International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

## Final Evaluation of 'Technical Support to Government of Nepal to implement Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Act Project'

**Commissioned By:** IOM Nepal

**Evaluation Context:** Government of Nepal and IOM signed a Cooperation Agreement in 2007 to encourage cooperation and the delivery of services to Nepal, which is a country of origin, transit and destination of migration. IOM's initial focus was on the resettlement of Bhutanese refugees and slowly integrated other sectoral areas of migration such as Migration and Health, Emergency Response, Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience, Land, Property & Reparation, Migration, Environment and Climate Change, Labour Migration, Migrant Assistance & Protection, and Migration & Development in its wide range of programme. IOM Nepal is a member of United Nations Country Team and works within the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) whose strategic areas are derived from the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and Nepal's Fourteenth National Development Plan.

IOM has been supporting the efforts of the Government of Nepal to minimize the challenges which the country faces regularly regarding the natural hazard induced disasters, displacement, by contributing in building community resilience. As Nepal embarked to new federal structure, Constitution of Nepal set the course for a massive shift of power from the federal to the provincial and municipal levels of government. Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) is among 22 exclusive powers that are now the responsibility of devolved authorities to exercise. Constitution has spelled out the DRRM functions of all three levels of government -the federal, provincial and local levels- with significant decentralization for decision making, resources management and service delivery systems. In this context, IOM with support from USAID/OFDA implemented a one year project that technically supported the Government to implement the DRRM Act. The Act outlines tasks such as undertaking disaster assessment, managing disaster management fund, and implementation of local disaster risk reduction programs, response, recovery and reconstruction including operating local emergency operations centre and envisages establishment of National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA). The project aims to contribute to the establishment of the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Authority (NDRRMA) following the DRRM Act 2017 by ensuring that guidelines and by-laws are endorsed for the effective implementation of NDRRMA, focusing on organizational and management structure. Taking these into account the project prioritized these actions deriving three major outputs i.e.

1. Municipal Government have increased capacity for implementing DRM and post-disaster recovery
2. Guidelines and by-laws relating to DRRM Act are developed with wider solicitation and consensus from concerned stakeholders
3. Government, civil society, humanitarian actors and communities are committed to support and advocate for the implementation of the DRRM Act and NDMA

**Evaluation Purpose:** The evaluation is being conducted for use by the project team and program unit, so that the documentations, lessons learned and best practices from a completed set of activities are captured and could be used in similar context/projects that envisages of similar objective. The evaluation is intended to assess and examine the extent to which the DRRM Project has achieved its intended activities, outcomes and outputs to fulfil the objective of contributing to the establishment of a National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Authority (NDRRMA) through the provision of technical assistance to the Government of Nepal,

**Evaluation Scope:** This evaluation will cover the whole project's period, including the 3-month no-cost extension, and cover the seven provinces and the 14 selected urban and rural municipalities across the country.

**Evaluation Criteria:** In line with the purpose of the evaluation, four evaluation criteria, including, relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, will be the focus of the evaluation. For relevance, the evaluation will assess to what extent the project's intervention responded to the strategic needs of the Government of Nepal, while effectiveness, it will assess to what extent the project achieved its intended results. For Impact, the evaluation will assess to what extend any critical changes have been observed resulting from the project, and to what extend the project's results including its observable impacts could be sustained under the criteria of sustainability.

**Evaluation Questions:**

| Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Questions |
|---|---|
| Relevance | 1. Was the project aligned and remained aligned to the needs of the Government of Nepal in term of the efforts in managing disasters? |
| | 2. To what extend the project's proposed theory of change was logic and valid? |
| Effectiveness | 3. To what extend the project's intended results were achieved in term of both quantity and quality? |
| | 4. What were key contributing and disenabling factors for the project to achieve its intended results? |
| | 5. What lessons learned and good practices could be documented in this regard? |
| Impact | 6. Were there any positive/negative and intended/unintended effects are being produced by the project, and are they as a result of the project activities, external factors or from both? |
| | 7. What lessons learned and good practices related to project's impacts that could be documented? |

| | 8. If there are some negative impacts, to what extend the project takes timely measures to mitigate those? |
|---|---|
| Sustainability | 9. What are observable changes in term of structures, resources and processes introduced by the Government of Nepal to ensure that the results/benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases? <br> 10. What are lessons learned and good practices could be documented in relation to increasing project's result sustainability? |

**Evaluation Methodology:** The evaluation will employ the non-experimental design and collect and analyse both qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluator is expected to collect and review relevant project's documents, such as project proposal, project's interim and final reports (narrative and financial), training reports, meeting or workshop reports, DRRM related reports made/published by INGOs/UN Agencies and international development agencies, newspapers, social media., etc. In addition, the evaluator is expected to collect primary data (field-base) through conducting key information interviews, focus group discussion and/or survey with project's stakeholders. Sample selection and sample size will be made in consultation with the project management.

To ensure impartiality, credibility, independence of the evaluation findings, the evaluator is strongly expected to comply with IOM Data protection policy, UNEG norms and standards, and relevant national ethical requirements.

However, the selected evaluator is expected to review this proposed methodology and recommend a more suitable ones for further discussion during the Inception Phase.

a. Hold consultation meetings with concerned multiple stakeholders prior to the field evaluation (relevant staff of IOM and Government officials of Project Steering Committee i.e Ministry of Urban Development, Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration

b. Submit an inception report with evaluation plan including data collection toolkit, stakeholder analysis, sample interview guides and survey questions developed in close coordination with TA project staffs.

c. Conduct on-site project visit to evaluate and discuss the project's outcome with the officials from province and municipal Government bodies.

d. Consult with IOM on appropriate measures and strategies to be followed during evaluation.

e. Upon completion of the tasks, provide the Organization with a Final Evaluation Report on the consultancy assignment and its outcomes.

f. Perform any other duties as may be assigned.

**Evaluation Deliverables:**

a.  An Inception Report including evaluation plan inter alia methodology, tools and timeframe;
b.  A first draft of evaluation report, including an executive summary and recommendations, following IOM's evaluation report template (electronic version);
c.  A final report (using IOM evaluation report template) to be delivered and presented to IOM. The report should make a clear distribution between findings, conclusions and recommendations. It should be concise and clear in English and should not exceed more than 25 pages excluding annexes.
d.  2-pager evaluation brief, using IOM evaluation brief template.

**Evaluation Work plan:**

| Activity | Day | Responsible | Location | Schedule |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kick-off meeting | .5 | Evaluator + Project Team and project steering committee | Skype/in-person | 5 days of the contract signed |
| Submit the final Inception Report (IR) | 2 | Evaluator | | One weekday of the kick-off meeting |
| Conduct field data collection | 7 | Evaluator | | 2 days after the finalization of the IR |
| Data cleaning and analysis | 1.5 | Evaluator | | Immediate after the completion of fieldwork |
| Report writing and submission of the first draft evaluation report | 5 | Evaluator | | 10 days of completion of field evaluation |
| Submit the second draft evaluation report and evaluation brief | 1.5 | Evaluator | | Within 7 days of finalization of the first draft report |
| Submit the final evaluation report and the final evaluation brief | 1 | Evaluator | | Within 7 days of finalization of the second draft report. |
| Total | 20.5 | | | |