



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

---

The UN Migration Agency

# **Final Evaluation of IOM's Disaster Preparedness for Effective Response Project (PREPARE)**

**Office of the Inspector General  
June 2018**

# Table of Contents

Acronyms .....	2
Executive Summary .....	4
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.1 Background .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.2 Objective of the Evaluation .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.3 Evaluation Methodology .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2. Evaluation Findings.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.1 Relevance.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.2 Effectiveness.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.3 Efficiency .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>2.3 Impact.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2.3 Sustainability .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>3. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>3.1 Conclusions .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>3.2 Recommendations .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Annex 1 Terms of Reference .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Annex 2 Interviews and Bibliography .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Annex 3 Interview Guides.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Annex 4 Pictures from the Field Visit to Ulithi .....</b>	<b>68</b>

## Acronyms

CADRE	Community Action for Disaster Response
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCAP	Coastal Community Adaptation Project
CoFA	Compact of Free Association
CoM	Chief of Mission
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DCO	Disaster Coordination Officer
DECCEM	Department of Environment, Climate Change and Emergency Management
DMO	Disaster Management Office
DMRRP	Disaster, Mitigation, Relief and Reconstruction Programme
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DSAR	Disaster Search and Rescue
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
EFR	Emergency First Responder
EHA	Essentials of Humanitarian Assistance
EIA	Environment Impact Assessment
EMP	Environment Management Planning
EMMP	Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
ERCPS	Emergency Response Contingency Plans
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
IMC	International Medical Corps
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JDA	Joint Damage Assessment
JNAP	Joint National Action Plan
JRMN	Joint Risk Management Network
JSAP	Joint State Action Plan
NSP	National Strategic Plan
MCOF	Migration Crisis Operational Framework
MiGOF	Migration Governance Framework
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MS	Member State
NDRP	National Disaster Response Plan
NERP	National Emergency Response Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OEEM	Office of Environment and Emergency Management
OFDA	Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
OBP	Operational Blueprint
PREPARE	Disaster Preparedness for Effective Response Project

RCP	Reconstruction Contingency Plan
ROP	Response Operation Plan
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
TMRP	Typhoon Maysak Reconstruction Project
UNDAC	United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination
UNOCHA	UN Office for the Coordination of the Humanitarian Affairs
UNISDR	United National Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	World Food Programme
WG	Working Group
WUTMI	Women United Together Marshall Islands

## Executive Summary

The vulnerability of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands is on the rise due to the impending effects of climate change and natural disasters coupled with a high population density, poverty, remoteness of the islands and limited fresh water resources. The lack of resources and absorption capacities to support the disaster risk reduction (DRR) and disaster risk management (DRM) initiatives does not allow the countries to develop optimal institutional arrangements for disaster coordination and risk management.

The Disaster Preparedness for Effective Response Project (PREPARE), funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), is part of the long-term assistance to strengthen the institutional structures and improve resilience of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands in mitigating the effects of natural disasters through enhanced national and local capacities for disaster preparedness, response and recovery.

Using a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses, the final evaluation assessed the overall performance and achievements of PREPARE, as well as the impact and sustainability prospects under the national and local capacities.

PREPARE's relevance is evidenced in a close alignment with the governmental and international policy drivers for climate change, with the cross-sectoral nature of DRR, DRM and climate change, calling for a synchronised sectoral, regional and international cooperation.

The project effectively contributed to the strengthened preparedness for disasters in the provision of tools, materials and contingency plans already institutionalised by the island nations. The provision of targeted capacity building in disaster search and rescue, humanitarian assistance, emergency first responders and first aid in addition enhanced the resilience and self-reliance of the nations. The development and implementation of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) further streamlined the establishment of coordination mechanisms to prepare and respond to disasters. The community-level awareness of disasters increased through the radio communication campaigns, delivery of equipment to enhance receptivity of radio messaging and infrastructure works, enabling the broadcasting of messages to the outer islands.

PREPARE's post-disaster emergency response following the devastating effects of the super typhoon Maysak in March 2015 in the Federated States of Micronesia was impressive. The reconstruction and rehabilitation works in the affected States of Chuuk and Yap totalled USD 41.5 million and resulted in 422 new homes built and 153 public infrastructure projects finalised. The start-up vouchers distributed to 1,355 families for USD 2.7 million also supported the rehabilitation of damages.

Commendable flexibility exerted by the project to stay on track despite the adverse conditions in the Federated States of Micronesia is noted, especially in cases of a slow initial response of the Government to offer mitigation measures and conduct public outreach, in addition to the governmental changes, unmaterialized commitment to provide national vessels or information on public infrastructure. The donor coordination, communication and visibility, as confirmed by the

USAID Philippines and United States of America (US) Embassies in the countries, have been highly satisfactory.

Unfortunately, the high initial turnover of project management and use of short-term staff undermined the efficiency of PREPARE, as well as the prolonged internal recruitment procedures of over eight months. The Modification to Cooperative Agreement No. 12 was also awaited since November 2017 due to the donor considering new funding and an extension until the end of 2018, allowing the implementation of additional activities. The modification of the cooperative agreement was finalized in May 2018.

Overall, a positive impact has been noted as the operational framework for DRR and DRM has been established following the tested SOPs, with the tabletop exercises now co-owned by the Federated States of Micronesia project partners, being included in the Government budget. The process of revising the USAID Operational Blueprint (OBP) resulted in joint assessments, which now include: the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), USAID, state and national Governments as well as representatives from the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The established procedures enable the island nations to issue an appeal based on the identified priorities.

The unplanned positive effects from the distribution of menstrual hygiene kits and the *Cookhouse consultations* in the Republic of the Marshall Islands are seen through open discussions on topics previously considered as taboo and the change of attitude as both Governments became generally more interested and aware of the importance of the gender perspective in response to disasters (a gender perspective now is included in the development of disaster response plans or contingency plans).

Despite the progress made, the beneficiary countries are still not able to manage the impending effects of climate change, natural disasters and the unfavourable socio-economic conditions: the financial assistance from the US remains the primary source of revenue. There are visible instances of increased local ownership, such as policies set aside under 2019 budget preparation to include larger allocations for DRM or national contributions increasingly provided to the organization of annual outer islands focal point workshops and tabletop exercises. Limited human, resource and absorption capacities of the countries nevertheless remain the biggest impediments to taking the full ownership over PREPARE's results.

The main project partners expressed willingness to participate in the consultative process over the preparation of project's exit strategy but also in the planning and implementation of future projects, which, if adequately backed up by the national financial or in-kind contributions, are expected to enable a smoother implementation and increase sustainability prospects under future projects.

The evaluation recommendations relating to future interventions include designing a separate workplan for each country to properly account for their respective contexts and engagement levels. In addition, ensuring financial or in-kind national contributions prior to a project's start is expected to prevent potential risks from materializing. Moreover, the establishment of a Project Steering Committee, comprised of donor(s), project partners and project representatives, usually facilitates smooth project follow up and decision making. Finally, continued technical support is required for: disaster management offices and emergency operation centres in both countries; the process

of conducting vulnerability and environmental impact assessments; and, the institutionalization of various national DRR and joint risk management platforms.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

The two island nations of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands increasingly are enduring the impending effects of climate change, natural disasters (such as flooding, drought, typhoons, wave surges and tsunamis), on top of the physical, demographic, and socio-economic conditions of high population density, poverty, low elevation, limited fresh water resources and remoteness that further increase the islands' vulnerability. This is especially the case in the Republic of the Marshall Islands and outer islands in the Federated States of Micronesia.

Despite the above identified challenges, the institutional arrangements for disaster coordination are still not optimal due to the lack of dedicated staff and resources to support the national and local initiatives. Both Governments have recognised that tangible measures are needed at the policy, institutional and community levels to support DRR and DRM.

The international organizations, including USAID and IOM, have been long supporting the strengthening of capacity of local governments and civil society to enhance preparedness and response. The Government of the United States of America (USG) has been expediting the delivery of emergency and reconstruction assistance in the event of US Presidentially declared natural disasters in the two island nations since their independence in 1986. Following the signing related agreements between the respective host governments and USAID in 2008, IOM established offices in Majuro, Pohnpei and Yap including the warehouses for the secure storage of USAID relief commodities that can be released immediately upon donor's request. With funds from a complementary funded project, IOM opened offices in Chuuk and Kosrae several years later, thus establishing the very much needed presence in most major locations of both beneficiary countries.

PREPARE project, which was also built on lessons learned from the Disaster, Mitigation, Relief and Reconstruction Programme (DMRRP), is funded by USAID with a duration period of five years and six months (namely from 1 July 2013 until 30 December 2018) and a budget of USD 46.7 million.

The overall objective of PREPARE is “to contribute to improving resilience of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands in mitigating the effects of disasters by enhancing national and local capacities for disaster preparedness, response, and recovery and strengthening USAID/Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) response mechanisms”.

More specifically, the improved resilience is aimed to be achieved under the three stages of preparedness, response and reconstruction, through reaching the following results:

- (i) USAID and Federal partners are better prepared to respond expeditiously and comprehensively to US Presidentially declared disasters;
- (ii) Strengthened capacity of the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia and Republic of the Marshall Islands and non-government stakeholders to prepare for, respond to and recover from large and small-scale disasters;
- (iii) Strengthened capacity of USAID and Federal partners to implement recovery and reconstruction activities following a disaster;
- (iv) Operationally support USAID/OFDA during a post-disaster emergency response; and
- (v) Operationally support USAID, in a post-disaster period, in recovery and reconstruction consistent with the OPB.

## 1.2 Objective of the Evaluation

The current final evaluation exercise focuses on the analysis of the overall project performance under the stages of preparedness, response and reconstruction, and the impact and sustainability prospects achieved so far. The evaluation proposes actions for the future implementation of similar projects, either by up-scaling or adapting them to a similar context within the region.

The evaluation in addition examines the correlations and complementary approach used by IOM and donors in the field of DRR and DRM in the beneficiary countries, for instance USAID funded Coastal Community Adaptation Project (CCAP), the Australian-funded community-based Climate Adaptation, DRR and Education Programme as well as ongoing collaborations with existing partners, through forums such as the Joint Risk Management Network (JRMN).

As per the evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR), the overall objective of the evaluation is “to evaluate IOM overall performance and achievements in the implementation of PREPARE project, collaborative approach and strategy in improving resilience of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to mitigate the effects of disasters, and impact and sustainability prospects under national and local capacities for disaster preparedness, response and recovery”.

The evaluation examines the performance and achievements using the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria<sup>1</sup> of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact, and discusses sustainability prospects forthcoming from the implementation of the current and previous assistance. More specifically, the evaluation focuses on the following questions:

### Relevance:

- ✓ Was the project strategy consistent with the lessons learned from DMRRP and local and national government policies?
- ✓ Has the gender analysis been properly integrated in the intervention logic?
- ✓ Have potential environmental damages been adequately considered in the design?

---

<sup>1</sup> IOM Evaluation guidelines are based on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria, where evaluation is defined as an assessment “to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability” of efforts supported by aid agencies: [http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/main/site/about\\_iom/eva\\_techref/Evaluation\\_Guidelines\\_2006\\_1.pdf](http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/main/site/about_iom/eva_techref/Evaluation_Guidelines_2006_1.pdf); or <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

- ✓ Was the three-stage project approach appropriate to adequately support the overall organizational strategy on DRR?
- ✓ Was the phase-out (exit) strategy envisaged in project design?
- ✓ Were there any elements which could lead to the conclusion that the project strategy, objective and results needed to be adjusted?

**Effectiveness:**

- ✓ Was the project effective in reaching the planned results?
- ✓ Did changes in stakeholders' priorities affect the implementation of the project?
- ✓ Were the project partners actively involved in project implementation?
- ✓ Did the project results reach the target groups and beneficiaries as planned?
- ✓ Did the project take/plan appropriate measures to counter any unplanned negative effects?
- ✓ Did the project effectively coordinate with key actors to encourage synergies?
- ✓ Were there any unplanned positive effects on the results?
- ✓ Have IOM and donor communication and visibility guidelines been respected?

**Efficiency:**

- ✓ What measures have been taken to ensure that resources are efficiently used?
- ✓ Were project expenditures efficient to guarantee accountability and transparency?
- ✓ Were the project expenditures in line with the agreed budget?
- ✓ Could activities have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality of the results?

**Impact:**

- ✓ What were the major changes expected to occur during the implementation and did they occur during the lifetime of the project?
- ✓ What impacts are already apparent?
- ✓ Have any external factors jeopardised direct project impact?
- ✓ Have the target groups and other stakeholders already perceived any impact from project results?
- ✓ Were there any improvements in the FSM and RMI relating to decision making, information management, decentralized response capacity, gender equality?

**Sustainability:**

- ✓ Can activities, outputs and results be considered sustainable for the beneficiaries?
- ✓ Has the phase-out strategy or exit strategy been put in place?
- ✓ Have the capacities of project partners been properly developed (technically, financially and managerially)?
- ✓ Will sustainability of the project also be addressed by complementary activities implemented through other projects?

Detailed evaluation questions can be found in the ToR, Annex 1, and interview guides under Annex 3.

### 1.3 Evaluation Methodology

Mixed methods of quantitative and qualitative analysis have enabled the capturing of data, information and conclusions under the present exercise. Data has been obtained through a desk research and documentary review of the reports and papers produced by the project, government authorities, donor, UN and other international agencies, specialised task forces and other relevant entities actively involved in the field of DRR and DRM in the beneficiary countries.

Data produced by the monitoring database, dashboard reports, GIS mapping of critical infrastructure and utilities in all the islands and other analytical capabilities has in addition been examined to assess progress and achievements under key quantitative and qualitative performance indicators.

In addition, a series of interviews has been conducted with IOM project staff, government officials, donors, project beneficiaries, other agencies and partners having participated in the implementation of the project. The focus groups discussions with a number of beneficiaries and communities were also conducted to ensure that the views of the target groups are appropriately incorporated in the evaluation.

The field visit was conducted in April 2018 and the draft evaluation report made available to the IOM Office in Pohnpei by the end of May 2018. The cost of the evaluation has been borne by the Office of the Inspector General. The list of interviewees and bibliography can be found in Annex 2.

## 2. Evaluation Findings

In line with the overall objective for the evaluation, this section analyses overall performance and achievements of the project under the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

### 2.1 Relevance

The section examines the project's alignment with the governmental and international policies and other initiatives (USAID, IOM and non-IOM) and whether the overall objective and expected results have remained valid throughout the project lifetime. The beneficiary inputs in the project design have been verified (i.e. of the governments, migrants, communities), as well as the consideration of institutional and cultural factors, gender and environmental aspects.

The consistency of the project strategy has been assessed to determine if lessons learned from previous initiatives have been incorporated, to support the response and preparedness capacity of the national and state actors, the target groups and communities assisted. The appropriateness of the exit strategy has been examined to verify if adequately tackled in the design stage. Finally, the need for adjustment of the project strategy has been analysed, to ensure project's alignment with reality and other initiatives implemented under DRR and DRM in the beneficiary countries.

#### *Policy framework*

The alignment of the project's strategy with the governmental policies and international initiatives under DRR and DRM has been satisfactory. The cross-sectoral nature of DRR, DRM and climate change requires a greater awareness across several national agencies and calls for close sectoral, regional and international cooperation, which has been greatly supported by the project.

For the Federated States of Micronesia, the Multi-State Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan 2005 for four States (i.e. Yap, Chuuk, Pohnpei and Kosrae) remains the main Government framework dealing specifically with DRR, which also incorporates the national and state level mitigation plans for all hazards. The Federated States of Micronesia's National Climate Change Policy 2009 focuses on adaptation at the national, state and community levels to reduce the country's vulnerability to adverse impacts from climate change, to be achieved through "all development activities in the Federated States of Micronesia to consider projected climatic changes in the design and implementation" and "to integrate climate change into other policies, strategies and (sector) action plans including disaster preparedness and mitigation".

In addition, several sector plans, currently under finalization, such as the new agricultural policy, state that: "the competing demands on the environment and differentiated impacts of climate change must be assessed and taken into consideration when formulating strategies to address the development challenges". The project has been clearly supportive of the above frameworks, particularly through the capacity building and the drafting of strategic and operational frameworks.

The issue of disaster mitigation is referred to in most of the strategic plans, per actions identified in the Multi-State Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. Thus, the country has prepared the National Disaster Response Plan (NDRP) in 2016, that outlines arrangements for state disaster management, sets operational structures for DRM at the national and state levels, and lists main sectoral priorities and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks as minimum requirements to guide the development of Joint State Action Plans (JSAP) for DRM and climate change for each state.

In terms of legislation, respective states have also incorporated DRR into the respective legislative frameworks; the Kosrae State Law No. 10-2 (2011) for instance takes climate change and its adaptation into consideration for future development activities.

Regarding the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the National Climate Change Policy Framework 2011 sets out the Government's commitments to address the climate change and guides the preparation of sectoral policies and plans, including the Energy Policy and Action Plan (2012), the National Action Plan 2008–2018, the Climate Change Roadmap 2010, all developed through an inter-agency consultative process and subsequently adopted by the Cabinet.

Other national policies and strategic plans incorporating disaster management and response include the National Emergency Response Plan (NERP) 2010, the Airport Emergency Plan (2012) and the Drought Contingency Plan (2010). These documents, directly aligned with the project, provide direct linkages to the national and sectoral planning and development, where management of climate change risks and impacts are incorporated to ensure sustainable development of the country.

The Republic of the Marshall Islands National Strategic Plan (NSP) 2015–2017 in addition coordinates the medium-term development goals and objectives of the Government and lists sectoral priorities and M&E frameworks to guide the development the Joint National Action Plan (JNAP) for Climate Change Adaptation and DRM (2013–18). PREPARE targets development objectives and priorities under environment, climate change and resilience sector, such as the mainstreaming of risk reduction measures into resource management (under vulnerability assessment and DRR) and support to the establishment of coordinated system of international emergency response and humanitarian aid (under disaster management and response).

The Government framework and project strategy are also well aligned with the regional and international policy frameworks, including the main regional policy drivers for climate change, the Pacific Islands DRR and Disaster Management Framework for Action (2005–2015<sup>2</sup>) and the Pacific Regional Environment Programme Strategic Plan (2011–2015), which are closely guided by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change<sup>3</sup>.

An alignment with the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005–2015 and the Sendai Framework for DRR 2015–2030<sup>4</sup> has also been noted, along with the Sphere Humanitarian Principles<sup>5</sup> (i.e. the right to life with dignity, the right to receive humanitarian assistance and the

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/policies/v.php?id=34617>

<sup>3</sup> <https://unfccc.int/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/sendai-framework>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.spherehandbook.org/en/the-humanitarian-charter/>

right to protection and security) or with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness<sup>6</sup>. The HFA provided clear guidelines for a reduced disaster risk and vulnerabilities to natural hazards, assisting the efforts of nations and communities to become more resilient to, and cope better with the hazards, to substantially reduce disaster losses in lives. Coherence and collaboration across global and regional mechanisms and institutions has been facilitated by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR).

The 2011–2013 national HFA progress review contributed in both countries to the development of the Integrated Regional Strategy for DRM and JNAP and JSAPs for DRM and climate change. PREPARE has also been fully aligned with the long-term assistance priorities of the USG to support the national and local partners to formalise the DRR and DRM initiatives since their independence in 1986. The project’s intervention logic and three-stage approach have been supporting the Compacts of Free Association (CoFA), the agreements signed between the USG and each beneficiary country to advance the economic self-sufficiency. CoFA remains the main framework through which the USAID assistance is obligated.

The three project stages have been directly aligned with the USAID OBP 2008 and CoFA’s Article 1 on grant assistance (i.e. Title II, Economic Relations) Section I, referring to capacity building in the public sector, environment, humanitarian assistance and public infrastructure disaster assistance emergency fund, and Article, 10 (i.e. disaster preparedness and response) of the amended CoFA 2002.

PREPARE builds on the solid foundation created by previous USAID assistance to harmonize the national and sub-national DRM strategies with USAID’s Pacific Island Strategy (i.e. Intermediate Result 1.1 under Development Objective “resilience in communities strengthened” and sub-Intermediate Result 1.1.3, “disaster management strengthened) and the disaster assistance obligations under the Compacts.

The project is further aligned with USAID/OFDA priorities to support DRR and reduce the loss of lives and livelihoods during a disaster and to help communities become more resilient to future crises, in coordination with affected countries, other donors, international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Finally, the intervention logic feeds well into the IOM Country Strategies (2017–2020) for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, fitting well the two strategic priorities of (i) migrants and communities benefitting from migration as a sustainable development and climate change adaptation strategy; and, (ii) displaced persons and affected communities protected from and resilient to the impacts of natural disasters and climate change. Both priorities are clearly aligned with the UN and USAID Pacific Strategies, the Republic of the Marshall Islands Agenda 2020 and NSP 2013–2017 and the Federated States of Micronesia NDRP and JNAP 2016.

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/parisdeclarationandaccraagendaforaction.htm>

### *Institutional and cross-cutting aspects*

The institutional and cultural factors as well as the gender and environmental aspects have been appropriately considered in project's design. The good relations built since 2008 with the main project partners, as evidenced in the letters of support provided prior to project's start (i.e. the state Governments of Pohnpei, Chuuk, Yap, Kosrae, the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia Programme Management Unit and Office of Environment and Emergency Management (OEEM)) well reflect the commitment of stakeholders to the project.

The project's technical proposal has been developed in close coordination with government and civil society partners, including the workplans and M&E plan, to ensure PREPARE targets the institutional needs of beneficiary countries. By using the existing institutional capacities and initiatives of the host governments and civil society, the project's strategy further advanced the local and national capacities to strengthen the preparedness and response through development of the policy and strategic frameworks.

A close coordination with the project partners is particularly important during the response phase, as well as for the policy and planning purposes, as the countries have different administrative set-ups: the central administrative set-up of the Republic of the Marshall Islands provides for a more coordinated approach under the response and policy development processes, while the federal arrangement of the Federated States of Micronesia calls for an enhanced coordination and continuous dialogue during the consultation processes.

The views of gender and vulnerable groups have been appropriately considered through the needs assessment conducted prior to project start, and elaborated in the Gender Action Plan, rightly recognizing that disasters often disproportionately affect those already vulnerable in society such as children, the elderly, women or people living with disabilities. The plan details gender roles and the role of women in the beneficiary societies, to support the understanding of operational context for the project and the key role women play in community empowerment and resilience.

Women are traditionally not visible in the political domain and gender roles remain rigidly defined with the caste system still very much entrenched. Challenges inherent to gender roles and disparities have been properly identified, characterizing the countries' current contexts, such as patriarchal societies where men have leadership roles (such as traditional chiefs, mayors and most school principals), generally with a greater representation of males among educators also noted.

The project design recognised that it is critical that women be involved in all aspects of the decision-making process of the community, not only to empower women, but also to ensure the long-term mainstreaming of gender needs, community buy-in and participation. PREPARE aimed to "increase capability of women and girls to realise rights, determine the life outcomes, and influence decision making in households, communities and society" per USAID's 2012 Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> USAID's 2012 Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy. March 2012  
[http://transition.usaid.gov/our\\_work/policy\\_planning\\_and\\_learning/documents/GenderEqualityPolicy.pdf](http://transition.usaid.gov/our_work/policy_planning_and_learning/documents/GenderEqualityPolicy.pdf)

In addition, the technical proposal well incorporates the cultural factors, such as traditional knowledge and pride in the history of adaptation and resilience, while ensuring, as much as possible, the incorporation of local languages and cultural strengths into PREPARE’s intervention logic. PREPARE used the relationship networks built since 2008 with the non-state actors to enhance local capacities as well as coordination throughout all sectors with the signed teaming agreements with the main women associations and local non-state actors (such as, Pohnpei’s Women’s Advisory Council, Chuuk’s Women’s Council, Women United Together in Marshall Islands (WUTMI) and the Micronesian Red Cross Society, which plays a key role in disaster management) reflecting commitment to the project.

Finally, PREPARE recognises the critical importance of empowering the youth as ‘agents of change’ in the both societies; the signed teaming agreements with the two national colleges (i.e. College of Micronesia and College of the Marshal Islands) were attached to the technical proposal, to enable capacity building in disaster preparedness

In terms of the environment, the technical proposal (specifically, Result 3 and accompanying indicators) appropriately tackled environmental issues in the implementation of recovery and reconstruction activities following a disaster, through environmental assessments and regularly updated Reconstruction Contingency Plans (RCPs). PREPARE worked with the construction industry and training institutions to ensure safe and disaster resilient practices are incorporated into the construction training courses and management planning. The incorporation of environmental considerations in the RCP is planned to be done through the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA), Environment Management Planning (EMP) guidelines, and inclusive consultation workshops with key stakeholders to validate/endorse the RCP. PREPARE also envisaged to work with the emergency and environmental management offices, PMUs, the Environmental Protection Agencies, and other local conservation entities to provide technical advice in conducting EIAs.

The technical proposal envisaged the review of environmentally sound reconstruction practices through environmental evaluations. The environmental compliance with USAID’s requirements is planned to be ensured through the preparation of Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) to comply with USAID’s environmental regulations<sup>8</sup> per USAID Environmental Compliance Manual.

### *Project strategy*

The strategic approach of PREPARE is based on the understanding that stronger local capacity to prepare, respond to and recover from natural disasters facilitates a more effective response to USG declared disasters. It also supports the gradual take-over and increased ownership under disaster risk management to lead up to an enabling environment for a sustainable risk management structure.

The project incorporated, to the possible extent, concrete lessons learned from previous initiatives such as DMRPP, including a more targeted and strategic engagement with the emergency

---

<sup>8</sup> [https://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/environment/compliance/22cfr216](https://www.usaid.gov/our_work/environment/compliance/22cfr216)

management offices; enhanced warehouse management system with more appropriate pre-positioned supplies; improved M&E system for tracking short- and medium-term deliverables; increased consultation on housing designs and reconstruction modalities in the outer islands; strategic partnerships with the national colleges; enhanced assessment techniques for critical infrastructure; and increased testing of contingency plans through inter-agency simulation exercises. Additionally, through building community resilience to disasters and the effects of climate change under the Community Action for Disaster Response (CADRE) project, lessons learned from 50 participating CADRE communities were used to ensure state and national level policies and plans developed were grounded in a solid understanding of grassroots realities in the two island nations.

The technical proposal's exit strategy focuses on community buy-in, a participatory community approach and close working relationships with community leaders, local, state and national partners. The proposed mitigation measures tackle the identified risks (such as the lack of political support, limited local absorption capacity, inadequate technical assistance or training, deteriorating relations with stakeholders), enhanced project visibility, tailored DRR and DRM methodologies, tools, protocols, and training targeting local capacities and aiming to gradually prepare the countries for negotiations of CoFA beyond 2024 under more direct responsibility for disaster preparedness, relief and recovery.

Different administrative set-ups in the countries have also been considered, one central (the Republic of the Marshall Islands) and another federal (the Federated States of Micronesia). The modus operandi, however, was not fully tailored to address the individual contexts such as the different absorption capacities and engagement levels of the countries (more details are provided under the sub-section on effectiveness, external conditions and project's flexibility). PREPARE relied on IOM's solid sub-office structure and cost-sharing arrangements with other related programmes to facilitate a strong working relationship and skills transfer with the local governments, communities and civil society actors.

There was no need to significantly adjust the project strategy prepared by the IOM Regional Office Bangkok, DMRPP staff and the donor. The three-stage approach designed in the initial solicitation by USAID has been confirmed as relevant by project partners, and has continued to further advance the achievements of CADRE and DMRRP through the participatory community approach and the use of multi-sectoral data on the main population centres, critical infrastructure and data from hazard, vulnerability, capacity mapping, and contingency planning with outer islands.

The project was flexible enough to make changes over its lifetime to reflect the realities on the ground such as the activities related to some of the indicators discussed below. The use of IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) methodology standardised the process of data collection across the states, enabling the development of baselines to be used for M&E purposes and for future emergencies. However, the project design did not incorporate a specific strategy for each country, with tailor-made workplans reflecting individual country capacities and engagement levels.

The M&E plan for PREPARE was finalised in December 2014, after repeated consultations with the donor to improve the tracking system and record achievements per state and per quarter. Certain activities, outputs and indicators were tailored under Stage 1, as per the request of project partners or the donor (i.e. consolidated contingency plans covering rapid and slower-onset disasters were developed, or DECCEM and disaster coordination officers (DCOs) supporting the dissemination and capacity building of the initial disaster assessment form).

The indicators were modified in 2017 and the Indicator Tracking Table regularly updated, greatly facilitating the tracking of project achievements towards results, but modifications to the Logframe have not been made. For instance, the Logframe lists four outputs under Result 1 (strengthened 1.1 emergency response preparedness; 1.2 contingency plans; 1.3 readiness of disaster relief materials; and 1.4 capabilities of local disaster responders) while the Indicator Tracking Table lists three outputs under Result 1 (1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, with output 1.4. moved under Result 2). Some sub-office managers mentioned their lack of familiarity with the Logframe, collaborative agreement or technical proposal.

## CONCLUSION

The project remains highly relevant and closely aligned with governmental and international policy drivers under DRR and DRM; the beneficiary countries recently finalised the national and state strategic disaster response and management plans that clearly arrange the disaster management and operational structures for DRM at the national and state levels, and guide the process of developing the action plans for DRM and climate change.

The close coordination with government and civil society partners enabled the project to address the institutional priorities of the beneficiary countries. In addition, the relations built through previous projects with the government and non-state actors, as evidenced in the signed teaming agreements and letters of support, reflect the stakeholders' commitment to the project.

Thus, aside from adjustments requested by project partners or donor to better fit the Stage 1 outputs to beneficiary needs, there was no need to significantly adjust the project strategy during project lifetime. The evaluation noted that the Logframe has not been fully utilized, and that strategy and workplans customized to each country's contexts were not developed.

## RECOMMENDATION

For future projects, it is recommended to:

1. Synchronise the amendments to project design (namely, the outputs, activities, indicators) between the Logframe and Indicator Tracking Table, and share the Logframe with sub-office project management, staff and project partners to ensure the use of Logframe as project management and monitoring tool.
2. Design a strategy, workplan and activities specific to each country's context to appropriately reflect different absorption capacities and engagement levels.

## 2.2 Effectiveness

This section examines the extent to which the project has reached the planned results and contributed to the overall objective. It also analyses if the changes in policies and stakeholders' priorities affected the project's implementation and whether the project has been sufficiently flexible to adapt to changing external conditions.

The project partners' involvement in implementation is analysed to verify if the planned results have reached the target groups and if there was any need to counter any unplanned negative effects. The coordination between the project, national and local authorities, donor, communities, and other key actors is also examined, as well as the branding actions to verify the levels of awareness and visibility of donor, IOM and project achievements.

### *Results achievement*

The project has been effective in reaching the planned results, strongly contributing to its overall objective. The indicators have mostly been reached, in some cases exceeding expectations. In terms of individual result achievements, three results under Stage 1 (i.e. preparedness), have mostly been accomplished, as follows:

Outputs contributing to *Result 1* (preparedness for disasters) have mostly been delivered, including the preparedness tools, materials and contingency plans, considering the gender and vulnerable group needs, supporting the ability of beneficiary countries to prepare and respond to disasters, and thus enhancing the island countries resilience and self-reliance.

To name a few, the OBP was updated during 2015–2016 (discussed and revised jointly with the donor) and finalised in January 2017. Five Emergency Response Contingency Plans (ERCs) for rapid and slow on-set responses (four for the Federated States of Micronesia and one for the Republic of the Marshall Islands) were finalised by June 2017. Following the infrastructure surveys conducted in the Federated States of Micronesia by the end of 2016, the public infrastructure profiles were completed and shared with DECCEM in July 2017. The profiles feed into to the planning of joint damage assessments following a disaster, to be used as baseline information in the reconstruction phase. Regarding the Republic of the Marshall Islands, 60 infrastructure profiles have been prioritized for Majuro and Ebeye, with infrastructure surveys planned for the following months.

Information obtained through surveys has populated a public infrastructure database, to be used by USAID and beneficiary governments for future damage assessments. The government partners expressed willingness to manage the data collected in the infrastructure base.

National, state and community profiles were finalised for the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia and for its states (Pohnpei, Chuuk, Yap, and Kosrae) in December 2017, containing information critical for planning and implementing a response to a disaster. The Federated States of Micronesia's DECCEM and the Republic of the Marshall Islands' National Disaster Management Office (NDMO) confirmed that local ownership over state profiles is desirable, and expressed need for further IOM's support in this regard.

Significant capacity building supported the reinforcement of stakeholder capacities in Disaster Search and Rescue (DSAR), Essentials of Humanitarian Assistance (EHA), Emergency First Responder (EFR) and First Aid. The initial EHA curriculum was redesigned per project partners request to make the content more relevant and training of trainers (ToT) was completed in 2017 and successfully rolled out in the countries for government agencies and CSOs. More specifically, the new curriculum consists of five modules: (i) Principles of Humanitarian Assistance; (ii) Humanitarian Actors and Stakeholders; (iii) Evacuation Center Management; (iv) Protection during Emergencies; and (v) country-specific Post-Event Assessments.

The indicator of 100 participants per year for training participants has been. For the EHA and EFR trainings, the number of participants increased from 100 in 2013 to 200 participants in 2014. The focus for 2015 included grassroots organizations, civil society, environment-focused, youth and women's groups, with the female participation in the training courses recorded between 20 and 25 per cent. In 2017, 42 participants were trained in five EHA modules in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, while numbers varied for the Federated States of Micronesia<sup>9</sup> between 91 and 335 under all five modules. In 2018, 34 participants were trained in EHA in the Federated States of Micronesia<sup>10</sup>. There were in addition 190 people in the Federated States of Micronesia trained in EFR and DSAR, and 173 in the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

Under *Result 2* (strengthened capacity for disasters), following the NDRP endorsement in 2017, and as requested by the project partners, the national SOPs in the Federated States of Micronesia were drafted jointly with DECCEM by November 2017. The state level SOPs, (referred to as Response Operation Plans (ROPs) in the Logframe, for Yap, Chuuk, Pohnpei and Kosrae were drafted jointly with the respective DCOs.

The project in addition supported DECCEM to implement the SOPs. Tabletop exercises were organized in Chuuk, Kosrae and Yap (with plans currently drawn for Pohnpei) to ensure the national and state response plans are tested, the OBP process is clear, and the ability to manage a response is strengthened. In the Republic of the Marshall Islands, after reviewing the NERP jointly with the main project partner, NDMO, and relevant stakeholders, the SOPs are currently finalised and three-day tabletop exercises are planned to test the understanding of key response agencies regarding NERP, SOPs and OBP.

Standardised forms for post-event assessments have been adopted in each country; in the Federated States of Micronesia as the Initial Damage Assessment Form and in the Republic of the Marshall Islands as an Initial Situation Overview Form, with the capacity building conducted and incorporated under the EHA curriculum in June 2017.

Following several disasters occurring throughout the project's lifetime (details under Result 3), per project partners request, PREPARE implemented extensive radio communication campaigns with communities to boost the community-level awareness of disasters and strengthen the

---

<sup>9</sup> Module 1: 91; Module 2: 96; Module 3: 246; Module 4: 54; and Module 5: 335

<sup>10</sup> Modules 3 and 5 had 37 and 73 participants respectively

preparedness responsibilities. The campaigns included public safety announcements (PSA), early warning messages and DRM radio dramas.

The receptivity of radio messaging has been enhanced to enable the coverage and broadcast signal to furthest atolls and outer islands:

The Republic of the Marshall Islands	The Federated States of Micronesia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 622 durable hand-crank/solar radios distributed to community-level organizations (<i>Note: One radio retained by PREPARE for training purposes and the other damaged during transport</i>);</li> <li>✓ Upgrades to the AM medium-wave transmitters carried out in July 2017.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Works on Yap and Chuuk states radio stations completed in April 2018;</li> <li>✓ Pohnpei radio station works are pending due to prolonged coordination with US Department of Rural Development regarding funding.</li> </ul>

The findings from the survey on the perception of broadcasted programming conducted among communities that received solar radios showed that communities have followed both the English and Marshallese broadcasts and found the messages clear and helpful. One-day Radio Station Workshops have in addition been implemented in Yap, Kosrae and Chuuk by August 2017, detailing strategies of how radio stations could most effectively broadcast DRR messaging. Majuro and Pohnpei workshops are planned in the following months.

Under *Result 3* (recovery and reconstruction after a disaster), the RCP prepared in December 2016 through a community work group approach is used by both countries as an overall strategy containing housing designs, staffing plans, environmental compliance procedures and the internal forms consistent between the two countries. The project rightly intends to tailor certain sections of the RCP to the specificities of each country to enable a comprehensive plan to guide a reconstruction programme in the event of future disasters.

Outputs delivered under above Results supported the achievements under *Result 4* (post-disaster emergency response), Stage 2:

- ✓ The emergency response contingency plans facilitated proposal submissions and provided links to service providers;
- ✓ The reconstruction contingency plans informed the execution of reconstruction activities under Stage 3;
- ✓ The EHA training built skills of island mayors in needs-based assistance and understanding the responsibilities under the delivery of relief goods; and, most importantly;

- ✓ The relationships with national and state governments, the USG and private sector entities and regional suppliers have been well tested and utilized to execute reconstruction and rehabilitation of private and public infrastructure.

Disasters that occurred during the project's lifetime, including the 2013 and 2016 droughts in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Typhoons Hagupit (2014), Nangka and Dolphin (2015), the drought conditions following El Nino (2015) (a climate cycle in the Pacific Ocean), and other tropical storms provided opportunities for simulation. For instance, in coordination with the Pohnpei Utilities Corporation, the project predicted the Typhoon Dolphin conditions (i.e. passing close to Pohnpei) through installation of gensets at strategic locations and plugged into the municipal power grid to bolster municipal resilience to storm-related disruptions, which proved compatible with key water/power infrastructure prioritized for post-storm continuity.

But none of the disasters had the severity and devastating effects of the super typhoon Maysak, which prompted the Stage 3, and *Result 5* (recovery and reconstruction), to be implemented sooner than planned. Funding under Stages 2, emergency response, and Stage 3, recovery and reconstruction capacity, are activated only by a US Presidentially declared emergency. Typhoon Maysak traversed Chuuk and Yap states in the Federated States of Micronesia in March 2015, bringing destructive winds damaging houses, crops, and public infrastructure and reaching a super typhoon status (category 5) with sustained winds exceeding 160 miles per hour. The state, presidential and US Ambassador declarations of emergency were announced between March 30-April 2, 2015, followed by the US presidential disaster declaration on April 28, 2015, which authorized the release of emergency relief and reconstruction funding from FEMA.

IOM staff provided logistical support and participated as observers during the official PDA (i.e. including USAID, FEMA, DECCEM and DCOs), which utilized arrangements with the public and private sector entities and service providers established by PREPARE. The project provided the updated response contingency plan and two situation reports, which indicated no loss of life, but significant damage on the two states. IOM delivered emergency food (i.e. more than 2,000 metric tons of supplemental food assistance) and shelter assistance (i.e. plastic sheeting, tarpaulin and ropes to 908 households) to the affected communities, with the emergency response amounting to USD 15.0 million.

The Typhoon Maysak Reconstruction Programme (TMRP) was designed to support the affected communities rebuild homes, restore critical public infrastructure and repair utilities. The impressive achievements include the construction of new houses and public infrastructure projects, amounting USD 41.5 million, as seen in the table below. Depending on the level of damage, vouchers for reconstruction tool kits, equipment and assets were distributed in Chuuk to 1,167 households (amounting USD 2.5 million) and in Yap to 188 households (amounting to USD 0.2 million). The construction basics curriculum was in addition designed under TMRP, to train site supervisors and community focal points throughout 2017.

Reconstruction Activity	Status	% completed
1. Housing Assistance: Replacement Homes	422 new houses completed/handed-over (328 in Chuuk and 94 in Yap)	100%
2. Housing Assistance: Start-up vouchers for the rehabilitation of damaged houses	1,167 provided in Chuuk and 188 in Yap	100%
3. Public Infrastructure: Reconstruction	All 153 public infrastructures completed (Chuuk: 87, Yap: 66)	100%

The reconstruction works have unfortunately been delayed from the projected 18 months to three years due to numerous reasons:

- ✓ The bureaucracy of USAID, IOM and FEMA (i.e. legal requirements under the cooperative agreement between USAID and IOM, but also FEMA funding requirements, needed to be followed) prolonged the expediency of reconstruction.
- ✓ A prolonged delivery of materials by suppliers.
- ✓ Damages to ports (i.e. the broken crane and forklift impeded the offloading of materials in the Yap port) and ports closure due to Christmas and New Year’s holidays.
- ✓ Severe weather conditions (i.e. the supplier of rain water collection systems had to divert stocks to the Caribbean and the US due to hurricanes in North America). The project showed creativity and devised “first flush” or rain diverter system, a new way to remove contamination from water, which was approved by USAID, but the installation of the flush systems was prolonged for several months.

The inventory of left-over construction material was completed and equipment (skiff boats, barges and vehicles) was parked in the IOM warehouse in Chuuk and in rented spaces. The state public companies (Yap State Public Service Corporation and Federated States of Micronesia Telecommunications Corporation) currently are finalising the electrical works requested by the partners (copper versus fibre optic cable). Completion is expected for in June 2018; the latter work is closely monitored by IOM with site visits, photographs and percentage of completion is assessed.

*External conditions and project’s flexibility*

The changes happening in the operational environment in the Federated States of Micronesia affected somewhat the pace of implementation, but the project exerted commendable flexibility and adapted to external conditions to ensure results achievement. The lack of proactive preparedness and mitigation measures noted in 2015 due to political discrepancies between the national and state levels influenced the effectiveness of emergency response. The slow response

of the government officials to offer mitigation initiatives and public outreach was due to low resource and absorption capacities at the national level. PREPARE supported DECCEM to improve the staff capacity by seconding a national staff member twice a week until the government recruited two staff members within the emergency management structure in 2016.

Due to the change in the Yap administration in 2016, additional technical assistance was requested of the project, especially so due to challenges brought about by typhoon Maysak and the El Nino. PREPARE updated the State Disaster and Emergency Management Plan, which had not been updated since 2010 as old FEMA templates lacked the definitions required to execute early warning, onset and relief operations.

Additionally, a low cooperation from the state government departments was noted in 2017, as gathering public infrastructure lists and conducting infrastructure surveys proved to be a challenge, particularly in Chuuk. Some departments throughout the country were also hesitant to allow PREPARE engineers to take pictures of the infrastructure. Nonetheless, these challenges were communicated to OEEM and an overall infrastructure list was eventually provided to the project.

Similarly, following the presidential change, accessing the Federated States of Micronesia vessels proved impossible although previously committed by the project partner. Passenger and Cargo transportation between islands has hampered the rapid dispatch of emergency supplies in an emergency response situation, as the Government had only one field service ship to cover 271 square miles territory of the country. As the territory is vast, the vessel could only travel to the outer islands once a year. The Australian Navy donated three patrol boats to the Federated States of Micronesia and two boats to the Republic of the Marshall Islands to help enforce various fishing regulations. However, the two Governments have limited funds and the boats are chronically short of fuel and are usually docked in the ports. In order to bring the construction supplies to Yap, the project requested assistance from the national government, which was confirmed at first (i.e. as the boats supported the early response in Chuuk following Typhoon Maysak), but later on vessels were frequently retracted for state purposes. The project in the end reallocated budget lines and leased vessels to deliver 150 tonnes of construction materials.

Regarding the Republic of the Marshall Islands, although the presidential elections were organized during the project, there were no adverse effects on the project's implementation, as the new Government officials were ready to meet with project staff to establish close partnership relations from the onset.

IOM also showed flexibility to provide additional humanitarian assistance to migrants (i.e. per the Federated States of Micronesia Government request in 2014, the support was provided to boats with 55 Vietnamese and 36 Nepalese, Indian and Indonesians migrants), under the US Department of State's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons project (J/TIP) and victim assistance fund. Based on this experience, PREPARE created a pattern of assistance to meet the basic water, sanitation and shelter (WASH) needs for migrants, jointly with the Red Cross, through arranging regular distribution of culturally-appropriate and healthy food baskets with local vendors and lobbying for an increased level of support and service provision from the state and national actors.

PREPARE pioneered other initiatives such as community working groups, the voucher programme, the purchase of transport assets and vessel chartering mentioned under the Efficiency sub-section, showing its responsiveness to the adverse external conditions. Due to expensive and complex logistics, vouchers (rather than house repair kits) were piloted to allow beneficiaries to purchase individually or collectively from the selected vendors. Certain safeguards were put in place to ensure the funds could not be misused for drugs, alcohol and firearms.

### *Project partners and beneficiary involvement*

Direct project partners (DECCEM and NDMO), state governments, beneficiaries and civil society were consulted during the development of technical proposal, as are they now, during the implementation and steering of the project. IOM further strengthened partnership relations with the Governments and non-state actors in both countries, built during CADRE and DMRRP, through participatory recovery and reconstruction contingency planning and the provision of additional technical assistance and equipment.

Certain misunderstandings between the DMRRP and PREPARE approaches appeared during the initial project years, requiring that the project exert additional efforts to make the local counterparts and civil society understand the capacity and local ownership objectives of PREPARE. Whereas the DMRRP largely focused on the operationalization of USG financial assistance following the transition of responsibility from FEMA to USAID in 2008, PREPARE focused on enhancing preparedness through building community, national and state level capacities to manage disaster response and depend less on external assistance.

The support provided for the organization of the annual DRM conferences ensured local buy-in for the project: in 2014 four states in the Federated States of Micronesia requested technical assistance from PREPARE in the fine-tuning of SOPs, inviting PREPARE to participate in the El Nino Taskforce represented by state-level response agencies for utilities, telecommunications, and public safety; similarly, in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, following the state of disaster as a result of drought in 2013, and per NDMO's request, PREPARE supported the drafting of the immediate response and recovery plan.

The Republic of the Marshall Islands' project partners, NDMO and interviewed stakeholders (see Annex 2 for details) confirmed that PREPARE's support is well targeted and appreciated, especially under policy drafting, capacity building, information campaigns but also transportation. Since the ships cannot visit all the atolls due to previously mentioned constraints, cost-sharing efforts with IOM have helped ensure that time and funds are not wasted. The communication and update on the project implementation was described as regular and highly satisfactory.

The Federated States of Micronesia's project partners acknowledged that the communication and cooperation improved with the arrival of the new project manager for PREPARE. IOM participated in the annual state government and DCO meetings during which the priorities were discussed and to which IOM was invited to support either with technical assistance or funding. DECCEM confirmed that regular updates from PREPARE are missing, such as quarterly or annual reports or newsletters, as the counterparts are not aware of all the activities implemented under

PREPARE. The reconstruction projects, the certification of local construction workers, the building of government capacity and the tabletop exercises were confirmed as having been implemented in a highly satisfactory manner.

For future projects, DECCEM expressed the need to strengthen the local ownership by participating in project planning, implementation and steering of actions. Recognising its low absorption capacities, DECCEM expressed the need to have IOM's technical advisors work directly with DCO offices to strengthen their capacities and support smoother coordination and communication mechanisms between the national and state levels.

Visits to the Chuuk and Yap infrastructure sites were regularly conducted by the Federated States of Micronesia officials, to monitor the activities and, more importantly, to convey their support to the project. The Vice President, jointly with USAID, participated in the handover of the newly built houses.

The project results fully reached the target groups and final beneficiaries and indirect beneficiaries, such as the certified construction workers mentioned under Result 5. The criteria and definitions under the reconstruction project set by FEMA, relating to minor, major and total damage, were not entirely clear to some community members. PREPARE identified more beneficiaries than the donor concurred with during the initial assessments in the Federated States of Micronesia, and as certain beneficiaries did not qualify for the programme, frictions were noted among communities.

The quality of the construction work was commended by the final beneficiaries, who confirmed that "houses look sturdier than before". There were some isolated instances, such as the Falalop dispensary, which also serves as typhoon shelter, where advice from the beneficiaries was not followed, such as raising ceilings for the safety of patients but also to prevent lightbulbs from being stolen, which now regularly happens. A special tin for the roofs was not used, so parts of ceiling are now leaking, and, in some cases, old wiring was not replaced resulting in lights flickering.

Some humanitarian assistance had to be turned down as the donated clothes included high heels, considered inappropriate for a situation following a disaster. Some beneficiaries commented that the voucher programme made the local population too dependent and stimulated local economy only in the short term, as community members who had jobs in the construction for two years now had to go back to subsistence living. The high turnover of project staff was also criticized by some final beneficiaries and community members, as well as the conflicting information by different staff members and irregular communication and updates from PREPARE.

The Project Steering Committee was not established, which somewhat hindered local commitment (or its lack in the Federated States of Micronesia), regular follow up and easier decision making. The follow-up on project deliverables was, however, enabled to some extent through different networks. In 2016, DECCEM reactivated JRMN, but meetings were not organized until 2017 owing to time constraints of government officials. In the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the project is part of the National Disaster Committee, through which disaster-related efforts are coordinated and which convenes on an annual basis and, among other items, regularly discusses project implementation. The participants, besides IOM and USAID, include 16 Government and civil society stakeholders.

The project activities supported gender, human rights and good governance. Rapid needs assessments for women and girls have been conducted in the case of droughts in both countries, with technical assistance provided to integrate gender analysis in the disaster response and assessments (such as including gender differentiated questions and setting up a gender protection cluster).

Informal working groups for women in disasters, set up by the project in 2015 in the Republic of the Marshall Islands to assess women's needs in droughts through focus group discussions, became the *Cookhouse Confidential*, a menstrual hygiene management programme addressing women's hygiene in a context-specific, culturally-appropriate manner (i.e. per Sphere hygiene promotion standard 2: disaster-affected population has access to and is involved in identifying and promoting the use of hygiene items to ensure personal hygiene, health, dignity and well-being). WUTMI, the project's implementing partner, conducted the research to get a better understanding on how disasters impact women's abilities to manage menstrual hygiene. The result of the focus group discussions was the elaboration and distribution of hygiene kits for women.

CSOs confirmed IOM efforts towards supporting good governance and civil society inclusion in the Government's work and identified further needs, such as the inclusion of all outer islands in focus group discussions, improving the designated shelter areas to cater to the needs of women and to encourage female representation in the disaster management committees to be established in every island because previously, each time a committee was established, it was comprised only of male members. Another issue was related to the hygiene kits, as some of the beneficiary feedback included men's feedback who mentioned kits were not useful (in this instance, one survey per household was carried out, so if the only household member was a male this feedback was collected).

#### *Donor synergies and visibility under PREPARE*

There are attempts to coordinate and synchronize donor assistance, but the lack of capacities does not allow for the synergies to be fully government-led, in the form of a cluster or a country team for coordination. Examples of government efforts to ensure synergies were noted regarding the improved two-way radio communication equipment, as DECCEM requested PREPARE to postpone the activities until synergies with the Reach Out Pacific (REPAC) activities are ensured. REPAC is a Hawaiian NGO dedicated to improving healthcare services and education in the Federated States of Micronesia.

IOM ensures regular coordination with the national and local authorities, donor, communities, and other key players to avoid duplication, being engaged for more than a decade in the DRR and CCA sector through the implementation of complementary programmes in climate adaptation, DRR and education, and coastal protection programmes in both countries. PREPARE was designed with the Federated States of Micronesia 2014 objectives in mind to complement the European Union funded Building Safety and Resilience in the Pacific project (for USD 4.5 million) managed by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and DECCEM.

IOM is involved in multi-agency strategies and coordination bodies (such as JRMN in the Federated States of Micronesia; Coastal Management Advisory Counsel<sup>11</sup> in the Republic of the Marshall Islands) and provides technical assistance to the national governments in their international commitments to the HFA through the development of a national platform in the Federated States of Micronesia. In the Republic of the Marshall Islands, as IOM is among a few agencies based in Majuro, the coordination and consultation are ensured with all new initiatives to guarantee that assistance is well-coordinated. Support is also provided to the Division for International Development Assistance within the Ministry of Finance, willing to strengthen the coordination mechanisms to eliminate potential assistance overlap.

PREPARE improved the functionality of project partners (NDMO, DECCEM and state DCOs) through the provision of supplies and equipment (computers, printers, work stations, radios), re-establishment of the emergency phone line “911” for Pohnpei State Department of Public Safety and VHF/HF radios and receivers for DECCEM to bolster two-way communications with the outer islands. In the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the project supports the NDMO in developing and printing maps of all the atolls.

Since SPC obtained the European Union funding to expand the JRMN, the SPC and IOM have been working together to reinforce the JRMN platform to become the coordination forum for all partners involved in DRR, DRM and climate change to share information on individual actions to reduce duplication.

IOM further strengthens the assistance coordination by working closely with partners, such as SPC and the Micronesian Red Cross Society, through building the capacity of community outer island focal points, or with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) involved in the community DRR work. Regular contact is kept with the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies as well as the American Red Cross, to build the national red cross capacity, as well as with the embassies of US, Australia, Japan and China in the Federated States of Micronesia and the New Zealand in Honolulu, which provide funds, such as those by the Australian and New Zealand Governments, that can be disbursed within short timeframes.

Prevention of duplication is also noted among IOM projects but also other USAID projects; the organization of World Water Day and EFR training was conducted jointly with CADRE, as well as with the Governments of New Zealand and Australia regarding communication campaign and radios, identified through PREPARE and CADRE projects; and with USAID CCAP<sup>12</sup> that completed infrastructure adaptation projects and disaster preparedness and response plans across its partner communities across nine Pacific Island countries.

Other donors involved in DRR include the World Bank, which has a strong climate and disaster focus and works on the Green Climate Fund, and the German Agency for International Development. All efforts are well aligned with the JNAP, as PREPARE recently participated in the JNAP for DRM and CCA review in Majuro in coordination with the Pacific Island Forum.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://atollconservation.org/cmac/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.usaid.gov/pacific-islands/environment-and-global-climate-change/coastal-community-adaptation-project>

Regular contact is kept with the UN agencies, which frequently conduct site visits to the beneficiary countries. IOM updates UN Fiji and UN Office for the Coordination of the Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) on project activities and collaborates with the World Food Program (WFP) by hosting consultants to: conduct a training needs assessment and deliver the logistics and emergency response training in the Republic of the Marshall Islands; and, conduct a survey on access to radio programming throughout the Federated States of Micronesia. The latter are complementary to project's work.

In addition, the project partners noted good coordination under the WASH cluster in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, where IOM provides good technical and logistical support for organizing meetings and following up on action points. Food, health and logistics clusters exist as well, although they are not governmentally led. The cooperation is ensured with the UNISDR; on climate change, working with the SPC's Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission, UNISDR assists Island states in the Pacific to develop an Integrated Strategy that links disaster and climate risk management with sustainable development. The Pacific is the first region to move towards combined regional, national and sub-national efforts to reduce disaster and climate-related risks to sustainable national development.

The coordination and communication with the donor highly satisfactory, as confirmed by the USAID office in the Philippines and the US Embassies in the countries. The project's diligence has been highly commended, as has satisfaction been expressed with regards to: the achieved project results, the high responsiveness of the project manager and managers of sub-offices, and the facilitation of site visits to PREPARE's infrastructure sites and during PDAs.

The donor representatives recognized the challenges with donor coordination in the island nations and confirmed that there exists a serious gap. The relationships between the project and beneficiaries in the Republic of the Marshall Islands were noted to be strong, thanks to IOM's good partnership with NDMO. In the Federated States of Micronesia, despite the challenges brought about by the federal system, the donor was pleased with the positive impressions of direct beneficiaries under the reconstruction programme or training for government officials. The donor representatives also recognised that IOM responds well to USG challenging reconstruction and response requests (i.e. in navigating through requirements of OFDA, USAID Philippines, FEMA, US embassies).

In terms of the project's branding and visibility, following the initial flaws noted during the official PREPARE launch where the lack of visibility highlighting USAID's support of preparedness efforts was noted (the absence of multi-directional branding was noted as IOM staff attended the launch wearing blue IOM shirts which had not been co-branded with the USAID logo), the USAID branded materials –including shirts, banners, standing displays, warehouse items, relief non-food items– were well distributed throughout IOM offices in both countries. In addition, the project hired a dedicated media staff member to ensure conformance with USAID visibility and branding guidelines and increase PREPARE presence in social media, radio broadcasts, newsletters, one-pagers and local newspapers. The donor representatives commented however, that due to poor internet connections, not all beneficiaries have access to social media.

Events were regularly organized for the national, state and municipal government, traditional leadership members, and women's groups to ensure visibility, raise awareness and ensure that citizens are familiar with the basics of humanitarian needs-based assistance and the importance of assessments and information management.

For instance, PREPARE and CADRE co-organized the World Water Day lead by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and visited schools in Majuro and Ebeye where public information booths were installed and PREPARE interns engaged with community members to discuss El Nino, drought, water conservation and to hand out awareness materials. PREPARE also raised awareness of many communities several weeks prior to Typhoon Maysak, through the organization of meetings and radio broadcasts, thanks to which the communities had time to prepare for a disaster (such as in cases where trees were growing over houses, they were cut down to prevent any damage before arrival of a storm).

The information campaigns and public awareness activities fully respected the cultural contexts of the countries, for example for the early warning system project, campaigns were presented in local languages, were gender caution, with female participants on one side and male participants on the other, and respected seniority, speaking to the chiefs first.

The US embassies in both countries confirmed that the branding was strong and that project awareness has been a major achievement –if not the best among all assistance programmes– thanks to which the beneficiaries in the communities have greater acquired an awareness of the preparedness for and responding– to disasters. Challenges were also recognised, as awareness messages in English language, on social media, radio or in newspapers, could not reach the entire population.

## CONCLUSION

The project's effectiveness strongly contributed to resilience and self-reliance of island countries. Outputs under Stage 1 contributed to preparedness for disasters through the development of preparedness tools, materials and contingency plans, supporting the ability of beneficiary countries to prepare and respond to disasters, while those contributing to a strengthened capacity for disasters included the preparation and practical implementation of SOPs in the Federated States of Micronesia, with the process currently being finalized in the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Recovery and reconstruction after a disaster have been supported through the finalization of the RCP that is already used as the reconstruction contingency planning strategy in both countries. The post-disaster emergency response, under Stage 2, has been facilitated through the implementation of contingency plans that enabled proposal submissions and links to service providers, the execution of Stage 3 reconstruction activities proposed to USAID and the building of capacity in needs-based assistance and understanding the responsibilities under the delivery of relief goods.

The relationships between the governments, USG and private sector entities and regional suppliers have been well tested to enable the recovery and reconstruction achievements, under Stage 3, with nearly 100 per cent execution of the reconstruction and rehabilitation of private

and public infrastructure following the aftermath of the super typhoon Maysak. In addition, distribution of vouchers for reconstruction tool kits, equipment and assets supported the affected people whose houses were either damaged or destroyed during the typhoon.

The changes occurring in the operational environment in the Federated States of Micronesia affected somewhat the pace of implementation and showed lack of local commitment. Regarding the Republic of the Marshall Islands, there were no adverse effects on project's implementation or lack of local commitment. The Project Steering Committee was not established, due to which the local commitment (or the lack of it noted in the Federated States of Micronesia), regular follow up and easier decision making were not facilitated. The donor coordination, communication and visibility of PREPARE, as confirmed by USAID in the Philippines and US Embassies in the countries, have been highly satisfactory.

## RECOMMENDATION

The evaluation recommends to:

1. Provide the capacity building and facilitate the transfer of responsibilities over:
  - (i) State profiles to the countries' project partners; and
  - (ii) Public infrastructure database to USAID and countries' project partners, to be utilized during future damage assessments.
2. Design future projects in such a way as to:
  - (i) Ensure that written national commitments and contributions (financial or in-kind) are obtained prior to project start, with arrangements clearly communicated between the national to state levels to prevent materialization of risks (especially in the case of the Federated States of Micronesia). If national contributions are not possible, the budget needs to be designed accordingly.
  - (ii) Establish a Project Steering Committee, consisting of donor(s), project partner(s) and project management representatives to meet on quarterly or six-monthly basis to provide follow up and smooth decision making.
  - (iii) Consider additional means of communication, for example, radio, briefs in local languages, text messages, as poor internet conditions do not allow for all beneficiaries to have access to social media.
  - (iv) With low absorption capacities in the Federated States of Micronesia in mind, continue supporting the DECCEM and DCOs to improve staff absorption capacity.
  - (v) Exert additional efforts to explain the donor criteria and definitions to the final beneficiaries under future reconstruction efforts.

### 2.3 Efficiency

The subsection of efficiency examines project resources and how the inputs have been transferred into activities and outputs, and what measures have been undertaken to ensure resources are efficiently used. It also considers whether the project expenditures have been efficient to guarantee

accountability and transparency of the action and if the cost analysis was undertaken to support the reaching of results. The expenditures have been verified to check their alignment with the agreed budget and if the activities could have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results.

### *Input utilisation*

At the end of March 2018, when 86 per cent of project's time elapsed, inputs were utilized at 89 per cent (USD 43.7 million) with donor funding provided at 85 per cent (USD 41.7 million). The initial project budget of USD 19.7 million increased to a total amount of USD 46.7 million (with the total obligated amount of USD 49 million), per approved modification letters between IOM and the donor following the perceived beneficiary needs, the enactments of Stages 2 and 3 following the aftermath of Typhoon Maysak and accompanying US presidential disaster declarations.

The funding for the staff and office costs of USD 12.4 million, out of which USD 11.8 million or 95 per cent has been utilized by March 2018, was sufficient to support smooth project implementation, including demanding travel and transportation for the purposes of monitoring, training and coordination between the islands, equipment and supplies, project vehicles, office running costs, emergency communication (satellite phones and 2-way radios), capacity building, information and communication campaigns (including the preparation of Branding Strategy and Marketing Plan), and various technical inputs.

Funding from USAID has been delayed on several occasions throughout the project's lifetime, although by shifting funds from operational lines IOM could cover staff and office costs. The Modification to Cooperative Agreement No. 12 has been awaited since November 2017, with USAID providing new funding in May 2018, allowing the implementation of additional activities until the end of 2018. The modification of the cooperative agreement was finalized in May 2018.

The time extension is deemed appropriate, having in mind that the project inputs were not available at the project's inception. Following the start date of the cooperative agreement on 1 July 2013, the initial Project Manager<sup>13</sup> remotely managed the project until assuming the full-time duties in Pohnpei in August 2014. Both the Deputy Project Manager and Emergency Assistance Specialist only were hired in November 2014.

The recruitment of programme officers started around July 2014 but this was significantly delayed due to scarcity of appropriate candidates (i.e. not speaking two required languages – Pohnpeian and, preferably, one other outer island language; finding the required qualification of Bachelor degree in combination with relevant disaster management experience proved to be problematic). During 2014 and 2015, the project staff for eight offices was recruited and increased from 30 to 200 in 2016 with 75 per cent being local and 25 per cent international.

Due to differences of opinion on project strategy between the original Project Manager and project partners, the Project Manager was replaced in May 2016 and the deputy Project Manager in May

---

<sup>13</sup> The Chief of Party and Deputy Chief of Party per USAID's official title, which may be confused for Chief of Mission by project partners

2017. The replacement of key project staff and the recruitment process has been significantly delayed and lasted over eight months due to IOM internal procedures of centralizing Human Resources in the Regional Office in Bangkok.

Significant and complex procurement under PREPARE was facilitated by the IOM's Administrative Centre in Manila and the Global Procurement Unit as IOM and USAID procurement rules and regulations were followed. More precisely, rules of global competitiveness were applied to the procurement of high value charter ships.,

In May 2014, the USAID/OFDA provided funding under a separate agreement of one hundred thousand USD to enable IOM to continue renting the three warehouses in Pohnpei (which later was moved to Chuuk), Yap and Majuro. However, the amount was not sufficient to fund warehouse staffing, running costs and maintenance, servicing of supplies and generators. Consequently, the rest of the budget was subsidized by PREPARE, including the management staff for the warehouses. Warehouse inventories have been conducted regularly and warehouse inspections, such as the monitoring and maintenance of prepositioned supplies, on quarterly basis.

Tested systems for full exemption from customs duties and bilateral arrangements for expedited clearance of humanitarian relief items have been ensured. However, this was not the case under the vouchers scheme, which, after the repeated negotiations with the Federated States of Micronesia officials, have not been exempt from tax, ultimately resulting in the project paying for the difference.

Donor involvement and guidance during project implementation has been sufficient and frequent, with regular meetings and briefings conducted (i.e. weekly meetings for the implementation of Stage 3 activities), supporting smooth approval of contract modifications. M&E system established for the project was satisfactory, with regular evaluations and environmental assessments under TMRP in Chuuk and Yap conducted, including site inspections, interviews with beneficiaries and community work group leaders.

An environmental screening under public infrastructure and housing was conducted in March 2016 (depicting low environmental impacts due to small-scale construction works); an external evaluation of the TMRP building plans and house designs in November 2016; and, two evaluations of the project's environmental compliance against the approved EMMP (February and December 2017). The final evaluation of December 2017 identified the biggest set-back to compliance in a failure to timely produce the EMMP, which was only finalised in February 2016 due to a high turnover of management staff in the early project years. This delay resulted in additional costs: the procurement of materials was initiated prior to the EMMP approval (against USAID regulations), resulting in choosing the CCA-treated plywood, over safer and more agreeable alternatives, and causing costly mitigation measures with regards to disposal, chemical leakage and handling.

Nevertheless, the overall environmental findings show a good overall environmental compliance with significant improvements observed when compared to the February 2017 assessment, such as: community working groups trained, safe delivery of materials/equipment ensured, procurement errors rectified, personal protective equipment promoted to the extent possible within the cultural

context, efforts made to rectify the impact of CCA-treated plywood use and waste disposal managed well.

Regarding project reporting, regular and detailed updates were provided, including the quarterly performance and financial reports, annual progress reports and updates to the workplan and M&E plan, as well as weekly updates prepared under the TMRP project. Regular emails and phone briefings also supported the smooth follow up of this comprehensive project, with US officials confirming the relationship with IOM to be “fruitful, close and highly responsive”. Communication between the project management and staff also was reported to be smooth.

The project implemented cost saving measures to ensure cost efficiency and effectiveness under all three Stages, by sharing logistic costs, organizing joint meetings, reshuffling staff between different TMRP activities and the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands implementation sites. Cost analyses were regularly conducted and the project was innovative to ensure savings by engaging human resources from the affected communities in the construction process. The college partners offered their facilities at no costs, which reduced significantly the cost of training. Regarding the cash voucher programme implemented in Chuuk and Yap, studies were conducted to explore alternative methods or systems to distribute cash-based assistance in the event of future disaster responses and to analyse a sample of purchases to establish buying patterns and priorities, including qualitative data from beneficiaries and participant suppliers.

There were certain issues with project sub-contractors and delays (noted under the effectiveness subsection), such as with the Community Media for Development, not being able to finalise the radio dramas, PSA and theme songs. The project terminated the service agreement and worked with a local production company instead to ensure radio materials for the Federated States of Micronesia were developed.

### *Short-term recruitment*

As indicated earlier, the high turnover of project management and the inability to find technically qualified local staff impeded to some extent the efficiency of PREPARE. The project was forced to hire short-term staff in the Federated States of Micronesia to fill temporary staffing gaps and acquire specific technical expertise. These positions are often less than one year in duration (from three to nine months) and the recruitment and selection process is typically less cumbersome than applying to locally or internationally advertised professional posts.

Per internal recruitment procedures, the short-term staff could not be rehired after two contract extensions (totalling 12 months), which forced the project to hire new short-term staff again. The new staff needed to familiarize with the project, and after their contracts expired, the process had to be repeated, and at some points the project partners and donor representatives confirmed that there was no staff to support the response and reconstruction stages, which somewhat tainted the PREPARE image.

In addition, there were constant reshuffles of staff in the Federated States of Micronesia to get the right person for some jobs to respond to TMRP, which was questioned by both the donor and project partners. In terms of the operations in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, there was no significant turnover. PREPARE provided extensive feedback on the internal inefficiency of the centralised recruitment process to the Regional Office in Bangkok and Headquarters to find a solution as there was no Resource Management Officer in the islands.

The local staff was confirmed by both project management and its partners to be a strength in supporting the coordination between the project, its partners and beneficiaries, especially in the work with the community leaders. However, more specialized staff, such as information technology and media communication experts, human resources, radio consultants present full time in the country (as opposed to working remotely), were still lacking to enable fully efficient project operations and to provide technical assistance to government.

## CONCLUSION

The high turnover and untimely recruitment of project management impeded project's efficiency. Due to an inability to find technically qualified local staff, the project had to rely on short-term personnel recruitment in the Federated States of Micronesia. Hence, staff unfamiliarised with the project activities was hired, which tainted the PREPARE image to a certain extent. However, supervisors also managed to build effective teams of unskilled labour working daily, fit to work in the response. The prolonged internal recruitment procedures of over eight months delayed the project's efficiency.

Funding from USAID was delayed on couple of occasions during project's lifetime; the Modification to Cooperative Agreement No. 12 for instance was awaited since November 2017 due to the donor considering new funding and an extension until the end of 2018, allowing the implementation of additional new activities. The modification of the cooperative agreement was finalized in May 2018.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

IOM Headquarters and the Regional Office in Bangkok are recommended to identify internal procedural shortcomings that caused significant delays under PREPARE recruitment, and, jointly with project management, find solutions to improve new recruitments either through decentralized recruitment procedures or redesigning guidelines to enable efficient recruitment procedures under the emergency responses.

## 2.4 Impact

The section examines the achieved overall effect and benefits from project results and previous initiatives and assesses the external factors to determine if such factors might have jeopardised

direct project impact. Impacts already apparent or likely to be reached are analysed, to verify if such impacts can be specifically attributed to the project.

Views of target groups and stakeholders are verified to explore if any impact from project results is already perceived, relating to decision making, information management, decentralized response capacity, the needs of men, women, or vulnerable population groups, such as the elderly.

### *Direct project's impact*

Direct and positive impact is already visible from project actions. The operational framework for the DRR and DRM has been created, thanks to PREPARE and other stakeholders, through the development of Joint National and State Action Plans and SOPs to enable countries to gradually take ownership of DRM and climate change mitigation. The action plans provide direct linkages to the national and sectoral planning and development, where management of climate change risks and impacts are incorporated to ensure sustainable development of the country.

The SOPs detail the preparedness, response and reconstruction strategies, effective coordination mechanisms (in case of the Federated States of Micronesia between the three levels of government – national, state and municipality), and progress towards the achievement of HFA progress indicators, and directly address the recommendations identified in the HFA mid-term review, such as the missing links between policy and practice at the local and national levels, the provision of clear responsibilities, trained staff and clearly defined and accountable action plans to address the hazard exposure.

The implementation of SOPs ensured that the national and state response plans were tested in the Federated States of Micronesia; the OBP process is clear and the ability to manage a response is reinforced. The tabletop exercise is now co-managed by DECCEM as the Government is implementing SOPs for disaster management plans as well as communication channels and responsibilities also are established within the Government to manage an emergency response. PREPARE continues to co-fund, oversee and provide technical assistance to DECCEM to eventually fully lead the planning and facilitation of tabletop exercises on a regular annual basis. Visible impact is also expected in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, after the activities are fully implemented.

The project in addition revised the OBP to better identify hazard and natural disaster affected areas and households, and to ensure that beneficiaries who meet the criteria were selected for the reconstruction projects. The OBP revisions resulted in the joint assessments, which include FEMA, USAID, state/national government; determination of the targeted households is done during the joint assessment.

Direct impact is further noted in the boosted community-level awareness on disasters and strengthened preparedness responsibilities thanks to PREPARE's communication campaigns with communities via radio outreach and distribution of additional radio equipment that increased coverage and broadcast signal to lagoons and outer islands, used as early warning system to disseminate information on rapid onset.

Per PREPARE's primary objective to increase the capacity and oversight of disaster preparedness and response capacity, the island nations are now more able to issue an appeal based on their identified priorities. Following a disaster, the Republic of the Marshall Islands' National Disaster Committee endorses a multi-sectoral team, including IOM, to conduct in-depth damage and needs assessments in terms of logistics, infrastructure, health, agriculture, and WASH, which are the basis for the development of the response and recovery plan. Similarly, the states of the Federated States of Micronesia establish the taskforce, including IOM, to conduct assessments.

The technical support provided to Emergency Operations Centers (EOCs) in the Republic of the Marshall Islands for instance, resulted in partners' leading the 2016 draught assessment and management, proactively addressing the hazard and showing increased capacity to respond well in advance of its negative effects. The EOCs independently (i.e. without the support of United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) or UNOCHA teams) issued the nine-month immediate and near drought response plan in 2016, which well anticipated the prioritized activities in food security, WASH, health and logistics requiring USD 9 million to achieve. When the brief of joint assessment findings is presented, the US can more easily address what needs will be supported out of the recommended interventions provided in the immediate and near-term response plan, which is a visible impact from project actions.

The institutionalised forms and functions, such as assessment forms, outer island focal points in the Federated States of Micronesia, an individual, usually a traditional chief leader, who receives the training on assessment forms, cluster system, and community members in the Republic of the Marshall Islands show further evidence of increased government capacity to respond to disasters, which all have been tested and trained by the project.

Furthermore, the endorsed RCP now provides an overall strategy and comprehensive plan for the countries to guide a reconstruction programme in the event of future disasters. The RCP lists documents required to be prepared before a disaster occurs including: (i) a draft workplan template, (ii) a template of initial budget, and (iii) an implementation timeline. Other documents needed include: staffing plan, procurement/vendor information, EMMP, health and safety plan, inventory of public infrastructure, updated prices for house materials, updated housing designs, long term agreements and pre-positioned assets, review of procurement processes, funding transfer process and preparation for PDAs.

Visible and concrete impacts under Stage 3 following the Super Typhoon Maysak include 422 new houses constructed, 153 public infrastructures rebuilt, with 1,355 households receiving vouchers for materials and tools. The sustainable community development was achieved and strong image built of both USAID and IOM as active community partners, as project partners confirmed they would not be able to do it themselves.

As the response required to meet Sphere standard drinking water needs, impact was noted from donating reverse osmosis units (specifically water purification units) and capacity building provided to ensure their proper handling. Compared to the 2013 drought when the water tanks dried up, the Republic of the Marshall Islands' beneficiaries were more prepared in 2016 with clean drinking water available.

A slow behavioural change is also noted in terms of gender perspective, both governments got generally more interested and aware of the importance of the gender perspective in response to disasters thanks to the *Cookhouse Confidential* project in the Republic of the Marshall Islands that addresses women's health in the disasters, particularly drought, but with time also considering other disasters and the impacts of climate change. Both countries now try to include the gender equality in the development of disaster response plans or contingency plans, with women's role especially valuable in the outer islands where emergency teams are not readily available.

The increased mainstreaming of gender and disability, particularly during EHA training and different conferences supported by the project, as well as through intensified efforts to recruit female attendees and disability advocacy organizations, enabled higher awareness of populations living with disabilities, their needs and appropriate preparedness outreach. As a result of project efforts, female attendance in EHA training increased in Pohnpei; for instance, in 2017 from 25 per cent to 37 per cent. The voucher programme in Chuuk also used two additional signatories to boost female engagement.

Increased environmental awareness is also noted, through organizing trash collection or clean-up contests for the outer islands during Stage 2 activities; under Stage 3 environmental regulations were put in place, such as appropriate lumber treatment, aggregate usage (coarse to medium grained particulate material used in construction), and cleaning the sites following the completion of construction works. ROUs are for example solar powered.

#### *Unplanned positive and adverse impact*

Project partners confirmed that the emergency response in both countries has fully reached the target groups and beneficiaries. The unplanned positive impact is reflected in the engagement of human resources from the affected communities in the construction process. (The approach had an indirect economic impact of directing over USD 6 million toward sustainable community development, resulting in the cost-effectiveness and efficiency minimizing delays that accompany local labour as opposed to using contractors. Interestingly, FEMA was against this approach initially, perceiving significant liability to engage communities in the Federated States of Micronesia.

As local workers purchased tools and small materials from the local vendors and suppliers, the local economy was boosted, as was employment as local retailers were in a position to employ more people. The local construction workers in addition got certified, which enabled them to find jobs elsewhere as they could prove that skills were obtained during the implementation of the largest construction project in both states.

The menstrual hygiene kits and the *Cookhouse Confidential* consultations in the Republic of the Marshall Islands enabled open discussions on the topics that used to be taboo, which was not foreseen in the project design. Because of *Cookhouse Confidential* and hygiene kits, the Government was more interested and aware of the importance of gender perspective in response to disasters.

The final evaluation of the project’s environmental compliance against the approved EMMP (published in December 2017) found an indirect positive impact from the project after removing non-project related waste from the Yap outer islands, which resulted in a net positive for that region as the removal of the waste is above the planned mitigation measures.

Through hiring the local staff and engaging them in the community work with traditional leaders, a positive and unplanned impact was noticed as previously, churches and traditional leaders have been harder to access for IOM staff. Also, as confirmed by the project partners, CADRE started to incorporate DRR and DRM awareness raising activities in primary schools, in coordination with PREPARE.

There were also adverse impacts noted; some vouchers were used for purchasing boats, washers and driers for instance, which questions the fair access, distribution and income generating. Additionally, despite the agreement on the tax exemption status signed between IOM and the Federated States of Micronesia, the national and state governments were unwilling to grant IOM tax exemption for the vouchers. The donor was involved in resolving the situation, but the Government did not change its position and in the end the taxes were paid by the donor.

## CONCLUSION

Positive impact from the project is visible through the establishment of the operational framework for DRR and DRM, with tested SOPs and tabletop exercises now co-managed by DECCEM. The process of revising the USAID OBP resulted in joint assessments, which include FEMA, USAID, state/national governments and IOM representatives. The established procedures, per PREPARE’s primary objective to increase the capacity and oversight over disaster preparedness and response, enable the island nations to issue an appeal based on closely identified priorities. Positive impacts from the emergency food delivery, shelter assistance, construction of new houses, public infrastructure and employment of local workers are visible in more sustainable community development and stronger images of USAID and IOM as reliable community partners.

The unplanned positive effects from the distribution of menstrual hygiene kits and the *Cookhouse Confidential* consultations in the Republic of the Marshall Islands enabled open discussions on the topics that used to be taboo, which was not foreseen in the project design. The forthcoming behavioural change is seen in both governments gradually getting more interested and aware of the importance of gender perspective in response to disasters, with gender equality included in the development of disaster response plans, contingency plans and other documents.

Certain impeding impacts were also noted, in the case of the voucher programme, in case of purchasing items such as boats, washers and driers, which questions the fair access, distribution and income generating. Finally, despite USAID and IOM’s tax exemption status in the Federated States of Micronesia, the voucher scheme was not tax exempt.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

For future projects the Chief of Mission and Project Manager are advised to consider the impending factors under the voucher scheme and tax exemption, and to prepare clear mitigation measures to be potentially included as future national contributions.

## 2.5 Sustainability

The subsection of sustainability analyses whether project benefits can continue after the project's conclusion and what measures have been put in place to guarantee that the project results continue functioning without the external financial support. Activities, outputs and results are also examined to verify if sustainable for the beneficiaries in both countries.

The phase-out strategy is examined to ensure the handover of project's technical, managerial and capacity benefits is properly done. The capacities of project partners have also been analysed to verify if they were properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) to continue delivering the project's benefits, and if the sustainability is planned to be addressed by complementary activities implemented through other projects.

### *USG support*

Economic activity in the Federated States of Micronesia with a population of 105,000 mainly consisting of farming and fishing with a strong potential for tourism, but the lack of infrastructure and remote location hinder any concrete development. In the Republic of the Marshall Islands, with the population of slightly over 53,000, the main economic activities include the production of crafts and copra, tuna processing and a potential for tourism. The beneficiary countries are still not able to fight alone the impending effects of climate change, natural disasters and the unfavourable socio-economic conditions, due to which the financial assistance from the US remains the primary source of revenue.

The initial financial package under the first CoFA (Compact) was agreed for a period of 15 years (1986–2003), setting out mutual obligations regarding governmental, economic, security and defence relations, in addition to providing the financial assistance of circa USD 1.5 billion to the Federated States of Micronesia and USD 1 billion to the Republic of the Marshall Islands, in exchange for unrestricted exclusive access to the countries' economic zone and waterways for strategic purposes, and the denial of such access to other powers. The Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands used Compact financial assistance for general government operations, including health and education, economic development, capital improvements and special purposes.

A second financial package, the amended Compact, provided the USG financial assistance during a 20-year period (2004–2024, with the Federated States of Micronesia receiving roughly USD 2.1 billion and the Republic of the Marshall Islands USD 1.5 billion). The financial assistance provides grants for: education, health and medical care –being the highest priorities– and private sector

growth, the environment, public sector capacity building, and public infrastructure. Unlike the first financial package, which assisted the current consumption and investment, the amended Compact's financial package includes annual and escalating contributions to two separate trust funds designed to provide annual revenue streams after the annual US financial assistance is over.

The Compacts, which establish the relationship of free association between the USG, the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands do not expire after 2024<sup>14</sup>. The US expects to maintain its defence and security relationship with both countries indefinitely. Consistent with the overall goal of assisting the island nations in their efforts to achieve economic self-sufficiency, the United States intends to terminate annual mandatory financial assistance after 20 years, and replace it with the proceeds of a separate trust fund. The Compact nations will be able to utilize funds from a jointly-funded account –the Disaster Assistance Emergency Fund– following a State of Emergency. The United States is also currently negotiating an extension of certain Federal services for 20 more years, to be decided by the US Congress.

The United States intends to contribute to the trust fund, and expects the countries to contribute to the fund as well. It is important to note that the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands negotiations are on separate tracks. Each country's assistance is based on the demonstrated needs of that country rather than a general comparison of the two based on a simple per capita formula.

The NSP in the Republic of the Marshall Islands and Strategic Development Plan in the Federated States of Micronesia have been used by government leaders as the roadmap for development and progress in the medium term (2015–2017) and will be continually updated for use in meeting longer term objectives as the countries move towards the scheduled completion of CoFA. On its end, IOM conducts regular consultations with project partners and conducts informal needs assessments to be able to record lessons learned and design project proposals that will target future preparedness and disaster responses.

### *Local ownership*

The budget planning for 2019 started in both countries with policies set for DRM under which larger budget allocations are envisaged. Funds for the response fund under DRM are also currently allocated for the first time; previously the funding was made available from budget lines pertaining to health or education. This budget planning is critical to sustain PREPARE and its results.

National contributions to support PREPARE activities are also increasingly provided. The phase II under public infrastructure projects for instance was supposed to be finalised in September 2017 in the Federated States of Micronesia, but per beneficiary request the technical specifications were upgraded (copper vs. fiber optic cable) to better fit the beneficiary needs, with higher associated costs covered by the Federated States of Micronesia Telecommunications. In addition, NDMO and DECCEM increasingly contribute to project events, NDMO covers the expenses for the participants in the annual outer islands focal point workshops for instance, and DECCEM similarly

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/eap/rls/9656.htm>

covers the costs for the venue, per diems, and travel for the participants in tabletop exercises, under which the Federated States of Micronesia Government has taken co-ownership (jointly with PREPARE) and incorporated them in its annual workplans.

Although the Republic of the Marshall Islands remains more receptive in terms of absorption of capacity building, proactive government approach and setting up the institutional response, thanks to the head of NRMO who used to work with IOM for seven years, the Federated States of Micronesia Government is increasingly showing commitment. Additional budget and human resources are allocated, as seen in DECCEM becoming an independent department recently, with new staff and a boat acquired for the newly established DCO in Chuuk; two new staff members in the DCO in Yap; and one staff member in the DCO in Kosrae. The Republic of the Marshall Islands does not have a high staff turnover, compared to the Federated States of Micronesia where in states like Chuuk there were three DCO changes in one year.

By developing SOPs jointly with project partners, PREPARE strengthened government capacities to eventually play a leading role in coordinating local efforts and investments; however, partners noted that major constraints under the preparedness and risk reduction remain limited human, resource and absorption capacities. On the response side, the identified weakness remains the inability to immediately respond in case of disasters due to the lack of adequate resources or capacities to ensure that communities, households and infrastructure are restored to their previous, if not to an improved condition. The limited capacities remain the biggest issue in taking over PREPARE's activities and processes, to prepare the countries for negotiations of CoFA beyond 2024 under more direct ownership for disaster preparedness, relief and recovery. In addition, the effects of climate change are on the rise and are predicted to increase vulnerability of the islands.

Additional challenges that prevent the effective implementation of DRM arrangements in the case of the Federated States of Micronesia (per NDRP) include insufficient implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the Multi-State Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, the need for greater cooperation between national and state levels in streamlining SOPs, and the limited human, resource and functional capacity at state level due in part to government austerity programmes (for example early retirement of experienced staff). National and state DMOs remain under-resourced in terms of core operating budget, staff, and equipment, with the integrity of the development consent process and EIAs questioned.

The Republic of the Marshall Islands partners recognised challenges (also identified in NSP) such as the lack of clear mechanisms to undertake vulnerability assessments and DRR, as well as the lack of coordinated system of international emergency response and humanitarian aid (such as emergency protocols, local evacuation planning, establishment of disaster shelters and a centre for distributing relief supplies, community awareness on ways to prepare households and property for natural disasters, effective early warning system; continuity of government emergency operations centres). There is a major lack of capacity to carry out EIA under minor and major projects in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the National Disaster Committee is not institutionalized yet, which is not able to go beyond responsiveness in crisis towards preparedness and proactiveness.

Over the next two years some of the above challenges will be tackled by the World Bank project (namely the Community Vulnerability and Capacity Mapping Exercise and Assessment) which aims to strengthen the capacity of NDMO, by reviewing and updating NDMO's SOPs for emergency response for the different government agencies and ministries, and to work with the weather service office on early warning systems. The Government is already sending text messages about weather conditions such as high tidal waves, which supports awareness and preparedness efforts. The Republic of the Marshall Islands is also interested to develop a household registry. With 77,035 households in the country an active registry would allow better coordination and the provision of targeted assistance, especially to the more vulnerable households, for instance the lower income households, both in terms of preparedness and recovery.

Participants in the PREPARE's ToT stated that the timeframe of three days was not enough to cover the entire EHA curriculum. Project partners confirmed they have no access to the list of trainers (IOM staff) to ensure the capacity efforts are sustained and rolled out. The Marshall Islands Red Cross Society on the other hand signed the Memorandum of Understanding with the Ministry of Health and Human Services that certifies their unique capacity to conduct the First Aid Instructor training, to support the ambitious goal of having a first aid trained person in every single household in the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

The project addresses the exit strategy, as under Stage 3 the disposition plan is currently developed to include all assets over USD 5,000 and an inventory of the construction materials. Main project partners expressed willingness to participate in the process of preparing the project's exit strategy under all three stages, to discuss what aspects of the project could be continued by project partners to ensure accountability (e.g. warehouses, focal point training, capacity building efforts and communication with the outer islands). In addition, the partners expressed commitment to participate in the planning and implementation of future projects, which, if backed up by the national financial or in-kind contributions, is expected to enable smoother implementation and increase sustainability prospects under future projects.

## CONCLUSION

The beneficiary countries are still not able to fight alone the impeding effects of climate change, natural disasters and the unfavourable socio-economic conditions, due to which the financial assistance from the US remains the primary source of revenue. The US expects to maintain its defence and security relationship with both countries indefinitely, and is currently negotiating an extension of certain Federal services for 20 more years, to be decided by the US Congress.

The budget planning for 2019 started in both countries with policies set for DRM under which larger budget allocations are envisaged. Funds for the response fund under DRM are also currently allocated for the first time; previously the finding was made available from budget lines pertaining to health or education. This budget planning is critical to sustain PREPARE and its results.

Through development of SOPs, PREPARE ensured the governments' capacities are strengthened to play a leading role, in close coordination with local efforts and investments. Both countries also identified major constraints under preparedness and risk reduction in limited

capacity and resources. The identified weakness on the response side was the inability to immediately respond due to the lack of adequate resources or capacities to ensure communities, households and infrastructure are restored to their previous, if not to an improved condition. Similar weaknesses do not allow the sustainability of training efforts under EHA training, with project partners confirming that the timeframe for the trained was limited, and that contact list of trainers is not distributed.

Thus, limited human, resource and absorption capacities remain the biggest issue in taking over PREPARE's activities and processes, to prepare the countries for negotiations of CoFA beyond 2024, under more direct responsibility for disaster preparedness, relief and recovery.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Future projects should continue strengthening DMOs, EOCs, the capacity to conduct vulnerability assessments and EIAs, the process of institutionalizing National Disaster Committee in the Republic of the Marshall Islands and JRMN in the Federated States of Micronesia, and develop a household registry for the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

It is also recommended, as per a project partner request, to organize again the refresher Training of Trainers (ToT) under the EHA curriculum and discuss with project partners' modus to ensure that training efforts are sustained and ToT rolled out.

## 3. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

### 3.1 Conclusions

#### Relevance

The project remains highly relevant and closely aligned with governmental and international policy drivers under DRR and DRM; the beneficiary countries recently finalised the national and state strategic disaster response and management plans that clearly arrange the disaster management and operational structures for DRM at the national and state levels, and guide the process of developing the action plans for DRM and climate change.

The close coordination with government and civil society partners enabled the project to address the institutional priorities of the beneficiary countries. In addition, the relations built through previous projects with the government and non-state actors, as evidenced in the signed teaming agreements and letters of support, reflect the stakeholders' commitment to the project.

Thus, aside from adjustments requested by project partners or donor to better fit the Stage 1 outputs to beneficiary needs, there was no need to significantly adjust the project strategy during project lifetime. The evaluation noted that the Logframe has not been fully utilized, and that strategy and workplans customized to each country's contexts were not developed.

#### Effectiveness

The project's effectiveness strongly contributed to resilience and self-reliance of island countries. Outputs under Stage 1 contributed to preparedness for disasters through the development of preparedness tools, materials and contingency plans, supporting the ability of beneficiary countries to prepare and respond to disasters, while those contributing to a strengthened capacity for disasters included the preparation and practical implementation of SOPs in the Federated States of Micronesia, with the process currently being finalized in the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Recovery and reconstruction after a disaster have been supported through the finalization of the RCP that is already used as the reconstruction contingency planning strategy in both countries. The post-disaster emergency response, under Stage 2, has been facilitated through the implementation of contingency plans that enabled proposal submissions and links to service providers, the execution of Stage 3 reconstruction activities proposed to USAID and the building of capacity in needs-based assistance and understanding the responsibilities under the delivery of relief goods.

The relationships between the governments, USG and private sector entities and regional suppliers have been well tested to enable the recovery and reconstruction achievements, under Stage 3, with nearly 100 per cent execution of the reconstruction and rehabilitation of private and public infrastructure following the aftermath of the super typhoon Maysak. In addition, distribution of vouchers for reconstruction tool kits, equipment and assets supported the affected people whose houses were either damaged or destroyed during the typhoon.

The changes occurring in the operational environment in the Federated States of Micronesia affected somewhat the pace of implementation and showed lack of local commitment. Regarding the Republic of the Marshall Islands, there were no adverse effects on project's implementation or lack of local commitment. The Project Steering Committee was not established, due to which the local commitment (or the lack of it noted in the Federated States of Micronesia), regular follow up and easier decision making were not facilitated. The donor coordination, communication and visibility of PREPARE, as confirmed by USAID in the Philippines and US Embassies in the countries, have been highly satisfactory.

### Efficiency

The high turnover and untimely recruitment of project management impeded project's efficiency. Due to an inability to find technically qualified local staff, the project had to rely on short-term personnel recruitment in the Federated States of Micronesia. Hence, staff unfamiliarised with the project activities was hired, which tainted the PREPARE image to a certain extent. However, supervisors also managed to build effective teams of unskilled labour working daily, fit to work in the response. The prolonged internal recruitment procedures of over eight months delayed the project's efficiency.

Funding from USAID was delayed on couple of occasions during project's lifetime; the Modification to Cooperative Agreement No. 12 for instance was awaited since November 2017 due to the donor considering new funding and an extension until the end of 2018, allowing the implementation of additional activities. The modification of the cooperative agreement was finalized in May 2018.

### Impact

Positive impact from the project is visible through the establishment of the operational framework for DRR and DRM, with tested SOPs and tabletop exercises now co-managed by DECCEM. The process of revising the USAID OBP resulted in joint assessments, which include FEMA, USAID, state/national governments and IOM representatives. The established procedures, per PREPARE's primary objective to increase the capacity and oversight over disaster preparedness and response, enable the island nations to issue an appeal based on closely identified priorities. Positive impacts from the emergency food delivery, shelter assistance, construction of new houses, public infrastructure and employment of local workers are visible in more sustainable community development and stronger images of USAID and IOM as reliable community partners.

The unplanned positive effects from the distribution of menstrual hygiene kits and the *Cookhouse Confidential* consultations in the Republic of the Marshall Islands enabled open discussions on the topics that used to be taboo, which was not foreseen in the project design. The forthcoming behavioural change is seen in both governments gradually getting more interested and aware of the importance of gender perspective in response to disasters, with gender equality included in the development of disaster response plans, contingency plans and other documents.

Certain impeding impacts were also noted, in the case of the voucher programme, in case of purchasing items such as boats, washers and driers, which questions the fair access, distribution and income generating. Finally, despite USAID and IOM's tax exemption status in the Federated States of Micronesia, the voucher scheme was not tax exempt.

### Sustainability

The beneficiary countries are still not able to fight alone the impeding effects of climate change, natural disasters and the unfavourable socio-economic conditions, due to which the financial assistance from the US remains the primary source of revenue. The US expects to maintain its defence and security relationship with both countries indefinitely, and is currently negotiating an extension of certain Federal services for 20 more years, to be decided by the US Congress.

The budget planning for 2019 started in both countries with policies set for DRM under which larger budget allocations are envisaged. Funds for the response fund under DRM are also currently allocated for the first time; previously the finding was made available from budget lines pertaining to health or education. This budget planning is critical to sustain PREPARE and its results.

Through development of SOPs, PREPARE ensured the governments' capacities are strengthened to play a leading role, in close coordination with local efforts and investments. Both countries also identified major constraints under preparedness and risk reduction in limited capacity and resources. The identified weakness on the response side was the inability to immediately respond due to the lack of adequate resources or capacities to ensure communities, households and infrastructure are restored to their previous, if not to an improved condition. Similar weaknesses do not allow the sustainability of training efforts under EHA training, with project partners confirming that the timeframe for the trained was limited, and that contact list of trainers is not distributed.

Thus, limited human, resource and absorption capacities remain the biggest issue in taking over PREPARE's activities and processes, to prepare the countries for negotiations of CoFA beyond 2024, under more direct responsibility for disaster preparedness, relief and recovery.

## 3.2 Recommendations

### For PREPARE:

The evaluation recommends to:

1. Provide the capacity building and facilitate the transfer of responsibilities over: (i) State profiles to the countries' project partners; and (ii) Public infrastructure database to USAID and countries' project partners, to be utilized during future damage assessments.

2. Per a project partner request, to organize again the refresher Training of Trainers (ToT) under the EHA curriculum and discuss with project partners' modus to ensure that training efforts are sustained and ToT rolled out.

*For future DRR and DRM interventions:*

It is recommended to:

3. Synchronise the amendments to project design (namely the outputs, activities, indicators) between the Logframe and Indicator Tracking Table, and share the Logframe with sub-office project management, staff and project partners to ensure the use of Logframe as project management and monitoring tool.
4. Design a strategy, workplan and activities specific to each country's context to appropriately reflect different absorption capacities and engagement levels.
5. Ensure that written national commitments and contributions (financial or in-kind) are obtained prior to project start, with arrangements clearly communicated between the national to state levels to prevent materialization of risks (especially in the case of the Federated States of Micronesia). If national contributions are not possible, the budget needs to be designed accordingly.
6. Establish a Project Steering Committee, consisting of donor(s), project partner(s) and project management representatives to meet on quarterly or six-monthly basis to provide follow up and smooth decision making.
7. Consider additional means of communication, for example, radio, briefs in local languages, text messages, as poor internet conditions do not allow for all beneficiaries to have access to social media.
8. With low absorption capacities in the Federated States of Micronesia in mind, continue supporting the DECCEM and DCOs to improve staff absorption capacity.
9. Exert additional efforts to explain the donor criteria and definitions to the final beneficiaries under future reconstruction efforts.
10. Consider the impeding factors under the voucher scheme and tax exemption, and prepare clear mitigation measures to be potentially included as future national contributions.
11. Future projects should continue strengthening DMOs, EOCs, capacity to conduct vulnerability assessments and EIAs, the process of institutionalizing National Disaster Committee in the Republic of the Marshall Islands and JRMN in the Federated States of Micronesia, and develop a household registry for the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

On recruitment:

The IOM Headquarters and Regional Office Bangkok are recommended to:

12. Identify internal procedural shortcomings that caused significant delays under PREPARE recruitment, and jointly with project management find solutions to improve new recruitments either through decentralized recruitment procedures or redesigning guidelines to enable efficient recruitment procedures under the emergency responses.

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference

### FINAL EVALUATION OF THE IOM PROJECT “DISASTER PREPAREDNESS FOR EFFECTIVE RESPONSE (PREPARE)”

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE

---

##### 1. BACKGROUND

The island nations of Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands consist of over 1,700 islands (comprising 340 square miles), spanning 2,000 miles across the northwestern Pacific Ocean. Two island nations with a combined population of just over 155,000 are particularly vulnerable to natural disasters, the effects of climate change and geographic isolation, reinforcing the need for detailed preparedness planning. A number of disasters within the last decade, including flooding, drought, typhoons, wave surges and tsunamis, affected thousands of people and led to fatalities. Physical, demographic, and socio-economic conditions in addition exacerbate vulnerability to the above hazards, including high population density, poverty, low elevation, limited fresh water resources, rugged terrain or remoteness, which leave many disaster-prone communities isolated from resources and assistance.

Despite the above risks and the hazard-prone nature of the countries, formalized Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Disaster Risk Management (DRM) initiatives are still at the formative stage at both national and local levels. Disaster coordination and institutional arrangements for disaster response currently exist on paper in both countries (i.e. Cabinet level taskforce in the Federated States of Micronesia and the National Disaster Committee in the Republic of the Marshall Islands), as there is no dedicated staff or resources to support the initiatives. The Office of the Environment and Emergency Management in the Federated States of Micronesia and Office of the Chief Secretary in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, although responsible for secretariat functions, are tasked with a much wider mandate and the high-level disaster coordination bodies rarely meet. While it is encouraging to see a reinvigorated DRR policy environment that incorporates the effects of climate change, there is still significant lack of government capacity to engage in critical activities, such as leveraging community based efforts, effectively harnessing the private sector, promoting ownership of all preparedness plans, as well as testing and revising the plans.

Tangible measures are needed at the policy, institutional and community levels as well as strengthening the links between DRR and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)<sup>15</sup>. The Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands have acknowledged that to address the hazard exposure and inherent vulnerability of the island nations,

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.unisdr.org/we/advocate/climate-change>

the DRM policies need to be updated. Additionally, detailed and regularly tested operational plans are required with clear roles and responsibilities, trained staff and clearly defined and accountable action plans. Recently, international organizations, including IOM, have been working in partnership with relevant government stakeholders to update the existing policy framework by developing Joint National Action Plan (JNAP) on DRM and CCA in both countries. The strategic approach of PREPARE was built on lessons learned from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and IOM implemented Disaster, Mitigation, Relief and Reconstruction Programme (DMRRP), aiming to enhance resilience of the two nations by improving national and local capacities for disaster risk reduction, response, and recovery.

IOM is uniquely positioned to fully leverage infrastructure established, relationships and confidence built, as well as contextual knowledge gained during the initial USAID response to disaster and emergency preparedness. Based on lessons learned, IOM has partnered with International Medical Corps to utilize its global preparedness experience to provide additional technical inputs and expertise at targeted periods throughout the life of the project. PREPARE seeks to harmonize national and sub-national DRM strategies with USAID’s Pacific Island Strategy<sup>16</sup> and the disaster assistance obligations. Through a phased approach PREPARE focuses on strengthening preparedness (Stage 1), emergency response (Stage 2), and recovery and reconstruction capacity (Stage 3).

The main objective of the project is “*to contribute to improving resilience of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands in mitigating the effects of disasters by enhancing national and local capacities for disaster preparedness, response, and recovery and strengthening USAID/Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) response mechanisms*”. The PREPARE budget is USD 19.65 million funded by the USAID and duration is five years, from July 2013 to June 2018. More specifically, the project aims to achieve the following results:

#### Results under Stage 1: PREPAREDNESS

- (i) USAID and Federal partners are better prepared to respond expeditiously and comprehensively to US Presidentially declared disasters;
- (ii) Strengthened capacity of Government of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands and non-government stakeholders to prepare for, respond to and recover from large and small scale disasters;
- (iii) Strengthened capacity of USAID and Federal partners to implement recovery and reconstruction activities following a disaster.

#### Result under Stage 2: RESPONSE

- (iv) Operationally support USAID/OFDA during a post-disaster emergency response.

#### Result under Stage 3: RECONSTRUCTION

- (v) Operationally support USAID, in a post-disaster period, in recovery and reconstruction

---

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.usaid.gov/results-and-data/planning>

consistent with the Operational Blueprint.

## 2. OBJECTIVE FOR THE EVALUATION

The PREPARE technical application specified that during the lifetime of the project, USAID would conduct third party evaluations at critical points in the life of the project. In addition, to ensure internal project learning, IOM and IMC would conduct internal, formative evaluations or annual performance evaluations to ensure project results were being met. Until now, three internal evaluations took place (i.e. under Reconstruction contingency plan, Response contingency plan, RMI 2013 & 2016 drought cost analysis), one external evaluation (i.e. of Stage 3 “Reconstruction” house design by Build Change), an environmental evaluation of Stage 3 “Reconstruction”, and the reconstruction lessons learned workshop during the last week of February 2018, in view of the 6 months no-cost extension currently considered by the donor to bridge the current project until the next phase for which the funds are currently being allocated.

The current evaluation exercise will be considered as a summative, final, evaluation to analyse overall programme implementation and performance under three Stages, impact and sustainability prospects based on the lessons learned from both DMRRP and PREPARE projects, and propose actions for future implementation of similar projects (or continuation of the current project), either by scaling up the future projects or adapting them to a similar context within the region. The evaluation will in addition examine the correlations and complementary approach used by IOM and donors in the field of disaster risk reduction and disaster management in the beneficiary countries, for instance USAID funded Coastal Community Adaptation Project, Climate Change Adaption Project and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Project. Synergies will also be explored with the Australian-funded community-based Climate Adaptation, DRR and Education Programme as well as ongoing collaborations with existing partners, through forums such as the Joint Risk Management Network (JRM-N).

Thus, the objective for the evaluation is “*to evaluate IOM overall performance and achievements in the implementation of PREPARE project, collaborative approach and strategy in improving resilience of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to mitigate the effects of disasters, and impact and sustainability prospects under national and local capacities for disaster preparedness, response, and recovery*”. The evaluation will examine the performance and achievements through the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact, and will discuss sustainability prospects based on the benefits, if any, forthcoming from the implementation of DMRRP and PREPARE projects. More specifically:

Relevance will examine if the project has been responding adequately to detected issues, to what extent the project strategy has considered governmental policies and other initiatives (USAID, IOM and non-IOM) and to what extent the objective and expected results have remained valid throughout project lifetime:

- Was the project strategy consistent with the lessons learned from DMRRP and risks analysis conducted to support the response and preparedness capacity within the Federated States of

Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, including national and state actors, the target groups and the communities assisted?

- Was the project designed with the beneficiary inputs in mind (e.g. governments, migrants, communities, etc.) and was it relevant to local and national government policies, administrative capacities and institutional and cultural factors?
- Has the gender analysis been properly integrated in the project intervention logic, needs assessment, stakeholder analysis and other assessments and analyses?
- Have potential environmental damages and contributions been adequately considered in the project design?
- Was the three-stage project approach appropriate to adequately support the overall organizational strategy on DRR?
- Was the phase-out (exit) strategy envisaged in project design, including appropriate handover of project's technical, managerial and capacity benefits?
- Were there any elements which could lead to the conclusion that the project strategy, objective and results needed to be adjusted to have the project better aligned to reality and with other initiatives?

Effectiveness examines to what extent the implementation of the project reached the desired results and outcomes, analysing also the level of performance in contributing to the overall objective:

- Was the project effective in reaching the planned results and outcome and in bringing the anticipated changes?
- Did changes in policies and stakeholders' priorities affect the implementation of the project and was the project able to adapt to changing external conditions to ensure results achievement?
- Were the project partners actively involved in project implementation and steering of the action (i.e. evidence of a participatory recovery and reconstruction contingency planning)?
- Did the project results reach the target groups and beneficiaries as planned, and did it reach other indirect beneficiaries?
- Did the project take/plan appropriate measures to counter any unplanned negative effects on target groups (e.g. related to good environmental practices when negotiating additional contributions for DRR and DRM, gender related issues in line with the project approach to gender, human rights, good governance, or others)?
- Did the project effectively coordinate with the national and local government authorities, donor, communities, and other key actors to encourage synergies and avoid duplication?
- Were there any unplanned positive effects on the results? To what extent has this contributed/will contribute to improve project results?
- Have the IOM and donor communication and visibility guidelines been respected and actions implemented to increase awareness on and visibility of project achievements?

Efficiency analyses how well resources or inputs are used to undertake activities and converted to outputs and results:

- What measures have been taken to ensure that resources are efficiently used?
- Were project expenditures efficient to guarantee accountability and transparency, and was a global analysis of the costs incurred available to support reaching the results?
- Were the project expenditures in line with the agreed budget and consistent with the strategy of the project?
- Could activities have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results?

Impact examines the achieved effect, benefits from project results and direct and indirect impact from current and previous initiatives and assesses external factors to determine if such factors might have jeopardised direct project impact:

- What were the major changes expected to occur during the implementation and did they occur during the lifetime of the project?
- What impacts are already apparent or very likely to be reached (expected/unexpected and positive/negative) and can they be specifically attributed to the project?
- Have any external factors jeopardised direct project impact and did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?
- Have the target groups and other stakeholders already perceived any impact from the achieved project results?
- What can be observed in terms of frameworks in the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands relating to decision making, information management, decentralized response capacity while ensuring the needs of men, women, as well as vulnerable groups, such as elderly and the disabled, are addressed?

Sustainability analyses to what extent the project benefits continue after the conclusion of external support and what measures have been put in place to guarantee that the project results and benefits continue functioning without the external financial support:

- Can activities, outputs and results be considered sustainable for the beneficiaries in the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands regions (i.e. have the funds been made available to institutionally support the results? If so, by whom?).
- Has the phase-out strategy or exit strategy been put in place, including the handover of project's technical, managerial and capacity benefits?
- Have the capacities of project partners been properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) to continue delivering project's benefits (i.e. what capacities exist to deal with critical risks that could affect sustainability in terms of climate risks or risks of natural disasters)?
- Will sustainability of the project also be addressed by complementary activities implemented through other projects?

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

Mixed methods of quantitative and qualitative analysis will be used. The methodology will consist of a desk research and documentary review of the reports and documents produced by the project, government authorities, donor, UN and other international agencies, specialised task forces and other relevant entities actively involved in the field of DRR and DRM, including IOM main donors. Data produced by the monitoring database, dashboard reports, GIS mapping of critical infrastructure and utilities in all the islands and other analytical capabilities will be used to assess progress and achievements under key quantitative and qualitative performance indicators.

A series of interviews will be conducted with the IOM project staff, government officials and other agencies and partners having participated in the implementation of the project, as well as with the donor. The use of surveys and/or focus groups discussions with the beneficiaries and communities will be explored to make sure the views of target groups are appropriately incorporated during evaluation.

The IOM Office in Pohnpei, the Federated States of Micronesia, will be in charge of providing the necessary documentation related to project implementation and other projects and activities that could be relevant for the evaluation as well as coordinating interviews and discussions with relevant stakeholders. It can include regular activity/monitoring reports, letters, notes for the file of meetings, reports related to staff deployment, Memorandum of Understanding with government authorities (national and local), between agencies and with various partners when relevant to the analysis, and any other documentation that IOM in the Federated States of Micronesia considers important for the evaluation exercise.

OIG will conduct a field visit towards the end of first quarter of 2018, between the end of February and end of March 2018. A workplan will be established at the start of the evaluation, including a refinement of the methodology, and qualitative and quantitative tools used under evaluation.

### **4. RESOURCES AND TIMING**

The cost of the evaluation will be borne by the Office of the Inspector General and a draft report should be made available to IOM Office in Pohnpei by the end of April 2018.

## Annex 2: Interviews and Bibliography

### Interviews Conducted:

- 1) Stuart Simpson, IOM Chief of Mission, IOM Pohnpei (FSM);
- 2) Nathan Glancy, PREPARE Program Manager, IOM Pohnpei (FSM);
- 3) Ryan McVEY, PREPARE Deputy Program Manager, IOM Pohnpei, (FSM);
- 4) Philip Raffilpiy, IOM Head of Sub Office Yap, (FSM);
- 5) Angela Saunders, IOM Head of Sub-Office Majuro, (RMI);
- 6) James Lukan, Director, Yap State Disaster Coordination Office (FSM);
- 7) Faustino Yangmog, General Manager, Yap State Public Service Corporation (FSM);
- 8) Teresa Filepin, Director, Yap State Department of Education (FSM);
- 9) Manuel Maneichog, Director, Yap State Department of Transportation and Public Works (FSM);
- 10) John Rulmal Jr., Project Manager/Community Liaison, Ulithi Falalop Community Action Program (FSM);
- 11) Terence Fong, Vice Principal, Ulithi Falalop High School (FSM);
- 12) Zora Haleyaluw, Archie Yagsemal, and Ali Fong (Students), Ulithi Falalop High School (FSM);
- 13) Libertus V. Mangdou, Community Elder, Ulithi Falalop (FSM);
- 14) Mark Lureg, Doctor, Ulithi Falalop Dispensary (FSM);
- 15) Elina Paul, Assistant Director for Emergency Management, Department of Environment, Climate Change, and Emergency Management (FSM);
- 16) Joanne Cummings, Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy, (FSM);
- 17) Lynn Pangelinan, Political and Military Affairs Assistant, U.S. Embassy, (FSM);
- 18) Karen Stewart, U.S. Ambassador to the Marshall Islands, U.S. Embassy (RMI);
- 19) Deborah Murphy, Acting Regional Advisor, Pacific Islands USAID Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, U.S. Embassy (RMI);
- 20) Jack Niedenthal, Secretary General, Marshall Islands Red Cross Society (RMI);
- 21) Waylon Muller, Director of Administration and Finance, Ministry of Transportation and Communications (Logistics Cluster Lead), RMI;
- 22) Francine Wase Jacklick, Program Director, Ministry of Health and Human Services (RMI)
- 23) Timmy Langrine, Director, National Disaster Management Office, (RMI);
- 24) Kino Kabua, Deputy Secretary, National Disaster Management Office, (RMI);
- 25) Yetta Aliven, Information Management Officer, National Disaster Management Office, (RMI);
- 26) Jennifer DeBrum, JNAP Coordinator, National Disaster Management Office, (RMI);
- 27) Benjamin Graham, Chief Secretary, Office of the Chief Secretary (RMI);
- 28) Barry Jekkar, Education Specialist, Ministry of Culture and Internal Affairs (RMI);
- 29) Sashimi deBrum, Ministry of Culture and Internal Affairs (RMI);
- 30) Katie Relang, Former Executive Director, Women United Together Marshall Islands (RMI);
- 31) Marie Maddison, Acting Executive Director, Women United Together Marshall Islands (RMI);

- 32) Halston Wani deBrum, WASH Cluster Lead, Majuro Water Sewer Company (RMI);  
33) Jeremy Gustafson, Office Director for Environment, and  
34) Robert Pierce, General Development Office, Environment Office, USAID Philippines

## Bibliography

- FSM Government, *Multi-State Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan*, 2005;  
FSM Government, *National Climate Change Policy*, 2009;  
FSM Government, *National Progress Report on the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013)*;  
FSM Government, *Disaster Management Reference Handbook*, 2016;  
FSM Government, *Infrastructure Development Plan (2016-2025)*;  
FSM Government, *Strategic Development Plan (2004-2023)*;  
FSM Government, *National Disaster Response Plan*, 2016;  
FSM Pohnpei State, *Joint State Action Plan for DRM and Climate Change*, 2016;  
FSM Chuuk State, *Joint State Action Plan for DRM and Climate Change*, 2016;  
FSM Kosrae State, *Joint State Action Plan for DRM and Climate Change*, 2016;  
FSM Yap State, *Joint State Action Plan for DRM and Climate Change*, 2016;  
Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015);  
Integrated Regional Strategy for DRM and Climate Change (Roadmap), 2015;  
IOM, *PREPARE Technical Proposal and Project Budget*, 2013;  
IOM, *RMI and FSM Country Strategies (2017-2020)*;  
IOM – USAID, *Handbook*, 2005;  
Pacific Islands, *DRR and Disaster Management Framework for Action (2005-2015)*;  
Pacific Islands, *Regional Environment Programme Strategic Plan (2011-2015)*;  
PREPARE, *Rapid Assessment of the IOM Typhoon Maysak Reconstruction Project's Environmental Compliance*, 2017;  
PREPARE, *Final Evaluation of the Typhoon Maysak Reconstruction Project's Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan*, 2017;  
PREPARE, *Quarterly Progress Reports No. 1 to No. 19 with Indicator Tracking Tables*, 2013-2018;  
PREPARE, *Weekly Progress Reports for 2016, 2017 and 2018*;  
PREPARE, *Quarterly Financial and Accrual Reports for 2016-2017*;

PREPARE outputs and documents: *Monthly and quarterly newsletters; Emergency Response Contingency Plans, Reconstruction Contingency Plans, Environment Impact Assessment, Environment Management Planning Guidelines, Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan; Implementation agreements, payment schedules and disbursements of public utility corporations, Cancellations of infrastructure and house works, GIS data; Stage 1 State Profiles, Training Curricula on Early Responders, EHA, Warehouse Inspections, SOPs, TA outputs for project partners; Stage 2 RCP, Immediate Draught Response in RMI; Stage 3 revised project budget and work plan 2016, master schedule, personnel plan, Organisational chart, Quality assurance plans, Occupational health and safety plan, Media Outreach and Branding Strategy, Lessons Learned and Success Stories, Weekly meetings minutes with USAID 2016 and 2017, USAID Visit Briefings;*

RMI Government, *National Climate Change Policy Framework*, 2011;

RMI Government, *National Interim Progress Report on the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013)*;

RMI Government, *Energy Policy and Action Plan*, 2012;

RMI Government, *National Action Plan (2008-2018)*;

RMI Government, *Climate Change Roadmap*, 2010;

RMI Government, *National Strategic Plan (2015-2017)*;

RMI Government, *Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation and DRM (2014–2018)*;

RMI Government, *National Emergency Response Plan*, 2010;

RMI Ports Authority, *Airport Emergency Plan*, 2012;

RMI Government, *Drought Contingency Plan*, 2010;

UNISDR, *Summary Report on the Post-HFA National Consultations*, 2012;

UNISDR, *Country Risk Profile for FSM*, 2015;

UNISDR, *Country Risk Profile for RMI*, 2015;

USAID, *Partners in Advancing Sustainable, Resilient Development in the Pacific Islands*, 2016;

USAID, *Environmental Screening Report*, 2016;

USAID Asia, *Regional Development Cooperation Strategy for Asia (2014-2018)*;

USAID/FEMA, *Operational Blueprint for DRR in the FSM and RMI*, 2017;

USAID/FEMA, *Strategy for Disaster Mitigation and Reconstruction (2008–2023)*;

USAID and IOM, *Cooperative Agreement No. AID-492-A-13-00009*, July 2013;

USAID and PREPARE, *Modifications to Cooperative Agreement No. 1 to 11*, 2013-2017;

USG, *First Five Year Review of CoFA with FSM*, 2009;

USG, *Report to the Congress on CoFA with FSM and RMI, 2009 and 2010*;

USG and FMI, *CoFA (2004-2024)*, 2003;

USG and RMI, *CoFA (2004-2024)*, 2003;

Governments of US, FSM and RMI, *Compacts of Free Association (2004-2024)*;

**Internet sources:**

European Union Strategy on adaptation to climate change in 2013:

[https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/adaptation/what\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/adaptation/what_en)

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness:

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/parisdeclarationandaccraagendaforaction.htm>

Sendai Framework for DRR 2015-2030: <https://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/sendai-framework>

Sphere Humanitarian Principles: <http://www.spherehandbook.org/en/the-humanitarian-charter/>

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change: <https://unfccc.int/>

USAID's Pacific Island Strategy:

<https://pw.usembassy.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/282/2017/05/2016-USAID-Pacific-Islands-Development-Handbook-as-of-August-2016.pdf>

USAID, Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy 2012:

[http://transition.usaid.gov/our\\_work/policy\\_planning\\_and\\_learning/documents/GenderEqualityPolicy.pdf](http://transition.usaid.gov/our_work/policy_planning_and_learning/documents/GenderEqualityPolicy.pdf)

USAID, Environmental regulations per USAID Environmental Compliance Manual:

[https://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/environment/compliance/22cfr216](https://www.usaid.gov/our_work/environment/compliance/22cfr216)

## Annex 3: IOM Interview Guides

The questions were developed based on the documents perused serving as guiding questions only. Further questions and/or evaluation matrix can be developed based on the additional information obtained during PM/COM briefings, relating to the groups of interviewees who will be participating in the interviews, the time available for the interview and the discussion on-going between the evaluator and the interviewees.

<b><u>IOM (PM and COM)</u></b>	
<b><u>Relevance:</u></b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Was the project strategy consistent with the lessons learned from DMRRP and risks analysis conducted to support the response and preparedness capacity within FSM and RMI, including national and state actors, the target groups and the communities assisted?</li> <li>2) Was the project designed with the beneficiary inputs in mind (e.g. governments, migrants, communities, CSOs, etc.) and was it relevant to local and national government policies, administrative capacities and institutional and cultural factors? Have main project partners (i.e. IMC, OEEM, OCS, FMS, CMI, MRCS, NGOs) been consulted and involved in needs assessment?</li> <li>3) Has the gender analysis been properly integrated in the project intervention logic, needs assessment, stakeholder analysis and other assessments and analyses? Inclusion of Gender Action Plan in project proposal, was it IOM or donor originated (quite impressive btw)?</li> <li>4) Have potential environmental damages and contributions been adequately considered in the project design?</li> <li>5) Was the three-stage project approach appropriate to adequately support the overall organisational strategy on DRR? Could some other approach be considered instead?</li> <li>6) How were the project sites selected? Based on what risks? Was there a plan for identifying areas of significant risk in FSM and RMI and was the participatory approach used in the selection process? Have any communities been left behind?</li> <li>7) Was the phase-out (exit) strategy envisaged in project design, including appropriate handover of project's technical, managerial and capacity benefits?</li> </ol>

	8) Were there any elements which could lead to the conclusion that the project strategy, objective and results needed to be adjusted to have the project better aligned to reality and with other initiatives?
<b><u>Effectiveness:</u></b>	<p>9) Was the project effective in reaching the planned results and outcome and in bringing the anticipated changes? Can differences be noted when FSM and RMI are compared?</p> <p>10) Did changes in policies and stakeholders’ priorities affect the implementation of the project and was the project able to adapt to changing external conditions to ensure results achievement?</p> <p>11) Were the project partners actively involved in project implementation and steering of the action (i.e. evidence of a participatory recovery and reconstruction contingency planning)? How about the beneficiaries?</p> <p>12) Did the project results reach the target groups and beneficiaries as planned, and did it reach other indirect beneficiaries?</p> <p>13) Did the project take/plan appropriate measures to counter any unplanned negative effects on target groups (e.g. related to good environmental practices when negotiating additional contributions for DRR and DRM, gender related issues in line with the project approach to gender, human rights, good governance, or others)?</p> <p>14) Did the project effectively coordinate with the national and local government authorities, donor, communities, CSOs, and other key actors to encourage synergies and avoid duplication?</p> <p>15) What other donors are involved in DRR and do they have a mechanism to coordinate?</p> <p>16) Were there any unplanned positive effects on the results? To what extent has this contributed/will contribute to improve project results?</p> <p>17) Have the IOM and donor communication and visibility guidelines been respected and actions implemented to increase awareness on and visibility of project achievements?</p>
<b><u>Efficiency:</u></b>	18) What measures have been taken to ensure that resources are efficiently used? Were there any cost saving measures worth sharing beyond project context?

	<p>19) Is there anything that was not efficiently addressed by the project due to a lack of funding?</p> <p>20) What measures are in place to ensure procurement and recruitment are efficient? Where there any delays in the recruitment of project team? Why was the Deputy COP replaced?</p> <p>21) Were project expenditures efficient to guarantee accountability and transparency, and was a global analysis of the costs incurred available to support reaching the results?</p> <p>22) Were the project expenditures in line with the agreed budget and consistent with the strategy of the project? What is the current input utilisation, the end date March 31, 2018?</p> <p>23) Could activities have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results?</p> <p>24) Was the project successful in implementing more activities (delivering more outputs) for the same budget (going beyond ToR)?</p>
<p><b><u>Impact:</u></b></p>	<p>25) What were the major changes expected to occur during the implementation and did they occur during the lifetime of the project?</p> <p>26) What impacts are already apparent or very likely to be reached (expected/unexpected and positive/negative) and can they be specifically attributed to the project?</p> <p>27) Have any external factors jeopardised direct project impact and did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?</p> <p>28) Have the target groups and other stakeholders already perceived any impact from the achieved project results?</p> <p>29) What can be observed in terms of frameworks in the FSM and RMI relating to decision making, information management, decentralized response capacity while ensuring the needs of men, women, as well as vulnerable groups, such as elderly and the disabled, are addressed?</p>
<p><b><u>Sustainability:</u></b></p>	<p>30) Can activities, outputs and results be considered sustainable for the beneficiaries in the FSM and the RMI regions (i.e. have the funds been</p>

	<p>made available to institutionally support the results? If so, by whom?)?</p> <p>31) Has the phase-out strategy or exit strategy been put in place, including the handover of project’s technical, managerial and capacity benefits?</p> <p>32) Have the capacities of project partners been properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) to continue delivering project’s benefits (i.e. what capacities exist to deal with critical risks that could affect sustainability in terms of climate risks or risks of natural disasters)? Have the ToT been rolled out?</p> <p>33) Will sustainability of the project also be addressed by complementary activities implemented through other projects or the continuation of this project?</p> <p>34) Had the mission developed a fundraising strategy for DRR to ensure sustainability of project benefits?</p> <p>35) Can DRR related activities be sustainable in light of climate change and continuing adverse effects? Are there zones that are of particular risk due to climate change (or not)?</p>
--	--

<b><u>PROJECT PARTNERS AND STAKEHOLDERS</u></b>	
<b><u>Relevance:</u></b>	<p>1) Were you involved in project design? How were the project sites selected? Based on what risks? Have any communities been left behind??</p> <p>2) Do you participate in implementation, steering of the actions and if yes, can you provide details?</p> <p>3) How are the project objective(s) and outcomes aligned with partner government policies, in terms of JNAP on DRM and CCA, national and sub-national DRM strategies, but also other strategies such as Pacific Island Strategy? Is there any other policy the project is linked to?</p> <p>4) Do all key stakeholders and partners demonstrate effective commitment (ownership)?</p> <p>5) Are the project objective(s) and outcomes consistent with the needs of the beneficiaries? Does the implementation allow to address them satisfactorily?</p>

	<p>6) Does the project contribute to the present capacity of the local partners? Does it go beyond ToR to improve it?</p> <p>7) How do you see the coordination with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid duplication? Can the coordination be improved?</p> <p>8) Do any inter-institutional structures e.g. steering committees, monitoring systems, contribute to effective project implementation?</p> <p>9) Are the quality and effective implementation/production of the results/services in line with expectations and/or common quality standards?</p> <p>10) Do all beneficiaries and project partners have access to and/or are they using project results/services?</p> <p>11) Are there any factors which prevent beneficiaries and project partners from benefiting from/accessing the results/services?</p>
<p><b><u>Effectiveness/ Efficiency:</u></b></p>	<p>12) Have all partners been able to provide their financial and/or human resources contributions?</p> <p>13) Do you provide any contributions, either in funding or in-kind? If so, are they being acknowledged?</p> <p>14) Is the communication between you and the project satisfactory? Are you informed on project implementation? What is the quality of project reporting? Are you satisfied with the information provided and communication under the project? Are the CSOs involved in project?</p> <p>15) Are there any strengths and weaknesses in the coordination between the project and its partners (how about beneficiaries)?</p>
<p><b><u>Impact/ Sustainability</u></b></p>	<p>16) What impacts are already apparent or very likely to be reached (expected/unexpected and positive/negative) and can they be specifically attributed to the project?</p> <p>17) Can you describe what has IOM done so far relating to DRR/DRM and do you think that the 3-stage project strategy was the right strategy to address the disaster risks in the country? What could be done differently?</p> <p>18) Are there any external factors likely to jeopardise expected positive project</p>

	<p>impact?</p> <p>19) If the services/results have to be supported institutionally after closure of the project, are funds likely to be made available? If so, by whom?</p> <p>20) Do the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the services/products produced in the project framework?</p> <p>21) Are project partnerships being properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project’s benefits/services? What do you think of the ToT?</p> <p>22) How can DRR related activities be sustainable?</p>
<p><b><u>Cross Cutting Issues:</u></b></p>	<p>23) Have gender interests/problems been adequately considered in the project? What is the likeliness of increased gender equality and/or equity beyond project end?</p> <p>24) Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of human rights of migrants?</p> <p>25) Is the project respecting/addressing environmental needs/problems? Can this project be sustainable in light of climate change and continuing adverse effects? Are there zones that are of particular risk due to climate change (or not)?</p> <p>26) Have the communication and visibility actions for the project been implemented in an appropriate manner? How about information (public awareness) campaigns?</p> <p>27) So far, are there good practices inherent to the project which could be useful to share beyond the project context?</p> <p>28) Has the project already identified some good practices or success stories?</p> <p>29) Are there already some lessons to be learned from the project or recommendations for future interventions?</p>

<b><u>DONOR</u></b>	
	1) Was the project design stage coordinated with the national stakeholders in

<p><b><u>Relevance:</u></b></p>	<p>FSM and RMI and was the participatory approach used? Was it consistent with the previously implemented projects and aligned with country and donor strategies and policies relating to DRR? How about Pacific Island Strategy?</p> <p>2) Was the project relevant to local, national but also donor government policies, administrative capacities and institutional and cultural factors? Details?</p> <p>3) Have potential environmental damages and contributions been adequately considered in the project design? What about gender analysis? Was the Gender Action Plan adequate?</p> <p>4) Was the three-stage project approach appropriate to adequately support the overall organisational strategy on DRR? Could some other approach be considered instead?</p> <p>5) Were you satisfied with the selection of project sites? How were they selected, based on what risks? Have any communities been left behind? Was there a plan for identifying areas of significant risk in FSM and RMI and was the participatory approach used in the selection process?</p> <p>6) Was the phase-out (exit) strategy considered for the project as well as appropriate handover of project’s technical, managerial and capacity benefits?</p> <p>7) Was there any need to adjust project strategy, objective and results needed to have the project better aligned to reality and with other initiatives?</p>
<p><b><u>Effectiveness:</u></b></p>	<p>8) Was the project effective in reaching the planned results and outcome and in bringing the anticipated changes? Were there any changes in policies and stakeholders’ priorities to affect the implementation of the project?</p> <p>9) Was the project flexible enough to adapt to changing external conditions to ensure results achievement?</p> <p>10) What was the relationship between the project and its partners in both FSM and RMI? How about the relations with the target groups and beneficiaries? Indirect beneficiaries? Can you identify strengths and weaknesses?</p> <p>11) Did the project effectively coordinate with other similar projects and donors to encourage synergies and avoid duplication?</p>

	<p>12) Do donors coordinate amongst themselves effectively to determine and ensure the needs under DRR are adequately addressed? Can anything be done differently?</p> <p>13) Have the donor communication and visibility guidelines been respected and actions implemented to increase awareness on and visibility of project achievements?</p>
<b><u>Efficiency:</u></b>	<p>14) Were the project resources efficiently used? How about the procurement, recruitment and reconstruction under the project, were those processes efficiently, accountably and transparently implemented?</p> <p>15) What was the quality of project reporting? Were the reports timely submitted?</p> <p>16) What was the follow-up and communication under the project? Could anything be improved?</p>
<b><u>Impact:</u></b>	<p>17) What were the major changes occurring thanks to the implementation of this and previous projects? Did IOM specifically contribute to the improvement in DRR?</p> <p>18) Can any positive or negative effects be specifically attributed to the project or IOM?</p> <p>19) Have any external factors jeopardised direct project impact and did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?</p> <p>20) Have the target groups and other stakeholders already perceived any impact from the achieved project results?</p> <p>21) Have the frameworks in the FSM and RMI relating to decision making, information management, decentralized response capacity been improved?</p> <p>22) Were the needs of men, women, as well as vulnerable groups, such as elderly and the disabled, adequately addressed?</p>
<b><u>Sustainability</u></b>	<p>23) Can activities, outputs and results be considered sustainable for the beneficiaries in the FSM and the RMI regions (i.e. have the funds been made available to institutionally support the results? If so, by whom?).</p> <p>24) What do you think about project's exit strategy in terms of technical,</p>

	<p>managerial and capacity outcomes?</p> <p>25) Have the capacities of project partners been properly developed (technically, financially and managerially)? Could anything be done differently?</p> <p>26) Do you have any long-term plans for the countries and DRR? Do you plan to implement complementary activities through other projects?</p> <p>27) Can DRR related activities be sustainable in light of climate change and continuing adverse effects? Are there zones that are of particular risk due to climate change (or not)?</p>
--	--

<b><u>FINAL BENEFICIARIES</u></b>	
<b><u>Relevance:</u></b>	<p>1) How did you find out about IOM and the project? Were you involved in project design and later on in the selection of project sites, implementation? Have any communities been left behind?</p> <p>2) Do you believe that government and donors do enough to support you in terms of DRR? What hazards affect your community, and when was the last time you experienced hazards (floods waves, tsunamis, strong wind)?</p> <p>3) What can be done to support your needs even more?</p> <p>4) Do you have access to and/or are you using project results/services?</p> <p>5) Are there any factors to prevent you from benefiting from/accessing the results/services?</p>
<b><u>Effectiveness/ Efficiency:</u></b>	<p>6) Have you been invited (able) to provide your contributions to the project?</p> <p>7) What do you think about the communication between you and the project? Are you informed on project implementation? Are you satisfied with the information provided? Can anything be improved?</p> <p>8) Are there any strengths and weaknesses noted that can help us improve this or future projects?</p>
<b><u>Impact/ Sustainability:</u></b>	<p>9) Are there any positive or negative changes that can be attributed to the project or IOM?</p> <p>10) Can you describe what has IOM done so far relating to DRR/DRM? What could be done differently?</p>

	<p>11) What will happen when project ends? Will the services/results be supported institutionally or by other organisations?</p> <p>12) Do you have your own plans to continue project services/products?</p> <p>13) Have you been properly trained under the project?</p> <p>14) How can DRR related activities be sustainable?</p>
<p><b><u>Cross Cutting Issues:</u></b></p>	<p>15) Have gender interests/problems been adequately considered by the project? What do you think about gender equality and how is it addressed in your country?</p> <p>16) Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of human rights of migrants?</p> <p>17) Is the project respecting/addressing environmental needs/problems? Can this project be sustainable in light of climate change and continuing adverse effects? Are there zones that are of particular risk due to climate change (or not)?</p> <p>18) Have the project and IOM been visible enough? How about the donor and other stakeholders? What do you think about the awareness campaigns, if any?</p> <p>19) So far, are there good or bad practices inherent to the project? Are there any lessons to be learned or recommendations for this and future interventions?</p>

## Annex 4: Pictures from Field Visit to Ulithi Secondary School, Yap State

The field visit was conducted on 13 April 2018 to review the finalisation of public infrastructure reconstruction efforts conducted on the Outer Islands High School built in 1963 in Ulithi atoll, Falalop island. The reconstruction works are part of USAID's Typhoon Maysak Reconstruction Project, where USAID and IOM partnered to rebuild 66 public-use facilities damaged or destroyed by Typhoon Maysak throughout the Ulithi Atoll in March 2015.



