
TITLE: Final Evaluation for the success of COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PROGRAMME (CRP) – PHASE 13: DURABLE
SOLUTIONS FOR AL-HOL AND IDP RETURNS
Commissioned by: IOM IRAQ COUNTRY OFFICE
July 2025
IOM Iraq

INTRODUCTION

1.1. EVALUATION CONTEXT

IOM works on migration and development, facilitating migration, regulating migration and solutions for forced migration. IOM activities that cut across these areas include the promotion of international migration law, policy debate and guidance, protection of migrants' rights, migration health and the gender dimension of migration.

Despite the formal end of conflict with ISIL in 2017, Iraq continues to face significant displacement challenges. While millions of internally displaced persons (IDPs) have returned to their areas of origin, more than one million individuals remain displaced, many in protracted situations, facing barriers to achieving durable solutions. The Government of Iraq's push for camp closures, particularly since 2019, has accelerated returns, often without the necessary conditions in place to ensure safety, dignity, and sustainability for returnees.

Compounding these challenges is the complex dynamic of returns from northeast Syria, particularly from Al-Hol Camp, where Iraqis have been detained under severe conditions. The Government of Iraq's decision to repatriate its citizens from Al-Hol, facilitated through the Al Amal Rehabilitation Center, adds further urgency and complexity to the displacement landscape. The profiles of returnees from Al-Hol—including a high proportion of women, children, and individuals perceived to have ISIL affiliation—bring elevated protection risks, reintegration barriers, and social tensions in communities of return or relocation.

At the same time, the operating environment in Iraq remains highly fluid. Security dynamics, political instability, limited government capacity, and fragile social cohesion continue to hinder durable solutions efforts. Communities of return are often marked by damaged infrastructure and housing, insufficient services, and economic fragility. Reintegration efforts are further strained by community resistance, stigmatization of returnees, and bureaucratic barriers, particularly in relation to identity and civil documentation and housing, land, and property (HLP) rights, including primarily access to compensation and reparation schemes.

This evaluation is situated within a wider humanitarian-development-peace nexus where there is increasing pressure from both the Government of Iraq and the international community to transition from humanitarian assistance toward sustainable recovery and development. The evaluation will therefore need to consider not only the immediate effectiveness of project interventions but also their relevance and contribution to broader policy objectives, including the national durable solutions strategy and international commitments.

Furthermore, the evaluation occurs at a time when the scale of returns from northeast Syria is expected to continue rising, and the Government of Iraq's camp closure policies remain in force. The findings are expected to inform decision-making on how to strengthen the design and implementation of durable solutions programming in Iraq, ensure alignment with government strategies, improve coordination among stakeholders, and contribute to better outcomes for both returnees and host communities.

Summary of the project:

Donor	Project Title	Start date	End date	Total Budget
USA - DOS - Bureau of Population Refugees and Migration (PRM)	Community Revitalization Programme – Phase XIII	30-Sep-2024	29-Sep-2025	29,865,790.00 US Dollar

The project implemented is a comprehensive, multisectoral initiative designed to enhance the sustainability of reintegration for displacement-affected populations in Iraq and returnees from northeast Syria. The project spanned six governorates, Anbar, Diyala, Dohuk, Erbil, Ninewa, and Salah Al-Din, targeted both in-camp and out-of-camp populations. It integrated multiple thematic sectors including protection, legal assistance (e.g. civil documentation, HLP, and family law), camp coordination and camp management (CCCM), mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS), facilitated voluntary movement (FVM), livelihoods and economic recovery, shelter rehabilitation, rental assistance, and support to basic service access.

Protection interventions encompassed awareness-raising sessions, referrals, case management, and community engagement on PSEA. Legal services included one-on-one counselling, representation, and dissemination of legal information to help beneficiaries secure essential documents and resolve legal disputes. MHPSS support is provided across multiple layers, from community-based psychosocial activities to focused care, and is also integrated into FVM processes for individuals voluntarily returning to their areas of origin.

Livelihoods support included market-based vocational training, entrepreneurship training, in-kind grants, and business advisory services aimed at strengthening self-reliance. Shelter interventions consisted of light to medium rehabilitation of war-affected homes and rental assistance for families unable to return. The project also facilitated access to basic services through small-scale community infrastructure works and coordination with service providers. Tribal engagement, promoted peaceful dialogue among communities and resolved intercommunal disputes to enable safe returns and sustainable reintegration.

Throughout all components, the project prioritized the inclusion of cross-cutting themes such as equality and women's empowerment, disability inclusion, conflict sensitivity, accountability to affected populations (AAP), and protection mainstreaming. By addressing the legal, economic, psychosocial, and social dimensions of recovery, the project aims to promote sustainable, dignified reintegration, foster community resilience, and contribute to durable solutions in complex displacement-affected contexts.

Objective: Enhance the sustainability of (re)integration for people affected by displacement in Iraq and returning from Northeast Syria by improving the conditions for dignified, voluntary and safe access to and pursuit of durable solutions pathways.

- **Outcome 1:** Persons in need in Al Amal Rehabilitation Center have increased support to meet their basic needs, improve their resilience, and achieve their sustainable (re-) integration.
 - Output 1.1: Persons in Al Amal have access to basic services and safe living conditions through CCCM.

- Output 1.2: Targeted populations in Al Amal have enhanced access to specialized protection assistance including prevention of violence against women and girls and response services that will protect their rights and address their protection needs.
- Output 1.3: Actors in Al Amal have increased capacities to adhere to protection principles through enhanced coordination and safeguarding efforts.
- Output 1.4: Targeted populations in Al Amal have improved access to resocialization activities to better prepare for reintegration.
- Output 1.5: Targeted populations in Al Amal have improved access to psychosocial well-being support through MHPSS services.
- Output 1.6: Targeted populations in Al Amal have increased access to legal services and improved ability to cope with legal-related barriers.
- Output 1.7: Technical Working Group for the implementation of the Global Framework and the Taskforce for Rehabilitation and Transitional Services are operationalized.
- **Outcome 2:** IDPs and returnees from northeast Syria have improved access to pathways to durable solutions through facilitated, safe, and voluntary return, local integration, or settlement in new locations.
 - Output 2.1: IDPs are supported in identifying their preferred solution pathways, enabling them to make voluntary and informed decisions about their return and relocation.
 - Output 2.2: Through the provision of information on areas of destination, facilitation of preparations and targeted assistance to address barriers to return or relocation, IDPs and returnees from northeast Syria are supported to pursue their pathway of choice in a safe and dignified manner.
 - Output 2.3: Registered and prioritized IDPs and returnees from northeast Syria receive material assistance in support of safe and dignified movements.
 - Output 2.4: Evidence on reintegration of displaced people from northeast Syria and other parts of Iraq is available to program and policy decision-makers.
- **Outcome 3:** Progress towards durable solutions and sustainable reintegration for displacement-affected people is enhanced through community-based interventions and multi-sectoral service provision in target areas.
 - Output 3.1: Communities and key stakeholders are engaged through strengthened identification and prioritization of community needs, and the development of community-based plans and responses.
 - Output 3.2: Reintegration of target population is supported through the provision of mental health services and prevention and response of human rights violations.

- Output 3.3: IDPs, returnees, and host communities have increased access to legal services on civil documentation and HLP rights.
- Output 3.4: Returnees, IDPs, and host communities have increased access to livelihoods and employment opportunities.
- Output 3.5: Sustainable access to housing is facilitated through rehabilitation of damaged and destroyed shelter and HLP support.
- Output 3.6: IDPs, returnees, and host communities have increased access to basic services through Quick Impact Projects (QIPs).
- Output 3.7: Returnees, IDPs and host communities in vulnerable communities have access to essential primary health care.
- Output 3.8: Community cohesion and stabilization is enhanced in areas of return to improve reintegration outcomes.
- Output 3.9: Enhance sustainability of the initial reintegration phase for IDPs and returnees from Al Amal through improved access to services and periodic monitoring of progress towards reintegration.

1.2. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

The purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the results that have been brought to the project targets due to the implementation of the project and compare the achievements with the desired results initially articulated in the Programme's results framework. The evaluation will also identify lessons learned and suggest plausible recommendations that will inform future programme design in similar thematic areas. The intended users of the evaluation will be the donor, programme staff, IOM Iraq Mission, and partners. The external evaluation will be conducted over a four-month period from the signing of the agreement.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are outlined as follows.

- Evaluate the extent to which the project has contributed to the improvement of the conditions for dignified, voluntary, and safe access to durable solutions for internally displaced persons, returnees from northeast Syria (especially Al-Hol Camp), and host communities. This includes assessing achievements in facilitating safe returns, relocation, and local integration through multisectoral assistance. The evaluation will also assess the indicators at the objective and outcome levels by comparing them to the targets outlined in the results matrix
- Examine how the project delivered its multi-sectoral and integrated services, such as Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM), Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS), legal assistance, protection services (including violence against women and girls), livelihoods support, shelter reconstruction and rehabilitation, rental assistance, tribal engagement& social cohesion, and access to basic services and how these contributed to resilience, reintegration, and community stabilization.
- Assess the extent to which cross-cutting themes, such as protection, inclusion of persons with disabilities, environmental sustainability, and accountability to affected populations were mainstreamed across project activities, and identify key results and remaining gaps.

- Document lessons learned, best practices, and operational challenges encountered during implementation, especially in relation to targeting, coordination with government and private sector stakeholders, and promoting sustainability and scalability of interventions.
- Provide actionable recommendations for IOM, donors, government partners, and other stakeholders to inform the design and implementation of future community revitalization programming in Iraq.

1.3. EVALUATION SCOPE

The primary geographical focus of the final evaluation will cover six governorates where the activities have been implemented, namely Anbar, Diyala, Dohuk, Erbil, Ninawa, and Salah Al-Din. The evaluation will cover the entire project implementation period, from 30 September 2024 to 30 September 2025. In terms of content, the evaluation will focus on assessing the project's overall objective and its three main outcomes, which aim to enhance the sustainability of reintegration for displacement-affected populations in Iraq and returnees from northeast Syria. The evaluation will examine how the project improved access to durable solutions, including voluntary return, local integration, and relocation, through multisectoral interventions such as protection, legal assistance, livelihoods support, MHPSS, shelter reconstruction and rehabilitation, rental assistance, and improved access to basic services. It will also assess how the project's area-based and community-driven approaches contributed to community resilience, social cohesion, and sustainable reintegration in the targeted governorates. Attention will be paid to the integration and effectiveness of cross-cutting themes, including the protection of vulnerable groups (such as women, children, and persons with disabilities), gender equality, PSEA prevention, inclusive MHPSS services, and the operationalization of Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) principles across all components of the intervention.

1.4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The project's performance will be evaluated against the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. These criteria will guide both the design and the analytical framework of the evaluation. In addition, the evaluation will incorporate key cross-cutting themes, including gender equality, disability inclusion, environmental considerations, and accountability to affected populations (AAP). These themes will be assessed both as standalone considerations and as elements integrated across the six OECD/DAC criteria. Together, these criteria and cross-cutting themes form the foundation for the evaluation questions outlined below.

1.5. EVALUATION GUIDING QUESTIONS

Relevance

- a) To what extent does the project align with the needs, priorities and policies of the target population, local authorities, and other stakeholders?
- b) What additional needs or gaps emerged during implementation, particularly related to access to housing, livelihoods, protection, legal documentation, MHPSS, and basic services? How do these gaps inform future programming for durable solutions?
- c) Were the project's interventions flexible and adaptive in responding to changes in the operational context, including evolving security conditions, policy shifts, and fluctuations in return trends from northeast Syria?
- d) Were the outputs / outcomes of the project consistent with the overall objective of the project and were critical, balanced and appropriate ?

Coherence

- e) How compatible is the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution?
- f) To what extent the programme is coherent with donor and the local gov't policy for displacement solutions, social cohesion, and reintegration?
- g) To what extent is the project aligned with IOM's regional strategies for the MENA region and national-level strategic priorities in Iraq?
- h) To what extent is the project coherent with global policy frameworks such as the Global Compact for Migration (GCM) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?

Effectiveness

- i) To what extent did the project achieve its expected results and activities, as measured against the indicators and targets outlined in the results matrix, and what challenges hindered this progress?
- j) How effective was the project's area-based and community-driven approach in addressing the barriers to return, relocation, and local integration for displacement-affected populations?
- k) What internal and external factors influenced the implementation of the project, positively or negatively, and how did these factors affect the delivery of activities and achievement of results?

Efficiency

- l) Were the project activities and output delivered on time?
- m) How efficiently were the resources used to achieve the intended results in line with the implementation context?

Impact

- n) What were the broader effects of the project on individuals, institutions, community groups, gender, and age groups?
- o) What unintended positive or negative outcomes emerged at household, community, and institutional levels, including in relation to protection risks, gender dynamics, community tensions, or perceptions of returnees?
- p) How has the project contributed to strengthening community resilience and local capacities to support sustainable reintegration beyond the direct beneficiaries?
- q) To what extent did the project contribute to reducing protection risks, enhancing safety, and improving social cohesion for returnees, IDPs, and host communities in areas of return or relocation?

Sustainability

- r) To what extent are the structures, resources, capacities, and community mechanisms put in place by the project likely to sustain access to durable solutions and essential services after the project ends?
- s) To what extent were relevant target groups taking ownership of the project?
- t) How far was the project embedded in institutional structures that are likely to survive beyond the life of the project?

Cross-cutting issues

- u. To what extent does the project incorporate a gender-responsive approach, promoting gender equality and addressing the specific needs and experiences of both women and men throughout its design, implementation, and outcomes?
- v. How effectively does the project integrate and address the needs of individuals with disabilities, ensuring their meaningful participation, equal access to services, and overall inclusion in all project activities and outcomes?
- w. What actual or expectable positive and negative effects are foreseeable on the environment?

- x. Were relevant and timely information provided to beneficiaries about the programme objectives, time-frame, how to participate in the decision-making process, and how to provide feedback and raise concerns? Did beneficiaries raise concerns related to possible violations of rights? Was there a functional feedback and complaint response mechanism in place?

2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The selected firm will be responsible for designing a strong methodological framework and leading the evaluation process. The consultancy firm is expected to employ a summative programme evaluation approach with both quantitative and qualitative methods to answer both the outcome indicators and evaluation questions. The quantitative method will employ a descriptive beneficiaries survey while the qualitative method will employ a participatory community consultation with thematic content analysis methods. The qualitative study (community consultation) should represent the views of all target groups. The methodologies utilized must emphasize inclusivity, ensure representation of all relevant stakeholders, while aligning effectively with the project's objectives and scope. The outlined project components and targets in the evaluation scope section should guide the sampling strategy and the determination of appropriate sample sizes for each evaluation tool.

To ensure a comprehensive and contextually appropriate evaluation, the process should focus on engaging a diverse range of stakeholders involved in the implementation and impact of the project. This includes government counterparts such as the Ministry of Migration and Displacement (MoMD), Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, Civil Affairs Directorates, and relevant branches of local authorities in the targeted governorates. In addition, the evaluation should engage community representatives, civil society organizations (CSOs), tribal leaders involved in social cohesion efforts, and implementing partners such as the Women Rehabilitation Organization (WRO) in the protection sector. The evaluation should also consult with service providers at Al Amal Rehabilitation Center, staff involved in camp management, livelihoods beneficiaries (including those supported through Individual Livelihood Assistance and Employment for Public Works), shelter assistance recipients, and legal aid beneficiaries. Engagement with relevant UN partners, the Technical Working Group (TWG), Durable Solutions Task Force (DSTF), and other actors involved in return, reintegration, and durable solutions processes will also be essential to capture the broader impact and coordination dynamics of the project.

The methodology will include Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with project staff, government authorities, local partners, service providers at Al Amal Rehabilitation Center, camp management staff, and community leaders, as well as international partners involved in return and reintegration processes. Additionally, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and semi-structured interviews will be conducted with selected project beneficiaries, including individuals who received livelihoods assistance, legal assistance, MHPSS services, protection case management, as well as shelter and basic and other services support. FGDs will also include members of the wider host communities and returnees from northeast Syria. These consultations will assess the project's responsiveness to the needs, priorities, and expectations of the target populations, with particular attention to return and reintegration outcomes, protection needs, access to services, and barriers to achieving durable solutions.

Technical support and oversight will be provided by the IOM Iraq MEAL team and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), with additional consultation from the PMR Officer at IOM's Regional Office in Cairo as needed. Evaluation findings will contribute to organizational learning, accountability, and the design of future transitional justice and resilience-building interventions in Iraq.

To enhance access, context sensitivity, and local engagement, the evaluation team is encouraged to collaborate with qualified local consultants or field researchers based in Iraq. Data collection will be conducted through in-person interviews and direct engagements.

Summary of the Evaluation Methodology and Data Collection Tools

Table 01: Evaluation Methodology and Data Collection Tools

Method	Tasks	Tools required	Products
Desk study	Review project reports, mid-term evaluation, assessments, selection criteria, work plans and other documents.	Evaluation rubric ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation strategies identification. • Identification of progress and challenges • Key project components implemented, and result achieved
Key Informant Interviews	The evaluation will involve conducting Key Informant Interviews with a range of stakeholders, including IOM programme staff, representatives from MoMD, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, Civil Affairs Directorates, provincial and local authorities, community leaders, tribal leaders involved in social cohesion efforts, implementing partners, service providers at Al Amal Rehabilitation Center, and UN agencies involved in return, reintegration, and durable solutions programming. <u>A minimum of 55 KIIs will be conducted.</u>	Key informant interview guide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative data on project processes and performance about target results • Insight on the view of problems and recommended solutions. • Different perspectives on issues
On-site observation	Conduct field visits, observation of project activities and sites. Sample size is identified under the Beneficiary Interviews and surveys	Observation Checklist	Qualitative data/cues about Project contexts/challenges as well as risks
Focus group discussion	FGDs will be conducted to explore beneficiary and community stakeholder perceptions on the project's engagement processes, implementation, and responsiveness to their needs and expectations. FGDs will collect in-depth qualitative information on participants' experiences with services such as livelihoods, legal assistance, protection services, MHPSS, shelter assistance, and access to basic and other services. Participants will include beneficiaries from Al Amal Rehabilitation Center, returnees from northeast Syria, IDPs, and host community	Focus group discussion guide	An in-depth qualitative information

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

Method	Tasks	Tools required	Products
	members in areas of return or relocation. Approximately 20 to 25 FGDs will be conducted across project locations, ensuring participation is gender- and age-sensitive and inclusive of vulnerable groups such as women, youth, persons with disabilities, and other at-risk groups.		
Household Survey	Surveys will be conducted with direct project beneficiaries. The survey will assess beneficiaries' satisfaction with the services received, perceived improvements in their living conditions, progress toward reintegration, and overall perceptions of the project's relevance, effectiveness, and responsiveness to their needs. A statistically representative sample will be selected using a 95% confidence level, 50% population proportion, a 5% margin of error, with a 4 design effect and a 10% non-response rate. <u>Approximately 1,700, surveys will be conducted with direct beneficiaries.</u>	Structured questionnaire	Quantitative information

3. ETHIC, NORMS, AND STANDARDS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation process must adhere to IOM's Data Protection Principles, Code of Conduct, the "Do No Harm" principle, and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluations. Special care will be taken to ensure that the evaluation applies conflict-sensitive, protection-sensitive, and inclusive approaches, particularly when engaging with vulnerable groups such as IDPs, returnees, and persons with disabilities. The process will prioritize the safety, dignity, confidentiality, and voluntary participation of all respondents, ensuring that the evaluation does not cause harm or exacerbate existing vulnerabilities.

4. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to produce:

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

5. SPECIFICATIONS OF ROLES

The Evaluator(s) or Evaluation Team will be responsible for leading the evaluation process, including designing the methodology, developing the inception report, and conducting data collection and analysis in line with the agreed approach. They will ensure strict adherence to ethical and quality standards, particularly IOM's Data Protection Principles and the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The team will deliver all required outputs such as the inception report, draft and final evaluation reports, and presentations and actively participate in meetings with IOM and relevant stakeholders. All reporting must strictly adhere to IOM's official reporting templates and formats. Regular communication and coordination with IOM focal points will be maintained throughout the evaluation to ensure alignment and responsiveness. The Evaluation Manager, will oversee the entire evaluation process on behalf of IOM, ensuring that all activities align with organizational procedures and quality expectations. The Evaluation Manager will manage the recruitment and contracting of the evaluator(s), and serve as the primary liaison between the evaluators, and program teams. They will facilitate access to necessary project documents, coordinate the internal review of key deliverables such as the inception and final reports, and ensure the implementation of quality assurance mechanisms at all critical stages of the evaluation.

6. EVALUATION PROPOSED WORKPLAN

Table 02: The Evaluation proposed work plan

Activity	Responsible	Estimated Timeframes	Data Analysis	Aug 2025	Sep 2025	Oct 2025	Nov 2025
Kick-off meeting	IOM	To be completed by 14 th Aug 2025	Remote	X			
Desk review of project documents, partners documents, reports, and others	Evaluation firm	Starting from Aug 14 th	Remote	X			
Inception process: Development/submission of inception report/work plan and data collection tools	Evaluation firm & (IOM for Review)	1st version of inception report is sent to IOM on 21st of August.	Remote	X			
Inception report review	IOM	24 th August to 4 th September	Remote	X	X		
Inception report finalized incorporating IOM feedback, and final inception report package inclusive of data collection plans shared with IOM	Evaluation firm	14 th September	Remote		X		
Data collection tools translation and training of enumerators	Evaluation firm	September 14 th -17 th	Iraq- on-site		X		
Fieldwork – data collection	Evaluation firm	18 th of September- to 20 th October	Iraq – on site.			X	X

Activity	Responsible	Estimated Timeframes	Data Analysis	Aug 2025	Sep 2025	Oct 2025	Nov 2025
Submission of the first draft evaluation report together with the Management Response Matrix and a two-pager evaluation brief	Evaluation firm	First complete draft of the report to be shared on November 2 nd	Remote				X
Initial review of the first draft by IOM MEAL	IOM MEAL	November 5 th – 6 th	Remote				X
Reflection of MEAL's initial feedback if needed	Evaluation firm	November 7 th	Remote				X
IOM program team, and RO MEAL review.	IOM	November 9 th to November 18 th					
Meeting to present the main evaluation findings to IOM	Evaluation firm	November 17 th	Remote				X
Submission of the final evaluation report with the MRM and a two-pager evaluation brief	Evaluation firm	Final report package shared with IOM on <u>November 27th</u> <u>COB Iraq time</u>	Remote				X

7. TERMS OF PAYMENT

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

- Satisfactory inception report submission inclusive of data collection tools and plans – 30%
- Submission of first draft of the evaluation report package (evaluation brief, MRM tool) together with raw data – 30%
- Satisfactory final report with relevant annexes – 40%

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

8. REQUIREMENTS

An international consultancy firm with valid registrations, and it is expected to have legal registration paperwork in Iraq, and formal access to the locations of the programme implementation. Applicants should submit the following documents separately and sealed.

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

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

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

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

9. SELECTION CRITERIA

Table 03: Rating Criteria

No	Rating Criteria	Result
1.1	It is clear from the application that the TOR and tasks are clearly understood by the applicant	Pass/Fail
2.1	Has done at least three similar consulting work (programme and project evaluations) with UN agencies or INGOs	Pass/Fail
2.2	Has expertise/excellence in durable solutions, reintegration programming, and multi-sectoral service delivery, including thematic areas such as protection, livelihoods, shelter, legal assistance, MHPSS, and community-based recovery in displacement-affected contexts.	Pass/Fail
3.1	Lead Evaluator/Team leader's or consultancy firm's experience in similar consultancy work/programme evaluation	Pass/Fail
3.2	CVs of Evaluation team submitted, and team has necessary skills, competencies and experience to conduct the evaluation	Pass/Fail
5.1	Proposed methods to conduct the programme evaluation	Pass/Fail
5.2	Proposed data collection methods and tools	Pass/Fail
6.1	Presents clear logical work plan that shows how proposed activities of the consultancy will meet the consultancy objectives	Pass/Fail

10. HOW TO APPLY

The interested firm/ consultant is expected to submit a technical proposal with a detailed evaluation methodology, indicative work plan, and the overall approach to the evaluation and an all-inclusive budget proposal no later than **July 26th 2025**. The submission of proposals (technical and financial) and/or related questions is expected to be directed via procurement email to: Iraqtenders@iom.int

The submission is expected to include the following:

- Company/ Consultant profile including a history of similar projects;
- A cover letter;
- Financial proposal;
- Technical;
- CV and biographies of independent consultant/consulting firm and key assessment team members;
- References for each evaluation team member or the firm;
- An example of a recent evaluation report.

Important Note: When evaluating the competing applicants, IOM will consider the written qualifications/capability, financial offer, the information provided by the applicants, and any other information obtained by IOM through its research.

IOM reserves the right to change the calendar of events or revise any parts of the requirements of the evaluation at any time.