



INCEPTION REPORT

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT:

Reduction of Economic and Human Loss and Displacement by Natural Disasters through Community-based Resilience-building and the Capacity-building of the Government at All Levels in Papua New Guinea

Commissioned by the IOM mission in Papua New Guinea

Prepared by Joanie Durocher, IOM Evaluator

February 2023



Project funded by the

Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance

TABLE OF CONTENT

- 1. Introduction..... 3
- 2. Evaluation context..... 3
 - 2.1 Evaluation purpose..... 4
 - 2.2 Evaluation scope..... 4
 - 2.3 Evaluation criteria..... 5
 - 2.4 Evaluation Matrix 6
 - 2.5 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) 10
- 3. Methodology 11
 - 3.1 Data collection and analysis 11
 - 3.2 Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies..... 11
- 4. Workplan 12
- 5. List of annexes 12

- ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION
- ANNEX 2. AGENDA OF FIELD VISITS
- ANNEX 3. KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW (KII) GUIDE AND QUESTIONS
- ANNEX 4. DECLARATION ON CONSENT TO MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1. Introduction

Papua New Guinea (PNG) is prone to several natural hazards, such as volcanic activity, earthquakes, flooding, landslide, and sea-level rise. Such hazards often cause negative impacts such as the destruction of property, loss of human life, and population displacement. To *contribute to the reduction of economic and human loss and displacement by natural disasters through building community-based resilience and the capacity of government officials at all levels in Papua New Guinea*, IOM, the UN Migration Agency, has been implementing a variety of initiatives with communities and key stakeholders across the country.

The project *Reduction of economic and human loss and displacement by natural disasters through community-based resilience-building and the capacity-building of the government at all levels in Papua New Guinea*, which is funded by the Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) and implemented by the IOM mission in PNG, fits within this programmatic context. The project started on August 27, 2020, and was scheduled to end on February 26, 2022 (18 months). The project had a total budget of 2,800,000 USD. One request for no-cost extension and budget revision, the donor approved the no-cost extension for additional 12 months (to 30 months). In preparation for the end of the project on February 26, 2023, a final internal evaluation will take place.

The project builds more specifically on four separate outcomes:

- Outcome 1. The core national and international Disaster Management agencies and their coordination mechanisms effectively utilize available resources, especially trained human resources, to timely assess and respond to the areas affected by natural disasters and to increase preparedness and resilience to natural disasters in disaster-prone communities;
- Outcome 2. The Provincial Governments take actions to maintain their preparedness and respond to natural disasters in line with their respective Provincial DRM Strategies and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs);
- Outcome 4. Vulnerable communities in disaster-prone areas implement mitigation measures on disaster risks and maintain resilience; and
- Outcome 4. Long-term IDP communities are more integrated to host communities or reintegrated into their original lands.

The project activities were implemented through partnerships with key stakeholders, including the National Disaster Center (NDC), the Provincial Disaster Center (PDC), CBDRM committees, the donor, humanitarian partners, and other development actors. Moreover, the project is an integral part of the United Nations (UN) Joint Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Programme of Papua New Guinea. It supports the progress of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Framework (NDRRF) 2017-2030 within the framework of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2018 -2022 of PNG.

2. Evaluation context

The evaluation is commissioned by the Emergency and Disaster Management Unit (EDMU) and will be conducted by a certified internal IOM evaluator with the support of the IOM Regional Office in Bangkok, Thailand. It will focus on the achievements made at the time of the evaluation period and consider aspects related to the overall management and strategic scope of the project. Annexes to the final report will include the terms of reference of the evaluation, a list of the documents reviewed, a list of the persons interviewed, the field visits agenda, the present inception report (with all its annexes) as well as other relevant documents.

In line with the Terms of Reference (Annex 1) of the evaluation, this inception report is the first deliverable expected in the evaluation process. The report defines the general methodology, evaluation matrix, and work plan that will be followed in the conduct of the evaluation. It also articulates the criteria and questions that will guide the evaluation and allows the PMU to validate the data collection tools and methods. It is submitted and validated before the field missions. The final evaluation report is expected in March 2023.

2.1 Evaluation purpose

The purpose of this internal evaluation is to assess the achievement of results and sustainability of action and draw recommendations for the way forward based on the projects' progress and likely impact. The evaluation aims to inform an internal audience - the IOM country office team and specialized regional and global offices units - so that the lessons learned and recognized good practices are internalized and benefit future activities in this thematic area. Moreover, the evaluation aims to offer the donor an overall analysis of the sustainability and impact of the project at the end of its implementation. Specifically, the evaluation will:

1. Review the activities implemented, the results obtained, and the progresses made;
2. Analyze the progress toward achieving the objectives, results, and outcomes of the project;
3. Highlight the added value of the activities delivered during the project;
4. Highlight lessons learned and recommendations for further activities;
5. Measure the effectiveness of project management systems and tools; and
6. Identify gaps and related recommendations.

2.2 Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover the eight targeted CBDRM communities (Lanku, Tavana, Valaur, Biem Island, Zumara, Karel 1, Drimgas) in six provinces, including the Autonomous Region of Bougainville (AROB), East New Britain (ENB) Province, East Sepik Province (ESP), Morobe, Southern Highlands Province (SHP) and the Western Province (WP). The evaluation will cover the entire project duration, from August 27, 2020, to February 28, 2023.

Field visits will focus on the provinces of AROB, WP, and SHP and the national capital district. In Port Moresby, interviews will focus on the project staff, the donor, and the institutional beneficiaries at the national level. Other field visits and interviews with key stakeholders will focus on provincial and local beneficiaries, community members local staff. The detailed agenda of the visit can also be found in Annex B.

List of stakeholders / Meetings planned during the field visits		Locations
Leadership	COM	Port Moresby (POM)
Project Staff	Project Manager - Emergency and Disaster Management Unit (EDMU)	POM
	Project Team members (Simon Kafu, Peter MURORERA)	POM
	Project field staff (Quentin TALINGAPU)	Buka/AROB
	Project field staff (Sebastian HUOKOLI, Thomas MEK)	Mendi/SHP
	Project field staff (Philip Nere)	Kiunga/WP
	IOM RMU Head	POM
	IOM Procurement staff	POM
Authorities	Director National Disaster Centre (NDC) (Col. Carl H Wrakonei)	POM
	NDC Asst Director Corporate Coordination (Martin Mose)	POM
	NDC Asst Director Risk Management (Andrew Oaego)	POM
	NDC Disaster Risk Management Officer	POM
	WP Provincial Disaster Center (Max Maina, Willi John, Jeremiah James)	Kiunga/WP
	SHP Provincial Disaster Center (Peter Wari, John Kink)	Mendi/SHP
	AROB Provincial Disaster Center (John Emaka, John Lokobau)	Buka/AROB
	AROB Community Government (Puara Kamariti)	Buka/AROB
Partner	Disaster Management Team (Lindsay Lambi)	POM
	PNG Red Cross National DRR Manager (Lucinda Nawayap)	POM
	National Weather Service Assist Director (Kasis Inape)	POM
Beneficiaries	Drim Gas, Western Province (beneficiary of CBDRM)	WP/Drim Gas
	Karel, Southern Highland (beneficiary of CBDRM)	SH/ Karel
	Topa, Southern Highland (beneficiary of ES/NFI distribution)	SH/Topa
	Lemanu Manu/ AROB (beneficiary of CBDRM)	AROB/ Lemanu Manu
Donor	Rep. BHA/USAID (Joe Curry)	Manila
	US Embassy (Lesli Davis)	POM

2.3 Evaluation criteria

In compliance with the IOM Project Handbook, the IOM Evaluation Policy, the OECD Evaluation Criteria and other relevant guidance regarding gender and human rights, the final evaluation will be articulated around 6 criteria, including relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The evaluation will also look into the project's gender sensitivity.

Relevance:

1. Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objectives?
2. Does the project meet the needs of the beneficiaries?

Coherence:

3. Do the project activities and outputs consider relevant national policies and IOM guidelines?
4. To what extent does the project create synergies and linkages with other interventions implemented in the same thematic area, or previous projects implemented by IOM?

Effectiveness:

5. Have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?
6. Are the target beneficiaries satisfied with the services provided?
7. What are the major factors influencing the achievement of the project's expected outcomes?
8. To what extent has the project adapted to changing external conditions to ensure project outcomes?

Efficiency

9. How well are the resources (funds, expertise, and time) being converted into results?
10. Was the project implemented in an efficient way compared to alternative means of implementation?
11. Were the project activities undertaken, and were the outputs delivered on time? To what extent are activities implemented as scheduled?

Impact

12. Which positive/negative and intended/unintended effects are being produced by the project?
13. Does the impact come from the project activities, from external factors, or both?
14. Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?

Sustainability:

15. Are structures, resources, and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?
16. Is the project supported by local institutions and well-integrated into local social and cultural structures?
17. To what extent have target groups and possibly other relevant interest groups/stakeholders been involved in the planning/implementation process?
18. Do the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the outputs in the project framework?

The following evaluation matrix provides the list of all the specific questions that have been developed in order to assess project performances in light of the general criteria.

2.4 Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators (*Key performance indicators bolded)	Data collection tools and methods							
			Desk review	Visits	Interviews					Focus Groups
					IOM	Authorities	Partners	Beneficiaries	Donor	
Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right things?										
1. Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the outcomes and outputs well supported by the indicators? Is there any gap or issue in the logical framework? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence and quality of the Theory of change for the project interventions. Quality and alignment of the indicators to support the objectives and outcomes. 	X							
2. Does the project meet the needs of the beneficiaries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were the needs of the beneficiaries at the onset of the project? Did the context/needs evolve over time? If so, how was the project adapted? How was the project adapted based on the feedback received from key partners? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of the initial needs' assessment. Examples of the ways local needs were considered for project adaption. Capacity of the project to adequately adjust to meet the needs of beneficiaries, as reflected in needs analysis, changes in activities, targets, tools, approaches. 	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?										
3. Do the project activities and outputs consider relevant national policies and IOM guidelines?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which national strategies and priorities does the project address or align with? What are the main IOM guidelines considered during the implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which the EDMU is aware of national policies and IOM guidelines. Examples of the way the project influenced or contributed to national policies and strategic development in the relevant thematic area. 								
4. To what extent does the project create synergies and linkages with other interventions implemented in the same thematic area, or previous projects implemented by IOM?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This project builds on a previous project implemented by IOM. How complementary are these projects? Are there similar projects implemented by other agencies in the same communities? If so, how does IOM ensure synergies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of synergies between projects and incremental changes over time. Existence of structured coordination mechanisms; meeting notes demonstrating increased coordination and adjustments to increase synergies. 	X		X					

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators (*Key performance indicators bolded)	Data collection tools and methods							
			Desk review	Visits	Interviews					Focus Groups
					IOM	Authorities	Partners	Beneficiaries	Donor	
Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?										
5. Have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the project results? If changes were made to the targets over the course of the project, explain why? How do the outputs contribute to the achievement of the outcomes/objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which the targets were reached within the timelines scheduled. Changes made to the targets were discussed and agreed with the donor. 	X		X	X	X		X	
6. Are the targeted beneficiaries satisfied with the services provided?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are central-level government officials (incl. National Disaster Centre) // sub-national government (Provincial district and local) officials // members of the Disaster Management Team // key informants from communities/IDPs satisfied with the activities conducted? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General satisfaction of beneficiaries (quantitative and qualitative feedback, lessons learned, etc.) Existence of monitoring reports, qualitative interviews with beneficiaries and partners. 					X			
7. What are the main factors influencing the achievement of the expected results of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What factors impacted the implementation of this project the most? How did these factors influence the course of the project? To what extent? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of the project contexts and risks, reflected in reports and interviews. Diversity of the factors enumerated (e.g., internal, external) and risks monitoring. 	X		X				X	
8. To what extent has the project adapted or can it adapt to the changing external situation to ensure that direct effects are met?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When and how were monitoring and evaluation activities carried out? What was learned during the implementation of the project? How did the project change or adapt? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of coordination and monitoring mechanisms, including risks monitoring, allow for learnings and adaptations. Extent to which the changes contributed to achieve results or mitigate risks. Examples of ways the M&E informs decisions and implementation. 	X		X	X	X		X	
Efficiency: How well are resources being used?										
9. To what extent have resources (funds, technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the project objectives reached out with the budget, staff and time initially dedicated to the project? If not, why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost-benefit analysis of the results. Extent of the financial monitoring done as part of the project life cycle. 	X		X					

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators (*Key performance indicators bolded)	Data collection tools and methods							
			Desk review	Visits	Interviews					Focus Groups
					IOM	Authorities	Partners	Beneficiaries	Donor	
skills and time) been converted into results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project require a cost or non-cost extension? If so, why? Did the project require a budget reallocation? If so, why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of the budgetary changes requested, and quality of the justifications provided. 								
10. Was the project implemented in an efficient way compared to other implementation strategies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the staff structure contribute to the efficient management of the project? With regards to the project's implementation strategy, what was key for its success? What did not work well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of standard project management tools and coordination mechanisms. Examples of ways in which the project's implementation strategy was successful. 	X		X	X	X		X	X
11. Were the project activities undertaken, and were the outputs delivered on time? To what extent are activities implemented as scheduled?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was there an inception period for the project start? What hiring was required? Were there changes in project management during implementation? Was the project implemented as per the initial workplan? If not, why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability of the EDMU to anticipate problems and delays/react rapidly. Use of standard project management tools and coordination mechanisms. 	X		X					
Impact: What difference does the intervention make?										
12. Which positive/negative and intended/unintended effects are being produced by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What change do you observe in the communities and with the main governmental stakeholders? Do you observe other positive or negative unexpected changes that can be linked to the project implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of increased capacities and preparedness by responders in target communities and institutions. Impacts listed by KIIs and reports (positive/negative, intended/unintended). 	X		X	X	X		X	X
13. Does the impact come from project activities, external factors, or both?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you feel the project will have a lasting impact on disaster risk reduction in PNG? What other projects or developments have contributed to these changes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External sources discussing the impact and contribution of this project/other projects. Extent to which stakeholders feel the project will have a lasting impact in PNG. 	X		X	X	X		X	X
14. Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a risks matrix for this project? What was done to mitigate internal and external risks throughout the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of the mitigation and risks management efforts made to ensure achievement of outputs/outcomes. 	X		X				X	X

Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators (*Key performance indicators bolded)	Data collection tools and methods							
			Desk review	Visits	Interviews					Focus Groups
					IOM	Authorities	Partners	Beneficiaries	Donor	
Sustainability: Will the benefits last?										
15. Are structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you ensure that results will last? What are the most critical elements for the project's outcomes to last? Is there a need for a next project? If so, has it been discussed (ex. funding). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports and mechanisms define how the activities will be continued. Level of ownership of the processes, tools and capacities gained during the project (CBRMD, Community planning, CCCM and DTM trainings, DRM Strategies and SOPs, Manuals, Database, Pamphlets, etc.). 	X		X	X	X			X
16. Is the project supported by local institutions and integrated into local social and cultural structures?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did the project build on existing disaster management tools, mechanisms, structures. Are some of the activities planned to continue through trained trainers within the NDC, PDCs, DMT /Secretariat? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of ways in which local institutions and local social and cultural structures plan to build on project results. 	X		X	X	X			X
17. To what extent have target groups and possibly other relevant interest groups/stakeholders been involved in the planning /implementation process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the mechanisms in place to foster participation/consultations? Were these mechanisms functioning throughout the project duration and who was in charge of them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which stakeholders felt involved in the project's implementation. Participation and consultation were well integrated as part of the project life cycle. Examples of ways participation improved ownership, accountability, and efficiency 								
18. Do the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the outputs in the project framework?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the partners feel prepared and equipped to continue to support the project objectives after it ends? Did the institutional partners earmark resources to continue the activities? If so, what will continue? What might stop? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of resources and preparation of the partners responsible to pursue activities. Value of the staff and resources earmarked to maintain assistance beyond the project. 	X	X	X	X	X			X

2.5 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Relevance

KPI 1. Capacity of the project to adequately adjust to meet the needs of beneficiaries, as reflected in needs analysis, changes in activities, targets, tools, approaches.

Coherence

KPI 2. Examples of the way the project influenced or contributed to national policies and strategic development in the relevant thematic area.

Effectiveness

KPI 3. Extent to which the targets were reached within the timelines scheduled.

KPI 4. General satisfaction of beneficiaries (quantitative and qualitative, feedback, lessons learned)

KPI 5. Existence of coordination and monitoring mechanisms, including risks monitoring, allow for learnings and adaptations.

Efficiency

KPI 6. Extent of the budgetary changes requested, and quality of the justifications provided.

KPI 7. Examples of ways in which the project's implementation strategy was successful.

Impact

KPI 8. Evidence of increased capacities and preparedness by responders in target communities and institutions.

KPI 9. Extent to which stakeholders feel the project will have a lasting impact in PNG (quantitative and qualitative, with a gender lense where appropriate).

Sustainability

KPI 10. Level of ownership of the processes, tools and capacities gained during the project

KPI 11. Examples of ways participation improved ownership, accountability, and efficiency.

KPI 12. Level of resources and preparation of the partners responsible to pursue activities.

3. Methodology

The evaluation builds on a set of tools that will be adapted to the target audiences and translated as needed.

3.1 Data collection and analysis

Data will be collected through the following methods:

- **Documentary review:** Relevant project documents (shared before or after interviews/focus group discussions, but also found by the evaluator) will be reviewed in accordance with the evaluation questions, and critical elements will be highlighted to support the evaluation.
- **Key informant interviews:** Semi-structured interviews, with a mix of open and closed questions, will be conducted with key project staff, authorities, partners, donor and beneficiaries in accordance with the agenda developed for the field mission. The interview questionnaire (see Annex 2) is indicative of the structure and content of the interviews that will be conducted. However, it will be adjusted before and during the interviews to allow for follow-up questions, discussions, etc. S
- **Focus group discussions:** Focus group discussions, mainly with semi-structured questions, will be conducted with the project partners, more specifically with the VOT shelter management committee that was created as part of the project, in accordance with the agenda developed for the field mission (Annex 2). The focus group interview guide and instructions (Annex 4) may be slightly adjusted to develop on certain themes/feedback that will come up in the discussion.
- **Feedback surveys:** Surveys might be analysed to complement the field data collection, specifically for stakeholders who have participated in project activities (e.g. workshops, conference, sensitization, etc.). Data collected by the project team members through ongoing monitoring and evaluation activities, including satisfaction surveys or post-training feedback forms, will be considered as part of the evaluation, to document the level of satisfaction of partners and beneficiaries.

Data will be compiled and analyzed with quantitative tools, and qualitative data will be triangulated with external sources to complement information whenever possible. Data, notes and photos will be shared upon completion of the fieldwork phase through a restitution meeting, which will provide an opportunity for the EDMU to get a preview of the qualitative and quantitative data collected, to answer some final questions about the project, and to provide additional information to complement or nuance the information collected thus far. Based on this feedback, the evaluator will review and analyse the data collected to draft the preliminary evaluation report.

3.2 Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies

The project is officially ending on February 26, 2023, which means most of the activities conducted during the project will be terminated during the during the fieldwork phase of the evaluation. Additionally, at the time of writing the inception report, the EDMU had not shared any project documents with the evaluator, nor any existing reports/data/analysis on project monitoring, which the evaluation could draw on to analyze beneficiary satisfaction following capacity-building activities.

A limitation to this final evaluation is the access to stakeholders and beneficiaries in the three provinces that are not covered by the field visits. To overcome this barrier, telephone interviews will be arranged and facilitated by local translators whenever necessary. Moreover, due to the timelines of the evaluation process and challenges in reaching beneficiaries in preparation of the field visits, the evaluation questions will not be shared with key informants in advance of the interviews. Lastly, national IOM staff who are involved in the implementation of the project will support the process and meetings with community members. Whenever possible, the evaluator will privilege individual meetings without the presence of national staff. Similarly, data collected through phone interviews will be done by staff who were not involved in project implementation. The evaluator will ensure due diligence throughout the process, to ensure impartial information is collected in relations to the project achievements and implementation modalities.

4. Workplan

STEPS / TIME	FEB 01-18	FEB 19-25	FEB 25-04	MAR 05-11	MAR 12-18	MAR 19-25	MAR 26-31
1. Desk Review/Inception Report							
2. Field Visits and Observations							
Meetings with KIIs in Port Moresby							
Meetings with KIIs in W.P.							
Meetings with KIIs in AROB							
Meetings with KIIs in SHP							
Debrief with EDMU/IOM PNG							
3. Analysis and Reporting							
Review and editing of qualitative transcripts							
Cleaning and coding of quantitative data							
Data analysis and draft report submission							
Submission of first report							
Revision of Draft Report							
Submission of final report							
Submission of brief							

5. List of annexes

ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

ANNEX 2. AGENDA OF FIELD VISITS

ANNEX 3. KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW (KII) GUIDE AND QUESTIONS

ANNEX 4. FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS (FDGs) GUIDE AND QUESTIONS

ANNEX 5. DECLARATION ON CONSENT TO MONITORING AND EVALUATION