

Annex 5.5. Evaluation Terms of Reference Template

Terms of Reference

FINAL EVALUATION FOR "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 THE PAPUA NEW GUINEA PROJECT"

Commissioned by: As stated in the project document, the final evaluation is foreseen to be carried out at the end of the project.

Managed by: The Project Manager manages the evaluation under the overall leadership of COM.

1. Evaluation context

Papua New Guinea (PNG) is a fascinating and unique diverse country with over 800 spoken languages and 8 million inhabitants across a wide geographic area, including mountainous highland regions, vast tropical rainforests, low-lying coastal regions, and islands. Over 80 percent of the population lives in rural areas, with limited access to basic health, education, and agricultural services. Despite claims of economic gain /growth over the past few years, almost 40 percent of the country's population still lives in poverty. Gender inequality, Gender Based Violence (GBV), and other crime types are prevalent across the country. Corruption is rife at all levels. Rates of family and sexual violence are among the highest in the world.

PNG is prone to multiple hazards, such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, cyclones, flooding, and droughts, that lead to displacement and economic and human losses yearly. Ranked 10th globally in terms of risk from natural disasters, the high exposure combined with low resilience and coping capacities greatly hinders disaster preparedness and response in the country.

IOM Papua New Guinea supports the Government of PNG at the national, provincial, and local levels to respond to complex emergencies, reduce disaster-induced displacement, and mitigate the negative impacts of displacement on those affected through strengthened capacity in disaster mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. Through its Emergencies and Disaster Management (EDM) Unit, IOM PNG reaches displaced and vulnerable populations, stabilizes local villages, and empowers them to establish self-led disaster coping mechanisms.

As part of its response to these challenges, IOM has conducted since August 27 2020 a project titled "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." The

project's intended goal is 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 PNG. The project is an integrated 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.

USAID funds the project, which is 30 months project that started on August 27 2020. The project has nationwide coverage with a specific focus on seven provinces, mainly for community-based disaster risk management (CBDRM): i.e., Autonomous Region of Bougainville (AROB), East New Britain (ENB), Morobe, Western Province (WP), Southern Highlands (SHP), East Sepik (ESP) and Western Highlands (WH).

This TOR for Evaluation is developed based on the IOM project handbook (PHB) guideline and adapted to the context of the PNG. The project manager forwarded the evaluation purpose and questions, referring to the relevant purpose and questions in PHB and the generic nature of the post-Ante evaluation.

The evaluation covers the whole project area, but the field data collection is based on the selected three provinces representing the Island, Southern, and Highland regions. Accessibility of the targeted communities, representativeness to the wide range of the project area, and the existence of multiple projects or communities are the criteria applied to select the provinces.

2. Evaluation purpose and objective

As stated in the project document, the final evaluation is foreseen to be conducted by an independent Internal evaluator by a team from the IOM ROAP in the last months of the project period. The objective of the 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 finding of the evaluation could be used by various stakeholders, including the projects team, senior management, donor, and other stakeholders:

- The evaluation is being conducted for use by the project team so that they can document lessons learned and best practices from a completed set of activities.
- The evaluation is being conducted for use by the senior management, so they can assess organizational effectiveness in implementing strategy.
- The evaluation is being conducted for use by stakeholders, so they can assess the relevance and accountability of a project to intended beneficiaries.
- The evaluation is being conducted for use by the donor to assess the value for money for a set of activities they funded.

3. Evaluation scope

The evaluation is summative to give information about the effectiveness of the project and provides the stakeholders, including donors, the opportunity to use best practices identified during the evaluation.

Although the project is nationwide, the evaluation will specifically cover the eight targeted CBDRM communities in eight provinces indicated in the table below. The evaluation will cover the entire duration of the project, from August 27 2020 to February 28 2023.

Province	Community	Remark
AROB	Lanku	
ENB	Tavana and Valaur	Two communities
ESP	Biem Island	Not easily accessible as it involves travel on the sea
Morobe	Zumara	
SHP	Karel 1	
WP	Drimgas	

The evaluation also assesses the consideration of the cross-cutting themes in each phase of the project planning and execution of the project component like gender and diversity, inclusion, protection, community engagement, accountability to affected people, protection concerns, including child protection and GBV, and conflict-sensitive approaches.

The field visit and information gathering will be based on three selected representative provinces and the national capital district in reason of the wide spatial coverage and logistical challenges. The selected provinces are AROB, WP, and SHP.

4. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will be based on the criteria for the development or DRR projects, i.e., relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

- **Relevance:** the extent to which the project's outcome and intended results remain valid and pertinent as initially planned. It is to verify that the outcomes identified and formulated during project design are consistent with the priorities of the beneficiaries, the national or local government, the donor, and the alignment with IOM's regional and global strategies.
- **Effectiveness:** assesses the extent to which a project achieves its intended results. Theory of change (TOC): it investigates if the activities have led to the outputs if the delivery of outputs has led to the expected outcomes, and the degree to which the achievement of outcomes has contributed to the realization of the project's overall objective.

- **Efficiency:** how well human, physical, and financial resources are used to undertake activities and how well these resources are converted into outputs. Whether the project's intended results were achieved with cost efficiency and whether the benefits, justify the costs.
- **Impact** assesses the positive and negative primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a project, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally.
- **Sustainability:** assesses whether the minimal conditions exist for the project results to be sustained after its finalization.

5. Evaluation questions

- Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objectives?
- Do the project activities and outputs consider relevant national policies and IOM guidelines?
- Have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?
- Are the target beneficiaries satisfied with the services provided?
- What are the major factors influencing the achievement of the project's expected outcomes?
- Were there any factors preventing the project from attaining the results?
- To what extent has the project adapted to changing external conditions to ensure project outcomes?
- Were the project activities undertaken, and were the outputs delivered on time? To what extent are activities implemented as scheduled?
- How well are the resources (funds, expertise, and time) being converted into results?
- Was the project implemented in an efficient way compared to alternative means of implementation?
- Which positive/negative and intended/unintended effects are being produced by the project?
- Does the impact come from the project activities, from external factors, or from both?
- Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?
- Are structures, resources, and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?
- Is the project supported by local institutions and well-integrated into local social and cultural structures?
- To what extent have target groups and possibly other relevant interest groups/stakeholders been involved in the planning/implementation process?
- Do the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the outputs in the project framework?

6. Evaluation methodology

Three data/information collection methods are presented as a suggestion to apply in data collection for this evaluation exercise.

- **Document review:** This is an examination and analysis of existing documentation. It can include information about the project and its outputs and outcomes, such as activity reports, donor

reports, digital records, and other evidence. A document review can also include other documents relevant to the project, such as government statistics, studies and information, and media reports

- **Key informant Interview:** an in-depth interview, usually conducted in person and one-on-one, with a person that has first-hand knowledge about the issue being examined. (Project staff, NDC, DPLGA PDCs, DMT, community leader, or representatives).
- **On-site direct observation:** This is an on-site visit to see a situation, activity, product, behavior, or process in person. It typically uses a form to record observations made.
- **Focus Group Discussion:** small group discussion to explore stakeholder opinions and judgments towards an activity, process, project, or policy. It can also be used to collect in-depth information on the group's needs, motivations, intentions, and experiences.

Descriptive statistical methods will be applied to process and summarize the finding from the information and draft the evaluation report.

7. Ethics, norms, and standards for evaluation

The evaluation must follow IOM Data Protection Principles, UNEG Norms, standards for evaluation, and relevant ethical guidelines. IOM abides by the norms and standards of UNEG and expects all evaluation stakeholders to be familiar with the ethical conduct guidelines of UNEG and the consultant(s) with the UNEG codes of conduct as well.

8. Evaluation deliverables

The deliverables are:

- Evaluation matrix by the evaluator
- Draft evaluation report submitted for comment by the evaluator
- Final evaluation report by the evaluator
- Management response, by PM and COM

9. Specifications of roles

- COM- Serhan Aktoprak
- RMU- Zita Ortega Greco
- Project Manager- Getachew Alefe Mekuria
- Project officer- Peter MURORERA
- Project officer- Simon KAFU
- Field staff Western Province- Philip NERE
- Field staff AROB- Quentin TALINGAPUA
- Field staff ENB- Sharon NARIUS
- Field staff Morobe- Samike GAGGI
- Field staff ESP- Percy KAMBUI
- Field staff SHP- Sebastian HUOKOLI

- Field staff- David KUNA
- Field staff- Tomas MEK
- National Disaster Centre (NDC) Director- Col. Carl H Wrakonei, DMS MBE
- NDC Asst Director Risk Management- Andrew Oaego
- NDC Asst Director Corporate/coordination- Martin Mose
- NDC Risk Management Officer- Douglas Kinjua
- PNG Red Cross National DRR Manager-Lucinda Nawayap
- National Weather Service-Assist Director- Kasis Inape
- Western Province Provincial Disaster Center (PDC)- Daru Philip Gasuat
- Western Province PDC - Kiunga- Max Maina
- Southern Highlands- PDC Mendi- Peter Wari
- Jiwaka PDC- John Kupul
- East Sepik PDC- Derek Warakai
- Western Highlands PDC Robin Yakumb
- Morobe PDC- Charlie Massage
- East New Britain PDC- Donald Tokunai
- AROB PDC- John Lokobau
- USAID/BHA- Joe Curry
- Disaster Management Team(DMT) - Lindsay Lambi

The final terms of reference (ToR) between the evaluation manager and the evaluator will be done with the project manager and will be a binding doc once approved by the COM

All the initial evaluation matrix will be done by the evaluator and will be a working document once approved by the COM based on the recommendation from the project manager

All final evaluation reports will be done by the evaluator and will be accepted final version once approved by the COM based on the recommendation from the project manager

10. Time schedule

Activity	Responsible party	Number of days	Timing
Discussion/ Review/endorse the TOR	Project manager/project officer /RAOP	Seven days	-January 10 -16
Share the TOR with the donor/ endorsement	Project manager/project officer	Two days	January 16-18
Communicate with M&E colleagues to	Project manager/project officer /RAOP	14 days	January 10-24

locate the appropriate person			
Document and literature review	Evaluator/ Project team	Three days	January 25-28
Travel days	Evaluator	Two days	January 29 & February 12
Management meetings	Evaluator, COM, Project team	One day	January 30
Preparing inception report	Evaluator	Two days	January 31 to February 01
Data/information collection	Evaluator and Project team	Ten days	February 02-11
Data/information analysis	Evaluator	Two days	February 13-14
Presentation of initial findings	Evaluator, COM, Project team	One day	February 15
Preparing final report	Evaluator	Seven days	February 15-22
Revising final report	Evaluator, COM, Project team	Three days	February 23-25
Submission of the final report	Evaluator	Three days	February 26 to February 28

11. Evaluation budget