

**United Nations Development Programme**

조선민주주의인민공화국주재  
유엔개발계획대표부



---

Terminal Evaluation of the “Strengthening the Resilience of Communities  
through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management” Project  
(CBDRM Project)

[Award ID: 00091747, Project ID: 00096791]

## **TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

---

**Prepared By:**

Dr. Jeff Fang  
International Consultant

**January 2020**

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>13</b>
1.1 PURPOSE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION .....	13
1.2 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY .....	14
PHASE 1 – DESK REVIEW OF DOCUMENTATION (11 TO 22 NOVEMBER 2019): .....	14
PHASE 2 – DATA COLLECTION/FIELD MISSION IN DPRK (22 NOVEMBER TO 2 DECEMBER 2019).....	15
PHASE 3 – DRAFT AND FINALIZATION OF EVALUATION REPORT (9 TO 31 DECEMBER 2019): .....	16
1.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS .....	16
1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT.....	18
<b>2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT.....</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1 PROJECT START AND DURATION .....	19
2.2 PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS.....	19
2.3 IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT .....	19
2.4 BASELINE ESTABLISHED .....	20
2.5 MAIN STAKEHOLDERS .....	21
2.6 EXPECTED RESULTS .....	22
<b>3. FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1 PROJECT DESIGN .....	26
3.1.1 Project Document (PRODOC) Formulation .....	26
3.1.2 Analysis of Results and Resources Framework (Project Logic/Strategy and Indicators) .....	26
3.1.3 Risks and Assumptions .....	27
3.1.4 Lessons from Other Relevant Projects Incorporated into Project Design.....	28
3.1.5 Planned Stakeholder Participation .....	28
3.1.6 Replication Approach.....	28
3.1.7 Management Arrangements .....	29
3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION .....	31
3.2.1 Adaptive Management .....	31
3.2.2 Partnership Arrangements .....	33
3.2.3 Project Finance .....	34
3.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Activities Used for Adaptive Management.....	35
3.2.5 Implementing Agency.....	42
3.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT RESULTS .....	43
3.3.1 Overall Results/Impact.....	44
3.3.2 Relevance.....	47
3.3.3 Effectiveness .....	48
3.3.4 Efficiency .....	49
3.3.5 National Ownership.....	49
3.3.6 Sustainability.....	50
3.3.7 Basic Human Needs / Gender Equality .....	51
3.3.8 Synergy .....	51

<b>4. KEY SUCCESS STORY: INCREASED PUBLIC AWARENESS, KNOWLEDGE AND THE APPLICATION OF DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT TO STRENGTHEN VILLAGE COMMUNITY RESILIENCE .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>5.1 CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED .....</b>	<b>56</b>
Conclusion #1: Significant external factors/challenges severely affected the project .....	56
Conclusion #2: The CBDRM model has potential for replication across DPRK but requires strong national ownership and commitment as the key to overcome any difficulties faced and achieve optimum results.....	57
Conclusion #3: The UNDP CBDRM Project Team laid strong foundations of disaster risk management planning .....	58
<b>5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>59</b>
5.2.1 Operational Recommendations .....	59
5.2.2 Recommendations in Relation to Proposed Future Directions .....	60
<b>ANNEXES.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>A.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>A.2 ITINERARY .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>A.3 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>A.4 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED .....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>A.5 QUESTIONNAIRES USED DURING THE FIELD MISSION IN DPRK (22 NOVEMBER TO 2 DECEMBER 2019) .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>A.6 EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM.....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>A.7 AUDIT TRAIL.....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>A.8 EVALUATION MATRIX .....</b>	<b>84</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to acknowledge people and organisations that helped and supported directly and indirectly in this terminal evaluation.

I am very thankful to UNDP DPRK Programme Evaluation Team (Ms Le Le Lan and Mr Yu Kwang Song) for organizing the comprehensive work programme and all the guidance given for the terminal evaluation.

I appreciate the UNDP DPRK Programme Evaluation Team and Madam Hong Jong Hui (National Counterpart representative for MEPI) and all CBDRM Project national consultants onsite for all the assistance rendered to make my field mission trip in DPRK fruitful, insightful and pleasant.

I am very grateful to the National Counterparts of the DPRK Government for their support, time and openness during the evaluation.

I thank UNDP DPRK CBDRM Project Team and all UNDP DPRK staff for their cooperation and support. Many other interviewees (including the Vice-Chairpersons of CPCs) at Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province) were very helpful in meeting and sharing their views, ideas and perspectives. All of them added great value and were excellent hosts.

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS**

CO	Country Office
CBS	Central Bureau of Statistics
CBDRM	Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management
CDR	Combined Delivery Report
CPC	County Peoples' Committee
CPD	Country Programme Document
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
DRMP	Disaster Risk Management Planning
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
DLDD	Disaster Loss and Damage Database
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EW	Early Warning
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FMV	Field Monitoring Visits
HQ	Headquarters
ICF	Internal Control Framework
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MOLEP	Ministry of Land and Environment Protection
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NCC	DPRK National Coordinating Committee
NSDRR	National Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction
PRNA	Participatory Risk Needs Assessment
PRODOC	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SCEDM	State Committee for Emergency and Disaster Management
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SED	Support to Socio-Economic Development of Rural Areas in DPRK
SES	Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK
SHMA	State Hydro-Meteorological Administration
SLUG	Sloping Land User Group
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TOR	Terms of Reference
TRAC	Target for Resource Assignment from the Core System
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report is the result of the terminal evaluation mission which took place from November to December 2019, including the field mission in DPRK from 22 November to 2 December 2019. It was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations”.

### **1. Project Summary Table**

<b>Project Title</b>	“Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management” Project (CBDRM Project)		
ATLAS Business Unit, Award #, Project ID	Business Unit: UNDP DPRK Award ID: 00091747, Project ID: 00096791		
Country:	DPRK	Date project manager hired:	March 2016
Region:	Northeast Asia	Planned closing date:	31-12-2019
Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date:	08-10-2015	If revised, proposed closing date:	
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:	UNDP DPRK CO		
Other project partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS)</li> <li>• State Committee for Emergency and Disaster Management (SCEDM)</li> <li>• Ministry of Land and Environment Protection (MOLEP)</li> <li>• State Hydro-Meteorological Administration (SHMA)</li> <li>• Local counterparts at the county level: Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province), Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province)</li> </ul>		

<b>Project Financing</b>	<i>at Senior Management/Executive Board Level endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>Actual at Terminal Evaluation (US\$)</i>
[1] UNDP contribution:	US\$2,204,200 (approved PRODOC budget) with an increased project funding to US\$4,363,416.36 <sup>1</sup>	US\$3,401,031.60
[2] Government:	In-kind contributions	In-kind contributions
[3] Other partners:		
Project Total Costs	US\$4,363,416.36	US\$3,401,031.60 (As of 22 November 2019)

## 2. Project Description in Brief

The occurrences of extreme weather events and seasonal variability are one of the key contributors to loss in livelihoods, increase in poverty and significant threat to human development in rural areas in DPRK.

The causes of flood, landslides and droughts in the country are not limited to weather and climate conditions. In most of the rural areas, forest ecosystems have been converted into agricultural land in order to overcome food shortages and trees have been cut down as the primary source of household level energy.

The destruction of DPRK's forests contributed significantly to serious damage when impacted by natural hazards, especially, flooding, and landslides since deforestation weakens nature's buffering ability to store water. Currently, there is a large gap in capacities at all levels to cope with the impact of disasters and to improve communities' responsiveness and resilience.

The UNDP noted recent improvements in disaster preparedness and increased attention at national level to address the underlying factors that contribute to risks, against the backdrop of development priorities that focus on environmental protection and water conservation. The CBDRM Project will help local level communities acquire knowledge of successful practices in Community-based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) processes, timely and appropriate risk information and access to early warning, develop coping skills as well as access resources and services for disaster risk reduction actions.

The CBDRM Project was formulated in October 2015 with the following objective:

***To enhance vulnerable communities' resilience to natural hazards***

<sup>1</sup> The CBDRM Project has a duration of slightly over 4 years (October 2015 to December 2019) at an approved budget of US\$2,204,200. In November 2016 when UNDP focused on ad hoc intervention in flood affected areas in North Hamgyong Province, US\$1.6 million was added to the CBDRM project (through TRAC 1,2,3) to expedite emergency response. The project further received unspent funds from "Strengthening Ecosystem Resilience and Community Adaptive Capacity in Climate Affected River Basins in DPRK" (SERCARB) project and transferred some portion of management budget of the SED project towards the end of 2018, thus the project total budget became US\$ 4,363,416.36

In order to achieve the above project objective, two outputs are expected from the CBDRM Project:

- Output 1: Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.
- Output 2: Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) level. Further, the project will strengthen selected communities’ capacities for participatory hazard mapping and disaster reduction.

The CBDRM Project is aligned with the CPD Outcomes and is based on the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The CBDRM Project will directly contribute to 3 Corporate Outcomes:

- Outcome 1 - Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded
- Outcome 5 - Countries are able to lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change
- Outcome 6 - Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-disaster settings.

Adopting DIM, the CBDRM Project’s Implementing Agency is UNDP with a dedicated project management team based in the UNDP DPRK CO. An International Project Manager is responsible for the daily management of the project with assistance from national project staff and recruited consultants. The CBDRM Project also had the following project partners:

- National counterparts - NCC for UNDP, line ministries, State Institutions at the central level
- Local counterparts – CPCs and other key stakeholders of Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province)

The CBDRM Project has devised criteria for the selection of its sites in early 2016. Given the common parameters in terms of vulnerability, repeated exposure to disasters, and insufficient resources to respond, selected seven project sites in common with another ongoing “Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK” Project (SES Project) in the portfolio, given the inter-connections between energy access and disaster management, through integrated responses to leverage synergies of both projects for a magnified development result.



### 3. Evaluation Rating Table

Overall Results/Impact:		Achievement Rating <sup>a</sup>
<u>Outcome</u> Resilience to natural hazards of vulnerable communities are enhanced		
<u>Output 1</u> Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.	<u>Output 1.1</u> Communities in high risk areas with access to severe weather warning information, with involvement in local and indigenous early warning system and in community preparedness measures to undertake emergency response and early recovery.	<b>S</b>
	<u>Output 1.2</u> Communities in high risk areas have skills in hazard and vulnerability assessment, and involved in planning and implementing risk resilient agro forestry and rural livelihood. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-structural interventions</li> <li>Structural interventions</li> </ul>	<b>S</b> <b>U</b>
<u>Output 2</u> Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) levels	<u>Output 2.1</u> Stakeholders CBDRM Programme Framework is developed and agreed with elements of strategy, priorities, targeting, roles and responsibilities, resource allocation and resources and partnership including possible joint activities in training and project implementation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With National Counterparts</li> <li>With International Agencies/Organizations</li> </ul>	<b>HS</b> <b>MU</b>
	<u>Output 2.2</u> Comprehensive guidelines on CBDRM including training methodologies, materials, knowledge product.	<b>S</b>
	<u>Output 2.3<sup>b</sup></u> 2,666 housing units covered with semi-permanent shelter solutions (as emergency response to flooding in North Hamgyong province in October-November 2016)	<b>U/A</b> (The Evaluator did not visit the project site to verify and confirm the actual results)

Note:

a. Evaluation Rating:

- 6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings
- 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings
- 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings
- 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings
- 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings
- 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings
- N/A Not Applicable
- U/A Unable to Assess

b. Although not originally planned, an additional Output 2.3 was added in late 2016 with the approval of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) to channel emergency support for communities affected by flooding in the North Hamgyong Province.

Evaluation Ratings:			
Category	Rating <sup>c</sup>	Category	Rating <sup>c</sup>
Relevance	<b>S</b>	Basic Human Needs/Gender Equality	<b>S</b>
Effectiveness	<b>S U</b>	Synergy	<b>MS</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-Structural Interventions</li> <li>Structural Interventions</li> </ul>			
Efficiency	<b>MS</b>	National Ownership	<b>S</b>

Note:

c. Evaluation Rating:

- 6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings
- 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings
- 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings
- 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings
- 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings
- 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings

Sustainability Ratings	
Category	Rating <sup>d</sup>
Sustainability	<b>ML</b>

Note:

d. Sustainability Rating:

- 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability
- 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks
- 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks
- 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks

#### 4. Summary of Conclusions and Lessons Learned

##### Conclusion #1: Significant External Factors/Challenges Severely Affected the Project

Significant external factors/challenges beyond the control of the UNDP DPRK CO were encountered throughout the entire CBDRM project implementation, and severely affected the timely delivery of structural interventions and eventual achievement of results for Output 1.2. The 6 rounds of UN Sanctions on DPRK (2016-2017) and the extended period of the banking channel disruptions/closure were identified as the main constraints.

The evaluation noted that the CBDRM PRODOC did not include appropriate risk assessments which identified potential risks with impact and probability ratings. However, the CBDRM Project Team subsequently incorporated risk assessments in the Quarterly Progress Reports and risk logs in the Annual Project Progress Report. The evaluation reviewed that the risk analysis should have been included in the CBDRM PRODOC so that the Project could have prepared corresponding counter-measures/management responses which were appropriate at that point of time and during the project implementation (2015 to 2019).

The evaluation also determined that the implementation of the CBDRM Project's counter-measures/management responses by the UNDP DPRK CO and CBDRM Project Team could not appropriately resolve the significant change of events caused by the UN Sanction measures and the extended banking channel disruption/closure over the project duration.

Lesson Learned:

- Delayed efforts to complete structural interventions severely disrupted county and village community Ri development plans/activities, resulting in potential economic loss and hardship to village communities (Ris).
- It is important to better manage village community (Ri) expectations to avoid/minimize potential economic loss and hardship to counties and village communities (Ris).
- Long-term scenario planning together with annual reviews for change of direction should form part of risk assessment and mitigations in special country context projects.

Conclusion #2: CBDRM model has potential for replication across DPRK but requires strong national ownership and commitment as the key to overcome any difficulties faced and achieve optimum results

An important result demonstrated in the CBDRM Project was how the intended project outputs addressed country priorities and also fit within the county development priorities with new strategies and initiatives being planned for sustainable living and livelihoods. This was further strengthened with strong support and commitment from National/Local Counterparts.

The high level of national and local ownership ensured sustainability and positive environmental impact, despite the CBDRM Project encountering external challenges that severely constrained the project beneficiaries.

The CBDRM model has the potential to be replicated across DPRK in close partnership collaboration with National and Local Counterparts. To ensure the continuity and also strengthening of national ownership, future replication projects should also be accompanied by appropriate capacity building activities in PRNA and DRMP at local county and village levels. However, this replication must be must be complemented with timely structural interventions as part of disaster prevention/mitigation measures to benefit the end-users at the county/village community (Ri) level.

Lesson Learned:

- Strong national ownership combined with strong commitment/support and participation from CPCs and Ri village communities key to accelerate the CBDRM model and bear lasting results.
- Knowledge/operational transfer in PRNA and DRMP, including the knowledge/operational capabilities and capacities of the CBDRM Project National Consultants/Experts, should be carried out to extend the pool of national and local resources.

Conclusion #3: The UNDP CBDRM Project Team has done their best but there is room for improvement

Despite the challenging circumstances, the CBDRM Project Team has done their best and laid strong foundations of PRNA and DRMP through the CBDRM Project outputs and activities. In addition, the completed tasks align closely with the DPRK NSDRR. The CBDRM Project Team was able to implement the project, especially the non-structural interventions, despite encountering the significant external factors/challenges which are beyond the control of the UNDP DPRK CO throughout the entire CBDRM Project by:

- displaying good project management abilities and effectively utilising appropriate project management tools to implement the CBDRM Project to the best of their abilities and resulted in:
  - community risk maps and disaster risk management plans including annual review of these plans, preparedness for response and early recovery in 15 communities in 2017.
  - annual review of Participatory Risk and Needs Assessment (PRNA) and Disaster Risk Management Planning (DRMP) in 15 village communities (Ris) in 2017, where reports

including DRM plans were finalised and translated into Korean which were subsequently handed over to the Ris.

- PRNA and DRMP in 15 village communities (Ris) and also with Sloping Land User Groups (SLUGs) using a combination of DRM equipment, tools and techniques
- training for 10,162 people (including 4,611 female), based on project reports, on coping strategies against a target of 450 through evacuation simulation, PRNA and DRM plan trainings across the 15 selected Ris.
- procured resources and delivered supplies for community level preparedness measures for early warning and evacuation.
- national workshops on discussing lessons learned, progress, challenges and opportunities for improving CBDRM practice.
- promotion of south-south cooperation with other countries through organized study tours while implementing the CBDRM Project.
- training materials on CBDRM functions to represent comprehensive guidelines and methodologies on CBDRM.
- guidelines for local level EW Systems and evacuation measure, protection of critical community assets focusing on local rainfall and weather parameters.
- guidelines on local level preparedness and contingency planning process.
- guidelines and technical training on disaster damage, loss and needs assessment and reporting.

However, improvements could still be further strengthened in the following areas:

1. communication of project results, information sharing and lessons learned among international agencies and organizations through a suitable communications platform.
2. field data collection to measure effectiveness and impact on completed project activities.
3. for improved financial accountability and transparency purposes as part of demonstrating the efficient use of funding on project output-based activities, future financial reporting processes and templates of UNDP DPRK projects should:
  - track and report consistent financial figures (budget and actual expenditure).
  - have consistent comparisons between budget and actual expenditure, as per project outputs, based on project CDRs, for submissions of all relevant project reports (including annual progress reports and submissions to PSC meetings).

Lesson Learned:

- CBDRM is a multi-level and multi-sectoral effort. The communication of project results, sharing of information and lessons learned among international organizations/agencies would further strengthen and broaden efforts exponentially in emergency response, early warning, disaster management/planning and disaster prevention/mitigation measures.
- it is important to conduct an independent impact evaluation study as a future project output/activity component to measure impact effectiveness, final end-line indicators and actual benefits gained.

### **Key Success Story: Increased Public Awareness, Knowledge and The Application Of Disaster Risk Management to Strengthen Village Community Resilience**

The CBDRM Project aims to enhance the resilience of vulnerable communities to different types of natural hazards. The CBDRM Project seeks to achieve this objective by imparting skills and guiding the appropriate use of resources necessary for managing risks over time at village community (Ri) level. These will enable village communities (Ris) to minimize and reduce annual loss of lives, recurring losses to livelihood assets and build capacities to manage and sustain achievements in coping with disasters and in adapting to changing climate conditions.

	<b>Prior to UNDP CBDRM Project Interventions</b>	<b>Post UNDP CBDRM Project Interventions</b>
Public awareness and knowledge of natural disaster types and DRM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of knowledge in natural disaster types for different seasons such as typhoons, torrential rains, floods</li> <li>• Lack of understanding on causes of landslides and soil erosion on mountain slopes</li> <li>• No understanding or knowledge of village community's current vulnerable/danger areas, needs and resources</li> <li>• Lack of information on local village community (Ri) disaster records and histories</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational materials on natural disaster types and emergency preparations/responses distributed to village community (Ri) households to increase public awareness and knowledge on disaster types and DRM</li> <li>• SLUGs received training on risk resilient livelihood and ecosystem development.</li> <li>• agro-forestry activities through provision of seeds and saplings, and management of tree nursery transplantation of fast-growing trees prevented soil erosion and landslides on mountain slopes</li> <li>• village communities (Ris) developed DRM Plans which identified the major disasters, risks and disaster mitigation and emergency response plans</li> <li>• Established Disaster Loss and Damage data cards to collect important information for taking informed decisions and come up with interventions in DRM and DRR</li> <li>• Annual emergency response drills and simulation exercises (active participation by village community people) increased community alertness and preparedness for natural disasters</li> </ul>
Responding to natural disasters at village communities (Ris)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to disseminate information as telecommunications were cut off</li> <li>• community used traditional methods such as gong, bell, signal flag, light, etc. to inform about disaster</li> <li>• village communities were not fully prepared and evacuated in a disorganized and chaotic manner</li> <li>• village people's first reaction was panic and to just run to the nearest known higher ground areas which might result in overcrowding at one evacuation point</li> <li>• village communities were confused, and did not clearly understand what to do, how to respond and where to go during a natural disaster</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of PRNAs, DRMPs, hazard/risk maps and evacuation route maps</li> <li>• Formation of Village (Ri) Non-Standing Disaster Risk Management Committee to take charge of developing/ implementing DRM plans and measures in response to natural disasters at village communities</li> <li>• Selection and allocation of village community (Ri) evacuation centers/sites/points</li> <li>• During Typhoon Ling Ling in early September 2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ village communities (Ris) prepared and used the emergency response equipment such as life jackets, megaphones and emergency alarming bells for EW during the disaster in cooperation with the UNDP CBDRM Project</li> <li>➤ village community (Ri) people applied what they learnt during the emergency response drills/simulation exercises and knew how to go to their allocated evaluation centers/sites/points in an organized manner</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## 5. Recommendations

The evaluation proposes 6 recommendations for consideration and implementation whereby:

- 3 operational recommendations relate to how the UNDP DPRK CO could further improve the way it operates as an organization. It is to be noted that the implementation of these recommendations would be dependent on the future of the UNDP DPRK CO structure operating in DPRK in view of the geo-political environment and the availability of an approved UNDP DPRK CPD.

### R1: Strengthen financial reporting processes

For improved financial accountability and transparency purposes, UNDP DPRK project financial reporting processes and templates should track and report progress of consistent financial figures i.e. budget and actual expenditure for consistent comparisons between budget and actual expenditure, as per project outputs, based on project CDRs, for submissions of all relevant project reports (including annual project progress reports), to demonstrate the efficient use of funding on project output-based activities.

### R2: Extensive review and update of UNDP DPRK CO policies and procedures

UNDP DPRK CO should ensure that suitable policies and procedures can be implemented to resolve future issues in the event of unforeseen circumstances and minimize reputational risks by:

- R2.1) working with UNDP Regional HQ to extensively review and update all operational, procurement and financial management policies and procedures to account for all that happened within the 2015-2019 period and appropriately mitigate any future constraints.
- R2.2) incorporating extensive long-term scenario planning processes with appropriate and specific risk assessments and counter-measures.
- R2.3) setting conditions and mechanisms to implement "Force Majeure" or early termination of projects if need to.
- R2.4) strengthening its relationship management processes with project beneficiaries such as continued field visits, as practical and as relevant as required during the project implementation period, to better manage stakeholder expectations. By doing so, this would avoid/minimize potential economic and productivity losses to counties/village communities (Ris).
- R2.5) minimizing and/or avoiding unequal distribution of delivered assets/items to avoid unhealthy comparisons between project beneficiaries and across any projects that have synergies.

### R3: Should UNDP DPRK be authorized to proceed, all remaining project activities (specifically relating to the CBDRM Project's structural interventions) as part of disaster prevention/mitigation strengthening measures should be completed

To strengthen disaster mitigation/prevention measures at village community (Ri) level, UNDP DPRK CO, if authorized to proceed, should work closely with national and local DPRK counterparts to complete all remaining project activities:

- R3.1) complete all planned procurement of equipment/materials relating to structural interventions, while strictly adhering to relevant UNDP Policies and Procedures and UNDP DPRK Guidelines for Field Monitoring Visits to:
  - monitor and report on the use of the assets and delivered items, after handover to project beneficiaries, at minimum during project implementation.
  - ensure successful delivery onsite and the use of the delivered items for their intended purpose to achieve the desired project results, particularly paying attention to monitoring the delivery of the structural interventions to ensure their intended purpose after the CBDRM Project closure.

- R3.2) conduct an independent impact evaluation study, as a future project output/activity component, to measure the impact effectiveness, final end-line indicators and actual benefits gained.
- 3 recommendations relate to future directions by building on the successful pilot projects in the CBDRM Project. By doing so, this will further replicate and upscale with a significant focus on humanitarian-oriented interventions to overcome climate change conditions in the DPRK. Similarly, it is to be noted that the implementation of these recommendations would be dependent on the future of the UNDP DPRK CO structure operating in DPRK in view of the geo-political environment and the availability of an approved UNDP DPRK CPD.

R4: Nation-wide rollout/replication of the CBDRM Project in DPRK at village community (Ri) level

It is strongly recommended that UNDP DPRK CO should fully adopt the CBDRM Project and continue to upscale from its successful pilot CBDRM model for future nation-wide rollout/replication in DPRK. This should be done by working in close partnership with relevant DPRK national counterparts (SCEDM, MOLEP, CBS and SHMA) and local DPRK counties to implement at village community (Ri) level:

- R4.1) facilitate knowledge/operational transfer of the CBDRM Project with procedural, operational and hands-on training manuals, guidelines, SOPs, DRM plans and other related DRM equipment/materials.
- R4.2) implement suitable, cost-effective and timely structural interventions to strengthen disaster mitigation/prevention measures for identified disaster high-risk areas.
- R4.3) fully establish a fit-for-purpose Early Warning System at local village community (Ri) level to better inform emergency response/preparedness.
- R4.4) organize study tours, in other countries of similar context and/or culture to DPRK, for increased exposure to acquiring knowledge/application of best practices in DRM/DRR/EW Systems.

R5: Incorporate future UNDP DPRK CBDRM activities to align with/support the implementation of the DPRK National Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (NSDRR)

It is strongly recommended that future UNDP DPRK CBDRM activities should align with/support the implementation of the DPRK NSDRR. This would include working closely with SCEDM in its leading role to:

- R5.1) strengthen and integrate infrastructure, systems and processes for disaster risk reduction, early warning and emergency response purposes at county level.
- R5.2) develop fully-automated measurements at local village community (Ri) level for accurate forecasting of climatic hazards.
- R5.3) improve watershed management to reduce/eliminate disaster risk factors such as floods, landslides and soil erosion.
- R5.4) establish a fully-integrated fit-for-purpose national disaster management system, incorporating a standardized nation-wide village community (Ri) reporting on disaster loss and damage information, that complies with international standards such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

R6: Communication and sharing of CBDRM model and results with international organizations/agencies for enhanced synergies and learnings

It is strongly recommended that any future CBDRM-related projects should strengthen its communication/sharing platforms to engage in closer collaboration/synergies with international organizations/agencies on future CBDRM activities.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This report covers the TE of the UNDP project entitled “Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management” Project (CBDRM Project). The TE has been conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’.

The CBDRM Project had a duration of slightly over 4 years (October 2015 to December 2019) at an approved budget of US\$2,204,200. In November 2016 when UNDP focused on ad-hoc interventions in flood affected areas in North Hamgyong Province, US\$1.6 million was added to the CBDRM Project (through TRAC 1, 2 and 3) to expedite emergency response. The CBDRM Project further received unspent funds from the “Strengthening Ecosystem Resilience and Community Adaptive Capacity in Climate Affected River Basins in DPRK” (SERCARB) Project and also transferred some portion of management budget of the SED Project towards the end of 2018, thus the project total budget became US\$4,363,416.36. Following its final year of project implementation in 2019 and as stated in the PRODOC, the CBDRM Project is now required to undergo a TE.

### **1.1 Purpose of the Terminal Evaluation**

As outlined in the CBDRM PRODOC, a TE would be required upon completion of implementation and to be conducted by an independent third party, in consultation with UNDP DPRK and CBDRM stakeholders at national and local levels. The objectives of the TE are to:

- assess the achievement, outcomes and impacts of the CBDRM Project compared to the baseline.
- detail the lessons learnt and issues faced during the implementation phase of the CBDRM Project.
- provide recommendations of future possible interventions for the DPRK.

It was further noted that significant challenges were encountered throughout the entire CBDRM Project implementation such as:

- 6 rounds of UN sanction resolutions on DPRK, wherein the latest UNSC resolution 2397 (22 December 2017) required case-by-case exemption request for procurement of goods.
- extended period of banking channel disruption/closure for funds transfer to UNDP DPRK CO which affected the ability to proceed with international and local procurement.

In view of the above context and circumstances faced by the CBDRM Project, the TE assessed on project results and experiences as well as key challenges met, lessons learnt, and areas for improvement. This was done through the questions of the following evaluation criteria as outlined in the TOR: (1) Relevance, (2) Effectiveness, (3) Efficiency, (4) Sustainability, (5) Basic Human Needs, (6) Gender Equality, and (7) Synergy.



## 1.2 Scope and Methodology

As stated in the TOR, the CBDRM PRODOC required a TE to:

- "... be conducted by an independent third party, will be initiated at the end of the Project and involve consultation with the Project stakeholders at the national and local levels".
- "... detail the achievements, outcomes & impacts of the project compared to baseline, the issues faced, and lessons learned during the project implementation and will provide recommendations for future actions".

The TE of the CBDRM Project reviewed the entire duration of project implementation (October 2015 to December 2019), focusing on project results and experiences as well as key challenges met, lessons learnt, and areas for improvement, through the lenses of Relevance, Efficiency, National Ownership, Effectiveness and Sustainability as well as taking into consideration issues of gender, basic human needs and leaving no one behind. This would lead to recommendations of areas and methods of possible future interventions for the DPRK.

Based on the objectives and scope of the evaluation assignment as outlined in the TOR, the evaluation methodology was conducted in three phases.

The Evaluator was of a view that the data collected should also capture, where possible, case study examples of what has worked well in the CBDRM Project.

### **Phase 1 – Desk Review of Documentation (11 to 22 November 2019):**

Prior to and during the field mission in DPRK, the Evaluator reviewed a wide variety of documents covering project design, implementation progress, monitoring, amongst others such as annual progress and monitoring reports, minutes from PSC meetings, work plans, technical documents, implementing partner agreements, capacity building/training materials and other materials related to CBDRM Project activities.

At the start of the field mission trip in DPRK, an inception and planning meeting was held between the Evaluator, UNDP DPRK and possibly other key stakeholders with in-depth knowledge of the CBDRM Project. This included government line ministries and national/local counterparts who:

- have historical knowledge of the CBDRM Project.
- are current/previous counterpart project managers and key CBDRM project beneficiary representatives.
- provided the funds and/or in-kind resources to the CBDRM Project.
- can ensure the correct data is identified to address the evaluation questions.

**The Evaluator also utilized local knowledge, insights and understanding obtained from the previous final evaluation of the "Pilot Project to Support Socio-economic Development of Rural Areas in DPRK" (SED) project to contextualize, synergize and value-add to the CBDRM Project.**

**Expected Deliverable #1: Inception Report (including Evaluation Matrix) – 10 to 15 pages**

## **Phase 2 – Data Collection/Field Mission in DPRK (22 November to 2 December 2019)**

Data collection comprised interviews with key informants, focus group discussion (FGD) and field visits for the gathering, verification and analysis of the evaluation required data.

### **(1) Face-to-Face consultations**

Face-to-face consultations in the form of semi-structured interviews with key informants and focus group discussion (FGD) was conducted with a wide range of key stakeholders and beneficiaries. Conducted in English and assisted by a DPRK translator if required to, the face-to-face consultations enabled the Evaluator to understand about the experiences, feelings, hopes, views and opinions expressed in the words of the respondents on the CBDRM Project activities. This also included conversations focusing on capturing the essence, meaning or significance of the experiences of respondents within their work environment.

The order of sequence for the interview/focus group questions was flexible and dynamic, and allowed follow-up questions to clarify. Triangulation of results such as comparing information from different sources like documentation and interviews, or interviews on the same subject with different stakeholders, was used to corroborate or check the reliability of evidence.

Proposed participants for the semi-structured interviews and FGDs included (but not limited to):

- UN/UNDP senior management
- UNDP CBDRM project team
- International agencies/organizations – IFRC, FAO, UNICEF, SDC, UNFPA, EUPS3
- National counterparts - NCC for UNDP, Line Ministries and State Institutions at the central level [CBS, SCEDM, MOLEP, SHMA]
- Local counterparts – CPCs and other key stakeholders of: Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province)

### **(2) Direct observations of project results and activities through 6 CBDRM Project site visits (26-28 November 2019)**

Site visits were conducted to better understand the on-the-ground environment, experience, views and culture of the project beneficiaries.

This enabled the Evaluator to be immersed into the world of the CBDRM project beneficiaries and provided the context on different work place settings. The site visits were conducted over 3 days in the following locations:

- Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province)
- Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province)

Observation data collected complemented other primary and secondary data collected to give a more holistic and accurate context around the role and contributions of the CBDRM Project. The site visits validated key tangible outputs and interventions from the CBDRM Project.

A Stakeholder Workshop meeting was organized which brought together key CBDRM project stakeholders to consider and discuss/validate findings, conclusions and recommendations. It aimed to:

- organize a validation / debriefing meeting with relevant key national counterparts and UNDP DPRK staff.
- present the findings and recommendations, covering achievement and experiences, challenges and lessons, future improvement in possible continuation and/or replication.

## **Expected Deliverable #2: Evaluation Debriefing – Presentation of field mission findings and recommendations**

### **Phase 3 – Draft and Finalization of Evaluation Report (9 to 31 December 2019):**

Using thematic analysis and comparative analysis, the draft evaluation report aimed to identify and translate the collated data into key issues, findings, conclusions and recommendations such as:

- presentation of clear data analysis against all evaluation questions, including triangulated information.
- substantiation by credible evidence that has been checked for accuracy, consistency and reliability.
- limitations or gaps in evidence (if applicable).
- indications where evidence is inconclusive (if applicable).

The Evaluator would prepare the TE (Terminal Evaluation) report, which incorporated feedback from UNDP and national counterparts to convey clear findings, conclusions and recommendations.

### **Deliverable #3: Draft Evaluation Report – 40 to 60 pages**

### **Deliverable #4: TE (Terminal Evaluation) Report (including an executive summary) – 40 to 60 pages**

In planning for future developments, the Evaluator worked with UNDP DPRK to further develop recommendations of areas and methods of possible future interventions for the DPRK. In addition, the Evaluator also consolidated project completion activities to conclude the evaluation assignment:

- data records management: Archive, compile and store all primary and secondary data.
- develop and submit Project Completion Report.
- deliver electronic copies of TE package (including TE Report, all data records and Project Completion Report) to UNDP DPRK.

## **1.3 Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

Based on the TOR requirements, this TE applied the UNDP evaluation criteria of “Relevance”, “Effectiveness”, “Efficiency”, and “Sustainability” to align with the evaluation objectives. The TOR further highlighted the “Basic Human Needs”, “Gender Equality” and “Synergy” elements to integrate their cross-cutting linkages with the other criteria.

The TOR included a set of evaluation questions to be assessed in relation to Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, Basic Human Needs, Gender Equality and Synergy:

<b><u>Category</u></b>	<b><u>Sample Questions</u></b>
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?</li> <li>• To what extent does the project contribute to the Theory of Change for the relevant CPD outcome?</li> <li>• To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?</li> <li>• To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?</li> <li>• To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the basic human needs?</li> <li>• To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did the project contribute to the CPD outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?</li> <li>• To what extent were the project outputs achieved?</li> <li>• What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?</li> <li>• To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?</li> <li>• What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?</li> <li>• In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?</li> <li>• In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?</li> <li>• What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?</li> <li>• Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?</li> <li>• To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?</li> <li>• To what extent is project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?</li> <li>• To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?</li> <li>• To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of basic human needs?</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the PRODOC efficient in generating the expected results?</li> <li>• To what extent has UNDP's project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?</li> <li>• To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?</li> <li>• To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?</li> <li>• To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?</li> <li>• To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?</li> </ul>

<b>Category</b>	<b>Sample Questions</b>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?</li> <li>• To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?</li> <li>• Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?</li> <li>• Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?</li> <li>• To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?</li> <li>• What is the risk that the level of stakeholder's ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?</li> <li>• To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, basic human needs and human development by primary stakeholders?</li> <li>• To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?</li> <li>• To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?</li> <li>• To what extent do UNDP interventions have well designed and well-planned exit strategies?</li> <li>• What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?</li> </ul>
Basic Human Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the principles of Human Rights, to what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and vulnerable groups benefitted from UNDP DPRK's work in contributing to enhance fulfilment of people's economic and social needs?</li> </ul>
Gender Equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?</li> <li>• Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?</li> <li>• To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?</li> </ul>
Synergy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent the synergies of CBDRM and SES Projects have been addressed contributing to a magnified development results?</li> </ul>

## 1.4 Structure of the Terminal Evaluation Report

The report is divided into five major sections:

- **Section 1** summarizes the project together with the purpose of the TE, scoping and methodology
- **Section 2** outlines the development context and discusses the problems that the project sets out to address, the strategy adopted, operationalization arrangements and key milestones and stakeholders impacted by the CBDRM Project
- **Section 3** reports the key findings from the CBDRM Project and presents under the perspectives of project strategy, project implementation and project results
- **Section 4** features a key success story on how increased public awareness, knowledge and the application of disaster risk management has strengthened village community resilience
- **Section 5** reveals the conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations

## **2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT**

### **2.1 Project Start and Duration**

Project Implementation Start : 8<sup>th</sup> October 2015  
Closing Date (Original) : 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019

The CBDRM Project was launched on 8 October 2015. The project document was signed on 8 October 2015 after the PAC meeting on 14 July 2015. The project was implemented by UNDP in direct implementation modality (DIM). The project had a duration of slightly more than 4 years (October 2015 – December 2019).

### **2.2 Problems that the Project Sought to Address**

The occurrences of extreme weather events and seasonal variability are one of the key contributors to loss in livelihoods, increase in poverty and significant threat to human development in rural areas in DPRK. The causes of flood, landslides and droughts in the country are not limited to weather and climate conditions. In most of the rural areas, forest ecosystems have been converted into agricultural land in order to overcome food shortages and trees have been cut down as the primary source of household level energy. The destruction of DPRK’s forests contributed significantly to serious damage when impacted by natural hazards, especially, flooding, and landslides since deforestation weakens nature’s buffering ability to store water. There is a large gap in capacities at all levels to cope with the impact of disasters and to improve communities’ responsiveness and resilience.

The UNDP noted improvements in disaster preparedness and increased attention at national level to address the underlying factors that contribute to risks, against the backdrop of development priorities that focus on environmental protection and water conservation. The CBDRM Project would help local level communities acquire knowledge of successful practices in Community-based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) processes, timely and appropriate risk information and access to early warning, develop coping skills as well as access resources and services for disaster risk reduction actions that offer development benefits in the relative near term as well as reductions in vulnerability over the long term.

### **2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project**

The CBDRM Project started in October 2015 with the following objective:

***To enhance vulnerable communities’ resilience to natural hazards***

The project sought to achieve this objective by imparting skills and guiding the appropriate use of resources necessary for managing risks over time at household and local (Ri) levels. The CBDRM approach aimed to promote and support actions that enhanced local capacities so that community members, including women and youth, became important participants in risk reduction and recovery, including helping communities acquire knowledge of successful practices in CBDRM processes, timely and appropriate risk information and access to early warning.

Seven project sites were selected in common with another ongoing “Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK” Project (SES Project) in Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province). Given the inter-connections between energy access and disaster management, vulnerability of these communities to repeated exposure to

disasters, and insufficient resources to respond, both SES and CBDRM projects provided integrated responses to leverage synergies of both projects for a magnified development result.

## 2.4 Baseline Established

The established baseline was a result of the joint efforts of UNDP in the DPRK, the local partners and engaged consultant. Implemented participatory risk assessments, analytical tools and methods used for the assessments were accepted by all the stakeholders as the best possible in the given conditions. According to the CBDRM PRODOC, the baseline of CBDRM Project is as follow:

Project outputs	Baseline indicators	Baseline assumptions
Output 1: Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.		
Output 1.1: Communities in high risk areas with access to severe weather warning information, with involvement in local and indigenous early warning system and in community preparedness measures to undertake emergency response and early recovery.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No. of Communities with community risk maps and plans on preparedness for response and early recovery</li> <li>2. No. of communities with basic supplies for emergency response and recovery</li> <li>3. No. of communities with plans and implementing risk resilient agro forestry and rural livelihoods</li> <li>4. No. of communities provided with basic inputs for agro forestry and rural livelihoods</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Poor infrastructure perennially vulnerable to heavy damages due to flood and landslides</li> <li>▪ Inaccurate information and forecasts are not received on time</li> <li>▪ Decisions made based on rough estimates resulting in ineffective and untimely actions and overall failure to protect infrastructure</li> </ul>
Output 1.2: Communities in high risk areas have skills in hazard and vulnerability assessment, and involved in planning and implementing risk resilient agro forestry and rural livelihood.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No. of communities with skills in hazard and vulnerability assessments and engaged in the planning and implementation of risk-resilient agroforestry and rural livelihood interventions</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Limited capacity for risk assessment</li> <li>▪ Inadequate capacity for weather forecasting, early warning and dissemination to communities</li> <li>▪ Lack of systematic reporting and recording of disaster loss and damages of different types of disasters</li> </ul>

Project outputs	Baseline indicators	Baseline assumptions
Output 2: Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) levels		
Output 2.1: Stakeholders CBDRM Programme Framework is developed and agreed with elements of strategy, priorities, targeting, roles and responsibilities, resource allocation and resources and partnership including possible joint activities in training and project implementation.	1. UN Stakeholders CBDRM Programme Framework	No full operating coordination mechanism between UN agencies and the Government in terms of information sharing, cooperation in preparedness and disaster risk reduction <sup>a</sup>
Output 2.2: Comprehensive guidelines on CBDRM including training methodologies, materials, knowledge product.	1. Comprehensive guidelines on CBDRM developed and under implementation	No coordination of UN and Government procedures for rapid response and support to community recovery <sup>a</sup>

Note:

- a. Since the commencement of the CBDRM Project, there is a Disaster Risk Reduction Sector Working Group operating under UNCT, comprising various international agencies and international organizations, and supported by the UNOCHA.

Although not originally planned, an additional Output 2.3 was added in late 2016 with the approval of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) to channel emergency support for communities affected by flooding in the North Hamgyong Province. The sub-output states: Strengthened UNDP coordination, assessment and planning capacities for emergency response and early recovery

## 2.5 Main Stakeholders

Adopting DIM, the CBDRM Project's Implementing Agency was UNDP with a dedicated project management team based in the UNDP DPRK CO. An International Project Manager was responsible for the daily management of the project with assistance from national project staff and recruited consultants. The CBDRM Project also had the following project partners:

- National counterparts - NCC for UNDP, Line Ministries and State Institutions at the central level including Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), State Committee for Emergency and Disaster Management (SCEDM), Ministry of Land and Environment Protection (MoLEP), State Hydro-Meteorological Administration (SHMA)
- Local counterparts – County People's Committees (CPCs) and other key stakeholders of Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province)

The CBDRM Project was managed by the Project Manager (PM), under the oversight of the Deputy Resident Representative, and the CBDRM Project Steering Committee (PSC). The PM was supported by the Project Management Team, located at the UNDP DPRK CO in Pyongyang and comprised the:

- National Technical Coordinator
- National Administrative Assistant
- Project Driver

Administrative, financial and procurement support to the CBDRM Project Team was also provided by the Operations Team of the UNDP DPRK CO.



Programme monitoring and oversight of CBDRM Project activities was led by the M&E Specialist with support from the Programme Analyst.

## 2.6 Expected Results

Project outputs	Expected results
Project Objective: Resilience to natural hazards of vulnerable communities are enhanced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Ri level communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.</li> <li>✓ Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) levels.</li> </ul>
Output 1: Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.	
<p>Output 1.1: Communities in high risk areas with access to severe weather warning information, with involvement in local and indigenous early warning system and in community preparedness measures to undertake emergency response and early recovery.</p> <p><u>Activity results</u></p> <p>1.1.1 Community engagement, introductory Workshops and awareness-raising. Engagement of women as key stakeholders in planning and decision making.</p> <p>1.1.2 Conduct baseline needs assessment and age disaggregated stakeholders and gender-based analysis and prepare specific local level work plan (focus on social resiliency vis-à-vis preparedness for response and early recovery)</p> <p>1.1.3 Conduct training on community-based risk assessment and identifying the most vulnerable to flood, landslides, typhoon, and drought as appropriate to local conditions.</p> <p>1.1.4 Conduct training on CBDRM functions, i.e. participatory planning, prioritization, project development, mobilization of households, monitoring and decision making</p> <p>1.1.5 Conduct training on CBDRM practices on preparedness for emergency response, i.e. in local early warning, contingency planning, stockpiling of emergency supplies, evacuation and temporary shelters and mobilization of community members.</p> <p>1.1.6 Conduct training on CBDRM practices on preparedness for early recovery, i.e. in immediate debris clearing of hazardous areas, repairs of critical community infrastructure</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> No. of Communities/Ris generated risk maps</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> None</p> <p><u>Target: 15 communities</u></p> <p>Year 1: 5 communities</p> <p>Year 2: 5 communities</p> <p>Year 3: 5 communities</p> <p>Year 4: Updating/ Revision of Maps</p>

Project outputs	Expected results
such as water and sanitation, health clinics, nurseries and schools; restore livelihood assets and plan and implement alternative livelihood measures.	
<p>1.1.7 (a) Establish a pool of women trainers with capacity to teach other grassroots women and youth on a range of coping strategies which include how to manage and distribute relief aid, organize health and sanitation groups, manage multi-purpose women and children's centers (in disaster hit communities), construct disaster-resistant housing and community infras. (e.g. irrigation systems, warehouses,...) map community risks &amp; improving water &amp; sanitation.</p> <p>(b) (i) Establish action research protocols, in collaboration with IFRC, for exploring local and indigenous knowledge systems (LINKS).</p> <p>(b) (ii) identify knowledge that can be integrated with science, and subsequently further disseminated for use by beneficiaries and practitioners.</p> <p>(b) (iii) revitalize and strengthen LINK resources by designing information, education and communication (IEC) material demonstrating that LINK can be used to anticipate and mitigate hazards, and the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>1.1.8 Support Ri level planning including: a) gender sensitive roles and responsibilities, local level standard operating procedures; b) details on resources needed to implement participatory risk assessment, local early warning systems, materials for preparedness for response and recovery.</p> <p>1.1.9 Procure resources and delivery of supplies for community level preparedness measures, i.e. for early warning system, evacuation, situation analysis and other response and early recovery measures.</p> <p>1.1.10 Support in delivery and installation, construction of community level facilities needed for preparedness.</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> No. of people trained on coping strategies</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> None</p> <p><u>Target:</u> 450 people Year 1: 150 people Year 2: 150 people Year 3: 150 people Year 4: 0</p>

Project outputs	Expected results
<p>Output 1.2: Communities in high risk areas have skills in hazard and vulnerability assessment, and involved in planning and implementing risk resilient agro forestry and rural livelihood.</p> <p><u>Activity results</u></p> <p>1.2.1 Conduct baseline needs assessment and age disaggregated stakeholders and gender based analysis and prepare specific local (Ri) level work plan (focus on social resiliency visà-vis livelihood and ecosystem assets).</p> <p>1.2.2 Conduct training on CBDRM practices in hazard and vulnerability assessment of livelihood and ecosystem assets.</p> <p>1.2.3 Conduct training on planning and implementing risk sensitive agro forestry and sustainable rural livelihood.</p> <p>1.2.4 Support Ri level planning including : a) gender and youth sensitive roles and responsibilities; b) detailed resources needed for risk sensitive agro forestry and rural livelihood.</p> <p>1.2.5 Establish a pool of women trainers with capacity to teach other grassroots women on risk resilient livelihood and ecosystem development.</p> <p>1.2.6 Procure resources and delivery of supplies for community driven risk resilient projects in agro forestry, energy, slope protection, rural enterprises.</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> No. of communities implementing risk resilient agro-forestry and rural livelihoods plans</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> None</p> <p><u>Target: 10 communities</u> Year 1: 5 communities Year 2: 2 communities Year 3: 3 communities Year 4: 0</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> No. of Sloping Land User Groups (SLUGs) benefited from skills in risk-resilient agro-forestry and reducing impact on rural livelihoods</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> None</p> <p><u>Target: 10 SLUGS</u> Year 1: 5 SLUGS Year 2: 2 SLUGS Year 3: 3 SLUGS Year 4: 0</p>
<p>Output 2: Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) levels.</p>	
<p>Output 2.1: Stakeholders CBDRM Programme Framework is developed and agreed with elements of strategy, priorities, targeting, roles and responsibilities, resource allocation and resources and partnership including possible joint activities in training and project implementation.</p> <p><u>Activity results</u></p> <p>2.1.1 Conduct baseline information gathering, , mapping stakeholders' programme priorities, setting of indicators for monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>2.1.2 Develop a programme framework for promoting CBDRM, identifying strategic objectives, sub objectives, priority actions, resources, lead organization/s and</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> Level of progress of UN Stakeholders CBDRM Programme Framework</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> 0</p> <p><u>Target: Finalization of CBDRM Programme Framework</u> Year 1: Zero Drafting Year 2: 1<sup>st</sup> Draft Year 3: 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Year 4: Finalization</p>

Project outputs	Expected results
<p>partnerships. with UN agencies and IFRC/DPRK Red Cross</p> <p>2.1.3 Support national workshops on discussing lessons learned, progress, challenges and opportunities for improving CBDRM practice.</p> <p>2.1.4 Promote south-south cooperation with other countries implementing CBDRM.</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> Mapping of stakeholders</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> 0</p> <p><u>Target:</u> 2 mappings (2 counties)</p> <p>Year 1: 2 mappings (2 counties)</p> <p>Year 2: 0</p> <p>Year 3: Review and update of 2 mappings (2 counties)</p> <p>Year 4: 0</p>
<p>Output 2.2: Comprehensive guidelines on CBDRM including training methodologies, materials, knowledge product.</p> <p><u>Activity results</u></p> <p>2.2.1 Developing guidelines and methodologies in promoting community-based disaster risk management with IFRC/DPRK Red Cross</p> <p>2.2.2 Develop guidelines for local level EWS and evacuation measure, protection of critical community assets focusing on local rainfall and weather parameters; who does what, when and where with SHMA.</p> <p>2.2.3 Develop guideline on local level preparedness and contingency planning process and conduct training with other UN agencies such as OCHA, UNICEF, WFP.</p> <p>2.2.4 Develop guidelines and conduct technical training on disaster damage, loss and needs assessment and reporting with CBS and SCEDM and in methods of joint assessment with UN agencies.</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> Level of progress of the comprehensive guidelines on CBDRM</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> None</p> <p><u>Target:</u> Finalization of comprehensive guidelines on CBDRM</p> <p>Year 1: Zero Draft</p> <p>Year 2: 1<sup>st</sup> Draft</p> <p>Year 3: 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft</p> <p>Year 4: Finalization</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Establish disaster damage and loss database as per international standards</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> None</p> <p><u>Target:</u> 2 counties report damage and loss as per international standards</p> <p>Year 1: 0</p> <p>Year 2: 2 counties report damage and loss as per international standards</p> <p>Year 3: 0</p> <p>Year 4: 0</p>
<p>Output 2.3: Strengthened UNDP coordination, assessment and planning capacities for emergency response and early recovery<sup>2</sup></p> <p><u>Activity results</u></p> <p>2.3.1 2,666 housing units covered with semi-permanent shelter solutions (as emergency response to flooding in North Hamgyong province in October-November 2016)</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> No. of Counties/Cities benefited through DRM and early recovery activities</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> None</p> <p><u>Target:</u> 2 counties and 1 city</p>

<sup>2</sup> Although not originally planned, an additional Output 2.3 was added in late 2016 with the approval of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) to channel emergency support for communities affected by flooding in the North Hamgyong Province.

### **3. FINDINGS**

#### **3.1 Project Design**

##### **3.1.1 Project Document (PRODOC) Formulation**

The CBDRM PRODOC indicated that the earliest commencement of the CBDRM Project formulation was a UNDP fact-finding mission to validate the situation at community level in mid-April 2014. A detailed assessment and initial PRODOC was developed with the aim to support community-based disaster risk management at the local (Ri) level through an approach that entails the following 2 main outputs:

- Output 1: Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.
- Output 2: Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) level. Further, the project will strengthen selected communities' capacities for participatory hazard mapping and disaster reduction.

The CBDRM PRODOC developed TORs to recruit suitable project team members to implement and manage the CBDRM Project. Due to the prolonged recruitment process, the SES Project Manager had been assigned by UNDP DPRK CO senior management to the role of becoming the incumbent CBDRM Project Manager<sup>3</sup>. The evaluation determined that the CBDRM Project Team (comprising one International Project Manager, one National Technical Coordinator and One National Administration Assistant) had the project management expertise, but with limited technical expertise to deliver the project which are technically complex and required specialised expertise and knowledge in DRM.

##### **3.1.2 Analysis of Results and Resources Framework (Project Logic/Strategy and Indicators)**

In reviewing the effectiveness and efficiency of the CBDRM Project in meeting its outcome, the evaluation reviewed the CBDRM Project's Results and Resources Framework in relation to the UNDP DPRK CPD (2011 to 2015) and UNSF (2011 to 2016, 2017 to 2021) on the strategic priorities, outcomes, outputs and the primary applicable key environment and sustainable development key result areas (KRAs). The evaluation assessment also addressed the CBDRM Project's strategy, indicators, baseline, end of project target, source of verification, and risk and assumptions.

The evaluation reviewed that the CBDRM Project's Results and Resources Framework design was revised in Q2/2016 which was eventually approved in April 2016. This revision has taken careful consideration of the UNDP DPRK CPD and UNSF outcomes and was aligned to the key environment and sustainable development KRAs. Furthermore, the CBDRM Project's updated Results and Resources Framework had considered an in-depth analysis, accurately described the end of project goals, listed the sources of verification, and appropriately identified the risks and the assumptions.

The Results and Resources Framework was clearly described with the indicative activities and end of project targets. There were 9 indicators in total which reflected against outputs and activities.

---

<sup>3</sup> The evaluation understands that in 2019 with the closure of the SED Project, the SED Project Manager was assigned to be the CBDRM Project Manager but delegated full responsibilities to the current incumbent CBDRM Project Manager.

The project took extensive consideration to stakeholder participation in project design, decision making, planning, implementation and monitoring. For example, the National Counterparts and Local Counterparts were invited to contribute to designing of project interventions and technical discussions on the output activities. This translated to an increase in confidence and ownership of project activities in the CBDRM Project implementation.

The CBDRM Project's outcome and outputs were consistent with the DPRK Government's national priorities. A consultative approach with the National and Local Counterparts was followed in the development and design of project outputs and activities, resulting in strong project ownership and commitment.

The CBDRM Project's proposed outcomes and outputs individually addressed specific needs identified and collectively presented a comprehensive solution to strengthen local village community (Ri) capacity and increase resilience for DRM.

The CBDRM Project also aligned with local county development plans and reinforced stakeholders' engagement and supported their achievement of priorities. The CBDRM Project design was also strategically aligned and consistent with the UN Millennium Development Goals and subsequent UN SDGs.

The evaluation further noted that the CBDRM Project's expected results in the CBDMR PRODOC are more output-oriented (WHAT IS BEING PRODUCED - EFFICIENCY) than outcome-oriented (WHAT IS THE VALUE/BENEFIT/ CHANGE/IMPACT - EFFECTIVENESS). While this is not an assessment of the CBDRM Project Team's performance, the evaluation is of a view that future PRODOC design should consider a balance of expected results with outcome-oriented targets and indicators to determine the effectiveness.

### **3.1.3 Risks and Assumptions**

The evaluation noted that the CBDRM PRODOC did not include appropriate risk assessments which identified potential risks with impact and probability ratings. However, these were subsequently included by the CBDRM Project Team in the Quarterly Progress Reports and risk logs in the Annual Project Progress Report.

The evaluation reviewed that a comprehensive risk analysis should have been included in the CBDRM PRODOC so that the Project could have prepared corresponding counter-measures/management responses which were appropriate at that point of time and for the project duration (2015 to 2019).

Furthermore, the evaluation reviewed that the risk assessments could be further extended to be part of the Results and Resources Framework to identify the key risks and appropriate counter-measures/management response for each of the 2 CBDRM Project outputs. Many of these activities would have governance, operational risks, strategic risks, financial/fiduciary and/or sustainability risks that would require appropriate counter-measures/management responses.

The evaluation also determined that the CBDRM PRODOC did not account for scenarios of extreme UN sanction measures and the extended banking channel disruption/closure. Furthermore, the implementation of the CBDRM PRODOC's counter-measures/management responses did not appropriately resolve the significant change of events caused by the UN Sanction measures and the extended banking channel disruption/closure over the project duration.

### **3.1.4 Lessons from Other Relevant Projects Incorporated into Project Design**

The evaluation observed that the CBDRM Project Team took opportunity to have joint project sites with the SES Project to maximize the synergies (more details found in Section 3.3.8).

The CBDRM Project was built from the experience and lessons learned from one previous UNDP DPRK project, namely the “Strengthening Ecosystem Resilience and Community Adaptive Capacity in Climate Affected River Basins in DPRK” Project (SERCARB Project).

For example:

- the CBDRM Project focused on a community-based approach for much larger impact at the Ri level, including Sloping Land User Groups (SLUGs), rather than an entire ecosystem approach followed under the SERCARB project.
- the CBDRM project made use of lessons learned, existing guidelines and methodologies developed under the SERCARB project.
- SERCARB-related interventions that are important in achieving the mutual objective with the CBDRM projects include: a) promotion of participatory hazard mapping; b) support to community based early warning system in pilot watershed and river basin areas; and c) improvement of forest management to reduce flood and landslide risks.

### **3.1.5 Planned Stakeholder Participation**

The CBDRM Project generated strong stakeholder interest, especially at the DPRK national/central government ministries and Local Counterparts such as CPCs and other key stakeholders of Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province).

In terms of project design, the proxy indicators would be the number of stakeholders involved in planning and attendance during the project formulation/planning meetings. The evaluation interviews with National and Local Counterparts indicated sufficient evidence of direct involvement based on detailed accounts of the project outputs.

The minutes of the PSC meetings recorded perfect attendance and representations from the National Counterparts. The proxy indicators from M&E Field Monitoring Visits for participation at the project implementation stage indicated high project output ownership, perfect attendance at project field site meetings, capacity development/knowledge dissemination activities, and the visible evidence of CBDRM-related equipment and materials onsite. During the evaluation interviews, there were high levels of project output-ownership as the Local Counterparts and beneficiaries were able to participate and own project activities, such as evacuation simulation training, seedling and saplings being nurtured in tree nurseries, etc..

### **3.1.6 Replication Approach**

Replication and up-scaling are fundamental to the CBDRM Project as it provides the opportunity to build on best practices and lessons learned, and expand the reach and impact of its project outputs. As such UNDP, government agencies and international agencies/organizations would utilize these given opportunities to support the replication and up-scaling of the most successful results and practices through their networks and contacts.

The CBDRM Project has the potential for replication in other provinces and counties in DPRK through:

- distribution and dissemination of Ri level PRNA and DRM planning, methodology and tool for assessment and planning, training materials, video product for flood simulation guidance, standard

operation procedures (SOP), community based early warning protocol, DRM terminology and CBDRM framework document.

- annual review and update of PRNA and DRM Planning by communities under overall guidance and coordination by SCEDM and line ministries as well as technical support by national experts.
- national workshops on discussing lessons learned, progress, challenges and opportunities for improving CBDRM practice.
- community risk maps and disaster risk management plans including annual review of these plans, preparedness for response and early recovery.
- "Kor-Disaster", currently included data for 15 Ris that integrated Sendai Framework monitoring. This database could accommodate data from all the counties and village communities (Ris).
- beneficiaries finding usefulness of early warning and evacuation materials. Other village communities (Ris) may procure basic early warning and material used for evacuation as required.

### 3.1.7 Management Arrangements

**Execution Modality:** In accordance with the CBDRM PRODOC, the CBDRM Project modality was Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) which meant the project execution and implementation would be undertaken directly by UNDP DPRK in compliance with UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP). The overall decision, including financial accountability would rest with the UNDP DPRK CO and the CBDRM Project was to be executed in coordination with relevant partners, including at the local county level, with a view to ensuring that effective assistance flowed directly to targeted beneficiaries.

**Project Steering Committee (PSC):** The PSC was established to provide high-level oversight and to steer the CBDRM Project. The PSC is responsible for high-level management decisions and policy guidance required for implementation of the project, including recommendations and approval of project plans, budget and revision. The PSC membership comprised the following key stakeholders:

- UNDP DPRK:
  - Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP DPRK (PSC Chairperson)
  - CBDRM Project Manager
  - Programme Analyst
  - M&E Specialist
- Government of the DPRK:
  - Coordinator of National Coordinating Committee (NCC) for UNDP (PSC Co-Chairperson)
  - Representative of Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS)
  - Representative of State Committee for Emergency and Disaster Management (SCEDM)
  - Representative of Ministry of Land and Environment Protection (MOLEP)
  - Representative of State Hydro-Meteorological Administration (SHMA)

The evaluation reviewed that PSC decisions in relation to the CBDRM Project were effective and adhered to standards that ensure efficiency, cost effectiveness, transparency, effective institutional coordination, and harmony with overall priorities of the Government of DPRK and UNDP.

The PSC was first constituted in April 2016 and met regularly in every quarter. The meeting minutes for all meetings made available showed that the PSC effectively provided important directions and oversight. In addition, the PSC was also successful in advising on technical aspects of project implementation, discussions and deliberations on the external/environmental challenges faced in relation to procurement and prioritization of interventions keeping project cost considerations in view.



**UNDP:** As the DIM agency, UNDP offered substantive support services to the CBDRM Project, which included project management/administration, financial reporting, procurement support, and technical advisory services. The CBDRM Project updates to the PSC, Project Annual Progress Reports, Programme and Project Field Monitoring Visits (FMV) Reports were comprehensive and timely produced. These reports covered many details and provided insights into project implementation, overall management, the many challenges faced in project implementation and mitigations/counter-measures to overcome the barriers.

**Project Counterparts:** At the National/Central level, the DPRK government agencies involved in the project were:

- National Coordinating Committee (NCC) for UNDP
- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS)
- State Committee for Emergency and Disaster Management (SCEDM)
- Ministry of Land and Environment Protection (MOLEP)
- State Hydro-Meteorological Administration (SHMA)

At the local level, the main project partners were CPCs and other key stakeholders of:

- Yonsan County, North Hwanghae Province
- Singye County, North Hwanghae Province
- Yangdok County, South Pyongan Province

The CBDRM Project Team travelled to the respective county locations to hold regular and quarterly meetings with the project partners to review the project progress and initiate early corrective actions.

The CBDRM Project FMV reports indicated effective discussions to resolve project management and coordination issues, and also contained details of reviews and actions taken. The Programme FMV, led by the M&E Specialist and CO Management, validated the results achieved. All recommended actions were consistently followed up and presented by the M&E Specialist at PSC meetings and captured in the quarterly programme and oversight FMV reports. Those reports were subsequently sent to the UNDP Regional Bureau as required by the UNDP DPRK ICF. The evaluation reviewed that there was a focus on results and activity scheduling across activities and outputs. Progress was reviewed against the objectives and targets set in the CBDRM PRODOC's Results and Resources Framework. The Project and Programme FMV reports were written to reflect the progress achieved against targets.

**Project Management Unit (PMU):** Being a DIM agency, the UNDP formed a PMU comprising one International Project Manager, one National Technical Coordinator and one National Administrative Assistant.

The PMU would be fully responsible for the coordination of National/Local Counterparts for project execution in a timely manner and within budget. The PMU facilitated effective project planning, that included preparation of annual work plans and project monitoring and reporting. The PMU was charged with coordinating and facilitating the procurements. As a curator, the evaluation reviewed that the PMU had effectively and efficiently held all the records, publications and minutes of meetings pertaining to the CBDRM Project.

## 3.2 Project Implementation

### 3.2.1 Adaptive Management

The CBDRM Project was formally signed off on 8 October 2015. However, there were prolonged delays at the start of the project due to the:

- extended period of banking channel closure/disruptions for funds transfer to the UNDP DPRK CO

Due to the early UN Sanctions on DPRK (UN Resolutions #2087 and #2094), the UNDP DPRK CO had to implement prolonged periods of organizational cash conservation mode due to the lack of funds being transferred into DPRK. Hence, there was minimal funds to implement any project activities and eventually slow progress in delivering project results.

- lengthy recruitment process and eventual late recruitment of the CBDRM Project Team

The extended period of banking channel closures/disruptions created uncertainties for the UNDP DPRK CO and resulted in the lengthy recruitment process of the CBDRM Project Team. The Project Manager, National Technical Coordinator and Project Administrative Assistant were eventually on board in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2016.

Despite the early and recurring setbacks, the evaluation reviewed that the CBDRM Project Team displayed good project management abilities and effectively utilised appropriate project management tools to implement the CBDRM Project to the best of their abilities.

The project implementation was delayed by 5 months from October 2015 to March 2016, with the first PSC Meeting involving the CBDRM Project Team on board held on 21 April 2016. The CBDRM Project Team effectively applied adaptive management in planning by having to reschedule the timelines for activities in order to accomplish the project outputs, with activities starting in 2016.

The UN Security Council imposed two UN Sanctions (UN Resolutions #2270 and #2321) in 2016 and another four UN Sanctions (UN Resolutions #2356, #2371, #2375 and #2397) in 2017 were imposed on DPRK which included (among many measures) import, financial and economic restrictions.

Table 1 below showed the implementation status of each CBDRM Project output as assessed by the evaluation. The evaluation noted that the CBDRM Project would have produced a significantly different implementation status if there were no UN Sanctions imposed on DPRK and there was no banking channel disruption/closure issue to deal with.

**Table 1: CBDRM Project Implementation Status**

<b>CBDRM PRODOC</b>		<b>Implementation Status<sup>1</sup></b>
<u>Outcome</u> Resilience to natural hazards of vulnerable communities are enhanced		
<u>Output 1</u> Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.		Substantially Achieved
<u>Output 2</u> Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) levels		Substantially Achieved

Note:

1. The implementation status is purely based on the desired results of the CBDRM PRODOC. It has not been moderated based on the implications and resultant consequences attributed to the 6 UN Sanctions imposed on DPRK in 2016 and 2017, and the extended period of banking channel disruption/closure which severely disrupted funds being transferred into DPRK to implement project activities.

In the case of Output 1, structural mitigation measures were yet to be implemented, but procurement was put on hold (due to the UN sanctions and the extended banking channel disruption/closure), the evaluation reviewed that these implications and resultant consequences were beyond the control of the CBDRM Project Team and the UNDP DPRK CO. Furthermore, there were minimal or no alternative adaptive management measures that could have produced a better outcome.

The evaluation further assessed that specific communication aspects of the CBDRM Project would need to be strengthened, particularly there is a need to manage village community (Ri) expectations on (1) UNDP's "inconsistent" delivery of items (such as structural interventions) to different Ris to minimize the occurrence of unhealthy comparisons and unhealthy competitions between project Ris, and (2) prolonged delays in UNDP interventions to minimize/avoid potential economic loss and hardship to counties and village communities (Ris).

UNDP DPRK has also gained a reputation among national and local counterparts as an organization that failed to deliver on its promises, specifically on structural interventions through procurement for disaster risk reduction mitigations/measures. Restoring UNDP's reputation as an organization that can effectively deliver results would need to be a key priority. The evaluation would therefore find it beneficial for UNDP DPRK by:

- continuing field visits, as practical and as relevant as required during the project implementation period, to maintain relationships and communications with village communities (Ris).
- prescribing conditions and mechanisms to implement "Force Majeure" or early termination of projects if need to.

### 3.2.2 Partnership Arrangements

The CBDRM Project generated strong stakeholder interest and participation from National/Local Counterparts in DPRK. The stakeholders at the National/Central level were:

- National Coordinating Committee (NCC) for UNDP
- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS)
- State Committee for Emergency and Disaster Management (SCEDM)
- Ministry of Land and Environment Protection (MOLEP)
- State Hydro-Meteorological Administration (SHMA)

At the local level, the main project partners were from Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province) comprising representatives from:

- County People's Committees (CPC)
- Other key stakeholders

There was evidence of strong interest and commitment at the local county level through stakeholder contributions (both financial and in-kind), roles and responsibilities to implement the CBDRM Project activities.

Despite the external factors/challenges that were beyond the control of the UNDP DPRK CO, the partnership arrangement between CBDRM Project Team and the National and Local Counterparts endured the challenging just slightly over 4-year project period, and demonstrated great patience, understanding and resilience to overcome the difficulties faced. Based on project reports, the fruits of this partnership agreement in challenging circumstances were the successful completion of many CBDRM Project interventions as follow:

- community risk maps and disaster risk management plans including annual review of these plans, preparedness for response and early recovery in 15 communities in 2017.
- annual review of Participatory Risk and Needs Assessment (PRNA) and Disaster Risk Management Planning (DRMP) in 15 village communities (Ris) in 2018 and 2019, where reports including DRM plans were finalised and translated into Korean which were subsequently handed over to the Ris.
- PRNA and DRMP in 15 Ris and also with Sloping Land User Groups (SLUGs) using a combination of DRM equipment, tools and techniques.
- training for 10,162 people (including 4,611 female), based on project reports, on coping strategies against a target of 450 through evacuation simulation, PRNA and DRM plan trainings across the 15 selected Ris.
- procured resources and delivered supplies for community level preparedness measures for early warning and evacuation.
- national workshops on discussing lessons learned, progress, challenges and opportunities for improving CBDRM practice.
- promotion of south-south cooperation with other countries through organized study tours while implementing the CBDRM Project.
- training materials on CBDRM functions to represent comprehensive guidelines and methodologies on CBDRM.
- guidelines for local level EWS and evacuation measure, protection of critical community assets focusing on local rainfall and weather parameters.
- guidelines on local level preparedness and contingency planning process.
- guidelines and technical training on disaster damage, loss and needs assessment and reporting.

### 3.2.3 Project Finance

The CBDRM Project had a duration of slightly over 4 years (October 2015 to December 2019) with an approved budget of US\$2,204,200. The details of the planned financing allocation based on the CBDRM PRODOC are as follow:

**Table 2: CBDRM Project – Original Planned Budget as per CBDRM PRODOC**

<b>CBDRM Project</b>	<b>2015 (US\$)</b>	<b>2016 (US\$)</b>	<b>2017 (US\$)</b>	<b>2018 (US\$)</b>	<b>2019 – As of 22 Nov 2019 (US\$)</b>
<b>Output 1</b>	368,500		426,500	422,600	368,600
<b>Output 2</b>	118,000		198,000	155,000	147,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>486,500</b>		<b>624,500</b>	<b>577,600</b>	<b>515,600</b>

In November 2016 when UNDP focused on ad-hoc intervention in flood affected areas in North Hamgyong Province, 1.6 million USD was added to CBDRM project (through TRAC 1,2,3) to expedite emergency response. The project further received unspent funds from “Strengthening Ecosystem Resilience and Community Adaptive Capacity in Climate Affected River Basins in DPRK” (SERCARB) project and transferred some portion of management budget of the SED Project towards the end of 2018, thus the project total budget became US\$ 4,363,416.36.

While the CBDRM PRODOC did not include any co-financing from National and Local Counterparts, the evaluation reviewed that the Local Counterparts provided in-kind contributions (labour and construction-related materials) to assist the timely completion of CBDRM Project activities.

The budget and actual expenditure of the CBDRM Project is provided below in Table 3.

**Table 3: Summary of Budget and Actual Expenditure (CBDRM Project)**

<b>CBDRM Project</b>	<b>2015 (US\$)</b>	<b>2016 (US\$)</b>	<b>2017 (US\$)</b>	<b>2018 (US\$)</b>	<b>2019 – As of 22 Nov 2019 (US\$)</b>
<b>Total AWP Budget</b>		<b>2,027,250.00</b>	<b>891,879.88</b>	<b>790,000.00</b>	<b>1,278,583.25</b>
Output 1 (Actual)	610.56	1,592,984.30	594,671.22	311,663.57	245,685.27
Output 2 (Actual)		121,742.17	236,583.29	149,963.96	147,127.26
<b>Total (Actual)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>610.56</b>	<b>1,714,726.47</b>	<b>831,254.51</b>	<b>461,627.53</b>	<b>392,812.53</b>
<b>Utilization Rate (Actual/AWP Budget)</b>		<b>85%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>31%</b>

Note:

1. Actual figures are based on financial system extracts provided by the UNDP DPRK CO

2. Based on CBDRM Project Annual Work Plan (AWP)

The evaluation noted that the CBDRM Project under-spent its allocated total project funds by about 32% and its utilization was an average of 67%. This was due to the extended banking channel disruption/closure, caused by the UN Sanctions, which disrupted funds from being transferred into DPRK. This further resulted in the CBDRM Project’s inability to obtain funds to implement the CBDRM Project activities.

In considering the UN Sanction measures together with recurring and extended banking channel disruption/closure which led to the UNDP DPRK CO activating the cash conservation mode to sustain the office operations, the CBDRM Project Team displayed appropriate financial management processes to implement the relevant CBDRM Project activities which were not affected by the UN Sanction measures.

However, the evaluation reviewed that there were inconsistencies (and inconsistent templates) in the CBDRM Project Team's financial reporting processes due to different reporting requirements given.

1. Inconsistent reporting of CBDRM Project actual expenditure figures

The actual expenditure provided to the evaluation was based on actual expenditure according to project outputs. However, the actual expenditure in the CBDRM Project Annual Progress Reports were based on actual expenditure, as per financial reporting templates being provided by UNDP DPRK CO, according to the categories of Project Activity, Management and Staff, General Operations Expenditure, and/or Common Services.

2. Inconsistent reporting on comparison of CBDRM Project budget versus actual expenditure figures

The CBDRM Project Team did not provide budget and actual expenditure figures in PSC meetings. However, the CBDRM Project Annual Progress Reports reported these comparisons for the calendar year period but not at output levels as the CBDRM Project Team followed the financial reporting templates being provided by UNDP DPRK CO. The evaluation further noted that only the CBDRM Project's CDR run was attached at the time of the report submission.

For improved financial accountability and transparency purposes as part of demonstrating the efficient use of funding on project output-based activities, future financial reporting processes and templates of UNDP DPRK projects should:

- track and report consistent financial figures (budget and actual expenditure).
- have consistent comparisons between budget and actual expenditure, as per project outputs, based on project CDRs, for submissions of all relevant project reports (including annual progress reports and submissions to PSC meetings).

### **3.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Activities Used for Adaptive Management**

The M&E framework consisted of local monitoring and reporting as well as international independent evaluations. Both the CBDRM Project Team and the UNDP DPRK M&E Specialist were responsible for the preparation and submission of the M&E reports and evaluations at project and programme levels respectively, as stated in the CBDRM PRODOC. Table 4 below summarizes the achievement of monitoring actions as required by the CBDRM PRODOC.

**Table 4: M&E Plan and Completion Status**

Type of M&E Activity/Report	Frequency/Timing	Status	Comments
<b>Detailed Quarterly Workplan</b>	Every beginning of the quarter	Completed	Detailed workplans for 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 completed
<b>Annual Workplan and Budget</b>	Beginning of each year	Completed	Detailed workplans with budget for 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 completed
<b>Quarterly Progress Report</b>	Quarterly	Completed	Reports completed every quarter in 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019
<b>Annual Progress Report</b>	Yearly	In progress	Reports completed in 2016, 2017 and 2018. The Annual Progress Report for 2019 is to be completed by the CBDRM Project Manager in December 2019
<b>Mid-Term Review</b>	End of Year 2	Completed	This M&E activity was delayed with one MTR report completed by an independent evaluator in August 2018
<b>Terminal Report</b>	End of the CBDRM Project	In progress	One Terminal Report to be completed by the CBDRM Project Manager in 2019
<b>Independent Terminal Evaluation</b>	End of the CBDRM Project (3 months prior to the terminal project steering committee meeting)	In progress	One Terminal Evaluation report to be completed by an independent evaluator in January 2020
<b>Field Monitoring Visits/Reports</b>	After each mission	Completed	Field Monitoring Visits/Reports by CBDRM Project Team and UNDP DPRK Programme M&E Team completed
<b>Mission reports</b>	After each mission	Completed	Mission reports by individual experts (International and National) completed
<b>Other Reports and Deliverables</b>	After each TA or sub-contract	Completed	Reports and deliverable by individual experts (International and National) completed

Type of M&E Activity/Report	Frequency/ Timing	Status	Comments
<b>Quarterly M&amp;E Reports</b>	Quarterly	Completed	Quarterly M&E reports by UNDP DPRK CO/Programme M&E Team completed
<b>Financial records &amp; reporting</b>	Continuous	Completed	Financial records and reporting completed

The UNDP DPRK CO and the CBDRM Project Team proactively responded with specific adaptive management measures to recommendations from MTR as shown below in Table 5:

**Table 5: Management Response to CBDRM Project MTR Recommendations**

CBDRM Project MTR Recommendation	Management Response
<p><u>Improved Monitoring.</u> The MTR has frequently noted that limiting monitoring and data collection to quantitative approaches only undermines the ability of the project to capture the qualitative change created and the potential impact of the project in the short and medium term. While it is understood by the consultant that opportunities for qualitative monitoring are limited, it is nonetheless important that some qualitative output indicators be included in the RRF to improve analysis of progress and to communicate results. Providing analysis of qualitative change can also demonstrate the importance of the project despite the significant operational challenges, not least procurement challenges, which have caused delay in the implementation of some activities. The MTR recommends including the following indicators at the sub-output level:</p> <p>1.1 Extent to which target communities use risk maps and DRM Plans to support risk reduction in annual agricultural and infrastructure planning And Extent to which information on coping strategies reduces HH asset loss during crises</p> <p>1.2 Area of deforested land (including sloping land used for agriculture) replaced by agro-forestry And Extent to which agro-forestry has reduced the number of landslides during heavy rain in target communities</p> <p>2.1 Extent to which the CBDRM is used as a coordination tool by the government (assessed by proxy through other CBDRM actors such as IFRC, FAO, OCHA etc)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Agree.</u> It is important some qualitative output indicators are considered to improve reporting on the qualitative changes. Providing analysis of qualitative change can also demonstrate the importance of the project despite the significant operational challenges, not least procurement challenges, which have caused delay in the implementation of some activities.</li> </ul> <p>1.1 In consultation with counterparts following indicators will be monitored by CBDRM project. These will be reported in the Quarterly Progress Reports/Annual Progress Reports.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DRM Plans are reviewed annually by the communities and financially supported for implementation</li> <li>Usefulness of Disaster Loss and Damage Database (DLDD) reports for DRM planning at three counties</li> </ol> <p>1.2 At the programme level, Programme staff report qualitative changes of the projects in ROAR through captured qualitative results from projects</p>



CBDRM Project MTR Recommendation	Management Response
<p><u>Revised Output Targets.</u> Although initial project targets were set within the previous sanctions regime and were highly likely to be achieved, given the fluidity of the current international environment regarding DPRK in mid-2018, it is difficult to determine whether or not the project will be able to achieve its present targets by end 2019 when the project is scheduled to close. Moreover, current targets are entirely quantitative in nature and do not provide the necessary evidence that the activities implemented have resulted in any meaningful change. However, given that it is unlikely that the project will increase the number of target communities in which to implement activities, quantitative targets cannot easily be changed without completely revising all output indicators. With both issues in mind, and following from the suggested revised indicators in the previous recommendation, the MTR recommends sub-output targets for the supplementary indicators accordingly:</p> <p>1.1 Risk maps inform agricultural and infrastructure planning to ensure that appropriate crops are planted in low risk areas and infrastructure is not built in immediate hazard areas. And Reduction in the number of HH experiencing complete asset and livelihood loss</p> <p>1.2 At least 10% of deforested land replaced by agro-forestry in target communities (by end 2019) And The number of landslides negatively impacting dwellings and agricultural productivity is reduced</p> <p>2.1 SCEDM and partners endorse the CBDRM Programme Framework as the main tool for the coordination of CBDRM activity implementation</p>	<p><u>N.A.</u></p>
<p><u>Standardized monitoring tools.</u> Based on documents reviewed and discussions with project and programme staff, it is evident that although there are comprehensive guidelines for project and programme monitoring in the Country Office, the lack of appropriate tools for data collection and analysis severely impacts what type of data is being collected and by whom. It is recommended that instead of having joint reports following field visits, whether or implementation and monitoring purposes, team members should submit individual BTORs, with project and programme aspects kept separate. A standardized quarterly monitoring report should be used to consolidate data from the BTORs on a quarterly basis only, providing ease in data analysis. Other country offices in the Asia-Pacific region have implemented a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Agree</u> It is recommended that instead of having joint reports following field visits, whether it is for implementation and/or monitoring purposes, team members should submit individual BTORs separately for project and programme.</li> <li>2.1 Projects and programme team will submit separate BTORs upon field missions.</li> <li>2.2 Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) should be completed by the project team (led by the Project Manager), with quality assurance of the data and analysis undertaken.</li> </ul>

CBDRM Project MTR Recommendation	Management Response
<p>similar tool, an example of which is attached as Annex 10. The report should be completed by the project team (lead by the Project Manager), with quality assurance of the data and analysis undertaken by M&amp;E Specialist. This process would improve the storage and analysis of information, both at activity level, and at output level, where analysis to date is weak. This also provides a clear delineation between the role of the project and programme in monitoring and reporting at the project level.</p>	<p>2.3 Report qualitative changes of the projects in ROAR through captured qualitative results from projects.</p>
<p><u>Communication of project results.</u> Geo-political issues surrounding the relevance of the project in terms of its humanitarian role have created challenges in terms of how to communicate the results of the project. If results are communicated at the activity level through purely quantitative data, it is difficult to understand the longer-term, life-saving impact that the project has and will have. With the inclusion of more qualitative indicators at the output level, it is hoped that more meaningful analysis of the humanitarian importance of the project will be capture, and it is recommended that the UNDP Country Office put significantly more effort into communicating these results within the wider UN system in order to reinforce why UNDP's presence in DPRK is essential, as well as providing evidence for the need to ease some procurement challenges for more effective project implementation and the easing of the humanitarian burden on other agencies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Agree</u> With the inclusion of more qualitative indicators at the output level, it is hoped that more meaningful analysis of the humanitarian importance of the project will be captured, bearing in mind the sensitivities in sharing project results publicly due to the complex geopolitical context under which UNDP operates in DPRK. Following are some of the key actions that will be taken to improve the reporting of qualitative changes that the project is leading on the ground.</li> </ul> <p>3.1 CBDRM project to share communication material (videos/brochures...) with relevant parties including BRH</p> <p>3.2 Conduct a painting competition for school children to deepen their awareness of DRM among people and select most innovative and creative ideas.</p>
<p><u>Managing community expectations.</u> The most frequent negative feedback received by beneficiaries during the MTR country mission was that procurement of materials for structural interventions was routinely delayed. While plans for structural interventions were agreed with target communities, delays in procurement undermine community commitment and ownership to the initiatives. For example, if seedlings for transplant of fast rotation crops are not soon provided, it would be unsurprising if the community priorities were to change and they reverted to using sloping land for agriculture despite the risks posed by landslides. The project needs to find a way to better manage community expectations related to structural interventions, perhaps by only</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Agree</u> The project needs to find a way to better manage community expectations related to structural interventions, perhaps by only discussing these plans once procurement is approved based on previous needs assessments.</li> </ul> <p>4.1 Until sanctions issue is resolved, CBDRM project is expected to be engaged in soft activities rather than hard/structural interventions</p> <p>4.2 If it comes to the point when procurement is no longer possible, exit</p>

CBDRM Project MTR Recommendation	Management Response
discussing these plans once procurement is approved based on previous needs assessments.	<p>strategy would be enforced as had been recommended</p> <p>4.3 Project team must be in constant touch with local communities and keep them updated of the project progress in procurement</p>
<p><u>Focus on soft interventions.</u> Based on the on-going delays in procurement, it will be important for the CBDRM team to prepare a work plan which puts significant effort on soft-activities which consolidate knowledge transfer at the county level and aim to put in place tools or informal systems whereby knowledge transfer or organic roll-out of activities could take place in the medium-term. For example, identifying county individuals who could act as trainers for other counties, or provide tools and guidance on how counties can improve data collection and document lessons and problem-solving processes. The planning of these activities could be guided by UNDP's Capacity Development toolkits/handbooks, particularly focusing on individuals and institutions, to understand where knowledge transfer gaps may take place, and target activities to address such gaps. Some examples include an annual review of the DRM Plans, continued simulation trainings, moving from training on preparedness and recovery to mitigation and response, in-country study tours, and continued refinement of the CBDRM Framework.</p>	<p><u>N.A.</u></p>
<p><u>Consolidating CBDRM commitment at the national level.</u> Despite limitations in how UNDP can engage with national stakeholders, the sustainability of current results and possible future scale-up of CBDRM relies heavily on the capacity of SCEDM to take ownership of DRM coordination in the country. It is recommended that the project team facilitate more knowledge transfer and leadership skills to SCEDM, using the CBDRM Programme Framework as a launching point for improved coordination of the crosscutting sector. Potential avenues for communication are joint workshops with other agencies involved in (CB)DRM, as well as using the PSC meetings as a venue for one-on-one knowledge transfer and question/answer opportunities with SCEDM beyond issues of project implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Agree</u> It is recommended that the project team facilitate more knowledge transfer and leadership skills to SCEDM, using the CBDRM Programme Framework as a launching point for improved coordination of the cross-cutting sector.</li> </ul> <p>5.1 SCEDM and partners endorse the CBDRM Programme Framework as the main tool for the coordination of DRM activities at community level. It's included as part of DRR/DRM strategy of DPRK.</p>

CBDRM Project MTR Recommendation	Management Response
<p><u>Exit Strategy.</u> Considering the ongoing absence of a CPD for the Country Office, one option that UNDP may want to consider as a potential exit strategy for the project beyond 2019 is to coordinate with other UN agencies and IFRC to transfer the knowledge products, protocols and guidelines for roll-out to other communities where these agencies are doing CBDRM-related work. Moreover, it is recommended that UNDP identify an agency to take over the responsibility for coordinating the CBDRM Programme Framework after the project is complete as it is unlikely that SCEDM capacity to take on that role will be sufficient by the time the project ends, and it would be a waste of time and effort if the coordination of CBDRM programming was interrupted. Further, UNDP should work closely with participating counties for the formal handover of products such as the DLDD and CBDRM for the improved ownership and continued learning of county officials related to risks, vulnerabilities and community-based disaster risk management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Agree</u> As the CBDRM project will end by December 2019 according to the Prodoc, it's the right time to start deploying its exit strategy to meaningfully consolidate the results achieved till date and ensure, there is a sustainability in the project activities and results.</li> </ul> <p>6.1 CBDRM project shall organize a National Partners Meet to assess what was done better and what else need to be completed in fulfilling the needs of the communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) At this meet, CBDRM project must encourage the local communities to make in-kind contributions in the absence of procurement activities.</li> <li>b) Consolidating CBDRM project results till date</li> </ul>

The evaluation reviewed that the M&E process at the project and programme level was very comprehensive. The UNDP DPRK Programme M&E showed high competency in:

- conducting field monitoring visits every quarterly to assess the progress of the CBDRM Project outputs. This included the verification of delivered items and assets through the identification of UNDP item/asset identity tags at the field sites and monitoring the use of the delivered items and assets to ensure sustainable operations and productions. UNDP-delivered items were well-tagged and kept in all sites visited which showed UNDP's visibility, recognition and support on the ground.
- producing high quality quarterly programme monitoring and oversight reports, as required by the UNDP DPRK ICF and UNDP DPRK CO Guidelines for Field Monitoring Visits, with key findings and analysis of progress towards results, project performance and implementation issues.
- providing key recommendations and corrective actions/measures to further improving the CBDRM Project, and monitoring the implementation of these key recommendations and corrective actions/measures until completion.
- updating the M&E progresses at all PSC meetings.

The CBDRM Project Team showed high competency in:

- conducting project field monitoring visits every quarterly to assess the progress of the CBDRM Project outputs. This included the verification of delivered items and assets through the identification of UNDP item/asset identity tags at the field sites, the onsite testing of equipment delivered by UNDP. UNDP-delivered items were well-tagged and kept in all sites visited which showed UNDP's visibility, recognition and support on the ground.
- producing high quality quarterly and annual project progress reports and presenting them at all PSC meetings.
- identifying key issues faced, and providing key recommendations and corrective actions/measures to address these key issues.
- updating project implementation monitoring progress at all PSC meetings.

However, the M&E process at the project level by the CBDRM Project Team could be further strengthened in the field data collection to measure effectiveness and impact on completed project activities. While the CBDRM Project has consistently reported the impact through significant increase in public awareness and knowledge/application in DRM, there is a need for the CBDRM Project Team to collect data to measure the effectiveness and impact on the village community beneficiaries.

Enabling the field data collection to measure effectiveness and impact on village communities would further strengthen the:

- overall sustainability results of the CBDRM Project pilot activities.
- case for future replication of the CBDRM model in other counties/village communities (Ris) in DPRK.

### **3.2.5 Implementing Agency**

The CBDRM Project adopted the direct implementation modality (DIM) which meant that UNDP DPRK would be the Implementing Agency with a dedicated project team based in the UNDP DPRK CO. An International Project Manager would be recruited and be responsible for the daily management of the project with assistance from recruited national project staff (comprising one National Technical Coordinator and one National Administrative Assistant). The CBDRM Project Team would further engage International and/or National Consultants as required based on the CBDRM Project's technical requirements.

The CBDRM Project also formed a Project Steering Committee (PSC) to guide the project direction and address any challenges. The PSC was co-chaired by the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative and the National Coordinator from the DPRK National Coordinating Committee (NCC) for UNDP, with participation of representatives from the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), State Committee for Emergency and Disaster Management (SCEDM), Ministry of Land and Environment Protection (MOLEP), State Hydro-Meteorological Administration (SHMA) and other institutions as needed at the central level.

The CBDRM Project would also work closely with Local Counterparts such as CPCs and other key stakeholders from:

- Yonsan County, North Hwanghae Province
- Singye County, North Hwanghae Province
- Yangdok County, South Pyongan Province

The evaluation established that there were strong working relationships between the UNDP DPRK CO, the CBDRM Project Team, National and Local Counterparts and project beneficiaries at the county and village community (Ri) level. These working relationships were frequently tested by the slow progress of the CBDRM Project's structural interventions in Output 1.2 such as procuring materials for constructing road, footbridges, river embankments, village community evacuation centers/shelters and water tanks.

Key representatives of the National and Local Counterparts expressed disappointments at the prolonged delays and unsuccessful implementation of these procurement-related activities during the 4-year project duration. Many of these expressed disappointments were understandably justified as, in their views, structural measures for disaster risk reduction were not delivered. Despite these procurement setbacks, the National and Local Counterparts expressed deep gratitude and appreciation on the limited but successful implementation of the CBDRM Project non-structural interventions such as capacity building activities for DRMP and emergency response/preparations. The application of

these non-structural interventions were being tested during Typhoon Ling Ling in early September 2019. More details could be found in Section 4 which features a key success story on how increased public awareness, knowledge and the application of disaster risk management has strengthened village community resilience.

The National and Local Counterparts expressed deep gratitude and appreciation for the CBDRM Project Team who had done their very best, in the midst of many external factors/challenges faced, to implement the project with some significant success.

The National and Local Counterparts, while fully understanding that the external factors/challenges such as the UN Sanctions and the geo-political situation had severely affected the CBDRM Project, highlighted their disappointment in the UNDP as an organization for not being able to deliver the desired results.

### 3.3 Achievement of Project Results

The TE assessed four broad categories:

- Project Design/Formulation
- Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Achievement of Project Results in the categories of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Basic Human Needs, Gender Equality, Synergy, Overall Results/Impact, National Ownership (using Evaluation Ratings)
- Sustainability (using Sustainability Ratings)

The evaluation rated the CBDRM Project's project results according to the evaluation ratings table listed below in Table 6.

**Table 6: Evaluation Overall Results/Impact Rating**

Evaluation Ratings for Overall Results/Impact, Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Basic Human Needs, Gender Equality, National Ownership	Sustainability Ratings:
6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)	



### 3.3.1 Overall Results/Impact

The evaluation rated the CBDRM Project's overall results/impact with reference to its overall project outcome and 4 project outputs (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2) as per stated in the CBDRM PRODOC. The overall results/impact are presented below in Table 7.

**Table 7: Overall Results/Impact – CBDRM Project**

CBDRM PRODOC		Achievement Rating	Comments
<u>Outcome</u> Resilience to natural hazards of vulnerable communities are enhanced			
<u>Output 1</u> Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community based disaster risk management measures.	<u>Output 1.1</u> Communities in high risk areas with access to severe weather warning information, with involvement in local and indigenous early warning system and in community preparedness measures to undertake emergency response and early recovery	<b>5/6</b>  (Satisfactory) Minor shortcomings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conducted Participatory Risk and Needs Assessment (PRNA) and Disaster Risk Management Planning (DRMP) in 15 Ris, including completion of annual review and update of PRNAs and DRMPs of 8 Ris in 2018 while remaining 7 Ris were completed in 2019. Ris are expected to review these plans annually.</li> <li>PRNAs seem to identify structural interventions as the top priority for disaster risk reduction and mitigation measures (also the commonly expressed views from the field mission trip) but CBDRM Project went ahead with non-structural interventions first (UN Sanction Resolution #2397 not yet passed).</li> <li>Trained on coping strategies conducted through evacuation simulation, PRNA and DRMP trainings across the 15 selected Ris.</li> <li>Procured resources and delivered supplies for community level preparedness in emergency response, early warning and evacuation.</li> <li>Early warning and evacuation materials were provided to all 15 communities for emergency response and preparedness. Visual aids/placards suggested for practical purposes.</li> <li>Fit-for-purpose local/indigenous early warning system needed.</li> </ul>
	<u>Output 1.2</u> Communities in high risk areas have skills in hazard and vulnerability assessment, and involved in planning and implementing risk resilient agro forestry and rural livelihood	<u>Non-structural interventions</u>  <b>5/6</b>  (Satisfactory) Minor shortcomings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant increase in public awareness and knowledge in DRM.</li> <li>Required early warning and evacuation material were provided to Ris.</li> <li>Conducted PRNA and DRMP for Ris in close combination with SLUGs, which benefited from improved skills in hazard and vulnerability assessments.</li> <li>Communities in 9 Ris were provided with seeds for improved livelihoods and saplings to prevent soil erosion using soil bioengineering, while other remaining 6 Ris did not receive seed and saplings, possibly due to staggered distribution schedule affected by sanctions and banking channel closure.</li> <li>Established a pool of women trainers with capacity to teach other grassroots women on planning and implementing risk resilient agro-forestry and rural livelihood.</li> </ul>

CBDRM PRODOC		Achievement Rating	Comments
<p><u>Output 1</u> Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community based disaster risk management measures.</p>	<p><u>Output 1.2</u> Communities in high risk areas have skills in hazard and vulnerability assessment, and involved in planning and implementing risk resilient agro forestry and rural livelihood</p> <p>(CONTINUED)</p>	<p><u>Structural interventions</u></p> <p><b>2/6</b></p> <p>(Unsatisfactory) Major shortcomings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent ownership and participation in agro-forestry activities by village communities (Ris) through in-kind contribution which included management of tree nursery, transplantation of fast-growing trees.</li> <li>• Implemented structural interventions (check dams and landslide protection structures) in Chuma Ri (2016).</li> <li>• Remaining structural interventions (such as construction of footbridges, river embankments, village community evacuation centers/shelters, water tanks) for other Ris yet to be completed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ need to manage Ri community’s comparisons, disappointments and frustrations</li> <li>➢ due to sanctions and banking channel disruption/ closure (beyond the control of the UNDP DPRK CO)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><u>Output 2</u> Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) levels</p>	<p><u>Output 2.1</u> Stakeholders CBDRM Programme Framework is developed and agreed with elements of strategy, priorities, targeting, roles and responsibilities, resource allocation and resources and partnership including possible joint activities in training and project implementation.</p>	<p><b>6/6</b></p> <p>(Highly Satisfactory) No shortcomings</p>	<p><u>National counterparts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully socialized and familiar with the CBDRM Programme Framework since workshop in April/May 2018.</li> <li>• NSDRR was developed by DPRK Government in June 2019. CBDRM Programme Framework aligns and informed the NSDRR with potential contribution such as implementing the CBDRM model (one county per province) if estimated adoptable.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>3/6</b></p> <p>(Moderately Unsatisfactory) Significant shortcomings</p>	<p><u>International agencies/organizations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBDRM Programme Framework developed with the aim of “promoting CBDRM, identifying strategic objectives, sub objectives, priority actions, resources, lead organization/s and partnerships with UN agencies and IFRC/DPRK Red Cross”.</li> <li>• International agencies/organizations were not fully socialized, and not familiar with the CBDRM Programme Framework and CBDRM results.</li> <li>• CBDRM Programme Framework did not specify the partnership roles, responsibilities and required actions/resources attributed directly to international agencies/organizations.</li> <li>• Synergies and communications with international agencies/organizations could be further improved.</li> </ul>



CBDRM PRODOC		Achievement Rating	Comments
<p><u>Output 2</u> Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) levels  (CONTINUED)</p>	<p><u>Output 2.2</u> Comprehensive guidelines on CBDRM including training methodologies, materials, knowledge product.</p>	<p><b>5/6</b>  (Satisfactory) Minor shortcomings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong evidence of CBDRM guidelines and materials at village community (Ri) level.</li> <li>• Disaster Loss and Damage Database (DLDD) developed at Central/County Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Some challenges encountered in collection of data at county/village community level to filling up the DLDD data cards.</li> <li>➢ local counties/communities need further training in collecting accurate and meaningful data.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CBDRM EW Protocol developed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ guidelines and principles incorporated into the PRNA and DRMP of 15 Ris.</li> <li>➢ Socialization and application at National Level appropriate. This is the first EW protocol in DPRK but need improvements and updating.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<p><u>Output 2.3<sup>a</sup></u> 2,666 housing units covered with semi-permanent shelter solutions (as emergency response to flooding in North Hamgyong province in October-November 2016)</p>	<p><b>U/A</b>  (The Evaluator did not visit the project site to verify and confirm the actual results)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New ad-hoc output incorporated in 2016/2017 to assist in flood emergency response and coordination support in North Hamgyong Province (<b>based on reports</b>)</li> <li>• 200,437.56m<sup>2</sup> of CGI sheets, roof ridges and nails procured and delivered → 145,309 m<sup>2</sup> of UNDP supported CGI was used directly or indirectly, through swap, for roofing of dwelling houses, benefitting 2,750 households, the rest being used for roofing of public institutions delivering essential social services (85 buildings) throughout most affected counties (<b>based on reports</b>)</li> <li>• Operational challenges encountered in the midst of challenging circumstances: (<b>based on reports</b>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Unreliable communications in remote areas with little/no telecommunication signals</li> <li>➢ Discrepancies on actual onsite-receipt of CGI sheets and contractor schedule/recordings</li> <li>➢ Delayed deliveries due to unfavorable weather conditions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Early recovery assessments were not conducted. Budget re-allocated to soil bioengineering to strengthen 3 gullies in Tokso Ri (<b>based on reports</b>)</li> </ul>

Note:

a. Although not originally planned, an additional Output 2.3 was added in late 2016 with the approval of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) to channel emergency support for communities affected by flooding in the North Hamgyong Province.

The evaluation further noted that the CBDRM Project Team and UNDP DPRK CO had done their best to deliver and achieve the desired project results despite encountering significant external factors/challenges, mainly due to the 6 UN Sanctions in 2016 and 2017 and the recurring banking channel disruption/closure that prevented funds transfer into DPRK) during the CBDRM Project duration.

### 3.3.2 Relevance

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory - Minor Shortcomings)

The CBDRM Project was highly relevant and aligned with the DPRK national strategies and priorities. The CBDRM Project was designed with humanitarian-oriented outputs and activities which were aimed to address the humanitarian needs of intended beneficiaries.

The CBDRM Project's relevance was further strengthened with National and Local Counterparts being involved and consulted during the project design and also during project implementation. The CBDRM Project Team, particularly the Project Manager, also had suitable technical skillsets and competencies to deliver most of the project outputs which are technically complex and required specialised expertise and knowledge in DRM.

Challenges in procurement due to UN Sanctions and banking channel disruption/closure severely disrupted the ability to procure internationally and in-country, which is beyond the control of the UNDP DPRK Project Team and CO. Hence the CBDRM Project could not fully deliver the required procurement of equipment and materials for structural interventions, which were perceived as the key need and priority by project beneficiaries.

#### Field mission observation:

- Non-structural interventions were highly relevant, well-received and successfully implemented at village community (Ri) level. These would include the following:
  - Conduct of Participatory Risk and Needs Assessment (PRNA) and Disaster Risk Management Planning (DRMP) in 15 Ris, including completion of annual review and update of PRNAs and DRMPs.
  - Trained on coping strategies conducted through evacuation simulation, PRNA and DRMP trainings across the 15 selected Ris.
  - Procured resources and delivered supplies for community level preparedness in emergency response, early warning and evacuation.
  - Early warning and evacuation materials to increase public awareness and knowledge in DRM
- Structural interventions (such as construction of footbridges, river embankments, village community evacuation centers/shelters, water tanks) were regarded at village community (Ri) level as a higher priority need than non-structural interventions but the CBDRM project plan schedule proceeded with non-structural interventions first.
- The needs and priorities at village community Ri level possibly changed and were also affected by geo-political context but the CBDRM Project Output 1.2 could not accommodate and adapt appropriately.

### 3.3.3 Effectiveness

#### Non-Structural Interventions

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory – Minor Shortcomings)

There were surprising unintended results ie. the innovative creativity, solutions, resilience and unity of the village community (Ri) beneficiaries:

- Yonsan County: The county produced a video of its countywide evacuation simulation exercise involving the community Ri, county staff, DPRK emergency services personnel (fire brigade, ambulance). There were also sighting of UNDP-delivered well-tagged items that were used for emergency preparedness and response. Other counties were invited to witness the simulation exercise.
- Sagi Ri (Yangdok County): The county demonstrated perseverance to complete the structural interventions in the absence of UNDP support. Despite the challenges, the county remained hopeful and positive.
- Singye County: The county potentially introduced and replicated the CBDRM model to 20 non-project Ris.

Output activities (specifically, non-structural interventions) met the intended needs of the target beneficiaries at the village community (Ri) level. However, an independent impact evaluation study would be required as a future project output/activity component to measure the impact effectiveness, final end-line indicators and actual benefits gained.

#### Structural Interventions

Achievement Rating: **2/6** (Unsatisfactory – Major Shortcomings)

External factors/environment beyond the control of the CBDRM Project Team and UNDP DPRK CO have affected the desired Output 1.2 results to be fully achieved, particularly the procurement of equipment and materials for structural interventions (such as construction of footbridges, river embankments, village community evacuation centers/shelters, water tanks).

These were perceived as the key needs and priorities by project beneficiaries, who expressed disappointments at the prolonged delays and unsuccessful implementation of the CBDRM Project procurement-related activities.

The evaluation determined that PRNAs seemed to identify structural interventions as the top priority for disaster risk reduction and mitigation measures (also the commonly expressed views from the field mission trip) but the CBDRM Project went ahead with non-structural interventions first (UN Sanction Resolution #2397 was not yet passed at this stage).

### 3.3.4 Efficiency

Achievement Rating: **4/6** (Moderately Satisfactory – Moderate Shortcomings)

The project achieved the intended outcome (but only for non-structural interventions). Out of the 4 outputs:

- Outputs 1.1 and 2.2 were considered almost fully achieved
- Outputs 1.2 and 2.1 were considered partially achieved

As of 22 November 2019, the CBDRM Project under-spent allocated total project funds by about 32%. This is mainly due to the inability to obtain project funds for procurement of equipment and materials for structural interventions, which is caused by the delayed UN sanctions exemptions/clearance process and the extended banking channel disruption/closure. The CBDRM Project Team displayed appropriate financial management processes to implement the relevant project activities which were not affected by the UN sanction measures.

Financial reporting processes and templates should be further strengthened for consistencies, financial accountability and transparency purposes in financial budgeting and accounting:

- tracking progress of budget vs expenditure at output level for submissions of all relevant project reports (including APPRs), to demonstrate the efficient management and use of funding on project output-based activities, and align activity/output impact and results to the corresponding financial budgets
- reporting these budget vs expenditure comparisons at output levels at PSC meetings

### 3.3.5 National Ownership

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory – Minor Shortcomings)

While the CBDRM PRODOC did not include any DPRK counterparts to lead in implementing any project outputs, strong national ownership was achieved at the National/Central level through perfect attendance by DPRK counterpart representatives (CBS, SCEDM, MOLEP, and SHMA) of all PSC meetings.

The evaluation also found a high degree of national ownership through strong commitment and interest at the local county level with sustained results of initiation, knowledge/operational transfer and innovative creativity from the CBDRM Project, as follow:

- Excellent application of CBDRM SOPs, guidelines and materials:
  - Significant increase in public awareness and knowledge of DRM
  - Overcoming Typhoon Ling Ling in early September 2019
  - Sighting of PRNAs, DRMP, risk maps, selection of public buildings as evacuation centers and evacuation route maps
- High degree of national ownership at county and village community (Ri) level:
  - Yonsan County: The county produced a video of its countywide evacuation simulation exercise involving the community Ri, county staff, DPRK emergency services personnel (fire brigade, ambulance). There were also sighting of UNDP-delivered well-tagged items that were used for emergency preparedness and response. Other counties were invited to witness the simulation exercise.

- Sagi Ri (Yangdok County): The county demonstrated perseverance to complete the structural interventions in the absence of UNDP support. Despite the challenges, the county remained hopeful and positive.
- Singye County: The county potentially introduced/replicated the CBDRM model to 20 non-project Ris.

However, the evaluation observed that county stakeholders still encountered some challenges in the collection of data to filling up the DLDD data cards. This indicated that local counties and communities still needed to be trained in data collection. Due to the incomplete procurement activities, much needed structural interventions have yet to be completed for affected Ris. As such, local abilities for disaster risk management and disaster risk reduction could not yet be fully realized/achieved to their full potential.

### 3.3.6 Sustainability

Sustainability Rating: **3/4** (Moderately Likely - Moderate Risks)

The CBDRM PRODOC did not conduct any risk analysis and furthermore did not account for external environments such as the UN sanctions and the extended banking channel disruption/closure. The CBDRM Project Team identified and implemented risk assessments, and mitigation strategies and action plans. However, it did not resolve the external environments. This resulted in unanticipated sustainability issues (incomplete structural interventions for strengthening disaster prevention/mitigation measures) emerging during project implementation and the project outcome could not be fully realized/implemented.

The CBDRM model should be replicated (in close cooperation with national and local counterparts) to other counties/Ris but needs to be complemented with appropriate and timely structural interventions to maximize effectiveness and impact.

The evaluation observed that National Consultants/Experts received extensive capacity building and knowledge in DRM and DRMP. This is a commendable effort and there is a need to conduct knowledge/operational transfer to have extended pool of national resources for future CBDRM model roll-out.

The CBDRM Project appropriately developed an exit strategy and took into account the following:

- Political factors - there is strong support and commitment from the DPRK Government and CPCs to continue as emphasized in the NSDRR.
- Financial factors - there is financial stability to operate on its own without further financial support.
- Technical factors - skills and expertise needed were suitably assessed and with capacity building activities organized to up-skill the beneficiaries.
- Environmental factors - the CBDRM model can be replicated (in close cooperation with national and local counterparts) to other counties and village communities (Ris) but this needs to be complemented with appropriate and timely structural interventions to maximize effectiveness and impact. It is also critically important to continue implementing the CBDRM model as part of the DPRK NSDRR to enhance resilience to natural hazards in all the vulnerable village communities (Ris) in DPRK, led by SCEDM in close cooperation with international agencies and organizations.

### 3.3.7 Basic Human Needs / Gender Equality

Achievement Rating: **5/6** (Satisfactory – Minor Shortcomings)

The CBDRM PRODOC did not include specific gender mainstreaming/social inclusion strategy. However the CBDRM Project has factored these into its activities. Basic human needs and gender equality were potentially achieved based on anecdotal and proxy indicator evidence through concrete examples of:

- Children and families receiving the calendar and understanding better on the different types of seasonal disasters.
- DRMP and evacuation simulations providing inclusiveness by prioritizing vulnerable groups such as elderly, pregnant women, children, the sick, people with disabilities.
- Women from SLUGs receiving training in the CBDRM project.

While the reported benefits by project reports could be perceived as immense, the evaluation could not fully verify the actual benefits at ground level. This could be further realized if an impact evaluation study at project output/activity level could be externally conducted by an independent party.

Future CBDRM-related projects in DPRK should continue to prioritise gender mainstreaming activities to assess the capacity needs according to gender requirements, and develop capacity development activities specifically relating to enhancing gender equality and improving the women's living and livelihood standards.

### 3.3.8 Synergy

Achievement Rating: **4/6** (Moderately Satisfactory – Moderate Shortcomings)

The evaluation assessed that there were strong synergy effects between the CBDRM Project and SES Project as follow:

- Strengthening of river embankment concept from CBDRM project was implemented with SES Project activities to enable and strengthen the implementation of renewable energy technologies.
- as part of the SES Project, public buildings such as kindergartens and schools were retrofitted with energy efficiency measures. Some of these public buildings were also selected as evacuation centers in the CBDRM Project. This would result in a positive impact to the well-being and safety of beneficiaries during emergency situations such as floods and typhoons. However, this was not highlighted by the project beneficiaries or sighted in the 5 Ris visited.
- the SES Project implemented energy efficiency measures to improve the indoor heating system (Ondol floor heating). This would also increase indoor thermal comfort and also increase the protection of village communities from extreme cold conditions as part of CBDRM Project interventions in disaster risk management. However, this was not highlighted by the project beneficiaries in the 5 Ris visited.
- EE stoves and solar PV panels were installed as part of the SES Project which helped to improve the heat insulation, improve cooking efficiency and maintain the warm indoor environment. This would result in less timber being collected by SLUG groups and used by village communities (Ris) for firewood which would be required for cooking and also for keeping the indoor environment warm during winter season. The lessened use of timber meant that more trees would be preserved on mountain slopes to strengthen prevention of soil erosion and landslides as part of CBDRM Project interventions in disaster risk management.

- CBDRM project provided seeds (pinus koreansis, larix leptolepis, and castanata crenata) for improving livelihoods and saplings (aronia melanocarpa, and bamboo willow) to prevent soil erosion using soil bioengineering. Communities have further used firewood species such as poplar to enhance biomass resources availability.

The evaluation also observed that synergy effect between the SES Project and CBDRM Project have undesirable implications such as:

- village communities (Ri) who were not the beneficiaries of both SES and CBDRM Projects would perceive as receiving less "benefits". Proposed "compensation" with more structural interventions (such as construction of roads, bridges, river embankments, village community evacuation centers/shelters, water tanks) were not realized due to the UN sanctions and extended period of banking channel disruption/closure.
- unhealthy comparisons and competitions between the projects village communities (Ris) observed. For example some Ris received such as tree seeds and saplings while other Ris did not receive these items.

The evaluation further noted that the CBDRM Project Team justified its response to the needs on ground based on the project objective whereby:

- the SES and CBDRM projects have responded to the needs on ground considering availability of budget, prioritisation at the community level in order to balance its overall support.
- procurement plans 2018 and 2019 were not materialised under SES and CBDRM. This is beyond the CBDRM Project Team's control.

The evaluation also observed that synergies and communications with other UN agencies and international organizations could be improved in relation to the CBDRM Programme Framework:

- international agencies and organizations were not fully socialized and not familiar with the CBDRM Programme Framework and CBDRM results.
- the CBDRM Programme Framework did not specify the partnership roles, responsibilities and required actions/resources attributed directly to international agencies and organizations.

Hence the evaluation assessed that the CBDRM Project needed to improve its weak synergies with other UN agencies and international organizations with similar project/programme outputs and results.

In particular, any future CBDRM should strengthen its information sharing, communication of project results and valuable lessons learned as part of multi-level and multi-sectoral DRM and DRR in DPRK.

#### **4. KEY SUCCESS STORY: INCREASED PUBLIC AWARENESS, KNOWLEDGE AND THE APPLICATION OF DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT TO STRENGTHEN VILLAGE COMMUNITY RESILIENCE**

##### **Background and context:**

Rural areas in DPRK that are heavily dependent on subsistence agriculture usually benefit from periods of rainfall occurring annually. However, rural communities would experience severe and at times devastating effects to their living and livelihoods when the rainfall amount are concentrated in during short-term periods and exceeds the capacity threshold of a community ecosystem. Community resilience will be further eroded if the necessary emergency relief, recovery and response interventions are not undertaken.

Similarly the lack of or below average rainfall amount, while perceived as less visually dramatic compared to floods, would also affect the rural population with equal or more serious/extensive effects. Hence, extreme weather events and seasonal variability can be key contributors to increased loss in livelihoods, and increased poverty and significant threat to human development in rural areas in DPRK.

The causes of flood, landslides and droughts in the country are not limited to weather and climate conditions. In most rural areas in DPRK, forest ecosystems have been converted into agricultural land in order to overcome food shortages and trees have been cut down as the primary source of household level energy.

##### **Results and Impact:**

The CBDRM Project aims to enhance the resilience of vulnerable communities to different types of natural hazards. The CBDRM Project seeks to achieve this objective by imparting skills and guiding the appropriate use of resources necessary for managing risks over time at village community (Ri) level. These will enable village communities (Ris) to minimize and reduce annual loss of lives, recurring losses to livelihood assets and build capacities to manage and sustain achievements in coping with disasters and in adapting to changing climate conditions.

The CBDRM Project has produced notable positive impacts within the village communities (Ris) as shown in Table 8:



**Table 8: The Impact of CBDRM Project Interventions on Rural Community Resilience**

	<b>Prior to UNDP CBDRM Project Interventions</b>	<b>Post UNDP CBDRM Project Interventions</b>
Public awareness and knowledge of natural disaster types and DRM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of knowledge in natural disaster types for different seasons such as typhoons, torrential rains, floods</li> <li>• Lack of understanding on causes of landslides and soil erosion on mountain slopes</li> <li>• No understanding or knowledge of village community’s current vulnerable/danger areas, needs and resources</li> <li>• Lack of information on local village community (Ri) disaster records and histories</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational materials on natural disaster types and emergency preparations/responses distributed to village community (Ri) households to increase public awareness and knowledge on disaster types and DRM</li> <li>• SLUGs received training on risk resilient livelihood and ecosystem development.</li> <li>• agro-forestry activities through provision of seeds and saplings, and management of tree nursery transplantation of fast-growing trees prevented soil erosion and landslides on mountain slopes</li> <li>• village communities (Ris) developed DRM Plans which identified the major disasters, risks and disaster mitigation and emergency response plans</li> <li>• Established Disaster Loss and Damage data cards to collect important information for taking informed decisions and come up with interventions in DRM and DRR</li> <li>• Annual emergency response drills and simulation exercises (active participation by village community people) increased community alertness and preparedness for natural disasters</li> </ul>
Responding to natural disasters at village communities (Ris)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to disseminate information as telecommunications were cut off</li> <li>• community used traditional methods such as gong, bell, signal flag, light, etc. to inform about disaster</li> <li>• village communities were not fully prepared and evacuated in a disorganized and chaotic manner</li> <li>• village people’s first reaction was panic and to just run to the nearest known higher ground areas which might result in overcrowding at one evacuation point</li> <li>• village communities were confused, and did not clearly understand what to do, how to respond and where to go during a natural disaster</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of PRNAs, DRMPs, hazard/risk maps and evacuation route maps</li> <li>• Formation of Village (Ri) Non-Standing Disaster Risk Management Committee to take charge of developing/ implementing DRM plans and measures in response to natural disasters at village communities</li> <li>• Selection and allocation of village community (Ri) evacuation centers/sites/points</li> <li>• During Typhoon Ling Ling in early September 2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ village communities (Ris) prepared and used the emergency response equipment such as life jackets, megaphones and emergency alarming bells for EW during the disaster in cooperation with the UNDP CBDRM Project</li> <li>➤ village community (Ri) people applied what they learnt during the emergency response drills/simulation exercises and knew how to go to their allocated evaluation centers/sites/points in an organized manner</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Disaster Risk Management planning by village community (Ri) officials/leaders and members



UNDP-delivered DRM/emergency response equipment for village communities (Ris)



Enhancing community preparedness through emergency response drills and simulation exercises



Development of DRM plans, risk maps, and hazard maps for village communities (Ris)



Calendar of natural disasters distributed to village community (Ri) households to increase public awareness



SAMPLE



SAMPLE

Development of village (Ri) evacuation route maps for 15 Ris

## 5. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Conclusions and Lessons Learned

#### **Conclusion #1: Significant external factors/challenges severely affected the project**

Significant external factors/challenges beyond the control of the UNDP DPRK CO were encountered throughout the entire CBDRM project implementation, and severely affected the timely delivery of structural interventions and eventual achievement of results for Output 1.2.

Table 9 below shows the timeline of how 6 significant external factors/challenges overlapped each other, hence the CBDRM Project Team would not be free of any constraints at any point of time between 2015 to 2019 to effectively and efficiently implement the project outputs to achieve the desired project outcome.

**Table 9: Timeline of External Factors/Challenges Faced by UNDP DPRK CO**

	2015				2016				2017				2018				2019			
	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4
Project Design delay				**																
Late recruitment of the CBDRM Project Team																				
6 rounds of UN sanction resolutions on DPRK (2016-2017), severely affecting international/local procurement					2270			2321		2356	2371 2375	2397								
Extended period of banking channel disruptions/closure due to UN Sanctions for international funds transfer to UNDP DPRK CO																				

\*\* CBDRM PRODOC signed in October 2015

In particular, the evaluation highlights below the 2 external factors/challenges as the main constraints.

1. 6 Rounds of UN Sanctions on DPRK (2016-2017); and
2. Extended Period of Banking Channel Disruption/Closure

The UN Security Council imposed two UN Sanctions (UN Resolutions #2270 and #2321) in 2016 and another four UN Sanctions (UN Resolutions #2356, #2371, #2375 and #2397) in 2017 were imposed on DPRK which included (among many measures) import, financial and economic restrictions. As a result, the UNDP DPRK CO and CBDRM Project Team were severely constrained and negatively impacted the CBDRM project's delivery as follow:

- The complicated, lengthy and increasingly difficult process to obtain clearance or exemptions for international procurement from UN Sanctions Committee 1718 which oversees the implementation of the UN Sanctions on DPRK.
- The recurred disruption/closure of the banking channel prevented funds transfer into DPRK for the UNDP DPRK CO to fully implement local activities and local procurement. This also led to the UNDP DPRK CO having to activate cash conservation mode and enforce stringent internal measures to sustain the office operations, which resulted in (1) restrictions for in-country/local procurement, and (2) increased complexity and time to implement the CBDRM project activities.

The evaluation noted that the CBDRM PRODOC did not include appropriate risk assessments which identified potential risks with impact and probability ratings. However, the CBDRM Project Team subsequently incorporated risk assessments in the Quarterly Progress Reports and risk logs in the Annual Project Progress Report. The evaluation reviewed that the risk analysis should have been included in the CBDRM PRODOC so that the CBDRM Project could have prepared corresponding counter-measures and management responses which were appropriate at that point of time and during the project implementation (2015 to 2019).

The evaluation also determined that the implementation of the CBDRM Project's counter-measures and management responses by the UNDP DPRK CO and CBDRM Project Team could not appropriately resolve the significant change of events caused by the UN Sanction measures and the extended banking channel disruption/closure over the project duration.

Lesson Learned:

- Delayed efforts to complete structural interventions severely disrupted county and village community Ri development plans/activities, resulting in potential economic loss and hardship to village communities (Ris).
- It is important to better manage village community (Ri) expectations to avoid/minimize potential economic loss and hardship to counties and village communities (Ris).
- Long-term scenario planning together with annual reviews for change of direction should form part of risk assessment and mitigations in special country context projects.

**Conclusion #2: The CBDRM model has potential for replication across DPRK but requires strong national ownership and commitment as the key to overcome any difficulties faced and achieve optimum results**

An important result demonstrated in the CBDRM Project was how the intended project outputs addressed country priorities and also fit within the county development priorities with new strategies and initiatives being planned for sustainable living and livelihoods. This was further strengthened with strong support and commitment from National and Local Counterparts.

The high level of national and local ownership ensured sustainability and positive environmental impact, despite the CBDRM Project encountering external challenges that severely constrained the project beneficiaries.

The CBDRM model has the potential to be replicated across DPRK in close partnership collaboration with National and Local Counterparts. To ensure the continuity and also strengthening of national ownership, future projects in the area of disaster risk management and reduction should also be accompanied by appropriate capacity building activities in PRNA and DRMP at local county and village levels. However, this replication must be complemented with timely implementation of structural interventions as part of disaster risk reduction and mitigation measures to benefit the end-users at the county and village community (Ri) level.

Lesson Learned:

- Strong national ownership combined with strong commitment/support and participation from CPCs and Ri village communities key to accelerate the CBDRM model and bear lasting results.
- Knowledge/operational transfer in PRNA and DRMP, including the knowledge/operational capabilities and capacities of the CBDRM Project National Consultants and Experts, should be carried out to extend the pool of national and local resources.

### **Conclusion #3: The UNDP CBDRM Project Team laid strong foundations of disaster risk management planning**

Despite the challenging circumstances, the CBDRM Project Team has done their best and laid strong foundations of PRNA and DRMP through the CBDRM Project outputs and activities. In addition, the completed tasks align closely with the DPRK NSDRR. The CBDRM Project Team was able to implement the project, especially the non-structural interventions, despite encountering the significant external factors and challenges that are beyond the control of the UNDP DPRK CO throughout the entire CBDRM Project by:

- displaying good project management abilities and effectively utilising appropriate project management tools to implement the CBDRM Project to the best of their abilities and resulted in:
  - community risk maps and disaster risk management plans including annual review of these plans, preparedness for response and early recovery in 15 communities in 2017.
  - annual review of Participatory Risk and Needs Assessment (PRNA) and Disaster Risk Management Planning (DRMP) in 15 village communities (Ris) during 2018 and 2019, where reports including DRM plans were finalised and translated into Korean which were subsequently handed over to the Ris.
  - PRNA and DRMP in 15 village communities (Ris) and also with Sloping Land User Groups (SLUGs) using a combination of DRM equipment, tools and techniques
  - training for 10,162 people (including 4,611 female), based on project reports, on coping strategies against a target of 450 through evacuation simulation, PRNA and DRM plan trainings across the 15 selected Ris.
  - procured resources and delivered supplies for community level preparedness measures for early warning and evacuation.
  - national workshops on discussing lessons learned, progress, challenges and opportunities for improving CBDRM practice.
  - promotion of south-south cooperation with other countries through organized study tours while implementing the CBDRM Project.
  - training materials on CBDRM functions to represent comprehensive guidelines and methodologies on CBDRM.
  - guidelines for local level EW systems and evacuation measure, protection of critical community assets focusing on local rainfall and weather parameters.
  - guidelines on local level preparedness and contingency planning process.
  - guidelines and technical training on disaster damage, loss and needs assessment and reporting.

However, improvements could still be further strengthened in the following areas:

1. communication of project results, information sharing and lessons learned among international agencies and organizations through a suitable communications platform.
2. field data collection to measure effectiveness and impact on completed project activities.
3. for improved financial accountability and transparency purposes as part of demonstrating the efficient use of funding on project output-based activities, future financial reporting processes and templates of UNDP DPRK projects should:
  - track and report consistent financial figures (budget and actual expenditure)
  - have consistent comparisons between budget and actual expenditure, as per project outputs, based on project CDRs, for submissions of all relevant project reports (including annual progress reports and submissions to PSC meetings)

### Lesson Learned:

- CBDRM is a multi-level and multi-sectoral effort. The communication of project results, sharing of information and lessons learned among international organizations/agencies would further strengthen and broaden efforts exponentially in emergency response, early warning, disaster management and planning, and appropriate disaster risk reduction and mitigation measures.
- it is important to conduct an independent impact evaluation study as a future project output/activity component to measure impact effectiveness, final end-line indicators and actual benefits gained.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

The evaluation proposes 6 recommendations for consideration and implementation whereby:

- 3 operational recommendations relate to how the UNDP DPRK CO could further improve the way it operates as an organization
- 3 recommendations relate to future directions by building on the successful pilot activities in the CBDRM Project. By doing so, this will further replicate and upscale with a significant focus on humanitarian-oriented interventions to overcome climate change conditions in the DPRK.

It is to be noted that the implementation of these recommendations would be dependent on the future of the UNDP DPRK CO structure operating in DPRK in view of the geo-political environment and the availability of an approved UNDP DPRK CPD.

### **5.2.1 Operational Recommendations**

#### R1: Strengthen financial reporting processes

For improved financial accountability and transparency purposes, UNDP DPRK project financial reporting processes and templates should track and report progress of consistent financial figures i.e. budget and actual expenditure for consistent comparisons between budget and actual expenditure, as per project outputs, based on project CDRs, for submissions of all relevant project reports (including annual project progress reports), to demonstrate the efficient use of funding on project output-based activities.

#### R2: Extensive review and update of UNDP DPRK CO policies and procedures

UNDP DPRK CO should ensure that suitable policies and procedures can be implemented to resolve future issues in the event of unforeseen circumstances and minimize reputational risks by:

- R2.1) working with UNDP Regional HQ to extensively review and update all operational, procurement and financial management policies and procedures to account for all that happened within the 2015-2019 period and appropriately mitigate any future constraints.
- R2.2) incorporating extensive long-term scenario planning processes with appropriate and specific risk assessments and counter-measures.
- R2.3) setting conditions and mechanisms to implement "Force Majeure" or early termination of projects if need to.
- R2.4) strengthening its relationship management processes with project beneficiaries such as continued field visits, as practical and as relevant as required during the project implementation period, to better manage stakeholder expectations. By doing so, this would avoid/minimize potential economic and productivity losses to counties/village communities (Ris).
- R2.5) minimizing and/or avoiding unequal distribution of delivered assets/items to avoid unhealthy comparisons between project beneficiaries and across any projects that have synergies.



R3: Should UNDP DPRK be authorized to proceed, all remaining project activities (specifically relating to the CBDRM Project's structural interventions) as part of disaster prevention/mitigation strengthening measures should be completed

To strengthen disaster mitigation/prevention measures at village community (Ri) level, UNDP DPRK CO, if authorized to proceed, should work closely with national and local DPRK counterparts to complete all remaining project activities:

- R3.1) complete all planned procurement of equipment/materials relating to structural interventions, while strictly adhering to relevant UNDP Policies and Procedures and UNDP DPRK Guidelines for Field Monitoring Visits to:
- monitor and report on the use of the assets and delivered items, after handover to project beneficiaries, at minimum during project implementation.
  - ensure successful delivery onsite and the use of the delivered items for their intended purpose to achieve the desired project results, particularly paying attention to monitoring the delivery of the structural interventions to ensure their intended purpose after the CBDRM Project closure.
- R3.2) conduct an independent impact evaluation study, as a future project output/activity component, to measure the impact effectiveness, final end-line indicators and actual benefits gained.

## **5.2.2 Recommendations in Relation to Proposed Future Directions**

R4: Nation-wide rollout/replication of the CBDRM Project in DPRK at village community (Ri) level

It is strongly recommended that UNDP DPRK CO should fully adopt the CBDRM Project and continue to upscale from its successful pilot CBDRM model for future nation-wide rollout/replication in DPRK. This should be done by working in close partnership with relevant DPRK national counterparts (SCEDM, MOLEP, CBS and SHMA) and local DPRK counties to implement at village community (Ri) level:

- R4.1) facilitate knowledge/operational transfer of the CBDRM Project with procedural, operational and hands-on training manuals, guidelines, SOPs, DRM plans and other related DRM equipment/materials.
- R4.2) implement suitable, cost-effective and timely structural interventions to strengthen disaster mitigation/prevention measures for identified disaster high-risk areas.
- R4.3) fully establish a fit-for-purpose Early Warning System at local village community (Ri) level to better inform emergency response/preparedness.
- R4.4) organize study tours, in other countries of similar context and/or culture to DPRK, for increased exposure to acquiring knowledge/application of best practices in DRM/DRR/EW Systems.

R5: Incorporate future UNDP DPRK CBDRM activities to align with/support the implementation of the DPRK National Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (NSDRR)

It is strongly recommended that future UNDP DPRK CBDRM activities should align with/support the implementation of the DPRK NSDRR. This would include working closely with SCEDM in its leading role to:

- R5.1) strengthen and integrate infrastructure, systems and processes for disaster risk reduction, early warning and emergency response purposes at county level.
- R5.2) develop fully-automated measurements at local village community (Ri) level for accurate forecasting of climatic hazards.
- R5.3) improve watershed management to reduce/eliminate disaster risk factors such as floods, landslides and soil erosion.
- R5.4) establish a fully-integrated fit-for-purpose national disaster management system, incorporating a standardized nation-wide village community (Ri) reporting on disaster loss and damage information, that complies with international standards such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

R6: Communication and sharing of CBDRM model and results with international organizations/agencies for enhanced synergies and learnings

It is strongly recommended that any future CBDRM-related projects should strengthen its communication/sharing platforms to engage in closer collaboration/synergies with international organizations/agencies on future CBDRM activities.



## **ANNEXES**

### **A.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **Final Evaluation of the “Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management” (CBDRM project)**

<b>Location</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Home based</li> <li>- DPRK: Pyongyang and CBDRM project areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Yonsan (3 Ris)</li> <li>✓ Singye (8 Ris) Counties, North Hwanghae Province;</li> <li>✓ Yangdok County (4 Ris), South Pyongan Province)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Application deadline</b>	14 October 2019
<b>Type of Contract</b>	Individual Contractor
<b>Post Level</b>	International Consultant
<b>Languages required:</b>	English
<b>Duration of Initial Contract:</b>	Total 25 working days (including 7 working days in DPRK)

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Briefly describe the project rationale / background and the objectives of the project**

#### **About the project:**

The occurrences of extreme weather events and seasonal variability are one of the key contributors to loss in livelihoods, increase in poverty and significant threat to human development in rural areas in Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK). The causes of flood, landslides and droughts in the country are not limited to weather and climate conditions. In most of the rural areas, forest ecosystems have been converted into agricultural land in order to overcome food shortages and trees have been cut down as the primary source of household level energy. The destruction of DPRK’s forests contributed significantly to serious damage when impacted by natural hazards, especially, flooding, and landslides since deforestation weakens nature's buffering ability to store water. Currently, there is a large gap in capacities at all levels to cope with the impact of disasters and to improve communities’ responsiveness and resilience. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) noted recent improvements in disaster preparedness and increased attention at national level to address the underlying factors that contribute to risks, against the backdrop of development priorities that focus on environmental protection and water conservation. CBDRM project will help local level communities acquire knowledge of successful practices in Community-based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) processes, timely and appropriate risk information and access to early warning, develop coping skills as well as access resources and services for disaster risk reduction actions that offer

development benefits in near term as well as reductions in vulnerability over the long term.

*The project’s objective* is to enhance vulnerable communities’ resilience to natural hazards. This will be achieved through CBDRM approaches, the project aims to support social resilience, whereby people can identify and anticipate risks, plan and act collectively, and can marshal their individual capabilities to overcome threats and shocks. The effects of disasters when they occur can further be lessened through preparedness and recovery efforts that can also leave communities more resilient. Such resilience is not only critical to contribute towards greater progress in human development, but also to ensure sustainable progress over time.

*UNDP’s strategy* for community-based disaster risk management is to focus its efforts at the local (Ri) level. The CBDRM approaches will promote and support actions initially in the target areas, that range from incremental steps to the introduction of entirely new community and household-level practices that are important for reducing risks from recurring climate extremes and future climate scenarios. It is intended to enhance local capacities so that community members, including women and youth, are key important stakeholders in risk reduction and recovery.

#### *Key Outputs:*

- Output 1: Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.
- Output 2: Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) level. Further, the project will strengthen selected communities’ capacities for participatory hazard mapping and disaster reduction.

#### **Management structure and stakeholders for the project:**

Adopting a direct implementation modality (DIM), the project has its dedicated management team based in the UNDP CO. An International Project Manager responsible for the daily management of the project with assistance from national project staff and consultant was recruited.

A Project Steering Committee was formed for guiding the project direction and addressing challenges, cochaired by the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative and the National Coordinator from the DPRK National Coordinating Committee (NCC) for UNDP, with participation of representatives from the Line Ministries and other institutions as needed at the central level.

#### **Synergy with other UNDP project**

The CBDRM project has purposefully selected some pilot areas in common with UNDP’s another ongoing project “Sustainable Energy Solution for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK” (SES), given the inter-connections between disaster management and energy access, through integrated responses to leverage synergies of both projects for a magnified development result.

## **EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND SAMPLE QUESTIONS**

#### **Purpose and scope of evaluation:**

The project conducted a Mid-Term-Review in 2018 to assess its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and recommend specific measure for further improvement of project implementation including solutions for overcoming the challenges.

The project document also requires a “Terminal Evaluation, to be conducted by an independent third

*party, will be initiated at the end of the Project and involve consultation with the Project stakeholders at the national and local levels". It further outlines that the "Terminal Evaluation will detail the achievements, outcomes & impacts of the project compared to baseline, the issues faced, and lessons learned during the project implementation and will provide recommendations for future actions".*

Therefore, this Terms of Reference (ToR) outlines the conduct of the Final Evaluation of the CBDRM project. The international consultant to be recruited will need to review the entire duration of project implementation (October 2015 to December 2019), focusing on project results and experiences as well as key challenges met, lessons learnt, and areas for improvement, through the lenses of relevance, efficiency, national ownership, effectiveness and sustainability. The consultant will also take into consideration issues of gender, human rights and leaving no one behind. This will lead to recommendations of areas and methods of possible future interventions for the DPRK.

#### **Evaluation questions:**

The mainstream definitions of the OECD-DAC criteria are neutral in terms of human rights and gender dimensions which need to be added into the evaluation criteria chosen (link [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](#))

- ***Relevance:***

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the Theory of Change for the relevant CPD outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

- ***Effectiveness:***

- To what extent did the project contribute to the CPD outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?

- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
- To what extent is project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?
- **Efficiency:**
  - To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results?
  - To what extent has UNDP's project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
  - To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
  - To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
  - To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
  - To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?
- **Sustainability:**
  - Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
  - To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
  - Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?
  - Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
  - To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
  - What is the risk that the level of stakeholder's ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
  - To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?
  - To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
  - To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
  - To what extent do UNDP interventions have well designed and well-planned exit strategies?
  - What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

**Evaluation crosscutting issues sample questions:**

- **Human rights:**
  - To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP DPRK's work in contributing to

enhance fulfillment of people's economic and social right?

- **Gender equity:**
  - To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
  - Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
  - To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
- **Synergy**
  - To what extent the synergies of CBDRM and SES projects have been addressed contributing to a magnified development results

## DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### Expected Outputs and Deliverables

#### **Methodology:**

The evaluation will be guided by the updated UNDP evaluation policy building on its global practices (Programme and Project Operating Procedures). Following this TOR by the UNDP DPRK Country Office, the international consultant should,

#### *Before the field mission to DPRK*

- Conduct an extensive project related document review, based on which prepare a draft Inception Report with detailed evaluation methodology proposed such as Key Informant Interviews (KII), Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and other effective ways as appropriate to capture perceptions and evidence from both the key stakeholders at central level and the beneficiaries at the community level in the project areas, utilizing quantitative and qualitative mixed-methods.
- Finalize the Inception Report integrating comments and suggestions from UNDP and national counterparts.

#### *During the field mission in DPRK*

- Conduct field assessment applying the methodologies as per the Inception Report.
- Organize a validation / debriefing meeting with relevant key government counterparts and UNDP, to test the assumptions, findings, and recommendations, covering achievement and experiences, challenges and lessons, future improvement in possible continuation and / or replication.

#### *After the field mission in DPRK*

- Utilize high quality info-graphics and other means in communicating the data and findings in the final report.
- Illustrate the extent to which the design and implementation of the project incorporate a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach.
- Adopt an evidence-based approach underpinned by observations and especially data collected in findings provided, conclusions drawn, and recommendations made.

#### Methodologies may include some or all of the following:

- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- Review of all relevant documentation including:
  - UN Strategic Framework DPRK 2011-2016
  - UN Strategic Framework DPRK 2017-2021
  - UNDP Country Programme Document DPRK 2011-2015

- UNDP DPRK quarterly programme monitoring and oversight reports
- Project Document including theory of change and results framework
- Annual Work Plans
- Quarterly and Annual Reports
- Project Steering Committee meeting minutes
- Field monitoring and visit reports
- MTR report 2018
- UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- Technical/Financial Monitoring Reports
- Other reports and materials produced by the project
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members, and implementing partners:
  - Development of questionnaires assessing relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability through interviewing different stakeholders.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- Participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the evaluation managers, relevant stakeholders and direct beneficiaries.
- Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
  - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the consultant will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

#### Deliverables:

- *Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages)*: the inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP CO, desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to field mission in DPRK.
- *Evaluation debriefings*: before leaving DPRK, UNDP will hold a preliminary debrief and findings with the consultant.

- *Evaluation matrix<sup>1</sup>*:

Sample Evaluation matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Su b- Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

<sup>1</sup> The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

- *Draft evaluation report* (within an agreed length)<sup>2</sup>: UNDP CO will review the draft evaluation report, coordinate inputs from relevant stakeholders and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the consultant within two weeks.
- *Final Evaluation Report with a stand-alone Executive Summary*: final editing to be completed within two weeks by the consultant with incorporation of comments received. For the purpose of *evaluation report audit trail*, changes by the consultant in response to the draft report should be retained by the consultant to show how s/he has addressed comments.

### **Evaluation ethics**

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'<sup>3</sup>.

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The Consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on its data. The Consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

The Consultant is expected to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.

### **Institutional Arrangement**

- UNDP ensures the participation of key stakeholders and beneficiaries through meetings, discussions and sharing of evaluation report.
- UNDP Evaluation Commissioner/Owner (UNDP Resident Representative a.i / UNDP Deputy Resident Representative a.i) as advisory body will provide a sounding board for the international consultant while protecting his/her independence and ensure UNDP's ownership of the report's findings and recommendations.
- UNDP Evaluation Manager (M&ES) and Programme Manager (Programme Analyst) will support the conduct of the evaluation, including provision of feedback to the inception report, participation in the validation meeting, provision and coordination for comments on the draft report, distribution of the final report, and initiation of the recommendations' implementation.
- UNDP Programme Manager will be responsible for facilitating the provision of the existing data / documents to the international consultant and field data collection in DPRK, including preparation of field assessment schedules and logistic coordination.
- The international consultant will work independently.
- Detailed arrangements including service days and schedule of payments will be defined in UNDP's contract with the recruited Individual Consultant.
- UNDP Evaluation Commissioner/Owner will approve the Final Evaluation Report.

### **Duration of the Work**

The estimated duration of the assignment is 25 working days during December 2019. The whole

<sup>2</sup> 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested

<sup>3</sup> UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008: <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>

process will be completed with the final report submitted and approved by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019.

The tentative key stages of evaluation include:

- Phase 1 – Consultant selection: by 18 October 2019.
- Phase 2 - Desk review and inception report: during November 2019 (5 consultancy/working days)
- Phase 3 - Data collection/field mission in DPRK: 3 – 14 December 2019 (7 consultancy/working days)
- Phase 4 - Draft and finalization of report (incl. an executive summary): final report by 31 December 2019 (13 consultancy/working days)

#### **Duty Station**

- During mission in the DPRK, the Consultant will be based in Pyongyang, but with at least 2-3 days of field trips to the selected sites in the project areas (Yonsan and Singye Counties, North Hwanghae Province and Yangdok County, South Pyongan Province).

## **COMPETENCIES**

- Strong facilitation, communication, presentation skills.
- Strong analytical abilities and reporting skills, with openness to change responding to feedbacks received.
- Ability to plan, organize and implement work, including under pressure and tight deadlines.
- Proficiency in the use of IT facilities including office applications and also networks in conducting research.
- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards.
- Displays cultural, gender, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

## **REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

#### **Educational Qualifications:**

- At least master's degree in economics, development or other related fields

#### **Experience**

- At least 8 years of demonstrable experience in development project assessment/evaluation
- Experience in dealing with government agencies at different levels, international organizations, and community people
- Understanding of socialist planned economy is a great asset
- Prior work experience with international organizations in DPRK or other countries in Asia Pacific region is desirable

#### **Language requirements**

- Excellent communication, presentation and writing skills in English

#### **Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**



The candidates who feel interested in the assignment must send a financial proposal at Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be itemized covering all costs required to perform the tasks identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance and any other applicable cost to be incurred. The contract price will be output-based regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be made upon completion of the deliverables/outputs as per below percentages:

- *Deliverables - phase 1: 40% of total contract amount*
  - Desk Review, Inception Report and Evaluation matrix produced, submitted to and cleared by UNDP DPRK Country Office
  - Evaluation debriefing conducted with relevant stakeholders before leaving DPR Korea
- *Deliverables - phase 2: 60% of total contract amount*
  - Draft Evaluation Report submitted to UNDP for review and comments and acknowledged by UNDP DPRK CO
  - Final Evaluation Report incl. Executive summary incorporating comments received and approved by UNDP DPRK CO

#### **Evaluation Method and Criteria**

The candidates will be evaluated based on the *cumulative analysis* methodology.

The award of the contract shall be made to the candidate whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%) and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

#### **Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 70 points):**

- Criteria 1: Education – Max 10 points (10 pts – PhD degree; 5 pts – Master’s degree)
- Criteria 2: Relevant professional experience - Max 20 Points (20 pts – above 12 years; 15 pts – 10 to 12 years; 10 pts – 8 to 10 years);
- Criteria 3: Language skills – Max 5 points (5pts - native English speaker)
- Criteria 4: Knowledge and experience about DPRK – Max 10 points (10 pts - work or consultancy experience in DPRK; 5pts – experience in other Asia Pacific countries)
- Criteria 5: Proposed methodology to undertake the assignment – Max 25 Points (25 pts – fully understand the task, logical and reachable; 15 pts - get sense of the task, basically meet the requirement; 5 pts – rough and unclear)

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

#### **Documentation required**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into one (1) single PDF document as follows:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided in Annex II.

- Personal CV or [P11](#), indicating 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.
- Technical proposal, including a) a brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment; and b) a methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- Financial proposal, as per template provided in Annex II. Incomplete proposals may not be considered.

#### **Annexes**

- Annex I - [Individual IC General Terms and Conditions](#)
- Annex II - [Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual IC, including Financial Proposal Template](#)

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to [operations.dprk@undp.org](mailto:operations.dprk@undp.org)

## A.2 ITINERARY

Date	Time	Place	Schedule	Evaluation focus on sites
Nov. 22 <sup>nd</sup> 2019 (Friday)	17:00	Pyongyang Airport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pickup</li> <li>Arrival at UNDP CO</li> </ul>	
	18:30	UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security briefing</li> <li>Email checking</li> </ul>	
	19:00	Munsu Guest House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check-in Munsu Guest House</li> </ul>	
Nov. 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2019 (Saturday)		UNDP	Prepare for CBDRM/SES project	
Nov. 24 <sup>th</sup> 2019 (Sunday)		UNDP	Prepare for CBDRM/SES project	
Nov. 25 <sup>th</sup> 2019 (Monday)	09:15-10:15	UNDP	<b>CBDRM Evaluation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briefing with UNDP DPRK CO Senior Management</li> </ul>	Co-chair DRR SWG w/UNDP
	10:20-12:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with relevant program and project team members (questions and answers, planning and methodologies, etc.)</li> </ul>	
	14:30-16:00	Taedonggang Diplomatic Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with NCC and national-level stakeholders i.e. line ministries (SCEDM, MOLEP, SHMA, CBS) &amp; National Expert Group under CBDRM. A MEPI focal point under SES attends in the meeting to explain about synergic effect with SES</li> </ul>	
	16:00-17:30	IFRC Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with Mohamed Babiker/IFRC on CBDRM</li> </ul>	
	17:30-18:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summing up of the meeting &amp; Email checking</li> </ul>	
Nov. 26 <sup>th</sup> 2019 (Tuesday)	08:00-10:30	Pyongyang/Yonsan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure UNDP CO and arrive in Taeryong Ri, Yonsan County (CBDRM project)</li> </ul>	Evaluation of SES & CBDRM synergies
	10:30-13:00	Yonsan County, North Hwanghae Province	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with CPC officials</li> <li>Visit to project sites and interview with beneficiaries under CBDRM</li> </ul>	CBDRM (early warning, evacuation, etc.)
	13:00-14:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working Lunch</li> </ul>	
	14:00-15:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure to Taegun Ri, Yonsan County (CBDRM project)</li> <li>Visit to project sites and interview with beneficiaries under CBDRM</li> </ul>	
	15:00-17:00			
	17:00-18:30	Yonsan/Pyongyang	Departure to and arrival in Pyongyang	

Date	Time	Place	Schedule	Evaluation focus on sites
Nov. 27 <sup>th</sup> 2019 (Wednesday)	08:00-10:30	Pyongyang/ Singye	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure from UNDP CO and arrival in Sajong Ri, Singye County (CBDRM project)</li> </ul>	CBDRM (tree nursery, sloping land management, agro-forestry, etc.)
	10:30-13:00	Singye County, North Hwanghae Province	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with CPC officials, visit to project sites and interview with beneficiaries</li> </ul>	
	13:00-14:30		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working Lunch</li> </ul>	Evaluation of SES & CBDRM synergies
	14:30-15:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure to Sinhung Ri, Singye County (CBDRM project)</li> </ul>	
	15:00-17:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visit to project sites and interview with beneficiaries</li> </ul>	
	17:00-18:30	Singye/Pyongyang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure from Sinhung Ri and arrival in Pyongyang</li> </ul>	
Nov. 28 <sup>th</sup> 2019 (Thursday)	08:00-11:30	Pyongyang/ Yangdok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure to Sagi Ri, Yangdok County (CBDRM project)</li> </ul>	Evaluation of SES & CBDRM synergies
	11:30-13:00	Yangdok County, South Pyongan Province	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting with CPC officials, visit to project sites and interview with beneficiaries</li> </ul>	Evaluation of SES & CBDRM synergies
	13:00-14:00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working lunch</li> </ul>	
	14:00-14:15		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure to Tongdong-ri (CBDRM project)</li> </ul>	
	14:15-15:30		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visit to project sites and interview with beneficiaries</li> </ul>	
	15:30-18:00	Yangdok/Pyongyang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departure to and arrival in Pyongyang</li> </ul>	
Nov. 29 <sup>th</sup> 2019 (Friday)	Morning	UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare for debriefing with UNDP CO Senior management on CBDRM project</li> </ul>	FAO/UNSF outcome 3
	13:30-15:00	FAO Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Mr Bir Mandal/FAO on SES/CBDRM</li> </ul>	
	16:00-17:30	UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Mr Sathya/UNFPA on CBDRM</li> </ul>	UNFPA/UNSF outcome 3
Nov. 30 <sup>th</sup> 2019 (Saturday)		UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare for debriefing on CBDRM project</li> </ul>	
Dec. 1 <sup>st</sup> 2019 (Sunday)		UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare for debriefing on CBDRM project</li> </ul>	
Dec. 2 <sup>nd</sup> 2019 (Monday)	09:15-10:00	UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Debriefing UNDP management and project team on CBDRM</li> </ul>	UNICEF/UNSF outcome 3: supported primary data on energy – both
	10:30-12:30	Taedonggang Diplomatic Club	<b>CBDRM:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder debriefing meeting (NCC, representatives from SCEDM, MOLEP, SHMA, CBS) to share / validate findings, conclusions, recommendations under CBDRM</li> </ul>	

### **A.3 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

#### **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP DPRK):**

- Mr. Vineet Bhatia, Former Resident Representative a.i., UNDP DPRK
- Mr. Yu Hua, Deputy Resident Representative a.i., UNDP DPRK
- Mr. Kiye Mwakawago, Operations Manager, UNDP DPRK
- Dr. Butchaiah Gadde, Project Manager – CBDRM Project, UNDP DPRK
- Mr. Ri Hak Chol, National Training Coordinator – CBDRM Project, UNDP DPRK
- Ms. Jo Gi Hyang, Project Administrative Assistant – CBDRM Project, UNDP DPRK
- Ms. Le Le Lan, M&E Specialist, UNDP DPRK
- Mr. Yu Kwang Song, M&E Programme Analyst, UNDP DPRK

#### **United Nations (UN DPRK):**

- Mr. Frode Mauring, Resident Coordinator a.i., UN DPRK

#### **United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA DPRK):**

- Mr. Sathyanarayana Kundur, Technical Specialist (Population and Development)/Representative-in-Charge, UNFPA DPRK

#### **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO DPRK):**

- Mr. Bir Chandra Mandal, Deputy Representative, FAO DPRK

#### **United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF DPRK):**

- Ms. Odile Bulten, Deputy Resident Representative, UNICEF DPRK
- Mr. Silas Rapold, M&E Specialist, UNICEF DPRK
- Mr. Kencho Namgyal, WASH Specialist, UNICEF DPRK

#### **Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC DPRK):**

- Mr. Matthias Meier, Director of Cooperation, SDC DPRK

#### **International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC DPRK):**

- Mr. Mohamed Babiker, Country Head, IFRC DPRK

#### **European Union Programme Support Unit 3 (EUPS Unit 3):**

- Mr. Saroj Dash, Country Director, IFRC DPRK

#### **National Counterparts:**

- Mr. Hong Chang Bom, Coordinator - National Coordinating Committee (NCC) for UNDP, DPRK
- Mr. Kim Song Il, Officer, Department of External Affairs, State Committee of Emergency Disaster Management (SCEDM), DPRK
- Mr. Song Yong Chol, Director, Department of External Cooperation, State Hydro-Meteorological Administration (SHMA), DPRK
- Ms. Jim Jong Ok, Senior Officer, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Land and Environment Protection (MOLEP), DPRK
- Ms. Kim Hui Yong, National Consultant (DLDD) – CBDRM Project
- Mr. Paek Yong Nam, Senior Officer, Bureau of External Affairs, Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), DPRK

**Local Counterparts:**

Taeryong-Ri, Yonsan County, North Hwanghae Province

- Mr. Kim Song Il, Vice-Chairman, Yonsan CPC
- Ms. Ho Sun Ok, Senior Statistics Officer, Yonsan CPC
- Ms. Hwang Myong Hui, Chairwoman, Taeryong-Ri Farm Management Board
- Mr. Ri Ok Chol, Chief of SLUG Team (beneficiary)
- Ms. Ri Ok Hwa, Chief of Neighbourhood Unit No. 3 (beneficiary)

Taegun-Ri, Yonsan County, North Hwanghae Province

- Mr. Ri Kyong Chol, Chairman, Taegun-Ri Farm Management Board
- Mr. An Sung Won, Electrical Engineer, Taegun-Ri Farm Management Board
- Ms. Kim Son Suk, Farmer, Work Team No.1 (beneficiary)
- Ms. Hwang Son Hwa, Farmer, Work Team No. 3 (beneficiary)
- Ms. Song Myong Ae, Member of SLUG Team (beneficiary)
- Mr. Kim Jong Chol, National Expert - CBDRM Project

Sajong-Ri, Singye County, North Hwanghae Province

- Mr. Kwak Chol Su, Vice-Chairman, Singye CPC
- Mr. Kwon Chol Ju, Section Chief - DRM, Singye CPC
- Mr. Kim Kyong Sop, Section Officer - Culture, Singye CPC
- Ms. Paek Chang Hwa, Chairwoman, Sajong-Ri Farm Management Board
- Mr. Sok Jong Su, Farmer, Livestock Work Team (beneficiary)
- Mr. Ri Myong Chol, Chief of SLUG Team (beneficiary)

Sinhung-Ri, Singye County, North Hwanghae Province

- Mr. Son Jin Song, Section Officer - Statistics, Singye CPC
- Mr. Ri Chung Hyok, Chairperson, Sajong-Ri Farm Management Board
- Ms. Ri Jong Sil, Farmer, Work Team No. 2 (beneficiary)

Sagi-Ri, Yangdok County, South Pyongan Province

- Mr. Kim Hyok Chol, Section Chief - Culture, Yangdok CPC
- Mr. Ri Un Song, Section Officer - DRM, Yangdok CPC
- Mr. Son Yong Su, Section Officer - Logistics, Yangdok CPC
- Ms. Hong Jong Sil, Chairwoman, Sagi-ri Farm Management Board
- Mr. Chae Kyong Son, Chief of Work Team No. 6 (beneficiary)
- Ms. Ham Sun Hui, Member of SLUG Team (beneficiary)

## **A.4 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

- UN Strategic Framework DPRK 2011-2016
- UN Strategic Framework DPRK 2017-2021
- UNDP Country Programme Document DPRK 2011-2015
- CBDRM Project Document
- UNDP DPRK quarterly programme monitoring and oversight reports
- CBDRM Annual Work Plans
- CBDRM Project Quarterly/Annual Progress Reports
- CBDRM Project Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
- CBDRM Field Monitoring and Visit Reports
- CBDRM MTR Report 2018
- CBDRM Project Capacity Building/Knowledge Dissemination Training Plans and Reports
- CBDRM Project internal reports/documents
- UNDP DPRK Annual Monitoring Reports
- UNDP DPRK CO Internal Control Framework
- UNDP DPRK CO Guidelines for Field Monitoring Visits
- UNDP Technical Assistance/Mission Reports

## A.5 QUESTIONNAIRES USED DURING THE FIELD MISSION IN DPRK (22 NOVEMBER TO 2 DECEMBER 2019)

Field Visit to Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province)	
Category	Sample Questions
Introduction/ Background	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is your background and how are you involved in this CBDRM Project?</li> <li>2. Before this CBDRM project began: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how would the community know if there was going to be flood, landslide or drought or any other natural hazard/disaster coming? Were there any early warning systems in place?</li> <li>• How would the community prepare themselves and communicate/make announcements before and during any natural hazards/disasters?</li> <li>• How long did it take the community to recover and restore back to pre-natural hazard and disaster conditions?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Relevance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is your understanding on UNDP and this CBDRM Project in the beginning?</li> <li>2. Were you involved in contributing feedback, comments, ideas and suggestions during the project design stage in the middle of 2014?</li> <li>3. What were your expectations then when the CBDRM Project was first introduced to you?</li> <li>4. Was the explanation of the CBDRM project clear to you and was the CBDRM Project relevant to your needs and priorities of community-based disaster risk management?</li> </ol>
Effectiveness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the CBDRM Project contribute to your county development plan and workplan for community-based disaster risk management?</li> <li>2. Are you and the community able to effectively respond better to current and future natural hazards/disasters? If so, how?</li> <li>3. What are the successes, strengths or achievements of this CBDRM Project?</li> <li>4. What are the weaknesses and gaps of this CBDRM Project? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?</li> </ol>
Efficiency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the CBDRM project improve the use of your resources (money, processing/work time, food, travelling time etc.)? If so, how?</li> <li>2. Have project activities and materials/procured equipment been delivered in a timely manner?</li> <li>3. How would you assess the quality of the delivered training workshops, programmes, materials?</li> <li>4. How would you assess the quality of the CGI sheets and other equipment procured?</li> </ol>
Impact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did you benefit from the capacity building and training workshops? If so, how?</li> <li>2. Did you benefit from the study tours? If so, how?</li> <li>3. Has the CBDRM Project improved community readiness, responsiveness and recovery from natural disasters (flooding, landslides and/or droughts)? If so, how?</li> <li>4. Was the training provided to improve agriculture and forestry livelihoods to reduce disaster risk helpful? If so, how?</li> <li>5. Was the early warning system beneficial and met the community needs? If so, how?</li> </ol>

<b>Field Visit to Yonsan and Singye Counties (North Hwanghae Province) and Yangdok County (South Pyongan Province)</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Sample Questions</b>
Sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can this CBDRM training materials and disaster risk management guidelines/protocols/procedures be replicated to other counties? Would you recommend this to other counties?</li> <li>2. Would you require further technical support or other form of support in relation to community-based disaster risk management?</li> <li>3. Were you given simulation exercises on disaster management? If so, how often did this occur? Were the simulation exercises useful?</li> <li>4. Were the training materials, guidelines, protocols and procedural guidelines/manuals for community-based disaster risk management useful? Were they shared with other counties?</li> <li>5. What would you like to see for future improvements for UNDP or future UNDP projects?</li> <li>6. Do local CPCs have institutional capacities, systems and processes to implement community-based disaster risk management measures and to implement early warning systems to alert local communities of natural hazards/disasters?</li> </ol>
Synergy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent are the inter-linkages between project outputs and related activities?</li> <li>2. To what extent do any partnerships/inter-linkages bring together both CBDRM and SES Projects to result in strengthened outcomes/outputs</li> <li>3. Did the CBDRM Project collaborate and cooperate with other international agency/organization project efforts which resulted in higher achieving results?</li> <li>4. Does the DPRK CBDRM Framework developed by the DPRK Government (with UNDP DPRK assistance) and the Community-Based Early Warning Protocol developed by SHMA enable better synergies with CPCs and relevant international organization stakeholders involved in disaster risk management?</li> </ol>
UNDP Project Team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How do you find the quality of services/support by UNDP?</li> <li>2. How do you find the quality of communications and working relationship with UNDP?</li> <li>3. Is communication with UNDP regular and effective?</li> <li>4. Are you regulated updated on progress of the UNDP project?</li> </ol>



<b><u>Interview with International Organizations and Agencies</u></b>	
<b><u>Category</u></b>	<b><u>Sample Questions</u></b>
Relevance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent was the project in line with DPRK national priorities?</li> <li>2. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?</li> <li>3. Did the CBDRM Project communicate its results well with all stakeholders and across sectors?</li> <li>4. Before this CBDRM project began: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how would the community know if there was going to be flood, landslide or drought or any other natural hazard/disaster coming? Were there any early warning systems in place?</li> <li>• How would the community prepare themselves and communicate/make announcements before and during any natural hazards/disasters?</li> <li>• How long did it take the community to recover and restore back to pre-natural hazard and disaster conditions?</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Is the DPRK CBDRM Framework developed by the DPRK Government (with UNDP DPRK assistance) and the Community-Based Early Warning Protocol developed by SHMA relevant to DPRK national priorities on disaster risk management?</li> </ol>
Effectiveness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent did the CBDRM Project contribute to DPRK national priorities?</li> <li>2. To what extent were the project outputs achieved? What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the desired project outputs?</li> <li>3. What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?</li> <li>4. In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?</li> <li>5. In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?</li> <li>6. What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?</li> <li>7. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the local community needs and changing national/local community priorities?</li> </ol>
Efficiency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent has UNDP's project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?</li> <li>2. To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?</li> <li>3. To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?</li> </ol>

<b><u>Interview with International Organizations and Agencies</u></b>	
<b><u>Category</u></b>	<b><u>Sample Questions</u></b>
Sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?</li> <li>2. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?</li> <li>3. Are there any social or political risks, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and project benefits?</li> <li>4. Taking into account political, financial, technical and environmental factors, to what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the CBDRM project results?</li> <li>5. To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?</li> <li>6. Does the CBDRM Project have well designed and well-planned exit strategies? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability if any? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the level of national/local counterpart ownership sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained after project closure?</li> <li>• Do MOLEP, SHMA and SCEDM have institutional capacities, systems and processes to provide accurate forecasting/warning information (such as weather, climate, hydrology, water resource etc.), and formulate policies and strategies relating to disaster management and coordination?</li> <li>• Do local CPCs have institutional capacities, systems and processes to implement community-based disaster risk management measures and to implement early warning systems to alert local communities of natural hazards/disasters?</li> <li>• Can the DPRK CBDRM Framework developed by the DPRK Government (with UNDP DPRK assistance) and the Community-Based Early Warning Protocol developed by SHMA continue to be implemented and updated even after project closure?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Basic Human Needs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on the principles of Human Rights, to what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and vulnerable groups benefitted from UNDP DPRK's work in contributing to enhance fulfilment of people's economic and social needs?</li> </ol>
Gender Equality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?</li> <li>2. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?</li> </ol>
Synergy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the synergies and coordination by reinforcing a common strategy among project partners resulted in higher achieving results?</li> <li>2. Did the CBDRM Project collaborate and cooperate with other international agency/organization project efforts which resulted in higher achieving results?</li> <li>3. Does the DPRK CBDRM Framework developed by the DPRK Government (with UNDP DPRK assistance) and the Community-Based Early Warning Protocol developed by SHMA enable better synergies with international and national stakeholders involved in disaster risk management in DPRK?</li> </ol>

<b><u>Interview with UNDP DPRK Country Office and DPRK National Counterparts</u></b>	
<b><u>Category</u></b>	<b><u>Sample Questions</u></b>
Relevance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent was the project in line with DPRK national priorities on disaster risk management?</li> <li>2. To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?</li> <li>3. To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?</li> <li>4. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?</li> <li>5. Before this CBDRM project began: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how would the community know if there was going to be flood, landslide or drought or any other natural hazard/disaster coming? Were there any early warning systems in place?</li> <li>• How would the community prepare themselves and communicate/make announcements before and during any natural hazards/disasters?</li> <li>• How long did it take the community to recover and restore back to pre-natural hazard and disaster conditions?</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. Are the DPRK Government and project beneficiaries appropriately and consistently consulted during the project design stage and during the project implementation phase?</li> <li>7. Did the CBDRM Project communicate its results well with all stakeholders and across sectors?</li> <li>8. Is the DPRK CBDRM Framework developed by the DPRK Government (with UNDP DPRK assistance) and the Community-Based Early Warning Protocol developed by SHMA relevant to DPRK national priorities on disaster risk management?</li> </ol>
Effectiveness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent did the CBDRM Project contribute to the CPD outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan and DPRK national priorities?</li> <li>2. To what extent were the project outputs achieved? What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the desired project outputs?</li> <li>3. What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?</li> <li>4. In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?</li> <li>5. In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?</li> <li>6. What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?</li> <li>7. Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?</li> <li>8. To what extent have national and local counterpart stakeholders been involved in participating in project design and project implementation? Is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?</li> <li>9. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the local community needs and changing national/local community priorities?</li> </ol>
Efficiency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the PRODOC efficient in generating the expected results?</li> <li>2. To what extent has UNDP's project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?</li> <li>3. To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?</li> <li>4. To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?</li> <li>5. To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?</li> <li>6. To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP at programme and project level ensure effective and efficient project management?</li> </ol>

<b><u>Interview with UNDP DPRK Country Office and DPRK National Counterparts</u></b>	
<b><u>Category</u></b>	<b><u>Sample Questions</u></b>
Sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?</li> <li>To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?</li> <li>Are there any social or political risks, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and project benefits?</li> <li>Taking into account political, financial, technical and environmental factors, to what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the CBDRM project results?</li> <li>Would MOLEP, SHMA and SCEDM require further technical support or other form of support in relation to community-based disaster risk management?</li> <li>To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?</li> <li>Does the CBDRM Project have well designed and well-planned exit strategies? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability if any? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the level of national/local counterpart ownership sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained after project closure?</li> <li>Do MOLEP, SHMA and SCEDM have institutional capacities, systems and processes to provide accurate forecasting/warning information (such as weather, climate, hydrology, water resource etc.), and formulate policies and strategies relating to disaster management and coordination?</li> <li>Do local CPCs have institutional capacities, systems and processes to implement community-based disaster risk management measures and to implement early warning systems to alert local communities of natural hazards/disasters?</li> <li>Can the DPRK CBDRM Framework developed by the DPRK Government (with UNDP DPRK assistance) and the Community-Based Early Warning Protocol developed by SHMA continue to be implemented and updated even after project closure?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Basic Human Needs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the principles of Human Rights, to what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and vulnerable groups benefitted from UNDP DPRK's work in contributing to enhance fulfilment of people's economic and social needs?</li> <li>Did the CBDRM Project monitor and capture the actual benefits (such as conducting an impact/benefits study on project beneficiaries) that can demonstrate the enhancing fulfilment of people's economic and social needs?</li> </ol>
Gender Equality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?</li> <li>To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?</li> <li>Did the CBDRM Project monitor and capture the actual benefits (such as conducting an impact/benefits study on project beneficiaries) that can demonstrate gender equality?</li> </ol>
Synergy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent are the inter-linkages between project outputs and related activities?</li> <li>To what extent do any partnerships/inter-linkages bring together both CBDRM and SES Projects to result in strengthened outcomes/outputs</li> <li>Did the synergies and coordination by reinforcing a common strategy among project partners resulted in higher achieving results?</li> <li>Did the CBDRM Project collaborate and cooperate with other international agency/organization project efforts which resulted in higher achieving results?</li> <li>Does the DPRK CBDRM Framework developed by the DPRK Government (with UNDP DPRK assistance) and the Community-Based Early Warning Protocol developed by SHMA enable better synergies with international organization and national stakeholders involved in disaster risk management in DPRK?</li> </ol>
UNDP Project Team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do you find the quality of services/support by UNDP?</li> <li>How do you find the quality of communications and working relationship with UNDP?</li> <li>Is communication with UNDP regular and effective?</li> <li>Are you regulated updated on progress of the UNDP project?</li> </ol>

## **A.6 EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM**

Evaluators/Consultants:

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<sup>7</sup>**

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

**Name of Consultant:** Jeff Fang

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed on *20 January 2020* Signature: 

<sup>7</sup> [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## **A.7 AUDIT TRAIL**

Annexed in a separate file

## A.8 EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<b>RELEVANCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?</li> <li>To what extent does the project contribute to the Theory of Change for the relevant CPD outcome?</li> <li>To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?</li> <li>To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?</li> <li>To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the basic human needs?</li> <li>To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Project Stakeholders</li> <li>Project beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation review</li> <li>Interviews/FGDs with project stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Field notes during visits to selected project sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project aligns with national strategies</li> <li>The project addresses the human development needs of</li> <li>intended beneficiaries (poor, women, disadvantaged groups)</li> <li>Extensive analysis was done in designing the project</li> <li>National and local (provincial/county) counterparts, rural communities including women) and/or other stakeholders have been involved and consulted during the project design</li> <li>Resources are sufficiently allocated to achieve the objectives of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic Analysis</li> <li>Comparative Analysis</li> </ul>

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent did the project contribute to the CPD outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?</li> <li>To what extent were the project outputs achieved?</li> <li>What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?</li> <li>To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?</li> <li>What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?</li> <li>In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?</li> <li>In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?</li> <li>What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?</li> <li>Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?</li> <li>To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?</li> <li>To what extent is project management and implementation participatory and is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Project Stakeholders</li> <li>Project beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation review</li> <li>Interviews with project stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Field notes during visits to selected project sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has fully achieved the intended outcome</li> <li>The project has fully achieved the intended outputs</li> <li>What percentage of the project results at the output level has been achieved?</li> <li>What changes can be observed as a result of these outputs?</li> <li>What other factors may have affected the project results?</li> <li>What were the unintended results (+ or -)?</li> <li>The project results reached the intended local community, district, regional or national level</li> <li>The project has successfully reached and met the intended needs of the target beneficiaries</li> <li>How have the particular needs of targeted and/or disadvantaged groups been taken into account in the design and implementation, benefit sharing, monitoring and evaluation of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic Analysis</li> <li>Comparative Analysis</li> </ul>



Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<p>this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?</li> <li>To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of basic human needs?</li> </ul>				
<p><b>EFFICIENCY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results?</li> <li>To what extent has UNDP's project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?</li> <li>To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?</li> <li>To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?</li> <li>To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?</li> <li>To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Project Stakeholders</li> <li>Project beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation review</li> <li>Interviews with project stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Field notes during visits to selected project sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Circumstances giving rise to the need for time extension on the project were justified</li> <li>Has there been over-expenditure or under-expenditure on the project?</li> <li>Effective mechanisms are in place to monitor project implementation</li> <li>Are project resources concentrated on the most important outputs/activities or are they scattered/spread thinly across?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic Analysis</li> <li>Comparative Analysis</li> </ul>

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<b>SUSTAINABILITY</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?</li> <li>To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?</li> <li>Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?</li> <li>Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?</li> <li>To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?</li> <li>What is the risk that the level of stakeholder's ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?</li> <li>To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, basic human needs and human development by primary stakeholders?</li> <li>To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Project Stakeholders</li> <li>Project beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation review</li> <li>Interviews with project stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Field notes during visits to selected project sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has planned and put in place an exit strategy</li> <li>To what extent does the exit strategy take into account the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political factors (support from national /local authorities)</li> <li>Financial factors (available budgets)</li> <li>Technical factors (skills and expertise needed)</li> <li>Environmental factors (environmental appraisal)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Risk assessments and mitigation strategies/action plans were identified and implemented during project design</li> <li>Unanticipated sustainability threats emerged during project implementation were mitigated with appropriate measures</li> <li>What actions have been taken to scale up the project if it is a pilot initiative?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic Analysis</li> <li>Comparative Analysis</li> </ul>

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?</li> <li>To what extent do UNDP interventions have well designed and well-planned exit strategies?</li> <li>What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?</li> </ul>				
<b>BASIC HUMAN NEEDS</b> 1. Based on the principles of human rights, to what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP DPRK's work in contributing to enhance fulfilment of people's economic and social needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Project Stakeholders</li> <li>Project beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation review</li> <li>Interviews with project stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Field notes during visits to selected project sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has concrete example(s) of how the initiative takes into account the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups such as women, youth, disabled persons.</li> <li>How has the project programmed social inclusion into the output/activity?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic Analysis</li> <li>Comparative Analysis</li> </ul>
<b>GENDER EQUALITY</b> 2. To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?</li> <li>To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Documents</li> <li>Project Stakeholders</li> <li>Project beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation review</li> <li>Interviews with project stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>Field notes during visits to selected project sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has concrete examples of contribution to gender equality.</li> <li>The project results can be disaggregated by gender</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic Analysis</li> <li>Comparative Analysis</li> </ul>

Evaluation Criteria / Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Indicators (Success Standard/ What to Look Out For)	Methods for Data Analysis
<b>SYNERGY</b> 3. To what extent the synergies of CBDRM and SES Projects have been addressed contributing to a magnified development results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Documents</li> <li>• Project Stakeholders</li> <li>• Project beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation review</li> <li>• Interviews with project stakeholders and beneficiaries</li> <li>• Field notes during visits to selected project sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are evidences of inter-linkages between project activities</li> <li>• There are partnerships bringing together both CBDRM and SES Projects concerned within single shared outcomes/outputs</li> <li>• There are evidences of synergies and coordination by reinforcing a common strategy among both project partners towards results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thematic Analysis</li> <li>• Comparative Analysis</li> </ul>