Terms of References
of the external evaluation
of the International Organization for Migration on going activities developed under the agreement between Sida and IOM on support to the flash appeal for Haiti earthquake 2010

Introduction

The UN Flash appeal in response to the 12th January 2010 earthquake in Haiti was first launched on 16th January 2010 and then revised on 18th February 2010. On 19th April 2010, an agreement was signed between Sida and the International Organization for Migration in order to fund the implementation of activities related to five projects developed by IOM within the framework of the revised UN Flash appeal earthquake response Haiti 2010.

On 19 November 2010, the cholera outbreak was announced in the Artibonite Department and a UN Flash appeal specific to the cholera response was released. In this context, Sida announced its willingness to support IOM projects and an amendment to the existing projects was signed on 10th December 2010.

Sida expressed its interest in financing an external evaluation on the project activities listed in the agreement.

External evaluation objective

The purpose of this external evaluation is to assess the performance and whenever possible the outcome and impact of the activities carried out by IOM, with a main focus on funding received from Sida, in order to identify lessons learnt and good practices for IOM's implementation of projects and management. The evaluation was planned to take place during the implementation in order to provide IOM Haiti programme managers with useful inputs that could be used as suggestions before the end of the project itself and for the implementation of other projects.

The evaluation specific objectives are:

❖ To **assess the projects** through **evaluation criteria** (relevance of the intervention to the humanitarian situation, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. A particular attention will be paid to the coverage, coherence, connectedness, coordination among other subjects) with a particular focus on the results (Results-Based Evaluation) and in particular to identify the **lessons learnt** and related recommendations based on the qualitative and quantitative analysis of results in terms of the changes occurred in the lives of beneficiaries and the degree to which the level of previous living condition have improved.

❖ To identify **best practices** that could be applied on a **wider scale** in the activities implementation, taking into account the **particular profile and vulnerability of the target beneficiaries**.

The evaluation should also serve as accountability purposes towards the donor, in particular towards the Sida-IOM agreement', and partners and providing transparent information between programmes and IOM units allowing improvement in the planning and management of current and future projects.

General information
Beginning in 1994, IOM Haiti has been implementing programming ranging from participatory community development and stabilization, demobilisation, communal governance, migration and border management to counter-trafficking. As a result, IOM has established a strong partnership with the government and has gained the trust and support of Haitian communities and local authorities. These relationships have facilitated the comprehensive role IOM has played following the 12 January 2010 earthquake, in particular at the camp level. IOM Camp Management Officers (CMOs) have been working in camps with cluster partners, local Haitian organisations and Government of Haiti (GoH) agencies, including the MSPP, DINEPA and DPC, to meet the needs of displaced populations. In addition, as CCCM cluster lead and provider of last resort, IOM maintains a regular presence in hundreds of IDP sites and has strong connections with GoH and the Haitian people. IOM showed the same level of strong partnership with GoH in supporting its cholera response efforts, including dissemination of hygiene promotion communications, strengthened monitoring and case response mechanisms, supplies and equipment, and NFI procurement/distribution

Through Sida funding, IOM was able to carry out five emergency response projects in response to the 12 January 2010 earthquake. These projects[1] are:
- **Cash-for-Work**: Facilitating return and restoring livelihoods through rehabilitation reconstruction and rubble removal (Cap Project Code: HTI-10/ER/31415/R)
- Provision of comprehensive **shelter assistance** to earthquake-affected communities in Haiti (Cap Project Code: HTI-10/ S-NF/31777/R).
- **Emergency Psychosocial Assistance** (Cap Project Code: HTI-10/H/31438/R)
- Emergency support for IDPs through **provision of Water and Sanitation facilities** (Cap Project Code: HTI-10/WS/31476/R).
- **Camp Coordination Support** (Cap Project Code: HTI-10/CSS/31454/R/298)

All projects are in accordance with the project descriptions in the UN Consolidated Appeal 2010 for Haiti. The agreement between Sida and IOM was signed on the.19th April 2011 for a period of more than 20 months. Additional funding from Sida was received to contribute to cholera response efforts in the country and an amendment was signed on the 10th of December 2010, bringing the projects implementation period until the 31st of May 2011.

As per the above agreement, IOM is free to move funds as needed between approved projects and to use a single donor result and reporting framework, in line with the CAP project descriptions, subject to consultation with Sida.

Evaluation Phases
- Preparation phase
- Field work
- Analysis and Reporting

---

[1] These projects are in accordance with the project descriptions in the UN Flash Appeal dated 16 January 2010 and revised 18 February 2010.

Methodology
The evaluation team will review the activities achieved and the overall performance of IOM implementation through on site observation and a combination of data collection and interviews.

The following methodology and steps will have to be implemented:
1) Study of documents related to the projects (primary and secondary source of information)
2) Meeting with IOM staff directly involved in the projects implementation
3) Semi structured interviews with local and international partners involved directly and indirectly with the projects implementation
4) Structured interviews and/or focus groups with direct beneficiaries for each projects
5) Sites visit (direct observation organized through check lists)
6) Reporting
7) Sharing of findings and suggestions
8) Presentation of findings and suggestions

In particular and not exclusively a list of secondary source of information is provided below and documents shall be handed over to the selected evaluation team:
- Signed IOM donor agreement
- Original and updated project budgets with matching RAFs on Sida funded projects.
- Flash appeal dated 16 January 2010 (http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2010.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/SODA-7ZQPUC-full_report.pdf/$File/full_report.pdf) and dated 18 February 2010 (http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/files/Haiti_Appeal_Revised_18_Feb_2010.pdf) and CAP appeal project descriptions and budgets dated 12 of November 2010 (Annex 2).
- OECD-DAC Guidelines for Evaluations of Humanitarian Assistance http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/9/50/2667294.pdf
- Reports provided to Sida on the projects.
- UNEG Norms, Standards and Ethical guidelines (IOM adhered to UNEG Norms) (http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/about_iom/eva_techref/UNEG_ethical_guidelines.pdf)
- Other evaluations conducted in Haiti with relevance to the projects http://www.alnap.org/current/haitiportalresources.aspx

The data collection and analysis methods can be divided in two parts:
1. A **qualitative and quantitative survey** of target beneficiaries, which will involve a representative sample of beneficiaries. All the specific dimensions of the project outcomes described in the focus of the evaluation will be translated into specific questions in the survey and others will be added after document study.

2. **Field visit**, which will be a combination of **direct** on-site **observation**, **semi-structured interviews** and/or **focus group** with a sample of selected beneficiaries, training providers, key IOM project staff and other main stakeholders, including other NGOs working in the same sector of intervention. Some specific dimensions of the project outcomes and the project approach described in the focus of the evaluation will be translated into specific questions in the semi-structured interviews.

The **two parts will be carried out in parallel**, but it will be preferable that the sample beneficiaries' visit be done with their filled questionnaires already available, in order to save time and keep separate the two levels of data collection.

The first draft report, in accordance with the format given below, shall be submitted by electronic transmission (MS Word 7.0 or higher) to relevant persons at both Sida and IOM simultaneously and respectively, as part of an Evaluation Review Board that will submit their remarks and comments within 3 working days.

A final report will be submitted within 5 working days and will account for both Sida and IOM's remarks and comments.

The evaluation will result in the drawing of one report written in a straightforward manner, in English, including the Executive Summary which should include lesson learned and recommendations.

The Evaluation result will be presented in PowerPoint format to IOM staff. A copy of the presentation will be sent to Sida.

All exchanges related to the Evaluation should be in English.

Chronogram

Time	Activities
1 week	Preparation phase
10 days	Field work
1 week	Draft report
1 week	Collecting inputs form IOM
4 days	Redaction of final report
1 day	PowerPoint presentation

Estimated start and end date of evaluation
Beginning of May to Middle June 2011

Evaluation team
1 evaluation team leader
Evaluation team members

Suitable consultants will preferably be identified through the ALNAP network.

Roles, Responsibilities, and Coordination

IOM and Sida shall both approve the selection of the independent consultant(s).

The evaluation shall be conducted by the evaluation team, in close consultation with both IOM and Sida.

The specific projects teams will be the direct counterparts of the evaluators.
The specific projects teams will introduce the evaluation team to potential participants. IOM team will be responsible for making direct contact, arranging interviews while the evaluation team will be responsible of conducting them.

Tasks description:

IOM will be responsible for
- Provision of all documents related to the project
- Facilitate the contact with resource personnel and with actors involved in the project
- Planning of the meeting and organization of the transportation
- Final report delivering to actors' involved in the project including donor
- Address to IOM management a letter as a response to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation

Evaluation team will be responsible for
- Evaluation planning
- Evaluation project activities indicators design
- Evaluation tools preparation according to objectives and methodology
- Document and second source document analysis
- Evaluation field activities
- Draft report writing
- Final report writing after IOM and Sida inputs
- Evaluation finding presentation in PowerPoint format to IOM and Sida representative (if present). A copy of the presentation could be sent to Sida together with the evaluation report, in case a Sida representative is not present.

Budget
The total budget should not exceed 27,500 USD.

Evaluation Principles
The evaluation should be conducted according to the following general evaluation standards and principles:
Utility: evaluations should serve the information needs of intended users;
Feasibility: the viability should be well assessed before engaging in an evaluation, such as the availability of data, key stakeholders, and project staff;
Ethics: managers should carefully assess if evaluation is the appropriate tool to use in a given situation. Managers should remain open to the results, and consider the welfare of those involved in and affected by evaluations;
Credibility: evaluators should adhere to standards or good practices of evaluations;
Supporting an evaluation culture: evaluation should be a tool to help staff improve their work and results, and should be incorporated into ongoing work processes and incentive systems;
Transparency: there should be clear communication with all those involved in and affected by the evaluation;
Accessibility: results should, as far as possible, be available to partners, donors and other stakeholders;

<u>Impartiality</u>: evaluation should be fair and complete and review both strengths and weaknesses. The procedures should aim at minimizing distortion caused by personal bias;

<u>Security and safety</u>: the welfare of informants and the safety of venues in which interviews or other data collection methods take place are paramount, as are considerations for the implication on informants of talking to evaluators. Judgments will be made on a case-by-case basis in consultation with local partners and contacts;

<u>Confidentiality</u>: all persons contributing to the evaluation will be assured that their contributions will be kept confidential and non-attributable, if they so desire. Participants will be asked to make clear their level of consent for the use of their interview material, which will always be adhered to at all times, including consent to audio recording, photos or to identified by name, etc.; and

<u>Sensitivity</u>: it will be made clear that interviews, focus groups or other methods for data collection can be stopped at any time by both parties. Participants will be able to specify who they are comfortable with having in the room during any data collection exercise.

Annex 1: Evaluation reports format

Annex 2: IOM-Haiti, CAP Compendium

Annex 1: EVALUATION REPORTS FORMAT

Executive Summary

Length: 5-6 pages

The executive summary is an essential part of the report: it is more influential and has higher readership than the main body of the report. It should focus on the main purpose and issues of the evaluation, emphasize performance highlights, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learnt and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text that follows.

The executive summary should contain information on: (a) Purpose of the evaluation; (b) Context of the evaluation; (c) Methodology; (d) Analysis of main results; (e) Conclusions and recommendations.

Introduction

Length: 1-2 pages

Briefly describe the purpose of the report and the scope and context of the project being evaluated. Acknowledgements to those who contributed to the evaluation can be included.

Methodology

Length: 3 pages

Indicate how the evaluation questions were addressed and what limitations were experienced. Describe the performance indicators used, as well as the sources of information and the methods for information collection and analysis. Stakeholders' contribution to the evaluation should also be provided.

Findings

Length: this is the longest section of the report, 30 pages

Findings constitute statements based on the information collected. The core of the report should follow the five evaluation criteria, describing the facts and interpreting or analysing them in accordance with the key questions pertinent to each criteria.

i.   Relevance: whether the design of the project was originally, and still is, sound, i.e. it targets the real needs and problems of the intended beneficiaries.

ii. Efficiency: How well resources in general (funds, expertise, time, etc.), or inputs, are used to undertake activities, and are converted to results

iii. Effectiveness: whether the specific objectives were in fact achieved and the planned benefits received by the beneficiaries; whether the results achieved lead to the project purpose.

iv. Cost Effectiveness: Whether the same results could have been achieved at lower cost, whether there might have been different, more appropriate ways of achieving the same results.

v.   Impact: Refers to the projects contribution to well-being of the beneficiaries and assesses changes brought about.

vi. Sustainability: whether the flow of benefits to the beneficiaries, and to society generally, is likely to continue or not, and why.

vii. Accountability towards donors: To demonstrate that the work is consistent with the contract terms.

Conclusions and recommendations

Length: 3-6 pages

Conclusions describe the results achieved and how they compare with the expectations set out during project planning and design phases. Recommendations are statements derived from the evidence that prescribe who should do what in the future, and provide suggestions for introducing improvements and/or identify matters for follow-up. Wherever possible, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation.

The ultimate value of an evaluation depends on the quality and credibility of the recommendations offered. Recommendations should therefore be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the project, and of the resources available to implement them both locally and in the Commission.

Recommendations should be carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels.

Annexes

The report should generally include the following annexes:

Conclusions describe the results achieved and how they compare with the expectations set out during project planning and design phases. Recommendations are statements derived from the evidence that prescribe who should do what in the future, and provide suggestions for introducing improvements and/or identify matters for follow-up. Wherever possible, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation.

1. The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
2. The composition of the evaluation team (CVs should be shown, better if summarized)
3. Logical Framework matrices (original and possibly improved/updated)
4. Technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses)
5. Map of project area, if relevant
6. List of persons met/organizations consulted
7. Literature and documentation consulted