHA, the misunderstandings were corrected and a productive relationship was forged over the ensuing months. CDAC Haiti subsequently engaged a Government Liaison Officer who played a critical role in ensuring a smooth and mutually beneficial relationship with the different GoH entities involved in emergency response and communication.

CDAC Haiti’s good relationship with the GoH gave it credibility in the humanitarian community. For example, the Education Cluster asked the CDAC Haiti Coordinator for assistance in getting messages approved by the Education and Public Awareness Committee (CTESP) regarding the use of schools during emergencies. The Coordinator ensured that the appropriate individuals and departments were consulted and involved and received the required approval.

CDAC Haiti’s credibility in the humanitarian system as a coordinating body was reflected by the fact that it was invited to the Inter-Cluster Coordination (ICC) meetings, which were typically attended only by cluster coordinators.

According to informants, the fact that the CDAC Haiti secretariat had a sound understanding of the media landscape, a solid overview of the humanitarian communication effort and significant insight and understanding of GoH structures (particularly the MSPP and the DPC), made it well-placed to serve as a catalyst for partnerships and as an advisor:

“The CDAC [Haiti] Coordinator is plugged in.”

“CDAC [Haiti] serves as a one-stop shop.”

Informants said that the CDAC Haiti secretariat acted as a neutral party, ran its meetings in a democratic manner and that it facilitated joint planning and decision making.

In its later phases, the CDAC Haiti secretariat became particularly skilled in building consensus among the range of different partners (humanitarian agencies, international NGOs, clusters, GoH and media development organisations) to ensure coordinated approaches.

During the cholera outbreak, the convening skills of the CDAC Haiti secretariat were regarded as a particular strength.

“[CDAC Haiti] would bring information to the table and say: ‘This is how we see it. What do you think?’”

During this period the CDAC Haiti secretariat assisted humanitarian actors in designing and adapting their communication activities so that they were harmonised with the GoH’s standardised and approved messages. Although a few informants found the CDAC Haiti secretariat’s manner somewhat overbearing when promoting messages approved by the GoH, all other informants were very appreciative of this work.

Many informants pointed out that the CDAC Haiti secretariat did not have sufficient resources for running a coordination mechanism, but managed well with what it had. CDAC Haiti group members expressed that the CDAC Haiti secretariat:

“[The CDAC Haiti secretariat] did a huge amount with limited resources.”

“[The CDAC Haiti secretariat] worked like dogs. All of them.”

“[The last CDAC Haiti Coordinator] was a force of nature.”

### 4.3 Coordination Systems and Information Management

Effective coordination involves regular interaction among the partners – preferably face-to-face – to share and exchange information. However, convening meetings for the actors needs to be supported by systems to gather, analyse, package and disseminate information among stakeholders. The following two sections examine how the CDAC Haiti Secretariat performed with regard to these two tasks.

## 4.4 Coordination Meetings

From January 2010 until February 2011, CDAC Haiti held weekly coordination meetings. In CDAC Haiti's final phase, these meetings were held less regularly. In terms of the balance of organisations that attended the meetings, the meetings were made up of a mix of NGOs, media development agencies, UN and GoH agencies and a few Haitian civil society organisations. Although the meetings included representatives from most of the key actors, some stakeholders felt that more involvement from Haitian civil society would have been desirable (although the humanitarian community as a whole has faced challenges in engaging with Haitian civil society due to its weak foundations). Some of those attending believed that any future country-level CDAC Haiti-like initiative should include more journalists in meetings<sup>37</sup> and engage more with telecommunications operators. Others pointed out that while the Red Cross movement collaborated in several CDAC Haiti initiatives and had attended meetings in the first phase, they did not attend meetings during the later phases.

Most stakeholders found the weekly meetings to be useful, although a few found that the usefulness and dynamism varied from meeting to meeting, depending on the topics discussed. A few of the informants contrasted the CDAC Haiti meetings with typical cluster meetings and held that the former were more worthwhile because they were more technically-oriented and involved more exchange, sharing and dynamism.

A few conveyed that the CDAC Haiti secretariat had considerable convening power because of its participation in many of the clusters. This gave it an overview that members found valuable:

“The [CDAC Haiti] secretariat understood what was going on.”

Throughout CDAC Haiti's existence, the meetings appear to have played an important role for networking activities. Several organisations told of critical partnerships that they forged during the meetings:

“The [CDAC Haiti] meetings provided a great forum for information exchange and allowed everyone to know what everyone else was doing.”

“[The CDAC Haiti meetings were] a place for real exchanges about things that needed to be addressed in a common way.”

Stakeholders maintained that coordinating communication work among the humanitarian actors was especially successful in avoiding duplication and filling gaps in the response. They felt that there was a tendency for agencies to operate in the same geographic areas (perhaps for reasons related to logistics or visibility), but that by having the CDAC Haiti platform for coordination, gaps and duplication could be identified and addressed. One example is that of ACF, which, with the support of CDAC Haiti, avoided providing duplicative cholera communication services in a geographic area and instead identified a region where needs were not covered. Similarly, UNOPS, which had approximately 50 community mobilisers, would attend the weekly CDAC Haiti meetings to help prioritise where the mobilising teams should be deployed. And UNOPS found that only at the CDAC Haiti meeting was it able to get sufficient information to help it prioritise its work.

Some of the meetings stakeholders appreciated most were those that discussed research efforts undertaken by partners relating to the communication needs of affected populations and their preferred information channels. Internews, which had a comparatively strong research capacity, brought its on-going research to CDAC Haiti meetings for feedback on how to interpret the results and

<sup>37</sup> Journalists did not bring this up, saying that while they were interested in interacting with CDAC Haiti, they did not have much use for coordination meetings.

make them relevant to humanitarian action. This improved the quality of Internews' work, while at the same time informants said they appreciated the opportunity to partake in research findings.<sup>38</sup>

Moreover, Internews was able to use CDAC Haiti to leverage its research work by ensuring greater diffusion of the results thereby gaining more influence on strategic decisions in the humanitarian sector.

Informants said that meetings were most dynamic and strategic after CDAC Haiti was asked by the Humanitarian Coordinator to take the lead on cholera communication in October 2010. During this period, in addition to its weekly CDAC Haiti group meeting, CDAC Haiti led the weekly communication working group with the main cluster leads and agencies involved in the communication response (e.g. WHO, IOM, WASH, MINUSTAH). Stakeholders were highly impressed with what the CDAC Haiti secretariat and the group accomplished together with the government during this period:

“Never in twelve years have I seen such an effective joint effort by the international community.”

“It was an extraordinary effort.”

“No one else could have filled the void. No one else had the perspective that CDAC [Haiti] had during the cholera crisis.”

“Initially everyone was doing their own thing. CDAC [Haiti] got everyone on board to adopt the approved government messages.”

“CDAC [Haiti] was tirelessly undertaking [advocacy], sending emails and following up.”

“Without CDAC [Haiti], we would have had an even greater problem on our hands.”

Some informants that did not attend CDAC Haiti meetings felt they received the information they needed in the emails from the CDAC Haiti Coordinator and/or interacted with the CDAC Haiti secretariat in other group activities. Examples of such partners include WFP<sup>39</sup> and the Haitian Red Cross.<sup>40</sup>

## 4.5 Diverging Views and Shortcomings of the Coordination Meetings

Some representatives of the Red Cross movement said that they did not find the CDAC Haiti coordination meetings sufficiently useful for their needs and did not attend them. They felt that while they might have been able to contribute to the meetings (for example, by providing information and technical expertise, Red Cross members had significant resources in the area of beneficiary communications and were doing a lot of ground breaking work), participating in the meetings would not add much value to their work.

<sup>41</sup> One Red Cross society also felt it did not need CDAC Haiti as much as some organisations since “the Red Cross is in a unique position as an auxiliary to government and therefore has those established

<sup>38</sup> Internews eventually provided free focus group training to a small group of organisations that attended CDAC Haiti meetings based on the promise that these organisation would assist in data collection.

<sup>39</sup> In the first months after the earthquake, WFP was an active member of CDAC Haiti and coordinated its food distribution messages and feedback with the other partners. As the operation became less dependent on communication activities over time, it rolled back its communication work and stopped attending CDAC Haiti meetings.

<sup>40</sup> This review did not interview organisations that had never interacted with CDAC Haiti.

<sup>41</sup> One organisation felt that the NGO community's informal HAP network in Haiti – that addressed M&E, participation, transparency, complaints & response mechanisms – was more useful because it covered broader issues. This is because it is common for people to consider ‘two-way communication’ as part of accountability work.



links with government already through the Haitian Red Cross”. Furthermore, the numerous Red Cross entities were fully occupied by coordinating amongst themselves. In addition, the need for interpreters to attend CDAC Haiti meetings acted as a disincentive for key staff.<sup>42</sup>

One criticism of the coordination meetings from a Red Cross national society was that it perceived that “CDAC [Haiti] was made up of and focused on journalism and not beneficiary communication as the Red Cross delivers it”. It also felt that the Red Cross mandate and fundamental principles differ from those of NGOs and this “affects how it works with journalists”.

Meanwhile, some journalists and journalist organisations said that they did not find the discussions sufficiently relevant to their work. They stated that they wanted either to gain material with which to create news stories or to receive capacity building support. The CDAC Haiti coordination meetings did not offer either of these.

Several informants saw the lack of regional-level coordination meetings in different provinces as a gap. The CDAC Haiti secretariat had also identified this need but did not have sufficient resources to fully address it.

Most informants, including the CDAC Haiti Coordinator, agreed that the loss of regular CDAC Haiti coordination meetings during its final phase (April to November 2011) due to the CDAC Haiti secretariat’s reduced capacity was a shortcoming. The Coordinator also regretted the lack of capacity in the secretariat since the cholera outbreak to prepare minutes of the coordination meetings. It was felt that sharing of these minutes would have contributed to the visibility and effectiveness of the CDAC Haiti group.

### 4.5.1 Information Management

Effective coordination requires relevant, timely and valid information and this function was central to CDAC Haiti from its inception. Since its establishment, the CDAC Haiti secretariat diffused information in five main forms to a broad range of more than 100 actors – including cluster leads who in turn relayed the information further through their respective constituencies.

First, a key information product regularly prepared by the CDAC Haiti secretariat prepared and updated was the “3Ws document”, essentially an inventory of activities typically produced by cluster leads. These data were also entered onto maps. GoH actors, the UN, NGOs and local media informants all said they appreciated the 3Ws document and made regular use of it.

Second, CDAC Haiti prepared regular email updates.<sup>43</sup> These updates varied in nature and content (e.g., summaries from meetings, copies of newly approved cholera messages, updated lists of cholera treatment centres, radio spots, new survey findings, reports, etc.) and were sometimes targeted to certain types of stakeholders. Several informants (including those from the GoH) were highly appreciative of the updates, which they said included pre-digested and packaged information from clusters and government meetings. The updates were described as “succinct”, “useful”, “reliable” and “a great service” that helped stakeholders analyse the situation. The information provided by the CDAC Haiti secretariat was viewed by many informants as saving valuable time and resources. Some explained that they did not have the time to attend the many different meetings, but needed the information that was generated by them.

<sup>42</sup> IFRC, however, did play an active role in the Cholera Baseline Survey with the other CDAC Haiti members.

<sup>43</sup> Minutes of meetings were less frequent after the cholera outbreak due to limited resources and a shift in priorities to public updates and OCHA set reps.



Fourth, the CDAC Haiti secretariat prepared regular reports covering the initiatives of the different communication actors to be included in OCHA's sit reps and bulletins. During the cholera crisis, a daily situation report was produced.

Finally, CDAC Haiti created a website providing information products that it had produced, as well as information from any organisation wanting to share material (e.g., press releases, reports, communication materials, minutes, updates, etc.). Several informants found the website useful, once they figured out how to navigate it. However, this review agrees with many informants who found the site poorly designed, incomplete and confusing. Part of the problem was due to a lack of sufficient resources to keep the website updated, which was made worse by the funding insecurity facing CDAC Haiti. Overall, however, stakeholders felt that the CDAC Haiti secretariat's direct service and its regular email updates compensated for the shortcomings of the website.

## 4.6 Strategic Leadership

As a pilot initiative with no official status, CDAC Haiti did not develop a formal strategy. However, as this section demonstrates to a large degree, the CDAC Haiti secretariat did provide leadership that was strategic in furthering communication with disaster affected communities. Examples of this include: its role in coordinating the communication response to cholera; promoting linkages and partnerships among its constituents; and coordinating initiatives that furthered communication with disaster affected communities. These are discussed in the sections that follow. The final section discusses how a future CDAC Haiti-like initiative could contribute more strategically to furthering communication with disaster affected communities.

### 4.6.1 Strategic Cholera Coordination

During the cholera outbreak, the CDAC Haiti secretariat exercised strategic leadership by:

- Unifying the humanitarian actors in terms of the overall communication approach to ensure a coordinated and non-contradictory response
- Channelling the findings of NGOs that related to communication needs expressed by communities to the relevant GoH entities and other actors
- Providing assistance to the Ministry of Health in preparing standardised messages so that they reflected needs expressed by the affected communities
- Providing assistance to humanitarian actors when they wanted to produce their own information products by facilitating interaction with the authorities for approval

In effect, the CDAC Haiti secretariat promoted communication with disaster affected communities by relaying approved messages from the GoH to the humanitarian actors, while providing community-level feedback to the GoH that drew on the CDAC Haiti group's capacity on the ground; a capacity that the GoH did not possess. GoH stakeholders interviewed by the review held that the GoH itself could not have shouldered the relaying function and did not have the capacity to interact at the community level. A key stakeholder said that CDAC Haiti gave the GoH greater relevance in the response effort by virtue of the CDAC Haiti secretariat relaying information between the government and the NGO community.

## 4.6.2 Synergies and Partnerships

CDAC Haiti provided opportunities for partner organisations to meet and forge synergistic partnerships with other groups. Organisations including ENDK, MINUSTAH FM, Radio Boukman, Radio Tap Tap, CARE, IOM, UNOPS, HelpAge, ACTED, the WASH Cluster and WFP reported that CDAC Haiti had facilitated linkages that contributed to a more effective response.

The CDAC Haiti secretariat was seen as particularly useful in facilitating interaction between international organisations and the local media. For example, it held a series of informal and off the record 'Meet the Press' social gatherings between the media and NGOs around the country, and brought media together for the six-month and one-year anniversary of the 2010 earthquake. Several stakeholders said that this helped strengthen the relationship between humanitarian actors and the media. Some thought more initiatives like these should be undertaken.

CDAC Haiti was also active in arranging contacts and pitching stories to the media. Some examples include:

- When MINUSTAH FM wanted to broadcast a panel discussion on health in 2010, the CDAC Haiti secretariat used its GoH contacts to help put together the panel.
- When unrest following the 2010 elections created roadblocks obstructing ambulances and humanitarian supplies, and the government was not in a position to react due to political concerns, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator arranged for an interview with the Head of Communications of the Haitian Red Cross by ENDK in which he implored people to respect the need for humanitarian access. The segment was distributed for immediate broadcast to commercial radios across Haiti by the Conseil National des Télécommunications (CONATEL). CDAC Haiti group members including Sosyete Animasyon Kominikasyon Sosyal (SAKS), IFRC, IOM, CARE and OXFAM also distributed the interview across Haiti with the support of commercial and community radio stations.
- When the GoH launched plans for broadcasting a seven-hour multiplex radio/TV programme on cholera prevention at the end of 2010, the CDAC Haiti secretariat helped to involve an array of media organisations. It also promoted the inclusion of NGO representatives and the Haitian Red Cross in the programme.
- When rumours were spread in camps that if a family accepted a temporary shelter, it would be barred from ever obtaining a US visa, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator arranged for an ENDK interview with a US embassy representative to correct the misinformation.
- In September 2011, CDAC Haiti pitched stories regarding the Intentions Survey and assisted media organisations in obtaining interviews with the most relevant people.

## 4.6.3 Joint Initiatives

The CDAC Haiti secretariat played an active role in leading and coordinating initiatives undertaken jointly by partners. The four initiatives most mentioned by informants were the Caravan (July-August 2010), the Baseline Information on Cholera (November-December 2010), the Intentions Survey (October 2010- September 2011) and TWiG on food markets (August-November 2011).

Several of the stakeholders who had collaborated on the Caravan in the summer of 2010 regarded it very favourably. They thought it successfully brought a range of actors together to strengthen communication with affected people. While there was no monitoring of the extent to which messages

were internalised by people, the Caravan was popular and participation among affected communities was active. A second Caravan was discussed to address the cholera crisis but never took place because the CDAC Haiti secretariat ceased operations in January 2011.

The Cholera Baseline Survey was considered a critical tool in the effort to address the cholera crisis. The ability of the CDAC Haiti group to draw upon the resources of the member organisations – in particular, its community mobilisers – and to jointly conduct the survey simultaneously was considered an important achievement. The GoH informants valued this effort and said that undertaking it would have been beyond the capacity of the GoH at the time.

The actors involved in the Intentions Survey (see Annex 6 for more information) said that the CDAC Haiti secretariat played a critical role in pushing the process, coordinating the different actors and contributing to the analysis. The peer review process that the CDAC Haiti secretariat organised in connection with the survey was greatly appreciated and informants believed that it improved the rigor of the analysis. Informants said that the survey would have been very difficult to undertake without the CDAC Haiti secretariat playing the role it did. For the humanitarian actors, the Intentions Survey has become a crucial advocacy tool. The GoH has embraced the survey, which is informing the on-going return and relocation process.

“The Intentions Survey was a long and painful process, but in the end it was a great achievement.”

The data provided in the Intentions Survey report entered into Haitian political discourse when the new Prime Minister spoke to the parliament and senate in October 2011 using findings from the survey. It was also used by IOM in its advocacy work and the design of the “16/6 Presidential Plan” that aimed to relocate six camps into 16 neighbourhoods.

Informants were excited by the TWiG set up by CDAC Haiti to mitigate cholera by addressing food markets. It was believed that this effort could have a significant impact in the future on curbing the cholera epidemic by addressing infrastructure issues and undertaking communication work based on feedback from communities. Because of the inter-sectoral nature of both the study and the future actions that will be needed, the CDAC Haiti secretariat was regarded as particularly suited to bring the GoH and humanitarian partners together and facilitate and coordinate the process.

#### 4.6.4 Enhancing the Strategic Approach

Stakeholders suggested ways in which a future CDAC Haiti-like initiative could enhance its strategic role:

- Developing a strategy or policy document to guide work and help set priorities
- Having specific funding for activities, such as undertaking pilot projects with partners, that could then be taken to scale
- Driving and coordinating more research and studies, particularly in relation to the information needs of affected communities and the use of communication channels
- Contributing to systematic monitoring and evaluating the effects of communication work<sup>44</sup>
- Monitoring how the local media cover humanitarian activities

<sup>44</sup> The need for CDAC Haiti to undertake monitoring and evaluating communications activities was discussed at the global CDAC Network on 26 February 2010, but the function was never developed or made part of the funding proposals.

In addition, some informants felt there was much greater scope for involving programme staff more systematically to achieve improved communication with the affected populations. They noted the disconnect that can occur in humanitarian response between the communication community that CDAC Haiti worked with and people working with programmatic, operational and field monitoring issues who also engage in communication work, albeit often in the context of inter-personal relationships that have been built up over time.<sup>45</sup> This disconnect (and sometimes rivalry) often exists within humanitarian organisations themselves. A better mutual recognition of skills and capacities is required.

Some informants highlighted the need for a CDAC Haiti-like function to draw more effectively on pre-disaster experience regarding effective communication channels and practices. It was felt that obtaining knowledge from ‘development communications’ would avoid having to ‘reinvent the wheel’. This would require establishing better links with international and national development actors that have worked with communication activities in any country for a longer period of time.

Some stakeholders also held that the methodologies used in rights-based approaches, which have participation, accountability and non-discrimination as central tenets, should also be explored in future CDAC Haiti-like initiatives. This could involve closer collaboration with the Humanitarian Accountability Project and organisations with experience of rights-based approaches.

## 4.7 Integration in Humanitarian Coordination System

Early on, the global CDAC Network and CDAC Haiti considered it a priority to actively work with the different bodies and structures of the humanitarian system to promote communication with disaster affected populations. By the end of January 2010, CDAC Haiti had begun participating in the humanitarian cluster system. It attended and liaised with Shelter, GBV, CCCM, WASH, Food, and Protection clusters/sub-clusters. By summer 2010, it was a regular participant at the Inter-Cluster Coordination (ICC) meetings for cluster leads. Attending these meetings allowed the CDAC Haiti secretariat to advocate for two-way communication, network and keep abreast with priorities and activities in the different clusters and report them back to CDAC Haiti group at meetings and through emails. Many of the clusters considered CDAC Haiti as a core member.<sup>46</sup>

When the cholera crisis began, the Humanitarian Coordinator requested that CDAC Haiti coordinate the communication activities of the humanitarian effort, thereby becoming the sub-cluster for cholera communication. As discussed earlier in this report, this meant CDAC Haiti led the weekly communication working group with the relevant cluster leads and key agencies involved in the communication response. It also undertook several functions of a cluster, including facilitating discussion and strategic direction preparing situation reports for OCHA and participating in the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) meetings when invited.

The ICC actors interviewed were satisfied with the information CDAC Haiti provided in these meetings. The CDAC Haiti Coordinator in the final two phases was described as open to ideas and playing an important role in linking the field level with the overall humanitarian strategy level:

“The role the CDAC [Haiti] Coordinator played in ICC meetings cannot be under-estimated.”

<sup>45</sup> This was also echoed in the master’s thesis by Ayako Tsujisaka, “Coordinating Communications in Emergencies: A Case Study of the ‘Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities’ (CDAC) Initiative in Post-Earthquake Haiti 2010” August 2010.

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, the 2011 Consolidated Appeal for Haiti.

In the final phase of CDAC Haiti's existence, cluster meetings were not considered sufficiently effective by many humanitarian actors. Therefore, decisions among clusters members were often made in separate parallel meetings. Similarly, much of the CDAC Haiti secretariat work involved bilateral interactions or side meetings. Informants maintained that the CDAC Haiti Coordinator navigated the system well and played a suitable role.

## 4.8 Capacity Building

CDAC Haiti had three potential target groups for capacity building in the area of disaster affected communities: humanitarian actors, local media and GoH actors. Capacity building is not a core function of a coordination mechanism; this work is typically undertaken by its members. However, the IASC cluster guidelines regard capacity building as a task that a coordination body might perform. Because of the relative newness of coordinated communication work in emergency response, and because communication technology is advancing continually, the building of capacity by CDAC Haiti would seem to have been relevant. The CDAC Haiti secretariat, however, had limited resources to engage in capacity building and technical support. Nevertheless, in its last phase, a significant part of its work focused on capacity development of GoH entities involved in emergency response.

Support to the GoH was largely process-oriented and provided in the form of on-going technical assistance, with the Government Liaison Officer working in the offices of the DPC alongside staff involved in the CTESP and the Pool de Communication. Examples of issues addressed include: developing mechanisms for feedback from the population, community mobilisers and local journalists; systems to quickly adapt messaging in response to public feedback channelled through call centres; and different templates for communicating with the humanitarian community, departmental focal points and the media. The CDAC Haiti secretariat also facilitated workshops to redefine the role and functions for the Pool de Communication and assisted in developing an inventory of national communication expertise in the country to potentially draw upon during emergencies.<sup>47</sup>

Thus, CDAC Haiti's capacity building support reinforced existing GoH structures, institutionalised processes and provided useful technical expertise with the aim of promoting two-way communication flows between the government and people for prevention and crisis response. This support was guided by the need to ensure connectedness; that CDAC Haiti's work linked up with Haiti's national emergency response institutions and took a long-term perspective into account to ensure a measure of sustainability. As one GoH stakeholder put it:

“CDAC [Haiti] is working hard to leave something behind.”

Although it is too early to assess the effects of the capacity building work, there are some indications of its effects. For example, stakeholders said that the GoH now understands how serving journalists can serve GoH plans and approaches. This is evidenced by the fact that by November 2011, the CTESP was coordinating a project designed in collaboration with CDAC Haiti that expected to train 30 journalists in each GoH department on the latest messages on disaster risk reduction (hurricane, earthquake, tsunami and cholera). The plan was that the journalists would play a communication role in Haiti's national system for disaster and risk management. This communication capacity is being used by the new health/hygiene communication effort led by MSPP/DINEPA for cholera sensitisation.

Although some of the CDAC Haiti partner organisations provided support to local media (for example, Internews, IMS, and CECOSIDA), the CDAC Haiti secretariat's work around capacity building of the local media was limited, although it was engaged with Internews' media support programme.

<sup>47</sup> For more details, see Annex 6.

Nevertheless, in late 2010, an Oxfam staff member was seconded to the CDAC Haiti secretariat to map the national coverage of radio spots on cholera with a view for CDAC Haiti to undertake training in areas with gaps with support from the MCC. Not all the maps were completed, nor was the planned journalist training initiated due to the shortage of funds.

The CDAC Haiti secretariat did not direct any capacity building initiative at the humanitarian agencies, although some felt that participating in CDAC Haiti meetings provided them with a better understanding of communicating with disaster affected communities. Moreover, some received technical advice from the CDAC Haiti secretariat. Several humanitarian agencies saw a need for training, (generally in the area of communicating with affected populations and the use of media and new technologies), technical support, and tools and guidelines. They felt that future CDAC Haiti-like functions should provide this type of support.

### Box 1: Practical implications of more communication

An informant with camp-level experience highlighted that while engaging with affected populations was a necessity, establishing an open dialogue and mechanisms for complaints was not easy to implement in practice, given the limitations of the humanitarian system: “First, how do you deal with and analyse the data load? If you manage to handle the data, how do you deal with demands that you cannot address because they are not in your approved budget? Is it ethical to ask for people’s views if you have no means of addressing them? Would establishing contingency budgets that are earmarked for addressing needs expressed by affected communities solve the problem? Would donors agree to such proposals?”

## 4.9 Advocacy

Although advocacy was not stated as a formal goal, CDAC Haiti was relatively successful in this area. It was also a function that stakeholders saw a need for: several key actors highlighted the need for continuous advocacy for two-way communication, listening to vulnerable people and taking their voices into account. For informants in Haiti, this was not just a question of ensuring effective and efficient support to the communities, it was also a question of respect and the right of people to be informed and to be heard. They held that in emergencies there is generally insufficient consultation with affected people, a lack of dialogue and participation. National civil society is often bulldozed by the international humanitarian actors who are in ‘urgentiste’ mode.<sup>48</sup>

Stakeholders from the GoH, international NGOs, the UN and the cluster management system highlighted that a significant contribution of CDAC Haiti was that awareness of the importance of two-way communication had been raised in different clusters, the ICC, Humanitarian Country Team meetings, networks and events.

“The message has been made clear and the message has got through. There is a consciousness now.”

“CDAC [Haiti] forced us to look through a communication lens.”

“The seeds have been planted and are germinating.”

“I’ve never been in a response where so many people have talked about communication.”

<sup>48</sup> This position has been reflected since the early 1990s in the “Do No Harm Project” and by the “Listening Project” established in 2005.



One informant said that the CDAC Haiti Coordinator added value to the meetings he/she attended by reminding and underlining the importance of ensuring that the communication angle was addressed in all humanitarian efforts. Others mentioned the advocacy effort was particularly effective during the cholera outbreak:

“The advocacy work that [the CDAC Haiti secretariat] performed during the cholera crisis has been extraordinary.”

“In this period the need for feedback from the population hit home.”

A key aspect of CDAC Haiti’s advocacy during the cholera period was the need for testing messages before they were widely disseminated. While the CDAC Haiti secretariat felt that there was insufficient testing in place, GoH, NGO and UN informants of this review mentioned the importance of testing, suggesting that at least awareness for testing had been raised.

At first, the advocacy effort of CDAC Haiti had difficulties in filtering upstream to the HQ level in the UN system. In January 2010, the pitch for communication questions in the overall UN joint needs assessment was rejected. However, by November 2010, upon request from the Humanitarian Coordinator, the CDAC Haiti secretariat coordinated and submitted a draft appeal of USD1.5 million to OCHA for communication projects involving 13 agencies that aimed to address the cholera epidemic. Some of these proposed projects were included in the final 2011 Consolidated Appeal for Haiti.

## 4.10 Adding Value

Stakeholders affirmed that there was need in Haiti for the coordination of communication efforts and messaging to avoid fragmentation and to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of assistance. As one stakeholder from the Haitian Red Cross Movement said:

“If there is a fault in communications to beneficiary populations, it is usually a coordination problem.”

The function performed by CDAC Haiti secretariat was considered relevant and useful, and there was consensus within the CDAC Haiti group that CDAC Haiti added value:

“CDAC Haiti is filling a huge gap.”

“CDAC [Haiti] reinforces the humanitarian system.”

“CDAC [Haiti] has played a very important role in a country where rumours spread fast.”

### Box 2: Communications and Clusters

There are different ways to address communication with affected communities within the cluster architecture. A stand-alone cluster would be a possibility, but it would risk isolating communication and could result in a ‘silo’ effect. A communication sub-cluster that would be similar to CDAC Haiti could be established. Alternatively, a communication coordinating function could be integrated into each of the cluster leads by employing staff with the relevant backgrounds. The communication specialists from each cluster lead could collaborate in a cross-cluster working group to ensure cohesion and further coordination. This would allow for a clear mainstreaming of communication with affected communities.

To better understand the value CDAC Haiti added, the review team asked stakeholders to consider the hypothetical supposition of what the situation would have been like without CDAC Haiti. Those involved in the initiative said that they believed that the quality and efficiency of their work would have been adversely affected and many opportunities would have been missed:

“We would not have been able to get things done as quickly and as well.”

Other feedback on what effect a response without CDAC Haiti might have been included:

- There would have been a lot more duplication, uncovered gaps and contradictory messaging, particularly after the cholera outbreak
- The cholera outbreak would have been an even greater disaster, with many more lives having been lost to cholera [views of health actors and stakeholders working close to the ground]
- The quality of the WASH response to cholera would have been diminished
- The GoH would have played a diminished role in the relief effort
- The Intentions Survey would have been of less quality, may not have gained the same prominence, or may never have been completed<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> See annex 6 for details.

# 5 Governance, Management and Funding

## 5.1 Governance and Strategic Management

When the global CDAC Network discussed deploying a field presence in Haiti, most of the Steering Committee showed an interest. A few members of the CDAC Network were particularly eager and found the opportunity too compelling to pass over.

CDAC Haiti faced a number of governance and strategic management challenges. First, the CDAC Network, which at the time was an informal, *ad hoc*, inter-agency working group,<sup>50</sup> was young and not institutionally established. There was no formal governance structure or procedures for decision making, reporting and accountability. And it was not clear how the global CDAC Network, its Chair and the host agency should relate to CDAC Haiti and who should take what decisions. (What was the mandate of the CDAC Network Chair? When should issues be brought to the attention of CDAC Network members? What was the domain of the host agency? How was accountability of the CDAC Haiti Coordinator to be assured?) Moreover, the individual members at the HQ level did not have the capacity or the resources to engage in the CDAC Network in any comprehensive way due to their primary commitments to their own organisations. In retrospect, informants saw a need for clearer definition from the beginning, and a streamlined decision making process and communication protocols.

Second, there were questions of ownership of CDAC Haiti within the CDAC Network. As time passed, some members felt less ownership and/or were ambivalent towards the initiative in Haiti. As CDAC Haiti evolved, most CDAC Network members at HQ level had a limited understanding of what CDAC Haiti did and how it functioned. Some felt the initiative came at a significant opportunity cost, anticipating that it would end after a few months as originally planned. Others came to see CDAC Haiti as a removed, parallel off-shoot of the global CDAC Network and expected Internews to manage the initiative.

Ownership of CDAC Haiti by some of the CDAC Network members was further weakened by them not being present in Haiti during the full duration of CDAC Haiti. Since there were no clear lines of authority between staff working with the global CDAC initiative and their field-level colleagues, there was no way that the former group could insist that field staff support and participate in CDAC Haiti. Some field-level stakeholders suggested that a visit from each new CDAC Network Chair<sup>51</sup> might have created an impetus for better engagement among global CDAC Network members in Haiti.

Meanwhile, at the country level there was also no clear ownership among the CDAC Haiti group because there was never a formal membership structure for CDAC in Haiti, in part because CDAC Haiti had billed itself as a platform and a service. Some individuals and a few organisations were highly committed, counted themselves as members of sorts, and showed support when CDAC Haiti faced funding shortages. As members of the global CDAC Network, both the OCHA and Internews<sup>52</sup> offices in Haiti felt special ownership toward CDAC Haiti and provided it with a measure of guidance

50 CDAC did not formally adopt the term 'Network' until March 2011. During the recent strategic review, the majority of those interviewed fed back that the CDAC should operate as a network as this would maximise impact in a complex humanitarian environment.

51 In January 2010, the Chair of the CDAC Network visited Haiti. He could not be involved with CDAC Haiti or the global-level CDAC Haiti working group due to personal circumstances.

52 Initially, Internews' country director was sceptical about CDAC Haiti. However, as the initiative developed and proved its worth, he became a staunch supporter.

and advice on an *ad hoc* basis, particularly during periods when the perceived lack of support from the global CDAC Network generated significant stress among the CDAC Haiti secretariat staff. OCHA, however, had to tread carefully as it was also CDAC Haiti's main donor.

Third, insufficient communication between CDAC Haiti and the global CDAC Network presented a clear challenge to governance and accountability. While there was some reporting from Haiti, it only occurred during certain periods, mainly concerned activities and achievements, and usually did not cover management issues, strategic decisions or discussion about how CDAC Haiti should interpret and develop its role. Communication between the host agency and the global CDAC Network was also sub-optimal. Information was not shared sufficiently by the host, there was little reporting and the CDAC Network was not always informed of decisions. Insufficient ownership and understanding of the Haiti initiative among several of the CDAC Network members worked as a disincentive for CDAC Haiti and the host agency to communicate. Insufficient communication contributed to misgivings among some global CDAC Network members, which further weakened ownership.

At the same time, CDAC Haiti was not always kept in the loop of developments at the global level. CDAC Haiti Coordinators rarely had conference calls with the global CDAC Network Chair or the Steering Committee.

Fourth, until the spring of 2011, there was no central capacity within the CDAC Network to provide strategic management. All of the CDAC Network members' representatives had fulltime jobs in their respective organisations. The CDAC Network Chair was a demanding and time-consuming role involving coordinating the activities of CDAC Network members. For example, in the second half of 2010, the CDAC Network Chair was required to spend most of his efforts on non-Haiti-related work as the CDAC Network worked to formalise itself and initiated a new CDAC ground presence in Pakistan. As host agency, Internews (at HQ level and in Haiti) found itself having to increase its contribution to the project and provide overall guidance to CDAC Haiti.

In CDAC Haiti's last phase, a Global Coordinator for the CDAC Network was recruited, increasing central capacity. Initially introduced to the CDAC Haiti Coordinator as a peer, the global CDAC Network Coordinator was subsequently requested to take on management responsibility for the CDAC Haiti Coordinator. The change improved communication and the two Coordinators initially began having weekly calls. The CDAC Global Coordinator also facilitated dissemination of information on CDAC Haiti amongst CDAC Network members and a wider group of stakeholders. In addition, the CDAC Global Coordinator, the CDAC Network Chair and the Internews Executive Director were mandated by the larger CDAC Steering Committee to jointly take decisions on issues that were not considered of high strategic importance on behalf of the Steering Committee. However, frustration remained high among all parties, communication and supporting structures were unsatisfactory and the Coordinators at both levels felt insufficiently supported.

The fact that for most of its existence CDAC Haiti has operated in a governance vacuum was double-edged. On the one hand, it meant isolation and a lack of guidance. On the other, it meant freedom, flexibility and autonomy. And the different Coordinators, both at the Haiti- and global-level, had personalities and approaches that made the most of the situation in a positive way. With no formal constituency in Haiti; no memoranda or other agreements with any stakeholders in Haiti (GoH, UN or otherwise) to define its status; funding proposals (the first two) that were open to interpretation due to their poor formulation; and a donor (OCHA) that backed the experimental nature of the initiative; CDAC Haiti faced few constraints in developing its role and thus freely and quickly manoeuvred to respond to opportunities (within the limits of its financial and human resources). The CDAC Haiti experience therefore allowed for a fairly extensive exploration of what a CDAC Haiti-like function on the ground could potentially engage in and accomplish. One informant in Haiti summed it up as:

“The CDAC [Haiti] Coordinator is a free agent.”

In addition to stronger support and guidance from the global CDAC Network, the CDAC Haiti secretariat would have benefitted from on-going guidance and advice from actors in-country that had a current and strategic understanding of the humanitarian and political context. At the end of the second phase (September 2010), there was an attempt by Internews and OCHA to establish a steering committee at the field level that mirrored the global engagement, including a few key players in Haiti who were not members at the global level. This approach worked on the management processes related to recruiting a new coordinator and securing more funding. It was eventually abandoned during the double impact of Hurricane Tomas and the cholera outbreak. The CDAC Haiti Coordinator later proposed establishing a local advisory group composed of members of the CDAC Haiti group, for the final funding phase. Since the funding amount for this period was lower than originally anticipated, this initiative was eventually dropped.

While the envisaged local advisory group could have been a benefit, CDAC Haiti would have had even greater use of an advisory group composed of senior representatives from selected UN agencies, donors, international NGOs, local NGOs, media organisations and GoH departments.<sup>53</sup> In addition to providing insight, acting as a sounding board and offering advice, an advisory group of this type would have strengthened CDAC Haiti's position in the humanitarian system, reinforced its advocacy base, and allowed CDAC Haiti the opportunity to interact with and understand the strategic priorities of the different facets of the humanitarian effort.

## 5.2 Host Agency Model

As mentioned in Section 1.1, Internews was given the task by the CDAC Network to host the CDAC initiative in Haiti because it had a strong field presence in Haiti. This meant that Internews undertook fiduciary responsibility for CDAC Haiti, which it interpreted as including the provision of administrative, logistical and security support to the CDAC Haiti secretariat.<sup>54</sup> Assuming the role of host created a number of challenges. First, there was never a memorandum of understanding between Internews and the CDAC Network, and there was no precedent that could inform what the host role entailed, or how it should be performed.

Second, since there was no formal governance mechanism to provide strategic and programmatic guidance to CDAC Haiti, Internews found itself supporting CDAC Haiti in this area as well, particularly when rapid decisions had to be taken. This further complicated relations with the CDAC Network.

Third, acting as host proved time-consuming and resource intensive for Internews both at the HQ and country level. Nonetheless, while there was significant scope for improving communication between the different involved parties, Internews provided smooth and efficient administrative backstopping to CDAC Haiti.

Internews' host role did create a potential area of conflict. As part of OCHA's request to accelerate the administrative process, the initial grant from OCHA to CDAC Haiti included funds earmarked for Internews' ENDK 'News that You Can Use' radio programme. This may have created tension between Internews and some of the global CDAC Network members. However, the prospect of obtaining funding for ENDK acted as an incentive for Internews to take on the hosting function. Furthermore, the ENDK element in the proposal added strength to the application. In retrospect, ENDK has constituted an important partner and resource for CDAC Haiti. Moreover, evidence suggests that the initial coupling of ENDK with CDAC Haiti did not blur the delineations between the two in the eyes of other stakeholders. Rather, while Internews was regarded by stakeholders as a key champion of CDAC Haiti, OCHA was viewed by informants as an even more important partner (this is discussed further in Chapter 6).<sup>55</sup>

<sup>53</sup> This structure is common among clusters. For example, the WASH Cluster Lead in Haiti developed a similar structure that is considered useful and effective.

<sup>54</sup> Annex 5 includes a summary of lessons from Internews regarding the hosting role.

<sup>55</sup> One informant believed that CDAC Haiti was organisationally a part of Internews, while two informants believed that it was organisationally placed under OCHA. Other informants had a clear understanding of the relationships.

## 5.3 Funding and Resource Mobilisation

CDAC Haiti received three main grants that were all from the Emergency Relief Response Fund (ERRF). In total the endeavour amounted to the relatively small sum of \$US 615,000. The first grant of approximately \$265,000 funded activities through September 2010. When it appeared that CDAC Haiti would have to close at the end of September 2010, members of the CDAC Haiti group attended a meeting with OCHA to show its full support for the continuation of the initiative, and more than 20 organisations – including local GoH bodies – provided supporting testimonials. In recognition of this strong local need, OCHA exceptionally provided a second grant of \$139,570 from the ERRF to maintain CDAC Haiti activities through the end of January 2011.

At that point, CDAC Haiti closed down (see Section 3.4). Within two weeks of closing, however, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator obtained verbal commitments from both ECHO and OCHA who were both potentially willing to fund CDAC Haiti for the remainder of 2011. However, the global CDAC Network was not in agreement about whether CDAC Haiti should continue to exist.<sup>56</sup> There had been insufficient consultation about obtaining what was felt to be indefinite funding, and an anxiety about mounting opportunity costs to both the global CDAC Network Secretariat (one person only at this time) and to Internews. It was not until after a strategic meeting in March 2011 that the global CDAC Network agreed that CDAC Haiti should be restarted. In the meantime, an ERRF audit slowed its ability to respond to new funding requests. And the results of the audit led to a tightening of the ERRF's terms and conditions, making securing new funding more difficult.

In the interim, the global CDAC Network provided six weeks' of bridge funding with the understanding that this would be reimbursed when the new ERRF grant came through. The global CDAC Network operates on a small budget and the bridge funding represented 13% of its annual budget at the time. After this period, WHO - which recognised the need for CDAC Haiti to address the cholera epidemic, eventually provided a grant for an additional month of bridge funding. Again, exceptionally, the ERRF decided to grant \$197,570 to allow CDAC Haiti to continue, based on the belief that ECHO would subsequently contribute.

This time the grant covered a broader scope (earthquake, cholera and hurricane season) and was intended to support collaboration with the GoH and an exit strategy. Internews, however, felt it was not in a position to pursue funds from ECHO due to: its commitments to another EC-funded project that required that much of its capacity for liaising with ECHO in PaP; the fact that the global CDAC Network wanted to focus on its own internal strategic capacity at the global level; and its understanding that the majority of the other CDAC Network members were at best ambivalent about continued operations in Haiti.

It is important to remember that CDAC Haiti was established with the anticipation that it would only exist for a single, short-term funding period during the immediate response phase. Therefore, no strategy of how to raise funds had been developed and the capacity of the CDAC Haiti secretariat had not been designed to mobilise financial resources.<sup>57</sup> While stakeholders on the ground saw a critical need for CDAC Haiti (and had considerable difficulty in understanding why CDAC Haiti and the global CDAC Network were not able to secure predictable and longer-term funding), many global CDAC Network members perceived it differently: CDAC Haiti had been an experiment; it was intended to be short-term; CDAC Haiti's continued existence represented a significant opportunity cost; and they did not feel fully committed to a continued CDAC presence on the ground.

<sup>56</sup> A few stakeholders held that if the global CDAC Network had felt stronger ownership of CDAC Haiti, funding from CDAC Network members might have been more forthcoming.

<sup>57</sup> CDAC Haiti did not apply for funds in the CAP because it was not envisaged at the global level that CDAC Haiti would exist into 2011.

Compounding these problems, ownership of the Haiti initiative was also a struggle as some CDAC Network members regarded CDAC Haiti as primarily an Internews project. Limited capacity and involvement made it challenging for the global CDAC Network to provide clear direction to CDAC Haiti on whether it should work to mobilise funds in Haiti or not, although the CDAC Network Chair did provide comments on at least two concept notes for funding prepared by Internews at the time. Nevertheless, without direction from the global CDAC Network, and without a strategy or much capacity to mobilise resources, CDAC Haiti's pursuit of donors was challenging. In September 2010, CDAC Haiti almost managed to secure additional financial resources just before existing funding expired. But with the arrival of the cholera crisis in the months that followed, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator was unable to dedicate sufficient time to fundraising to secure additional financial support before funding lapsed at the end of January 2011.

Internews also had limited resources to spend on fundraising for CDAC Haiti. Since it is unusual for a host role to also involve fundraising, it may also be argued that fundraising was beyond the fiduciary role that a host agency should play.<sup>58</sup>

Some members of the global CDAC Network felt that since CDAC Haiti was seen as useful to the humanitarian and media community in Haiti that it served, these stakeholders could be expected to provide funding to support it, as happened when the WHO decided to contribute. While this might seem logical – particularly considering the efficiency gains that CDAC Haiti imparted to many members – it was not a straightforward solution. First, many of the participants in CDAC Haiti were middle-level staff, often participating in CDAC Haiti as individuals who did not always have sufficient influence over their respective organisations' budgets. Second, there was no formal membership of CDAC Haiti; many organisations participated in CDAC Haiti because a staff member found it useful, not because of an institutional commitment. Third, there were few precedents of humanitarian actors jointly paying for a coordination platform.

The lack of secure, long-term funding had a profoundly negative effect on CDAC Haiti:

1. It made planning for the secretariat highly challenging, both from a management and from a strategic perspective
2. It contributed to a high turnover of staff due to the job insecurity that the short-term funding created
3. It meant CDAC Haiti could not be administrated effectively. In particular, the last grant from the ERRF barred any costs incurred by Internews HQ from being covered
4. It made it difficult for the partners in Haiti to plan joint initiatives and strategies, since it was unclear how long CDAC Haiti would be able to support processes
5. During the 'coma' phase, it meant that communication work in Haiti lost momentum on the ground, staff were lost and extra resources had to be devoted to re-establish operations when additional funding was secured

The funding difficulties experienced by CDAC Haiti also directly affected the global CDAC Network: bridge funding it provided to CDAC Haiti could not be reimbursed by the ERRF grant, meaning that the CDAC Network essentially 'lost' money from an already small annual budget. Although CDAC Network members agreed that they had made a useful investment in providing bridge funding to CDAC Haiti, this was nevertheless a frustrating outcome for the global group.

<sup>58</sup> Within the CDAC Network, these roles appear to have been regarded as connected: when it was discussed that IMS would potentially take over the hosting role in September 2010, raising funds was seen as part of the responsibility.

## 6 Overall Conclusions

CDAC Haiti began as a short-term pilot initiative. In the early months a few committed individuals at both HQ level and in Haiti set significant groundwork in place for the future direction of CDAC Haiti and its secretariat. When CDAC Haiti secretariat staff were eventually recruited, they were well-supported and able to quickly begin operating. They rapidly established CDAC Haiti's role as a coordinator, advocate and service provider for communication with disaster affected communities.

By the time of the cholera epidemic in October 2010, CDAC Haiti had gained enough credibility to be requested to become the communication sub-cluster on cholera. Evidence suggests that its achievements during this period were widely regarded as filling an important gap and adding value to the humanitarian effort.

CDAC Haiti's activities came to a halt when funding expired at the end of January 2011. While CDAC Haiti was restarted at the end of April 2011 after a nearly three-month break, it never fully regained its former momentum. In its last phase, although CDAC Haiti continued to undertake quality work, its coordination function became much less pronounced as its focus centred on building capacity among its key government partners. When the CDAC Haiti secretariat closed for a final time in November 2011, most stakeholders in Haiti were in agreement that CDAC Haiti ended its work prematurely and that it would have had a critical role to play in the upcoming return and relocation phases.

### 6.1 Objectives and Status

While the documentation reveals a clear sense of direction for CDAC Haiti from the beginning, it was unclear how it would develop and what role it would come to play. CDAC Haiti's formal objectives evolved over time, but they also existed in parallel to other sets of objectives that the CDAC Haiti secretariat used to explain its functions. None of these objectives fully corresponded with the work that CDAC Haiti actually undertook. This lack of consistent and accurate objectives did not hamper CDAC Haiti in any significant way operationally, but the situation was not conducive to monitoring progress and results. Nevertheless, as a pilot venture its ability to adapt and seize opportunities as they arose was arguably more important than a satisfactory structure for results-based management.

CDAC Haiti did not have a formal status in the humanitarian system. This gave it the freedom to explore different roles and functions as needs emerged. And while this was undoubtedly an advantage in many respects, it also undermined predictability and accountability.

### 6.2 Achievements as a Coordination Mechanism

The humanitarian response in Haiti was one of the largest cross-agency commitments to communication ever seen in an emergency. The humanitarian community's capacity to communicate with affected communities was significantly enhanced. Evidence suggests that CDAC Haiti played a critical role in this overall achievement by effectively mobilising partners towards appropriate, efficient and coherent communication with disaster affected communities.

To coordinate successfully, a coordination mechanism requires credibility, information management systems and regular coordination meetings. It also needs the ability to lead strategically, to integrate itself into the humanitarian system and to advocate. CDAC Haiti consistently met most of these requirements:



- Most stakeholders had a high regard for the competence, efficiency and dynamism of the CDAC Haiti secretariat staff. The secretariat acted as a neutral party, ran meetings in a democratic manner and was adept at building consensus among the range of different partners.
- Overall, most people considered the secretariat's regular coordination meetings useful. These meetings made it possible for partners to collaborate on: i) providing coordinated and relevant life-saving information to disaster affected populations, and ii) ensuring that feedback from affected populations was effectively channelled to the humanitarian community. Stakeholders maintained that the coordination effort was effective in avoiding duplication and filling gaps in the response. Without CDAC Haiti, they believed, many opportunities would have been missed and the quality of the response would have been diminished.
- The secretariat was particularly noted for being an efficient provider of reliable information. It digested and packaged information using different channels and formats to meet the needs of its constituency.
- The CDAC Haiti secretariat offered strategic leadership by playing a proactive and catalytic role. This included pitching ideas, bringing parties together, promoting synergies and coordinating joint initiatives that advanced the overall goal of communicating with disaster affected populations. Furthermore, the secretariat offered its advice and support to partners that saved them time and resources.
- The CDAC Haiti secretariat effectively integrated itself into the humanitarian system. It regularly liaised and networked with several clusters. Despite its lack of a formal coordination status and initial recognition within the system, because of its credibility and knowledge CDAC Haiti was invited to participate in the overall Inter-Cluster Coordination (ICC) meetings as if it were itself a cluster within the humanitarian system.
- CDAC Haiti made clear gains in raising awareness about two-way communication, listening to vulnerable people and taking their voices into account. Informants believe that the secretariat's persistent advocacy resulted in the CDAC Haiti message getting through to humanitarian organisations and relevant government agencies.

One particular strength that the CDAC Haiti secretariat developed over time was its ability to collaborate with GoH partners and connect the GoH with the NGO community in relevant ways. Having a Government Liaison Officer was seen as an important asset in this regard. Evidence suggests that the systematic work to build capacity among GoH partners enhanced connectedness and will result in tangible improvements with good prospects for sustainability.

Some areas that stakeholders thought should be considered in the context of a future CDAC Haiti-like initiative, but which CDAC Haiti did not address sufficiently or at all, included developing a policy document to guide the work and help set priorities; funding pilot projects with partners that could be taken to scale; undertaking or facilitating more research and studies; technical support to partners; contributing to systematic monitoring and evaluation of the effects of communication work; and involving programme staff more systematically.

## 6.3 Enabling Factors

For the purpose of learning and replicating, it is useful to examine what factors enabled CDAC Haiti to successfully undertake its role as a coordination mechanism.

First, CDAC Haiti greatly benefitted from hard-working, competent and committed individuals. CDAC Haiti was started by a team of global CDAC Network members committed to establishing it as an effective mechanism. It was subsequently run by highly dedicated, dynamic, professional and agile staff who accomplished much with limited resources. Given the funding insecurity that CDAC Haiti faced, attracting competent staff could have been a challenge. In the words of one informant:

“CDAC [Haiti] worked because of the people.”

Second, CDAC Haiti received solid backing from the Humanitarian Coordinator and OCHA. While the Humanitarian Coordinator was not involved with CDAC Haiti on day-to-day basis, he supported it from the start, fully concurred with CDAC Haiti’s overall principles and gave it the opportunity to lead the sub-cluster on cholera communication. At the same time, OCHA lent its support to CDAC Haiti in a variety of ways. In the beginning, OCHA in Geneva backstopped the initiative while OCHA in Haiti played a role in recruiting organisations to come to CDAC Haiti meetings. OCHA provided ERRF funding to CDAC Haiti, even though this facility was not structured to provide multiple grants for one project. OCHA also Chaired the CDAC Haiti meetings and led the CDAC Haiti secretariat during staffing gaps.<sup>59</sup> When needed, OCHA helped place CDAC Haiti on the agenda of different strategic meetings and gave it visibility. When relations with the GoH turned sour, OCHA effectively mediated. And through its association with OCHA, CDAC Haiti gained a measure of legitimacy that allowed it to interact effectively within the cluster system.

Third, Internews provided critical support for CDAC Haiti, not only as its host agency, but also as an active member of the CDAC Haiti group. Internews ensured that part of CDAC Haiti maintained a solid footing in the media sector. Moreover, its audience research and analysis added significant value to the CDAC Haiti network, particularly since very few humanitarian organisations possessed this kind of capacity. At its HQ, Internews had a clear understanding of the practicalities of running CDAC Haiti since key staff had worked in Haiti for periods of time. Meanwhile, the Internews team in PaP provided valuable support. There is little doubt that Internews’ involvement with CDAC Haiti was also advantageous for Internews itself. For example, Internews used CDAC Haiti meetings to leverage some of its work. However, Internews was integral to CDAC Haiti’s overall goal that CDAC Haiti should be beneficial for its members.

Fourth, the cholera epidemic presented CDAC Haiti with the space to prove itself – albeit under tragic circumstances. Given the enormous demands placed on their operational capacity, neither WHO/PAHO nor UNICEF had the capacity available to provide the lead in health communication coordination and asked CDAC for support – a position it was able to assume as it had already gained credibility in the humanitarian system.

### Box 3: Emergency Relief Response Fund for Haiti

The ERRF was established to provide rapid and flexible funding to address gaps in humanitarian needs. Among its objectives are to strengthen coordination mechanisms and solidify links with long-term development. Typically the fund addresses unforeseen needs not included in the CAP process.

<sup>59</sup> At one point OCHA recruited a staff member to backstop the CDAC Haiti secretariat, but she was never able to fulfill the role properly due to the burdens created by the additional emergency responses (hurricanes and cholera).

Fifth, having UNOPS and IOM as active members was a valuable resource for CDAC Haiti. Since these organisations had a large number of community mobilisers working at the field level, the voices of affected communities could be heard in CDAC Haiti meetings. It also enabled critical joint field-level assessments regarding the communication needs of affected communities, such as the Baseline Study on Cholera and the Intentions Survey.

Finally, even though some informants felt that CDAC Haiti was too dominated by the international humanitarian community (as opposed to the media community), or too driven by media development organisations, CDAC Haiti did benefit from a mix of members: UN agencies, humanitarian NGOs, media development organisations and organisations with social mobilisers. Although this membership mix was not perfect, there was enough critical mass of each type of organisation to create the balance it needed to achieve its goals. In retrospect, CDAC Haiti sorely missed representatives from Haitian civil society and may have benefitted from more interaction with more senior programme staff from organisations and stronger relations with telecom providers.

In summary, CDAC Haiti was enabled by:

- Capable and committed staff
- Support from the humanitarian top tier
- Backing from the UN humanitarian system
- Buy-in from key offices in the Haitian government
- A competent and supportive host
- A research capacity within the group
- Access to social mobilisers
- A critical mass of different types of organisations in the group to create a relative balance.

## 6.4 Impeding Factors

Despite its achievements, CDAC Haiti faced a number of impeding factors. First, CDAC Haiti had no formal status and several versions of objectives. Many stakeholders regarded this as an advantage; indeed, CDAC Haiti made the most of its ambiguous status by freely manoeuvring to respond to opportunities and explore what a CDAC function on the ground could potentially engage in and accomplish. Overall, however, the lack of formal status undermined accountability and predictability. The running of CDAC Haiti was left to individuals to define and manage as opportunities and needs arose. If it were not for the commitment and drive of these individuals, informants felt that CDAC Haiti would have collapsed soon after it was created. It is doubtful that another country-level CDAC Haiti-like initiative could function as well without its status, role and objectives being clearly defined and articulated within the humanitarian system.

Second, CDAC Haiti was encumbered by not having a funding strategy. It managed to survive, stumbling at times, disabled by the inability to plan ahead and strategise. In part, this was related to the third impediment, which was that CDAC Haiti did not receive enough strategic guidance. It was launched before the global CDAC Network was sufficiently developed to possess the tools, processes and structures needed to manage a country-level operation. In a sense, 'the cart was put before the horse'. Furthermore, there was insufficient capacity at the global level since CDAC Network representatives had other fulltime jobs. As time passed, some members felt little ownership and/or were ambivalent

towards the CDAC initiative in Haiti and began to regard it as a parallel structure. Meanwhile, Internews, as host agency, played a larger role than it initially envisaged that went beyond just fiduciary responsibilities.

Fourth, the lines of communication and accountability systems involving the country level, the host agency and the Steering Committee were not well established. A downward spiral was created in which sub-optimal communication practices by all parties led to further reduced ownership of CDAC Haiti by the CDAC Network, which in turn weakened the sense of accountability from the country level and led to even less communication. As a result, the different parties felt increasingly frustrated.

## 6.5 Lessons Learnt and Recommendations

Overall, CDAC Haiti was a highly relevant initiative that contributed to making the humanitarian effort in Haiti more effective, efficient and relevant to needs. It succeeded in providing much-needed:

1. Services
2. Coordination
3. Strategic leadership
4. Capacity building
5. Advocacy for better communication with affected populations.

While a favourable context and propitious circumstances played their part, hard work and skilful decisions were critical to CDAC Haiti's success. The CDAC Haiti experience provides a valuable lesson regarding effective coordination of communication with affected communities. It also illustrates the dynamics that provide results and the potential pitfalls along the way. Furthermore, the experience underscores the necessity of addressing governance systems, accountability, resource mobilisation and status issues before any CDAC Haiti-like entity is deployed in the future.

Some of the other lessons that can be gleaned from the CDAC Haiti experience include that a CDAC-focused coordination mechanism can add value if:

1. It is run by competent staff with adept brokering skills and expertise in communication, media and humanitarian response.
2. The Coordinator leads strategically, with an overall vision of how coordination can contribute to a more effective and efficient response. This entails understanding and maximising the complementarities of different agencies' comparative advantages. It also entails promoting synergies and joint initiatives and identifying what studies and assessments may be needed.
3. Coordination systems are established that involve regular, inclusive, coordination meetings and the management and dissemination of relevant, timely and accurate information.
4. It functions as an integral and formal part of the humanitarian coordination system and actively engages with its different parts.
5. Persistent advocacy is undertaken to raise awareness about the importance of two-way communication: listening to and engaging with vulnerable people and taking their voices into account.

6. It has the ability to respond to demands from humanitarian actors, local media organisations and relevant government partners regarding technical assistance and training in techniques, systems and technology relevant to communicating with disaster affected communities.
7. It develops fruitful collaboration with relevant government partners.
8. It consists of a mix of different types of organisations. This includes UN agencies, humanitarian NGOs, national NGOs and media development organisations. Crucially, it also needs partner organisations with social mobilisers and capacities to undertake communication-related assessments and analyses.
9. It has OCHA's and the Humanitarian Coordinator's active support and facilitation.

This review has three recommendations that should be considered during the planning for any subsequent CDAC Haiti-like initiatives:

**Recommendation 1:**

The international humanitarian community – in particular, members of the IASC, NGOs and donors – should consider the coordination of communication with disaster affected communities as a crucial and standard component of emergency responses. It should explore ways to ensure a predictable, legitimate and sufficiently resourced coordination function with a clear mandate to *inter alia* address gaps and duplicative efforts in communicating with affected populations. Since the information need of affected populations typically increases during the emergency phase, a CDAC Haiti-like coordination function will require a medium-term perspective. This function should be resourced so that lessons can be gathered and fed into the global CDAC Network. The CDAC Network should, in turn, advocate the above in all relevant fora.

**Recommendation 2:**

In its strategy formulation work, the CDAC Network should consider the role it can play in supporting global humanitarian efforts in the area of communicating with affected communities. The successes of CDAC Haiti offer the CDAC Network a new level of credibility to draw on for its critical advocacy role for communication with affected populations. It is also in a unique position to build on the experience gained in Haiti to further strengthen the humanitarian community's capacity to address the communication needs of disaster affected populations at the operational and policy levels. This includes sharing knowledge and skills by *inter alia* developing tools and guidelines; undertaking innovative pilot initiatives; identifying good practices; conducting training and backstopping the humanitarian effort on the ground.

**Recommendation 3:**

The global CDAC Network should engage with actors who are proponents of approaches that promote accountability, participation and human rights (such as HAP, the Listening Project, Save the Children, Oxfam, etc.). Jointly, they should explore how communicating with disaster affected communities can be enhanced by integrating principles and approaches related to accountability; freedom of expression; the right to information; the right to be heard; and to participate. Pilot initiatives and studies should be considered and donor organisations promoting rights based approaches should be sought as partners.

# Annexes

## Annex 1 Terms of Reference



### Terms of Reference CDAC Haiti Learning Review 12 August 2011

#### Background

The importance of information to, and communication with, disaster affected people has emerged as an important lesson from recent humanitarian evaluations (ECB, 2010:5; Steets & Grunewald *et al*, 2010:83). But the value of information for disaster affected populations is perhaps most succinctly expressed in the following two quotes:

Information is also a vital form of aid in itself. People need information as much as water, food, medicine or shelter. Information can save lives, livelihoods and resources (IFRC World Disasters Report, 2005:12).

Information is very directly about saving lives. If we take the wrong decisions and make the wrong choices about where we put our money and our effort because our knowledge is poor, we are condemning some of the most deserving to death and destruction (John Holmes, previous UN Emergency Relief Coordinator, opening of the OCHA Symposium on Information for Humanitarian Action, 2006:1).

Despite its potential to save lives, increase resilience, and improve the overall effectiveness of an aid effort, it is widely recognised that humanitarian organisations do not consistently utilise two-way communication approaches, including through the appropriate use of media and technology. Based on the acknowledgement of this deficiency, a number of humanitarian and media assistance organisations launched the Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC) Network at the global level in 2009.

#### CDAC Haiti and Rationale for the Review

Following the Haiti earthquake in early January 2010, CDAC Haiti became the first humanitarian response where the CDAC initiative has been operational. Funded largely through the Emergency Relief Response Fund (ERRF), with some additional short-term funding from the global CDAC Network and WHO, CDAC Haiti operates as a communication sub-group within the UN cluster system that

brings together humanitarian and media development organisations, local media and representatives of the Government of Haiti (GoH) in a collective effort to improve two-way communication between aid providers and the affected Haitian population.

Anecdotally, much valuable ‘good practice’ experience has been gained from CDAC Haiti. There have also been considerable challenges, identified informally by CDAC Haiti staff members, as well as by partners to the initiative. There is now an opportunity to formalise this learning about what worked and what didn’t with the final tranche of funding from the ERRF.

## Purpose and Objectives of the Review

The overall purpose of this review is to explore how to run a communication coordination mechanism in the context of an emergency response with the goal of enhancing overall aid effectiveness. The length of operation of CDAC Haiti will also provide an opportunity to gather important information about lessons learnt, especially in the areas of preparedness and early recovery.

To this end, the review will seek to:

- Examine CDAC Haiti as a communication coordination mechanism, considering what worked and what didn’t
- Identify elements of the CDAC Haiti initiative that might be relevant in other emergency contexts

A secondary purpose of the review is to assess the extent to which the operation of CDAC Haiti served to facilitate two-way communication flow between affected populations and the broader humanitarian community as a result of its recognised role as an inter-agency communication coordination platform within the UN Cluster system.

The objectives of the review are to:

- Examine CDAC Haiti’s objectives (CDAC Haiti has operated in three distinct phases; see Annex 1), determining their relevance and appropriateness and considering to what extent the objectives have been met
- Assess the role of CDAC Haiti as a coordination mechanism, particularly with regard to partners from the four main targeted categories (GoH, international humanitarian agencies, local journalist associations and local media and civil society)
- Assess the relationship of CDAC Haiti *vis-à-vis* UNOCHA, the cluster system, and Inter-cluster Coordination. For example, reviewing how cluster colleagues perceive that what CDAC Haiti advocates for (two-way communication) is being mainstreamed within the cluster/sector of activity
- Assess to what degree all partners feel that CDAC Haiti has strengthened their ability to coordinate as well as carry out more effective two-way communication activities
- Consider governance issues, including the role of Internews as host of CDAC Haiti, the role and functioning of the CDAC Haiti secretariat, and the relationship with CDAC Network at the global level as well as CDAC Network members active in Haiti
- Assess the key activities undertaken by CDAC Haiti from the outset of the project, and the predicted and unpredicted impacts they had. These activities fall into the following broad areas: liaison; advocacy; technical advice; coordination of sectoral activities; communication; relationship brokering; media assistance; and media liaison

- Assess the impact of fundraising activities on overall operations in terms of the sustainability of CDAC Haiti

In all of the above it will be important to capture lessons about what worked and what didn't work with a view to understanding and documenting whether CDAC Haiti has brought added value to the overall humanitarian response in Haiti and, if so, how, identifying good practice, lessons learnt and areas for improvement.

The results of the review will feed into the CDAC Network's strategic review and planning process, which will take place from September to November 2011.

### METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The emphasis of the learning review will be on process – i.e. CDAC Haiti as a communications coordination mechanism. Process reviews focus on understanding and documenting the 'how', and are often undertaken for new and innovative initiatives where the viability of implementation is not well known in advance. This has been the case in Haiti where the project has been considered a 'pilot'. They are also appropriate in the context of collaborative initiatives, such as CDAC Haiti, as effective collaborations are understood to be those that pay attention to both activity and process. Experience shows that people often neglect process issues in order to concentrate on their task. However both task and process suffer if they are split from each other.

Information from process reviews is also useful for understanding how programme outcomes are achieved and for programme replication. In this respect the review will also seek to assess the effectiveness of CDAC Haiti at the level of outcomes. Outcome reviews are also undertaken when a programme is an innovative model whose effectiveness has not yet been demonstrated (see <http://learningforsustainability.net/evaluation/questions.php>)

The overall methodological approach is expected to be qualitative, inclusive and transparent. The consultant will be encouraged to adopt a non-agency centric / non project-centred style commensurate with a collaborative initiative.

The methodological framework will cross-reference with the ALNAP [Guide to Evaluating Humanitarian Action using the OECD-DAC Criteria](#). These are: coherence; relevance / appropriateness; coverage; effectiveness; impact; coordination (not formal DAC criteria); efficiency; connectedness. However, it is anticipated that the focus will be on: coherence; connectedness; coordination; relevance / appropriateness; coverage; effectiveness.

Work has already been done to develop questions under these specific criteria. This will be provided to the consultant who will finalise the question list after the two briefing meetings (see below).



## Some Practical Considerations

Prior to starting the assignment, the consultant will provide a detailed work plan and timeframe for approval by the CDAC Network Steering Committee at the global level, as well as key colleagues in Haiti. The work plan will outline the proposed methodology for this review in more detail, and demonstrate how the proposed approach will cover all aspects of the review. It should reference some of the key resources the CDAC Network will make available for the review.

## Briefings

There will be a half day briefing prior to the start of the review in London. This will be with key stakeholders in the Steering Committee including a number of those who were present in Haiti at the start of the CDAC Haiti initiative. This could happen before or after the consultant develops the work plan. There will also be a half day briefing in Haiti once the consultant arrives in country. This will be with the current CDAC Haiti Coordinator as well as colleagues from the host agency Internews.

## Data Collection

It is suggested that data is collected in the following ways:

- Desk-based review of key documents related to: CDAC Haiti; the CDAC Network; coordination, collaboration and partnership; the cluster system; and communicating with disaster affected communities as a practice.
- Primary interviews: in-country with those involved in CDAC Haiti, CDAC Haiti partners, as well as those positioned outside the initiative; HQ with those involved in CDAC Haiti at the beginning and who are no longer in-country as well as CDAC Network Steering Committee members

An interview schedule with key informants will be set up in-country before travel to ensure availability, as far as possible. The consultant will liaise with the CDAC Haiti Coordinator on this. A list of key informants will be made available during the initial briefing meeting.

## Debriefing / Learning Workshops

There will be two debriefing / learning workshops: one in Haiti with national level stakeholders and one at the global level with the CDAC Network Steering Committee. The purpose of these will be to:

- Haiti: Present the preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations; gather feedback and seek to create consensus as far as possible; revise if necessary
- Global: Present the main findings, conclusions and recommendations

## Deliverables / Contractual Details

Not included here as they changed following the scoping.

## Language of the Review

The review will be written in English, although we require a fluent French / English speaker for this piece of work. The review will be translated into French by the project.

## Profile of the Reviewer

- Knowledge of emergency response, ideally but not necessarily in Haiti, preferably with prior emergency programme management experience including the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes
- Experience of working with / for humanitarian coordination mechanisms, and an understanding of strategic coordination
- Significant experience in the evaluation and review of humanitarian emergency projects
- Experience of process-focused evaluation and review
- Preferably knowledge / experience of working with a collaborative initiative within the humanitarian sector
- Fluent in French and English
- Proven ability to write clear reports
- Ability to manage time and resources and to work to tight deadlines
- Independence from the stakeholders involved, and no previous involvement in the CDAC Haiti initiative
- Available in the appropriate timeframe

## To Apply

- **To apply, please respond to this ToR by Friday 26 August**
- Interviews will be by phone on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> September
- Candidates will be informed of the outcome on Monday 5 September
- HQ briefing will take place on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> or Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> September

In application, please write a **letter of not more than two pages** outlining your relevant experience, your interest and your approach to this learning review. Please also suggest how you would structure the final report.

In support of your application please append (1) a previous evaluation / review report [if possible, one that focused on process / coordination]; (2) your CV with three referees; [3] a short key lessons-type document that summarises a longer piece of work that you have undertaken.

Please send your applications to: Craig Tucker on [craigtucker@cdacnetwork.org](mailto:craigtucker@cdacnetwork.org)

## Annex 2: List of Informants

1. Abaakouz, Zora	WHO, Social Mobilisation
2. Allouard, Phillippe	INTERNEWS Haiti, Director
3. Alphen, Dana Van	WHO, Health Cluster Lead
4. Angibeau, Nathalie	UNOPS, Communication Officer/Coordination Project
5. Belliard, Mildred	CARE Haiti, Communication Officer
6. Boudre, Sophie	Minustah FM
7. Byrne, Colm	Head of International Programmes, Irish Red Cross. Previously Chair of the CDAC Network
8. Casey, Niel	Independent Consultant
9. Cassani, Giovanni	IOM CCCM Cluster Lead
10. Celestin, Edgar	UNDP/DPC Communication Consultant
11. Chapelier, Carole	infoasaid Project
12. Chavannes, Leon	UNOPS, Team Leader, social mobilisation
13. Chery, Gerald Yves	CDAC Haiti Communication Officer
14. Condor, Jeremy	Independent Consultant
15. Damas, Roger	ACF International, Communication Officer
16. Daniel, Rafaela	UNOPS, Team Leader, social mobilisation
17. Desrosiers, Jacques	Association Journalistes Haïtiens (AJH), Président
18. Diallo, Abdourahmane	OCHA Information, Report Officer
19. Doyle Leonard	IOM, Public Information, Chief
20. Ellien, Rachel	OCHA, Public Information Officer
21. Etienne, Stéphanie	UNOPS, Team Leader

22. Fisher, Nigel	United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator
23. Fitzgerald, Emmet	IOM CCCM Technical Adviser
24. Georges, Amanda	British Red Cross, Communication Officer Delegate
25. Gilles, Claude	RSF Haiti
26. Gomez, Martha	WHO, HP Sub-Cluster/ Focal Point for MSPP
27. Gostelow, Lola	Independent Humanitarian Consultant
28. Harvey, Mark	Executive Director of Internews Europe
29. Houghton, Rachel	Network Coordinator, CDAC Network
30. Jean Baptiste, Pericles	Croix Rouge Haïtienne, Communications Director
31. Jean Baptiste, Alta	Civil Protection Department, Director
32. Jean Marie, Gesner	Croix Rouge Haïtienne, Assistant Communication
33. Joseph, Enosh	CDAC Haiti, Government Liaison Officer
34. Joseph, Kedma	MSPP, Head of Communication section, DPSPE
35. Jusselme, Damien	ACTED, Senior officer M&E Unit
36. Kaulard, Myrta	WFP
37. Mallawa, Suranga	UNOPS Haiti, Program Manager Shelter Emergency Unit
38. Mandel, Jennifer	INTERNEWS Haiti, Director of Research and Deputy Director
39. McConnan, Isobel	Independent Consultant
40. Naylor, Kelly Ann	UNICEF Haiti/ WASH cluster Coordinator
41. Noble, Ben	CDAC Haiti Coordinator
42. Peguet, Caroline	ERRF, Senior Funding Manager
43. Pierre, Emmanuel	CTESP, Coordinator
44. Quintanilla, Jacobo	Internews Europe Director of Humanitarian Information Projects, CDAC Network Steering Committee Member, and former CDAC Haiti Coordinator
45. Rasmussen, Finn	IMS, CDAC Network Steering Committee Member

46. Reader, Sharon	IFRC, Beneficiary Communication Delegate
47. Robinson, Lisa	BBC Media Action, CDAC Network Chair (at time of Learning Review)
48. Rommel, Jean	IMS
49. Rumbould, Yvens	ENDK Haiti, Redacteur en chef
50. Sacco, Steban	OCHA
51. Shembri, Herbert	UNICEF Haiti, Conseiller Principal, WASH Cluster
52. Simon, Jean Jacques	UNICEF, Communication Chief
53. Tremblay, Stéphanie	WFP, Public Information Officer
54. Victor, Claudel	HelpAge, Responsible for Communication
55. Wall, Imogen	Independent Consultant, Chair of CDAC Network working group for Haiti (Jan - March 2010), and former OCHA Haiti

## Annex 3

# List of Documents Reviewed

1. Abud, Matt. "CDAC Pakistan Representative. October – December 2010. Final report", December 2010.
2. ACF, "*Pou Pwoteje Nou Kont Kolera: Men Kek Konsey Ministe Sante Piblik ak Patne li yo*", No Date.
3. ADRA, "Cholera Guide du Sketch", 2010.
4. BBC World Service Trust, "*Left in the Dark: The unmet need for information in humanitarian responses*", Policy Briefing, No.2, October 2008.
5. Bennett, Jon et al. "Coordination of international humanitarian assistance in tsunami-affected countries", Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, July 2006.
6. Binder, Andrea and Francois Grunewald. *IASC Cluster Approach Evaluation, 2<sup>ND</sup> Phase Country Study, Haiti*, April 2010.
7. Boas, Alessandra V. "Communicating with Beneficiaries in Emergencies: How Can International Aid Organisations Improve?" *Centre for Development and Emergency Practice*, Oxford, August 2008.
8. Byrne, Colm. "RE: Re : Urgent CDAC funding for Haiti", E-mail to Mark Harvey et al., 3 December 2010.
9. Byrne, Colm. "RE: Urgent CDAC Funding", E-mail to Imogen Wall et al., 3 December 2010.
10. Casey, Sean. "Cholera in Haiti: still an Emergency" posted on The Guardian Poverty Matters Blog on 7 November 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/nov/07/haiti-cholera-still-emergency-donors>.
11. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 16 February 2010*.
12. CDAC Haiti Secretariat, "CDAC Haiti: Transition and Exit Strategy", October 2011.
13. CDAC Haiti Secretariat. "01 Update on CDAC", May 2010.
14. CDAC Haiti Secretariat. "02 HB – Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC)", June 2010.
15. CDAC Haiti Secretariat. "03 HB – Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC)", June 2010.
16. CDAC Haiti Secretariat. "04 HB – Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC)", July 2010.
17. CDAC Haiti Secretariat. "05 HB – Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC)", July 2010.
18. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 18 January 2010*.
19. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 2 February 2010*.

20. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 20 January 2010*.
21. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 22 January 2010*.
22. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 25 January 2010*.
23. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 25 February 2010*.
24. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 27 January 2010*.
25. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 29 January 2010*.
26. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 4 February 2010*.
27. CDAC Haiti Working Group, *Teleconference Minutes from 9 February 2010*.
28. CDAC Haiti Working Group. “*SITREP Sat-Sun 30-31/01/10*”, January 2010.
29. CDAC Haiti, “UNOCHA/CDAC Media Assistance Program for Haiti, June 2010.
30. CDAC Haiti, Briefing Report on CDAC-Haiti, 2011.
31. CDAC Haiti, Flyer, June 2010.
32. CDAC Haiti, Hygiene Promotion sub-Cluster Meeting Agenda, December 2010.
33. CDAC Haiti, Internews, Reporters sans Frontières, “July 7-12: Temporary Press Centre at the Montana”, 7 July 2010.
34. CDAC Haiti, Internews, Reporters sans Frontières, “Media Advisory. Calender: Morning Press Briefings for local and foreign media at the Hotel Montana”, 7-9 July 2010.
35. CDAC Haiti, IOM, ACTED. *Enquete Intention des Deplaces*, August 2011.
36. CDAC Haiti, Liste presence IFRC-CDAC Montana 181011.xlsx, October 2011.
37. CDAC Haiti, Meeting Agenda, 22 December 2010.
38. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 1 June 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
39. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 11 May 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
40. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 13 April 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
41. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 13 July 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
42. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 16 March 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
43. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 2 March 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince .
44. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 20 April 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
45. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 23 February 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince
46. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 24 August 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
47. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 25 May 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
48. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 27 April 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
49. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 27 July 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.

50. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 28 September 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
51. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 29 June 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
52. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 30 March 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
53. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 31 August 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
54. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 10 May 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
55. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 5 May 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince .
56. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 4 June 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
57. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 7 June 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
58. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 9 July 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
59. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 6 August 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
60. CDAC Haiti, *Minutes from 2 September 2010*, Centre du Presse de RSF, Port-Au-Prince.
61. CDAC Haiti, Presentation Schedule, January 10-14 2010.
62. CDAC Haiti, Termes de Reference du Pool de Communication du Systeme National de Gestion des Risques et des Desastres (SNRGD), September 2011.
63. CDAC Haiti, Update Document, September 2010.
64. CDAC Haiti. "CDAC Communications Sub Group – TOR", December 2010.
65. CDAC Haiti. "#1 Coordinator Weekly Update", April – May 2011.
66. CDAC Haiti. "#2 Coordinator Weekly Update", May 2011.
67. CDAC Haiti. "#3 Coordinator Weekly Update", May – June 2011.
68. CDAC Haiti. "#4 Coordinator Weekly Update", June 2011.
69. CDAC Haiti. "12 juillet-4 août: Une initiative pour encourager le dialogue dans les provinces. Le Gouvernement d’Haiti et ses partenaires présentent la caravane *Koute Ayiti!*", 7 September 2010.
70. CDAC Haiti. "CDAC Communications Sub-Group – TOR, December 2010 Draft" with comments from Colm Byrne.
71. CDAC Haiti. "Communications with Disaster Affected Communities. CDAC Haiti Meeting", 26 January 2011
72. CDAC Haiti. "Communications with Disaster Affected Communities. CDAC Haiti Meeting – Founding Agencies", 26 January 2011
73. CDAC Haiti. "Concept note. CDAC Haiti (January-June 2011)", 03 December 2010.
74. CDAC Haiti. "ERRF Haiti - IEU CDAC 6-month budget draft", 03 December 2010.
75. CDAC Haiti. "Haiti: Six Months After the Earthquake", for MINUSTAH Brochure, 2 June 2010.
76. CDAC Haiti. "Report from ICC meeting with Jon Ging, 16<sup>th</sup> of June", June 2011.



77. CDAC Haiti. "Update on Cholera and Hurricane Tomas", 22 October 2010.
78. CDAC Haiti. Background Paper and Proposed Next Steps, 2 May 2010.
79. CDAC Haiti. Draft Plan for Radio Citizen Forums, 2011.
80. CDAC Haiti. Powerpoint Presentation for DfID, 2011.
81. CDAC Network Communication Working Group, Cholera Epidemic – Communications Projects and Initiatives, January 2011.
82. CDAC Network Haiti, Rapport d'Activites: "Celebration de la Journée Internationale de Prevention des Catastrophes", October 2011.
83. CDAC Network, "Baseline Survey sur l'évaluation de l'impact de la campagne de communication sur le cholera", November/December 2010.
84. CDAC Network, "Cholera and Hurricane Response: Beneficiary Communications Projects", Report, October 2010.
85. CDAC Network, "Rapport des Activites du Gouvernement Liaison de CDAC", June-August 2011.
86. CDAC Network, "Rapport final: Journee de reflexion pour definir une approche strategique du CDAC", May 2010.
87. CDAC Network, "TWIG Intersectoriel Marches sans Cholera Presentation", February 2011.
88. CDAC Network, "UNOCHA/CDAC Media Assistance Program for Haiti", June 2012.
89. CDAC Network, CDAC Haiti/Internews Europe Letter d'accord HA/LOA/1100180.001, 2011.
90. CDAC Network, Cholera Epidemic: Communications Projects and Initiatives, 12 November 2010.
91. CDAC Network, Cholera Epidemic: Communications Projects and Initiatives, 29 November 2010.
92. CDAC Network, Cholera epidemic: Communications Projects and Initiatives, 29 July 2011
93. CDAC Network, Job Description: Coordinator – CDAC Haiti, October 2012.
94. CDAC Network, Media, Information Systems and Communities: Lessons from Haiti, May 2010.
95. CDAC Network. " Background Document for CDAC Strategy Meeting: Global Level", 23-24 March 2011.
96. CDAC Network. "CDAC Network one-pager", 28 September 2011.
97. CDAC Network. "CDAC Network: Strategic Review and Planning Process – Milestones and Deadlines", 19 September 2011.
98. CDAC Network. "CDAC Strategy, Governance, Membership, Sustainability Document Structure", 17 October 2011.
99. CDAC Network. "How CDAC Haiti Learning Review and the CDAC Network Strategy 'Talk' to Each Other", 27 November 2011.
100. CDAC Network. "Ideas for messages to Valerie Amos", 13 October 2011.

101. CDAC Network. "Inception report final", 20 September 2011.
102. CDAC Network. "Key Events in the Life of the CDAC Initiative. April 2009 – March 2011", March 2011.
103. CDAC Network. "Meeting Minutes DRAFT. CDAC Steering Committee Teleconference", 27 July 2011.
104. CDAC Network. "Meeting Minutes. CDAC Steering Committee Teleconference", 11 November 2011.
105. CDAC Network. "Meeting Minutes. CDAC Steering Committee Teleconference", 15 April 2011.
106. CDAC Network. "Meeting Report DRAFT. CDAC Network Strategy Meeting", 14 June 2011.
107. CDAC Network. "Meeting Report. CDAC Network Strategy Meeting", 23-24 March 2011.
108. CDAC Network. "Strategy, Governance and Sustainability Consultancy. Update 1", 12 October 2011.
109. CDAC Network. "The CDAC Network Moving Forward to 2014: Strategy, Governance, Membership and Sustainability: Draft for Discussion", 15 November 2011.
110. CDAC Network. "Timeline of Key Events in the Life of the CDAC Initiative. December 2008 – March 2011", 18 March 2011.
111. CDAC, Haiti Situation Report for OCHA, No.13. 11 March 2010.
112. CDAC, Haiti Situation Report for OCHA, No.14. 11 May 2010.
113. CDAC, Haiti Situation Report for OCHA, No.15. 11 June 2010.
114. CDAC, Haiti Situation Report for OCHA, No.16. 11 August 2010.
115. CDAC, Minutes from Meeting, 23 November 2010.
116. Clustercoordination.org. "How Does Cluster Coordination Add Value?", April 2008.
117. Clustercoordination.org. "Leadership", 11 March 2011.
118. Clustercoordination.org. "What is Cluster Coordination?", April 2008.
119. COMMS Sub group. "Final – National Cholera Response Plan", 02 November 2010.
120. Cravioto, Alejandro et al. (Independent UN Panel) "Final Report of the Independent Panel of Experts on the Cholera Outbreak in Haiti", May 2011.
121. DINEPA, "Réponses à l'Épidémie de Choléra", 28 December 2010.
122. DINEPA, "Réunion de Coordination du sous-Cluster Promotion d'Hygiène – Port au Prince, 22 December 2010".
123. DINEPA, "Réunion de Coordination du sous-Cluster Promotion d'Hygiène – Port au Prince, 15 December 2010".
124. DINEPA, Wash Cluster Sanitation Transition Strategy: Temporary Sites (Camps) & Return/Relocation Areas", April 2011.
125. DPSPE Haiti, "Mesaj Prevansyon Pou Pwoteje Nou Kont Kolera", October 2010.

126. DPSPE Haiti, “Messages De Sensibilisation Validés En Réponse À Épidémie Déclarée De Cholera”, October 2010.
127. ECB, “An Independent Joint Evaluation of the Haiti Earthquake Humanitarian Response”, October 2010.
128. Education Cluster Cholera 4W Report, 12 December 2010.
129. Emergency Capacity Building Project, *The Good Enough Guide: Impact Measurement and Accountability in Emergencies*, Eynsham: Information Press. 2007.
130. Figueroa, Marie E., Kincaid, D Lawrence., Rani, Manju., Lewis, Gary., “Communication for Social Change: An Integrated Model for Measuring the Process and Its Outcomes”, *Communication for Social Change Working Paper Series*, No.1, 2002.
131. Fisher, Nigel. “CDAC to DfID as requested”. E-mail to Ayliffe, Dan and Axisa, Tanya, 29 November 2010.
132. Global Education Cluster. *Education Cluster Coordinator Handbook*. Save the Children and UNICEF, May 2012.
133. Haitian Red Cross, “*Cholera Outbreak: Note on Community Beliefs, Feelings and Perceptions*”, Psychosocial Support Programme, December 2010.
134. Harvey, Mark. “Re: Re: Urgent CDAC funding for Haiti”, E-mail to Colm Byrne et al. 4 December 2010.
135. Harvey, Mark. “Re: Urgent CDAC funding for Haiti”, 3 December 2010.
136. IASC “Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthening Humanitarian Responses”, 23 November 2006.
137. ICC, *Minutes from 16 June 2011*, location not provided.
138. IFRC, “Beneficiary Communications Evaluation: Haiti Earthquake Operation 2011”, 2011.
139. IFRC, “Empowering Disaster-Affected Communities in Haiti/a strategic framework for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)”, February 2010.
140. IMS Haiti Conference Call, *Minutes from 2 February 2010*.
141. IMS Skype Conference Call, *Minutes from 19 January 2010*.
142. IMS, “Haiti Sit Rep #2”, January-February 2010.
143. IMS, “Haiti Sit Rep #3”, February 2010.
144. Internews Haiti, “Interim Report to Emergency Relief Response Fund for CDAC Haiti”, December 2010.
145. Internews Haiti, “Interim Report to Emergency Relief Response Fund for CDAC Haiti”, July 2010.
146. Internews Haiti, “Internews Haiti Emergency Response Fund Project Proposal”, July 2011.
147. Internews Haiti, “Internews Haiti Emergency Response Fund Project Proposal”, September 2010.

148. Internews Haiti, “Project Proposal to Haiti Emergency Relief Response Fund”, 14 December 2010 (revisions with comments from Colm Byrne).
149. Internews Haiti, “Projet OTI-DAI 269 – Rapport Evaluation de la Campagne D’information Autour du Cholera”, April 2011.
150. Internews Haiti, “Projet per-SNGRD: Rapport de L’enquete sur le Niveau Actuel des Connaissances de la Population sur les Menaces Naturelles”, August 2011.
151. Internews Haiti. “Analyse de l’enquete d’Audience par Tranche d’Age. Rapport #10”, 1-14 September 2010.
152. Internews Haiti. “Emergency Relief Response Fund: Budget”, February 2010.
153. Internews Haiti. “Project Proposal to Haiti Emergency Relief Response Fund”, December 2010.
154. Internews Haiti/CDAC Haiti, “Rapport narratif Période de l’accord: 15 Juin 2011 – 20 Juillet 2011” (For WHO/PAHO), August 2011.
155. Internews/CDAC Haiti. “Media, Information Systems and Communities: Lessons from Haiti”, August 2010.
156. IOM-ACTED-CDAC, “Joint Press Release, IDPs Intentions Survey”, August 2011.
157. Mandel, Jennifer. *Audience Research In A Time Of Cholera: Focus Group & Survey On Haiti’s Frontline*. Internews, 12 January 2011 (<http://www.internews.org/research-publications/audience-research-time-cholera-focus-group-survey-haiti-frontline>).
158. MICT Haiti, Formation des Membres du SNGRD en Communication D’Urgence et des Journalistes aux Traitements D’information D’urgence, November 2011.
159. MICT Haiti, Formation sur le Cholera et Accompagnement des Journalistes: Document de Travail, July 2011.
160. MICT, “Formation Sur le Cholera et Accompagnement des Journalistes: Document de Travail”, July 2011.
161. MSPP & CDAC, *Minutes from meeting 8/7/2011*, MSPP Conference Room.
162. MSPP-DPSPE *et al.* Cadre Pour la Promotion de L’Hygiene et de L’Assainissement: Standards Minimaux et Recommendation Technique/Pratiques, April 2011.
163. Nations Unies. “Haiti. Appel global. Revue a mi-parcours”, 2011.
164. Noble, Ben. “avis du groupe de travail communication (CDAC) sur le SRO fait maison”. E-mail to Burnache, Joceline and Schemann, Jean-Francois. 16 January 2011.
165. Noble, Ben. “Plan de diffusion et de communication de l’intention survey”. E-mail to unspecified recipients, 16 August 2011.
166. O’Halloran, Linda. “Collected Reflections. On the first anniversary of the fifth most deadly earthquake in recorded history”, January 2011
167. Parks, Will., Gray-Felder, Denise., Hunt, Jim., Byrne, Ailish., “Who Measures Change? An Introduction to Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Communication for Social Change”, *Communication for Social Change Consortium*, 2005.
168. Pierre-Louis, Jocelyne. “Avis du groupe de travail communication (CDAC) sur le SRO”. E-mail to Noble, Ben, 16 January 2011.

169. Ponpon, Helen. "Re: Update Pour Sitrep et Autres Informations Radio - CARE", E-mail to Ben Noble, 13 December 2010.
170. Quintanilla, Jacobo. Email to 'Ayako Tsujisaka, 2 June 2010.
171. Quintanilla, Jacobo. Email to CDAC Haiti group on Urgent Appeal - Communications Sub-Group, 9 November 2010.
172. Quintanilla, Jacobo. Email to Intercluster Coordinator Rudolf Jocondo, 2 November 2010.
173. Quintanilla, Jacobo. Email to Sophie Gabillet, 7 May 2010.
174. Tsujisaka, Ayako. "Coordinating Communications in Emergencies. A Case A Case Study of the 'Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities' (CDAC) Initiative in Post-Earthquake Haiti 2010", August 2011.
175. Tufte, Thomas and Paolo Mefalopulos. "Participatory Communication. A Practical Guide", June 2009.
176. UN, "Global Symposium+5 Information for Humanitarian Action: Final Report", October 2007.
177. UNICEF. Brief update on UNICEF's work on social mobilization, 12 October 2010.
178. UNOCHA Haiti, Debriefing of Amanda Pitt, no date provided.
179. UNOCHA Haiti, Debriefing of Kirsten Knutson, no date provided.
180. UNOCHA Haiti, Humanitarian Bulletin, April 2011.
181. UNOCHA Haiti, Strategie communication Cholera: Presence de partenaires et secteur d'activites, February 2011.
182. UNOCHA, "Advocacy Officer", Job Description, undated.
183. UNOCHA, "Disaster Relief 2.0: The Future of Information Sharing in Humanitarian Emergencies", March 2011.
184. UNOCHA, "Guidance Sheet for CDAC Service Coordinators", 2010.
185. UNOCHA, "Minutes of ad hoc Inter-cluster Coordination (ICC)", June 2011.
186. UNOCHA, Draft Coordination TOR for Internews in Haiti, 2010.
187. UNOCHA, Haiti - Cholera Situation Report #1, 22 October 2010.
188. UNOCHA, Haiti - Cholera Situation Report #2, 23 October 2010.
189. UNOCHA, Haiti - Cholera Situation Report #3, 24 October 2010.
190. UNOCHA, Haiti - Cholera Situation Report #9, 30 October 2010.
191. UNOCHA, Haiti - Hurricane Tomas Preparations – Cholera Situation Report #13, 3 November 2010.
192. UNOCHA, Situation Report, 11 October 2010.
193. UNOCHA, Situation Report, 11 November 2010.
194. UNOCHA. Réunion de concertation sur la relation entre OCHA Haïti et le projet de coordination du réseau CDAC, 14 January 2011.

195. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #1”, January 2010.
196. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #2”, January 2010.
197. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #3”, January 2010.
198. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #4”, January 2010.
199. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #6”, February 2010.
200. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #7”, February 2010.
201. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #9”, February 2010.
202. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #5”, January 2010.
203. UNOCHA/CDAC Haiti Working Group, “CDAC Haiti Sitrep #8”, February 2010.
204. Wall, Imogen and Chery, Yves G., *Kite Yo Pale (Let Them Speak): Best Practice and Lessons Learned in Communication with Disaster Affected Communities*, September 2011.
205. Wall, Imogen. “The Right to Know: The Challenge of Public Information and Accountability in Aceh and Sri Lanka”, Office of the UN Secretary General’s Special Envoy for Tsunami Recovery, October 2006.
206. Wall, Imogen. “Update from Imogen Wall”, March 2011.
207. Wall, Imogen. “Where’s My House? Improving communication with beneficiaries: an analysis of information flow to tsunami affection populations in Aceh Province”, UNDP, August 2005.
208. WASH Cluster, “Draft Proposition – Restructuration SAG – Phase Relevement Precocé”, April 2011.
209. WASH, Health, CCCM, Communications, Education, Food, Logistics Clusters. “Overview of the Cholera Response Interventions”, 20 September 2011.
210. WHO/PAHO. “Positionnement de l’Organisation Panaméricaine de Santé/ Organisation Mondiale de la Santé en Haiti au sujet de la promotion/utilisation de la solution de solution sucre/sel confectionnée à domicile dans le cadre de la réponse à l’épidémie de choléra en Haiti” General Notice, January 2011.
211. [www.cdac-haiti.org](http://www.cdac-haiti.org)
212. [www.clustercoordination.org](http://www.clustercoordination.org)

# Annex 4

## Methodological Approach

REVIEW CRITERIA	REVIEW QUESTIONS	INFORMATION SOURCE
<b>APPROPRIATENESS/RELEVANCE</b>		
The extent to which CDAC Haiti is in line with needs and priorities. The extent to which CDAC Haiti tailors activities to needs and increasing ownership.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Were the original objectives of CDAC Haiti appropriate?</li> <li>2. How were information and coordination needs of the partner types assessed in relation to two-way communication? How was this information used to inform CDAC Haiti's priorities and activities? To what extent did CDAC Haiti meet presented needs for information and improved two-way communication between aid actors and disaster-affected populations?</li> <li>3. To what extent was CDAC Haiti's work useful for its four partner types?</li> </ol>	<p>Desk review of CDAC Haiti's proposals, assessments</p> <p>Interviews with CDAC Haiti secretariat, Host</p>
<b>ADVOCACY EFFECTIVENESS</b>		
The extent to which CDAC Haiti has improved the two-way flow of information between the humanitarian effort and the affected population (CDAC Haiti's overall goal)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. What advocacy results (processes and activities) have been achieved? What results have not been achieved?</li> <li>5. To what extent has CDAC Haiti's advocacy work evolved over time?</li> <li>6. What are CDAC Haiti's strengths and weaknesses in its advocacy work?</li> <li>7. What factors enabled/impered results?</li> <li>8. As a pilot project, how has CDAC adapted to the circumstances and capitalised on opportunities? To what extent have opportunities been missed?</li> <li>9. To what extent was there a shared understanding amongst members of the CDAC network (four partner types) of the scope and parameters of two-way communication?</li> <li>10. To what extent did the target groups change their approaches to mainstream two-way communication?</li> </ol>	<p>Desk review of CDAC Haiti's proposals, project reports, sit-reps, studies, assessments.</p> <p>Interviews with: four types of partners</p>

REVIEW  
CRITERIA

REVIEW QUESTIONS

INFORMATION  
SOURCE

COORDINATION EFFECTIVENESS

The extent to which CDAC Haiti provided effective coordination on communication with affected and at risk communities among all actors (CDAC Haiti's role as a co-ordination mechanism)

11. What were the objectives of the coordination effort? To what extent were they achieved?
12. What factors enabled/impered the coordination effort?
13. Was there a common understanding of the goals and expected outcomes of the coordination efforts among the four partner types?
14. To what extent was CDAC Haiti successful in assuming leadership? What enabled/impered CDAC Haiti in this process?
15. What tools has CDAC Haiti developed to support its coordination work?
16. Who participated in the coordination efforts and to what extent? Were there key actors missing? If yes, why?
17. What were the capacities and resources that various actors earmarked for coordination efforts?
18. What were the dynamics of the coordination? To what extent was the coordination more than information sharing? To what extent were joint initiatives taken? How was consensus formed? How were disagreements handled/resolved? What was the level of adherence was there to coordinated decisions?
19. What form did coordination efforts take? Were coordination efforts simple and driven by a limited number of organisations, or did it involve complex coordination of multiple actors? To what extent were coordination efforts conceived as 'one off' projects, or more systematic?
20. How was the coordination effort and leadership perceived by the different partner types? To what extent and how was it regarded as useful and adding value? To what extent was it seen being driven by a specific agency, organisation, or donor? Did it compete/overlap with other coordination mechanisms or initiatives?
21. Did the coordination contribute to the overall effectiveness of the humanitarian effort by: reducing duplication, improving and simplifying

Desk review of CDAC Haiti's proposals, project reports, sit-reps, studies, assessments.

Interviews with:  
four types of partners

Observation of coordination meeting  
Cluster leads



**REVIEW CRITERIA**

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

**INFORMATION SOURCE**

- 22. How well was CDAC Haiti integrated into the broader humanitarian infrastructure (clusters, CERF and other joint planning and funding mechanisms)? In particular, how effective was the coordination between CDAC Haiti and the clusters? In terms of engagement with clusters, what has worked well, what has been challenging?
- 23. How could a mechanism such as CDAC Haiti be integrated better in future humanitarian responses?

**MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS**

The extent to which organisation, communication, resources and management contribute to CDAC Haiti fulfilling its role and objectives.

- 24. To what extent has the CDAC Haiti secretariat had the necessary resources to fulfil its functions?
- 25. What have been the strengths and challenges of the governance structure?
- 26. How effective have the communication been among the CDAC Haiti secretariat, the host and the global CDAC Network leadership?
- 27. What are the strengths/challenges of the 'host' model?
- 28. How successful has CDAC Haiti been at mobilising resources?
- 29. How can CDAC Haiti further strengthen its system for management of results?

CDAC Haiti secretariat, global CDAC Network representatives, OCHA, Host

**CONNECTEDNESS**

The extent to which CDAC Haiti's activities taken the broader humanitarian context (see Q22) and longer-term perspectives and issues into account.

- 30. To what extent were longer term perspectives taken into account by the CDAC Haiti initiative? How has the work of CDAC Haiti developed and adapted as the context and the humanitarian needs have changed?
- 31. To what extent have local capacities been supported and developed by the work of CDAC Haiti?
- 32. To what extent has CDAC Haiti's exit plans taken into account the future need for coordination and the future two-way communication needs of disaster-affected populations?

Interviews with: four types of partners, special focus on government/national entities

# Annex 5

## Lessons Learnt from Hosting CDAC Haiti

These lessons have been compiled with input from Internews. They are intended to serve as guidance for future CDAC Haiti-type coordination initiatives at country level.

### A. Relations and Communications between parties

It is essential to develop a Procedures Partnership Agreement (PPA) or a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the host agency at HQ, the host agency in the field and CDAC in the field to clarify and formalise processes, responsibilities and expectations of all parties. This document should include the following:

- Systems for providing governance, oversight, technical support and strategic guidance from the Steering Committee and CDAC Network Coordinator. These systems should be appropriately funded
- A clear communication structure between the CDAC field team, the global CDAC Network, the host agency in the field and host agency at HQ level, including monthly management calls that include all parties
- Systems for accountability, reporting and feedback, including regular written feedback on field-level reports by the CDAC Network staff, regular calls between the host agency, CDAC in country and the CDAC Network Coordinator

In addition to the structures set out in the agreement or memorandum, regular field visits from the CDAC Network staff and the CDAC Network Chair should be implemented to ensure a better understanding of the field-level challenges, and to allow for better strategic support. These visits would also help support learning, showcasing and advocacy. The visits should be appropriately funded.

It is important to foster good relations between the host agency and the donor at the country-level (for CDAC Haiti this was ERRF and PAHO/WHO). The CDAC Network should also ensure donor(s) have a clear understanding of the organisations involved in the CDAC initiative.

### B. Staff recruitment, expat and local hires, contracting (Human Resources)

In the case of CDAC Haiti, the host agency was responsible for the hiring and contracting processes of CDAC Haiti's international staff. It would be useful if members of the CDAC Network could recommend candidates for the field operation, or consider seconding their own staff. It is essential that a good roster of qualified staff available for rapid deployment is developed and maintained.

In Haiti, local staff were recruited by the CDAC Haiti Coordinator but were contracted by the host agency. Local staff worked within the rules and regulations of the host agency, but the formal authority over staff members was delegated to the CDAC Haiti Coordinator.

- ToRs for positions in CDAC Haiti have been drafted and are available.
- For CDAC international and local staff, per diem rates and status were consistent with other host agency staff.

## C. Funding restrictions and funding sources

CDAC Haiti's first ERRF grant had considerable flexibility. However, new and more restrictive regulations were put in place for the subsequent grants. This made it difficult to cover host agency costs at both HQ and country level. Among the challenges was that the ERRF had restrictions regarding international flights. This resulted in significant costs for the host agency. In the future, it would be important to:

- Identify funding sources that are flexible and/or a number of funding sources with different types of restrictions
- Identify funds (including within the CDAC Network itself and/or its members) that allow for a rapid deployment of the CDAC initiative at the onset of a humanitarian crisis
- Lobby OCHA to withdraw restrictions that hamper effectiveness

To prepare a realistic budget, it is advantageous if the host agency has in-country experience. Budget items that need to be considered include:

- Utilities
- Communication
- Vehicles and transportation
- Medical and office supplies
- Lodging and per diem
- International flights
- Security

## D. Management of funds (banking, purchasing, accounting)

It is important to separate financial management arrangements of the host agency projects and CDAC funding. This allows the CDAC Coordinator to manage operations effectively and efficiently and helps to avoid confusion for external parties.

In the case of CDAC Haiti, Internews was able to open a bank account in CDAC Haiti's name even though CDAC Haiti was not a legal entity. This was only possible because of Internews' good relations with its bank. In another country opening an account for an entity that does not exist legally could prove to be difficult or impossible. To avoid this, the CDAC Network should consider registering itself in the country in question.

## E. Management of donor relations and audits

In the case of CDAC Haiti, the host agency managed contractual negotiations with the donor. It submitted donor reports and budget modifications to the donor with input from CDAC Haiti and the Internews country office. With input from CDAC Haiti and the Internews country office (collection of support documentation as receipts, contracts, administrative documents,...XX) while HQ managed the HQ-level audits.

Meanwhile, country-level audits were managed by the host agency Country Director and Finance Manager with support from Internews HQ for aggregated financial reports, receipts for costs incurred at HQ level and any other support documentation required by the auditors and archived at HQ.

Funding from the ERRF was a challenge from an auditing perspective since audits, arranged by OCHA in Haiti, took place after a one-year delay. This involved a financial burden for the host agency since the final balance payment was pending until audit was finalised.

## F. Logistics - office rentals, cars

CDAC Haiti had its own offices, which was useful because it helped to reduce confusion between CDAC Haiti activities and those of the host agency. It also had its own vehicles, which allowed for greater flexibility for the CDAC Haiti team.

Internews and CDAC Haiti used motorcycle drivers as a messenger service and as a link between their offices. Motorcycles were also used to reach meetings at rush hour.

And while there was a conscious effort to separate CDAC Haiti and Internews operations as much as possible, some flexibility was built into the arrangement so that if special needs arose, the two entities could draw on each other's resources.

## G. Security

CDAC team should either set up their own security plan (if they have a separate office, housing, facilities, cars) or adopt the one of the host agency by default.

## H. Insurance

CDAC Haiti staff were covered by the host agency insurance plan.

## Annex 6

# CDAC Haiti: January 2010 - November 2011

This annex documents the development and activities of CDAC Haiti. It aims to contribute to the institutional memory of CDAC Haiti's initiative and is an extended version of Chapter 3 in the main learning review report.

### Phase 1: Pre-Secretariat (January-May 2010)

On 13 January 2010, the day after the earthquake in Haiti, the global CDAC Network held a teleconference during which it was agreed that an operation should be mounted to improve two-way communication in the humanitarian effort in Haiti. Several of the global CDAC Network members – Internews, OCHA, Thomson Reuters Foundation and IMS – arrived in Haiti shortly thereafter and began collaborating.

At the same time a CDAC Network Working Group for Haiti was established at HQ level.<sup>60</sup> This group included most of the Steering Committee members – the BBC World Service Trust (now BBC Media Action), the Irish Red Cross, the British Red Cross, Thomson Reuters Foundation, OCHA, IMS and Internews.

The Working Group held approximately a dozen conference calls in the six weeks following the earthquake, which were chaired by the CDAC Network focal point for OCHA in Geneva with minutes provided by the Irish Red Cross. These calls were used to collate information from Haiti from CDAC Network members and other stakeholders to uncover gaps and develop plans for what would eventually become CDAC Haiti. The minutes of these calls reveal an action-oriented approach and strong commitment and hard work from the individuals involved.

As the Working Group Chair, the focal point for OCHA in Geneva played a key role by daily collating information and networking at HQ level to backstop CDAC Haiti. With information gathered from Haiti, she produced CDAC Haiti sit-reps every few days that were circulated all CDAC Network members, new partners in Haiti and to more than 40 other organisations. The purpose of the sit-reps was to inform, advocate, provide the basis for decision making within agencies and within the group (i.e., to prevent duplication, to identify gaps and needs to help develop responses) and provide a written record of what was being done. By 22 January, the work of the CDAC actors in Haiti was being referenced in OCHA's global sit-reps. The Working Group Chair also led a conference call one month after the earthquake with eight CDAC Haiti partners on the ground – including UNESCO and seven media and communication actors.

Meanwhile, Internews played a central role on the ground in Haiti. It had a substantial field presence pre-disaster and was well-placed to take the lead when the CDAC Network chose it to establish a CDAC presence in Haiti.<sup>61</sup> By the end of January, Internews had split into two Haiti sections: one section

<sup>60</sup> This group was called the "CDAC Haiti Working Group" and later "CDAC Haiti Global".

<sup>61</sup> This was agreed upon by the global CDAC Network meeting at Save the Children UK on 26 February 2010.

focused on its emergency response; the other focused on coordination and preparing for the CDAC Haiti initiative.<sup>62</sup> OCHA supported Internews' funding application to the ERRF, which included resources to set up a dedicated CDAC Haiti coordination team.

## PARTNERS

Representatives of the CDAC Network members on the ground in Haiti (OCHA, Thomson Reuters Foundation, Internews, and IMS) helped recruit organisations to join the initiative. Attendance at CDAC Haiti meetings fluctuated considerably and tended to be 'individual' rather than 'institutional'. Reports from the period show that many of the agencies in the field were too busy to actively engage with CDAC Haiti and did not have time to come to meetings. Nevertheless, there was an average of 12 organisations represented at the meetings from February 2010 until the end of April 2010. OCHA, Internews, MINUSTAH, IOM, USHAHIDI, UNDP, WFP, CARE, Helpage and UNFPA<sup>63</sup> attended five or more of the 10 minuted meetings. A relatively high number of multilateral agencies also attended, although their actual engagement in the meetings varied. The leads for the Shelter Cluster (IFRC) also attended some of the meetings.

Representatives from donor governments (USAID, US Air Force, US Embassy and DfID) also attended some of the meetings. And on 27 April, a GoH representative from the President's Office attended a weekly meeting for the first time. At the end of May, this representative was accompanied by a member of the Civil Protection Department (DPC, part of the Ministry of the Interior) who outlined the GoH's plans and initiatives in relation to emergency messaging for earthquakes and hurricanes.

**Table 1: Participants of CDAC Haiti Meetings January to May 2010**

	ATTENDED 5+ MEETINGS	ATTENDED 2-5 MEETINGS	ATTENDED 1 MEETING
<b>Media-related NGOs</b>	Thomson Reuters Foundation, Internews IMS, USHAHIDI, RSF	Liberation	Haiti Press Network, AMARC, PDG Communications
<b>NGOs</b>	CARE, Helpage	OXFAM, CECOSIDA	Action Aid, HAP, NCA, MSF, RFCG
<b>Red Cross</b>	IFRC (Shelter)		ICRC
<b>Multilateral Agencies</b>	OCHA, MINUSTAH, IOM, UNDP, WFP, UNFPA, UNICEF	WHO / PAHO, UNESCO	
<b>Haitian Government</b>		President's Office	MCC
<b>Donor Government</b>			USAID, US Embassy, DfID

62 Minutes of Meeting of CDAC Haiti Working Group, 25 January 2010.

63 The Communications expert from UNFPA had participating in CDAC Haiti included in his ToR.

## MAIN ACTIVITIES

There were no ToRs to determine the scope of work for CDAC Haiti, which meant that the global CDAC Network members active in Haiti had to define and develop CDAC Haiti's role as work progressed. Evidence from this phase suggests that this led to some initial confusion and helped to cultivate a wide range of expectations. Although the work of CDAC Haiti without a secretariat in place during this period was *ad hoc*, significant groundwork was set for the direction of the future of the CDAC Haiti secretariat and for the group of organisations engaged in the initiative. This included establishing an overview of the communication environment; working with local media; promoting coordinated messaging to affected populations via mass media; information-sharing and coordination of communication activities; and integrating CDAC Haiti in the existing humanitarian system. These activities included:

1. **Assessments:** Assessments of local media and the communications environment, outlining damages and the recovery process for the sector, were made to identify gaps and opportunities. An audience survey was also undertaken to identify the affected population's information needs and preferred channels of communication.
2. **Building the CDAC Haiti group:** Efforts were made to reach out to national and international media and communication organisations not affiliated with the CDAC Network initiative at the global level to offer coordination services and discuss cooperation (e.g. AMARC, Association of Haitian Journalists, RSF, SOS Journalists and the Haitian Press Network). IMS led a sub-working group that coordinated direct technical and operational support to local media affected by the earthquake, including provision of work space and facilities, cash support to affected journalists and specialist technical support with the restoration of infrastructure.
3. **Systems for dissemination:** CDAC Haiti established systems to ensure that cluster-approved content was made available and used as widely as possible by international and local media outlets broadcasting and publishing for Haitian audiences. This involved coordinating the dissemination of life-saving information to affected populations including: food distribution; self-treatment of wounds; basic water purification techniques; on-going vaccination campaigns; advice on supporting traumatised children; services for women and girls affected by sexual violence; and cash for work programmes.
4. **Coordination meetings:** CDAC Haiti organised regular meetings (initiated in early February 2010) with humanitarian communication experts. A significant portion of these meetings was dedicated to information-sharing on communication initiatives. Many of the organisations involved used the meetings to feed ideas for content and key messages to other CDAC Haiti members. For example, the meetings promoted ICRC's reunification services and text messaging to direct survivors to hospitals with capacity, allowing CDAC members to cascade information about the programme throughout their individual organisational networks. The meetings also involved brainstorming on how to improve and develop communication practices with affected communities. Common themes included: public service announcements (a special committee was formed to discuss strategies and pricing for airtime); how to gather information on sexual violence; the limitations of standardised messaging regarding the shelter strategy and alternative ways of communicating about it; the importance of church actors for communication; how to distribute donated hand-held radios;<sup>64</sup> the use of SMS; and information gaps about affected populations and how research could assist to fill these gaps.
5. **Cluster system engagement:** CDAC Network representatives on the ground in Haiti worked to integrate CDAC Haiti into the cluster system by attending cluster meetings, advocating for two-way communication and explaining CDAC Haiti's aims. They established partnerships with the Protection, Health, Food, WASH and Early Recovery clusters and the GBV sub-cluster.

64 The CDAC Haiti secretariat coordinated the distribution of 9,000 wind-up radios through local radio stations donated by the US Government.

One activity that was developed during this phase that would become an important tool of the CDAC Haiti group in the future was Internews' *Enfomayson Nou Dwe Konnen (News you Can Use)* – a daily 15-minute humanitarian radio programme in Creole produced by a local team of reporters. The programme helped survivors know where and how to access aid and how to help themselves. It was (and still is) currently carried on more than 30 stations, including MINUSTAH FM, running up to six times a day on some stations. The first broadcast took place on 21 January 2010, and addressed curfews, access to water, waste management, education services and disposal of human remains.

## Phase 2: Newly Established Secretariat (May-September 2010)

In late May 2010, the CDAC Haiti secretariat was established and staffed with a Coordinator, an Information Officer, a Media Liaison Officer and an accountant. Almost immediately a retreat was held and attended by the CDAC Haiti secretariat staff, four UN entities, seven media development NGOs, two government representatives and three international NGOs. The CDAC Haiti secretariat based its operations in the same building as Reporters sans Frontières.

### PARTNERS

This second phase of CDAC Haiti's development saw an increase in the number of attendants at the weekly meetings to approximately 25 to 30 participants – the greatest number and variation of actors during CDAC Haiti's existence. OCHA, Internews, IOM, UNDP, IMS, Helpage, Oxfam and CECOSIDA attended most of the minuted meetings, with at least five humanitarian NGOs, five media and communications organisations, and five UN agencies usually attending. Among those that attended at least once were 10 multilateral agencies, approximately 15 different local media or media development organisations and approximately 15 international humanitarian NGOs. The American Embassy or USAID was represented at most meetings, and the Ministry of Culture and Communications and the Department of Civil Protection (DPC) from the GoH and representatives from a sector cluster lead would also occasionally attend.

**Table 2: Participants\* of CDAC Haiti Meetings May to September 2010**

<b>Media-related NGOs</b>	Internews, IMS, USHAHIDI, RSF, RFI, Film Aid, Radio Boukman, Ticket, Radio CPAM, SAKS, AJH, Radio Utile, PQMD, Radio Shalom, RMEGA, ASHAPS, Knight Fellowship
<b>NGOs</b>	CARE, Helpage, MSF, IMC, OXFAM, CECOSIDA, IRC, GAPS, Save the Children, CRS, GFF, ACF, Thinking Development, JHAFF, HTD
<b>Red Cross</b>	IFRC, ICRC, Canadian Red Cross
<b>Multilateral Agencies</b>	OCHA, MINUSTAH, IOM, UNDP, WFP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNESCO, GBV Sub-Cluster, Shelter Cluster, UNOPS, UNAIDS
<b>Haitian Government</b>	President's Office, MCC, DPC
<b>Donor Government</b>	DfID, US embassy, USAID

\* The actual number of participants is likely to be greater than the list above. The minutes of some meetings are missing and some minutes do not include participant lists.



Although CDAC Haiti meetings were now attracting an array of actors, participation from some members of the global CDAC Network was irregular. For example, the Chair of the CDAC Network in HQ, the relevant IFRC societies and Save the Children did not regularly attend CDAC Haiti meetings. Reasons for this varied: the IFRC had conflicting internal meetings at the same time that CDAC Haiti meetings were held; and Save the Children did not have a dedicated communications staff member. Furthermore, its offices were led by SC-USA who were unaware of CDAC Haiti's existence until June 2010.

### MAIN ACTIVITIES

During this phase, the CDAC Haiti secretariat played a proactive role that helped the initiative to grow and gain visibility. CDAC Haiti:

1. Consolidated its coordination function
2. Engaged and built capacity within local media
3. Supported and coordinated communication campaigns and initiatives undertaken by members of the CDAC Haiti group

First, CDAC Haiti began to consolidate itself as a platform for coordination for communication-related work. The CDAC Haiti secretariat produced a Haitian Media Directory<sup>65</sup> and a Media/Communications Services Directory for its members. The CDAC Haiti secretariat also began regularly participating in different cluster and inter-cluster coordination meetings. Furthermore, it began to apply its coordination function in relation to the government and the actors in the provinces. In consultation with DPC, several CDAC Haiti partners (Internews, IMS, WFP, OCHA, MINUSTAH, coordinated by CDAC Haiti) conducted joint fact-finding missions to Gonaives, Jacmel and Les Cayes to identify needs in relation to the hurricane season and map existing local communication networks. The aim was to ensure that communities received useful information and could have their voices heard by identifying communication system gaps and providing solutions.

Second, CDAC Haiti involved itself in several activities and launched and coordinated a number of initiatives. For example, two multi-stakeholder (GoH actors, local media, the UN and NGOs) campaigns were held that promoted communication with affected populations. The first, led by the GoH and MINUSTAH and supported by FilmAid, consisted of bringing the World Cup to communities by providing big screens and using the opportunity to air six different public service announcements on national television.

The other initiative, led by the CDAC Haiti secretariat, was a performance Caravan (*Koute Ayiti* - Listening to Haiti) that toured the affected parts of the country over a 2-month period to promote dialogue and awareness on key issues (e.g. disaster preparedness, legal documentation, health, GVB, HIV etc.) through street drama, films and music. It also engaged GoH officials, humanitarian organisations and local media in public debate. Actors involved included the Ministry of Culture and Communication (MCC), the Department of Civil Protection (DPC), the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Women's Affairs, the police, and more than 15 humanitarian NGOs and UN agencies. The Caravan was seen as a flagship initiative that could also raise the profile of CDAC Haiti and attract more active engagement from different stakeholders.

Third, the CDAC Haiti secretariat engaged with local media:

---

65 (<http://cdac-haiti.org/content/annuaire-des-medias>)

In July 2010, the CDAC Haiti secretariat and Internews set up a temporary press centre to facilitate the coverage of the 6-month commemoration of the earthquake with support from some partner agencies. Three press briefings featuring the Humanitarian Coordinator and representative from two clusters were organised. An average of 30-40 journalists representing Haitian and international media participated.

- Also in July 2010, the GoH, in partnership with IOM, IFRC, MINUSTAH and the CDAC Haiti secretariat, organised a live TV and radio talk show to discuss the many and complex impacts of the January earthquake.
- With support from its members, the CDAC Haiti secretariat organised ‘Meet the Press’ events in Port-au-Prince, Jacmel, Léogane and Petit-Goâve, in an effort to bridge the gap between humanitarian organisations and local media.
- With funds from OCHA, the CDAC Haiti secretariat and Internews launched a US\$ 90,000 media assistance programme aimed at supporting the recovery of Haitian media outlets, media associations and journalists. The programme consisted of cash grants, equipment procurement and technical support, with IMS as a collaborating partner.

At the end of September 2010, CDAC Haiti’s funding expired and no new grants had been secured. Agencies involved in CDAC Haiti worked together to support CDAC Haiti at a meeting with OCHA (CDAC Haiti’s main donor) and by writing more than 20 testimonials in support. A new grant was exceptionally approved by the ERRF, providing funds for an additional four months of CDAC Haiti activities until the end of January 2011.

### Phase 3: Hurricane Season, Cholera Crisis and Government Partnership (October 2010 to January 2011)

For CDAC Haiti, the period from October 2010 to January 2011 presented the greatest challenge and also the best opportunities to showcase what CDAC Haiti was capable of.

First, the remainder of the 2010 hurricane season posed a particularly serious threat given that nearly a million Haitians were living in camp conditions that offered insufficient protection against the elements. Second, cholera, which had been unknown in Haiti for more than a century, spread rapidly after the sanitation facilities of a MINUSTAH contingent contaminated a river to create the worst outbreak in recent memory. By November 2011, there had been nearly 475,000 cases of cholera and more than 6,600 people had died.<sup>66</sup>

CDAC Haiti’s relations with GoH actors evolved during this phase. Until this point, CDAC Haiti had had some interaction with the President’s Office (his media advisor had attended several CDAC Haiti meetings), the MCC and the DPC. The DPC, however, had an unclear understanding of what CDAC Haiti actually was, what mandate it had, and what role it was trying to play. It also felt that CDAC Haiti was not working in concert with GoH processes and procedures. When tensions increased, OCHA stepped in to mediate. After this, a fruitful relationship began to grow between the CDAC Haiti secretariat and the DPC.

CDAC Haiti’s interaction with other GoH entities also increased. In December 2010, the CDAC Haiti secretariat employed a Government Liaison Officer to help it and the CDAC Haiti group to engage with GoH actors. By participating in the nationally-led responses to the cholera epidemic and the hurricane

<sup>66</sup> Sean Casey, “Cholera in Haiti: still an Emergency” posted on The Guardian Poverty Matters Blog on 7 November 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/nov/07/haiti-cholera-still-emergency-donors>

season, the CDAC Haiti secretariat strengthened its relations with the Ministry of Health (and its relevant departments), the national crisis response mechanism (COUN), and the National Directorate for Water Supply and Sanitation (DINEPA).

According to informants, one strength of this phase was represented by the CDAC Haiti secretariat's ability to build consensus among CDAC Haiti's different partners (humanitarian agencies, international NGOs, clusters, GoH and media development organisations) to ensure coordinated approaches.

## PARTNERS

There are only a few meeting minutes from CDAC Haiti coordination meetings from this period and the ones that exist do not list the participants. Reports do mention that Caritas, Oxfam, IMC, ACF, UNOPS, HelpAge, CECOSIDA, Handicap International, Internews, Medecins du Monde, UNESCO, IFRC, HRC, CARE, MINUSTAH, CONCERN, World Vision, IOM, WHO, UNOPS and UNICEF (WASH) were actively involved in CDAC Haiti.

During this phase, the CDAC Haiti secretariat interacted with an increasingly large group of GoH actors. Key partners were DPC, COUN, CTESP, MSPP, DINEPA, MCC, Direction de Promotion de la Santé et de la Protection de l'Environnement (DPSPE), WHO, the Health Cluster, WASH Cluster and Hygiene Promotion Working Group.

## MAIN ACTIVITIES

**Hurricane season:** The main hurricane to affect Haiti in 2010 was Hurricane Tomas, in early November. CDAC Haiti maintained a 24-hour presence at the Centre Operationnel d'Urgence National (COUN), where several press conferences and meetings were organised by the DPC and the President's Office. The CDAC Haiti secretariat represented the communication dimension of the humanitarian community at the Pool de Communication of the COUN and advocated for better media access to humanitarian information. It also promoted the Haitian national communication strategy among the humanitarian organisations.

During the hurricane alert, the CDAC Haiti secretariat also deployed staff to lower Artibonite, Gonaives, Léogane, and Las Cayes to raise awareness about Hurricane Tomas among the internally displaced persons who had been evacuated to temporary shelters. This effort was supported by Internews who sent a 'surge capacity' into the field. The initiative consisted of coordinating communication efforts among local authorities, local media, DPC, UN agencies and NGOs, and distributed 300 megaphones donated by the NGO JP/Haitian Relief Organisation to the DPC (150 in Port au Prince, 50 in Gonaives and 80 in Les Cayes).

**Cholera:** The cholera outbreak overwhelmed the GoH and the humanitarian community still reeling from the effects of the earthquake. While the GoH was quick to react, it had limited capacity to coordinate the international humanitarian response. Stakeholders tell of a chaotic situation: humanitarian organisations were in disarray, acting independently to address the cholera outbreak without interaction amongst themselves or with the GoH resulting in gaps, duplications and contradictory messaging.

Interviewees widely acknowledged that there was no actor in the UN system (WHO, PAHO or UNICEF) willing or able to coordinate communication efforts to address the cholera outbreak. The Humanitarian Coordinator therefore asked the CDAC Haiti secretariat to lead. As the lead of what became the cholera communication sub-group of the humanitarian system in Haiti, the CDAC Haiti secretariat tried to

represent the common interests of the humanitarian response community in the area of communication with affected communities. This involved participating in five different coordinating bodies and relaying information between them:

1. The Inter-cluster weekly meeting at OCHA
2. The Inter-cluster bi-weekly meeting led by the Ministry of Health with key representatives of the COUN; WHO and the Health, WASH, CCCM and Logistics clusters
3. The weekly cholera communication working group lead by the CDAC Haiti secretariat with main cluster leads/leads of agencies involved in the communication response (e.g. WHO, IOM, WASH, MINUSTAH)
4. The WASH hygiene promotion communication sub-group weekly meeting with special focus on hygiene promotion activities
5. The CDAC Haiti weekly meeting with communication experts

The meetings with the GoH actors involved working to develop standardised messages that could be approved by the Ministry of Health. The CDAC Haiti secretariat promoted GoH-approved communication products (19 during this period – including posters, radio spots and video messages<sup>67</sup>) to complement the cholera communication messages of the humanitarian community. And when humanitarian actors wanted to produce their own products, the CDAC Haiti secretariat facilitated their interaction with the authorities for approval.

CDAC Haiti meetings were used to identify gaps, discuss the communication initiatives of the different members and share the information needs of the affected populations that had been gathered by field staff. The group discussed what questions affected communities were asking about cholera; what types of messages would be needed; how to best formulate them; and what channels to use. It also considered how certain messages were best depicted in drawings. In this phase the community mobilisers (in particular those from IOM, UNOPS<sup>68</sup> and CARE) played a critical role and were used in an effective way to benefit the overall humanitarian communication effort.

Another important initiative undertaken during the initial period of the cholera outbreak was the Cholera Baseline Survey, a collaborative effort that proved to be a key tool for the cholera response. The survey was (jointly) designed to gather data on what people were retaining from broadcasts and other communication initiatives on cholera, and IOM, UNOPS, IFRC, the Haitian Red Cross, and Concern used their community mobilisers to conduct the survey. Internews then compiled and analysed the data.<sup>69</sup>

With mapping technology supplied by OCHA, CDAC Haiti worked in partnership with the Pool de Communication of the COUN to contribute data for maps that depicted:

1. The 3Ws (who was doing what communication activities where) of CDAC Haiti's partners' communication activities and campaigns
2. International and national deployment capacities regarding communication/hygiene promotion activities

<sup>67</sup> CDAC Haiti Website.

<sup>68</sup> The team of UNOPS community mobilisers were hired under a technical project (related to buildings affected by the earthquake) that ran out of funds during mid-2010. CDAC Haiti and OCHA successfully advocated for an additional grant to keep the community mobilisers to support the humanitarian communication effort.

<sup>69</sup> See *Audience Research In A Time Of Cholera: Focus Group & Survey On Haiti's Frontline*. Jennifer Mandel, Internews, 12 January 2011 (<http://www.internews.org/research-publications/audience-research-time-cholera-focus-group-survey-haiti-frontline>) and *For Haitians, Radio is Key Information Source on Cholera*. Internews, 9 June 2011 (<http://www.internews.org/our-stories/program-news/haitians-radio-key-information-source-cholera>).

3. Hygiene promotion activities lead by the WASH communication sub-cluster. With the MCC and the support of an Oxfam staff member who was seconded to the CDAC Haiti secretariat, the national coverage of radio shows and spots about cholera was mapped with a view to undertaking training in areas with gaps. Not all maps were completed, nor was the anticipated journalist training initiative devised, due to the shortage of funds.

At the request of the Humanitarian Coordinator and the Inter-Cluster Coordination, CDAC Haiti, as the *de facto* Communications Sub-Group for the cholera appeal, was tasked with putting together a consolidated appeal with communication projects to tackle cholera. CDAC Haiti submitted a matrix to OCHA for the Flash Appeal with cholera communication projects from 13 humanitarian partners for a total amount of \$US 1.3 million for the period of one month. It was later decided that all of the projects for the cholera response would be included in the Consolidated Appeal Process for 2011.

### Phase 4: 'Coma' (February to April 2011)

CDAC Haiti activities came to a halt on 31 January 2011. Although operations would eventually be restarted, stakeholders said the loss of the momentum was never fully regained.

Without any funding to continue, all of CDAC Haiti's staff members were let go, although the CDAC Haiti Coordinator was granted an extra 10 days to try to secure financial support. Within a fortnight, two donors showed interest in providing funding. Meanwhile, members of the global CDAC Network who felt limited ownership of CDAC Haiti, were unsure of whether the continuation of CDAC Haiti was in line with the Network's overall priorities. The global CDAC Network was in the process of consolidating itself, developing its strategic direction and had other commitments, including the recruitment of a Global Project Manager.

With no funds left to pay his salary, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator was asked by Internews to take leave without pay until the global CDAC Network had come to decision on how to progress. The Coordinator, who felt deeply committed to CDAC Haiti, continued working on a voluntary basis until the end of April 2011. He continued to gather and update information, search for funding, send out email updates and provide limited services on demand to participating agencies. He also began developing future activities related to capacity development and future handover to the government.

In March 2011, the global CDAC Network held its first strategy meeting in London with the newly recruited CDAC Global Coordinator, the Network's first. The CDAC Haiti Coordinator was also asked to attend. The CDAC Network agreed that the CDAC Haiti Coordinator should restart the operation to provide coordination support to the on-going cholera epidemic; disaster risk reduction planning in relation to the 2011 hurricane season; and devise, execute and learn from a transition and exit strategy.<sup>70</sup> At that time, continuation of CDAC Haiti activities was envisaged as a maximum of six to nine months (the end of 2011 at the latest).

Several humanitarian actors and government counterparts said they experienced a sense of loss during the CDAC Haiti closure period.

<sup>70</sup> Meeting Report, CDAC Network Strategy Meeting, 23-24 March 2011.

## Phase 5: Capacity Building and Exit (April to November 2011)

By the spring of 2011, Haiti was considered by the UN system and the GoH to be one year behind in its recovery from the earthquake. Political instability, the cholera outbreak, land property issues and an Interim Reconstruction Commission that could not deliver fast enough meant that as many as 650,000 Haitian were still living in temporary camps. Furthermore, informal 'illegal' camps had sprung up around the PaP metropolitan area as some IDPs left the formal camps when international NGOs withdrew fearing evictions and general insecurity.

For CDAC Haiti, the beginning of this phase involved the time-consuming task of restarting the CDAC Haiti secretariat. New office space had to be found, staff had to be (re)hired and funding had to again be secured. CDAC Haiti re-launched some of its activities to support the cholera and disaster risk reduction efforts and to build capacity among GoH partners so that key functions of the CDAC Haiti secretariat could eventually be transitioned to them. A key component of work involved connecting GoH, media and NGO actors and promoting collaboration among them in the different GoH-led communication coordination bodies, including CTESP, the Pool de Communication and the newly-formed TWiG on Cholera Communication in Food Markets.

Initial plans were based on the expectation of larger grants from both the ERRF and ECHO, but when only ERRF funding proved to be available, these plans had to be scaled back.

Most informants in Haiti thought that CDAC Haiti was finishing its work prematurely, and that there was still important work to be done; with the coming months of return and relocation, effective communication with affected communities was considered critical.

### Partners

During this final phase, the CDAC Haiti secretariat did not reinstate its weekly coordination meetings with communication experts due to reduced staffing capacity and its focus on capacity building, handover and exit. Interaction with partners was instead undertaken bilaterally, in other fora or by email. On the GoH side, the DPC and the MSPP were central partners along with the UNDP Technical Assistant assigned to the DPC. GoH structures including CTESP and the Pool de Communication were key fora. The Emergency Preparedness and Response Working Group established by OCHA (including several NGOs, UN agencies and donors) was also an important forum in which the CDAC Haiti secretariat engaged.

### Main activities

#### GENERAL COORDINATION

The CDAC Haiti secretariat's coordination efforts during this period consisted of gathering, analysing and disseminating information. Without weekly coordination meetings as a source of information, the staff liaised with partners individually, gathered information from stakeholders and participated in different coordinating bodies (the clusters, ICC, the Humanitarian Forum, CTESP, the Humanitarian Country Team). This information was digested and shared in emails. The staff also continued to provide coordination tools, and to update its 3Ws and list of media actors, although not as frequently as before.

During the flash floods in June 2011 and Hurricanes Emily and Irene, the CDAC Haiti secretariat maintained a 24-hour presence at the Pool de Communication and diffused GoH messages to the humanitarian community so that they could be used by community mobilisers, radio stations and posted in prominent places across the country.

The CDAC Haiti secretariat also led on the distribution of the official list of Cholera Treatment Centres (CTCs) prepared by WHO and the MSPP to communication actors and radio stations. Since approximately 70% of the people surveyed did not know where the closest CTC was, and CTCs were continuously opening and closing, there was a clear need to ensure the lists were frequently updated and widely circulated.

A few *ad hoc* meetings were held with partners to present the InfoAsAid-sponsored research on best practice and lessons learnt in disaster affected communications,<sup>71</sup> the IFRC evaluation on communication with beneficiaries<sup>72</sup> and CDAC Haiti's exit strategy.

### INTENTIONS SURVEY

The Intentions Survey was a collaborative effort among the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) cluster, the Shelter Cluster, UNOPS, IOM, ACTED and Internews, with the CDAC Haiti secretariat coordinating, providing analytical inputs and helping to organise the process.

The idea for the survey was first raised by OCHA in mid-2010. The survey questions were prepared by staff from Internews' research team, UNOPS, the Shelter Cluster Lead (IFRC) and CCCM Shelter Cluster Lead, while IOM undertook the data collection by calling the cell phones (IOM possesses registration database that tracks camp populations) of 15,000 people living in camps. ACTED undertook the main analysis.<sup>73</sup> The CDAC Haiti secretariat then established a peer review panel to scrutinise and further improve the analysis. The CDAC Haiti secretariat also actively diffused the results of the survey by presenting them to five or six clusters, key donors and presidential advisors, and promoting its coverage in the media. CDAC Haiti group members also appeared on nation-wide interactive radios shows to respond calls from affected people to discuss the findings of the research.

### TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP ON FOOD MARKETS

The CDAC Haiti secretariat organised a technical working group (TWiG) with WHO, WASH (UNICEF), MSPP, DINEPA, Save the Children, IOM, UNOPS, Concern and CARE to mitigate cholera by addressing food markets. The aim was to:

1. Use an inter-sectoral approach to analyse physical market infrastructure (water, sanitation, vending stalls)
2. Study risk behaviour and practices (of both vendors and shoppers)
3. Address infrastructural weaknesses
4. Devise appropriate messages to change behaviour and practices connected to both the (evolving) physical infrastructure and services provided

The TWiG also served as a template for future communication coordination initiatives since it brought together the two main GoH bodies responsible for cholera messaging (DPSPE-MSPP and DINEPA) with the hygiene promotion and communication actors within the international humanitarian community. The latter would ensure two-way communication by field testing messages and providing feedback from the market populations.

71 Imogen Wall with Yves Gérard Chéry- "Kite Yo Pale (let them speak) - Best Practice and Lessons Learned in Communication with Disaster Affected Communities", 2011.

72 Catherine Chazaly. "Beneficiary Communications Evaluation, Haiti Earthquake Operation 2011", July 2011.

73 It was envisaged that the CDAC Haiti secretariat would undertake the bulk of the analysis but the data became available during the secretariat's 'coma' phase.

## BUILDING CAPACITY

Since one of the main elements of this phase concerned handover and exit, the CDAC Haiti secretariat devoted more resources to working with the government to build capacity than to any other activity. This work proved to be extremely time-consuming. In addition to a Government Liaison Officer who was rehired in June 2011 to work fulltime with the government, the CDAC Haiti Coordinator also dedicated a large portion of his time to this effort.

Much of the support provided by CDAC Haiti was process-oriented and provided in the form of on-going technical assistance, with the Government Liaison Officer working in the offices of the DPC alongside staff involved in the CTESP and the Pool de Communication. Issues addressed included:

1. Developing approval processes for messages with clear criteria and making these known to NGOs
2. Developing different templates for communicating with the humanitarian community, departmental focal points and the media, depending on the emergency phase
3. Promoting the decentralisation of communication coordination to the regional and municipal levels by working with the DPC communication officers
4. Putting in place mechanisms for feedback from the population, community mobilisers and local journalists
5. Phasing and prioritisation of messages during emergency press conferences and linking prevention messages with examples of effects
6. Developing systems to quickly adapt messaging in response to public feedback that were channelled through the free GoH call centre during the emergency

Other CDAC Haiti capacity building activities included:

1. Facilitating workshops to redefine the role and functions for the Pool de Communication to maximise the different skills and networks of its partners. The objectives included ensuring systems to address and integrate the information needs and concerns of affected populations, the local media and the humanitarian community
2. Developing an inventory of organisations that had been trained by international partners in cholera-related communication to provide an overview of what human resources exist in Haiti that could potentially be drawn upon in emergencies<sup>74</sup>
3. Preparing a project proposal for training journalists from around the country in emergency communication so that they could form a network that could be mobilised to support future emergency efforts<sup>75</sup>
4. Supporting a GoH initiative in northern Haiti for the 2011 International Day of Disaster Risk Reduction that involved a week of activities (including a Run-for-Your-Life tsunami race) to sensitise the public, NGOs and journalists about DRR and to promote a joint and inclusive local platform of collaboration in the prevention and response effort
5. Using the emergency responses to Hurricanes Irene and Emily as opportunities for process-oriented capacity building activities

<sup>74</sup> By November 2011, the inventory was already being used for cholera sensitisation by the new health/hygiene communication effort led by MSPP/DINEPA.

<sup>75</sup> By November 2011, the project was initiated under the coordination of the CTESP. It is expected to train 30 journalists in each department on the latest messages on DRR (hurricane, earthquake, tsunami and cholera) and will ensure that they are integrated into the SNGRD so that they can play a role in the system of re-adaptation of messages during emergencies.