

Commissioned by: IOM IRAQ COUNTRY OFFICE

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 EVALUATION CONTEXT

#### **1.1.1 Political, Environmental, and Socio-economic Context:**

Iraq continues to face complex political, environmental, and socio-economic challenges that directly impact the effectiveness and sustainability of recovery efforts in conflict-affected areas. The country has been in a fragile political state following the defeat of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), with ongoing governance struggles, political fragmentation, and tensions between federal and regional authorities. These factors contribute to inconsistent policy implementation, limited institutional capacity, and delays in economic reforms, affecting efforts to rebuild communities and create sustainable livelihoods.

From an environmental perspective, Iraq is highly vulnerable to climate change, facing increasing desertification, water scarcity, and extreme weather conditions, which directly impact agriculture and employment in rural areas. Additionally, the legacy of conflict has left behind significant environmental degradation, with destroyed infrastructure and contaminated lands limiting economic opportunities and slowing down recovery efforts.

On the socio-economic front, the country continues to experience high unemployment rates, especially among youth and women. The private sector remains underdeveloped, with limited access to financial capital and a strong reliance on oil revenues. Despite some economic recovery, many internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees, and host communities face difficulties accessing stable employment, basic services, and financial resources to rebuild their livelihoods. Women, in particular, encounter structural barriers to labor market participation, further limiting inclusive economic growth.

Given these contextual challenges, interventions focusing on economic recovery, private sector revitalization, and access to sustainable livelihoods are critical to fostering long-term stability and resilience in Iraq. The project aligns with national recovery strategies by supporting displaced populations, strengthening local businesses, and enhancing employability through targeted livelihood assistance.

### 1.1. Summary of the project:

Donor	Project Title	Start date	End date
KOICA	Local Economic Recovery of Conflict-Affected Areas of Iraq	1/Jul/2021	30/Jun/2025

The project aimed to contribute to the local economic recovery and community resilience of conflict-affected areas in Iraq by increasing access to sustainable and decent work opportunities. It provided targeted livelihood interventions that enhanced individual employability and supported small and medium enterprises (SMEs) through the Enterprise Development Fund (EDF).

Through a combination of direct livelihood assistance and SME support, the project helped beneficiaries improve their income-generating capacity, facilitating economic reintegration and stability. It focused on two key outcomes: (1) improving access to sustainable job opportunities by strengthening the private sector and (2) enhancing human capital through vocational training, job referrals, on-the-job training, and business support packages.

The interventions were designed based on market assessments and community engagement to ensure their relevance and effectiveness. The project also aligned with national recovery strategies and development priorities, addressing the needs of internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees, and host community members. By fostering economic opportunities and strengthening local businesses, the project contributed to long-term resilience and self-reliance in targeted communities.

## 2. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

The purpose of the evaluations is to assess the program's performance against the desired results, as articulated in the Programme's results framework. The evaluation will also identify lessons learned and suggest plausible recommendations that will inform future programme design in similar thematic areas. The intended users of the evaluation will be the donor, programme staff, IOM Iraq Mission, and partners. The evaluation will be conducted over a three-month period from May to July 2025.

The specific objectives of the evaluation is outline as follows.

- Assessing the overall results and impacts of the project towards the local economic recovery and community resilience of conflict-affected areas by improving access to sustainable and decent work opportunities.
- Document the lessons-learned/best practices from the implementation of the project's activities that will be useful for future strategies in similar interventions.
- Asses the cross-cutting issues relevant to the project (gender equality, AAP, disability inclusion, protection and "do not harm", environmental sustainability, social cohesion, and rights-based programming), how mainstreamed in the project implementation, the results achieved, and gaps identified throughout the project cycle management.
- Suggest plausible recommendations for programme managers, local partners and donors in achieving the desired results and sustainable impacts.

### 3. EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation will focus on the following outcomes of the project:

**Objective:** contribute to local economic recovery and community resilience through increased access to sustainable and decent work. The underlying goals of IOM's livelihoods interventions are to create new, sustainable jobs and improve the employability of beneficiaries. IOM will achieve this through two outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Communities have improved access to sustainable job opportunities through support to the private sector
  - **Output 1.1:** SMEs have funds to rehabilitate and expand, directly creating sustainable job opportunities through grants from the EDF.
- **Outcome 2:** Individuals have enhanced human capital which improves their employability and economic inclusion
  - **Output 2.1:** Vulnerable individuals have increased income generation capacity.

The evaluation will exclusively be on the IOM “Local Economic Recovery of Conflict-Affected Areas of Iraq” project. The primary geographical focus will be on the three governorates where the activities have been implemented, namely, Ninewa, Kirkuk, and Baghdad. The period of the evaluation will cover from July 2021 to June 2025.

### 4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Project's performance should be evaluated against the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coverage, effectiveness, coherence and coordination, efficiency, sustainability and impact. In addition, this evaluation will consider cross-cutting issues on gender, disability inclusion and the environment. In total, the evaluation criteria form the basis and guidance for the evaluation suggested questions as presented below.

### 5. EVALUATION GUIDING QUESTIONS

#### Relevance

- a. To what extent does the project align with the needs, priorities and policies of the target population, local authorities, and other stakeholders?
- b. Are the project's interventions adaptable to changes in the context, and how have they adjusted to these changes through the project cycle management?
- c. Were the outputs / outcomes of the programmes consistent with the overall objective of the project and were critical, balanced and appropriate ?

#### Effectiveness

- d. To what extent did the project achieve the expected results, and what challenges hindered this progress?
- e. Which components of the project/programme were most and least effective in achieving the expected results?
- f. What are the internal or external factors that affected the achievement of planned outputs and outcomes. how did the project address those factors?

#### Efficiency

- g. Were project activities and output delivered on time and in the most efficient manner possible?

- h. How efficiently were resources utilized to achieve the intended results within the implementation context?
- j. To what extent was the existing project/programme implementation modality efficient compared to other modalities and approaches?

**Coherence**

- k. How compatible was the intervention with other initiatives within the programme-transition and recovery, with other programmes, such as social cohesion, protection, peacebuilding and stabilization guidelines and policies in the IOM?
- l. To what extent the programme is coherent with donor and the local gov't policy towards economic recovery and resilience of conflict affected people in Iraq?

**Sustainability**

- m. To what extent have the project's results contributed to long-term change and benefits for the target population beyond the project's duration?
- n. How well did the project integrate local resources and knowledge into its design and implementation to promote sustainability?
- o. What strategies are in place to ensure the scalability of the project and the potential to replicate its successes in other contexts?

**Impact**

- p. What broader effects intended or unintended, positive or negative, have the project had on individuals, communities, institutions, vulnerable groups?
- q. What significant factors influenced the achievement of the project's results and impacts?

**Cross-cutting issues**

- r. How effectively does the project promote gender equality and address the specific needs of women and men in its design, implementation, and outcomes?
- s. How inclusive is the project in addressing the needs of individuals with disabilities, ensuring their participation and equal access to services?
- t. What positive or negative effects does the project have, or is likely to have on the environment?
- u. To what extent does the project incorporate rights-based programming, ensuring the protection and promotion of the rights of vulnerable populations throughout its implementation?
- v. How effectively has the project mainstreamed protection principles, including accountability, non-discrimination, and inclusivity, across all stages of design and delivery?
- w. Did the program effectively apply 'Do No Harm' principles, minimizing harm to beneficiaries and communities?
- x. To what extent were relevant target groups actively involved in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation?
- Y. How effectively did the project incorporate feedback from beneficiaries and stakeholders to ensure relevance throughout its implementation?

6. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The selected firm will be responsible for designing a strong methodological framework and leading the final evaluation process. The methodologies utilized must emphasize inclusivity, ensuring representation of all relevant stakeholders, while aligning effectively with the project’s objectives and scope. The outlined project components and targets in the evaluation scope section should guide the sampling strategy and the determination of appropriate sample sizes for each evaluation tool.

The methodology will follow a mixed-method approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. To ensure a comprehensive evaluation, efforts should focus on engaging diverse stakeholders to capture their perspectives on the project’s implementation. This includes returnees, internally displaced persons (IDPs), host communities, vulnerable conflict-affected populations, civil society organizations, government counterparts, and community and local authority leaders.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with community representatives, government authorities, and other relevant actors will be conducted. Additionally, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and interviews with selected beneficiaries—such as returnees, IDPs, and host community members—will assess the project’s responsiveness to their needs, priorities, and expectations. Methodologies will also outline how the collected data will be analyzed to answer the evaluation questions, ensuring transparency and rigor in the process. The methodology should acknowledge and address expected limitations, proposing mitigation strategies to minimize their impact on the evaluation’s findings.

The evaluation is expected to involve in-person activities. To enhance the process, the firm may consider collaborating with local consultants based in Iraq.

Summary of the Evaluation Methodology and Data Collection Tools

Table 01: Evaluation Methodology and Data Collection Tools

Method	Tasks	Tools required	Products
Desk study	Review project reports, M&E reports, assessments, selection criteria, work plans and other documents.	Evaluation rubric <sup>1</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation strategies identification;</li><li>• Identification of progress and challenges</li><li>• Key project components implemented, and result achieved</li></ul>
Qualitative			

Key Informant Interviews	Identify and secure an interview with relevant KIs: programme staff, management, community and stakeholders' representatives (IDPs, host communities, governmental authorities, private sector, civil societies, and other actors). <u>At least 30- 35 KIIs with relevant stakeholders</u>	Interview Guides for the evaluation purpose, Structured questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative data on project processes and performance about target results</li> <li>• Insight on the view of problems and recommended solutions.</li> <li>• Different perspectives on issues</li> </ul>
On-site observation	Conduct field visits, observation of project activities and sites. Sample size is identified under the Beneficiary Interviews and surveys	Observation Guides	Qualitative data/cues about Project contexts/challenges as well as risks
Focus group discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FGDs to explore stakeholder opinions and judgements towards the engagement level, processes, and project implementation.</li> <li>• In-Depth information on the needs, motivations, intentions, and experiences of the group to assess. How the project has responded according to their Expectations?</li> </ul> <u>Approximately 16-20 FGDs</u>	Structured questions	An in-depth qualitative information
<b>Quantitative</b>			
Household Survey	Sampling should be done scientifically appropriate to the context with 95% of confidence level, and 5% of margin of error. The sample size should consider sample selection bias due to stratification and clustering, and non-response rates Minimum 600 interviews/surveys with program direct beneficiaries	Structured questionnaire	Quantitative information

<sup>1</sup> Evaluative rubric is a qualitative data assessment tool which involves articulating things that matter in the initiative being evaluated in line with the performance quality standard in project activities, their delivery strategies and resultant products or services predefined according to the evaluation purpose. See also: [http://carla.umn.edu/assessment/vac/improvement/p\\_4.html](http://carla.umn.edu/assessment/vac/improvement/p_4.html).

## 7. ETHIC, NORMS, AND STANDARDS

The evaluation process must adhere to IOM's Data Protection Principles, Code of Conduct, the "Do No Harm" principle, and the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluations. Technical support and oversight will be provided by the IOM Iraq MEAL team and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), with additional consultation from the M&E Advisor at IOM's Regional Office in Cairo as needed. The evaluation findings will contribute to organizational learning and inform the design of future interventions.

## 8. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected produce:

- (1) Inception report as per the IOM template including a detailed workplan, data collection plan and /materials/templates.
- (2) Develop data collection tools tailored to each project activity, ensuring inclusivity and specificity.
- (3) Sharing all the data collected from the different sources in a clean, well-formatted standard.
- (4) Briefing and debriefing meetings in addition to the routine meetings and discussions with IOM.
- (5) A first draft final evaluation report (based on IOM template, incorporating comments and technical inputs from the IOM reference group) along with datasets from data collected in a clean, well-formatted standard. with a summary evaluation brief (2-pager evaluation brief per IOM template), followed by a final version of the final evaluation report by incorporating IOM revision.
- (6) A management response matrix, and evaluation brief as per (IOM template).
- (7) A final meeting with IOM Team to present the key findings.
- (8) Updates Results Framework that clearly shows the status/value of Project indicators visa-vis the targets.

## 9. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

<b>Roles and Responsibilities</b>	<b>Consultancy Firm/Consultant</b>	<b>IOM Iraq</b>
<b>Survey Development</b>	Develop methods and materials for the survey.	Provide secondary data and supportive project documents.
<b>Inception Report</b>	Submission of inception report, incorporating IOM feedback, and submitting satisfactory final inception report.	Provide timely technical review and comments on the inception report.
<b>Field operating permits</b>	Facilitate the permissions needed for data collection and in country activities.	Issue facilitation letter to the consultancy firm.
<b>Training</b>	Prepare training modules for data collectors and lead the training sessions.	N/A
<b>Data Collection Tools</b>	Develop data collection tools and data entry software.	Provide timely technical review and comments on the data collection tools.
<b>Logistics and Field Management</b>	Provide necessary logistics and manage field data collection to ensure survey quality. IOM Iraq will not provide logistical support.	Follow up the data collection process.
<b>Stakeholder Engagement</b>	Involve local government structures, communities, and partners in the assessment process.	Providing available support.
<b>Reporting and Presentation</b>	Prepare PowerPoint presentations and present evaluation results to partners, project staff, and stakeholders.	Attending the sessions.

<b>Report Submission</b>	Submit draft reports with track changes, cleaned and final reports.	Provide timely technical review and comments on the draft final report, and endorse final report
<b>Payment and Deliverables</b>	Note: IOM Iraq is not responsible for payment delays caused by delays in deliverables.	Facilitate payment based on the proposed payment modality.

## 10. EVALUATION PROPOSED WORKPLAN

Table 02: The Evaluation proposed work plan

Activity	Who	Estimated Timeframes	Data Analysis	May	June	July	August
1. Meetings: M&E team, project manager / staff / focal points, management.	IOM	To be completed by 28 <sup>th</sup> May 2025	Remote	X			
2. Desk review of project documents, partners documents, reports, and others	Evaluation firm	Starting from 28 <sup>th</sup> May	Remote	X			
3.a Inception process: Development/submission of inception report/work plan and data collection tools.	Evaluation firm	1st version of inception report is sent to IOM on June 8 <sup>th</sup> (7 working days)	Remote	X	X		
3.b Inception process: IOM CO and RO review inception report and data collection tools	IOM	IOM send back the feedback on the inception report by June 17 <sup>th</sup> (7 working days)	Remote		X		
3.c Inception process: Evaluation firm finalize the inception report.	Evaluation firm	Final revised version of the inception report by June 26 <sup>th</sup> (7 working days)	Remote		X		
4. Sharing detailed data collection plans and updating IOM in case of changes.	Evaluation firm	Final revised version by June 26 <sup>th</sup>	Iraq - Field site.		X		



5. Fieldwork – data collection	Evaluation firm	To be finalized by July 21 <sup>st</sup> (23 days)	Iraq - Field site.			X	
6. Sharing raw data and data analysis	Evaluation firm	To be shared by July 31 <sup>st</sup> (10 days)	Remote			X	
7. Report writing and submission of the first draft (in IOM template)	Evaluation firm	1st version of the evaluation report is sent to IOM on July 31 <sup>st</sup> (10 days)	Remote			X	
8. Meeting to present main findings to IOM	Evaluation firm	To be held on August 13 <sup>th</sup>	Remote				X
9. Review of the first draft of the evaluation report	IOM	To be finalized by August 14 <sup>th</sup> (14 days)	Remote				X
10. Incorporate feedback and submit a final report with a two-pager evaluation brief (as per IOM template)	Evaluation firm	Final version of the evaluation report is sent to IOM on <b>August 24<sup>th</sup> COB Iraq time</b> (10 days)	Remote				X

## 11. TERMS OF PAYMENT

The payment terms shall be issued per the terms and conditions of the Purchase Order (PO) based on the disbursement schedule below.

- Satisfactory inception report submission – 30%
- Submission of first draft of the evaluation report together with raw data – 30%
- Satisfactory final report with relevant annexes – 40%

The final payment shall be issued not less than 30 days upon (1) the completion of the work, (2) receipt of the final original invoice and (3) receipt of the final evaluation report and summary of the evaluation brief following the incorporation of feedback from the IOM ERG and RO.

## 12. REQUIREMENTS

An international consultancy firm with valid registrations, and it is expected to have legal registration paperwork in Iraq, and formal access to the locations of the programme implementation.

Expression of interest: a cover letter with a maximum of one page introducing the consulting firm with an expression of interest to carry out the work as described in this ToR.

**Financial Proposal:** The financial proposal should include details of the evaluation cost breakdown per evaluation activities and should be submitted sealed. The financial proposal will be evaluated out of 30% and opened on successful technical evaluation result above 50%.

**Technical proposal:** This should include, but not limited to, understanding of the ToR with critical reflection on the consultancy assignment, methods (with extremely strong emphasis, should be detailed with clear presentation), tentative work plan, proposed team qualification and experience, others. The technical proposal will be evaluated out of 70%. Note that once the consultancy firm or consultant has been selected to undertake the study, IOM Iraq will not accept changes on the team composition.

The selected firm/ consultant is expected to possess the following minimum qualifications as follows:

### 13. SELECTION CRITERIA

No	Rating Criteria	Score
<i>Understanding of the TOR (10 point)</i>		
1.1	It is clear from the application that the TOR and tasks are clearly understood by the applicant	10
<i>Practical experience of the firm in related work (15 points)</i>		
2.1	Has done at least three similar consulting work (programme and project evaluations) with UN agencies or INGOs	10
2.2	Has expertise /excellence/ on Economic Growth & Market Systems Development thematic areas-such as SMEs, Livelihoods, and related areas.	5
<i>Professional team composition accounts (15 Points)</i> <i>Proposed Evaluation Team is appropriate for the purpose and scope of the evaluation</i>		
3.1	Lead Evaluator/Team leader's or consultancy firm's experience in similar consultancy work/programme evaluation	8
3.2	CVs of Evaluation team submitted and team has necessary skills, competencies and experience to conduct the evaluation	7
<i>Budget</i>		
4.1	The budget proposal is realistic, reflects market rates and does not exceed available funds	
<i>Methods and Materials (25 Points)</i>		
5.1	Proposed methods and Materials design to conduct the programme evaluation	14
5.2	Proposed data collection methods and tools	11
<i>Time frame-schedule. (5 Points)</i>		
6.1	Presents clear logical work plan that shows of how proposed activities of the consultancy will meet the consultancy objectives	5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>

### 14. HOW TO APPLY

The interested firm/ consultant is expected to submit a technical proposal with a detailed evaluation methodology, indicative work plan, and the overall approach to the evaluation and an all-inclusive budget proposal no later than **April 30<sup>th</sup> 2025**. The submission of proposals (technical and financial) and/or related questions is expected to be directed via procurement email to: **iraqtenders@iom.int**