Independent Evaluation of:

IDPs Community mobilization BPRM Project

EVALUATION REPORT

Presented by:
Stars Orbit Consultants and Management Development

May 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background and Context

During the past few years, more than 4.5 million Iraqis are living as refugees inside their own country or in neighboring countries. This represents the largest displacement of people in the Middle East since 1948. On average, 75 to 80 percent of the displaced in any crisis are women and children. They are also the most vulnerable. The Iraqi Red Crescent Society estimates that more than 83 percent of those displaced inside Iraq are women and children, and the majority of the children are under 12.

This project aimed at ensuring an orderly and sustainable phase-out of NRC's Community Mobilisation and Service Coordination Program started in 2011. Within this program, NRC's strategy was to engage IDP communities to better identify their needs, strengthen their capacity to engage with the government and promote improved delivery of basic services by local authorities, along with partner UN and NGO agencies. Furthermore, NRC has mobilised and built capacities of IDPs to play an active role in improving the living conditions of their communities; to become agents participating in the planning of positive development and protection of vulnerable individual and groups; to become respected counterparts in discussions with local, district and provincial authorities by improving their abilities to represent the needs and rights of their communities.

District Council Coordination Meeting (DCCM) formed as part of this project, and the main role of DCCM is to discuss IDP community needs with a view to identifying roles, responsibilities and solutions, and this will be in the form of coordinated service provision. Co-chaired by the respective District Council, DCCMs are attended by Government Ministry branch-offices, NGO service providers, UNHCR and IDP Settlement representatives.

Thus IDP community needs are addressed to the relevant ministry and/or service provider by Settlement Representative. In parallel, NRC enhanced the capacity of relevant GoI bodies through training on how legislation can translate into concrete government actions at the local level, thereby addressing both short-terms needs (access to basic services), while supporting the pursuit of durable solutions in accordance with IDP Guiding Principles and international human rights legal frameworks.

This Evaluation Report presents the findings, lessons learned, and recommendations of a systematic evaluation of the project, undertaken by Stars Orbit Consultants and Management Development. The evaluation was developed around the key criteria of relevance, impact, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability, and involved a thorough desk review of project documents, in addition to site visits to seven settlements representing the seven target districts, as well as interviews, survey data collection, and focus group discussions with different stakeholder groups.

Summary of Findings

Relevance

The project was found to be highly relevant in terms of both its initial design, and the way in which it was implemented. Key findings related to relevance are as follows:
- The project, as designed, was highly relevant to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries.

- The project was designed with a sound theory of change, and a well developed project design to support the delivery of results.
- The project activities were implemented in a manner that supported their continued relevance throughout the duration of the project.
- The project appears to have targeted many of the highest priority issues in the IDP settlements.

Impact and Achievement of Results

The evaluation team has concluded that all of the mandated results have been achieved at target levels, and that the project has succeeded in delivering meaningful changes to the targeted settlements. Key findings in relation to the project impact and results are as follows:
- Stakeholders and beneficiaries feel that the project has gone a long ways towards achieving its goal of improving the living conditions of IDPs.
- While the project achieved a great deal in tangible terms, there is a lot of work remaining to improve the living conditions of IDPs in informal settlements.
- While the amount of training provided by the project was not substantial, there is nonetheless good evidence of new skills being implemented effectively by those who received the training
- The main anticipated results of the project can be considered fully achieved

Efficiency and Effectiveness

The evaluation team developed a very positive impression on the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation, which reflects very favorably on NRC as the implementing agency. Key findings in this area are as follows:
- NRC has worked efficiently and effectively in the development and implementation of the project
- The project maintained a good effort in its monitoring and follow-up on activities.
- The project was generally very effective in mitigating the various challenges encountered during implementation.

Sustainability

Based on the available evidence, the prospects for the sustainability of the project's existing achievements, and the continuation of the coordination that led to those achievements, appear to be quite positive. The key finding identified in this area is as follows:
- Many of the individual achievements of the project appear well positioned to be sustained after handover, although stakeholders have mixed feelings on this.

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

DCCM	District Coordinating Committee Meeting
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
ID	Identification
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
MoMD	Ministry of Migration and Displacement
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
SOC	Stars Orbit Consultants and Management Development

INTRODUCTION

General Background

During the past few years, more than 4.5 million Iraqis are living as refugees inside their own country or in neighboring countries. This represents the largest displacement of people in the Middle East since 1948. On average, 75 to 80 percent of the displaced in any crisis are women and children. They are also the most vulnerable. The Iraqi Red Crescent Society estimates that more than 83 percent of those displaced inside Iraq are women and children, and the majority of the children are under 12.

Iraq's long-term stability and national unity face grave challenges as tens of thousands of Iraqis are driven from their homes due to conflict, straining resources in host communities and undermining more moderate voices across the country.

Moreover, tens of thousands of Iraqis have lost their lives in the violence since 2003. Women and girls inside Iraq have been targeted for murder and kidnapping, and have been subjected to violence. Wide-spread violence and new restrictive laws have significantly constrained women's and girls' lives and limited their access to and participation in the public sphere, women are afraid to leave the relative safety of their homes or shelters and parents are reluctant to send their children to school for fear of violence.[1]

Project Description

This project aimed at ensuring an orderly and sustainable phase-out of NRC's Community Mobilisation and Service Coordination Program started in 2011. Within this program, NRC's strategy was to engage IDP communities to better identify their needs, strengthen their capacity to engage with the government and promote improved delivery of basic services by local authorities, along with partner UN and NGO agencies. Furthermore, NRC has mobilised and built capacities of IDPs to play an active role in improving the living conditions of their communities; to become agents participating in the planning of positive development and protection of vulnerable individual and groups; to become respected counterparts in discussions with local, district and provincial authorities by improving their abilities to represent the needs and rights of their communities.

District Council Coordination Meeting (DCCM) formed as part of this project, and the main role of DCCM is to discuss IDP community needs with a view to identifying roles, responsibilities and solutions, and this will be in the form of coordinated service provision. Co-chaired by the respective District Council, DCCMs are attended by Government Ministry branch-offices, NGO service providers, UNHCR and IDP Settlement representatives.

Thus IDP community needs are addressed to the relevant ministry and/or service provider by Settlement Representative. In parallel, NRC enhanced the capacity of relevant GoI bodies through training on how legislation can translate into concrete government actions at the local level, thereby addressing both short-terms needs (access to basic services), while supporting the pursuit of durable solutions in accordance with IDP Guiding Principles and international human rights legal frameworks.

---

http://www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/partnerships/docs/2012-IOM-CSOConsultations/Additional_Resources/AVRR_Report_2011.pdf

Given that the new elected officials will hold office for four years, it is vital that the phase out focuses on introducing them to the approach and mechanisms of the community mobilisation and service coordination project and receive the tailored trainings. The aim of these training was to engage the participants to brainstorm and reflect jointly on key issues and challenges that they face on a daily basis.

Project geographical coverage

The project was implemented in 6 District of Baghdad: Karrada, Al Rashid, Khadumiyah, Al Adhamiyah, Al Karkh and 9 Nissan

Anticipated Project Results & Indicators to measure achievement

- **Result 1: IDPs in informal settlements of Baghdad have improved living conditions through access to basic services and entitlements.**
    1) Indicator: 25 services are provided as a result of DCCMs (October - January 2013).
    2) Indicator: 70% of women's committees are actively participating in DCCM on a monthly basis.
    3) Indicator: 200 women's committee members complete a three-hour training.
    4) Indicator: 100 participants from targeted group complete a one-day training (target: 50 IDPs, 30 Local and District Councils and 20 Baghdad Provincial Council members).

- **Result 2: Baghdad Provincial Council pursues durable solutions that are protective of the rights of IDPs in informal settlements of Baghdad.**
    1) Indicator: 10 DCCMs are organized between November and December 2013.
    2) Indicator: 60% of DCCMs continue after NRC's handover of the responsibility to the concerned District Councils, namely, Karrada, Al Rashid, Khadumiyah, Al Adhamiyah and 9 Nissan.
    3) Indicator: Baghdad Provincial Council support the DCCM by providing instruction to District Councils by October 2013 to host the meetings (and meetings actually take place) and/or allocating dedicated funding by end of December 2013

Role of SOC

Stars Orbit Consultants and Management Development (SOC) has been contracted to conduct an independent external evaluation of the project, based on the agreed upon Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Evaluation Objectives

The objective of this evaluation has been: To assess the impact of the project (positive and negative changes produced by the BPRM project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended) on IDP communities to better identify their needs, strengthen their capacity to engage with the government and promote improved delivery of basic services by local authorities.

Also, the evaluation process was designed to measure to what extend the project achieved its planed indicators and results and to provide NRC with recommendations for corrective actions that can be taken over to improve general implementation modalities and future similar initiatives.

Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

SOC has sought to ensure that the questions below would be fully addressed, including the identification of findings, lessons learned, and recommendations in relation to each.

1. Effectiveness: A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives. In evaluating the effectiveness of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:
- To what extent were the objectives achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- What were the main challenges of the projects and how were they addressed?
- How well are the activities carried out in terms of the approach adopted, the timeliness of the interventions, their quality, and the level and quality of community participation (women in particular)?

2. Impact: The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors. When evaluating the impact of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:
- What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people have been affected directly and indirectly?

3. Sustainability: Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after the project has ended. When evaluating the sustainability of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:
- To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after the project ended?
- What were the major factors, which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Approach

SOC has implemented the following evaluation methodology in order to obtain objective information in relation to each of the evaluation criteria and key questions presented above. The evaluation was implemented using a participatory approach, which sought the views and assessments of all beneficiaries, key stakeholders, and other relevant parties.

SOC has ensured that the evaluation has been carried out in conformity with the 'Evaluating Humanitarian Action using the OECD-DAC Criteria' and evaluation best practices. SOC has a copy of "Evaluating Humanitarian Action using the OECD-DAC Criteria" and has used this document to guide the development and implementation of the evaluation.

Data Collection Methods

The data collection for this evaluation has employed a blended quantitative/qualitative methodology with an emphasis collecting a sufficient variety of types of data from a sufficient range of sources, rather than a prescriptive adherence to a given methodological design. This balanced and well-rounded approach has allowed for triangulation and drawing meaningful conclusions with respect to the project implementation and results achieved.

Data was obtained from the NRC project team, as well as through information collected during site visits, including interviews, surveys with stakeholders, and focus group discussions. To complement formal data collection processes, informal communication also took place (face to face, telephone, and email), and meetings with stakeholders provided complementary information.

Data was obtained through the following general methods:
- Initial consultations
- Desk evaluation of all project documentation
- Field visits to the identified project sites in the six targeted districts, including:
  - Verification of the services being provided
  - Interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries
  - Survey data collection
  - Focus group discussions

Sampling Framework

In order to collect the necessary data pertaining to the Evaluation Framework and to ensure assessing the feedback from all project beneficiaries and stakeholders, SOC developed the sampling framework as outlined below. The selection of beneficiaries and locations was randomized, albeit ensuring appropriate representation in line with the agreed upon framework. The composition of the sample used in the data collection is presented in Table 1 below, including the aspects of the evaluation on which the data collection with each group was focused.

Table 1. Composition of evaluation sample

Stakeholder Group	Number	Location	Means of Data Collection	Evaluation Criteria Targeted
Targeted beneficiaries: IDPs, women committees.	56	6 locations in Baghdad	Interviews & FGDs	Effectiveness Impact Sustainability
Local councils representatives	6	Baghdad	Interviews	Relevance Impact Sustainability
DCCM representatives	6	Baghdad	Interviews	Relevance Impact Sustainability
Partners and actors directly involved in the project at different levels (lists of partners provided by NRC team included 219 names)	2 (in addition to those listed elsewhere)	Baghdad	Interviews	Relevance Impact Sustainability
Settlement representatives and presidents of women's committees	8	6 locations in Baghdad	Interviews in each targeted settlement	Relevance Impact Sustainability
Site visit to Adhmyia	11	Baghdad	Field visit to one settlement: Al-Sha'ab	Effectiveness Impact Sustainability
Site visit to 9-Nissan	13	Baghdad	Field visit to one settlement: Maytham Al-Tammar	
Site visit to Al-Karrada	11	Baghdad	Field visit to one settlement: Al-Sadarain	
Site visit to Al-Rasheed	11	Baghdad	Field visit to one settlement: Al-Thaqalain	
Site visit to Al-Kadhumiya	5	Baghdad	Field visit to one settlement: Al Hakeem	
Site visit to Al-Karkh	5	Baghdad	Field visit to one settlement: Um Al-Baneen	
Site visit to Al-Mansour	5		Field visit to one settlement: Al-Saydala	
NRC staff involved the project implementation and NRC staff involved in project monitoring.	5	Baghdad	Interviews and meetings	Relevance Sustainability Lessons Learned

This evaluation attempts to take stock of both positive and negative factors that have emerged during the implementation of the project to date, as well as to evaluate and prioritize feedback and recommendations provided by stakeholders and beneficiaries. The findings, lessons learned, and recommendations of this report are presented as discussion points and should not be taken as definitive. While an effort has been made to represent different perspectives on each issue, it should be noted that the evaluation included only a representative sample of beneficiaries and stakeholders in the data collection process, as agreed. There is naturally some variation in opinions and perspectives on any given issue, and while the data collection has been comprehensive and representative, it cannot be considered exhaustive.

Relevance

FINDING: The project activities were implemented in a manner that supported their continued relevance throughout the duration of the project.

While the design of a project has a major bearing on its overall relevance, the way in which the project activities are implemented can reinforce or undermine this relevance. There was a strong consensus among the stakeholders involved in the evaluation data collection that the relevance of the project was strengthened by the collaborative and dialogical approach taken to the activity implementation. All of those interviewed indicated that the project, as implemented, contributed to the overall goal of strengthening the IDPs capacity to engage with the government and promote improved delivery of basic services by local authorities. Individual interviewees indicated that the process of involving committees and representatives from the community in identifying and prioritizing issues, and then taking those issues forward to the DCCM was an effective approach. When queried about the process for identifying and selecting issues, many of those interviewed indicated that discussion helped to prioritize issues, and most indicated that there was good cooperation and motivation from community members. None of the parties interviewed indicated that there were serious issues with identifying or prioritizing issues. While it is likely that there were disagreements about priorities, given the complex environment and the range of stakeholders involved, it reflects positively on the project (and the beneficiaries themselves) that no major disagreements were reported.[2] The process appears to have been quite democratic and civil in nature.

Settlement representatives, as well as women's committee members indicated that the training they received had helped them to be more effective in their roles, and many indicated that it provided them with skills that they needed to help make changes in their communities. The contents of the training were reportedly quite relevant across the board, and when asked specifically what training topics were most helpful, most respondents indicated that all of the topics were practical and relevant, while several indicated that the emphasis on supporting women's involvement was highly important. Several of the female interviewees also indicated that the training helped with their confidence. Notwithstanding these positive comments about the relevance of the training, some issues were noted related to its effectiveness, and these are discussed further below.

The projects remained true to the original anticipated outcomes of the project, while engaging the beneficiaries and other stakeholders in activities that were substantively shaped by the input of those stakeholders themselves. More specifically, while some training topics and project activities were set by the project design, interviewees indicated that the focus of discussions in those activities, and in the

---

[2] Please refer to the Annexes of this report for a list of the beneficiaries interviewed.

DCCMs themselves, revolved around issues that were raised by the participants in the activities—issues that varied from community to community.

When project stakeholders (including NRC team members, settlement representatives, women's committee representatives, DC members, and UNHCR representatives) were asked specifically if the activities of the project were relevant to the needs of those involved, the mean response was 4/5, corresponding to a "very good" degree of relevance. Specific positive comments were made about the focus of the training activities as being relevant, and there was consistently positive feedback about the project's focus on women beneficiaries. This positive sentiment was further corroborated in interviews with women beneficiaries who attested directly to the value of the training they received supporting their involvement in the women's committees, and the participation in activities.

> **Lesson Learned**: The dialogical approach of the project helped to ensure relevance throughout implementation.

Further evidence pertaining to the relevance of the project activities can be found in the partnerships that developed as a result of these activities. This is because partnerships, and particularly those across stakeholder groups, tend only to develop in cases where the substantive focus of the activities is highly relevant to the different groups involved. Most germane to the project's interventions were the formal partnerships established through the DCCMs. This involved a wide range of stakeholders, including not only those in the settlements (men and women) and the DC itself, but also service providers. All of the stakeholders interviewed on this topic indicated that indeed new partnerships had developed as a result of the project. Importantly, these comments came from different groups, including, for example, both Settlement Representatives and Local Council Representatives. Statements given by these groups highlighted the partnerships established through the DCCM activities, citing cases of good coordination with local government officials from the concerned departments as well. Some of the Settlement Representatives interviewed also mentioned new partnerships with service providers, such as electric companies, as the provision of new services in the communities are viewed as partnerships—particularly by those with a sense of ownership for the achievement of bringing new services to their communities.

Additional partnerships identified during the course of the evaluation were primarily at the level of NRC itself, and there appears to be strong coordination with other players in the relevant sectors. NRC's local team is maintaining collaboration with UNHCR, and especially their Returnee Integration Community Centre staff, through exchange of information on IDPs and informal settlements. In addition, the project documents show evidence off good coordination with IRC, and all legal cases discovered by NRC staff in the IDP settlements are being referred to IRC, who are able to assist the individual IDPs.

FINDING: The project appears to have targeted many of the highest priority issues in the IDP settlements.

As part of the assessment of the project's relevance, the evaluation team asked stakeholders about the key issues and challenges facing their communities. While it is unrealistic to expect that a project such as this could completely resolve major issues such as health, security, and accommodation in the communities, the responses provided by interviewees do reinforce the focus of the project activities. Perhaps most importantly, the project methodology helped to identify and prioritize the issues facing the communities, and then provide a forum to help the community members connect with government stakeholders and service providers to address those needs.

The question posed to the stakeholders asked specifically about the key issues *currently* facing their communities (i.e., after the project implementation). In some cases, the most critical issues perceived to be facing the communities have already been addressed, as discussed in the section below related to project results, and the stakeholders identified new issues. In other cases, the issues identified are persistent ones, and the new service resulting from the project achievements are only part of the resolution to these broader issues. However, in all cases, there is a strong resonance between the issues targeted under the project auspices, and those identified as being key issues currently, thereby affirming the relevance of the project interventions. For readers of this report, it may be of interest to compare the response patterns across stakeholder groups in order to reveal potential gaps in the perception of priorities, particularly if new programming is being developed in these communities. The issues mentioned are outlined in the table below.

Table 2. Key issues identified by different stakeholder groups during interviews

Group	Details	Key issues identified
NRC Staff		• Accommodations • Health situation • Improving living conditions
Key Informants	Local Council Representatives; UNHCR Monitors; IDP Committee Representatives	• Accommodations • Infrastructure • Job opportunities • Health situation • Education provision • Security issues • General lack of assistance to IDPs
Settlement Representatives and Women's Committee Representatives	Adhmyia	• Dealing with government departments
	9-Nissan	• Community traditions
	Al-Karrada	• Infrastructure • Health facilities
	Al-Rasheed	• Lack of official registration for the settlement
	Al-Kadhumiya	• Community and family traditions
	Al-Karkh	• Impending threat that the settlement will be removed by the government
	Al-Mansour	• Weak financial situation of the IDPs • Closing of roads by security forces

It is worth noting in the table above that while there was general agreement between NRC Staff members and Key Informants, the key issues identified by the Settlement Representatives and Women's Committee Representatives were quite different in many cases. This is not to say that the issues identified by one group are not recognized by the other, but rather, the priority or perceived underlying importance of the issues may be different from one group to the next. For example, there is ongoing concern in some communities regarding the underlying issues of the status of the settlements, as well as coordinating with the government—issues which were not explicitly mentioned during interviews with NRC staff or other key informants. The evaluation team is confident that these stakeholders are indeed attuned to these issues, but the emphasis on the more tangible sector specific issues presented above may be of interest as a potential different in perspective. The issues of community and family traditions refers specifically to the status of women in the communities, and the challenges involved with increasing the level of engagement of the women in the process of identifying needs and working to have them addressed. Female community

members in particular mentioned these as key issues currently facing their communities, and it is natural for any subset of stakeholders to identify as key issues, those issues which are most directly related to their own personal situation.

> **Lesson Learned**: There may be subtle, but nonetheless important, differences in perspective around the priority of different issues affecting the targeted communities, and there may be potential to increase relevance by openly acknowledging and discussing such differences.

Impact and Achievement of Results

Key Question: What has happened as a result of the programme or project?

FINDING: While the project achieved a great deal in tangible terms, there is a lot of work remaining to improve the quality of living conditions in informal settlements.

The project substantially delivered on its promise of improving the quality of life of IDPs in the targeted settlements, and there were a number of tangible achievements. According to the project design, the majority of project activities related to the building of capacity and the establishment of mechanisms to identify and prioritize issues facing the communities, and bring those issues forward in a forum where they could be addressed in partnership and collaboration with partners in government and industry. It is this last aspect of the design where the results targeting the ultimate beneficiaries of the project are to be achieved. The key achievements related to this process, noted in the project's own evaluation report, include the following:

- Implementation of 10 DCCMs in five districts, noting that two districts did not implement DCCMs
- More than 25% of Women's Committees actively participating in the DCCMs
- 40 instances of expert and technical assistance (delivery of new services) provided by the government in the five districts.

This latter bullet point warrants further elaboration, because it relates directly to improving the quality of life in the settlements.

Table 3. Delivery of services identified in NRC reporting[3]

Dist.	Education	Electricity	Garbage removal	Health	Municipality	Security	Water	Residence ID	Land Tenure	Total
9-Nissan		2	1		1		3		1	8
Adhmyia				2			1			3
Karrada	1		4		1		2			8
Rasheed	3	3	4		2	1		3		16
Mansour		1	1			2		1		5
Total	4	6	11	2	4	3	6	4	1	40

It is important to bear in mind that the numbers recorded in the table relate to tangible and meaningful achievements resulting from the DCCM process and coordination with government bodies. These are services that directly affect the quality of life of those in the targeted settlements. During site visits and interviews with beneficiaries and Settlement Representatives sought to verify the delivery of the services identified in the table above. The monitoring team has confirmed the majority of the services delivered, either through the site visits, verbal confirmation from those in the communities, or in some cases, from the DCCM minutes themselves.

During the field data collection by the monitoring team asked Settlement Representatives and beneficiaries about the services being delivered to their communities as a result of the project, and the resulting list is somewhat different than that shown in Table 3. This is, in part, because the services listed in Table 4 are aggregated to the District level, whereas the evaluation field visits targeted individual settlements *within* those Districts. Many of the services listed in Table 4 have been, reportedly, delivered

---

[3] Table generated by NRC in May 2014

to other settlements within the five Districts mentioned. It is also worth noting that the field interviews identified a small number of services that do not appear to have been included in the NRC reporting. These are highlighted in Table 4 below, which provides the full list of services identified during the evaluation interviews.

Table 4. Delivery of services identified during field data collection, with DCCM attribution

District/ Settlement	New Services Provided/ Benefits	Did DCCM play a primary role in this
Adhmyia Al Sha'ab	• Health/ public health centre	Yes
	• Health awareness campaign	Uncertain
	• IDs for children	Uncertain
9-Nissan Maytham Al Tammer	• Municipal/ garbage removal	Yes
	• Awareness of health issues for women	Uncertain
Al-Karrada Al Sadarain	• Electricity	Yes
	• Security	Yes
Al-Rasheed Al Thaqalain	• Municipal/ garbage removal	Yes
	• Health/ public health centre/ vaccinations	Yes
	• Security	Yes
	• Residence ID	Yes
Al-Mansour Saydala & Efrazat	• Municipal/ settlement access	Yes
	• ID (accommodation) cards	Uncertain
	• Municipal/ garbage removal	Uncertain
	• Municipal/ sewage	Uncertain
	• Electricity	Uncertain

However, it is clear both from the site visits and the interviews that the service delivery is inadequate. As discussed in more depth later in this report, the delivery of services to the communities are not fully addressing the issues facing the communities. Even those issues that have been responded to with new services are only being partially alleviated. Moreover, in many cases, the services have targeted only a portion community members (such as IDs for some families in the communities) or provide only temporary relieve (such as pumping of pooled rain water, rather than a drainage system).

It appears from Table 4 above that Al-Rasheed was the most successful, at least numerically, in terms of bringing forward issues and successfully working toward the provision of corresponding services by the concerned authorities. According to Table 5, however, the situation of Al Rasheed does not appear to be substantially different from the other districts. The field data from the evaluation did not identify any specific factors that explain any difference between Al Rasheed and the other districts, and the field visits did not provide evidence that the quality of life in Al Rasheed is systematically better than in other districts. The stakeholders and beneficiaries were comparable to those of other districts in terms of their levels of engagement, and there was no indication from project records, DCCM minutes, or from the interviews themselves, that the activities were any more successful in Al Rasheed than in other districts. The interventions and stakeholders in Al Rasheed were comparable those in other districts, and it may simply be the case that the achievements (in terms of service delivery) in Al Rasheed were due to normal variability[4].

---

[4] The different services delivered vary from district to district, and between sectors, and as such, a purely numerical comparison is not justified, as some of the services reflect greater achievements than others. Moreover, a sample of five districts is too few to make any judgments about statistical significance of differences.

However, it is also interesting to note that the two districts in which DCCMs were not implemented (Al Karkh and Al Kadhumiya), achievements were also identified by the project stakeholders. These two districts are not included in the table above, because the attribution of the achievements to the project interventions is less clear. Moreover, the achievements noted during the field interviews may not provide an exhaustive list, and for this reason as well, should not be compared numerically to the other districts. However, the types of achievements are comparable to those noted in the other five districts where DCCMs were implemented. Stakeholders in Al-Kadhumiya indicated, for example, that they benefitted from improved partnerships with the departments of electricity, health, education, and municipalities in Karkh3, resulting in a number of tangible achievements, including: stimulating the DoE to establish school caravans in an adjacent complex; provision of electricity to the settlement; and improved health circumstances of the community members. In Karkh, however, the achievements were more limited, with the only achievement noted by the monitoring team being the implementation of a cleaning campaign/ garbage removal.

These achievements may have come about through other processes initiated by the project, including the training and coordination support provided by the project, but it is clear from this that change in the communities is not fully reliant on the DCCMs. Because of the complexity of interrelated factors affecting the IDP communities and their relationships with government departments, councils, and service providers, it is not possible to judge the extent to which the DCCMs specifically contributed to the achievements of the districts where they occurred. The DCCMs provide a systematic and efficient mechanism for bringing stakeholders together to discuss issues, priorities, and possible solutions, and as such, it is logical to infer that they were a contributing factor to the achievements of the five districts where they were implemented. However, they do not appear to be essential to the process. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the DCCMs were highlighted positively in field interviews with DC representatives, settlement representatives, and women's committee representatives, and the DCCMs have an inherent value in terms of providing a constructive forum and motivating the engagement of stakeholders.

> **Recommendation**: While the field data indicates that DCCMs are not essential to achieve progress in informal IDP settlements, the available evidence suggests they are inherently valuable and contribute positively to the project goals, and as such, should be included in the design of future projects.

In order to better understand the perspectives of different stakeholder groups on the results of the project, the monitoring team asked each group to identify what they felt were the most important benefits and achievements. This process also served to help verify the findings mentioned in project reports. The monitoring team noted that there was a high degree of consistency within each community regarding perceptions of the main achievements of the project, and in most cases, these corresponded to one or more of the new services/ technical assistance mentioned in Table 3 above. Those benefits in the table below that correspond to services in Table 3 are underlined. However, it is worth noting that in addition to these new services, one of the achievements cited most frequently was the improved level of coordination with authorities, along with improved awareness about how to identify and present needs to the respective government bodies. The table below outlines the key achievements noted by stakeholders in the different settlements visited by the monitoring team.

Table 5. Main benefits noted by beneficiaries from different districts

District	Main benefits noted
Adhmyia	• Increased understanding of how to communicate needs and get solutions from the government

	• Coordination with local authorities
	• <u>Health awareness campaign</u>
	• IDs for children
9-Nissan	• Link with government departments such as the DoH and receiving their support
Al-Karrada	• Link and coordination with government departments
	• Provision of electricity towers to support the settlement
	• Cooperation on security issues
	• Feeling that needs in the community are being listened to and addressed
Al-Rasheed	• Cooperation of service departments
	• <u>Provision of accommodation card for a year</u>
	• <u>Cooperation of security forces</u>
	• Support from Health Department for the provision of vaccinations against polio
Al-Kadhumiya	• Establishment of school caravans
	• Provision of electricity to the settlement
	• Improved health circumstances
	• General improved partnership with service departments
Al-Karkh	• Cleaning campaign completed
Al-Mansour	• <u>Provision of accommodation cards for the IDPs</u>
	• Increased cooperation with the Directorates for sewage, municipalities, and electricity
	• <u>Removal of waste from the community</u>
	• Financial opportunities for some families
Key stakeholders	• Improved coordination with municipalities, health, and electricity departments, as well as local councils
	• Improved understanding by citizens about how to get their needs met by the concerned government departments
	• Successfully activated the role of women in the communities, and helped to ensure that the needs of the women were met
	• Helped to change perceptions about the role of women in the community, and the value that they might bring to resolving issues that affect their families and the rest of the community as well
	• Health awareness campaigns in some communities
	• Children's vaccinations in some communities
	• Cleaning of some settlements by municipalities
	• Pest control in some settlements
	• Registration of IDPs and provision of IDs from the MoMD, as well as resolution to longstanding administrative issues in some communities
	• Registration of children for school in some communities

The tables above provide important evidence about the tangible achievements of the project, and it must be stressed that these achievements will deliver real and lasting benefit to the settlements and those within them. However, it also bears mentioning that the conditions in the settlements remain very challenging. The successes achieved to date represent a proof of concept, and validate the project design, but a great deal more work remains to be done in order to remediate all of the issues that truly require attention. As the evaluation team members conducting the site visits can attest, the IDP settlements remain very challenging in terms of meeting even the most basic needs of the IDPs for things such as water, sanitary facilities, rudimentary health and education, and so on. While each of these issues has been addressed in

one or more communities, the status of these services remains somewhat tenuous, and other challenges loom large in the lives of the targeted beneficiaries. As noted in Table 3, none of the service areas have yet been raised to a satisfactory level. This does not negate the benefits of the work that has been done, but it does underscore the need for continued efforts.

Key Question: What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?

FINDING: Stakeholders and beneficiaries feel that the project has gone a long ways towards achieving its goal of improving the living conditions of IDPs.

While the discussion above about services being provided to the communities is important, the important follow-up question is whether these services have made a genuine difference to the residents. There were consensus stakeholders and beneficiaries that the project has generally achieved its main objective of improving the living conditions of IDPs. While there were small variations from group to group, the resounding sentiment indicated a moderate to good level of results achievement, with an overall mean of 3.4 out of 5[5] on survey questions related to results achievement. In total, four interrelated questions were asked to respondents. The questions are listed below, and stakeholder responses are summarized in the table that follows.

- 3a. How well is the project achieve its goal of improving IDPs living conditions?
- 3b. To what extent are new skills being implemented effectively?
- 3c. How much do you think IDPs are now engaged in the process of identifying their needs?
- 3d. How much do you think IDPs are now engaged with the local authorities to improve the delivery of basic services to their community?

Table 6. Summary of survey data pertaining to stakeholder and beneficiary perceptions of results achievement

District		Female Beneficiaries	Mixed gender FGDs	Settlement Reps	Mean
Adhmyia	3a	4	4	4	4
	3b	4	4	4	4
	3c	3	3	3	3
	3d	3	3	5	3.7
	Mean	3.5	3.5	4	3.7
9-Nissan	3a	3	3	4	3.3
	3b	3	3	4	3.3
	3c	3	3	3	3.0
	3d	3	3	5	3.7
	Mean	3	3	4	3.3
Al-Karrada	3a	3	4	4	3.7
	3b	3	4	4	3.7
	3c	3	3	3	3.0
	3d	3	3	5	3.7
	Mean	3	3.5	4	3.5
Al-Rasheed	3a	3	3	4	3.3
	3b	3	3	4	3.3
	3c	3	3	3	3.0

---

[5] Likert scale was benchmarked as follows: 1=very poor; 2=poor; 3=moderate; 4=good; 5=very good

	3d	3	3	5	3.7
	Mean	3	3	4	3.3
Al-Kadhumiya	3a	3	*	4	3.5
	3b	3	*	4	3.5
	3c	3	*	3	3
	3d	3	*	5	4
	Mean	3	*	4	3.5
Al-Karkh	3a	3	3	3	3
	3b	4	4	4	4
	3c	3	3	3	3
	3d	3	3	3	3
	Mean	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Al-Mansour	3a	3	*	4	3.5
	3b	3	*	4	3.5
	3c	3	*	3	3
	3d	3	*	5	4
	Mean	3	*	4	3.5
Mean	3a	3.1	3.5	3.9	3.5
	3b	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.6
	3c	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	3d	3.0	3.0	4.7	3.7
Overall Mean		3.1	3.3	3.9	3.4

The differences in response patterns between the groups discussed above are of some interest to the discussion of the overall achievement of the project goals. A few points are therefore warranted. First, it is noteworthy that among the different settlements visited, the lowest overall perceptions about the level of accomplishment came from 9-Nissan and Al-Rasheed, while the highest came from Adhmiya. This suggests, naturally, that there may be some difference in the degree of results achievement related to different activities in the different settlements, although it should be noted that perceptions about achievement do not always correspond to actual achievement, and may be related to other factors. It is worth noting, for example, that Al Rasheed, which provided the lowest ratings related to results achievement (along with Al Karkh and 9-Nissan), was also the district where the largest number of new services were being delivered by the end of the project. As such, the perceptional data does not correspond with this objective measure of results achievement. The evaluation team also reviewed the available workshop assessment and pre/post data from project activities, and did not identify a clear trend related to perceived results achievement in this activity data. As such, it appears likely that variations in the levels of perceptions about results achievement are related to individual differences in perceptions, rather than any structural differences or significant differences in the results from one district to the next.

Second, it is worth noting that the perceptions of female beneficiaries were substantially lower than those of Settlement Representatives, with overall means of 3.1 and 3.9 respectively. It is not surprising that Settlement Representatives might have a slightly inflated perception of the accomplishments of the project, given their central role in the process of conveying community needs and working to ensure they are addressed.

Key Question: How many people have been affected directly and indirectly?

Project documentation indicates that the original project design targeted a total of 300 direct beneficiaries, and would indirectly benefit a total of 11,065 IDPs living in the target communities. In terms of its actual achievements, project records indicate that a total of 553 direct beneficiaries were involved in the project training activities, for an over-achievement of 84%. The evaluation team was unable to verify this number through triangulation due to incomplete documentation made available; however, the available activity reports and other related training documentation such as pre/post test data is consistent with the numbers reported. For example, pre/post test data was available for all 105 participants in the one-day training activity (against a target of 100). In addition, a total of 150 stakeholders were reportedly involved in the project's DCCM meetings, and it is worth noting that according to the project's metrics, these individuals are not credited as beneficiaries. They were, however, directly involved in project activities, and this warrants mention even if there is some overlap with the beneficiary group involved in the project training.

In terms of indirect beneficiaries, the field evaluation asked different stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries and Settlement Representatives, how many people benefitted from the project. The unanimous response was that the whole community had benefitted. This would suggest a figure in the range of the 11,065 IDPs noted in the project documentation. It is worth noting, however, that not all of the services delivered through the project mechanism benefit all residents equally. For example, some targeted services like education and vaccinations focused on children; whereas other services such as the provision of ID cards were not, in all cases, provided to all families. Thus, while the overall impact of the project has been community wide, and there does not appear to be any bias in the distribution of benefits, there are no doubt some individuals who received more direct benefit than others.

Effectiveness and Efficiency

Key Question: To what extent were the objectives achieved?

FINDING: The main anticipated results of the project can be considered fully achieved

Overall, the project's anticipated results can be considered fully achieved. This includes not only the planned project outcomes, but also the activity level outputs envisaged by the project design. The Performance Measurement Framework of the project included quantitative targets for each of the key outputs and outcomes, and all of these targets were either met or exceeded through the course of the implementation. The table below provides a summary of the project achievements in relation to its performance indicators.

Table 7. Summary of results achievement within the project

Result 1: IDPs in informal settlements of Baghdad have improved living conditions through access to basic services and entitlements.

Narrative Overview:
The activities within this component of the project have been successfully implemented, and numerical targets have been exceeded. Feedback from participants indicates that they are satisfied with the activities and that the results have been achieved. For example, training activities achieved their desired results. The monitoring team has some concerns about the measurement of the results of the training, but overall, these activities appear to have served their purpose, as the trainees fulfilled their roles in the manner envisioned by the project design.

At the outcome level, the new services provided to the communities have contributed very positively to the lives of the community members, and it is clear that quality of life has been improved. This is particularly noted in the case of key services the provision of education, electricity, waste removal, and drinking water, which dramatically affect the daily experiences of many residents.

- Desk review: Project documents indicate all indicator targets have been achieved or exceeded.
- Interviews with beneficiaries: Beneficiaries indicate that they are benefitting from the new services to their communities.
- Interviews with Settlement Representatives: Settlement Representatives unanimously indicated that the project has improved life in the settlements, through the delivery of new services, and through the introduction of a way of communicating more effectively with the District Councils.
- Site visits: Visits to the settlements by the field monitors have confirmed the evidence of the new services provided.

Indicator	Planned Target	Achievement Status	Comments
Indicator: 25 services are provided as a result of DCCMs (October - January 2013).	• 25 services	• 40 services	• Target was exceeded by 60% • It is not clear whether the new services can be attributed directly to the DCCMs, as there are multiple factors involved, and evidence from Al Kadhumiya in particular suggests that DCCMs are not an essential aspect in service delivery • Not all services are of equal value,

			difficulty, or priority, and as such, the simple counting of services is not a strong outcome indicator
Indicator: 70% of women's committees are actively participating in DCCM on a monthly basis.	• 25%[6]	• 25%	• Target not clear • The indicator itself references a target of 70%, while the planned target column, taken from the Evaluation Report of the project, mentions a target of just 25%
Indicator: 200 women's committee members complete a three-hour training.	• 200 partici-pants	• 448 partici-pants	• Target exceeded by 124%
Indicator: 100 participants from targeted group complete a one-day training (target: 50 IDPs, 30 Local and District Councils and 20 Baghdad Provincial Council members).	• 100 partici-pants	• 105 partici-pants	• Target exceeded by 5%

Result 2: Baghdad Provincial Council pursues durable solutions that are protective of the rights of IDPs in informal settlements of Baghdad.

Narrative Summary:

Because the indicator targets have been met for all indicators under this outcome, the result can be considered achieved. Moreover, issuing of a letter by the Provincial Council for the District Councils to take over the hosting of the DCCMs provides clear evidence of their pursuit of durable solutions, and their endorsement of the DCCMs as a mechanism by which to do so. However, the evaluation team notes the lack of evidence that DCCMs have continued beyond May 2014, and it appears that there has been little, if any, follow up from the Provincial Council to ensure its instructions are implemented at the District level. This issue relates more to sustainability than results achievement, and is discussed more below.

- Desk review: Project documents, including an official letter of instructions from the Baghdad Provincial Council, as well as DCCM minutes, indicate that the DCCMs were held up until May 2014, but there is no evidence that they have continued after that time.
- Interviews with Settlement Representatives: Settlement Representatives indicated that the DCCM mechanism was effective and had good potential, but were not able to confirm the continuation of the DCCM meetings.
- Site visits: Visits to the settlements by the field monitors indicate that the sites remain in need of further support in the form of durable solutions. .

---

[6] It is noted that the indicator itself references a target of 70%, while the planned target column, taken from the Evaluation Report of the project, mentions a target of just 25%.

Indicator	Planned Target	Achievement Status/ Comments	
Indicator: 10 DCCMs are organized between November and December 2013.	• 10 DCCMs	• 10 DCCMs • The 10 DCCMs took place over the course of four months rather than two, and as such, their frequency was not at the anticipated level • DCCMs were only implemented in 5 of the 7 districts targeted • DCCMs reportedly involved 150 individual stakeholders across the 5 districts	•
Indicator: 60% of DCCMs continue after NRC's handover of the responsibility to the concerned District Councils, namely, Karrada, Al Rashid, Khadumiyah, Al Adhamiyah and 9 Nissan.	• 60% of DCCMs	• 80% of DCCMs • DCCM was not implemented in Al Khadumiyah as mentioned in the indicator, as the DC refused. DCCMs were instead implemented in Al Mansour.	•
Indicator: Baghdad Provincial Council support the DCCM by providing instruction to District Councils by October 2013 to host the meetings (and meetings actually take place) and/or allocating dedicated funding by end of December 2013	• Yes	• Yes • No evidence of funding for the DCCMs was uncovered by the monitoring team, but it is worth noting in kind contributions from the DCs, which hosted the meetings	•

Based on the data provided in the table above, it is clear that the performance targets of the project, at both the output and outcome level, have been met or exceeded. In all cases, the evaluation team has undertaken to verify the data reported by triangulating with project records, field interviews, and other data collection. The results reported by the NRC team in their project reporting have been verified by the evaluation team through interviews and analysis of the available documents. The only discrepancy noted by the team was in relation to the second indicator for Result 1, where the target embedded in the indicator is 70%, but the planned target column in some project documents erroneously mentioned a target of 25%.

> **Recommendation**: Performance indicators and targets, like the results they pertain to, should be reported with complete consistency, in order to avoid any confusion related to accountability for results.

Key Question: What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

FINDING: The achievement of results was due to a variety of factors, but the crux of the issue appears to be the cooperation of the government.

The achievement/ non-achievement of the project results is attributable to a wide range of factors. This section provides discussion on some of the positive contributing factors, such as the project design itself, as well as a number of challenges. However, based on field interviews with a wide range of stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, Settlement Representatives, and those involved from NRC, UNHCR, and Local Councils, the key factors appears to be the cooperation of the government officials.

The role of government officials in the project has been both positive and negative. Interviewees indicated that it has been positive in the sense that the achievement of results in terms of service delivery has been, in most cases, largely attributable to the support provided by government officials through the DCCM mechanism, and following the DCCM meetings to ensure follow-up. These same interviewees also indicated, however, that the role of the government officials has been negative in the sense that where service delivery has not been provided, it has often been attributable to lack of cooperation from the government officials. In some cases, individual stakeholders reported both the positive and negative role of the government on different issues. In other cases, individual stakeholders had a more consistently positive or negative perspective. However, common throughout the interviews was a sense that government officials were essential gatekeepers who were able to determine whether or not a given issue would be resolved.

In terms of other factors noted during the interviews, the table below presents a list of the items most commonly noted during the field interviews. There was very little variation between settlements in the types of factors noted.

Table 8. Summary of factors affecting the achievement and non-achievement of results.

Helped the project to succeed	Hindered the progress of the project
- Good cooperation from partners - Continuity in the project activities - Good follow-up and support from NRC - Continuous/ good coordination - Timing of the project was good - Training was helpful in providing the knowledge and skills needed - DCCM mechanism was helpful - DCCMs were well coordinated - Local council was motivated - Government officials were motivated	- Project was too rushed/ not enough time - Not enough financial support - Lack of local council support - Lack of support from government

FINDING: The project, as designed, was highly relevant to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries.

Through its site visits and interviews with beneficiaries, the evaluation team has confirmed that the project, as designed, was highly relevant to the targeted beneficiaries and their settlements more generally. The project was designed with a sound understanding of the nature of the issues present in the identified settlements, including not only the fundamental needs for security, infrastructure, and services in the communities, but also those related to the informal and unrecognized status of the communities and their inhabitants. As such, the project was designed in a manner that would help to mitigate the gaps in understanding of the different stakeholder groups involved by supporting improved organizational structures (women's committees, for example) to help identify and communicate needs, while at the same time supporting processes that would allow for more immediate relief to urgent needs, such as the implementation of DCCM meetings to communicate and discuss needs and priorities in the target communities. Feedback from the stakeholders and beneficiaries interviewed indicated that each of the work strands supported by the project had value, and there was positive feedback related to the women's committees, the DCCM meetings, and the NRC meetings, as well as the various training activities. There appears to have been a complementary effect from these different work strands, through which the outputs of the different work strands all contributed to the ultimate results.

The structure of the project does not allow for a scientific approach using control groups to determine which project components were most effective, and it in most cases, the delivery of new services to a community cannot be attributed to a single factor or intervention. However, there is evidence that some of the new services delivered during the project are attributable, at least in large part, to the fact that they were raised as key issues through the DCCM mechanism. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that even in the two districts where DCCM meetings were not implemented, new services were nonetheless delivered to the target settlements. As such, there is a degree of evidence to support the proposition that the DCCM meetings may have been superfluous to some degree—as some of the new services delivered to the communities were unrelated to the DCCM process. In this regard, it is important to note that there are other factors at play in these communities, including interventions from different levels of government and from other organizations, including service providers themselves. A full mapping of these factors and interventions is beyond the scope of this evaluation, however, this point is raised as it may affect future programming approaches. The SOC evaluation team is convinced that the DCCM mechanism has the potential to improve the coordination of service delivery, but in order to fully integrate all of the stakeholders, it would need to increase in its profile and level of activity.

While it cannot be said that all of the needs of all sub-sections of the IDP population in the targeted settlements were met equally, the project facilitated a process for helping to systematically identify and prioritize the needs in each of the targeted communities. Importantly, the project, through its support to women's committees, gave a strong voice to the needs identified by women—a subset of the population that has tended to be marginalized. This is critical not only because women represent approximately half of the community population, but also because of the insight women community members have on family and domestic issues, and other aspects of daily life about which male community members tend to be less informed (schooling, children's health, water and sanitation etc.).

In the target communities, many of the needs of community members continue to be unmet. In most cases, even the delivery of a new service cannot be said to have fully satisfied the needs it relates to, as the new services are being provided on a limited basis and cannot fully address the underlying issues. However, the table below outlines the community needs where new services are being delivered, and those have been highlighted during field issues as still being very problematic. It is worth noting that even the sectors where new services are being provided remain, in *all* cases, problematic for the residents. Representatives often indicated that while a given service, such as garbage removal or vaccinations were being delivered, the needs for those services (garbage removal/ sanitation, or health services) greatly exceed what has been provided.

Table 9. Summary of services and benefits provided by the project, and ongoing serious issues facing the settlements.

District/ Settlement	New Services Provided/ Benefits	Ongoing Serious Issues						
		Electricity	Water	Garbage Removal	Schools/ Teachers	Health	Res.IDs	Community Recog'n
Adhmyia Al Sha'ab	• Health/ public health centre • Health awareness campaign • IDs for children	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
9-Nissan Maytham Al Tammer	• Municipal/ garbage removal • Awareness of health issues for women	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Al-Karrada Al Sadarain	• Electricity • Security	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Al-Rasheed Al Thaqalain	• Municipal/ garbage removal • Health/ public health centre/ vaccinations • Security • Residence ID	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Al-Kadhumiya Al Hakeem	• Education/ school caravans • Electricity • Water • Health	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Al-Karkh Um Al Baneen	• Municipal/ garbage removal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Al-Mansour Saydala & Efrazat	• Municipal/ settlement access • ID (accommodation) cards • Municipal/ garbage removal • Municipal/ sewage • Electricity	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

During field interviews, stakeholders including Settlement Representatives, Women's Committee Representatives, Local Council Representatives, IDP Committee Representatives, UNHCR Monitors, and NRC staff, were asked about whether they felt that the project identified the right issues at its outset. The unanimous response from all stakeholder groups was that it had. This is not to say that every activity was equally relevant or valuable, but rather, that the project, as a whole, addressed the right issues. The project was wisely designed such that the substantive focus of the activities was left open-ended, to be determined through the implementation of the activities. Rather than identifying issues in advance, the process used by the project was highlighted by interviewees as contributing to this aspect of its relevance because it allowed them to identify the substantive issues themselves, and then work towards their resolution. Because the project was developed and implemented in close cooperation with the IDPs themselves, through discussions with representatives and beneficiary sample groups, the design of the project and the structure of activities benefitted from their input. Field interviews and surveys with the beneficiaries and local representatives indicated that because of the challenging living conditions in the settlements, all of the community members were motivated to participate in processes that would allow their concerns to be heard. The processes that engaged community members at the grass roots level, and then conveyed information upwards through the local representatives and women's representatives to the DCCM appears to have been effective in securing the buy-in of those involved. All of those interviewed who had participated in the DCCMs indicated that they found them to be a helpful mechanism for prioritizing and addressing the issues identified. In this way, the project was able to clearly understand the needs and aspirations of the communities, as they themselves see them. This, in turn, contributed to high levels of buy-in from both beneficiaries and stakeholders, because of their participation in the processes.

> **Lesson Learned**: Meaningful involvement of direct beneficiaries in the design and development of a project helps to ensure its relevance, as well as securing buy-in.

FINDING: The project was designed with a sound theory of change, and a well developed project design to support the delivery of results.

The project undertook an ambitious challenge—to establish a sustainable mechanism to identify, prioritize, and address the many needs of IDP settlements. It was well designed for this purpose. The project's theory of change was suitable to the nature of the implementation context, because it was flexible and multifaceted. For example, even in case of two districts (Al Karkh and Al Kadhumiya) where it was not possible to implement DCCM meetings, the project's other interventions were nonetheless carried out, and results were still achieved in both districts.

The project design leveraged a structure that combined two parallel levels of interventions, supporting coordination mechanisms by building the capacity of different stakeholder groups involved (women's committees, settlement representatives etc.), while at the same time directly supporting the coordination mechanisms themselves, namely, the women's committees and DCCMs. This combination of building capacity among stakeholders, while supporting the coordination mechanisms that bring them together, is theoretically sound, and was proven in practice by the implementation of the project.

While the DCCMs that were implemented have been characterized in the project's reports as "simple", they provided the necessary forum for dialogue between stakeholder groups, and were implemented systematically with different stakeholders being provided opportunities to express their concerns and priorities. During the project implementation period, 10 DCCMs were implemented across five of the seven targeted districts—four in November 2013; four in December 2013; and two in March 2014. Attendance averaged 26 per meeting, including all stakeholder groups. Due to the security breakdown in the country after the Parliamentary election of April 2014, further meetings have not been recorded. However, it is worth noting that prior to the breakdown, DCCMs were implemented independently of NRC support in four of the districts. The field monitoring team sought to obtain records of further DCCM activities following project closure, and it appears that these meetings have not continued. Those interviewed were not able to provide exact dates of their most recent meetings, but none indicated that the meetings continue at present. The latest records of DCCM activities were from May 2014, during which 9-Nissan and Adhmyia implemented their most recent recorded DCCMs.

> **Lesson Learned**: The dual approach of building capacity among stakeholder groups, while supporting the institutional processes for dialogue between them, creates opportunities for meaningful and fruitful dialogue. Through interviewing sample of participants in these meetings from the settlements representatives and women committees; they all confirmed that; these meetings enhanced the coordination with the local councils and their support to the settlements

The project's theory of change was supported by a logical results chain, with a clear set of outcomes[7], linked logically with the activities and outputs designed to achieve them. In addition to this, the results framework was further supported by a well-formulated performance measurement framework, with clear indicators and targets. While the performance indicators of the project are all quantitative, they are nonetheless sufficient for the purposes of providing accountability for results, and provide a good reference for discussing the overall achievements and impact of the project. Nonetheless, there is room for improvement in the performance measurement of the project. In addition to the inclusion of qualitative indicators, the evaluation team also noted that some clarification on certain quantitative indicators would be of value. For example, in setting a target for women's committees to be "actively participating" in DCCMs, it would be worthwhile to include a short description of what is deemed to be active participation. This could be done by developing a simple scale or rubric that could be assessed using the minutes of the DCCM meetings.

---

[7] While the term "objectives" is used in the project design, these objectives are essentially phrased as outcomes, and serve the necessary purpose of presenting a clear description of the anticipated results of the project.

Recommendation: In future projects, consideration should be given to balancing quantitative indicators with qualitative ones, as well as benchmarking descriptive terms used in discussion of targets.

Key Question: What were the main challenges of the projects and how were they addressed?

FINDING: The project was generally very effective in mitigating the various challenges encountered during implementation.

Before discussing the effectiveness of risk mitigation by NRC, it should be noted that the operating context of the project was an extremely challenging one, by both relative and absolute standards. Not surprisingly, the project encountered its share of challenges throughout implementation, and the project documents describe some of the processes for mitigating these, including daily security assessments prior to the initiation of field activities. In light of the known challenges in Baghdad in general during the project period, and specifically in the IDP communities, it is surprising, is that during interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries, there were very few comments were raised related to these challenges. Most stakeholders indicated that there were no significant challenges faced, and those that did mention challenges tended not to highlight the obvious ones, such as the security situation. This suggests that the challenges, which were objectively present, were either successfully mitigated by NRC, or simply taken for granted by the stakeholders as being not worth mentioning—and in the case of the latter, this also suggests effective mitigation, at least of the most serious challenges.

Having noted the above, a number of challenges were highlighted in interviews, particularly with NRC staff and Settlement Representatives. The challenges noted included the following:
- Since the Iraqi government considers these settlements to be informal, they are systematically marginalized. This was mitigated through the work of the DCCMs, and the project succeeded in changing the convictions of the government stakeholders in the five targeted districts. Note that two of the originally targeted districts were not successful, due to insurmountable challenges.
- The security situation was a serious challenge for NRC staff movements in the field. This was mitigated with the support of NRC's security team, as well as an experienced staff that is capable of managing the related pressure.
- The conservative nature of the communities made certain activities targeting, supporting, and engaging women more challenging. This was mitigated through the use of sensitive approach that delivered results, such that male stakeholders could be quickly convinced of the value of involving women.
- While note specifically noted as a challenge by many of the interviewees, one of the common factors cited as negatively affecting the achievement of results was the cooperation and/ or motivation of the government officials. This issue was mitigated, to the extent possible, through the project design itself. Part of the issue with the IDP communities is that they are not officially recognized. They lack the conventional organizational structures and mechanisms for interfacing with the government. The structures supported by the project, including the women's committees and the DCCMs provided a systematic and sanctioned approach for bridging this gap.

Ongoing challenges noted by stakeholders during the interview processes also included:
- Limited financial support to cover basic services
- Challenges with the relationships between IDPs, Settlement Representatives, Local Councils, and Government Departments, regarding needs and priorities

- Ongoing difficulties with involving women in committees, due to tribal and community obligations. It was noted that sometimes the Settlement Representatives would intervene in the activities of the women. In addition, when women attend the training, social commitments caused some women to bring their children to the training, which affected the training results to some extent.
- The security situation inside the settlements makes working there very challenging for outsiders in particular. This was coupled with difficult health and environmental conditions.
- Limited resources from government departments to support these communities, even when there is good will on the part of the officials based on constructive dialogue
- Official procedures causing delays for activities, particularly those involving government officials

Key Question: How well are the activities carried out in terms of the approach adopted, the timeliness of the interventions, their quality, and the level and quality of community participation (women in particular)?

FINDING: NRC has worked efficiently and effectively in the development and implementation of the project

Based on the data provided through the field evaluation exercise, including site visits, interviews, and focus group discussions with different stakeholders, the evaluation team gained a very positive view on the efficiency and effectiveness of NRC, as the implementing agency for the project. During interviews, SOC's evaluation team discussed different aspects of the project management and implementation with stakeholders, and feedback was very positive. When Settlement Representatives and Women's Committee Representatives were asked about the effectiveness and coordination of the DCCMs, all of the interviewees indicated that they were very well coordinated and effective in fulfilling their purpose. When beneficiaries were asked about the extent to which they had benefitted from the support provided by the project, most were quite positive, with an overall mean score of 3.8/5, and slightly lower means in Al Karhk and Adhmyia than in the other districts. Specifically, many of the Settlement Representatives in particular noted that the NRC team was highly organized and helpful.

In terms of the strengths of the project, respondents indicated that the communication between partners, monitoring, and follow-up by NRC were clear strengths. By all accounts, the implementation was carried out effectively, and the challenges which presented themselves were mitigated efficiently by the project team. The feedback was consistent across districts, with nearly all stakeholders rating their level of satisfaction at a 4/5, and a few individuals rating it at 5/5. Few challenges were noted and there were no weaknesses indicated about the performance of NRC.

While most of the feedback provided was quite general, there were some specific aspects of NRC's role that are worth mentioning. First and foremost, was the continuity of activities and the degree of follow-up provided by them. Some specific cases were mentioned where issues presented by beneficiaries were referred by NRC and subsequently resolved. This reflects a degree of individual care and attention that should be commended, and it is clear that sound work has been done to establish trust and confidence within the communities. Another aspect of NRC's work that received positive feedback was the quality of the project's training activities, and a large number of individuals commented about the good quality of both the training contents and the trainers themselves. This is consistent with the training assessment information provided by NRC to the evaluation team, which provided additional positive evidence about the quality of the training contents and implementation, including such aspects as the training venue. Participant selection also appears to have been effective in most cases, what relatively high levels of engagement and motivation among the participants interviewed.

Interestingly, when asked about the quality of the activities, one of the most common comments provided by interviewees was that the project's focus on women was an important aspect of its effectiveness. While this may go without saying in some other contexts, it is particularly noteworthy in the case of this project, because the IDPs tend to come from rural/ tribal areas, with deeply rooted conservative values and perspectives on the role of women in the community. The approach of NRC to focus on women was therefore potentially a risk factor. However, with their effective and sensitive work in this area, they appear to have succeeded in helping to shift the perspectives of many community members towards a position of increased appreciation for the value that women in the community can bring to the process of identifying needs and helping to see them addressed. While women interviewees in particular noted the importance of the project's emphasis on women, it is worth noting that the value of women's contributions was also noted by many of the men interviewed.

> **Lesson Learned**: Even in conservative communities, working with women to help them become more engaged as community members can not only help to deliver tangible results, but can also contribute to increasing the status of women in the community.

FINDING: While the amount of training provided by the project was not substantial, there is nonetheless good evidence of new skills being implemented effectively by those who received the training

There is good evidence from the evaluation data collection that the persons trained under the project are successfully applying the new knowledge and skills that they gained to facilitate dialogue and help identify community priorities. Perhaps most significantly, the beneficiaries and stakeholders interviewed, especially the women's committee members and settlement representatives, mentioned that the training provided by the project had helped them in their roles. More specifically, they indicated that the training helped them in their capacity about how to identify problems in the community, and which government departments to approach in order to resolve those problems.

Moreover, discussions with stakeholders, and minutes of DCCM meetings suggest that the women's committee members have been contributing meaningfully to discussions by sharing perspectives of the women community members, and the problems of greatest concern to them. Their participation can be attributed to the support provided by the project, not only in terms of the knowledge and skills gained through project training, but also in terms of their confidence to participate. The data related to achievements of the project and levels of engagement of those involved reinforce this point. The relevant performance targets of the project were all met or exceeded, including: the number of new services provided as a result of the DCCMs; the percentage of women's committees actively participating in DCCMs on a monthly basis; and the percentage of DCCMs continuing after the handover of responsibilities to the District Councils. This goes beyond the mere demonstration of skills, and illustrates both commitment and engagement on the part of all of the concerned stakeholder groups.

FINDING: The project maintained a good effort in its monitoring and follow-up on activities.

Internal monitoring of implementation by the implementing agency is as aspect of project management that is often neglected. However, NRC appears to have maintained strong work in this area, and reaped the reward in terms of strong documentation of results and achievements, as well as good continuity between activities and maintenance of momentum and motivation levels amongst stakeholders. As discussed above, monitoring and follow-up was one of the strengths of NRC that was mentioned repeatedly during interviews. In terms of the specific value of this follow up, a number of the stakeholders interviewed

indicated specifically that the good follow-up on the part of NRC helped to maintain the motivation levels of the women involved in the project. Continuing this motivation through regular contact is particularly important until the point where the results become evident, and motivation levels can be sustained based on the successes achieved. In many cases, these successes are already being achieved, and in Al Rasheed, for example, where a relatively large number of new services are being delivered, active follow-up is probably no longer necessary. Whereas in other districts that have achieved less success, such as Al Karkh and Adhmyia, the achievements have been less noteworthy, and continued monitoring and follow-up would likely be of some ongoing value.

> **Recommendation**: Insofar as it is possible, continue follow-up with the project stakeholders, and particularly the women involved in the project, in order to help maintain motivation levels. Such follow-up can be prioritized for communities no yet achieving significant results.

As part of the evaluation exercise, the evaluation team also reviewed the available project documentation, including reports, monitoring records, performance measurement reports, and so on. These were found to be thorough and well maintained. However, the evaluation team did identify one issue that warrants mentioning in this report. In the context of pre/post assessments for training participants, it was noted that while both pre-test and post-test scores were recorded, and while the proportion of individuals showing improvement were noted, the extent of that improvement was not reported. This is an important consideration in determining the degree of success of the training activity. Using the available data, the evaluation team calculated the extent of improvement in the test scores from the pre to post measures, across all of the workshops for which data was provided, and found them to be relatively modest, amounting to between one and three points in most cases on tests consisting of 15-20 items, with average improvements ranging from about 7% up to about 17% depending on the training activity. One might infer from this data the training provided little benefit to the participants, with such modest levels of improvement, but care should be taken in making such inferences, as the value of training activities is difficult to fully capture by means of a paper-based test. Better indications of the value of the training are provided by the results achieved by those who participated, as discussed in the preceding section.

> **Recommendation:** NRC leadership may wish to review internally its process for using pre/post tests as a measurement for training effectiveness, and to clarify procedures around analyzing and reporting on pre/post data.

> **Recommendation**: When reporting pre/post test data, and evaluating the degree of success of a training activity, the *extent* of improvement in scores is a highly pertinent piece of information.

> **Recommendation**: In addition to pre/post testing, qualitative measures should be used in assessing the effectiveness and results of project activities.

> **Lesson Learned**: While pre/post testing can be useful for demonstrating the value of training, care needs to be taken in constructing the tests in a manner that will allow participants to demonstrate what they have gained through the training.

Sustainability

Key Question: To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continues after the project ended?

FINDING: Many of the individual achievements of the project appear well positioned to be sustained after handover, although stakeholders have mixed feelings on this.

The evaluation team has conducted a review of the steps taken by the implementing agency to support the sustainability of the results achieved by the project. This aspect of the project's work has been systematic and appears to have positioned the project well in order to support sustainability to the extent possible. Specifically, NRC coordinated closely with the various government departments in order to ensure the continuity of activities. This resulted, as noted above, in a number of new partnerships for the delivery of services to the communities.

With respect to the DCCMs, the project appears to have made every reasonable effort to support their continuation. However, with considerable follow-up exploration from the evaluation team, it appears that while officially the monthly meetings are meant to be continuing, the evidence suggests they are not. Prior to the handover of the project, the NRC team agreed with officials in the local councils to organize monthly meetings. Moreover, the project was successful in securing a letter from Baghdad's Provincial Council, issuing instructions for the District Councils in the five targeted districts where DCCMs were implemented to take over responsibility for hosting the DCCMs. However, based on the field interviews and follow-up efforts by the evaluation team to determine the status of the DCCMs, no tangible evidence has been produced that the DCCMs have continued after May 2014. Responses from interviewees have been equivocal and imprecise as to the dates of the most recent DCCMs. Thus, while it is true that these meetings had continued after the project closure in April 2014, their continuation appears to have been very limited. Having said that, the mechanism itself has been established, and there remains potential for it to be re-activated should there be sufficient motivation from the concerned parties.

> **Recommendation:** NRC should follow-up with the Baghdad Provincial Council in order to motivate their follow-up in relation to their instructions to the District Councils to maintain the DCCM mechanism.

In terms of the tangible benefits delivered to the settlements—the services and technical supports provided by the concerned government departments, sustainability is also unclear. Fundamentally, the issue of sustainability is challenging when it concerns IDP communities, as these are typically viewed to be temporary arrangements until resettlement can occur, and as such, the extent to which service providers should plan for delivery of services in IDP settlements is an ongoing issue. The project's emphasis on establishing durable solutions is therefore important to acknowledge. The project interventions have provided an excellent foundation for continued coordination with the departments delivering services, however, there is no guarantee that their supports will be sustained. It is, however, likely that in most cases they will be, as the initial provision of services amounts to an informal recognition of the communities and their needs, and would have required authorizations up the chain of command within each department. Once these services have been provided initially, their continued or repeated provision is much more likely. The table below outlines the current status of all services identified by Settlement Representatives during field interviews. It is difficult to obtain definitive confirmation about the extent to which the delivery of services continues, in part because periodic services like waste removal or health services may continue at irregular intervals; however, the available data indicate that approximately half

of those new services identified during interviews with Settlement Representatives are indeed ongoing at present.

Table 10. Status of new services identified by Settlement Representatives.

District/ Settlement	New Services Provided/ Benefits	Status
Adhmyia Al Sha'ab	• Health/ public health centre	Continuing
	• Health awareness campaign	No further activity noted
	• IDs for children	No further activity noted
9-Nissan Maytham Al Tammer	• Municipal/ garbage removal	Continuing
	• Awareness of health issues for women	Uncertain
Al-Karrada Al Sadarain	• Electricity	Continuing
	• Security	Continuing
Al-Rasheed Al Thaqalain	• Municipal/ garbage removal	Not continuing
	• Health/ public health centre/ vaccinations	Continuing
	• Security	Continuing
	• Residence ID	Continuing
Al-Kadhumiya Al Hakeem	• Education/ school caravans	Continuing
	• Electricity	Continuing
	• Water	Continuing
	• Health	Uncertain
Al-Karkh Um Al Baneen	• Municipal/ garbage removal	Not continuing
Al-Mansour Saydala & Efrazat	• Municipal/ settlement access	Uncertain
	• ID (accommodation) cards	No further activity noted
	• Municipal/ garbage removal	Not continuing
	• Municipal/ sewage	Uncertain
	• Electricity	Uncertain

However, the sustainable aspects of the project go beyond the specific mechanisms and services mentioned above. Importantly, all of the training activities of the project have a degree of inherent sustainability, because they targeted individuals, and provided increased knowledge, skills, and awareness. In many cases, the project also succeeded in changing perceptions, particularly around the role of women in the communities, with the acknowledgement that women's perspectives are important. These achievements are durable, and while they may slowly erode over time, the legacy of the project will very likely continue on in many of the individuals involved.

While the preceding reflects the conclusions of the evaluation team, it is also worthwhile to note the perspectives of the stakeholders themselves. Among those interviewed, including Settlement Representatives, project beneficiaries, and key stakeholders, perspectives about the sustainability of the project results were quite mixed, ranging from a low of 1/5, to a high of 4/5, with a median response of 3/5[8]. There was no consistent pattern related to the district of the respondents or the group of stakeholders responding. The most insightful responses to follow-up tended to come from settlement representatives and other project stakeholders involved in the DCCMs, who identified a number of aspects of the project that had prepared it well for sustainability, including the improved coordination and communication between stakeholders. Several interviewees specifically mentioned the DCCMs as a sustainable

---

[8] 1=very poor; 2=poor; 3=moderate; 4=good; 5=very good

mechanism to ensure needs are addressed, however, no further elaboration on the role of the DCCMs was provided in light of the evidence that the meetings have not continued recently.

However, by contrast to the above, follow-up responses from many beneficiaries (particularly those not involved with DCCMs) yielded responses that suggest that there may be some misunderstandings about the nature of sustainability, as well as with the ownership for the project achievements. Despite NRC's clear work in implementing its handover and exit strategy, one of the most common recommendations made to support the sustainability of the project results was to continue implementing project activities. The evaluation team notes that this recommendation does not in fact refer to sustainability at all, in the sense used in assistance programs like this, where the objective is to have results continue following the withdrawal of support. This leads to the issue of ownership for achievements, because based on the project design, the intended results have now been achieved, and the mechanism of coordination has been handed over to local stakeholders, yet this does not appear to be clearly understood by many of the project beneficiaries. Moreover, the second most frequent recommendation for sustainability was that the project should establish some kind of coordination mechanism to support the connection and communication between the IDP settlements and the government departments. This is exactly what is provided by the mechanism of the DCCMs, and as such, many of the beneficiaries seem to be quite unclear about the overall project design, and this may limit the ongoing value of the project's achievements, and specifically, the DCCM mechanism.

> **Lesson Learned:** Lack of clarity around ownership for project-established mechanisms and other project achievements may jeopardize their sustainability.

> **Recommendation**: The project team should consider the potential value added of a final workshop or conference activity that would provide the opportunity to clarify misunderstandings about the project design, and the transfer of ownership for the DCCM mechanism.

> **Recommendation**: In future programming, it would be valuable to brief stakeholders more thoroughly on the bigger picture of the project design, so as to ensure that each party understands their role in project sustainability.

Key Question: What were the major factors, which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?

As with the corresponding question above related to the achievement of results, the factors affecting the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability are complex and interrelated, but the most prominent among them appears to be the role of the government. During field interviews, all stakeholder groups were asked about the factors affecting sustainability, and the responses varied considerably, reflecting different degrees of understanding of the idea of sustainability. Some respondents indicated simply that only the continuation of the project activities would ensure the sustainability of the project—reflecting a lack of understanding of the issues, and their role in sustaining the project results. Others noted that the creation of a coordination mechanism to facilitate communication and problem solving between the IDPs and the government departments provided a good opportunity for sustainability. Still others noted that the degree of coordination and collaboration would be the major factor affecting sustainability. Both of these comments relate to the DCCM mechanism. However, the evaluation team notes that the limiting factor in the DCCMs appears to be the government, and more specifically, the District Councils, to whom responsibility was transferred towards the end of the project. A number of interviewees noted directly that the sustainability of the project depended on the involvement of the government, reinforcing this point.

However, as noted above, the involvement of the District Councils in hosting the DCCMs appears to have dropped off shortly after the closure of the project. Moreover, while the Provincial Council issued instructions for the District Councils to continue these meetings, there does not appear to have been any follow-up on the part of the Provincial Councils to ensure the instruction is followed. While there are other aspects to the project design, and as noted above, the DCCMs do not appear to be essential to the achievement of new service delivery in the settlements, they are nonetheless the primary modality by which the project aimed to do so. Without further follow-up to re-engage the District Councils and re-activate the DCCMs, it appears that this aspect of the project may not continue to deliver results.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on a full review of the available documentation, as well as new data collection obtained through site visits to the targeted settlements, the evaluation team has concluded that the project has been highly successful in achieving its mandated results. The project design was found to be highly relevant to the targeted beneficiaries, and was well developed through a sound theory of change and results chain. Moreover, the project implementation reinforced this relevance, through its dialogic and participatory approach, with special consideration given to women in the IDP settlements.

The evaluation team assessed the results and achievements of the project, and has concluded that the mandated results, at both the output and outcome level, have been fully achieved. All of the project's performance targets have been met or exceeded. More importantly, and more fundamentally, the project has succeeded in producing a positive impact in the targeted settlements, through successful coordination between IDPs and government bodies, culminating from a series of well planned project interventions to build capacities and support coordination mechanisms. Through these activities, the settlements have benefitted from a total of 40 services or technical supports provided by the concerned government departments, and a number of additional services were noted by the project team, which Settlement Representatives attributed to the DCCM mechanism as well. These services and supports are delivering real and tangible benefits to the community members, and are contributing to improved quality of life in the settlements.

In terms of the effectiveness and efficiency of the project implementation, the evaluation team had a very favorable impression of the work of NRC. This evaluation looked systematically at many aspects of the project management and implementation, and sought feedback from the beneficiaries and stakeholders of the various activities. The evidence and feedback was resoundingly positive. In addition, the evaluation noted very positive work on the part of NRC in terms of its monitoring and follow-up with beneficiaries, and attributes part of the success of the project to this aspect of their work.

In terms of sustainability, while feedback from stakeholders is somewhat mixed, the evaluation team is optimistic about the prospects for the project results and achievements to be sustained in terms of service delivery, partnerships, and collaboration; however, the DCCMs, as one of the primary mechanisms for the project, do not appear to be continuing. The capacity and awareness gains for individuals trained under the project will have considerable durability. While a significant factor noted by the evaluation team was the issuing of a letter from the Baghdad Provincial Council, directing their local partners and to take on the responsibility for organizing and hosting the DCCMs, there does not appear to have been any follow-up on these instructions after May 2014 (one month after closure). The reactivation of this mechanism could provide a means for the ongoing coordination between the settlements and the service providers, which has thus far produced the main tangible results of the project.

Summary of Findings

- The project, as designed, was highly relevant to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries.
- The project was designed with a sound theory of change, and a well developed project design to support the delivery of results.
- The project activities were implemented in a manner that supported their continued relevance throughout the duration of the project.
- The project appears to have targeted many of the highest priority issues in the IDP settlements.

- Stakeholders and beneficiaries feel that the project has gone a long ways towards achieving its goal of improving the living conditions of IDPs.
- While the project achieved a great deal in tangible terms, there is a lot of work remaining to improve the living conditions of IDPs in informal settlements.
- While the amount of training provided by the project was not substantial, there is nonetheless good evidence of new skills being implemented effectively by those who received the training
- The main anticipated results of the project can be considered fully achieved
- NRC has worked efficiently and effectively in the development and implementation of the project
- The project maintained a good effort in its monitoring and follow-up on activities.
- The project was generally very effective in mitigating the various challenges encountered during implementation.
- Many of the individual achievements of the project appear well positioned to be sustained after handover, although stakeholders have mixed feelings on this.

Summary of Lessons Learned

- Meaningful involvement of direct beneficiaries in the design and development of a project helps to ensure its relevance, as well as securing buy-in.
- The dual approach of building capacity among stakeholder groups, while supporting the institutional processes for dialogue between them, creates opportunities for meaningful and fruitful dialogue.
- The dialogical approach of the project helped to ensure relevance throughout implementation.
- There may be subtle, but nonetheless important, differences in perspective around the priority of different issues affecting the targeted communities, and there may be potential to increase relevance by openly acknowledging and discussing such differences.
- While DCCMs have proven to be a very effective coordination mechanism, delivering tangible results to the settlements, they do not appear to be essential in order to achieve progress in informal IDP settlements.
- Even in conservative communities, working with women to help them become more engaged as community members can not only help to deliver tangible results, but can also contribute to increasing the status of women in the community.
- While pre/post testing can be useful for demonstrating the value of training, care needs to be taken in constructing the tests in a manner that will allow participants to demonstrate what they have gained through the training.
- Lack of clarity around ownership for project-established mechanisms and other project achievements may jeopardize their sustainability.

Summary of Recommendations

- In future projects, consideration should be given to balancing quantitative indicators with qualitative ones, as well as benchmarking descriptive terms used in discussion of targets.
- While the field data indicates that DCCMs are not essential to achieve progress in informal IDP settlements, the available evidence suggests they are inherently valuable and contribute positively to the project goals, and as such, should be included in the design of future projects.
- Performance indicators and targets, like the results they pertain to, should be reported with complete consistency, in order to avoid any confusion related to accountability for results.

- When reporting pre/post test data, and evaluating the degree of success of a training activity, the *extent* of improvement in scores is a highly pertinent piece of information.
- Insofar as it is possible, continue follow-up with the project stakeholders, and particularly the women involved in the project, in order to help maintain motivation levels. Such follow-up can be prioritized for communities no yet achieving significant results.
- The project team should consider the potential value added of a final workshop or conference activity that would provide the opportunity to clarify misunderstandings about the project design, and the transfer of ownership for the DCCM mechanism.
- In future programming, it would be valuable to brief stakeholders more thoroughly on the bigger picture of the project design, so as to ensure that each party understands their role in project sustainability.

ANNEXES

Annex A: List of documents reviewed:

The following documents were reviewed for the desk review in this evaluation.
- Annex 1-Objective a- Indicator 1.xlsx
- Annex 2- Outcomes statistics.xls
- Annexes - NRC.docx
- Baghdad PC Letter (Arabic).jpg
- Baghdad PC Letter (English).docx
- BPRM IQFY1303_Final Program Report 15 Aug14-00.docx
- BPRM- Terms of Reference for Evaluation.pdf
- Evaluation Report.doc
- IQFY1303 BPRM Q2 PPR SPRMCO13CA1163.pdf
- Iraq BPRM finale Proposal.pdf
- NRC _MR No 1_ CM phase out_Oct 232013.pdf
- NRC _MR No.2_ CM phase out_Oct 30, 2013.pdf
- NRC _MR No.3_ CM phase out_Dec. 30, 2013 (Recovered).pdf
- NRC _MR No.4_ CM phase out_Dec. 31, 2013 (Recovered).pdf
- NRC _MR No.5_ CM phase out_Feb. 25, 2014 (Recovered).pdf
- NRC Evaluation Final Report Template.docx
- NRC- BPRM Project Evaluation - SOC revised Inception Report - Clean.DOCX
- Referral Cases.xlsx
- S-PRMCO-13-CA-1163_NRC Q3 PPR_IQFY1303.pdf
- Samples of activities' impact.docx
- SPRMCO13CA1163 NRC Q1 Report - IQFY1303.pdf
- Success story.docx
- Table (3)Total Beneficiaries of DCCM 2013.xlsx
- Tables(4 & 5)Tables Training Evaluations & Pre_post tests.xlsx
- updated Baghdad 25 settlements -SOC meetings.xls

Annex B: M&E tools:

Evaluation Protocol for beneficiaries' interviews and FGDs

The proposed tool presented below has been designed to be flexible and adaptable to in-depth interviews with project beneficiaries from women (IDPs, women committees, etc.) and FGDs.

Introduction and Preamble:
Evaluation team will introduce themselves briefly, and provide background and purpose for their meeting and interview. Please explain that the purpose of the evaluation is to learn lessons from the implementation in order to learn from the experience and inform future planning and implementation.

For FGDs:

Evaluator will conduct focus group sessions, which will facilitate a wider coverage of the beneficiary groups in a shorter period of time and offer an opportunity to verify/confirm one-on-one interview results. The focus groups will typically involving 6-8 representatives of a given beneficiary group, in order to discuss project topics and training programs in greater depth.

The emphasis in the focus group sessions will be on having the participants stimulate new ideas, questions and comments from one another.

1. General information:

1a. How long were you involved in the project?	
1b. What is the nature of your involvement (focal point, trainee, beneficiary etc.)	
1c. Do you know who funded the project? Please state who	

2. Efficiency and Effectiveness:

2a. To what extent did you benefit as IDP from the service/support provided by our project?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
2b. How satisfied are you with the project implementation? Did project meeting your expectations?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
2c. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?	
2d. What were the main challenges of the projects and how were they addressed?	
2e. Please comment on the strengths/weaknesses project coordination (communication between partners, monitoring, and follow-up, quality of contractors etc.)	
2f. Please comment specifically on the training (quality of modules, materials, trainers, results etc.)	
2g. How well are the activities carried out in terms of the approach adopted, the timeliness of the interventions, their quality, and the level and quality of community participation (women in particular)?	

3. Impact and Progress Towards Results:

3a. How well is the project achieve its goal of improving IDPs living conditions?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3b. To what extent are new skills being implemented effectively?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3c. How much do you think IDPs are now engaged in the process of identifying their needs?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3d. How much do you think IDPs are now engaged with the local authorities to improve the delivery of basic services to their community?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3e. What benefits has your community received as a result of involvement in the project?	
3f. In your opinion, what were the main achievements of the project?	
3g. How many communities / people have been affected directly and indirectly?	

4. Sustainability:

4a. Do you think the benefits being delivered by the project will continue after the project is completed?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
4b. What has been done to make sure that new skills and arrangements with the local authorities practices will continue?	
4c. What needs to be done next to ensure that the maximum benefits are reaped from all the hard work done to date?	
4d. In your opinion, what were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?	

Evaluation Protocol for key informant interviews

The proposed tool presented below has been designed to be flexible and adaptable to in-depth interviews with project partners, stakeholder involved in the project, government officials, and Settlement representatives.

Introduction and Preamble:
Evaluation team will introduce themselves briefly, and provide background and purpose for their meeting and interview. Please explain that the purpose of the evaluation is to learn lessons from the implementation in order to learn from the experience and inform future planning and implementation.

1. General information:

1a. How long were you involved in the project?	
1b. What is the nature of your involvement (focal point, trainee, beneficiary etc.)	
1c. Do you know who funded the project? Please state who	

2. Relevance:

2a. Do you think the project at its start identified the rights issues to improve the engagement of IDP communities to better identify their needs? (Yes/No)	
2b. Is the project, as it is being implemented, participated in strengthening the IDPs capacity to engage with the government and promote improved delivery of basic services by local authorities? (Yes/No)	
2c. Have there been beneficial partnerships resulting from this project? (Yes/No)	
2d. Were the activities of the project (training etc.) relevant to the needs of those involved?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
2e. What are the biggest issues currently facing your community?	

3. Impact and Progress Towards Results:

3a. How well is the project achieve its goal of improving IDPs living conditions?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3b. To what extent are new skills being implemented effectively?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3c. How much do you think IDPs are now engaged in the process of identifying their needs?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3d. How much do you think IDPs are now engaged with the local authorities to improve the delivery of basic services to their community?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3e. What benefits has your community received as a result of involvement in the project?	
3f. In your opinion, what were the main achievements of the project?	
3g. How many communities / people have been affected directly and indirectly?	

4. Sustainability:

4a. Do you think the benefits being delivered by the project will continue after the project is completed?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
4b. What has been done to make sure that new skills and arrangements with the local authorities practices will continue?	
4c. What needs to be done next to ensure that the maximum benefits are reaped from all the hard work done to date?	
4d. In your opinion, what were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?	

Evaluation Protocol for NRC staff

The proposed tool presented below has been designed to be flexible and adaptable to in-depth interviews with NRC staff involved the implementation of the project.

Introduction and Preamble:
Evaluation team will introduce themselves briefly, and provide background and purpose for their meeting and interview. Please explain that the purpose of the evaluation is to learn lessons from the implementation in order to learn from the experience and inform future planning and implementation.

<u>1. General information:</u>

1a. How long were you involved in the project?	
1b. What is the nature of your involvement (focal point, trainee, beneficiary etc.)	
1c. Do you know who funded the project? Please state who	

<u>2. Relevance:</u>

2a. Do you think the project at its start identified the rights issues to improve the engagement of IDP communities to better identify their needs? (Yes/No)	
2b. Is the project, as it is being implemented, participated in strengthening the IDPs capacity to engage with the government and promote improved delivery of basic services by local authorities? (Yes/No)	
2c. Have there been beneficial partnerships resulting from this project? (Yes/No)	
2d. Were the activities of the project (training etc.) relevant to the needs of those involved?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
2e. What are the biggest issues <u>currently</u> facing your community?	

<u>3. Sustainability:</u>

3a. Do you think the benefits being delivered by the project will continue after the project is completed?	Not ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ Very
3b. What has been done to make sure that new skills and arrangements with the local authorities practices will continue?	
3c. What needs to be done next to ensure that the maximum benefits are reaped from all the hard work done to date?	
3d. In your opinion, what were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?	

<u>4. Lessons Learned:</u>

4a. What recommendations do you have for the project partners based on your observations?	
4b. What main challenges did the project face?	
4c. What challenges are you currently facing regarding the process of	

IDPs need assessment and coordination with the local authorities in your community?	
4d. What good practices from the project should be noted and shared?	
4e.Please comment on the strengths/weaknesses project coordination (communication between partners, monitoring, and follow-up, quality of contractors etc.)	