**International Consultant Terms of References**

**FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION EXPERT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project/Outcome Information** | | |
| Project title and  Outcome title | Mosul Dam Emergency Preparedness in Iraq (MDEP)  UNSDCF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP: 4.1. Strengthened and resourced policies and frameworks are implemented for managing natural resources (including transboundary issues), developing renewable resources, and increasing resilience to climate change, environmental stress and natural hazards, and human-induced and natural disasters.  SDG: 13 | |
| Atlas ID | 00118833 | |
| Country | Iraq | |
| Geographical coverage | Nationwide with particular focus on the provinces of Baghdad, Ninewa and Salah Al Din. | |
| Date Project document signed | 1 March 2019; Revised (no additional funds extension): 25 February 2021 | |
| Project dates | **Start** | **Planned end** |
| 1 March 2019 | 31 October 2021 |
| Project budget (USD) | 4,744,440.00 | |
| Resources mobilized (as of 30 May 2021) | 4,983,692.00 | |
| Programme delivery at the time of evaluation (as of 30 August 2021) | 4,085,867.14 | |
| Funding source | United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/Bureau of Humanitarian Affairs (BHA) | |
| Implementing party | United Nations Development Programme | |
| Assignment Start Date | 1st September 2021 | |

1. **Project Background**

Since January 2016, UNDP has support the Government of Iraq and mobilized emergency preparedness actions for safeguarding the vulnerable population along the Tigris floodplain. In doing so, the emergency alert and communication protocols have been instituted to warn populations along the flood-path in the event of dam failure. Targeted messages were developed and delivered through multiple platforms to raise risk awareness of the vulnerable communities. Iraqi officials were trained on dam safety operations, supported by drills/simulations that took account of risks of the vulnerable population inhabiting the downstream.

Whilst work on structural reinforcement has made considerable progress and the likelihood of an eminent Dam collapse has lessened, experts continue to express concerns about the likelihood of collapse and have called for sustained actions on emergency response and preparedness for the vulnerable communities in the downstream. Building on the lessons learned over the past years, the proposed project 'Mosul dam Emergency Preparedness' aims to build comprehensive preparedness capacities for safeguarding lives, livelihoods and assets in the vulnerable communities along the Tigris flood path. In achieving this objective, the project has been designed to undertake targeted interventions toward achieving two major outputs during over the next two years. These include - (a) National capacities including the high-risks governorates (Nineveh, Salahuddin, Baghdad} strengthened on disaster preparedness, early warning and risk reduction, and (b) Local and community capacities enhanced in the high-risk municipalities on flood preparedness and risks awareness. The project reflects the updated context and builds on the existing results as well as prioritizes the essentially urgent activities as determined in close coordination and consultation with the counterparts and the partners on the ground. To ensure continuity and to avoid losing any momentum, the project is planned to commence from first of April 2019 on the expiry of the earlier phase within the scope of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR} capacity building project in Iraq. The project will seek the opportunity to expand its engagement and deepen partnerships with a diverse set of stakeholders during the period of its implementation.

Soon after the launch of the Project, Iraq faced a series of unprecedented crises, including the country wide public protests that broke out across the country from the third quarter of 2019, and the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic from early 2020. The public protests resulted in bringing the federal and provincial government operations to a standstill, and led to changes in government at various levels, including the Prime Minister, Cabinet of Ministers and Provincial Governors. Furthermore, associated events triggered regional tensions between Iraq, Iran and the United States. The protests were still in progress when the COVID-19 broke-out forcing the government to shut down its non-essential operations, schools, businesses, and suspend inter-city and inter-provincial travel for several months as part of overall lockdown and containment measures to prevent the spread of the virus. The developments significantly affected the implementation of project activities, either due to the unavailability of the target beneficiaries and officials, or due to the travel restrictions and safeguarding measures that required avoiding in-person gatherings in compliance with the decisions of the Iraq Crisis Cell for COVID-19.

Since 1 March 2019, the Project has focused on following two major outputs and seven results areas;

**Output 1:** National capacities including the high‐risks governorates (Nineveh, Salahuddin, Baghdad) strengthened on disaster preparedness, early warning, and risk reduction.

* KR -1 Training and tools for the Gov. preparedness plans
* KR - 2 Risks advocacy for the vulnerable communities (IRCS, WHO, UNICEF)
* KR- 3 Simulations /drills conducted (WHO, UNICEF)
* KR-4 Volunteers network for community EW and evacuation (IRCS)
* KR-5 Emergency preparedness of major Dams strengthened

**Output 2:** Local and community capacities enhanced in the high‐risk municipalities on flood preparedness and risks awareness.

* KR-6 Major facilities protected along the Tigris flood plain
* KR-7 Environmental risks of toxic and chemical pollution mitigated

Overall, MDEP contributes to:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2022 | Outcome 3: Building resilience to shocks and crises |
| Programme Outcome / UNDP Country Programme Document (2020-2024) | UNSDCF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP: 4.1. Strengthened and resourced policies and frameworks are implemented for managing natural resources (including transboundary issues), developing renewable resources, and increasing resilience to climate change, environmental stress and natural hazards, and human-induced and natural disasters. |
| National Priority or Goal: Framework of Government Programme |  |
| Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) | Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts. TARGET\_13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries. |

1. **Evaluation purpose, scope, and objectives**

**2.1. Evaluation purpose**

This evaluation will be undertaken as part of the UNDP Programme Management requirements to:

- To promote accountability and transparency, assess whether the project has achieved its output level results, synthesize lessons to help guide future design and implementation of UNDP Projects, and contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving strategic objectives.

- Evaluation is an integral part of the UNDP project cycle[[1]](#footnote-1). Its purpose is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the project by assessing its design, process of implementation, achievements (outputs, outcomes, impacts and their sustainability) against project objectives endorsed by the UNDP and government (including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation) and any other results.

- The Evaluation is undertaken with the aim of gaining a deep understanding of project development impact. This will involve assessing project progress toward its stated objectives as well as contribution to relevant Country Programme Document (CPD) outcome.

**2.2. Scope of evaluation**

The evaluation will be conducted from 1st September 2021**,** covering the whole project period (1 March 2019 – 31st August 2021) of the Project implementation cycle. Given that the project is nationwide with a particular focus on the provinces of Ninewa, Diyala, Salah Al Din, and Baghdad, the evaluation will have a national scope. The evaluation will be carried out using a combined methodology of desk review and direct beneficiary and stakeholder interviews including GoI counterparts, donors, MDEP international partners (UNICEF and WHO), civil society partners and UNDP Project Staff.

Disasters affect women, men, girls, and boys differently. Members of these groups experience different levels of vulnerability and have different levels of capacity and skills to respond to the effects of a disaster. Therefore, the risk posed by hazards is also impacted by one’s gender. This programme emphasized equal participation by both men and women (and youth, where appropriate).

* 1. **Evaluation Objectives**

1. The main objective of this final evaluation is to assess whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve the project objectives. The evaluation assesses the project performance against the five evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact.
2. Take stock of the overall Project progress, achieved against the Project’s expected results, and contribution towards Outcome 4.1 of the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD).
3. The objectives of the evaluation are also 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.
4. The evaluation assesses the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluation include whether the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, building comprehensive preparedness capacities for safeguarding lives, livelihoods, and assets in the vulnerable communities along the Tigris flood path.
5. The Final Evaluation is also expected to draw lessons and develop recommendations that may help in improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country, improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.
6. **Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions**

Evaluation is an evidence-based assessment of a project’s concept and design, its implementation and its outputs, outcomes and impacts as documented in the project document. Evidence will be gathered by reviewing documents, interviewing key, selected stakeholders and from other ad hoc observations.

The standard evaluation criteria according to UNDP evaluation policy are Relevance, Impact, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability.

The Project Evaluation will generate evidence of progress and challenges faced, helping to ensure accountability for the implementation the project, as well as identifying and sharing knowledge and good practices through following standard Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria[[2]](#footnote-2):

**Relevance:** The extent to which the project strategy, proposed activities and expected outputs and outcome are justified and remain relevant to the Government of Iraq (GoI) in its efforts to safeguard the vulnerable population in the Mosul Dam flood path by provisioning time‐critical coordinated actions for alert/warning notification and clear and communicable massaging across the Government and the target population. More specifically, the relevance of the project should be assessed through the following guiding questions:

* Which target groups and individuals were reached by the interventions?
* How effective was the targeting approach in achieving the activity goal?
* Is the Project approach and inputs, realistic, appropriate, and adequate to the needs of target groups and for achieving the results?
* How has management adapted the activity design or implementation based on monitoring information and feedback from the target population?
* To what extent are the project’s outcome and outputs achieved?
* To what extent have the achieved results contributed to SDG 13, the UNDP- Iraq CPD (2020-2024) for Iraq?
* What factors (internal and external) have contributed to achieving or limiting the intended project outcome and outputs?
* Is the partnership approach appropriate and effective?
* Relevance of the Project to national disaster risk management priorities?

**Coherence**

* To what extent did the project complement work among different entities, especially with other UN actors?
* If the project was part of a broader package of support, to what degree were the project’s design, implementation, monitoring and reporting aligned with that of other projects’?
* How were stakeholders involved in the project’s design and implementation?
* Was project implementation among the three fund recipients done in a coherent and joint manner?

**Efficiency:** The extent to which the project resources (funds, expertise/human resources, time, etc.) are optimally used and converted into intended outputs. More specifically, the efficiency of the project should be assessed through the following guiding questions:

* How efficient is the functioning of the project management, technical support, administrative, procurement and financial management procedures? To what extent have the project management structure and allocated resources been efficient in achieving the expected results?
* To what extent have the project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* What is the visibility and communications strategy adopted by the project? Has it been cost-effective in terms of promoting the project and its achievements?
* How is the project keeping track of progress on expected outputs and outcomes? Does the monitoring and evaluation system put in place allow for continuous collection and analysis of quality and segregated data on expected outputs and outcomes?

**Effectiveness:** The extent to which the project’s expected outputs and outcomes are being achieved or are expected to be achieved. Factors contributing to or detracting from the achievement of the project desired results and objectives should also be included in the assessment. More specifically, the effectiveness of the project should be assessed through the following guiding questions:

* Is the intervention achieving its objectives?
* Is the project management strategy effective in delivering desired/planned results?
* Is there a suitable M&E framework to monitor and support the implementation of the targeted results both at project level and CO?
* Are the implementation tools used in project implementation effective?
* Is the project effective in responding to the needs of the direct beneficiaries and targeted institutions, and what results can be shown?
* To what extent the project was impacted by effect by any crises, including COVID-19?

**Impact:** The extent to which the project’s is expected to contribute to longer term outcomes/results. The impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target institutions or direct beneficiaries.

* What difference does the intervention make?
* What changes—expected and unexpected, positive and negative—were experienced by the targeted beneficiaries and other stakeholders?
* What factors appear to facilitate or inhibit these changes?
* Which interventions appeared to be more or less important to achieving activity outcomes?
* Does the overall project intervention contribute to longer-term outcomes/results?

**Sustainability:** Analyzing whether benefits of the project are likely to continue after the project cycle.

* To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to be sustained after the completion of the overall project cycle?
* What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the project outcome and benefits after completing the project?
* How effective are the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out of the project, including contributing factors and constraints?
* What are the key factors that will require attention to improve prospects of sustainability of the project outcome and the potential for replication of the approach?
* How are capacities strengthened and sustained at the individual and institutional level (including contributing factors and constraints)?
* Describe the main lessons that have emerged
* To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
* To what extent did the activity align and integrate with host government social protection strategy/policy/service delivery? ○ Was the activity able to end operations at the close of the award without causing significant disruptions in the targeted communities?

**Gender equality:** All evaluation criteria and evaluation questions applied need to be checked to see if there are any further gender dimensions attached to them, in addition to the stated gender equality questions.

* 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 assigned to this project representative of reality?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Did any unintended effects emerge for women, men or vulnerable groups?

**Disability**

* Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?
* What proportion of the beneficiaries of a programme were persons with disabilities?
* What barriers did persons with disabilities face?
* Was a twin-track approach adopted?[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Cross-cutting Issues:**

* Cross-cutting issues such as gender, human rights, civil society engagement and government - non-government partnerships, Do-No Harm and, conflict sensitivity principles are taken into consideration.

NOTE: Guiding evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with UNDP evaluation stakeholders.

1. **Methodology**

**The evaluation methodology used here is:**

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNDP and USAID evaluation guidelines and policies including Evaluation guidelines during COVID-19, United Nations Group Evaluation Norms and Ethical Standards; OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

**Project evaluations** encompass a broad range of evaluation methods. They often incorporate before-after comparisons, but generally lack a rigorously defined counterfactual. Project evaluations may address descriptive, normative, and/or cause-and-effect questions. As project evaluations do not contain a rigorously defined counterfactual, they should not answer questions about the amount of change attributable to an intervention, where other factors are likely to have influenced the variable in question. The evaluation shall provide analysis of the output level change in the target institutions; i.e. the change in knowledge and skills of the beneficiary officials, and the new planning and management tools that have been made available to the target entities, and how they are contributing to improve the performance of these entities. The evaluation shall also provide analysis of the change in knowledge of civil society and community level beneficiaries and how the newly acquired knowledge or skills are being exploited by the beneficiaries for emergency preparedness.

The Project Evaluation methodology[[4]](#footnote-4) will include the following data collection tools:

* Desk review of relevant project documents
* One- to-one interviews with Government and civil society partner institutions, volunteers, and beneficiary population, who are directly engaged in the project implementation
* Discussions with UNDP CO senior management and relevant project staff
* Consultations with the donor (USAID)
* Consultations with international partners who implemented certain outputs of the project (UNICEF, WHO and others)
* Consultations with relevant government representatives/implementing partners involved in the implementation of project both at national and provincial levels.
* Review of the social media content produced by the Project (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter) and the electronic media content; i.e. videos, tv broadcasts, if possible;

The project evaluation will use a mixed method to collect data, which includes the following: desk reviews of key documents (such as: annual report and strategic review), project data, and other relevant research, reference materials, interviews, and meetings with relevant stakeholders.

Data and information are to be collected via various methods, including semi-structured interviews covering participants in development project, project members, as well as data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods. Information to be analyzed and consulted with project, and then an evaluation report draft will be developed. Triangulation of data in this evaluation to be done through discussing multi-perspective when investigating the project effectiveness, data to be triangulated to increase the level of knowledge about the project and to strengthen the evaluation findings on standpoint from various aspects, and to facilitate validation of data through cross verification from different data sources.

If COVID-19 health pandemic related international travel restrictions and related containment measures are relaxed field visits to selected project sites and institutions will be carried out. All field-related work and relevant logistical arrangements should be made by the Consultant and are under its his/her responsibility. Assistance will be provided by the UNDP MDEP project Team in identifying key stakeholders and in facilitating the schedule of interviews, focus groups and site visits, when and where required. Alternatively, If COVID-19 health pandemic related international travel restrictions and related containment measures are not relaxed, the field mission will only be limited to Baghdad and Erbil based interviews with rest of the interviews conducted using virtual modalities.

All analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence, and data. Findings should be specific and concise and supported by information that is reliable and valid. Cross-cutting issues and the SDGs should be integrated into the final evaluation report. The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, key stakeholders and the evaluators.

1. **Evaluation Products (Key deliverables)**

The consultant is expected to deliver the following outputs/ deliverables.

* **Inception Report and presentation**: Based on the terms of reference (TOR) and initial debriefing with the UNDP team, as well as the desk review outcomes, the consultant is expected to develop an inception report. This report should detail out the *evaluator’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why*, the *evaluation methodology* that describes data collection methods and sampling plan, together with the rationale for their selection and limitations. The report should also include an *evaluation matrix* identifying the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered by the selected methods. Annexed *workplan* should include detailed schedule and resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and milestone deliverables.
* ***Debriefing*** after completion of the field work
* **Draft Evaluation Report** to be submitted to UNDP for review; UNDP will provide a combined set of comments, **using Evaluation Report Audit Trail**, to the evaluator to address the content required (as agreed in the inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in the UNDP evaluation guidelines.
* **A presentation** will be delivered to the UNDP Team on the draft report outlining the key following aspects: (i) overall evaluation findings of MDEP project, and (ii) overall evaluation findings and in-depth analysis relating to each Outputs. Feedback received from the presentation of this draft Evaluation Report should be considered when preparing the final report. The evaluator should produce an audit trail indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final Report.
* **Final Evaluation Report** (guided by the minimum requirements for a UNDP Evaluation Report /UNDP Outline of the evaluation report format (see annex 6) should be submitted to UNDP
* **Brief summary report** (within 5 pages) linking the final evaluation findings to the country programme outcome 4.1 focusing on Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction - DRR, to be submitted before expiry of the contract.

It should be noted that the above list of deliverables, together with the implementation time-frame (see section 8) might be subject to review and revision by UNDP in discussion with the Consultant in the event of unexpected changes to the context/ working environment in Iraq during the consultancy period.

Standard templates that need to be followed are provided in the Annexes section. It is expected that the Consultant will follow the UNDP evaluation guidelines and UNEG quality check list and ensure all the quality criteria are met in the evaluation report.

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete it, due to circumstances beyond his/her control.

1. **Evaluation ethics**

Evaluations in the UN are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[5]](#footnote-5). 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.”

1. **Management and implementation arrangements**

The Project Evaluation is commissioned by UNDP Iraq’s Energy, Environment and Climate Change Pillar (EECC). The main UNDP Focal Point will be the Programme Specialist (PS) of EECC pillar, who will be supported by the Programme Management Support Unit (PMSU). Together the MDEP project team and the PS will serve as the focal points for providing both substantive and logistical support to the Consultant. Assistance will be provided by the PS and MDEP project team to make any refinements to the work plan of the selected Consultant (i.e. key interview partners; organize meetings; and conduct field visits (if necessary and if the security situation permits).

This TOR shall be the basis upon which compliance with assignment requirements and overall quality of services provided by the Consultant will be assessed by UNDP.

As part of the assignment:

* UNDP will provide office space with access to the internet and printer when in-country in Baghdad/Erbil and in the event of visits to Erbil/Erbil, she/he will be provided office space.
* UNDP will provide the following list of additional documents to the selected Consultant
* Donor Reports
* Relevant Financial Information
* Contact Details of Stakeholders and Partners
* Programme Beneficiary Details
* Risk Analyses and Lessons Learned Logs
* Other relevant documents (including training manuals, awareness materials and technical guidelines, documents produced under the Project)
* The Evaluation Consultant is expected to
* Have/bring their laptops, and other relevant software/equipment.
* use their own mobile and personal email address during the consultancy period, including when in-country.
* make their own travel arrangements to fly to Baghdad and transportation arrangements outside work hours. UNDP will make arrangements for in-country travel from Baghdad to Erbil and any other locations, as required.
* UNDP will make arrangements for interpretation services locally, as required.

1. **Locations and timeframe for the evaluation process**

The detailed evaluation workplan will be agreed upon between the UNDP and the selected Consultant. The Project Evaluation will take place between 1st September – 10th October 2021, including a combination of home-based work and one (1) in-country visit, which includes travel to Project implementation locations. The security situation in each location will be reviewed prior to roll out of the final field visit plan. The assignment and final deliverable are expected to be completed no later than 15th October 2021, with the detail as described in the below table.

**Indicative work plan—timeframe for evaluation deliverables**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **ESTIMATED # OF DAYS** | **DATE OF COMPLETION** | **PLACE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| Sharing of the relevant documentation with the consultant | 0.5 days | At the time of contract signing 1 September 2021 | Via email | UNDP Team |
| Desk review, evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed | 4 days | Within 4 days of contract signing- 4 September 2021 | Home- based | Consultant |
| Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme manager and staff) | 0.5 days - | At the time of contract signing - 5 September 2021 | Home-based & UNDP CO (online) | Consultant  UNDP Team |
| Submission of the inception report and deliverables (15 pages maximum) | 1 Day | Within five days of contract signing - 6 September 2021 |  | Consultant |
| *Deliverable 1:*Comments on inception report | UNDP review time | Within three days of submission of the inception report- 9 September 2021 | UNDP Country Office | Consultant  UNDP Team |
| Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups | 10 days | Within four weeks of contract signing- 19 September 201 | In country  (field visits) | Consultant |
| Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages) | 5 days | Within two weeks of the completion of the field mission- 24 September 2021 | Home- based | Consultant |
| *Deliverable 2:*Draft evaluation report submission | - | 24 September 2021 | Home-based | Consultant |
| Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report | 2 days | Within one week of submission of the draft evaluation report- 28 September 2021 | UNDP Country Office | UNDP Team |
| Final debriefing with UNDP (including Senior Management) | 0.5 | Within one week of receipt of comments- 30 September 2021 | Home-based & UNDP CO (online) | Consultant  UNDP Team |
| Final evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP Iraq country office | 3 days | Within one weeks of final debriefing- 5 October 2021  …… | Home-based | Consultant |
| Submission of the brief summary report linking MDEP project evaluation to the EECC outcome (5 pages maximum excluding annexes) | 2.5 days | Within one weeks of final debriefing- 8 October 2021 | Home-based | Consultant |
| *Deliverable 5:*Approval of the brief summary report |  | By the time of contract ending- 10 October 2021 | Home-based & UNDP CO (online) |  |
| **Estimated total workdays for the evaluation** | **27 days** |  |  |  |

1. **Deliverables and Payment Schedule**

The consultant is expected to deliver the following outputs / deliverables. It should be noted that the following list of outputs/ deliverables might be subject to review and revision by UNDP in discussion with the consultant in the event of unexpected changes to the context / working environment in Baghdad/ Iraq during the consultancy period. Payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by UNDP of the planned deliverables, based on the following tentative payment schedule:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Terms of Payment | Percentage (%) |
| 1. Upon the satisfactory completion and acceptance of Inception Report and Presentation, including:-  * Updated evaluation methodology and work plan * Final Evaluation Report template * Questionnaires for Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) * Sampling methodology, as applicable * List of interviewees and desk review documents | 20% |
| 1. Upon the satisfactory   (a) completion of the field work in keeping with the agreed work plan;  (b) Debriefing presentation on the findings that will feature in the Draft report, and  © submission of the draft Evaluation Report | 40% |
| 1. Upon the satisfactory:   (a) Final debriefing addressing comments received on the draft Evaluation Report, and  (b) submission and acceptance of the final Evaluation Report duly approved by UNDP’s Programme Management Specialist / Programme Management Support Unit.  © submission and acceptance of the brief summary report (recommendation for CPD Outcome 4.1.) duly approved by UNDP’s Programme Management Specialist/Programme Management Support Unit | 40% |
| Total | 100 % |

### *\*N.B Travel and accommodation:*

*All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel within country or outside duty station/ repatriation travel. In general, UNDP does not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket.*

*In cases where UNDP arranges and provides travel and/or accommodation due to security and other reasons, it should be noted that these costs will be deducted from the payments to the Consultant.*

*In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon in writing, between UNDP and selected Consultant prior to travel and will be reimbursed.*

1. **Qualifications and required competencies**

### Education

Minimum of Master’s degree in Development studies, Monitoring and Evaluation, Project Management, disaster preparedness/disaster risk management, community development, Public Administration, social sciences or any other relevant university degree. In addition, the Consultant must possess the following competencies listed below.

### Work Experience

* At least 10 years’ experience in evaluation of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management projects / programmes in crisis countries required.
* At least 3 years experience in results-oriented monitoring and evaluation is required.
* Experience of evaluating at least 3 disaster risk reduction and management projects / programme implementation including field experience is required.
* Extensive experience in writing analytical research reports/project/project evaluation reports is required (previous evaluation reports to be submitted as part of the application);
* Experience in conducting Project/Programme evaluations for the UN or other international development organizations in an international setting is an asset.
* Experience of working at the policy level/strategic level would be an asset.
* Excellent analytical and problem-solving skills and proven ability to draft recommendations stemming from key findings is essential.
* Demonstrated experience of working with government institutions in post-disasters settings is an asset
* Experience in the usage of office software packages (MS Word, Excel, etc) is required.

### Corporate Competencies

* Demonstrates commitment to the UN’s values and ethical standards.
* Promotes the mission, vision and strategic goals of UNDP.
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
* Treats all people fairly and with impartiality.

### Functional Competencies

* Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
* Identifies priorities, allocates time and resources, foresees risks and allows for contingencies.
* Ability to work under pressure and to meet deadlines.
* Demonstrates excellent oral and written communication skills.
* Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities.
* Self-reliant and able to work as a part of a multi-cultural team in a stressful.
* Establishes and maintains productive partnerships with clients by gaining their trust and respect.

### Language

* Fluency in spoken and written English with good report writing skills is required. Samples of previously written work shall be submitted with the application. Fluency in spoken Arabic will be considered as an advantage.

**Note:** Applicants must not have worked in the design or implementation of this project or in an advisory capacity for any of the interventions, directly as consultants or through service providers.

Submitted proposals will be assessed using Cumulative Analysis Method. The proposals will be weighed according to the technical proposal (carrying 70%) and financial proposal (carrying 30%). Technical proposals should obtain a minimum of 70 points to qualify and to be considered. Financial proposals will be opened only for those application that obtained 70 or above in the technical proposal. Below are the criteria and points for technical and financial proposals

| ***Evaluation Criteria*** | | **Max. Point 100** | **Weight** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical** | **Criteria A:** relevance and responsiveness of candidate’s past experience, Qualification based on submitted documents:   * Minimum of Master’s degree in Development studies, Monitoring and Evaluation, Project Management, disaster preparedness/disaster risk management, community development, Public Administration, social sciences or any other relevant university degree. (**10 points)** * At least 10 years’ experience in evaluation of Disaster Rik Reduction and management projects/programmes in crisis countries **(10 points)** * At least 3 years experience in results-oriented monitoring and evaluation is required. (**10 points)** * Experience of evaluating at least 3 disaster risk reduction and management projects / programme implementation including field experience is required * Experience in conducting Project/Programme evaluations for the UN or other international development organizations in an international setting is an asset (**10 points)** * Experience of working at the policy level/strategic level (**10 points**) * Extensive experience in writing analytical research reports/project/project evaluation reports is required **(10 points)** | **60 Points** | **70%** |
| **Criteria B:** relevance and responsiveness of candidate’s approach, technical proposal and submitted work plan and Methodologies:   * Time plan, methodology on how the consultant will conduct the required tasks **(10 points)** * Experience in the usage of computers and office software packages (MS Word, Excel, etc) **(10 points)** | **40 Points** |
| **Financial** | **Lowest Offer / Offer\*100** | | **30%** |
| **Total Score = (Technical Score \* 0.7 + Financial Score \* 0.3)** | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Weight Per Technical Competence** | |
| 5 (outstanding): 96% - 100% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated an OUTSTANDING capacity for the analyzed competence. |
| 4 (Very good): 86% - 95% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a VERY GOOD capacity for the analyzed competence. |
| 3 (Good): 76% - 85% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a GOOD capacity for the analyzed competence. |
| 2 (Satisfactory): 70% - 75% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a SATISFACTORY capacity for the analyzed competence. |
| 1 (Weak): Below 70% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a WEAK capacity for the analyzed competence. |

### Annexes

This section presents additional documents to facilitate the proposal preparation by the Consultant.

**Annex 1:** Project Document as last revised in Dec., 2020 (No-additional Funds extension approved on February 25, 2021) – contains the Project Results and Resources Framework, the revised RFF would be attached as well.



1.1 Project Partners & Stakeholders

* Prime Minister National Operations Center
* Ministry of Health and Environment
* Ministry of Water Resources
* Ministry of Health and Environment
* Ministry and Departments of Education
* Joint Coordination and Monitoring Center (JCMC)
* Joint Crisis Coordination Center (JCC-KRG)
* Mosul Dam Management
* Darbandinkhan Dam Management
* Haditha Dam Management
* Hamrin Dam Management
* Civil Defense/Ministry of Interior
* Governorate of Baghdad
* Governorate of Ninewa
* Governorate of Salah Al Din
* District and sub-district authorities in Baghdad, Ninewa and Salah Al-Din
* Iraqi Red Crescent Society (IRCS)
* UNICEF (Education and C4D teams)
* WHO
* UNDP Iraq Management  
  USAID/Bureau of Humanitarian Affairs
* Training, workshop, drill beneficiary doctors, paramedics, government officials etc
* Red Crescent Volunteers
* Beneficiary communities in Baghdad, Ninewa and Salah Al-din

**Annex 2:** Documents to be consulted

1. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for development results: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf>
2. USAID M&E guidelines



1. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (June 2021):

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf>

1. UN Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/547>
2. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2020-2024



<https://www.iq.undp.org/content/iraq/en/home/library/iraq-cpd-2020-2024.html>

**Annex 3:** Evaluation matrix (Sample Evaluation Matrix) – to be included in the inception report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table A. Sample of evaluation matrix | | | | | | |
| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific  sub-questions | Data sources | Data  collection methods/tools | Indicators/  success standard | Data analysis method |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex 4:** Code of conduct forms.



*The Consultant Firm and each member of the Evaluation Team consultant will be requested to read carefully, understand and sign the “UN Code of Conduct.”*

**Annex 5:** Suggested minimum content/ guidance on Inception Report Template



**Annex 6:** Guidance on Evaluation Report Template Refer Annex 4 – PDF pages 118-122): <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/section-6.pdf>



Annex 7: [Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452)

* <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2107>
* [<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2695>](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2695)

Annex 8: [Audit trail](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%207%20Evaluation%20Audit%20trail%20form.docx) Template



Annex 9: Quality Assessment Checklists-June 2021 (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>)

Annex 10: Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details (will also be provided at the time of signing the contract)



1. UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPPs) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.html> <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The twin-track approach combines mainstream programmes and projects that are inclusive of persons with disabilities as well as programmes and projects that are *targeted* towards persons with disabilities. It is an essential element of any strategy that seeks to mainstream disability inclusion successfully. Also, see chapter 9 of the Technical Notes. Entity Accountability Framework. United Nations Disability and Inclusion Strategy: <https://www.un.org/en/disabilitystrategy/resources> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Please refer to the guidance: [https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USAID-BHA\_DRAFT\_Emergency\_ME\_Guidance\_April\_2021.pdf](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.usaid.gov%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2Fdocuments%2FUSAID-BHA_DRAFT_Emergency_ME_Guidance_April_2021.pdf&data=04%7C01%7Cibrahim.al-taey%40undp.org%7Ce9c76d8cec1b4b357f5008d93c59920f%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637607177659717856%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=eQ680tG4w8XwJWac%2F5M5aaTGezfWg2jTAfbADxZbhQg%3D&reserved=0) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’, June 2008. Available at <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/547> UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, updated June 2020: http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)