



**TITLE: EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE IOM'S COMMUNITY POLICING PROJECT, 2018/19 PROJECT CYCLE.**

**Commissioned by IOM Iraq Country Office**

## **1. EVALUATION CONTEXT**

### **1.1. Background about IOM Iraq:**

IOM Iraq was established in 2003 and has built a strong network of staff, offices and logistics capacity. IOM works in cooperation with the Government of Iraq to provide support across all of Iraq's Eighteen governorates. Since 2018, IOM has been scaling-up recovery and stabilization programmes to support the government's efforts to rebuild the country, especially responding to the needs of returning Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and host communities affected by conflict. These programmes address drivers of displacement and irregular migration, including through strengthening the Government of Iraq's capacity to provide services and rebuilding trust between communities, and increasing opportunities for community and civil society interaction. IOM works in partnership with various ministries within the Government of Iraq, at national and sub-national level, the international diplomatic community, UN agencies, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Community Service Organizations (CSOs). IOM is a member of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) and the UN Humanitarian Country Team (UNHCT) for Iraq.<sup>1</sup>

### **1.2. Political, Environmental, and Socio-economic Context:**

Within a fragile political, economic and security environment, IOM Iraq is addressing humanitarian needs, supporting the reintegration of returning IDPs, and promoting stabilization of communities. To reduce risks and vulnerabilities of displaced and host communities in Iraq, IOM integrates humanitarian and development approaches, and addresses the link between security and development using area-based, tailored approaches founded on evidence emanating from strong data analysis. Following Iraq's war against ISIL between 2014-2017, IOM provided immediate humanitarian assistance to many of the six million IDPs who were fleeing their homes following the crisis, through a multi-sectoral response, including provision of displacement tracking data, camp management and camp coordination, non-food items and shelter, community policing, emergency health-care, mental health and psycho-social support and protection.<sup>2</sup>

### **1.3. Summary of the IOM Iraq Community Policing Program:**

IOM Iraq has been supporting Community Policing (CP) since 2012, to contribute to enhanced peace, security and stability by connecting community, police and civil society actors and strengthening the quality of the dialogue. The CP model is a migration management tool that supports the prevention of exploitation of vulnerable groups and mitigate the drivers of irregular migration. By supporting the CP approach, IOM Iraq has contributed to re-establish the relationship between the police and the communities to prevent conflict, address security risks, and mitigate crimes leading to more secure communities. IOM Iraq does this by training the police and community on rights and responsibilities applying CP principles. Once trained, the community and police establish a Community Police Forum (CPF) in coordination with the Ministry of Interior (MoI) and local authorities, with the support of IOM. CPFs are open and inclusive platforms, facilitated by a CP officer and elected community members, where discussion of security issues affecting the community can take place. There are currently 112 CPFs established across 11 Governorates, 27 of whom established by the Police. IOM Iraq guides CPFs to develop Community Safety Plans which identify and prioritize the most important security and safety-related issues that can be jointly addressed by the community, the police and other stakeholders.

An integral focus of CPFs is the inclusion of vulnerable and marginalised groups, as they are often most at risk, and their voices are least likely to be heard. The CP model aims at fostering access to peace and security for the most vulnerable, and support women, minorities and marginalized groups to play an effective role in the pursuit of justice. Civil society is also an integral part of a successful CPF as they form a bridge between the community and the government, and in many cases, provides essential services to the community when the government cannot. Finally, in an effort to encourage communities to report and resolve crimes through the police and judicial system, IOM Iraq has supported the building of

<sup>1</sup> IOM Iraq Mission Services, <http://iomiraq.net/about-iom>

<sup>2</sup> IOM Presence in Iraq, <https://iraq.iom.int/iom-iraq>



## EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

17 CP Offices (CPO) across seven Governorates, which are staffed by CP officers that facilitate the CPFs. CPOs are attached to the main police station and staffed by CP Officers, that serves up to five CPFs within a 50 km radius.

IOM Iraq has also supported the establishment of 10 Housing, Land and Properties (HLP) Assistance Centres, linked to the CPFs to address IDPs and returnees' lack of access, information, understanding and mechanism to resolve HLP disputes which may potentially escalate into violence or tension. Through a capacity building comprehensive approach, IOM Iraq is also contributing to the establishment of the Strategic Center for Community Policing, to strengthen the CP apparatus further and develop its skills to problem-solving at the national level, while continuing in the field of cooperation at the local and international level. The development of a referral pathway and mechanism will link up the Strategic Center to the Community Policing National Advisory Forum and the local CPFs, in order to further strengthen the CP network across the country and therefore guarantee the model's sustainability.

### 2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The evaluation is an IOM end-cycle (final) summative evaluation to be conducted through an external firm. The evaluation is a final summative evaluation intended for programme management and donor. The main objective is to evaluate the program's performance against the desired results as articulated in the project's result framework. However, the primary purpose of this evaluation is to scale up the work of IOM community policing in Iraq and inform the next potential phase. Also, it will be used for advocacy and resource mobilization. Recommendations will be used to improve the program processes as well as the anticipated results in the most sustainable, effective, relevant and efficient manner.

The evaluation specific objectives aim to;

- 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 future improvement.
- Document vital lessons-learned/best practices resulting for future strategies and interventions.
- Understand better what the project has achieved in relation to gender-mainstreaming and overall results.
- Support the use of relevant and timely contributions to organizational 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.

The evaluation intends to help improve the project's processes as well as the implementation and wage specific attention to lessons learned and best practices at a strategic level to enhance learning for future interventions primarily for the next phase of a similar project as well as contribute beyond the organization by generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders.

### 3. EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation scope will focus on the two thematic areas as below;

- Outcome 1: Strengthening the capacity of law enforcement structures to contribute to improved social co-existence and engagement with the community to reach, identify and resolve security related issues through taking the community policing approach, and mainstream this approach across the law enforcement and security sector;
- Outcome 2: Strengthening the ability of the communities targeted - including relevant civil society organizations - to contribute to improved social co-existence and engage with security actors to effectively address security concerns through taking a community policing approach.

The above thematic components are outcome areas for the IB.0010/11 2018/19 programme cycle. The evaluation will exclusively cover the 23.5 months (26 January 2018 to 31 December 2019), in line with Table. 04 of Annexe 12.1. The primary geographical focus will be in the governorates of Diyala (Al-Muqdadia, Khanaqin and Baladrooz), Ninewa (Mosul, Telafar, Al Hamdaniyah, Sinjar and Al Qayyarah), Anbar (Haditha and Fallujah), Salah Al-Din (Samarra, Tikrit and Bajii), Kirkuk (Hawija), Basrah (Basrah), Dahuk (Sumel) and Sulaymaniyah (Sulaymaniyah) where project activities have been



## EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

implemented. The evaluation will observe IOM Iraq's internal response with emphasis on coordination level with community and stakeholder's engagement, partnership programs, capacity building of the civil society and government counterparts.

### 4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Project performance will be evaluated according to the OECD/DAC evaluation quality standards based on the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Thus, the evaluation question relating to sustainability is presented as connectedness since humanitarian assistance is generally of short-term duration and not meant to be sustainable. Hence, the criteria of connectedness, coverage, appropriateness and coherence/coordination that measure the success of humanitarian assistance are included. In total, seven evaluation criteria form the basis and guidance for the evaluation questions, in addition to cross-cutting issues (gender and environment) as presented in Table.05.

### 5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation shall be on the quality of project performance as per the evaluation criteria described above. The guiding evaluation questions are presented in Table 05: Evaluation guiding questions in the Annexes section as Annexe 12.2. The evaluation questions are related to the programme processes and delivery strategies based on the two outcome areas outlined under the evaluation scope in section three. The evaluator is encouraged to identify additional questions to gather sufficient data needed and to suggest the best approach.

### 6. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation is an IOM end-cycle (final) summative evaluation to be conducted through an external firm on IOM intervention towards Strengthening the Community Policing in Iraq (phase II - IB.0010 and IB.0011) as outlined in the evaluation scope section. The primary purpose of this evaluation is to scale up the work of IOM community policing in Iraq and inform the next potential phase. Also, it will be used for advocacy and resource mobilization as well as contribute beyond the organization by generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders. Efforts shall be exerted to safeguard the inclusivity and engagement of relevant stakeholders to bring out their voices on how they perceived the implementation; notably, the IDPs, host communities, the most vulnerable conflict-affected populations, women, youth, civil societies, government counterparts, community and local authority leaders. Key Informants Interviews (KIIs) with representatives from the community, CPFs, governmental authorities, and other relevant actors (if any).

The evaluation suggested data collection with both quantitative and qualitative methods shall include; (1) at least eight-field visits/site observation of service delivery points in some selected locations (where deemed necessary). (2) Desk reviews of project documents, narrative and financial statements. (3) At least eight FGDs using both structured and semi-structured questionnaires for some selected beneficiaries or community members. (4) At least eight KIIs with CPFs leaders, relevant authorities, staff involved in the implementation of the project, and the management. (5) Interviews and surveys with project beneficiaries based on the statistically relevant sample – for more information, see Table 01. The evaluation processes shall be in line with IOM Data Protection Principles<sup>3</sup>, IOM code of conduct, do no harm principles, UNEG norms and standards for evaluations<sup>4</sup>. The IOM Iraq M&E team and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)<sup>5</sup> 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 outcome of this evaluation should contribute to internal learning that will enhance the implementation of the next phase.

#### 6.1. Evaluation Reference Group:

The work of the Evaluator or the evaluation team/firm shall be reviewed and validated by the ERG. The essential functions of the ERG shall include but not limited to;

- Objectivity, credibility and independence in the evaluation process.
- Advisory and technical inputs

<sup>3</sup> IOM Data Protection Manual, <https://publications.iom.int/books/iom-data-protection-manual>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/guidance-documents>

<sup>5</sup> The ERG is a technical advisory group comprising of members representing different constituencies who have an interest in the evaluation outcomes E.g. PM, Project Officers, Project support Team, Senior management, M&E team, etc) They are chosen by their relevant expertise in Monitoring and Evaluation, Research Methods, Project Management, Coordination, livelihood and thematic representation.



## EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

- Facilitation of learning and use of evaluation findings
- The legitimacy of evaluation activities

### 6.2. Summary of the Evaluation Methodology and Data Collection Tools

Below is suggested evaluation methods and data collection tools required; the evaluator is encouraged to be innovative.

Table 01: Evaluation Methodology and Data Collection Tools

Method	Tasks	Tools required
<b>Desk Review</b>	Review project reports, assessments and other documents.	Evaluation rubric <sup>6</sup>
<b>Key Informant Interviews</b>	Identify and secure an interview with relevant KIs: programme staff, management, community and stakeholder’s representatives (IDPs, host-communities, governmental authorities, civil societies, and other actors). At one working group per governorate making a total of 8 KIIs with relevant stakeholders (CPF members)	Interview Guides for the evaluation purpose
<b>On-site observation</b>	Conduct field visit, observation of project activities and sites ( <i>at least 10 CPFs site visit out of the established 25 CPFs</i> )	Structured observation checklist
<b>Focus group discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least eight FDGs (one per governorate) with a small group (5-8 individuals) with gender representation in Dahuk, Sulaymaniyah, Nenawa, Salahaddin, Diyala, Anbar, Basra and Kirkuk. This is to explore stakeholder opinions and judgements towards the engagement level, processes, and project implementation.</li> <li>• In-depth information on the needs, motivations, intentions, and experiences of the group to assess how the project has responded according to their expectations.</li> </ul>	Structured questionnaire
<b>Beneficiary Interviews and surveys</b>	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)	Structured questionnaire

## 7. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to produce: (1) Work plan and inception report/plan per the IOM template ([click here](#)) including the tools/materials/templates, results and analysis produced to conduct FGDs, interviews and on-site observations. (2) Briefing and debriefing meetings in addition to the routine meetings and discussions with the M&E Officer, Programme Manager/ project team, ERG, Project focal points and IOM management. (3) A presentation of the initial/ preliminary findings and, a final draft report outlining the lessons-learned and recommendation. (4) A final report with a summary of the evaluation brief (2-pager evaluation brief per IOM template [click here](#)) - clearly describing concrete steps which will include an approach on how the four-thematic outcomes of the project (as outlined under the evaluation scope) were implemented and how it will be implemented in future. The final report shall be per the IOM evaluation template - [click here](#).

## 8. EVALUATION PROPOSED WORKPLAN

Table 02: The Evaluation proposed work plan

Activity	Responsible	Location	Start	Data Analysis	Reporting
			Dec	Jan	Feb
1. Meetings: M&E team, project manager/staff/focal points, management.	M&E Team	Erbil	X		

<sup>6</sup> 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](http://carla.umn.edu/assessment/vac/improvement/p_4.html)



## EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

2. Desk review of project documents	Evaluator	Erbil	X		
3. Inception process: Development/submission of inception report/work plan, tools for the FGD, survey and KIIs.	Evaluator	Erbil	X		
4. Fieldwork - Key Informant Interviews/ FGD/ On-site observation, etc.	Evaluator	Iraq - Field sites.	X	X	
5. Data Analysis	Evaluator	Erbil/ Home-		X	
6. Report writing and submission of the first draft per the IOM template - <a href="#">click here</a> .	Evaluator	Erbil/ Home-based		X	X
7. Incorporate feedback and submit a final report with a two-pager evaluation brief per the IOM template ( <a href="#">click here</a> ).	Evaluator	Erbil/ Home-based			X

### 9. FINAL PAYMENT

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. 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 – 40%
- Submission of a draft report – 20%
- Satisfactory final report with relevant annexes – 40%

### 10. REQUIREMENTS

IOM's preference is for a consultancy firm. The selected firm is expected to assemble a team of evaluators to ensure a combination of skills necessary to deliver the assignment. However, the evaluation agreement will be signed with the firm, and it's up to the firm to decide on how to assemble resources to produce expected results. The selected firm should possess the following minimum qualifications as follows:

Table 03: Qualifications and Experience

<i>Qualifications and experience</i>	
<i>Academic skills of the firm's evaluator</i>	Master's degree in advanced applied research/evaluation methods/ economics, policing, 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"> <li>o Seven years of evaluating humanitarian projects/programmes</li> <li>o At least two evaluation contracts of similar value, nature and complexity implemented over the last years.</li> <li>o Strong background in monitoring and evaluation techniques and ideal experience in conflict-affected countries.</li> <li>o Conversant with the context in Iraq, other countries in the Middle East or MENA region.</li> <li>o Experience in developing and implementing Evaluations with the UN, International NGOs or donors.</li> <li>o Familiarity with the OECD/DAC and UNEG evaluation framework.</li> <li>o Excellent knowledge and experience in survey design, implementation of surveys and statistical data analysis.</li> </ul>



## EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

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

### 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 **October 01, 2019**.

The submission should include the followings:

- o Company profile including a history of similar projects and context in which the firm has worked.
- o A cover letter outlining the interest to conduct the evaluation.
- o CV and biographies of independent consultant/consulting firm and key assessment team members.
- o References for each evaluation firm.
- o Copies of at least two recent evaluation report.

When evaluating the competing applicants, IOM will consider the written technical and financial proposal including the qualifications/capability, the information provided by the applicants, and any other relevant feedback obtained by IOM through its research.

The submission of proposals (technical and financial) and/or related questions should be directed via procurement email to: [IRAQCFP@iom.int](mailto:IRAQCFP@iom.int)

### 12. ANNEXES

#### 12.1. Project for the Evaluation:

The below project constitutes the subject of this evaluation with a strategic focus on strengthening community policing in Iraq. The evaluation expected to assess the suitability and effectiveness of the community Policing Model used by the project and make suggestions on the model enhancement.

*Table 04: Project for the Evaluation*

Donor	Project Code	Project Title	Start date	End date	Total Budget
Federal Republic of Germany	IB0010/11	Strengthening Community Policing in Iraq	16 Jan 18	31 Dec 19	€ 5.7 Million



## 12.2. Evaluation Guiding Questions

Table 05: Evaluation Guiding Questions

S/No	Criterion	Evaluation Guiding Questions
1	Relevance/ appropriateness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Was the project in line with local needs and priorities?</li> <li>b) Was a need assessment carried out, in which the needs were assessed, and the services required mentioned in accordance with the situation?</li> <li>c) Did the outputs lead to the intended outcomes?</li> <li>d) Have the activities to local needs increased ownership, accountability, and cost-effectiveness?</li> </ul>
2	Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Were the operation's objectives achieved?</li> <li>b) Did the project's activities and outputs lead to the intended outcomes?</li> <li>c) To what extent was the project Theory of change/and Theory of action sound?</li> </ul>
3	Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Were activities implemented on schedule and within budget? - outputs delivered economically.</li> <li>b) How efficiently were the resources used to achieve the intended results in line with the implementation context?</li> </ul>
4	Connectedness/ sustainability <sup>7</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) To what extent are the project activities connected to longer-term development concerns?</li> <li>b) Are the benefits likely to be maintained for an extended period after assistance ends?</li> <li>c) What is the likeliness of increased gender equality beyond the project end?</li> </ul>
5	Coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) To what extent did the assistance reach those affected? Which groups were considered, and which not?<sup>8</sup></li> <li>b) To what extent did certain parts of the target groups received support and/or protection or have been excluded?</li> </ul>
6	Coherence/ coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Were project activities coordinated with the communities and local stakeholders?</li> <li>b) What were political factors responsible for the coordination<sup>9</sup> of assistance or what made the latter more difficult?</li> </ul>
7	Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What changes did the project bring about?</li> <li>b) Were there any unplanned or unintended changes?</li> <li>c) To what extent will the gender-sensitive approach lead to an improved impact of the project?</li> </ul>
8	Cross-cutting issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) To what extent did the project design incorporate gender and environment? (i.e., gender analysis or gender-sensitive needs assessment, planning, implementation and results to be achieved? Or what are the broader effects of the project on individuals, environment, gender and age groups, IDPs/host-communities/returnees and institutions?</li> <li>b) What were the gender equality results and objectives achieved? Were gender mainstreaming principles adhered to by the project?</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> Humanitarian aid is generally planned as short-term interventions, yet should contribute to responses in the longer term, such as recovery or development.

<sup>8</sup> Disaggregated data (sex, governorate, age, socioeconomic categories)

<sup>9</sup> Security/military, development, humanitarian/ cluster policies, and coordination mechanism?