

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
Nepal Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Programme
Final Evaluation of “Reducing Disaster Risk and Enhancing Emergency
Response Capacities in Multi-hazard Risk Prone Urban areas of Nepal”



Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been present in Nepal since 1963, working towards sustainable development and resilience with a focus on the most remote, poor, vulnerable population in sparsely populated rural areas and dense settlements in urban areas. Reduction of vulnerability to disaster and climate risks is a core UNDP approach to promote resilient and sustainable development. UNDP has been a key partner to the Government of Nepal (GoN) along with key ministries on disaster risk management (DRM) with a focus on: promoting seismic resilience in urban areas, emergency preparedness and recovery, DRM governance, policy and legal issues, climate change adaptation, and community-based DRM. UNDP has been a technical partner to GoN on innovations relating to urban resilience, e.g. risk-sensitive land use planning for urban areas, with piloting in Kathmandu Valley, promotion and formulation of national building codes, building capacity of the federal and provincial government and municipalities in its implementation and scaling up. UNDP engagement with GoN has been significant in strengthening DRM governance, emergency preparedness for better response and promoting early warning systems across the country.

Nepal is one of the ten least urbanized countries in the world. However, it is also one of the top ten fastest urbanizing countries. Urbanization in Nepal is dominated by a few large and medium-sized cities with excessive population concentration in the Kathmandu Valley. High urban growth is occurring in the Kathmandu Valley, the Inner Terai valleys, and in market and border towns located on highway junctures between the east-west highway and the five main north-south corridors. Studies link the changing urban pattern - where once dense residential city core areas are evolving as economic hubs, with changing use of the buildings, densification due to influx of rental population, unauthorized vertical increment of buildings without upgradation of infrastructure - with the concentration of risks. This is largely due to severe deficit of basic infrastructure and services such as water supply, vehicular access, drainage systems, and electrical supplies, leading to severe negative impacts during any crisis. As witnessed in the 2015 earthquakes in Nepal, densely populated areas in the Kathmandu Valley and old settlements with irregular and narrow streets, congestion and fragile buildings amplify challenges in emergency response and evacuation, thus aggravating the impact of hazards like earthquakes and fires.

Similarly, urbanization patterns vary based on ecological regions, where the urban areas of the hilly belt, with high concentration of urban population, are mostly situated on the ridge tops. The flat plains, with a high number of urban municipalities, are developed along the highways and valley areas and have urbanized with dense, clustered building stock. The prevalent seismic risk aggravated by non-compliant and rampant construction in densifying urban core areas have increased risks to lives and challenges to effective disaster response. Similarly, in hilly areas, development of high-rise structures, without structural assessments, in steep slopes could lead to major impacts during landslides/earthquakes, while the urban sprawl in flood prone areas in flat lands have resulted in loss of lives, property and livelihoods.

In addition, in urban areas, fire incidence is high, compounded by high sensitivity of structures and activities to fire, and inadequate response capacities. The communities as first responders and local fire-fighting systems lack adequate knowledge and capacity on possible response

options, which is evident from frequent fire incidents and fatalities not just in hinterlands but also in highly urbanised areas, including the Kathmandu valley. Fire risks, as a consequence, need to be prioritised. With a growing number of urban municipalities recognizing the urban risk and vulnerabilities, UNDP with support from the European Union (EU) is implementing the “Reducing disaster risks and enhancing emergency response capacities in multi hazard-risk prone urban areas of Nepal” project (hereafter ‘Project’) for enhancing urban disaster preparedness and strengthening the disaster risk governance in selected municipalities. The project has been implemented under the EU/ECHO Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) 2019-2021.

This project is being implemented since June 2019 in core urban areas of three at-risk cities, one each from Terai (Bharatpur Metropolitan City), Hills (Bhimeshwor Municipality) and Valley (Lalitpur Metropolitan City), that are representatives of other cities across Nepal. The project aims to create a shared understanding on urban disaster risks and evolve mechanisms and measures that aids the communities, municipal governments, and private sector to address the risks and effectively respond to emergencies, with specific focus on vulnerable populations. In achieving its aim, the project contributes to enhance understanding of the communities and local authorities of at-risk urban areas and private sector about underlying multi-hazard risks and vulnerabilities, identifies and supports in key areas to undertake system strengthening and demonstrates possible structural and non-structural interventions to enable effective, coordinated emergency response and risk reduction.

The interventions focus on urban disaster risk reduction (DRR) implemented through this project encompass three major components:

1. Enhanced understanding of disaster risks at community and municipal levels in selected high-risk urban areas.
2. Systems strengthened/established at all levels for effective emergency response and management.
3. Enhanced disaster preparedness at community and municipal level for effective emergency response and risk reduction.

1.2 Project Location, Beneficiaries, Duration and Budget:

The project has been implemented in three municipalities of three districts in Bagmati Province. It covers a total of six urban wards (2 each) of Lalitpur Metropolitan City in Lalitpur District, Bharatpur Metropolitan City in Chitwan District, and Bhimeshwor Municipality in Dolakha District. However, the entire municipalities were benefitted by the interventions through development of plans, policies, frameworks and guidelines.

Since its inception, the Project has been able to contribute towards enhanced understanding of disaster risks through various consultation meetings at community, ward and local levels. With the realization of risk among the communities and elected representatives, the Project has been able to identify risks and vulnerabilities in the project wards and support for the preparation of ward level preparedness and response plans. Further, IEC materials were developed based on the findings of Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) survey together with the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Authority (NDRRMA) and the Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration (MoFAGA) which has supported to enhance awareness of people on urban related disaster risks and vulnerabilities. The preparation of ward level plans has also supported to prioritize the activities on DRRM for annual planning of wards and local governments.

As mentioned above, the Project has also supported in preparation of various plans, policies and guidelines as a steppingstone for preparing local level elected representatives and staff along with communities to prepare and timely respond to disasters through coordinated efforts. With the learnings from past disasters, such as the 2015 earthquakes and 2017 floods, and understanding the risk in urban areas, the Project has also supported in identification and training of community emergency response team in first aid, search and rescue, fire preparedness and domestic fire prevention. Many of the trained volunteers have already

demonstrated the skills in preventing fire events at the local level and some of the volunteers have been able to use their skills on search and rescue and firefighting. With identification of risks and vulnerabilities, the Project has been able to bring in private sector actors and vulnerable populations in various preparedness initiatives.

With enhanced understanding of risks, local governments have also been able to increase the budget allocations for disaster preparedness in annual planning, and the Project has been able to leverage the local government funding. Further, Municipal Emergency Operation Centers (MEOC) have been operationalized and working as hubs for coordination in disaster preparedness and response related activities through allocation of staff. With multiple activities on risk assessment, disaster risk governance, increased investment in disaster preparedness and enhanced capacity of community, the Project has been able to contribute towards urban resilience.

The Project commenced in June 2019 with an end date of February 2021. However, the Project implementation was directly impacted by the lockdown and travel restrictions imposed by the government to contain the spread of COVID-19. Hence, the project was granted a no-cost extension, with some modifications, until 31 October 2021. Thus, the total duration of the project is 29 months, between June 2019 - October 2021. The total approved budget for the project is USD 1,188,824.42.

As the project comes to an end on 31 October 2021, UNDP is planning to commission a final evaluation to identify and document achievements of project outputs, challenges, lessons learned and best practices. The findings of the final evaluation will provide guidance for the way forward for future course of action. Thus, the final evaluation report is expected to include specific recommendations for future interventions.

The project information is summarized in the below table.

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Reducing disaster risks and enhancing emergency response capacities in multi hazard-risk prone urban areas of Nepal	
Atlas ID	00117172	
Corporate outcome and output	<p>UNDAF/ CPD Outcome 3: By 2022, environmental management, sustainable recovery and reconstruction, and resilience to climate change and natural disaster are strengthen at all levels</p> <p>CPD Output 3.4: <i>Capacities of subnational governments and communities strengthened for effective preparedness and response, environment management, CCA/DRR.</i></p>	
Country	Nepal	
Region	Asia Pacific	
Date project document signed	26 June 2019	
Project dates	Start	Valid period
	01-06-2019	30-10-2021
Project budget	USD 1,188,824.42	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	USD XX (will be updated during the evaluation)	

Funding source	European Commission Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (EU Humanitarian Aid)
Implementing party	FORWARD Nepal, HURADEC Nepal and FSCN

1.3 Project implementation approach

Implementation Approach:

At federal level, the Project works closely with NDRRMA and MoFAGA. Further the Project works directly with local governments, vulnerable groups, district stakeholders like DDRC and EU Humanitarian Aid's country portfolio in Nepal. At the municipal level, the Project activities are being implemented in close coordination with elected representatives and government officials of the local governments. The Project is also working closely with social structures at community level, i.e. Tole Lane Organizations (TLOs), women's groups, population receiving Social Security Fund (SSF), LGBTIQ, Muslim community, people residing in urban slums, etc. The Project also engaged with hospitals, schools and hotels for promotion of disaster preparedness.

Human Resource Mobilization: Overall management of the EU funded project falls under CDRMP and apart from CDRMP's regular staff, there is a dedicated Project team at the central level (Project Coordinator, Senior Communication Assistant and Admin/Finance Assistant) and Municipal teams (one team comprising of Municipal Technical Officer, Information Management Officer who was seconded in the municipal office) in all three municipalities. A technical engineer was also hired as consultant to facilitate the small-scale mitigation work.

The municipal teams are mainly responsible for effective and efficient implementation of Project activities in close coordination with the local level stakeholders. The municipal teams in each municipality are supported through a team of Community Development Workers, Project Support Officer, Project Focal Point (Executive Director) and Admin and Finance Officer. In order to better manage the local staff in the field, CDRMP partnered with local NGOs in each Municipality, namely FORWARD Nepal in Bharatpur, FSCN in Lalitpur and HURADEC Nepal in Bhimeshwor. The main responsibility of these NGOs was to effectively implement the Project activities at the community level.

1.4 COVID-19 situation and its impact in project implementation

With the outbreak of the global COVID-19 pandemic in late 2019-early 2020, Nepal also experienced the first wave starting from March 2020 and a strict nationwide lockdown was imposed starting from 23rd of March 2020. The lockdown continued for almost six months till September 2020, disrupting regular works and impacting socio-economic aspects of most people, and in particular of already vulnerable groups. The three Project locations were no exception, and with the lockdown and restriction on movement, mass gatherings, meetings and consultations, Project activities were halted.

With the worsening situation and increasing number of cases in three local levels, the Project in consultation with EU/ECHO reoriented some portion of the budget towards support for COVID-19 preparedness and response related work in all three-local level. The main aim of the support was to supply essential medical and WASH items and realize local level importance of preparedness for better response in times of disaster. Some of the key activities supported for COVID-19 preparedness are listed below.

- Support in upgradation of quarantine centres in Bharatpur and Bhimeshwor Municipality, providing WASH items, and hospital beds. Municipalities have used the provided materials in the quarantine and isolation centres for treating COVID-19 patients.
- Supported in promotion of risk communication and awareness-raising through

development of IEC materials and the radio program “Jeevan Rakhsya” to link vulnerable populations with government service providers, as well as wall-paintings and other messaging.

- Installation of more than 50 contactless handwashing stations in hospitals, health posts, market, and municipal and ward offices.
- Disinfectant sprayed in markets in two wards of Lalitpur Metropolitan City.
- Supported in mobilization of Female Health Community Volunteers (FCHVs) and volunteers to have increased outreach to communities for COVID-19 preparedness and messaging related to social stigma.
- Support in information management of returnee migrants and vulnerable groups during lockdown for relief distribution.
- Documentation of lessons learnt from COVID-19.
- Rapid Assessment on effectiveness of risk and safety messaging through IEC materials and media for COVID-19 patients living in home or institutional isolation.

In light of the COVID-19 related risks, the Project utilized alternative strategies of engaging local level and communities through virtual means for meeting and information collection required for risk assessments, and preparation of plans and guidelines to meet the specific objectives. However, close contact trainings, like first aid, search and rescue, and fire safety trainings were kept on hold. Small focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews (KIIs) were also promoted as an alternative means to collect information ensuring engagement of local authorities and communities.

As project implementation was going on full-fledged after the ease in restrictions from the first lockdown, it was again affected by the second wave of COVID-19 which began in Nepal in April 2021, resulting in a prohibitory order in place till date. The Project, with consent from local level and district authorities, has conducted the planned trainings adhering to all safety protocols and limiting participants by doing trainings in two sessions. Along with that, virtual means of communication is also used.

2. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation:

The overall purpose of this final evaluation is to assess the results achieved and lesson learnt by the project. The final evaluation should assess the implementation approaches, results against output targets, contribution to higher level outcome results (changes in socio-economic status through the project implementation), and challenges encountered, as well as identify and document the lessons learnt and good practices and make specific recommendations for future course of actions.

The specific objectives are:

- To ascertain the achievements of the project and its relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, including synergies with other UNDP support efforts.
- To assess the effectiveness and usefulness of the various DRR strategies implemented with support from the Project to enhance the understanding of disaster risks by the elected representatives and other local stakeholders including most vulnerable people for early preparedness and mitigation measures.
- To review and assess the risks and opportunities (in terms of resource mobilization, synergy and areas of interventions) directly linked to the Project .
- To assess engagement of the municipal and ward stakeholders in the project, and their understanding, including financial and other commitment for sustainability of activities beyond the scope of the Project.
- To assess the effectiveness and relevancy of the capacity enhancement trainings, such as fire fighter, Search and Rescue, first aid, etc.

- To assess the effectiveness of Municipal Emergency Operation Centers (MEOCs) supported by the Project in emergency response and management.
- To assess the formulation process and effectiveness of the DRM plans, guidelines and enhancement of community capacity to respond to future disasters.
- To assess the extent of the engagement of vulnerable populations including women and excluded groups for enhancement of disaster preparedness.
- To assess effectiveness of COVID-19 response support activities with the local governments that were woven into the project in response to the first wave of COVID-19 in Nepal.

3. Scope of Work:

The final evaluation should assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the project intervention in three municipalities. In addition, the evaluation should indicate if the produced results are in the right direction towards facilitating and enhancing urban disaster preparedness and management in the project areas. Particularly, the evaluation should cover, but not be limited to, the following areas:

- Relevance of the project: review the progress against its purpose, objectives, outcomes, outputs and indicators, as per the project document and as defined in the project’s Theory of Change, as well as ascertain whether assumptions and risks remain valid. Identify any other intended or unintended, positive or negative results.
- Effectiveness and efficiency of implementation approaches: review project’s technical as well as operational approaches and deliverables, quality of results and their impact, alignment with national priorities and responding to the needs of the stakeholders covering the results achieved, the partnerships established, as well as issues of capacity enhancement and utilization.
- Review the project’s approaches, in general and with regards to mainstreaming of gender equality and social inclusion, with particular focus on women and excluded groups, including persons with disability.
- Review and assess the sustainability of the results achieved, risks and opportunities (in terms of resource mobilization, synergies and areas of interventions) related to future interventions.
- Review external factors beyond the control of the project that have affected its implementation positively or negatively.
- Review planning, management, monitoring, reporting and quality assurance mechanisms for the delivery of the project interventions.
- Review coordination and communication processes and mechanisms with the key Project stakeholders.
- Review how the implementation of project interventions may have been impacted by COVID-19 and if/how the reprogramming for immediate response was effective and appropriate.

4. Evaluation Criteria and guiding questions

The evaluation will follow the OECD-DAC’s revised evaluation criteria - Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. Human Rights, GESI and Disability will be added as cross-cutting criteria. The guiding questions outlined below should be further refined by the consultant and agreed with UNDP before commencement of the evaluation.

Criteria	Evaluation Questions
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How relevant were the overall design and approaches of the project?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent was the project in line with national development priorities, Country Programme Document outcome and outputs, and the SDGs? • To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in design? • To what extent the project was able to address the needs and priorities of the target groups and communities in the context of COVID-19 pandemic • To what extent the objectives of the project design (inputs, activities, outputs and their indicators) and its theory of change were logical and coherent? Did the project contribute to the outcomes and outputs of the CPD? • To what extent the results contributed in facilitating the preparedness efforts of the NDRRMA and MoFAGA at federal and local level? • How the project contributed and was relevant in strengthening disaster risk governance at local level, contributing towards effective urban preparedness? • To what extent the project was able to adapt to the needs of the different target groups (including tackling the gender equality and social inclusion aspects) in terms of creating an enabling environment for inclusive and vulnerable population centred preparedness policies and actions?
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent the project activities were delivered effectively in terms of quality, quantity and timing? • To what extent the project contributed to the Country Programme Document outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and national development priorities? • To what extent were the project results achieved, considering men, women, and excluded groups, including persons with disability? • Which factors contributed to achieving, or not achieving, the intended results? • To what extent different stakeholders were involved in project implementation? • To what extent the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and persons with disability and the realization of human rights? • To what extent monitoring arrangements have been effective and supported adaptive management? What were the lessons and how was feedback/learning incorporated in the subsequent process of planning and implementation? • How effective the project has been in enhancing the capacity of the communities and local governments, urban stakeholders (hospital, schools) to create an enabling environment for Urban Disaster Preparedness Initiatives? • To what extent the project interventions, like Resilience Fund support, were effective in leveraging government funds/resources and resources from other stakeholders? • To what extent the support provided to respond to the impact of COVID-19 was effective?
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well the intervention fit in changed context like during COVID-19 pandemic? • To what extent the intervention was coherent with Government's policies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent the intervention addressed the synergies and interlinkages with other interventions carried out by UNDP (internal coherence). • To what extent the intervention was consistent with other actor's interventions in the same context or adding value to avoid duplication of the efforts? (External coherence).
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How efficiently were the resources, including human, material and financial resources, used to achieve the project results in a timely manner? • To what extent was the project management structure, as outlined in project document, appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results? • To what extent has the project implementation strategy and its execution been efficient and cost-effective? • To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, staff, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve envisioned outcomes and outputs? • To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are the benefits of the projects likely to be sustained after completion of this project? • What are the plans or approaches of the local authorities/DRM committees to ensure that the initiatives will be continued after the project ends? • How has project contributed towards replication of initiatives at the local level? • What could be potential new areas of work and innovative measures for sustaining the results? • To what extent have lessons learned been documented by the project on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project? • What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability of the project?
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent the project initiatives and results indicate that intended impact will be achieved in the future?
Human rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have women and excluded groups, including Dalit, ethnic minorities, persons with disability, and others, benefitted from the work of the project? • To what extent has the project integrated Human Rights based approach in the design, implementation and monitoring? Have the resources been used in an efficient way to address Human Rights in the implementation (e.g. participation of target stakeholders, collection of disaggregated data, etc.)?
Gender equality and social inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? • To what extent has the project promoted positive changes of women, people with disability and marginalised groups. • To what extent the project contributed to gender equality and the empowerment of women and persons with disability, social inclusion, and the human rights-based approach?

Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation? • What proportion of the beneficiaries of the project were persons with disabilities? • Did persons with disabilities face any barriers to participate in and benefit from the Project?
------------	--

5. Methodology:

The evaluation methods provided here are indicative only. The consultant should review the methodology and propose the final methods and data collection tools as part of the inception report. The methods and tools should adequately address the issues of gender equality and social inclusion as well as the SDGs.

The evaluation should undertake a mix of qualitative and quantitative assessment. The evaluator 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, project team, UNDP Country Office and other key stakeholders, including project beneficiaries. Therefore, the evaluator will be responsible for designing and conducting the evaluation including finalizing appropriate methodologies, designing tools and questionnaires for data collection and analysis. The consultant is responsible (but not limited) to conduct:

- **Document review:** review of project document/proposals, Theory of Change and results framework, Annual Work Plans, activity designs, consolidated quarterly and annual reports, minutes of project board meetings, project modification document, project quality assurance reports, technical/financial monitoring reports, knowledge products, communication materials, and any other relevant documents.
- **Interviews and meetings:** Consultations with key stakeholders, such as key government counterparts (NDRRMA, MoFAGA), local authorities (municipalities/ward representatives), development partners, representatives of key civil society organizations, beneficiaries (men and women, Dalit, persons with disabilities and other excluded groups) and other stakeholders as per the need.
 - Semi-structured interviews: based on questions designed for different stakeholders based on the evaluation criteria and questions around relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
 - Key informant interviews and focus group discussions with beneficiaries and stakeholders, including men and women, and representatives from excluded groups.
 - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- **Surveys and questionnaires:** to project beneficiaries including male and female participants, other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic level.
- **Field visits:** for observations and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions in all three municipalities.
- **Briefing and debriefing sessions:** with UNDP and Project team as well as with other partners will be organised. The evaluator should ensure triangulation of the various data sources to maximize the validity and reliability of data.
- Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluator will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

GESI and human rights lens: All evaluation products need to address gender equality, social inclusion, and human right issues. The process/steps mentioned above should ensure that the

most appropriate and relevant data are gathered for the above-mentioned objectives. Based on the analysis and findings, the recommendations should be provided for future direction of the initiatives.

The consultant will have to submit the final full report in English. The structure and content of the report should meet the requirements of the UNDP Evaluation Guideline. The final report must meet the IEO's Quality Assessment (QA) criteria. Multiple reiterations may be required until the final report is approved.

The final methodological approach, including interview schedule, field visits, evaluation matrix and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed with UNDP. The evaluator should select the respondents using an appropriate sampling technique. While selecting the respondents, the evaluator should ensure gender balance. Care must be taken to ensure the voices of women, minority and vulnerable groups are captured.

6. Evaluation products (Deliverables)

The evaluator should submit the following deliverables. All the evaluation products need to address gender, disability and human rights issues.

- **Inception report** detailing the reviewer's understanding of what is being evaluated, why it is being evaluated, and how (methodology) it will be evaluated. The inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, evaluation tools, evaluation questions for each evaluation criteria and interviewee, activities and deliverables. The inception report should be prepared based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be submitted before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits).
- **Evaluation matrix** that includes key criteria, indicators and questions to capture and assess them.
- **Evaluation debriefing**- immediately after completion of data collection, the evaluator should provide preliminary debriefing and findings to UNDP, the project team and stakeholders.
- **Draft Evaluation report** for review and comments.
- **Evaluation Audit Trail** – The comments on the draft report and changes by the evaluator in response to them should be retained by the evaluator to show how the comments have been addressed.
- **Final report** within stipulated timeline with sufficient detail and quality by incorporating feedback from the concerned parties.
- An **exit presentation** on findings and recommendations.

7. Team composition and required competencies

The evaluation will be carried out through a national consultant. The person involved in any way in the design, management or implementation or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation will not qualify. The evaluator will be selected by UNDP CO.

National consultant

Duty Station: UNDP Country Office (home based) with required field visits to project implementation sites.

Total working days: 30

Major roles and responsibilities:

The national consultant will be responsible for conducting the final evaluation. She/he will be solely responsible to ensure quality and timely submission of all the deliverables including the evaluation report and briefing to UNDP, and for ensuring gender equality, social inclusion and

human rights perspectives are incorporated throughout the evaluation work and report. Specifically, the national consultant will have the following roles and responsibilities:

- Gathering and review of relevant documents
- Finalizing and designing the methodologies and data collection instruments
- Prepare inception report, evaluation matrix including the evaluation questions, data collection instruments, etc.
- Ensure GESI and human rights perspectives are incorporated throughout the evaluation process and final report
- Conduct field visits in project areas/communities and conduct interviews (by in-persons or virtual means) with the selected target groups, partners and stakeholders.
- Facilitate stakeholders' discussion and focus groups to collect, collate and synthesize information
- Analyse the data and prepare a draft evaluation report in the prescribed format
- Incorporate the feedback and finalize the evaluation report
- Coordinate with UNDP CO for evaluation related information

Qualification and Competencies:

- At least Master's degree in International Development, Development Economics/Planning, Economics, Statistics, Social sciences or other relevant subjects.
- Demonstrated experience in designing and leading similar kinds of evaluations of development projects related to DRR/reconstruction/EQ safety or related areas
- At least seven years' experience in development projects related to disaster preparedness and risk reduction, including in earthquake-affected areas, with particular emphasis on recovery needs, and resilient community infrastructures building
- Excellent analytical and report writing skills in English
- Excellent command in different data collection methods including FGDs, KII and Social surveys
- Adequate knowledge on GESI sensitive evaluation, and human rights issues.
- Adequate knowledge and/or experience of disability inclusion in development projects.
- Adequate knowledge and experience in other cross-cutting areas such as equality, disability issues, rights-based approach, and capacity development
- The consultant should not be involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the intervention that is the subject of the evaluation

8. Evaluation Ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultants 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 without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

Consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment.

9. Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this Evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Nepal. The UNDP CO will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of logistic

arrangements for implementation of the evaluation. The consultant will directly report to Evaluation Manager, i.e. RBM Analyst in this case.

RBM Analyst/Evaluation Manager will assure smooth, quality and independent implementation of the evaluation with needful guidance from UNDP's Senior Management. The Project team will be responsible for providing required information, furnishing documents for evaluation to the consultant in leadership of Portfolio Manager of the Resilience Portfolio. They will also be responsible for the logistic arrangements of the evaluation, for setting up stakeholder consultations and interviews as needed, arranging field visits, coordinating with the governments and development partners, etc.

The evaluation will remain fully independent. The consultant will maintain all the communication through Evaluation Manager. The Evaluation Manager should clear each step of the evaluation. The final evaluation report will be signed off by the UNDP CO Deputy Resident Representative. A mission wrap-up meeting during which comments from participants/stakeholders will be noted for incorporation in the final report.

The evaluator will be briefed by UNDP at the start of the assignment on the objectives, purpose and scope of the Final evaluation. Key relevant project documents mentioned in Annex (13 (i)) will be provided to the consultant after signing the contract. The consultant should review the relevant documents and share the draft inception report before the commencement of the field mission. The consultant should revise the methodology, data collection tools and evaluation questions as deemed necessary. The final methodology and instruments should be proposed in the inception report, including the evaluation schedule and evaluation matrix which guides the overall implementation of the evaluation.

10. Timeframe

The evaluation is expected to start in first week of October 2021 for an estimated duration of 30 days. This will include desk reviews, primary information collection, field work, analysis and report writing.

Planned Activities	Tentative Days	Remarks
Desk review and preparation of design (home based)	2 days	
Finalizing design, methods & inception report and sharing with reference group for feedback	3 days	UNDP needs at least 3 days to review and provide feedback on the inception report
Stakeholders' meetings and interviews in Field and Kathmandu (Virtual and/or field based)	15 days	
Analysis, preparation of draft report shares for review	7 days	UNDP needs at least 10 days to review and provide comments on the report
Incorporate comments and submit final report	3 days	
Total	30 days	

11. Use of Evaluation Results

The findings of the evaluation will be used to analyse the lessons learned and recommend ways forward for future course of actions. Therefore, the evaluation report should provide critical findings and specific recommendations for future interventions.

12. Application submission process and criteria for selection

It will be mentioned in Request for Proposal (RFP) document.

13. Annexes¹

- (i) List of relevant documents: Project Document, Annual Work Plans, Periodic and Annual Progress Report, Financial Reports, Knowledge products, Event reports, Monitoring reports, Communication products and tools, relevant government policies and plans, etc.
- (ii) List of key agencies, stakeholders and partners for interview/consultation

UNDP & Development Partner

- UNDP Policy Advisor, DRR and Resilience Portfolio
- UNDP Portfolio Manager, DRR and Resilience Portfolio
- Programme Officer, European Commission, Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations-Nepal
- CDRMP Project Manager and other relevant Project staffs as needed

Stakeholders:

- Officials of MoFAGA
- Officials of NDRRMA
- Local and Ward Disaster Management Committees (Municipality and Ward offices)
- District Disaster Management Committee
- Community Emergency Response team members
- Staff of Fire Brigade and Municipal police
- Staff of Petrol stations and petroleum dealer association members
- Local NGO partners
- Member of TLOs, Women Groups
- Any other relevant stakeholders

(iii) Inception Report Contents Outline

(iv) Evaluation matrix

(v) Format of the evaluation report

(vi) Evaluation Audit Trial Form

(vii) UNEG Code of Conduct

¹ These documents will be provided after signing of the contract.