

TITLE: Final evaluation of DS.0057 DS Netherlands Project; CONTRIBUTE TO DURABLE SOLUTIONS THROUGH SUSTAINABLE RETURNS AND REINTEGRATION IN IRAQ

Commissioned by: IOM IRAQ COUNTRY OFFICE

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is part of the United Nations System as the leading inter-governmental organization promoting since 1951 humane and orderly migration for the benefit of all, with 174 member states and presence in over 100 countries. IOM works on migration and development, facilitating migration, regulating migration and solutions for forced migration. IOM activities that cut across these areas include the promotion of international migration law, policy debate and guidance, protection of migrants' rights, migration health and the gender dimension of migration.

1. EVALUATION CONTEXT

1.1. Political, Environmental, and Socio-economic Context:

Iraq's security situation and development outlook have undergone significant transformations following the defeat of ISIL in 2017. However, the political landscape remains intricate, with ongoing tensions between the Government of Iraq (GoI) and the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) regarding displacement policies and the management of disputed territories. These political dynamics necessitate region-specific interventions to navigate complexities and foster cooperation among stakeholders.

Environmental challenges further compound the displacement crisis, with Iraq grappling with issues such as water scarcity, desertification, and pollution. These environmental stressors exacerbate socio-economic disparities, particularly in rural areas reliant on agriculture and natural resources. Addressing environmental degradation is crucial to promoting resilience and stability in displacement-affected communities.

Socio-economically, IDPs and returnees face numerous challenges accessing livelihood opportunities, essential services, and social support networks. Economic stagnation, worsened by the COVID-19 pandemic, has heightened poverty levels, especially among marginalized populations. Moreover, social cohesion issues, including ethnic and sectarian tensions, pose significant barriers to sustainable returns and reintegration efforts, necessitating inclusive approaches prioritizing community engagement and reconciliation.

1.2. Summary of the Project:

Donor	Project Title	Start date	End date
Netherlands	CONTRIBUTE TO DURABLE SOLUTIONS THROUGH SUSTAINABLE RETURNS AND REINTEGRATION IN IRAQ	1-Jan-2022	30-Jun-2024

This project was initiated in response to the complex displacement crisis in Iraq, particularly focusing on addressing the challenges faced by internally displaced persons (IDPs) and returnees. The context underscores the urgency for durable solutions amidst evolving security, socio-economic, and infrastructural conditions. Notably, despite significant efforts by the Government of Iraq (GoI) and the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG), numerous barriers persist, hindering sustainable returns and reintegration. These barriers include damaged housing, limited livelihood opportunities, social cohesion issues, and insufficient access to basic services. In light of these challenges, the project was designed to provide comprehensive support, leveraging the expertise and collaborative networks of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and its partners. Through a multi-sectoral approach, the project aimed to facilitate voluntary returns, promote community stabilization, and bolster sustainable (re)integration efforts. Key strategies included area-based interventions, coordination with stakeholders, and capacity-building initiatives targeting local authorities and civil society organizations. By addressing the root causes of displacement and fostering long-term solutions, the project sought to contribute to the stability and well-being of affected communities in Iraq.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The external evaluation will be conducted over a three-month period from July to September 2024. It will assess the program's performance against its desired results, as articulated in the project's result framework. The evaluation will also identify lessons learned and recommendations for improving the program and future interventions.

The evaluation will be conducted by an external firm with expertise in evaluating development programs. The firm will use a variety of data collection methods, including interviews with key stakeholders, surveys of beneficiaries, and review of project documentation.

The evaluation findings and recommendations will be shared with program management and the donor. The recommendations will be used to improve the program's design and implementation, and to inform future interventions.

The evaluation specific objectives aim to;

- Assess the progress of the project's indicators against the targets, as articulated in the result-framework.
- Assess the overall project's performance from planning, implementation and knowledge management by identifying the key strengths and areas of gaps and make the necessary recommendations for improvement.
- Document vital lessons-learned/best practices for future strategies and interventions.
- Support the use of relevant and timely contributions to organisational learning, informed decision-making processes resulting from the analysis, conclusions or recommendations as well as and accountability for results.
- Endorse IOM's obligation on transparency and Accountability to the Affected Populations (AAP), donors and Iraqi government authorities as well as assess the effectiveness of IOM's CFM effectiveness and the level of beneficiaries' usage.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE

The project's scope is carefully directed towards achieving the following outcomes and outputs:

Objective: Contribute to supporting access to durable solutions and effective (re)integration of internally displaced people in Iraq

- Outcome 1: IDPs have improved access to pathways for durable solutions through facilitated safe and voluntary returns, local integration, and/or settlement in new locations
 - Output 1.1: IDPs have increased capacity to identify preferred solutions pathways and make voluntary and informed decisions
 - Output 1.2: IDPs have increased assistance in preparing departures from areas of displacement through provision of information on areas of destination, liaison with authorities, and targeted assistance
 - Output 1.3: IDPs have increased access to services that enable their safe and dignified movements and sustainable reintegration
- Outcome 2: Displacement-affected populations have improved, community-informed, and inclusive access to key services to promote community stability in areas of IDP return, local integration, or relocation.

- Output 2.1: Communities and key stakeholders have increased engagement in the identification and prioritization of community needs and response planning.
- Output 2.2: IDPs, returnees, and host communities have increased access to basic services through quick impact projects (QIPs).
- Output 2.3: Residents in target locations have increased access to services and assistance via community resource centres (CRCs).
- Output 2.4: Understandings of trends on post-return dynamics are strengthened through monitoring and analysis, informing ongoing and future interventions.
- Outcome 3: Local stakeholders, including Government, civil society, and affected communities have increased capacities and engagement in support of durable solutions.
 - Output 3.1: Civil society has enhanced capacity to contribute towards the achievement of durable solutions for affected populations.
 - Output 3.2: Conflict-affected populations have enhanced capacity to contribute to social cohesion and sustainable returns through community-led activities.
 - Output 3.3: National Government and local authorities are engaged in the identification of solutions to displacement through durable solutions advocacy and technical assistance.
 - Output 3.4: Relevant Government counterparts have increased technical capacity in coordinating and developing national DS policies.

The evaluation will exclusively be on the IOM DS Netherlands project. The primary geographical focus will be in the two governorates where the activities have been implemented, namely, Salah ad-Din, and Ninewa.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Project's performance should be evaluated against the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coverage, effectiveness, coherence and coordination, efficiency, sustainability and impact. In addition, this evaluation will consider cross-cutting issues on gender, disability inclusion and the environment. In total, the evaluation criteria form the basis and guidance for the evaluation suggested questions as presented below.

5. EVALUATION GUIDING QUESTIONS

Relevance

- a) To what extent did the activities, outputs and outcomes remain sound and pertinent as initially intended?
- b) Was the project in line with local needs and priorities?
- c) To what extent was the selection of beneficiaries consistent with the project selection criteria, and did the selection criteria adequately target the populations most in need of stabilisation and revitalisation assistance?
- d) In light of potential contextual changes, such as shifts in lines of control or alterations in priorities, how has the project's relevance been assessed? Have there been adaptations or adjustments made during implementation to ensure continued alignment with evolving circumstances?

Coverage

- e) Who were the major groups in need of the assistance?
- f) Of these groups, who were provided with the assistance?
- g) What, if any, were the differential impacts of the assistance on different groups or subgroups?

Effectiveness

- h) What was the overall progress towards the expected results? Were there significant challenges that hindered the realisation of the planned results?
- i) What were the components and delivery approaches that were most effective, and which were least effective?
- j) What needed to be done to improve the performance to achieve the expected results?
- k) Did the program adequately apply 'Do No Harm' principles?
- l) Did outputs lead to the intended outcomes/results?

Coherence

- m) How compatible is the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution?
- n) Has the project/program effectively collaborated with relevant stakeholders and partners to leverage resources and expertise?

Efficiency

- o) Were the project activities undertaken and were the outputs delivered on time?
- p) Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative means of implementation?
- q) How efficiently were the resources used to achieve the intended results in line with the implementation context?

Sustainability

- r) Are structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?
- s) To what extent were relevant target groups actively involved in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation?
- t) How far was the project embedded in institutional structures that are likely to survive beyond the life of the project?

Impact

- u) What are the broader effects of the project on individuals, institutions, community groups, gender, and age groups?
- v) What are the intended/unintended positive/negative results at the macro (sector) and micro (household) levels?
- w) What were the significant factors influencing the achievement of the project's outputs and outcomes?

Cross-cutting issues

- x) To what extent does the project incorporate a gender-responsive approach, promoting gender equality and addressing the specific needs and experiences of both women and men throughout its design, implementation, and outcomes?
- y) How effectively does the project integrate and address the needs of individuals with disabilities, ensuring their meaningful participation, equal access to services, and overall inclusion in all project activities and outcomes?
- z) What actual or expectable positive and negative effects are foreseeable on the environment?

6. THE METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

The selected firm bears the responsibility of formulating a comprehensive methodological approach and overseeing the evaluation process. The chosen methodologies must prioritize inclusiveness and representation of all involved stakeholders, while also aligning seamlessly with the project's core objectives.

In the evaluation scope section above, the project components and targets are outlined. These elements can serve as guiding principles for the development of a sampling strategy and the determination of appropriate sample sizes for each evaluation methodology.

Efforts shall be exerted to safeguard the inclusivity and engagement of relevant stakeholders to bring out their voices on how they perceived the implementation of the project; notably, the returnees, IDPs, host communities, the most vulnerable conflict-affected populations, civil societies, government counterparts, community and local authorities' leaders. Key Informants Interviews (KIIs) with representatives from the community, government authorities, and other relevant actors (if any) should be held. Similarly, interviews and FGDs with a selected sample from the Returnees, IDPs and host-communities or beneficiaries should be conducted to assess how the project has responded according to their expectations, objectives and priorities.

The evaluation processes shall be in line with IOM Data Protection Principles¹, IOM code of conduct, Do no harm principles, UNEG norms and standards for evaluations². The IOM Iraq MEAL team and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)³ will provide technical support and guidance during the process. The M&E Advisor in IOM's Regional Office in Cairo will be consulted when deemed necessary. The results of this evaluation will contribute to improving learning for future interventions.

The evaluation is anticipated to be conducted through in-person activities. To bolster their efforts, the firm has the option to collaborate with local consultants residing in Iraq.

Summary of the Evaluation Methodology and Data Collection Tools

Table 01: Evaluation Methodology and Data Collection Tools

Method	Tasks	Tools required	Products
<i>Desk study</i>	Review project reports, partners reports, and other relevant project documents.	Evaluation rubric ⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation strategies identification; • Identification of progress and challenges • Key project components implemented, and result achieved
<i>Key Informant Interviews</i>	Identify and secure an interview with relevant KIIs: programme staff, management, community and stakeholder's representatives (IDPs, host-communities, governmental authorities, civil societies, Implementing partners, and other actors). <u>At least 30 KIIs with relevant stakeholders</u>	Interview Guides for the evaluation purpose, Structured questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative data on project processes and performance about target results • Insight on the view of problems and recommended solutions. • Different perspectives on issues
<i>On-site observation</i>	Conduct field visits, observation of project activities, project partners offices and implementation sites. <u>Sample size is identified under the Beneficiary Interviews and surveys</u>	Observation Guides	Qualitative data/cues about project contexts/challenges as well as risks

¹ IOM Data Protection Manual, <https://publications.iom.int/books/iom-data-protection-manual>.

² UNEG norms and standards for evaluation: <http://www.uneval.org/document/guidance-documents>.

³ The ERG is a technical advisory group comprising of members representing different constituencies who have an interest in the evaluation outcomes. They are chosen by their relevant expertise in Monitoring and Evaluation, Research methods, Project Management, Coordination, livelihood and thematic representation.

⁴ Evaluative rubric is a qualitative data assessment tool which involves articulating things that matter in the initiative being evaluated in line with the performance quality standard in project activities, their delivery strategies and resultant products or services predefined according to the evaluation purpose. See also: http://carla.umn.edu/assessment/vac/improvement/p_4.html.

<p><i>Focus group discussion</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FGDs to explore stakeholder opinions and judgements towards the engagement level, processes, and project implementation. • In-Depth information on the needs, motivations, intentions, and experiences of the group to assess how the project has responded according to their expectations. <p><i>Around 8 FGDs</i></p>	<p>Structured questionnaire</p>	<p>An in-depth qualitative information</p>
<p><i>Beneficiary Interviews and surveys</i></p>	<p>Identify and secure interviews with Beneficiaries (sample for each activity should be selected based on a statistically relevant sample per the survey system, that is, a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of 5). <i>Around 7,00 interviews/surveys with program direct beneficiaries</i></p>	<p>Structured questionnaire</p>	<p>Quantitative information</p>

7. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator should produce:

- Submit the inception report in accordance with the IOM template, inclusive of data collection tools, materials, and templates.
- Provide comprehensive data collection plans ahead of schedule, allowing IOM ample time for quality assurance procedures.
- Present a preliminary evaluation report along with the raw data files collected from diverse sources.
- Deliver a finalized evaluation report, adhering to the IOM template and incorporating feedback and technical inputs from the reference group. Additionally, include a two-page concise summary of the evaluation brief, aligned with the IOM template.
- Updates Results Framework that clearly shows the status/value of Project indicators visa-vis the targets.
- Engage in a meeting with the IOM team to deliver a comprehensive presentation on the principal findings, recommendations, and challenges encountered.
- Completing the evaluation recommendations within the IOM standard template of Management Follow-up Response Matrix by listing each recommendation alongside its significance or impact level.

8. EVALUATION PROPOSED WORKPLAN

Table 02: The Evaluation proposed work plan

Activity	Responsible	Start	Data Analysis	Reporting
		<i>Jul</i>	<i>Aug</i>	<i>Sep</i>
1. Meetings: M&E team, project manager/staff/focal points, management.	IOM	X		
2. Desk review of project documents, partners documents, reports, and others	Evaluation firm	X		
3. Inception process: Development/submission of inception report/work plan, and data collection tools	Evaluation firm	X		
4. Sharing detailed data collection plans and updating IOM in case of changes.	Evaluation firm	X		

EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

5. Fieldwork – data collection	Evaluation firm		X	
6. Sharing raw data	Evaluation firm			X
7. Data Analysis	Evaluation firm		X	X
8. Report writing and submission of the first draft (in IOM template)	Evaluation firm			X
7. Incorporate feedback and submit the final report with two-pager evaluation brief (as per IOM template)	Evaluation firm			X
9. Final report presentations	Evaluation firm			X

9. EVALUATION BUDGET AND DISBURSEMENT

The payment terms shall be issued per the terms and condition of the Purchase Order (PO) based on the disbursement schedule below;

- Satisfactory inception report submission – 30%
- Submission of first draft of the evaluation report together with raw data – 30%
- Satisfactory final report with relevant annexes – 40%

The final payment shall be issued not less than 30 days upon (1) the completion of the work, (2) receive of the final original invoice and (3) receive of the final evaluation report and summary of the evaluation brief following the incorporation of feedback from the IOM ERG.

10. REQUIREMENTS

An international consultancy firm with valid registrations, and it should have legal registration paperwork in Iraq, and formal access to the locations of the programme implementation.

The selected firm should possess the following minimum qualifications as follows:

Table 03: Qualifications and Experience

<i>Qualifications and experience</i>	
<i>Academic skills</i>	Master's degree in advanced applied research/evaluation methods/ economics, business, or any related academic discipline or an affiliation with a research institution or a university, holding a PhD, or being in pursuit of a PhD in a relevant field is an advantage.
<i>Previous Experience</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5 of years evaluating humanitarian programmes ○ At least two evaluation contracts of similar value, nature and complexity implemented over the last three years or more. ○ Strong background in monitoring and evaluation techniques and ideal experience in conflict-affected countries. ○ Conversant with the context in Iraq, other countries in the Middle East or MENA region. ○ Experience in developing and implementing Evaluations with the UN, International NGOs or donors. ○ Familiarity with the OECD/DAC and UNEG evaluation framework.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excellent knowledge and experience in survey design, implementation of surveys and statistical data analysis. ○ Excellent analytical, communication, writing and presentation skills in English. ○ Ability to analyse complex intervention.
<i>Accountability</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Creates a respectful office environment free of harassment and retaliation and promotes the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA). ○ Accepts and gives constructive criticism. ○ Follows all relevant procedures, processes, and policies related to the organisational principles. ○ Meets deadline, cost, and quality requirements for outputs. ○ Monitors own work to correct errors or incorporate inputs. ○ Takes responsibility for meeting commitments and for any shortcomings.
<i>Orientation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identifies the immediate and peripheral programme staff of own work. ○ Establishes and maintains productive working relationships with staff. ○ Identifies and monitors changes in the needs of evaluation, including donors, governments and project beneficiaries. ○ Keeps staff/managers informed of developments and setbacks related to the evaluation.

11. SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION/EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

The interested firm should submit a technical proposal with a detailed evaluation methodology, indicative work plan, and the overall approach to the evaluation and an all-inclusive budget proposal no later than **May 9th, 2024**. The submission of proposals (technical and financial) and/or related questions should be directed via procurement email to: IRAQTENDERS@iom.int

The submission must encompass the following elements:

- A comprehensive technical proposal outlining the methodologies, including the sampling approach, and a detailed workplan.
- An itemized financial proposal providing a breakdown of costs with precision.
- A comprehensive company profile including registration documents, substantiation of presence in Iraq, and a history of similar projects (if relevant).
- A well-crafted cover letter to accompany the submission.
- CVs and biographies for both the consulting firm and key members of the assessment team (if applicable).
- References for every evaluation team member or the consulting firm.
- A recent example of an evaluation report, showcasing the firm's capabilities.

Important Note: During the evaluation of competing applicants, IOM will consider written qualifications, financial offers, applicant-provided information, and any other insights obtained through research.

IOM reserves the right to change the calendar of events or revise any parts of the requirements of the evaluation at any time.