

TERMS OF REFERENCE
TERMINAL EVALUATION CONTRACTOR FOR GMMA READY PROJECT

PROJECT TITLE

Enhancing Greater Metro Manila's Institutional Capacities for Effective Disaster /Climate Risk Management towards Sustainable Development or GMMA READY Project

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The implementation of the GMMA READY Project is a collaborative endeavour between and among a number of national and sub-national agencies, local government units (LGUs) and civil society organizations with the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC) - Office of Civil Defense (OCD) as Implementing Partner (IP) and the following agencies as Responsible Partners (RPs) with DILG and NEDA as Cooperating Agencies:

1. Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology (PHIVOLCS)
2. Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration (PAGASA)
3. National Mapping and Resource Information Authority (NAMRIA)
4. Mines and Geosciences Bureau (MGB)
5. Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB)
6. Metro Manila Development Authority (MMDA)
7. Climate Change Commission (CCC)

The Project aims to increase institutional capacities of key local and national risk management actors towards a disaster /climate resilient GMMA. The project has as coverage : Metro Manila in the national capital region and the contiguous provinces of Laguna, Cavite and Rizal in Region IVA and Bulacan in Region III.

To project objectives is expected to be achieved through the systematic and integrated implementation and attainment of five (5) key outputs:

- Expected Output 1: GMMA's vulnerabilities to disaster and climate change risks assessed;
- Expected Output 2: Priority disaster/climate risk mitigation actions for GMMA such as formulation and testing of an integrated contingency plan and establishment of early warning systems developed and implemented;
- Expected Output 3: Competencies of GMMA LGUs and critical partners to mainstream DRM/CRM into local planning and regulatory processes enhanced;
- Expected Output 4: Mainstreaming DRM/CRM into local land use/development plan(s) and regulatory processes of Metro Manila and selected GMMA LGUs demonstrated; and
- Knowledge management system, including a vigorous Community of Practice on Disaster/Climate Risk Management established.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, draw lessons and good practices that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP and GOP programming.

SCOPE OF WORK

Specifically, the terminal evaluation should be able to:

1. Assess Project Results.

The final evaluation will assess achievement of the project's objective, outputs and outcomes and provide ratings for the targeted objective and outcomes and the extent to which they were achieved. The evaluation will also assess if the project has led to any other short term or long term positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's results, the final evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established.

Assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. An assessment of early or emerging impact should also be determined, if possible. The evaluator should assess project results using indicators and relevant tracking tools.

To determine the level of achievement of the project's objective and outcomes, the evaluation will be undertaken using the following criteria: **Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness**

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally, the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of the project's effectiveness and efficiency. In rating the project's outcomes, relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria.

The evaluator will also assess other results of the project, including positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long-term effects of a project. However, given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluator to identify or fully assess them. Evaluator will, nonetheless, indicate the steps to be taken to assess long-term project impacts, e.g. impacts on local populations, especially the vulnerable like women, children and the elderly; replication effects and other local effects.

- Capacity Development. The effects of Project activities on strengthening the capacities of the IP, other responsible partners, concerned peoples'/community based organization (s); and concerned local government unit(s) will be assessed.
- Leverage. An assessment of the Project's effectiveness in leveraging funds that would influence

larger projects or broader policies to support its goal should also be made.

- Awareness Raising. The Project's contribution to raising awareness on environmental issues, as well as its contribution to promoting policy or advocacy activities and collaboration among communities will be assessed.
- Gender Mainstreaming. The Project's contribution to mainstreaming gender perspective will be assessed. Financial Delivery. The following table should be completed to provide a summary of the planned and actual activities of the project as well as the expenditures up to the present.

- 2. Assess Sustainability of Project Outcomes.** The final evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this. Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. The following dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed: **a) Financial, b) Socio –political, c) Institutional framework and governance, and d) Environmental .**
- 3. Assess the Project's Catalytic Role / Partnerships and Replicability.** The final evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. Indicators for catalytic or replication effect would include partnerships established, IEC activities carried-out, local level acceptance and understanding of project, local level behavioral changes, if any, should be noted.
- 4. Assess the Project's Monitoring and Evaluation System.** The final evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the implementation of the Project M&E plan. Projects must have adequate budget for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project. The final evaluation report will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of the project M&E plan and of implementation of the M&E plan.
- 5. Assess Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results.** It is suggested that the evaluator also considers the following issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results, when relevant. Evaluators are not expected to provide ratings or separate assessment on the following issues but may consider them while assessing the performance and results: **a) Preparation and readiness; b) Country ownership ; c) Stakeholders involvement ; d) Financial planning; e) Implementing/Executing Agency's supervision and backstopping; f) Co-financing and Project Outcomes and Sustainability; and g) Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.**
- 6. Identify lessons and provide recommendations for future actions.** The evaluator will present lessons and recommendations in the final evaluation report on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. The evaluator will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment

of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Evaluator should seek to provide a few well formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand or to UNDP E&E overall portfolio. Final evaluations should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification, for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, the final evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.

To determine the level of achievement of the project's objective and outcomes, the evaluation will be undertaken using the following criteria: Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, sustainability and impact. Refer to TOR ANNEX 2 for set of questions covering each of the criteria. The evaluator may amend, complete, and submit the matrix as part of the inception report and as annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidenced based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with responsible partners and other stakeholders of the project through UNDP, OCD and Project Team. The evaluator is expected to conduct field visits to project sites in the cities and municipality of Metro Manila and the provinces of Bulacan in Regions III and Rizal, Laguna, Cavite in region IVA. Interviews will be held with the following LGUs, individuals and agencies at a minimum. List and contact numbers shall be provided by the project team during the inception meeting:

1. Team Managers or representatives from the Responsible Partners
2. CPDCs/DRRMOs of LGUs (17 MM an
3. OCD PMD staff
4. National Program Director, Project Manager, Assistant Project Manager
5. UNDP representative
6. Representatives from other partners

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the Project Document, Project Annual and Quarterly reports, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files. List of documents for the review of the evaluator is attached in ANNEX 1.

The evaluation findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to
2. Field visits to GMMA READY -supported projects/areas
3. Telephone and face-to-face interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other Stakeholders involved with the project. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with email questionnaires.
4. KIIs and FGD

EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The Evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

1. Inception Report. This is to be submitted by the evaluator before going into full- pledged data collection exercise. The inception report details what is evaluated and why, how each of the evaluation questions will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed data sources including data collection procedures. The evaluator shall also indicate in the inception report the

proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables and the evaluators' team member assigned for each of the task/deliverable. The inception report provides the programme unit and evaluators with an opportunity that they share same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any issues and concerns.

2. Initial Findings for Presentation to Project Management and UNDP. Towards the end of the exercise, the Evaluator will discuss its preliminary key findings and recommendations with the programme principals (OCD and UNDP) and present these at a key stakeholders' meeting participated in by the responsible partners, selected local government units and beneficiary organizations. The Consultant shall use this feedback mechanism to finalize the report.
3. Draft Final Report. The evaluator shall provide the programme principals (OCD and UNDP) with the draft final report for review.
4. Terminal Evaluation Report. All outputs are subject to the review and final approval of the contracting party.

Deliverables	Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
Inception Report	within the 2 nd week after contract signing	OCD and UNDP
Draft Evaluation Report (Initial)	Within the 3 rd week after inception meeting	
Draft Final Report	Within one week after Initial Evaluation Report	
Terminal Evaluation Report	Within one week after the Draft Final Report	

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

UNDP is the principal responsible for managing the evaluation. The Project team/OCD PMD will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholders interview and field visits with the following :

1. Team Managers or representatives from the Responsible Partners
2. CPDCs/DRRMOs of LGUs
3. OCD PMD staff
4. National Program Director, Project Manager, Assistant Project Manager
5. UNDP representative
6. Representatives from other partners

The consultant shall provide his/her own computers, cameras, communication during the entire contract duration. Computers, projectors, camera and other equipment to be used during the inception meeting shall be provided by the Project.

DURATION OF WORK

The evaluation is expected to be completed within a period of two (2) months.

Activity	Timing							
	Month 1				Month 2			
	Wk1	Wk2	Wk3	Wk4	W5	Wk6	Wk7	Wk8
Preparation								
Evaluation Mission								
Draft Evaluation Report								
Final Report								

The Project expects the Consultant to give an estimated lead time of two weeks for the RP and the IP to review outputs and give comments on the report outputs.

DUTY STATION

The Consultant shall have as his/her duty station for the contract duration at the OCD – Project Management Division. In pursuit of his/her other relevant activities, the Consultant is expected to travel to the Project areas /sites and offices of other concerned agencies (*Annex 2 List of areas or sites to be visited*).

The Consultant is not required to report regularly at their duty station/location.

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUCCESSFUL INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR

- a) Master's degree (PhD an advantage) in Development Management, Economics, Social Sciences, Community Development and or other related fields
- b) At least seven (7) years of progressively responsible experience in development research, evaluation of development programmes, or project management, preferably in areas related to basic services, livelihood, governance, peace and conflict resolution, humanitarian assistance, internal displacement or community development
- c) Demonstrate familiarity with the UN System and managing donor-financed projects will be given preference.
- d) Previous experience with results based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, technical knowledge in the targeted focal area/s.
- e) Proven ability to write high-quality technical reports

SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

The total cost for this project is a lump sum amount to include all costs such as professional fee, travel and meeting costs, and overhead costs, among others.

The schedule of payment will be as follows:

Tranche	% of Total Contract Cost	Documentation Requirements
1st	20%	Upon signing of Contract/Terms of Reference
2 nd	20%	Upon submission and acceptance by OCD of the approved Inception Report
3 rd	20%	Upon submission and acceptance by OCD of the Draft Terminal Evaluation Report by OCD
4 th	40%	Upon submission and acceptance by OCD of Final Terminal Evaluation Report and process documentation report
TOTAL	100%	

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF THE BEST OFFER

The Technical and Financial proposals shall comprise 70% and 30% respectively, of the evaluation criteria.

Technical proposal (70%)

The Technical proposal shall be comprised by the following documents :

- 1.CV of the Evaluator
- 2.Plan of Approach and Methodology

The Technical proposal shall be evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. Background and experience of Evaluator..... 30%
2. Plan of Approach and Methodology 70%

The Plan of Approach and Methodology should be a comprehensive narrative explaining in detail how the Evaluator plans to undertake the assignment, proposed list of respondents and data-collection methods, detailed work plan, framework and working outline of the evaluation report.

In the beginning of the assignment, an inception meeting will be held to discuss, revise and finalize the Plan of Approach and Methodology.

Financial Proposal (30%)

The Financial Proposal should be all-inclusive covering professional fees, travel expenses, supplies and all other related expenses.

DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED BY APPLICANTS

The preferred contents and presentation of the offer shall be as follows :

- a. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability**
- b. **Personal CV**, indication all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c. **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- d. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided:
 - the number of days required for the assessment
 - the applicant should state the number of areas that the proposal covers

TOR ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: List of Project Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators.

- a) Project Document
- b) Annual and Quarterly reports
- c) Approved WFPs
- d) MOAs
- e) Notes from PMB Meetings
- d) Project related Knowledge Products and other materials such as CLUPs produced;

ANNEX 2. List of Project sites and required travel time :

Methodology	Agencies/ Persons to be evaluated		Location		Required Travel Time
FGD	IP and RPs	Team Managers, representatives from technical and finance	Quezon City		Half day
FGD	PLGUs and Assisted MLGUs and Barangays				
	Bulacan	PDRRMO and MDRRMOs of assisted MLGUs	PDRRMO, Malolos, Bulacan	With Travel to concerned province and	3 days

	Cavite	PDRRMO and MDRRMOs of assisted MLGUs	PDRRMO, Trece Martirez, Cavite	2 barangays with CBEWS on flooding and one site with CBEWS on Tsunami	3 days
	Laguna	PDRRMO and MDRRMOs of assisted MLGUs	PDRRMO, Sta Cruz, Laguna	With Travel to concerned province and 2 barangays with CBEWS on flooding	2 .5 days
	Rizal	PDRRMO and MDRRMOs of assisted MLGUs	PDRRMO, Rizal		2.5 days
FGD	Assisted MM LGUs	CPDO and other members of CLUP Team	Muntinlupa		One day each
		CPDO and other members of CP and V&A Teams	San Juan		Half day
FGD	Assisted MM LGUs	CPDO, DRRMO and other member of CP and CLUP Teams	Paranaque		One day
		CPDO, DRRMO and other member of CP and CLUP Teams	Las Pinas		One day
Interview	Partners Agencies	DPWH	Manila		Half day
		DSWD	Manila		Half day
		DILG	QC		Half day

ANNEX 3. Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels			

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

ANNEX 4. Rating

Rating Scales		
Rating for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&EA Execution	Sustainability ratings	Relevance ratings
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability	2. Relevant (R)
5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings	3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks	1.. Not relevant (NR)
4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings	2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks	Impact Ratings:
3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had		3. Significant (S)
		2. Minimal (M)
		1. Negligible (N)

<p>significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe Shortcomings</p>	<p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	
--	--------------------------------------	--

ANNEX 5. Evaluation Report Outline

i. Opening page:

Title of Project, Project IDs, Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation, regions included in the report, operational/strategic program, implementing and responsible partners, other project partners, evaluation team members and acknowledgement

ii. Executive Summary:

Project Summary Table, Project Description (brief), Evaluation Rating Table, Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Introduction

Purpose of the evaluation, Scope & Methodology, Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context

Project start and duration, Problems that the project sought to address, Immediate and development objectives of the project, Baseline Indicators established, Main stakeholders, Expected Results

3. Findings

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with must be rated :

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

Analysis of Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators); Assumptions and Risks; Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design; Planned stakeholder participation; Replication approach; UNDP comparative advantage; linkages between project and other interventions within the sector; Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation

Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation), Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region), Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management, Project Finance: Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation; UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution , coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

Overall results (attainment of objectives) ,Relevance, Effectiveness & Efficiency ,Country ownership, Mainstreaming, Sustainability , Impact.

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project, Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project, Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives, Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. ANNEXES

TOR, Itinerary, List of persons interviewed, Summary of field visits, List of documents reviewed
Evaluation Question Matrix, Questionnaire used and summary of results, Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form, Evaluation Process Documentation report

ANNEX 6. Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement

Evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They

should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *(place)* on *date*

Signature: _____