**Action Plan on the follow-up of Evaluation Recommendations**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Title/Year:** *“Final Evaluation of IOM’s Disaster Preparedness for Effective Response Project (PREPARE)” – June 2018***Person(s) or body(ies) responsible for the follow up of implementation:** Nathan GLANCY, Chief of Party – PREPARE, M. Stuart SIMPSON, Chief of Mission |
| 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.  |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY  | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 2 (December 2018). |
| **Monitoring of Implementation**:   |
| 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. |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY  | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 2 (November 2018) |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 3. *For future projects:* 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. |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects)  |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 4. For future projects: Design a strategy, workplan and activities specific to each country’s context to appropriately reflect different absorption capacities and engagement levels. |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects)  |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 5. *For future projects:* 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. |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects) |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 6. *For future projects:* 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.  |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects)  |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 7. *For future projects:* 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. |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects)  |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 8. *For future projects:* With low absorption capacities in the Federated States of Micronesia in mind, continue supporting the DECCEM and DCOs to improve staff absorption capacity.  |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects) |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 9. *For future projects:* Exert additional efforts to explain the donor criteria and definitions to the final beneficiaries under future reconstruction efforts.  |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects) |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 10. *For future projects:* Consider the impeding factors under the voucher scheme and tax exemption, and prepare clear mitigation measures to be potentially included as future national contributions.  |
| **Recommendation to:** M. . N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects) |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 11. *For future projects:* 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. |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with RTS) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (in case of new projects) |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |
| 12. *Recruitment:*  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. |
| **Recommendation to:** M. N. GLANCY (in coordination with IOM Human Resources Department and Regional Office) | **Priority level (1 to 3), and timeframe:** Level 3 (In case of new projects and recruitment) |
| **Monitoring of implementation:** |