# **Evaluation of JPF Funded Projects in Sulawesi, Indonesia**

**Inception Report** 

Submitted to: PARCIC, PWJ

First Draft: April 2021

Japan Platform M&E Division



# **Table of Contents**

Α.	Introduction	3
E	Background & Context	3
P	Project Overview	3
в.	Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan	4
E	Evaluation Framework	4
E	Ethical Considerations & Risks Management	6
E	Evaluation Activities	6
	Key Informant Interviews and In-Depth Interviews	7
	Household Surveys	8
C.	Work Plan, Schedule & Expected Outputs	11



# **A.** Introduction

## **Background & Context**

On 28 September 2018, a tsunami triggered by a 7.5 magnitude earthquake struck Indonesia's Central Sulawesi Province. As of January 2019, the BNPB (the National Disaster Management Authority) of Indonesia reported that the death toll caused by both the earthquake and tsunami reached 4,340, with 667 missing, 10,679 injured and around 200,000 people still being displaced. Localized areas were decimated as the tsunami wiped away coastal zones, and soil



liquefaction caused three villages to sink into the earth and the ground to shift with mudslides. In addition, the earthquake caused widespread structural damage, displacing families temporarily from damaged and unsafe shelters.

According to BNPB, approximately 68,000 houses were damaged as a result of the quake and subsequent tsunami. Flash floods during the last rainy season (October-December 2018) washed away dozens of houses in Sigi District, while many camps in Donggala District were inundated, affecting thousands of people and generating secondary displacements.

JPF has launched the response programme immediately after the quake struck the island and so far the fund has spent via seven member NGOs working on WASH, Shelter, NFI, Livelihood, Agriculture etc. Although it's been almost two years and a half has been passed, unsolved issues regarding livelihood activities for community, education and infrastructures are still having a negative impact on the most severely affected.

### **Project Overview**

JPF has been providing funding for two separate humanitarian and / or development projects which have been implemented in Sulawesi since mid-2020. In accordance with JPF's operational strategy, JPF has acted as an intermediary support organisation for two Japanese Member NGOs, which have implemented the two projects. The Member NGOs have each implemented the project in collaboration with Local Partners, which are Indonesian NGOs with knowledge and experience in working with the target communities.

JPF plans to engage local consultants to conduct a final evaluation covering these two projects, which are:

 The PARCIC Projects: The projects, implemented by the Pacific Asia Resource Centre for Interpeoples' Cooperation (PARCIC, as Member NGO) and SKP-HAM /



Bina Swadaya, as Local Partners), which has conducted livelihood assistance for the victims in central Sulawesi.

 The PWJ Project: The project, implemented by Peace Winds Japan (PWJ, as Member NGO) and Aksi Cepat Tanggap (ACT) / Yayasan Inovasi Ketahanan Komunitas (INANTA), as Local Partners, which has conducted livelihood recovery for local farmers and capacity building in community disaster risk management in Sigi, central Sulawesi.

The main objectives of this evaluation exercise are:

- To verify the project was implemented in accordance with the project proposal
- To verify and measure actual outputs and if possible outcomes of the project based on CHS / OECD-DAC criteria
- To document above achievements and challenges and reports to donors to ensure accountability
- To assess to what extent the programme objectives were achieved
- To collect information about Local Actors
- To explore and identify emergency-recovery nexus in the project design and activities

# **B.** Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan

### **Evaluation Framework**

In order to provide an evidence-based assessment as well as actionable recommendations, JPF propose to employ both quantitative and qualitative approaches to evaluate the project. Quantitative survey data will be collected from individuals through structured questionnaire while qualitative data will be collected through KII.

In order to mitigate risks of Covid-19 transmission, JPF M&E team take necessary safeguarding protocols to ensure the safety of researchers, enumerators and respondents. During the field work, JPF will equip field M&E team with the necessary means to protect themselves. Although JPF prioritize in-person data collection method, remote research activities will also be employed where possible in accordance with the safety precautions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. JPF will remain abreast of any developments concerning COVID-19 restrictions, which may necessitate the re-design of research activities.

To evaluate the project, JPF has developed an evaluation matrix to guide the design of research tools used during field activities (See Table 1). The research tools will contain questions with a view to identifying lessons learned, examples of good practice, and actionable recommendations. The evaluation matrix is aligned with JPF's evaluation criteria and Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS).



Evaluation Criteria	Sample Questions <sup>1</sup>							
CHS1 Humanitarian response is appropriate and relevant (Relevance)	<ul> <li>To what extent are communities and people affected by crisis consider that the response takes account of their specific needs and culture.</li> <li>Did the assistance and protection provided correspond with assessed risks, vulnerabilities and needs?</li> <li>Did the response take account of the capacities (e.g. the skills and knowledge) of people requiring assistance and/or protection?</li> </ul>							
CHS 2 Humanitarian response is effective and timely (Effectiveness)	<ul> <li>To what extent the communities and people affected by crises consider that their needs are met by the response.</li> <li>To what extent has the communities and people affected by crises including the most vulnerable groups consider that the timing of the assistance and protection they receive is adequate.</li> <li>Was the humanitarian response meeting its objectives in terms of timing, quality and quantity?</li> </ul>							
CHS3 Humanitarian response strengthens local capacities and avoids negative effects (Impact& Sustainability)	<ul> <li>To what extent has the communities and people affected by crises consider themselves better able to withstand future shocks and stresses as a result of humanitarian action.</li> <li>To what extent have local authorities, leaders and organisations with responsibilities for responding to crises consider that their capacities have been increased.</li> <li>Did communities and people affected by crisis (including the most vulnerable) identify any negative effects resulting from humanitarian action?</li> </ul>							
CHS 4 Humanitarian response is based on communication, participation and feedback (Relevance and Coherence)	<ul> <li>To what extent were the communities and people affected by crisis (including the most vulnerable) aware of their rights and entitlements.</li> <li>To what extent do the communities and people affected by crisis consider that they have timely access to relevant and clear information</li> <li>To what extent were the communities and people affected by crisis satisfied with the opportunities they have to influence the response</li> </ul>							
CHS 5 Complaints are welcomed and addressed	<ul> <li>To what extent were the communities and people affected by crisis, including vulnerable and marginalized groups aware of complaints mechanisms established for their use.</li> </ul>							

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Sample questions were developed based on CHS Guidance Notes and Indicators (2015, CHS alliance).



(Coherence)	<ul> <li>To what extent did the communities and people affected by crisis consider the complaints mechanisms accessible, effective, confidential and safe.</li> <li>Were the complaints investigated, resolved and results fed back to the complaint within the stated timeframe.</li> </ul>
CHS 6 Humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary (Cover, Coherence)	<ul> <li>Did the communities and people affected by crisis identify any gaps and overlaps in the response?</li> <li>Did the responding organisations share relevant information through formal and informal coordination mechanism?</li> <li>Did the organizations coordinate needs assessments, delivery of humanitarian aid and monitoring of its implementation?</li> </ul>

### **Ethical Considerations & Risks Management**

JPF M&E team members will fulfil their ethical obligations of independence, impartiality, credibility, and honesty and integrity while carrying out the evaluation. The evaluation will also respect and uphold the participants' rights, including confidentiality and do no harm guarantees.

### **Evaluation Activities**

The evaluation activities are planned in three iterative phases which are **Inception**, **Implementation and Reporting**.

### **Phase 1: Inception**

Phase 1 (Inception) has taken approximately four weeks, covering the following activities:

### **Inception Meetings**

During the Inception phase, JPF coordinates an inception meeting with member NGOs. These project-specific inception meetings allowed JPF to explain the evaluation mission to Member NGOs. JPF explains its proposed evaluation approaches to data collection, on which the Member NGOs and Local Partners provide valuable feedback. The outcomes of these meetings were pivotal in helping JPF to finalise this Inception Report and tools.

### **Desk Research**

During the Inception phase, JPF M&E team conduct an adaptive desk research of relevant documents to re-construct and analyse the intervention logic and theory of change for each project. The desk review also allowed JPF to under each project's assumptions and identify critical information gaps, which will guide the development of the research tools.



Documents reviewed include the project proposal for each project, monthly reports, amendments and where possible, beneficiary selection criteria and baseline-end line reports. Desk research also incorporate reports from development agencies and academic sources, as well as other relevant secondary documentation.

# Phase 2: Implementation

JPF intends to carry out the Implementation phase for two projects over two weeks. This timeframe would allow enough time to collect data, ensure the consistent quality of fieldwork, and provide for overlap between data collection and data analysis. At the start of the Implementation phase, JPF will brief field M&E team on the specifics of the project, as outlined in the Inception Report. JPF will ensure that all research outputs remain anonymous, such that the identity of individual participants will not be revealed. This guarantee of confidentiality will elicit greater candour from the participants and therefore improve the quality of the final evaluation report.

JPF will conduct a range of research activities including Key Informant Interviews (*KIIs*) and Household Surveys and project-specific information on the proposed research activities is shown below. (See Table 2 & 3)

### **Key Informant Interviews and In-Depth Interviews**

Key informant interviews (KIIs) will be conducted using semi-structured questionnaires tailored to the person(s) being interviewed. As such, interviewees will be selected using a convenience/relevance sampling method based on a series of conversations between member NGOs and JPF. Naturally, these programme staff and experts are uniquely placed to provide valuable insight into the project's achievements and lessons learned.

#### **PARCIC Project**

Eight KIIs are envisioned to be conducted with the following stakeholders:

- 1. Staff members of PARCIC's in charge of the Sulawesi Project;
- 2. Staff members of local partner organization project coordinator (SKP-HAM)
- 3. Staff members of local partner organization project coordinator (Bina Swadaya)
- 4. Staff members of Local/International NGO working on livelihood sector in Central Sulawesi
- 5. RTRW of the project area
- 6. Direct beneficiaries (Three persons)

PARCIC and JPF will collaborate in selecting the final KII participants during the Inception



phase. Where possible, KIIs may be held remotely via Zoom, Skype, or any other online platform deemed feasible and easily accessible for identified key informants.

#### **PWJ Project**

Thirteen KIIs are envisioned to be conducted with the following stakeholders:

- 1. Staff members of PWJ's in charge of the Sulawesi Project
- 2. Staff members of local partner organization project coordinator (ACT)
- 3. Staff members of local partner organization project coordinator (INANTA)
- 4. An officer from the Department of Agriculture
- 5. An officer from the Department of Disaster Management
- 6. A leader of farmer's group (Direct beneficiary under component 1)
- 7. RTRW of the project area (One from each component)
- 8. Two facilitators of disaster risk analysis training (Direct beneficiary under component 2)
- 9. Villagers who participated in DRR activities (3 person)

PWJ and JPF will collaborate in selecting the final KII participants during the Inception phase. Where possible, KIIs may be held remotely via Zoom, Skype, or any other online platform deemed feasible and easily accessible for identified key informants.

### **Household Surveys**

#### **PARCIC Project**

JPF proposes a total of 25 household surveys with direct beneficiaries who participated in the project. The survey participants will be selected by non-probability sampling technique in which JPF and PARCIC select individuals to be sampled based on their judgement.

Household surveys will be conducted face-to-face with beneficiaries. If JPF M&E team cannot meet the required sample size with beneficiaries who can participate in the household survey, member NGOs will arrange for the remaining number of beneficiaries to participate in face-to-face surveys.

#### **PWJ Project**

JPF proposes a total of 25 household surveys with direct beneficiaries who participated in Agriculture component. The survey participants will be selected by non-probability sampling technique in which JPF and PWJ select individuals to be sampled based on their judgement.

Household surveys will be conducted face-to-face with beneficiaries. If JPF M&E team cannot meet the required sample size with beneficiaries who can participate in the household survey, member NGOs will arrange for the remaining number of beneficiaries to



participate in face-to-face surveys.

Research Activity	Number
Klls	8
Surveys	25

#### Table 2: Breakdown of Research Activities (PARCIC)

 Table 3: Breakdown of Research Activities (PWJ)

Research Activity	Number
Klis	13
Surveys	25

# Phase 3: Analysis & Reporting

Analysis & Reporting phase is scheduled to take place over 7 weeks, beginning in the final week of the Implementation phase.

# **Data Cleaning and Analysis**

JPF M&E team will start cleaning and analysing all qualitative and quantitative data as the Implementation phase draws to a close. The qualitative research activities are mutually reinforcing – the desk research helps shape the content of KIIs; in turn, KII findings will direct further desk research (if necessary) and final recommendations. These emerging findings will ultimately inform the draft and final evaluation reports.

# **Draft Evaluation Report**

JPF M&E team will develop a combined draft evaluation reports, which will summarise and present synthesised findings according to the agreed evaluation matrices. The document will be augmented by comments and insights emerging from the debriefing workshop.

# **Debriefing Workshop**



JPF will conduct a debriefing workshop for relevant Member NGO representatives at the end of the evaluation process. The workshop will further explain findings and make recommendations for future disaster response.

# **Final Evaluation Report**

Having received feedback on the draft evaluation report, JPF M&E team will draft and submit the final evaluation report at the end of the Analysis & Reporting phase.

# **C.** Work Plan, Schedule & Expected Outputs

Phases	Phase 1: Inception				Phase 2: Implementation		Phase 3: Analysis & Reporting						
Weeks	May Week1	May	May	May	June Week1	June Week2	June Week3	June Week4	July Week1	July Week2	July Week3	July Week4	August Week1
meens		Week2	Week3	Week4									
Conduct Desk Research													
Submit Inception Report													
Submit tools													
Confirm Final Inception Report													
Confirm final tools													
Data Collection					PWJ	PARCIC							
Data Cleaning and Analysis													
Submit Draft Evaluation Report													
Feedback on Draft													

#### Table 4 : Timeline & Work Plan

Evaluation Report						
Submit Final Evaluation Report and debriefing workshop						