

Enhancing Institutional and Community Resilience to Disasters and Climate Change Evaluation Terms of Reference

1. Background and context

India's disaster profile has undergone some change in recent years in response to growing urbanization, congestion of natural drainage and climate change. Though the annual mortality in disaster events has reduced over the years, the magnitude of damage and loss has increased considerably due to growing risk exposure. Out of 40 million hectare of the flood prone area in the country, on an average, floods affect around 7.5 million hectare per year. What has changed over the years is the period of inundation of crop lands, extending almost to three months. The period of inundation, which has a serious impact on soil and productivity, is caused by shrinking natural drainage in rural areas. The 2015 Global Assessment Report (GAR) produced by the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), estimates average annual economic loss due to disasters at \$9.8 billion. This includes over \$7 billion in flood losses.

Increasingly, the impact of climate change is being felt through highly erratic weather and extreme events. While both urban and rural areas are vulnerable, the impact on cities and towns is particularly concerning due to the high concentration of people and infrastructure. Cities face multiple climate hazards depending on their location and conditions, ranging from increased flooding and water logging to heat and cold waves, rise in sea level, and storm surges. Several coastal cities are severely affected by cyclonic storms. As cities have grown in an unregulated manner, more people are now living in slums, and the stress on the available natural resources increases exposure to risks. Many of the cities in India are in medium to high risk seismic zones. The housing stock and other physical infrastructure in these cities would be exposed to shocks during earthquakes and have the potential to result in massive destructions.

Rapid urbanization in India will be one of the most dominant trends in the coming years. As population expands and incomes grow, this shift will be realized alongside demographic changes that will exponentially increase the demand for urban amenities like housing, energy, transport, water, waste disposal. There is now a universal recognition of how development can be derailed by risks and vulnerabilities, and how building resilience at the level of communities and households is extremely important for preserving and consolidating development gains. It is noted that India plans to invest \$1 trillion in infrastructure in the next five years, and unless adequate steps are taken to make it resilient to natural calamities, the investment runs the risk of going waste. Therefore, global and national commitments through various policy instruments articulate the need address Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) as part of all sectoral developments in urban and rural areas.

The Project

The project on "Strengthening Institutional and Community Resilience to Disasters and Climate Change" was formulated with the aim to provide technical support to strengthen capacities of government, communities and institutions in fast-tracking implementation of the planning frameworks on Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA).

The components of the project are: (1) Facilitate enhanced risk-sensitive city development planning through disaster risk assessments and city disaster management plans in 6 cities (2) Conduct hazard risk and vulnerability analyses (3) Strengthen critical buildings based on detailed structural assessments (4) Strengthen early warning systems through implementation of pilots for specific hazards (5) Enhance capacity of local government and communities, including private sector, to respond to disasters and mitigate risks (6) Enhance private sector investment for risk reduction through innovative pilots (7) Create a pool of master trainers on psycho-social care and (8) Improve knowledge management, especially through the development of online data management portals.

Project sites include - Cuttack, Navi Mumbai, Shimla, Shillong, Vishakapatnam and Vijayawada.

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION			
Project/outcome title	Enhancing Institutional and Community Resilience to Disasters and Climate Change		
Atlas ID	75890		
Corporate outcome and output	<p>Outcome (UNSDF): By 2022, environmental and natural resource management is strengthened, and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks.</p> <p>Output (CPD): Effective institutional, legislative and policy frameworks in place to enhance the implementation of climate change and disaster risk reduction at national and subnational levels.</p>		
Country	India		
Region	Cuttack, Navi Mumbai, Shimla, Shillong, Vishakapatnam and Vijayawada.		
Date project document signed	Phase II initiated in 2016.		
Project dates	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Start Sept 2016</td> <td>Planned end December 2020</td> </tr> </table>	Start Sept 2016	Planned end December 2020
Start Sept 2016	Planned end December 2020		
Project budget	US\$2,500,000		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	US\$ 2153716		
Funding source	USAID		
Implementing party	Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India		

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

Evaluation purpose: The second phase of the USAID funded project on “Enhancing Institutional and Community resilience to disasters and climate change” will be ending in December 2020. As per the UNDP evaluation guidance, conducting a “Terminal Evaluation” during project closure is mandatory. The evaluation must aim to address the extent to which the project has been able to develop resilient cities through risk reduction in the context of disaster and climate change. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts. The results of the terminal evaluation will be presented to the Implementing partner (Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India) and will be used to highlight success stories and lesson learning for future endeavours.

Objectives: The objectives of the terminal evaluation is to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. Accordingly, proposed evaluation of the project will undertake:

- Outcome analysis - what and how much progress has been made towards the achievement of the outcome (including contributing factors and constraints);
- Output analysis - the relevance of and progress made in terms of the UNDP outputs (including analysis of both project and non-project activities);
- The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

Scope: Project intervention areas include six cities- Cuttack, Navi Mumbai, Shimla, Shillong, Vishakapatnam and Vijayawada.

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria.

Indicative questions:

1. Relevance

- To what extent is the initiative in line with the UNDP mandate, national priorities of Disaster Management and the requirements of the Urban Local bodies?
- To what extent was the method of delivery selected by UNDP appropriate to the development context, specific to urban resilience?
- To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?

2. Effectiveness

- To what extent has progress been made towards outcome achievement? What has been the UNDP contribution to the observed change at city level?
- To what extent has UNDP improved the capacities of national implementing partners to advocate on environmental issues, including climate change issues and disaster risk reduction?
- To what extent has UNDP partnered with civil society and local communities to promote environmental and disaster risk awareness in the country?
- To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- To what extent have marginalized groups benefited?
- Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up or consider going forward?

3. Efficiency

- To what extent were quality country project outputs delivered on time?
- To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- To what extent did UNDP promote gender equality, the empowerment of women, human rights and human development in the delivery of project outputs?
- To what extent did UNDP engage or coordinate with beneficiaries, implementing partners, other United Nations agencies and national counterparts to achieve project outcome-level results?

4. Sustainability

- To what extent did UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place (Disaster risk management) that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?
- 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 partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?
- To what extent have UNDP practices, policies, processes and decision-making capabilities affected the achievement of the country programme's outcomes?
- To what extent did UNDP engage or coordinate with beneficiaries, implementing partners, other United Nations agencies and national counterparts to achieve outcome-level results?

5. Gender

- To what extent have 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?

4. Methodology

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team is expected to develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager. If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report. If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.)

The evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.

- **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia **(will be provided to selected candidate on Day 1 of assignment)**
 - Project document (contribution agreement).
 - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
 - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports. (APRs/PIRs)
 - Project budget
 - Mid term review / progress reports
 - Results-oriented monitoring report.
 - Highlights of project board meetings.
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations and implementing partners:
 - **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
 - 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.
- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc may be used.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
 - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

It is preferable that the interviews/questionnaires with the Ministry of Home Affairs will need to take place on a face to face basis in Delhi. Interviews will also be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. Joint Secretary, Disaster Management, Ministry of Home Affairs (face to face meeting)
2. Programme Management specialist – Disaster management, USAID
3. Chief, Climate Change, Resilience and Energy, UNDP
4. Municipal Commissioners/representatives of Shimla, Navi Mumbai, Vishkapatnam, Vijayawada, Cuttack and Shillong.

5. Evaluation products (deliverables)- refer to Annex for templates.

- **Evaluation inception report:** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits)
- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report:** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to the Ministry of Home Affairs and/or the evaluation reference group**

6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation team will be composed of 2 national evaluators. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects in the area of disaster risk management and climate change. Experience with working with UNDP is an advantage. The Senior evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience with post graduate degree in engineering/ environment/ management or related filed domain
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies.
- Experience on handling projects around disaster risk management and climate change

7. Evaluation ethics

“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 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.”

8. Implementation arrangements

The two member evaluation team will be composed of 1 senior evaluator and 1 assistant evaluator. The Senior Evaluator will act as Team Leader responsible for the leading of the TE mission and compiling the Terminal Evaluation final report; while the Assistant Evaluator will provide facilitation and coordination support to the Team Leader.

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP India. The UNDP India will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The team will be responsible to, reporting to UNDP Country Office. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

9. Time frame for the evaluation process

The total duration of the evaluation will be 26 days according to the following plan:

Working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation (outcome evaluation)

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase One: Desk review and inception report				
Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed)	7 days	At the time of contract signing	Virtual	Evaluation Team and UNDP CO
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team		At the time of contract signing	Virtual	Evaluation Team
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed		Within 5 days of contract signing	Virtual	Evaluation Team
Submission of the inception report		Within 5 days of contract signing		Evaluation team
Comments and approval of inception report		Within 2 days of submission of the inception report	Virtual	UNDP CO
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits (virtual), in-depth interviews (face to face with Govt) and focus groups	7 days	Within two weeks of contract signing.	Virtual. May include visits to MHA.	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1 day		Virtual	Evaluation team
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Draft evaluation report submission	7 days	Within three weeks of the completion of the field mission	Virtual	Evaluation team
Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report		Within 2 days weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report	Virtual	UNDP CO
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office	3 days	Within 3 days of final receiving comments from UNDP	Virtual	Evaluation team
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (-	Within 3 days of final receiving comments from UNDP	Virtual	Evaluation team
Presentation of evaluation to Ministry of Home Affairs	1 day			
Estimated total days for the evaluation	26			

10. Application submission process and criteria for selection

Applicants (two member team) are requested to apply online _____

Individual consultants (Two member team) are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions.

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/ skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

11. TOR annexes



Inception Report -
Content Outline.docx



Audit Trail
Form.docx



Template -
Evaluation Report.docx



Preeti Loni