

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS
HAITI
RAPID RESPONSE
ECONOMIC - DISPLACEMENT/MIGRATION 2015**

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

Mourad Wahba

REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

- a. Please indicate when the After Action Review (AAR) was conducted and who participated.

The AAR was conducted from January to April 2016 when the Humanitarian community was discussing, drafting and launching the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) for Haiti. That exercise has gathered UN agencies, donors, international and national NGOs, the Red Cross Movement, and the Government's institutions.

- b. Please confirm that the Resident Coordinator and/or Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) Report was discussed in the Humanitarian and/or UN Country Team and by cluster/sector coordinators as outlined in the guidelines.

YES NO

- c. Was the final version of the RC/HC Report shared for review with in-country stakeholders as recommended in the guidelines (i.e. the CERF recipient agencies and their implementing partners, cluster/sector coordinators and members and relevant government counterparts)?

YES NO

The report was shared through Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) which includes UN agencies, donors, international and national NGOs, and the Red Cross Movements

I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

For many decades, Haitians have migrated to the Dominican Republic (DR) in search of work. The proximity, lax border controls, and the high demand for unskilled workers have lured many Haitians into the DR. This has prompted the DR to proceed with collective deportations on various occasions in the past, i.e. 1998, 2002 and 2011, when more than 30,000 people were deported in a six-week period.

It is estimated that some 460,000 Haitian migrants without a regular migratory status currently reside in the DR. In addition, a decision taken by the DR Constitutional Court in 2013 deprived of their Dominican nationality hundreds of thousands of people born in Dominican Republic to Haitian migrant parents or Dominican born persons of Haitian descent, rendering them “stateless”. The Dominican Government has established two regimes of regularization, the *Plan Nacional de Regularización de Extranjeros* (PNRE) in November 2013 for irregular migrants to regularize their situation and on May 2014, the Dominican Congress adopted law 169/14 that established a specific regime enabling every person born in the country between 1929 and 2007 of foreign parents in irregular immigration status to register and regularize their nationality situation. The latter distinguished two specific categories, “Group A” (an estimated 60,000 people who have formal civil registration), and “Group B” (some 75,000 people, also born on Dominican soil, but who had never been registered in the Dominican civil registry). These figures do not comprise the descendants of those affected by the ruling, which encompass several generations of individuals born in Dominican Republic since 1929.

IOM’s border monitoring financed by the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) and OCHA and conducted in collaboration with national civil society organizations has revealed on 22 September 2016 that a total 141,506 individuals (34.4% were female while 65.6% were male) - interviewed on a voluntary basis - have reported to have crossed the border into Haitian territory since June 2015. Of the total returnees, a total of 2,244 presumed unaccompanied minors were identified and 5,174 households declared having been registered in the PNRE (the National Plan for the Regularization of Foreigners in the Dominican Republic) corresponding to 10,241 individuals. Meanwhile, UNHCR has records from IOM pertaining to 6,299 families with one or more persons born in the Dominican Republic. UNHCR has interviewed and screened 1,428 families, of which 1,082 are of concern to UNHCR. The humanitarian and protection situation of those deported or voluntarily repatriated remain critical.

International human rights standards guarantee the right to judicial remedies for deportees. For the people born in DR, it is critical to have access to re-admission procedures to the Dominican Republic allowing them access to procedures that can allow them to claim access to Dominican citizenship, similar to those under Law 169-14. If they are deported by the Dominican authorities, their swift readmission into DR should be sought immediately.

Likely, expectations of an increase in deportations from the Dominican Republic (DR) in the course of 2016 were fortunately not borne out. Indeed, while DR authorities had issued a deadline of 18 July 2016 for people of Haitian origin who had received a residence permit of one year as part of the National Program of Regularization of Foreigners (PNRE) to regularize their status, the deadline was postponed for a year.

The DR electoral context has also presumably drawn less attention to migration issues. Despite what could have generated a lull in deportations, the situation of Haitian migrants and Dominicans of Haitian descent living in the DR remains precarious and several issues still need to be addressed. Returns and deportations both official and unofficial continue in border areas. Protection concerns remain in areas where structural problems, daily unregulated cross-border movements of people and goods co-exist with and are intrinsically linked with the fall-out from new Dominican citizenship laws.

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response: 22,800,000		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	1,986,864
	COUNTRY-BASED POOL FUND (<i>ERRF</i>)	
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	
	TOTAL	1,986,864

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 18-Nov-15			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
UNICEF	15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	718,880
UNHCR	15-RR-HCR-063	Protection	267,984
IOM	15-RR-IOM-044	Protection	1,000,000
TOTAL			1,986,864

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN agencies/IOM implementation	1,185,383.61
Funds forwarded to NGOs and Red Cross / Red Crescent for implementation	629,467
Funds forwarded to government partners	171,983.89
TOTAL	1,986,864

HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

The humanitarian context in Haiti remains complex and fragile due to multiple and inter-linked risk factors: the displacement of populations from the 2010 earthquake (61,302 people remaining in IDP camps as of June 2016); voluntary or forced return of Haitians from the Dominican Republic (141,506 people registered between June 2015 and 22 September 2016); food insecurity and malnutrition (1.5 million people affected by severe food insecurity); and persistence of cholera (28,145 cases and 259 deaths from 1 January to 10 September 2016). The situation is compounded by an extremely fragile political and economic situation and a significant vulnerability to natural disasters. The continued devaluation of the gourde aggravates further the living conditions of the most vulnerable. The resilience of the population is also extremely low.

It is against this background of socio-economic vulnerability that the deportations and returns from the DR occur.

The migration flow between Haiti and the Dominican Republic (DR) in the island of Hispaniola is highly active and challenging as it was estimated in 2012 that over half a million foreign born persons are living as irregular migrants in the DR, the vast majority of the (458,233 persons) are from the neighbouring Republic of Haiti. Consequently, migration management between Haiti and the Dominican Republic and the protection of vulnerable migrants remains a major challenge in Haiti. Adding to this protracted challenge is the Dominican Republic's Presidential Decree 327-13 concerning the National Plan to Regularize Foreigners in Conditions of Irregular Migration which granted the Dominican law enforcement authority to forcibly expel Individuals of Haitian descent, that are unable to produce the newly imposed identification and documentation reflecting their status in the country. Consequently since June 16th 2015, Haiti has faced a significant protection crisis with the return of thousands of migrants from the DR. IOM together with its international partners (UNHCR, OHCHR and UNICEF) and National Civil Society Organizations have focused on supporting the Government of Haiti (GoH) in reinforcing monitoring and data collection of border movement through the establishment of a (DTM) and the Border Monitoring Network.

In collaboration with the border monitoring network, IOM's main activity aims to track and monitor cross-border movements from Dominican Republic to the Haitian side of the border, occurring at the four official border points (Anse-à-Pitre/Pedernales, Malpasse/Jimani, Belladère/Elías Piña, and Ouanaminthe/Dajabón) and the 96 informal crossing points along the border.

In partnership with the Government of Haiti through the National Migration Office (Office National des Migrations/ONM), the Direction de l'Immigration et de l'Emigration (DIE), the Service Jesuite pour la Migration (SJM); Border Network Jeannot Succès (RFJS in French) and several of their local civil society partners IOM is ensuring border monitoring activities. Through collaborative partnerships with border monitoring networks, IOM ensures the collection of reliable statistical data and independent information about Haitians and persons of Haitian descent voluntarily returning to Haiti or being forcibly moved to Haiti from the Dominican Republic, while simultaneously establishing the necessary mechanism to pair highly vulnerable migrants with the respective government authority such as the Institute for Social Well Being and Research (IBESR in French), or humanitarian partners (such as UNICEF, UNHCR and OHCHR). Furthermore, IOM provides regular updates to the GoH, Civil Society Organizations and the humanitarian community through the weekly dissemination of narrative reports, maps and tabular data to ensure that all information gathered is shared in a timely manner, in order to effectively ease collaboration between all respective partners.

While the DR has committed to not deporting children and persons born on its soil, official and unofficial convoys regularly include children. The cross-border movement of children goes across several categories: children who are schooled in the neighbouring area or commute daily in search of economic opportunities; children who had migrated to urban areas in the DR in search of opportunities or to join relatives; and children born in the DR of Haitian parents whether documented or not. While not all these categories fit in the overall deportation framework, deportation processes and migratory patterns are often mixed in nature. Indeed, children are often deported by official authorities (CESFRONT and Immigration), even though this is not done as part of an official deportation process (i.e. inclusion in manifests, finger-printing in retention centers, etc.).

In this context, any adequate answer to the needs of children affected by the deportation process needs to rest on an overall strong child protection system with reinforced monitoring mechanisms and assistance capacities. Referral mechanisms of minors between IOM, UNHCR and IBESR need to be reinforced. The implementation of best interest determination (BID) processes for each child needs to be assured and children protected from exploitation and exposure to the risks engendered by family separation. Indeed, the period of time between identification and orientation to child protection actors is critical in ensuring children identified, mostly teenagers, do not expose themselves to further risks (returning to the DR) or engage in other risky behaviours.

Coupled with the fact that the majority of persons deported, children included, do not carry official civil documentation, there is a higher risk of children falling through the cracks either while in search of other opportunities within Haiti or going back to the DR. Transitory care assistance also provides a space within which other vulnerabilities can be identified, such as exposure to violence before or during the deportation process and the need for follow-up from social actors in areas of reunification. Family tracing remains a challenge due to the need to enhance coordination between IBESR, the Red Cross and other partners. In some cases the information provided is missing additional elements for comprehensive analysis such as exposure to violence, and in other cases reunifications are delayed due to unwillingness on the part of the child to return to his parents. Ensuring different case management systems are coherent and enabling smooth referral and orientation processes are key to providing adequate assistance to children identified as affected by deportations (separated, unaccompanied, at risk due to the cross-border movements of parents, etc.).

For the WASH component in border communities, a recommendation that came up during contingency planning in spring 2015 was to deliver projects that target not only the returnees but the overall host communities as well.

Drinking water needs had been identified in the commune of Belladère, one of four main entry points along the border, which could have a negative impact on the health of both host communities and returnees, particularly in regard to the persistence of cholera in the area.

II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

This submission of a CERF request was based on interagency assessment mission between UN, International and National NGOs and national institutions. It was also completed through an interagency border monitoring established at nine official and one hundred unofficial crossing borders since 17 June 2015.

It is estimated that some 460,000 Haitian migrants without a regular migratory status currently reside in the DR. In addition, a decision taken by the DR Constitutional Court in 2013 deprived of their Dominican nationality hundreds of thousands of people born in Dominican Republic to Haitian migrant parents or Dominican born persons of Haitian descent, rendering them “stateless”.

Since the 17 June 2015, the Haitian Government considered that over 30,000 individuals crossed the border from the DR and the Government of the Dominican Republic reported over 80,000 individuals who returned till end of August 2015. However, border monitoring conducted by the IOM since July 2015 and national civil society organizations reported 34,877 individuals (17,816 households) who have crossed the border into Haitian territory since June 2015 up to 23 October 2015. This assessment of the situation triggered the request of the CERF grant.

The CERF project contributed to the provision of life-saving activities which assisted people who had already been affected by the mixed migration crisis as well as population affected during the implementation of the project.

The CERF funds contributed to the implementation of critical life-saving activities which formed part of the following five (5) priority axes of intervention:

1. Maintain border monitoring of the 100 official and unofficial border crossing points to ensure continual coverage of all BCPs and reinforce the capacity of the border enumerators.
2. The Border Monitoring Network is present at all BCPs and conducts the Border Monitoring fiche with returning Haitian migrants (on a voluntary basis). Based on the information acquired, enumerators can identify (age, type of vulnerability, documentation status, etc.) and assist highly vulnerable migrants (such as stateless persons, unaccompanied minors, returnees registered in the PNRE etc.) through the referral mechanism. The pre-established referral mechanism pairs highly vulnerable migrants with the respective government authority (IBESR), or humanitarian partners (such as UNICEF, UNHCR and OHCHR). The border monitoring network is trained to identify protection and vulnerable cases and refer them according the existing referral mechanism.
3. Provide adequate emergency protection assistance with support from institutions and agencies with a migration-related mandate, including the DIE, ONM, IBESR and UNHCR.
4. In coordination with the Haiti's Civil Protection (DPC in French), IOM supported the registration of migrants stranded in informal settlements in the South East department. In addition, IOM facilitated the relocation of 2,320 individual that were spontaneously installed in six sites by conducting house visits, assistance and transportation from the displacement site to the selected relocation locations.
5. Provide minimum in transit assistance package/reintegration capacities to the most vulnerable households.

This project provided instrumental support and ensured the protection of highly vulnerable populations by providing humanitarian partners with accurate and timely information, ensuring the safe referral of vulnerable cases, and providing assistance in safe and humane onward transport to stranded migrants in the remote areas of Anse-a-Pitres.

The CERF funds also contributed to the implementation of protection activities which form part of the following priority axes of intervention:

- Support IBESR and its local partners to ensure systematic profiling of unaccompanied children;
- Provide an appropriate assessment of unaccompanied children and identification of the most adequate options based on family tracing, UNCHR status determination and the best interest of the child processes;

- Provide adequate protection assistance to those children affected by deportations in need of assistance: temporary care; medical; education; psychosocial support services; family reinsertion or placement in foster care; and social reinsertion (mainly for 16 – 18 age group);
- Support transitory care/transit structures with a view to ensuring adequate living conditions, in particular as far as access to drinking water and sanitation is concerned;
- Enhance identification mechanism in 13 non-official border crossing points

III. CERF PROCESS

This CERF request was decided by the UN Country Team in Haiti, based on the escalation of deportations/returns of people from the DR, which have exacerbated current and urgent humanitarian needs and priorities. In May 2015, when it appeared likely that there would be significant deportations and returns from the DR, the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) in Haiti initiated an interagency response through a joint contingency planning process with the Government of Haiti (GoH). Under this process, it was estimated that between 20,000 and 30,000 people would be deported or return from the DR by August 2015, with approximately 2-3 percent at risk of statelessness. These figures were reached in October 2015 and since 15 August the number of people crossing the border into Haiti has increased significantly, to an average of 2,600 per week (a weekly increase of 23%). Furthermore, the increase of returnees/deportees/expellees coincided with the hurricane season, the prevalence of cholera and a volatile political electoral period. The integrated response to mixed migration affecting the country was commonly defined and agreed between the Government of Haiti, HCT members and civil society partners. Agencies including IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA, WFP, UNICEF, OCHA in consultation with communities and local authorities affected by the issue, and based on the conducted assessments, were then engaged actively in the response.

The use of CERF funds has also been discussed with the network of NGO partners. Gender approach has been mainstreamed within the evaluation tools, planning process and direct intervention project were part of the response. There were major operational limitations for the response as most humanitarian agencies were involved in a downsizing process of funding and human resources when the emergency emerged.

Prioritisation of CERF funds was also guided by discussions carried out with other actors in this field i.e. UNHCR and IOM. Following consultations, it was also decided to harmonise as much as possible partnerships in order to streamline processes and improve referral processes. Given the fact that there was no established protection cluster or working group, the three projects for CERF funding were at the end of the consultation process selected by the HCT/HC. It is also worthy to recall, that others humanitarian priorities (cholera and food security) have received CERF grants months before in August-September 2015.

Additionally, in order to support the overall response, while CERF funds were allocated to answering to the needs of children, other available resources (ECHO contribution) were allocated to strengthening assistance mechanisms for vulnerable migrants and presumed group A and B members.

IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR ¹									
Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 141,506 as on 22 September 2016									
Cluster/Sector	Female			Male			Total		
	Girls (< 18)	Women (≥ 18)	Total	Boys (< 18)	Men (≥ 18)	Total	Children (< 18)	Adults (≥ 18)	Total
Child Protection	58	3,682	3,740	532	3,398	3,900	590	7,080	7,670
Protection	11,073	12,423	23,496	11,709	31,408	43,117	22,782	43,831	66,613

¹ Best estimate of the number of individuals (girls, women, boys, and men) directly supported through CERF funding by cluster/sector.

BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

TABLE 5: TOTAL DIRECT BENEFICIARIES REACHED THROUGH CERF FUNDING²			
	Children (< 18)	Adults (≥ 18)	Total
Female	11,131	16,105	27,236
Male	12,241	34,806	47,047
Total individuals (Female and male)	23,372	50,911	74,283

² Best estimate of the total number of individuals (girls, women, boys, and men) directly supported through CERF funding. This should, as best possible, exclude significant overlaps and double counting between the sectors.

CERF RESULTS

Throughout the implementation of the “Emergency assistance to migrant population and persons of specific protection needs in Haiti” project, IOM maintained the Border Monitoring Network and the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM). The objective of the Network is to assist the identification and profiling of persons crossing into Haiti from the Dominican border and record the collected data in the DTM system. IOM liaised and established the Border Monitoring Network in partnership with the three most active Haitian organizations working along the border, Services Jésuites aux Migrants (SJM), Réseau Frontalier Jeannot Succès (RFJS) and Groupe d'Appui aux Rapatriés et Réfugiés (GARR).

IOM Haiti supported the border monitoring network, through the provision of trainings for the enumerators. During this reporting period, six (6) trainings (1 in Ouanaminthe, 2 in Belladere, 2 in Malpasse and 1 in Anse-a-Pitres) were held. The overall objective of the trainings were to train an additional 109 enumerators and Government Officials from the Institute of Social Well Being and Research (IBESR in French) on the Border Monitoring questionnaire (elaborated by IOM, UNHCR and UNICEF), as well as on proper referral mechanisms for special/vulnerable cases (i.e. stateless persons, unaccompanied minors, etc.). Additionally, throughout these training IOM provided refresher trainings to the 134 established enumerators (84 males and 50 females). Thus, a total of twelve (12) trainings have been held, in which a total of 243 enumerators (154 males and 89 females) and Government Officials from the Institute of Social Well Being and Research (IBESR in French) were trained on border monitoring activities.

The trained enumerators are disbursed and monitor all of the 100 border crossing points (BCPs) - (4 officials and 96 unofficial) and their role is to conduct surveys with Haitian migrants (on a voluntary basis). Based on the information acquired, enumerators can establish (age, type of vulnerability, documentation status, place of birth, etc.) and through the referral system, assist highly vulnerable migrants (such as stateless persons, unaccompanied minors, returnees registered in the PNRE etc.).

Furthermore, IOM established a Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) database which focused on reinforcing monitoring and data collection of border movements between the two countries. The Displacement Tracking Matrix is accessible to the above mentioned Humanitarian partners.

As of June 30th 2016, border monitoring activities have revealed that 120,646 individuals (65% male and 35% female) have crossed the border into Haitian Territory. Of the total returnees, 74,528 individuals spontaneously returned, 21,907 claimed deportations and 23,861 were officially deported. Furthermore, 700 individuals benefited from the Assisted Voluntary Returns and Reintegration (AVRR) program carried out by IOM Dominican Republic.

Of the total returnees, a reported 1,641 presumed unaccompanied minors were also registered and referred to UNICEF/ the Institut de Bien-Etre Social et de Recherche (IBERS) – the governmental authority mandated to assist unaccompanied minors – in order to ensure that the appropriate action were taken to identify and assist them. Furthermore, 3,056 individuals were referred to UNHCR for additional assistance, including validation of stateless or refugee’s status and if applicable the eventual return to the DR.

Furthermore, due to insufficient reception capacities and returnees lack of support networks in Haiti, informal settlements were established on privately owned land in the South East Department near Anse-à-Pitres. Through a separate but collaborative partnership agreement, IOM conducted the identification and formal registration of the returnees stranded in informal settlements in January 2015. Following the registration exercise, 544 households, representing 2,203 individuals, were registered in six informal settlements in Anse-à-Pitres. Through this formal registration IOM captured reliable statistical data and information on the returnee's population (such as age, category of movement, etc.). The information obtained facilitated and supported the orderly and humane relocation and reintegration of returnees stranded in informal settlements.

IOM in partnership with the Directorate of Civil Protection (DPC), the Municipality of Anse à Pitres and the departmental delegation of the South East conducted the relocation process from February 2016 to May 2016. This relocation was responding to the urgent need to close all six (6) informal settlements created by the returnees from the Dominican Republic. The steady increase of returnees and the dire conditions of the informal settlements, required immediate Humanitarian and protection assistance as the returnees were experiencing high levels of vulnerability including degradation of living conditions, extreme poverty and severe food insecurity.

The main objective of this activity was to assist the 579 households (or 2,320 individuals) living in the informal by providing them with a rental subsidy cash grant sufficient to cover one year's rental accommodation and to allow them to return to a community of their choice. In order to ensure respect for the rights of beneficiaries and to better meet their specific needs, the return assistance approach included the following steps:

i. Registration/needs assessment

Returnees stranded in the informal settlements in Anse à Pitres were registered through a partnership agreement (Foreign & Commonwealth Office, Strategic Programme Fund and Bilateral Programme Fund) on 12-13 January 2016. By conducting a formal registration of all the returnees residing the camps, IOM captured reliable statistical data and independent information on the returnees. The information obtained facilitated complementary CEF activities focused on supporting the orderly and humane relocation of returnees stranded in Anse à Pitres.

ii. Sensitization of beneficiaries about the project

Different means of communication were used to increase awareness of individuals residing in the informal settlements. During the sensitization sessions, Returnees take an active part in the project through their interaction with IOM staff, asking questions and expressing their concerns. These activities took place on a daily basis during the execution of the project as IOM staff was present in the informal settlements and available at all times to answer questions or doubts regarding the programme.

IOM sensitization sessions were organized according to the following methodology:

- Mass sensitization: Mass sensitizations were held from February 29 to March 3, 2016. This activity marked the beginning of the communication process and informed the informal settlements' population of the project's purpose along with the services and products to be provided to those interested in leaving the informal settlements. The purpose of the mass sensitization was to provide information about the relocation process, conditions and participation modalities to the returnees living in the 6 informal settlements.

- Focus Groups: The camp-based focus groups provided details about the project, the criteria for choosing the place of return, and covered specific issues concerning vulnerability, aiming to answer any questions or clarify concerns the beneficiaries might have. These daily interactive activities were the beneficiaries' first point of access to critical information surrounding the relocation process. IOM staff identified spaces and audiences interested in being involved in these information forums.

- Door-to-door: This activity had the same purpose of the Focus Groups' though it specifically targeted informal settlements with small population where a face-to-face approach proves to be more efficient.

The returnee households interested in participating in the project were invited either to find homes for renting (one year period) or to return back to their families or communities of origin with the same support modalities.

iii. Identification of Appropriate Housing Solutions

The returnees themselves identified appropriate houses for rent and were responsible for negotiating the yearly rental cost with the landlord. The main criterion was to find a house suitable for the size of the family and with access to basic services in the surroundings.

iv. House Validation Visits

Considering the large return area, which covered the Municipalities of Anse-à-Pitre , Thiotte and Belle Anse, the IOM visit agents were supported by 20 agents seconded by the Directorate of Civil Protection for the house validation process. One day special training was provided to the 20 DPC agents by the IOM staff responsible for this process. The purpose of the training was to show the DPC how to use the house validation tools (GPS, contract signature principles and house validations forms) in order enable them to obtain clear agreements between returnees and landlords. The house validation process took 2 months, from March to April 2016.

v. Rental Subsidy Cash Grant

The relocation grant was distributed as followed:

- The allocation amount for beneficiary (each household) was 20,000.00 HTG for one year rental. The returnees had to negotiate the price of the house with the landlord. When the agreement reached is less than 20,000 HTG, the balance is paid back to the returnee.
- 40,000.00 HTG for big family (a family with 8 people or more) as protection cases.
- Fees for finding rentals (\$20.00 USD for family and \$15.00 for Landlords)
- Transportation fees for each family were \$20.00 USD for each member. A family with 3 people received **\$60.00 USD** (3 X \$20.00 USD)
- The exchange rate used was 61.00 HTG for \$1.00 USD.

The payments to landlords and returnees were made through the private money transfer company "Unitransfer" during the months of March and April 2016. All the beneficiaries' houses validated by the visit agents were automatically on a payroll sent to Unitransfer in order to proceed with the payments. Once the payroll was activated, the first payments were made to landlords, followed by the payment to the returnees. The process was conducted in order to guarantee that the landlords got paid and made the house available for the returnees. The payments were carried out via Unitransfer initially by providing mobile payment centres that went camp by camp to make payments and also through their office in the municipality of Thiotte. Based on a payments schedule previously agreed with IOM, Unitransfer moved to the different locations in order to proceed with the payments. IOM Staff were always present at the payment points to monitor and ensure the effectiveness of the payments and to support Unitransfer solving any problem faced during the process.

vi. Decommissioning of Informal Settlements

The departure of the returnees from the informal settlements took place after the payment of the rental subsidy cash grant. The returnees were responsible for dismantling their informal settlements before leaving the site and or organizing their transportation to the resettlement areas.

vii. Areas of Return

Following the validation of the lists by the Mayor's office, a beneficiary database was created by the IOM Data Management Unit. This database contained all relevant information collected during the registration of the informal settlements, and was progressively completed with information regarding the place of return of the families (GPS coordinates, landlord details and other related information), as well as specifics on individual cash grant disbursements including both rental payments.

At the end of the relocation activities, the office of the Mayor of Anse-à-Pitre confirmed on August 4th, by means of a signed letter, that all eligible families living in the informal settlements have been relocated.

Child Protection Component

1. Identification of unaccompanied children

The intervention was able to identify and provide assistance to a total of 590 unaccompanied children (58 girls) identified at border crossing points. 90 percent of children identified were boys and the age group most represented is the 15-17 age group (79 percent of beneficiaries).

The focus of the identification process has been placed on children affected by the deportation process and migratory patterns and in need of assistance and support for (i) family tracing, (ii) emergency assistance, and (iii) referral to UNHCR. Although more children moving across the borders alone were identified, they were referred to IBESR for social follow-up and most of them were from the border area and therefore did not require assistance from the intervention.

Although the DR has committed to not deporting children, 11 percent of children assisted claimed having gone through the formal deportation process (children were presented with real-life pictures of the different steps of the process and asked whether they went through those steps). Despite this fact, over the reporting period no child appeared on manifests.

Belladère (46.8 percent of total caseload) and Ouanaminthe (25 percent of caseload) were the border points where most children were identified. Yet, although Anse-à-Pitres only represents 14 percent of the total caseload, 65 percent of children presumably born in the DR and 95 percent of those presumably born in the DR before 2010 were identified there. This finding is consistent with UNHCR data and its caseload of persons of concern.

2. Among the children claiming to have been “officially deported”:

- 51 percent were identified at the Belladère official border point;
- 33 percent at the Malpasse border point; and
- 14 percent at the Ouanaminthe border point.

3. Alleged authorities of deportation

61 percent of children reported having been deported by immigration officers (i.e. in a bus from immigration, not necessarily as part of the formal deportation process), while 27 percent claimed having been deported by CESFRONT. The rate reaches 88 percent for children identified at non-official border points.

4. Children and living arrangements in the DR

The intervention also enabled child protection actors to develop a better understanding of the children affected by deportations and migratory patterns:

- Only 5 percent of children identified claimed to have been born in the DR. The same proportion of children had been living for more than a year in the DR;
- While 4 percent reportedly lived with at least one parent in the DR, 7 percent lived with other relatives, 10 percent with other adults, and 4 percent lived with other youths in the DR; and
- 20 percent of the children identified had a stable economic activity in the DR.

5. Logistical support

The CERF contribution has supported the re-activation of the Haitian Red Cross bus service at all official border points. The process of re-activating the bus system took longer than planned but is now in place and remains active with ECHO support. Given the Red Cross's network and acceptance on both sides of the border, the service enables migrants to be transferred from the DR to the Haiti side and enables IBESR staff and Red Cross volunteers on-board to assess the presence of minors. None of the manifests partners could access during the reporting period made mention of the presence of minors. Yet once documented by IBESR and child protection actors, several minors were identified among persons deported through official points.

6. Family tracing and reunification

The intervention relied on a partnership with the Haitian Red Cross to enhance family tracing capacities. The Red Cross added value consists of (i) technical expertise in the field of family tracing, and a (ii) wide network of volunteers across the country to support family tracing activities and follow-up.

576 children (83 percent boys and 83 percent aged 15-17) could be reunited with their families and relatives. 78 percent of these children were reunified with biological parents, while 22 percent were reunified with other family members (uncles, older siblings, etc.).

In Ouanaminthe, due to the difficulty of identifying biological parents or negative family assessments, 59 percent of children ended up being reunified with other family members. Three families were identified as being particularly vulnerable and were provided material assistance (school reinsertion, bedding, NFIs, etc.).

All children reunified received reunification kits consisting of hygienic kits and clothes. As part of another component supported by ECHO, all families are also provided mosquito nets and one-month food rations. Exchanges are also ongoing with micro-finance organisations FONKOZE, PALMIS, as well as Food for the Poor in order to allow families identified in this intervention to be referred to and included in their programs. Furthermore, coordination with the IOM's protection program (socio-economic assistance component) continues to ensure inclusion of the most vulnerable families identified by this intervention.

7. Best interest determination

Although fewer cases than planned were identified for submission to the BID process, CERF support has been instrumental in operationalising the BID process in border areas. This has provided a rare opportunity for coordination among social services such as IBESR, the police, justice ministry and municipalities. In 5 of the 10 cases presented to the BID panel, trafficking allegations were involved and judicial processes ongoing. In one case, a pastor was accused of illegally trying to cross the border with five children and arrested at the Ouanaminthe border point. Inter-service coordination led IBESR to carry out family assessment and coordinate with the judge to allow children to be reunited with their parents under the oversight of social services.

Such inter-sectoral coordination is a best practice which could in the long run serve as preventive and responsive mechanisms in the field of child protection.

8. Children at risk of statelessness

Although only 18 unaccompanied children with presumed places of birth in the DR were identified, a total 30 children were referred to UNHCR. This number included children claiming to have been born in the DR (18) as well as children for whom there were presumptions of lives centers in the DR (reportedly schooled in the DR for a long period of time, family ties in the DR, etc.).

Identification mechanisms were coordinated with the IOM in order to ensure referrals were as rapid as could be. This process had led the rate of unaccompanied children accessing assistance to move from 35 percent in November 2015 to 81 percent as of the time of reporting.

The CERF contribution enabled the strengthening of IBESR's capacities along the border, with all IBESR antennas along the border now having with office equipment as well as communication and transportation means.

Furthermore, in order to ensure increased identification capacity of children entering through non-official border points, the CERF contribution contributed to strengthening coordinated action around 13 border points jointly identified by IBESR, IOM, child protection actors and neighbouring communities. Criteria for selection of those points were:

- Accessibility;
- Reported arrivals of vulnerable migrants; and
- Existence of community network to support alert, monitoring and referral.

The points selected were:

- Nord-Est: Ferrier et Capotille; Corosse;
- Centre: Locaret; San Pedre; Cachiman-Rocher;
- Ouest: Fonds Verettes; Cornillon ;
- Sud-Est: Tete Source; Fond Jeannette; Pakado; Bonite; and Boulay Rose.

With joint support from ECHO, CERF and UNICEF, these points were equipped with basic equipment and assistance (shed, tables, hygienic kits, water, snacks) and logistical capacity strengthened in order to ensure swift transfer to transitory care structures of persons identified.

During the reporting period, UNICEF partners, IOM, UNHCR also worked on harmonised SOPs on the care and assistance to unaccompanied children as well as ToRs and SOPs for the functioning of best interest determination Panels. Although less children than foreseen met the criteria for BID determination, the system is in place and has been validated.

WASH Component

The main results of the project were the:

- rehabilitation of 460 linear meters of PVC SCH 40 3" in the localities of Morne Aurelien, La Hoy and Los Poetes, in the commune of Belladère;
- construction of a catchment of 35m2 with a flow rate of 4.8L / s;
- construction of a gathering basin of capacity 1.8m3;
- construction of 40 linear meters of masonry rock for the protection of pipelines;
- excavation and installation of 600 linear meters of PVC pipe SCH40 4" for supplying downtown Belladère and its surroundings;
- construction of six (6) water kiosk in the localities of Haut Cachiman, Cite Cazoute, Mateguasse, Nan 14 and Derriere Cimetiere;
- construction of a special kiosk to welcome migrants including four showers and two toilets in the locality;
- excavation and installation of 1,500 linear meters of PVC pipes SCH40 1"1 / 2 for supplying the kiosk of Carissal;
- building of a tank with a capacity of 7,000 gallons in the locale of GARR;
- excavation and installation of 372 linear meters of PVC SCH 40 pipe 1" ½ in the localities of Derriere Cimetiere and Mateguasse;
- construction of 12 valve boxes of capacity 1.20mx1.20m; and
- Revitalisation of the water supply committee for drinking water and sanitation (CAEPA) in Belladère.

CERF's ADDED VALUE

a) **Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries?**

YES PARTIALLY NO

The CERF funds were able to maintain the Border Monitoring Network and thus continue to ensure the collection of reliable statistical data and independent information about Haitians and persons of Haitian descent voluntarily returning to Haiti or being forcibly moved to Haiti from the Dominican Republic, while simultaneously establishing the necessary mechanism to pair highly vulnerable migrants. Furthermore, the CERF Funds supported the orderly and humane relocation of migrants stranded in informal settlements in the South East Department.

CERF assistance enabled the re-activation of the Red Cross bus service at all border points and setting up identification mechanisms at 13 unofficial border points. As a result of SAEP rehabilitation, CERF funds helped to meet water and sanitation needs of 12,000 people from the town of Belladère. In addition, the construction of a water tank with 7,000-gallon capacity in the locale of GARR will meet the water needs of returnees transiting through Belladère.

b) **Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs¹?**

YES PARTIALLY NO

The CERF funds were able to response to time critical needs through gathering, collecting, analyzing and dissemination of up to date information on the returnee and displaced population along the border. The maintenance of the border network allowed for the collection of an extremely valuable set of data about migration pattern between Haiti and Dominican Republic. In addition, CERF funds supported the orderly and humane relocation of migrants stranded in informal settlement in the South East department by 1) facilitating the identification of relocation houses by conducting house visits ,2) conducting house verification to ensure compliance and restrict cases of fraud and 3) assisting in facilitating transport from displacement site to selected relocation house.

¹ Time-critical response refers to necessary, rapid and time-limited actions and resources required to minimize additional loss of lives and damage to social and economic assets (e.g. emergency vaccination campaigns, locust control, etc.).

The period of time between identification and orientation to child protection actors is critical in ensuring children identified, mostly teenagers, do not expose themselves to further risks (returning to DR) or engage in other risky behaviours. The mechanisms set up with the support of CERF funds contribute to ensuring the window of time between identification and documentation is maximised to ensure the children most in need are identified.

In terms of water and sanitation in border communities, CERF funds enabled assistance to beneficiaries in the following manner:

- Building of six kiosks according to community specifications;
- Improved access to water, as well as quantity and quality, with the increased water flow leading to a reduction in waiting and filling time to avoid conflicts at the community level;
- Reduction in the cost of water compared to before the SAEP rehabilitation;
- Creation of 135 temporary jobs for 41 women and 94 men. The funds injected into the local economy enabled beneficiary households to meet some basic needs including the payment of school fees for children; and
- Reduction of the level of exposure of Belladère residents' especially Haitian migrants' to risks of transmission of diarrheal disease through the consumption of non-potable water.

c) Did CERF funds help improve resource mobilization from other sources?

YES PARTIALLY NO

IOM received supplementary funds from other partnership agreements such as the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade & Development to reinforce the shelters and assist unaccompanied minors throughout Haiti's border areas.

The availability of funds from CERF made it possible for UNICEF to apply for co-funding from ECHO to ensure response capacity until the end of the year. Other water and sanitation actions were financed at the same time at the border level with ECHO and OFDA. CERF funds enabled some synergy with these funds.

d) Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?

YES PARTIALLY NO

Through the CERF funding projects, the coordination amongst the humanitarian community was strengthened in terms of responding to the critical needs of the vulnerable migrants.

CERF funding to IOM, HCR and UNICEF contributed to enhanced dialogue and coordination among agencies and their partners. They were able to rally around the need to streamline SOPs as well as support gaps whenever necessary (IOM's logistical support while the Red Cross feet was being re-activated) and complement each other's interventions.

Operational coordination between actors has been enhanced and collaboration around the selection of non-official border points to be prioritised is also such an example of operational result-oriented inter-agency coordination.

e) If applicable, please highlight other ways in which CERF has added value to the humanitarian response

CERF had a substantive added value to the humanitarian response as it was able to contribute to the needs and priorities in terms of responding to mixed migration crisis. Thus, the CERF supported activities identified vulnerable migrants returning to Haiti from the Dominican Republic and was able to provide rapid humanitarian assistance through the referral mechanisms. In addition, the CERF Funds supported the orderly and humane relocation of migrants stranded in informal settlements in the South East Department. The impact of the CERF supported project was widespread across the border departments and was able to assist the populations affected and at risks.

CERF funds have also helped to prevent conflicts between DINEPA technicians and the population. Various threats initially expressed against system technicians by the population because of lack of access to water decreased substantially.

Without CERF funds the response to the needs of unaccompanied children affected by deportation processes and migratory patterns would not have been possible during the first quarter of 2016. It has enabled not only response to the urgent needs of affected children but also the generation of evidence deriving from programming which will be useful in designing future intervention and support to advocacy initiatives.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE <u>CERF SECRETARIAT</u>		
Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Need to enhance capacity for socio-economic support to most vulnerable families in order to address factors underlying migration and cross-border movements	Establish referral protocols with actors specialising in social protection, socio-economic support and micro-finance. Provide minimal response capacity in emergency interventions to support most vulnerable families.	All actors, OCHA, RC/HC
Due to a lack of infrastructure and access, certain Border Crossing Points (BCPs) remain difficult to access.	Civil Society Organization and enumerators are utilizing motorcycles to access difficult BCPs, and the selected enumerators live near their assigned BCP. This hampers the capacity of all actors to rapidly identify and transfer persons in need of attention.	IOM/Border Monitoring Network
Capacity of field based and decentralized governmental counterparts (ONM, DGIE, Police and IBESR) needs to be strengthened as well as working protocols between them.	In complement with other projects, UNICEF continued to support the permanent presence of IBESR agents at the official border crossing points. However, the level of involvement of other government agencies in the management of migratory issues remains limited, particularly ONM, DGIE and security services.	IOM, UNICEF, UNHCR
Capacity to provide transitory care to unaccompanied children needs to be reinforced including around non official border points..	IOM secured additional funding that will enable to rehabilitate exiting shelters. However, those are located around the official border points. The need to develop a network of care structures as well as extended family-based care all along the border including non-official points remains.	IOM, UNICEF
Lack of available housing for beneficiaries to relocate from the informal settlements	IOM extended the area of return to include the municipalities of to review cases with a focus on Anse-à-Pitre, Belle Anse and Thiotte. DPC supported the activity by provided 20 Agents to assist IOM's house visits and validation process. However it is important to note that this extension of relocation areas lengthened the house validation activities by an additional three weeks.	IOM/DPC
Lack of monitoring activities from the Municipality of Anse-à-Pitre	Before beginning the relocation process, the Municipality of Anse-à-Pitre agreed to provide efficient monitoring of the relocation process and thus ensure that no new settlements were constructed on the sites. IOM noticed in April 2016 that new tents had been constructed and notified the Municipality of Anse-à-Pitre res, the Departmental Delegation of the South East as well as Ministry of Interior and the General Director of the Haitian National Police, however no action has taken by the local authorities to find an appropriate solution.	Municipality of Anse-a-Pitres

TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR COUNTRY TEAMS

Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Coordination between migration authorities on both sides could help improve situation of migrants.	Strengthen coordination and dialogue between authorities on both sides, particularly DGM and DIE/ ONM	Both UNCTs, RC/HC,IOM
Strengthen UNHCR's capacity to review cases with a focus on Anse-à-Pitre.	Ensure status determination teams are available in areas generating the most important caseload of persons at risk of statelessness, preferably alongside IOM and in close coordination with transitory care actors to ensure swift documentation and assistance.	Both UNCTs, RC/HC,UNHCR
Interventions on both sides of the border are a factor which could strengthen documentation of the processes.	Monitoring interventions from the retention centers to border areas could help ensure a continuity of dialogue as well as documentation of processes at official border points.	Both UNCTs

VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS						
CERF project information						
1. Agency:	UNICEF	5. CERF grant period:	30/12/2015 – 30/06/2016			
2. CERF project code:	15-RR-CEF-135	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing			
3. Cluster/Sector:	Child Protection		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded			
4. Project title:	Strengthening of support and assistance systems in favour of children affected by deportations including unaccompanied children from the Dominican Republic					
7. Funding	a. Total funding requirements ² :	US\$ 4,904,442	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received ³ :	US\$ 1,127,880	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 363,266	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 718,880	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>		US\$ 171,983.56	
Beneficiaries						
8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).						
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>			<i>Reached</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Children (< 18)</i>	400	400	800	58	532	590
<i>Adults (≥ 18)</i>	490	610	1,100	3,682	3,398	7,080
Total	890	1,010	1,900	3,740	3,930	7,670
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>			<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>		
<i>Refugees</i>						
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>	1,900			7,670		

² This refers to the funding requirements of the requesting agency (agencies in case of joint projects) in the prioritized sector for this specific emergency.

³ This should include both funding received from CERF and from other donors.

Total (same as in 8a)	1,900	7670
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>	<p>The actual migratory flux was less than initially expected. The extension of the regularisation period as well as electoral periods in the DR may have contributed to fewer deportations than envisaged. Despite this, partners maintained a continuous presence and strengthened set-up in order to ensure continued capacity was maintained.</p> <p>In Belladère specifically, the intervention was confronted with difficulties stemming from the security situation at the border points: following an armed confrontation between security forces and alleged smugglers, several services at the borders were attacked. As a result, the IBESR work station was closed from May to July. Although activities continued, the documentation process could not be carried out as usual and this might have led to some cases not being identified in time.</p> <p>Although the intervention had planned to access as many girls as boys, migratory patterns have mainly concerned boys. The planning assumptions proved to be wrong and although girls' specific needs must be taken into account, boys represent the majority of unaccompanied minors identified.</p> <p>The envelope for water and sanitation-related activities was limited. UNICEF had suggested that OXFAM focus on the SAEPs of Belladère and GARR centre in Belladère. The VDH centers of Ouanaminthe and the CAD centre of Ganthier initially planned for these works were selected for lack of funds. The CAD center in Ganthier was rehabilitated with OFDA funds.</p>	

CERF Result Framework			
9. Project objective	Support the protection of children affected by the deportation process from the Dominican Republic		
10. Outcome statement	Through adequate transitory care, documentation and family reunification services based in Ouanaminthe, Malpasse, Belladere and Anse-à-Pitre , the adverse humanitarian impact of the deportation process, including family separation is mitigated for 1,900 Haitian migrants including 800 children affected by the deportation process from the DR		
11. Outputs			
Output 1	800 unaccompanied children (UA) who have crossed into Haiti from the Dominican Republic are identified and registered by the partners using the adopted standard procedures;		
Output 1 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 1.1	# unaccompanied children registered by agents at the 4 official border crossings disaggregated by age, sex, presumed country of birth, presumed authority at the origin of deportation	800	590 10% girls 79% aged 15-17 yrs 5% born in the DR 61% allegedly deported by immigration and 27% by CESFRONT
Indicator 1.2	# unaccompanied children registered at the unofficial border crossings and referred to IBESR agents age, sex, presumed country of birth, presumed authority at the origin of deportation	400	110 21% girls 19% reportedly born in DR 88% allegedly deported by CESFRONT
Indicator 1.3	The list of unaccompanied children and associated standard documents including reference numbers are	1	Yes

	available to the partners monthly		
Output 1 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 1.1	Identification, registration and reporting of unaccompanied children at the 4 official border crossings	OIM/IBESR/PNH and NGOs	OIM, IBESR, NGOs
Activity 1.2	Unaccompanied children at the unofficial border crossings are identified, registered and referred to IBESR	OIM/IBESR/civil society	OIM, Civil Society
Activity 1.3	Regular update, harmonisation and sharing of the database of unaccompanied children	OIM/IBESR/civil society	OIM/ IBESR/ Civil society
Output 2	Unaccompanied children receive temporary care at the four (4) official reception centres that meet the minimum standards for child protection		
Output 2 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 2.1	# unaccompanied children placed in temporary care at the 4 reception centres age, sex, presumed country of birth, presumed authority at the origin of deportation	800	590 10% girls 79% aged 15-17 yrs 5% born in the DR 61% allegedly deported by immigration and 27% by CESFRONT
Indicator 2.2	# unaccompanied children receiving appropriate medical, education and psychosocial activities age, sex, presumed country of birth, presumed authority at the origin of deportation	800	590 10% girls 79% aged 15-17 yrs 5% born in the DR 61% allegedly deported by immigration and 27% by CESFRONT Medical assistance: 50 children (3 girls, 47 boys) Psycho-social assistance: 341 children
Indicator 2.3	# of transitory care structures assisted with water and sanitation interventions disaggregated by location, number of persons assisted	2	1
Indicator 2.4	Water connection to the GARR center and CAD	1	1
Indicator 2.5	% of people transiting through centers that have access to proper water and sanitation facilities	100% (1,900)	100%
Output 2 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 2.1	Reception and temporary care of unaccompanied children in the four reception centres	Civil society	Civil society
Activity 2.2	Ensure documentation of records according to standard procedures including documentation of deportation process and specific vulnerabilities	Civil society/IBESR	Civil society/IBESR
Activity 2.3	Unaccompanied children receive appropriate medical, education, psychosocial support services and assistance	Civil society/sector-specific partners	Civil society

Activity 2.4	Water connection with the GARR and CAD	Oxfam	1
Activity 2.5	Provision of hygiene promotion materials, handwashing stations, and cleaning and disinfection products	Oxfam	1
Activity 2.6	Reception and temporary care of unaccompanied children in the four reception centres	Civil society	Civil society
Output 3	Appropriate protection measures are taken for 800 unaccompanied children based on the process of family tracing, UNCHR status determination and determination of the child's best interest		
Output 3 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 3.1	# unaccompanied children reunited with their families disaggregated by age, sex, place of reunification, status of persons reunified with (biological parents, other parents)	800	567 83% boys 83% 15-17 yrs 78% with parents 22% with other family members 14.5% from Malpasse 54.6% Belladere 26.7% Ounaminthe (to be noted that 59% of children in Ounaminthe were reunited with other family members) 14.5% Anse-à-Pitre
Indicator 3.2	# unaccompanied children referred to UNHCR disaggregated by age, sex, outcome of UNHCR status determination process	200	30 5 girls 25 boys 12-14 yrs: 5 children 15-17 yrs: 20 children All pending
Indicator 3.3	# of children whose cases were submitted to a "Best Interest of the Child" panel disaggregated by age, sex, specific vulnerability, decision taken by the BID panel	80	10 3 girls, 7 boys Below 1 yrs: 1 (child abandonment) 6-11: 6 children (5 alleged trafficking case and 1 mother's unable to care for the child due to mental problems) 15-17: 3 children (one pregnant teenage girl, one teenage boy with no family in Haiti and one teenage boy with extremely vulnerable parents) Decisions Family reunifications: 6 Transfer to Food for the poor village for support: 1 Temporary placement in care center under IBESR's supervision: 2

			One child returned to the DR before case could be settled.
Indicator 3.4	# unaccompanied children for which tracing is negative (no parents/ relative identified) disaggregated by age, sex, country of birth, current placement option	0	0
Indicator 3.5	# unaccompanied children for which the family tracing process is still pending disaggregated by age, sex, country of birth, current placement option	10	13
Output 3 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 3.1	Family tracing for unaccompanied minors is conducted by IBESR and its partners	IBESR/Croix Rouge	IBESR/ Haiti Red Cross?/IOM/Civil society
Activity 3.2	UNHCR conduct Status determination of unaccompanied children born in Dominican Republic and without any documentation	UNHCR	UNHCR
Activity 3.3	Child's best interest determination is conducted by IBESR and other protection partners	IBESR/civil society/ NGOs	IBESR/Civil society/NGOs
Activity 3.3	Unaccompanied children are appropriately reunited with the biological family, extended family, or returned to their family in the Dominican Republic or receive care pending reunification or receive assistance package/reintegration capacities	IBESR/NGOs/Civil Society	IBESR/NGOs/Civil society

<p>12. Please provide here additional information on project's outcomes and in case of any significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, outputs and activities, please describe reasons:</p> <p>The foreseen migratory flux was less than expected. The extension of the regularisation period as well as electoral periods in the DR may have contributed to fewer deportations than envisaged. Despite this, partners maintained a continuous presence and strengthened set-up in order to ensure continued capacity was maintained.</p> <p>In Belladère specifically, the intervention was confronted with difficulties stemming from the security situation at the border points: following an armed confrontation between security forces and alleged smugglers, several services at the borders were attacked. As a result, the IBESR work station was closed from May to July. Although activities continued, the documentation process could not be carried out as usual and this might have led to some cases not being identified in time.</p> <p>The envelope for water and sanitation-related activities was limited. UNICEF had suggested that OXFAM focus on the SAEPs of Belladère and GARR centre of Belladère. The VDH centres of Ouanaminthe and CAD centre of Ganthier initially planned for these works were not selected for lack of funds. The CAD centre in Ganthier was rehabilitated with OFDA funds.</p>
<p>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</p> <p><u>Water and sanitation component in border communities</u></p> <p>Mobilization and sensitization activities were carried out in the communities to intensify community participation and facilitate the appropriation of works by locals. To this end, six (6) community meetings were conducted with the participation of CAEPA officials and TEPACs.</p> <p>At the community level, sensitization sessions were organised. During the last session, special focus was on how to behave to ensure protection of the drinking water chain from contamination.</p>

<p>Awareness messages issued to this effect have mainly focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good management and maintenance of the system and water points; - The involvement and ownership of the system by the beneficiaries; - The contamination of the water chain (contamination at the point of collection, transportation contamination and contamination during storage); - The conservation and treatment of household water. <p>To ensure ownership and sustainability, community involvement and a system management structure (CAEPA) were favoured. Thus, apart from the organisation in conjunction with the OREPA centre, two training sessions for TEPACs and CAEPA officials were carried out to empower more people to manage SAEP, and a system of assessment and effective management of revenue was set up in order to answer any minor faults.</p> <p>In addition, in order to ensure the potability of the water, a 45-kg barrel of chlorine was made available to the TEPACs and CAEPA, including pool-test kits to ensure systematic monitoring of the level of residual chlorine at the kiosks.</p>	
14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>There is no particular evaluation for this component so far. UNICEF has visited the project during its implementation phase to ensure and verify progress. UNICEF is committed to accompanying CAEPA in working closely with the OREPA centre to ensure the sustainability of the work.</p> <p>Through its continued partnership with IBESR, UNICEF will continue ensuring processes and mechanisms continue to be used and implemented.</p>	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS

CERF project information						
1. Agency:	UNHCR		5. CERF grant period:	15/11/2015 – 15/05/2016		
2. CERF project code:	15-RR-HCR-063		6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
3. Cluster/Sector:	Protection			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
4. Project title:	Protection assistance to persons born in the Dominican Republic					
7. Funding	a. Total funding requirements ⁴ :	US\$ 267,984	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received ⁵ :	US\$ 267,984	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>			
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 267,984	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
Beneficiaries						
8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).						
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>			<i>Reached</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Children (< 18)</i>	1,639	1,611	3,250	1,368	1,403	2,771
<i>Adults (≥ 18)</i>	987	736	1,723	999	848	1,847
Total	2,626	2,347	4,973	2,367	2,251	4,618
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>			<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>		
<i>Refugees</i>						
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>	4,973			4,618		
Total (same as in 8a)	4,973			4,618		

⁴ This refers to the funding requirements of the requesting agency (agencies in case of joint projects) in the prioritized sector for this specific emergency.

⁵ This should include both funding received from CERF and from other donors.

<p><i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i></p>	<p>The registration team is short-staffed.</p> <p>Difficulty reaching and scheduling individuals who are located in remote villages and are scattered along the remote border areas.</p> <p>Some of the missions had to be cancelled due to the weather conditions which in turn affected the state of the roads, which are very often dirt tracks. Some areas like La Toison in Cornillon (Malpasse) are particularly inaccessible when it rains.</p>
---	--

CERF Result Framework			
9. Project objective	The overall objective is to provide protection and durable solutions through return for persons affected by the 2013 Dominican Constitutional Court ruling effectively rendering them Stateless, as well as their descendants, and for other groups (such as family members) affected by potential deportations, who entered Haiti.		
10. Outcome statement	Up to 4,973 persons affected by the 2013 Constitutional Court ruling, their descendants, and other groups (such as family members) affected by potential deportations are supported while in the Haitian border areas and able to find a durable solution. Up to 4618 persons have been verified. (4,001 of 4618 are PoC to UNHCR.)		
11. Outputs			
Output 1	Population has sufficient basic and domestic items		
Output 1 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 1.1	# of households receiving cash grants	55	37
Output 1 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 1.1	Cash grants are provided to assist PoC households in meeting their basic needs	UNHCR/SJM	UNHCR/SJM
Output 2	Identification of up to 4,973 persons of concern improved in Haiti border areas.		
Output 2 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 2.1	Identification exercise undertaken/supported	50%	50%
Indicator 2.2	# of Persons affected by the 2013 Constitutional Court ruling, their descendants, and other groups (such as family members) displaced to Haiti identified	5,000	4618
Output 2 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 2.1	Initial Registration undertaken (Haiti)	UNHCR/SJM/Digicel	UNHCR/SJM/Digicel
Activity 2.2	Biometric Identification and registration exercise undertaken (Haiti)	UNHCR/SJM	UNHCR
Activity 2.3	Issuance of individual/household proof of registration undertaken (Haiti)	UNHCR/SJM	UNHCR

12. Please provide here additional information on project's outcomes and in case of any significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, outputs and activities, please describe reasons:

As of July 31, 2016, UNHCR has interviewed 4,618 individuals to verify their status. 4001 were found to be of concern to UNHCR and have been registered as such. While only 1,895 of the 4001 individuals were born in the Dominican Republic before January 26, 2010, for the sake of preserving family unity, UNHCR has taken into consideration Haitian relatives and parents as well. So far, 1,895 of the individuals registered need a solution to their nationality problem.

Although UNHCR has records from IOM pertaining to 6,029 families (25,090 individuals) with one or more persons born in the Dominican Republic who would be eligible for a UNHCR's verification interview, it should be noted that UNHCR Haiti's registration team was still short-staffed (5 persons at that time) and even if the team was deployed on a weekly basis to conduct the interviews and register those of concern to UNHCR, the caseload was increasing every week.

Initial identification by SJM of those to be verified sometimes was extremely difficult because they were usually located in remote rural areas and/or inaccessible areas by road because of the adverse weather conditions. Some others could not be traced because they had returned to Dominican Republic to join their relatives, friends or their jobs. Moreover, the logistical aspects of the registration exercise by UNHCR was a key challenge because, in most remote places, the exercise required setting up temporary sites (tents and other mobile equipment) in improbable locations which are often very difficult and time consuming to reach.

Regarding the # of households receiving cash grants, it should be noted it was decided to reduce the initially 55 households to be assisted to 40. This was done in order to be able to increase the cash grant to each family. These families with specified needs were supposed to be assisted (unaccompanied children, persons with serious health conditions, women-headed households, persons with disabilities, older persons) and provided with an assistance package which included: cash grant, hygienic kits and food items.

13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:

- All Job Descriptions of UNHCR staff contain clear accountability commitments
- Project Partner Agreement outline accountability commitments
- Statistical reports on verification and registration activities were shared with government's authorities and key stakeholders.
- Community leaders were involved in tracing, identification and registration activities in the field.
- Coordination meetings were organized with the project partner on a regular basis.
- Monitoring visits were conducted to assisted households.
- Individual/household proof of registration was granted to registered families that are of concern to UNHCR.
- A participatory assessment exercise was carried out to collect data on protection and SGBV risks affecting the population in one border area.

14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

An evaluation has been carried out by the Implementing Partner but the results of the evaluation are still pending. They are expected to be finalized very soon and will be shared accordingly.

EVALUATION PENDING

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS

CERF project information						
1. Agency:	IOM		5. CERF grant period:	28/12/2015 – 28/06/2016		
2. CERF project code:	15-RR-IOM-044		6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
3. Cluster/Sector:	Protection			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
4. Project title:	Emergency assistance to migrant population and persons of specific protection needs in Haiti					
7. Funding	a. Total funding requirements ⁶ :	US\$ 1,000,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received ⁷ :	US\$ 1,000,000	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:		US\$266,000	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 1,000,000	▪ Government Partners:			
Beneficiaries						
8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) directly through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).						
Direct Beneficiaries	Planned			Reached		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Children (< 18)	9,071	8,732	17,803	9,705	10,306	20,011
Adults (≥ 18)	18,171	17,026	35,197	15,106	33,958	49,064
Total	27,242	25,758	53,000	24,811	44,264	69,075
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)			Number of people (Reached)		
Refugees	53,000			69,075		
IDPs						
Host population						
Other affected people						
Total (same as in 8a)	53,000			69,075		

⁶ This refers to the funding requirements of the requesting agency (agencies in case of joint projects) in the prioritized sector for this specific emergency.

⁷ This should include both funding received from CERF and from other donors.

<p><i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i></p>	<p>Throughout the implementation of the project (December 2015- June 2016), border monitoring activities have revealed that 66,755 individuals (64.5% male and 36.4% female) have crossed the border into Haitian Territory which was above the estimated figures of 50,000 individuals.</p> <p>Furthermore following the registration of the six (6) displacement camps near Anse-a-Pitres, a total of 2,320 individuals were assisted (50.4% male and 49.6% female). This figure was below the estimated figures of 3,000 individuals.</p>
---	--

CERF Result Framework			
9. Project objective	The overall objective of the project is to ensure the protection of highly vulnerable populations by providing humanitarian partners with accurate and timely information, ensuring the safe referral of vulnerable cases, and provide assistance in safe and humane onward transport to stranded migrants in the remote areas of Anse-a-Pitres.		
10. Outcome statement	Irregular and vulnerable returning migrants received the Life-saving, emergency protection assistance upon arrival in Haiti. (53,000 individuals)		
11. Outputs			
Output 1	A more detailed database and publications is available on the cross border movements allowing the GoH and humanitarian actors to better orient their initiatives and assist protection/vulnerable cases on the border. (50,000 individuals)		
Output 1 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 1.1	Number of weekly situation reports produced.	24	27
Indicator 1.2	% of Vulnerable persons screened and referred through identified referral mechanisms.	100%	
Indicator 1.3	% of Vulnerable persons screened and referred through identified referral mechanisms.	100%	
Indicator 1.4	Number of enumerators trained.	100 +	234
Output 1 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 1.1	Network of 100+ enumerators trained on data gathering and regular verification exercises.	IOM, GARR, SJM, RFJS	IOM, GARR, SJM, RFJS
Activity 1.2	Cross border database is maintained.	IOM	IOM
Activity 1.3	IOM focal points are deployed in each of the four (4) official points on the border (border monitoring Hubs) to gather all the data collected by the enumerators on the displaced population (en-route and area of return tracking).	IOM	IOM
Activity 1.4	Data analysis of the displaced population (demographic trends, destination, origin, etc.)	IOM	IOM, OCHA, UNICEF, UNHCR
Output 2	Support the orderly and humane relocation of migrants stranded in informal settlement in the South East department (3,000 individuals).		
Output 2 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 2.1	Number of stranded migrants registered through Phase II	TBD	2,320

	registration ⁸ mechanism.		
Indicator 2.2	% of stranded migrants living in informal settlements in the South East department that are successfully relocated.	100% (700 households)	100%
Output 2 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 2.1	In coordination with the DPC, IOM supports the registration of migrants stranded in informal settlements in the South East department.	IOM/DPC	IOM/DPC
Activity 2.2	Facilitate the identification of relocation houses by conducting house visits.	IOM	IOM/DPC
Activity 2.3	Conduct house verification to ensure compliance and restrict cases of fraud.	IOM	IOM/DPC
Activity 2.4	Cash grant to assist transport from displacement site to selected relocation house.	IOM	IOM

12. Please provide here additional information on project's outcomes and in case of any significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, outputs and activities, please describe reasons:	
IOM confirms the proper implementation of the project and does not claim any discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes	
13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:	
Over the course of the project, IOM worked closely with the respective government authority such as the Institute for Social Well Being and Research (IBESR in French), or humanitarian partners (such as UNICEF, UNHCR and OHCHR).	
14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
No evaluation was planned by IOM for this project.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

⁸ IOM has conducted a preliminary registration (Phase I), Phase II reviews and verifies the data collected during Phase I. The data collected through Phase II, is utilized for relocation/return and tracking of movement.

ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

CERF Project Code	Cluster/Sector	Agency	Partner Type	Total CERF Funds Transferred to Partner
15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	UNICEF	NNGO	\$25,874
15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	UNICEF	RedC	\$52,334
15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	UNICEF	NNGO	\$53,701
15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	UNICEF	NNGO	\$49,017
15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$87,000
15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$84,983
15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	UNICEF	NNGO	\$39,166
15-RR-CEF-135	Child Protection	UNICEF	NNGO	\$43,374
15-RR-CEF-135	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	INGO	\$100,000
15-RR-IOM-044	Protection	IOM	NNGO	\$88,667
15-RR-IOM-044	Protection	IOM	NNGO	\$88,667
15-RR-IOM-044	Protection	IOM	NNGO	\$88,667

ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

AVRR	Assisted Voluntary Returns and Reintegration
BCPs	Border Crossing Points
BID	Best Interest Determination
BPM	Brigade de Protection des Mineurs
CAEPA	Comité d'Approvisionnement en Eau Potable et d'Assainissement
CESFRONT	Cuerpo Especializado de Seguridad Fronteriza Terrestre
DGM	Dirección General de Migración
DIE	Direction de l'Immigration et de l'Émigration
DPC	Haiti's Civil Protection
DR	Dominican Republic
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Office
GARR	Groupe d'Appui aux Rapatriés et Réfugiés
GoH	Government of Haiti
IBESR	Institut du Bien Être Social et de Recherche (Institute for Social Well Being and Research)
IOM	International Organization for Migration
OCHA	Office de Coordination des Affaires Humanitaires
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
ONM	Office National des Migrations
OREPA	Office Regional de l'Eau Potable et de l'Assainissement
PNRE	Plan Nacional de Regularización de los Extranjeros
RFJS	Border Network Jeannot Succès
SAEP	Système d'Adduction d'Eau Potable
SJM	Service Jesuite aux Migrants
TEPAC	Techniciens en Eau Potable et en Assainissement pour les Communes
UAC	Unaccompanied children