



Terms of Reference

Mid Term Evaluation, National Urban Poverty Reduction Programme (NUPRP)

AGENCY/PROJECT NAME:	National Urban Poverty Reduction Programme (NUPRP)
DURATION:	30 days over a period of 3 months (15 December 2021 – 15 March 2022)
COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT:	Bangladesh
TYPE OF CONTRACT	Individual Contract
POST LEVEL	International Consultant
DUTY STATION	Dhaka (with potential field visits outside Dhaka)

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)

A. Project Title

National Urban Poverty Reduction Programme (NUPRP)

B. Background

The [National Urban Poverty Reduction Programme \(NUPRP\)](#) is Bangladesh's premier urban poverty reduction programme (2018-2023) which is being implemented by the Local Government Division (LGD) under the Ministry of LGRD&C, managed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and funded by the UK's Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO). The programme aims to support balanced, sustainable and pro-poor development for up to 4 million poor people living in the slum and low-income settlements in urban areas. The programme will contribute to more effective and inclusive urbanisation by working across three different levels of interventions: (i) the community level, (ii) municipal level, and (iii) national level. The programme is being implemented in 19 Cities/Towns (12 City Corporations and 8 Paurashavas) across the country with a focus on the most marginalised populations, particularly women and people with disabilities. The programme addresses complex as well as interconnected issues under **five broad Outputs**, including:

- Urban Governance and Planning (Output 1),
- Citizen's Participation and Community Mobilisation (Output 2),
- Economic Development and Livelihoods (Output 3),
- Housing and Land Tenure (Output 4), and
- Infrastructure and Basic Services/Climate Resilient Infrastructure (Output 5)

The five interrelated components of NUPRP will contribute in achieving the SDGs, particularly the following: [SDG-1: No Poverty](#); [SDG-5: Gender Equality](#); [SDG-6: Clean Water and Sanitation](#); [SDG 10: Reduced Inequalities](#); [SDG-11: Sustainable Cities & Communities](#); [SDG-13: Climate Action](#) and [SDG-16: Strong Institutions](#). The NUPRP will also contribute to achieving *more than 50 of the SDG targets* through improvements in the livelihoods and living conditions of urban poor people.

The [Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office](#) (is providing up to [£58.1 million over 7 years \(2016 - 2023\)](#) to support the programme's implementation. Up to [£20 million](#) of the budget is from the International Climate Fund (ICF), while the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) has committed to providing up to [£10 million](#) through a combination of financial and in-kind support. The NUPRP also underwent immense challenges.

The Government of Bangladesh (GoB) [Development Programme Proforma \(DPP\)](#) was not approved until August 2018 and the Government Order verifying the DPP was not received until October 2018¹. This considerably delayed the NUPRP implementation during 2018 as securing the DPP approval was a key milestone, demonstrating the Government's ownership and commitment before project commencement. NUPRP has rolled out the programme in a phased approach. The first phase in 7 Cities and Towns started in August 2018, the second phase in 3 Towns started in October 2018, and the third phase in 9 Cities and Towns began in April 2019. Despite operational challenges and limited timeframe, the NUPRP has demonstrated significant achievements across all programme outputs and operational milestones.

The year 2019 observed increased momentum across the programme interventions. However, the steady progress was halted by the [onset of the COVID-19 pandemic](#) in March 2020. COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant impact on the implementation of field-based interventions since the inception of the nationwide lockdown starting from end-March. Due to movement restrictions, many field-level activities were suspended, which delayed the programme implementation and achievement of targets. However, the Project was able to refocus targets in order to respond to the immediate crisis of the COVID-19, [the 2020 and 2021 Annual Work Plan](#) was [re-purposed](#), particularly the sectoral allocation and targets of indicators following close consultation with FCDO.

The COVID-19 pandemic has continued to significantly impact [the business and operations and continuity](#) of NUPRP office at both HQ/City level due to series of extended lockdowns and widespread community-level transmission across 2020 till present in 2021. While most staff have been working from home since 26 March 2020, a significant delay in programme implementation was avoided by adopting an alternative business continuity plan that includes [using digital technologies as the principal operating model](#). Meanwhile, it also opened a new avenue for NUPRP to respond to this unprecedented crisis and support the [vulnerable populations](#) at the grassroots level who have been adversely affected by COVID-19. With support from FCDO, NUPRP implemented an [extensive and multipronged COVID emergency response](#) programme spanning from [end-March to May 2020](#) covering multiple interventions – Communication and Outreach; Establishing Handwashing Facilities and Hygienic package; Strengthening Coordination Function; Food Assistance; Sensitisation and Capacity Building of Health Officials; Data, Research and Third-Party Monitoring and Operations. Notably, the emergency response interventions undertaken by the NUPRP was the largest urban response in Bangladesh and was also UNDP's one of the largest COVID emergency response by any single programme globally.

C. Evaluation Purpose

Purpose:

The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation is to review the overall performance of the programme, assess the achievements to date, document lessons learned, and provide recommendations to NUPRP/UNDP to inform the remaining implementation period of NUPRP and make any mid-course corrections. The outcome of the Mid-Term Evaluation will also enable NUPRP to engage in discussion to form an opinion on future interventions and potential expansion of the programme (for the government) with a renewed scope of work, by taking into consideration a radically changed context considering the urban poor and the 'new poor' in a post-COVID-19 environment

¹ Formal approval for implementation was received three years after the programme's start date.

Timing:

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is proposed to be conducted in December 2021 to March 2022 and a draft Report should be made available by end of February 2022.

Utilisation:

The MTE process will be aligned to the planned 2021 Annual Outcome Monitoring (AOM) process, the findings of which will inform the MTE. The AOM planned for August 2021 will measure progress against select set of high-level Outcome and Output Indicators. The major audience of this Evaluation will be NUPRP Team, UNDP Bangladesh, FCDO, Local Government (at City/National level) and Civil society Organisations who are currently under partnership with NUPRP.

UNDP will consider all useful findings, conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation, prepare a systematic management response for each recommendation, and implement follow-up actions as per UNDP Evaluation Resource Center guidance/policies.

D. Objectives of the Assignment

The main objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to undertake a *Performance Evaluation and Process Evaluation* of the NUPRP as it reaches its third year of programme implementation since its inception in August 2018. The evaluation will primarily be an independent assessment of the programme to track the performance against the approved Results Framework, will review the programme and operational processes which contribute to achieving the programme results and making recommendations to improve programme implementation and making necessary course corrections.

More specifically, the objectives of the MTE will be to assess:

- **Programme Performance:** Assess the progress made towards achieving the expected results and since the programme inception in August 2018 against the approved Results Framework and its contribution to the UNSDF/CPD outcomes.
- **Evaluability:** Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact (measuring processes towards the impact), coherence and sustainability of the programme within the country context.
- **Programme Design:** Assess the relevance of the Theory of Change and Programme Strategies in the evolving context of changing socioeconomic developments due to COVID -19 impact. Recommend adjustments, if any, in the Impact Evaluation Methodology.
- **Sustainability:** Review and recommend the sustainability of the Output wise strategies.
- **Partnership and Coordination:** Assess the quality and effectiveness of the existing Partnerships arrangements across the Output areas, operations and Cities and recommend potential partnerships to strengthen coordination and sustainability of the activities once NUPRP starts phasing out.
- **Scalability/Replication of Good Practices:** Assess the innovative practices across output areas in 19 Cities/Towns for wider scale-up and replication.
- **Risk Mitigation:** Assess the potential risks (based on FCDO Guidelines) to initiate counter-measures to address them.
- **Governance, Operational and Quality Assurance Mechanisms:** Review the existing management, operational and quality assurance mechanism at the HQ/City level to strengthen the internal processes and recommend measures to reduce the operational costs to respond to the overall Budget revision.
- **Lessons Learned, Challenges, New Opportunities:** Review and document the emerging lessons, challenges and opportunities within the COVID context.
- **Recommendations** to enhance the programme implementation and sustainability.

E. Scope of Evaluation

The Mid-Term Evaluation will follow the revised OECD DAC's Criteria outlined in the Evaluation Framework - **Relevance, Effectiveness, Coherence, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability**. Human Rights, Gender equality, disability, social inclusion, climate resilience, and anti-corruption will be added as cross-cutting criteria. The Team of Consultants will develop a set of Evaluation Questions covering each of these criteria and submit an evaluation matrix as part of the Inception Report and shall include it as an Annex to the final report.

The **geographical scope** of this review includes 19 Cities and Towns across the country. The mid-term evaluation covers the project implementation of the project from **14th August 2018** (the beginning of the NUPRP) to **December 2021**.

In brief, the MTE will focus on the programme's progress, achievement, challenges, lesson learnt and sustainability.

F. Scope of Work and Timeline

The evaluation team consists of one international consultant and one national consultant. The International Consultant (Team leader) will be responsible to take charge of the whole MTE of the programme and take care of the overall quality and timely submission of the report. Specifically, he/she will have the following roles and responsibilities.

- Overall lead and manage the MTE mission
- Review of relevant documents and finalise the review methods, scope and data collection and analysis instruments
- Guide the national team member in designing the data collection tools and data gathering process
- Consult with key persons of national partners and relevant international development partners including donors
- Contribute to and ensure the overall quality of the outputs and final report ensuring the triangulation of the findings, obtain strong evidence for the analysis of information from multiple sources
- Provide strategic guidance and inputs to the national consultant in drafting the report
- Share the key findings of the review with the concerned stakeholders
- Incorporate the comments and feedback of the stakeholders in the draft report to finalise it and submit the final report to NUPRP/UNDP within the stipulated timeline.

The Mid-Term Evaluation is proposed to be conducted in December 2021 and the evaluation report should be made available by February 2022. The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days over 3 months starting in December according to the following plan:

Phase	Scope of work of the consultant	Number of Days	Planned Timeline
Inception Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct desk review of existing documents, including project document, strategies developed by the project, reports and documents developed by the project, and write-ups on the project initiatives; • Draft an inception report, including detailed evaluation methodology, evaluation matrix, timeline, and data collection tools; • Develop data collection tools; • Organize an inception meeting to solicit feedback; • Revise and finalize the inception report and data collection tools 	05 Days	28 th December

Phase	Scope of work of the consultant	Number of Days	Planned Timeline
Data Collection Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct data collection in the field and/or remotely; Consult with relevant UNDP staff, including the management and stakeholders; Collect data and information through document review; Provide debriefing to the UNDP CO and the stakeholders on the key findings 	14 Days	15 th January
Reporting Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Triangulate/ analyze findings from desk review, stakeholders interviews, KIIs and FGDs; Prepare a draft evaluation report; Organize a meeting to share draft findings with UNDP and relevant stakeholders to solicit feedback; 	8 Days (Draft Evaluation Report)	28 th February (Draft Evaluation Report)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the draft evaluation report to incorporate comments and feedback; Finalize and submit a finalized evaluation report A brief on the future course of the project 	3 Days (Presentation and Finalized Evaluation Report)	15 th March (Presentation and Finalized Evaluation Report)

G. Evaluation Questions

The Evaluator/s will develop a set of evaluative questions based on the revised OECD DAC's Criteria as outlined below -

Relevance: The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

- To what extent was the NUPRP design relevant in supporting balanced, sustainable and pro-poor development in the slum and low-income settlements in urban areas through more effective and inclusive municipal/local governance?
- To what extent was the design and strategy of the NUPRP relevant with national priorities outlined in the 7th and 8th Five Year Plan and UN priorities in Bangladesh?
- To what extent was the design and strategy of the NUPRP aligned with CPD (2017-2020) and UNDAF (2017-2020)?
- To what extent was the theory of change applied in the NUPRP relevant to serve the needs of the urban poor?
- To what extent the theory of change was relevant in empowering the urban poor to exercise their right to life with dignity and respect?
- To what extent the COVID 19 emergency response was relevant in containing the transmission of COVID 19 infection in the urban poor communities with project presence?

Effectiveness: The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

- To what extent has the programme achieved the objectives and targets of the Results Framework in the Programme Document?
- Compared to 2019, to what extent has the programme been effective in creating structural space for policy dialogue and influencing?
- To what extent has the programme been effective in empowering the urban poor communities in pro-poor planning based on their priorities?
- What factors contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of the NUPRP outcomes and outputs?
- To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner/s impacted the effectiveness of the NUPRP?

- To what extent have the marginalised and vulnerable populations (Single Women Headed Households, People with Disabilities, Religious & Caste-based minorities, elderly) have been able to exercise their rights through the programme interventions? Have the programme interventions contributed to bringing about transformative change in power relations?
- To what extent NUPRP is contributing to improving the resilience of the urban poor to climate/man-made vulnerabilities and shocks?
- To what extent NUPRP was able to support the livelihood of the urban poor during the COVID 19 emergency response.

Efficiency: The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

- To what extent were the NUPRP outputs delivered in time to ensure high-quality programming?
- To what extent has NUPRP ensured value for money?
- To what extent has funding impacted the programme implementation? Was funding sufficient for the achievement of results? (Funding analysis)
- To what extent synergies were developed between UNDP initiatives/programmes that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?
- How well did programme management work to achieve targeted results?
- To what extent did programme M&E systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- To what extent did NUPRP ensure value for money and cost efficiency while responding to COVID emergencies.
- To what extent the mitigation measures were efficient in addressing the fiduciary risks including safeguarding at each level?

Sustainability: The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

- What are the national partner's resources, motivation and ability to continue implementing the programme till the end?
- To what extent will the NUPRP achievements be sustained? What are the indicators of sustainability for these achievements, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)? What are the challenges and opportunities?
- To what extent are the institutional mechanisms and policies in place to sustain the impact of NUPRP's interventions?
- Review the level and range of partnerships established at all levels which contributed to scaling up and sustaining the programme interventions?
- To what extent the capacities have been strengthened at the local and municipal governance levels?

Impact: Extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

- To what extent the annual milestones of programme outputs were achieved and contributed or expected to contribute to achieving the relevant outcome level results?

Coherence: The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.

- To what extent do various interrelated Output interventions (including policies) are coherent amongst each other in ensuring a harmonised response? It includes internal coherence and external coherence.
- To what extent the various components of the programme were coherent in addressing the human rights and exclusion issues of the urban poor?

H. Methodology

The Team of Consultants are expected to propose and determine a sound evaluation design and methodology (including detailed methodology to answer each evaluation question) and submit it to UNDP in the inception report following a review of all key relevant documents and meetings with representatives of UNDP, NUPRP and LGD. However, it is suggested that the evaluation should use a mixed-method approach – collecting and analysing both qualitative and quantitative data using multiple sources in order to draw valid and evidence-based findings and conclusions and practical recommendations. The evaluation team is

expected not only to conduct specific surveys to collect quantitative data but also is highly encouraged to review all relevant reports providing quantitative data collected by NUPRP, UNDP, Government or other agencies. However, final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation will be made through consultation among the UNDP, NUPRP and the consultants and key stakeholders about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives as well as answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. Methods to be used by the evaluation team to collect and analyze the required data shall include but not limited to:

a. Inception Phase

- Conduct a comprehensive desk review of the existing key documents that will be useful for this evidence-based assessment. The key documents include but not limited to Project document, Result Framework/M&E Framework, Project Quality Assurance Report, Annual Work Plans, Donor Reports, Progress Reports of COVID-19 supporting activities, and relevant survey/ study reports.
- Attend briefing sessions with the NUPRP team, FCDO and UNDP Country Management Team.
- Submit an Inception Report outlining in detail the Evaluation Questions, Methodology, and Evaluation Matrix to elaborate on how each evaluation question will be answered along with proposed sources of data, data collection tools and analysis procedures.
- Data and evidence will be triangulated with multiple sources to address evaluation questions. The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed upon between UNDP, stakeholders, and the consultants. The Evaluation team should select the respondents using an appropriate sampling technique.

b. Data Collection

- The Evaluation should use a mixed-method approach – collecting and analysing both qualitative and quantitative data using multiple sources in order to draw valid and evidence-based findings and conclusions and practical recommendations.
- The MTE should build upon the available programme documents, field visits to project sites (if possible due to restrictions imposed by the pandemic), Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with key stakeholders and focus group discussions (FGDs) with relevant stakeholders (virtual in case of travel restriction), which would provide an opportunity for more in-depth analysis and understanding of the programme.
- The Evaluator/s should use the findings of the Impact Evaluation Documents – Baseline Report, Socio-Economic Assessment of COVID Impact on Urban Poor, Annual Outcome Monitoring processes (2020/2021) to inform the Evaluation process. The Evaluator/s should triangulate the various data sources to maximise the validity and reliability of the data. Data from NUPRP's existing database may be used as secondary data if appropriate.
- Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigour in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.
- The methodology used in the Mid-Term Evaluation including data collection and analysis methods should review the extent to which cross-cutting areas including gender, disability, climate resilience and Leaving No One Behind has been integrated across the programme.
- The evaluation data and findings should be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, disability, geography etc.
- The Evaluator/s should develop semi-structured interview questionnaires and conduct in-depth interviews (could be virtually depending upon the COVID-19 situation) with selected representatives of the Local Government at the National and Corporation/Municipality level.
- The Evaluator/s should also interview (could be virtual) key officials from Networks, FCDO, and representatives of CSOs at both the National and City level.
- The Evaluator/s is expected to conduct a field mission (based on select sample Cities – not more than 5) to observe and conduct discussions with representatives of the Local Government, Field Office Staff,

Frontline Staff, Community leaders and members (subject to the COVID-19 situation). If the crisis remains unchanged, the team should conduct the discussions virtually.

- The Evaluator/s are expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the NUPRP Team implementing the programme and other key stakeholders.
- The current situation of the COVID-19 crisis in the country needs to be considered when proposing data collection tools. The evaluation team is expected to present alternative means of data collection as viable options.
- In case if a data collection/field mission is not possible, then remote interviews may be undertaken partially through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). Details will be decided during the inception phase in consultation with UNDP and stakeholders. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

c. Report Development

- Develop draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report and make a presentation on the draft findings with NUPRP, UNDP, FCDO and relevant stakeholders to solicit feedback.
- Revise the draft Report to address necessary feedback and finalise the Mid-Term Evaluation Report.

The evaluation report will contain the same sections as the final report and shall follow the structure outlined in Annex 3/ Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards (Page 56-60) of Section 4/ Evaluation Implementation and Use of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2021)². The draft report will be reviewed by the NUPRP, UNDP, and FCDO. The draft report will ensure that each evaluation question is answered with in-depth analysis of information and back up the arguments with credible quantitative and/or qualitative evidence.

The evaluation report will be quality assessed by UNDP Bangladesh Country Office and UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 (Page 9-13) of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines³. The evaluators consider it carefully while drafting the evaluation report.

Data and evidence will be triangulated with multiple sources to address evaluation questions. The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed upon between UNDP, stakeholders, and the consultants.

Gender and Human Rights-based Approach

As part of the requirement, the evaluation must include an assessment of the extent to which the design, implementation, and results of the project have incorporated a gender equality perspective and a rights-based approach. The evaluators are requested to review *UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation* during the inception phase⁴.

In addition, the methodology used in the mid-term evaluation, including data collection and analysis methods should be human rights and gender-sensitive to the greatest extent possible, with evaluation data and findings disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, etc. Detailed analysis on disaggregated data will be undertaken as part of mid-term evaluation from which findings are consolidated to make recommendations and identify lessons learned for the enhanced gender-responsive and rights-based approach of the project.

² Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2021), Section 4: Evaluation Implementation and Use, available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>

³ Quality Assessment Questions of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2021), Section 6: Quality Assessment, available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>

⁴ UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, available at http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=980

These evaluation approaches and methodology should consider different types of groups in the project intervention – women, youth, minorities, and vulnerable groups. Persons with disabilities (PwD) also need to be considered in the evaluation, following the updated UNDP evaluation report checklist.

I. Expected Deliverables

The Evaluator/s should submit the following deliverables:

- Inception report detailing the proposed Workplan, Methodology, Evaluation Matrix, and Data Collection Tools;
- Draft Evaluation Report;
- PowerPoint Presentation on key MTE findings;
- Final Evaluation Report within stipulated timeline incorporating feedback from the concerned parties.
- A brief on the future prospects, opportunities and engagement of the project
- Audit Trail and Data Collection Tools (if any)

J. Management Arrangements

The Evaluation Team will independently conduct the evaluation but shall take necessary assistance from NUPRP, and UNDP. Under the supervision of the Deputy Resident Representative, Assistant Resident Representative (Governance Cluster) and Assistant Resident Representative (Partnership Cluster), and M&E Focal Point of UNDP Bangladesh will provide the necessary oversight and quality assurance throughout the evaluation process and deliverables. The NUPRP team led by the CTA/Project Manager and the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist will provide necessary support to manage the evaluation process on a daily basis. The Consultant will also seek technical guidance from M&E Focal Point at UNDP Bangladesh Country Office. The programme evaluation report needs to be cleared by the M&E Focal Point at UNDP Bangladesh Country Office and approved by the Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Bangladesh, and RBM/ M&E focal point, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub.

K. Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

A consultant must send a financial proposal based on Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be a fixed output-based price regardless of the extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per the below percentages:

Deliverables/Outputs	Estimated duration	Tentative Due Dates	Payment Schedule	Review and Approvals Required
Submission of Inception Report, including a detailed methodology note and evaluation matrix (based on meetings with the NUPRP, the desk review and preliminary analysis of the available information provided by NUPRP)	5 days	28 December 2021	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ITA/ Project Manager, NUPRP - M&E Specialist, NUPRP - Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Bangladesh
Submission of Draft Evaluation Report	22 days	28 February 2021	45%	

Deliverables/Outputs	Estimated duration	Tentative Due Dates	Payment Schedule	Review and Approvals Required
Presentation of Report and Finalization A brief on the future course of the project	3 days	15 March 2021	35%	- Head of DG Cluster, UNDP Bangladesh - M&E Specialist, UNDP Bangladesh

2. Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies

A. Team Composition

The evaluation team will be comprised of one Team Leader (an International Consultant) and one national consultant. The presence of an international consultant and a national consultant is deemed desirable given the complexity and sensitivity of some of the issues concerned, and therefore to safeguard the independence and impartiality of the evaluation.

An International Evaluator shall be responsible for managing the overall evaluation process as a Team Leader, including evaluation design and implementation. The International Evaluator shall take the lead in the preparation and finalization of an evaluation report with the National Evaluator and ensure the quality of the report, incorporating feedback/ inputs from all relevant stakeholders. The National Evaluator shall be responsible for all evaluation processes and is particularly expected to provide quality inputs to all deliverables using her/his understanding of local contexts in the given thematic areas.

A detailed work plan, including the division of labour needs to be included in the inception report and will be discussed with UNDP and key stakeholders during the inception phase.

B. Qualifications

The qualifications below are for the International Consultant. It is expected that the Team Leader should fulfil all required skills and competencies.

- At least Master's degree in political science, disaster management, development evaluation, development studies/management or any other relevant subjects;
- At least 7 years of working experience in urban local governance and poverty reduction;
- Demonstrated experience of conducting similar evaluations of development programmes and projects, particularly from gender, exclusion and human rights-based approach;
- Knowledge and demonstrated experience in conducting evaluation and programme reviews, especially in South Asia, particularly Bangladesh

Special Note

The Consultant must have no previous involvement in the design and implementation of NUPRP project. Any individual who has had prior involvement in the design and implementation of NUPRP project or those who have been directly or indirectly related to the NUPRP project are not eligible for this consultancy due to conflict of interests.

C. Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards (human rights, tolerance, integrity, respect, and impartiality);
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

D. Functional Competencies:

- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
- Strong interpersonal and written and oral communication skills;
- Strong analytical skills and strong ability to communicate and summarise this analysis in writing
- Has ability to work both independently and in a team, and ability to deliver high-quality work on tight timelines.

E. Skills:

- Strong leadership and planning skills
- Excellent written and presentation skills (English)
- Strong analytical and report writing skills
- Strong communication skills
- Ability to work in the multi-cultural team environment and to deliver under pressure/meet deadlines
- Ability to work with a wide range of institutions/organisations, including high-level government, UN agencies, and civil society
- Ability to network with partners on various levels
- The necessary computer skills with competence in MS office package

3. Evaluation Ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'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 the collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure the 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. Signed 'Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations System' needs to be attached in the Annex of the final evaluation report. A template can be downloaded from the link below on the footnote⁶. The evaluation team may refer to UNDP's Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details⁷ (Annex 3 (page 55) of Section 4: Evaluation Implementation and Use of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2021)).

4. Evaluation of the Proposals

Evaluation Method and Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

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

Technical Criteria for Evaluation for International Consultant (Maximum 70 points)

⁵ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2020. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/2866>

⁶ 'Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations System'. Available at <http://uneval.org/document/detail/2866>

⁷ UNDP Evaluation dispute resolution process, UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2021), Section 4: Evaluation Implementation and Use. Available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<u>Technical</u>	70%	70
At least Master's degree in political science, disaster management, development evaluation, development studies/management or any other relevant subjects	5%	5
At least 7 years of working experience in urban local governance and poverty reduction	25%	25
Demonstrated experience of conducting similar evaluations of development programmes and projects, particularly from gender, exclusion and human rights based approach	30%	30
Knowledge and demonstrated experience in conducting evaluation and programme reviews, especially in South Asia, particularly Bangladesh	10%	10
<u>Financial</u>	30%	30
<u>Total</u>	100%	100 points

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

Financial Evaluation (Total 30 marks)

All technical qualified proposals will be scored out 30 based on the formula provided below. The maximum points (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals received points according to the following formula:

$$p = y (\mu/z)$$

Where:

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated;
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal;
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal;
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated.

DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

Proposal

- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
- Personal CV, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment;
- Financial Proposal: Financial Proposal has to be submitted through a standard interest and availability template which can be downloaded from the link below:

<http://www.bd.undp.org/content/dam/bangladesh/docs/Jobs/Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal-Template%20for%20Confirmation.doc>

5. Approval:



Name: Van Nguyen

Designation: Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Bangladesh

Date: 20-Nov-2021

Annex 1: Result Framework (subject to revision in 2021)

<p>Intended Outcome as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resource Framework: UNDAF Outcome 2: Enhance effective management of the natural and manmade environment focusing on improved sustainability and increased resilience of vulnerable individuals and groups. CPD Outcome: 1. Increase opportunities, especially for women and disadvantaged groups to contribute to and benefit from economic progress; 3. Enhance effective management of the natural and man-made environment focusing on improved sustainability and increased resilience of vulnerable individuals and groups</p>			
<p>Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan: Output 1.1.2 (Poverty) Marginalized groups, particularly the poor, women, people with disabilities and displaced are empowered to gain universal access to basic services and financial and non-financial assets to build productive capacities and benefit from sustainable livelihoods and jobs; Output 3.3.1 (Resilience) Evidence-based assessment and planning tools and mechanisms applied to enable implementation of gender-sensitive and risk-informed prevention and preparedness to limit the impact of natural hazards and pandemics and promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies CPD Outputs: Output 1.1. The Government has knowledge and skills to better target remaining pockets of poverty and expand opportunities for women to contribute to and benefit from economic progress Output 1.2: National and local government have the capacity to implement urban and rural poverty policies and programmes Output 3.1.: Government institutions have improved capacities, and institutional and legal frameworks to respond to and ensure resilient recovery from earthquakes, weather extremes, and environmental emergencies</p>			
<p>Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID): National Urban Poverty Reduction Programme (NUPRP), ID 00084928</p>			
Expected Outcome and Outputs	Indicators	Baseline and Targets	Data Source
<p>Outcome1: GoB and actors working in the urban space are more coordinated and strategic in their approach to inclusive, climate-smart urban development.</p>	<p>1.1 (i) Urban Chapter of the Eighth five Year Plan; (ii) Urban sector policy - influenced.</p>	<p>Baseline- N/A 2018 -N/A 2019 - ToR Develop 2020 - Stage 1- NUPRP provides inputs to inform the Urban Chapter of the 8th five-year plan of GoB- complete; Stage 2- Urban Social Protection issue is included in the common narrative of the Development Partners as priority agenda-complete; Stage 3-National level Consultation Workshop organised to advocate on the Urban Chapter in partnership with Bangladesh Institute of Planners (BIP) and Bangladesh Urban Forum (BUF)- initiated 2021- Stage 3-National level Consultation Workshop organised to advocate on the Urban Chapter in</p>	<p>Minute Consultation Meeting and Background studies. Annual Outcome Monitoring (AOM) & Impact Evaluation Report</p>

		<p>partnership with Bangladesh Institute of Planners (BIP) and Bangladesh Urban Forum (BUF) – complete; Stage 4- Urban Social Protection Policy document (based on NUPRP lessons) developed for national level policy advocacy- complete; Stage 5 - The Urban Sector Policy document is revised based on inputs of National Technical Committee formed by the LGD – 2021- initiated. 2022- Stage 5 - The Urban Sector Policy document is revised based on inputs of National Technical Committee formed by the LGD - 2021. Stage 6- UNDP/NUPRP provides technical assistance to the General Economics Division (GED) to develop urban sector plan under 8th Five Year Plan. 2023- Stage 7 - NUSP is approved by the LGD.</p>	
	<p>1.2 Performance of Bangladesh Urban Forum & Municipal Association of Bangladesh is strengthened on an objective and agreed scale to assess institutional effectiveness due to capacity building.</p>	<p>Baseline – NA 2018- NA 2019- Stage 1- Partnership TOR developed and MoU signed with MAB. 2020- Stage 1- Partnership TOR developed and MoU signed with MAB. Stage 2- Lessons learned on nCOVID impact by the MAB members documented (through webinar series) for policy advocacy Stage 3- Capacity Assessment of MAB undertaken and areas identified for institutional strengthening and advocacy- initiated. 2021- Stage 3- Capacity Assessment of MAB undertaken and areas identified for institutional strengthening and advocacy. Stage 4- Consultations (at least 4) with MAB affiliated municipalities organized to advocate on the best practices in Municipal Reform and inclusive urban development. Stage 5: Regional Urban Forum (at least two) organised and institutional development plan of BUF developed. 2022- Stage 6: NUPRP in partnership with MAB advocates for National Slum Upgrading Policy (at least one high-level policy roundtable organized) and develop an inclusive urban development guideline based on NUPRP good practices.</p>	<p>Eighth 5-year plan, Urban Sector Development Policy (USDP), Forum reports, strategies, mid-term review reports, background studies. Measured through Impact Evaluation, AOM</p>

		Stage 7: Policy advocacy initiated for adoption of Inclusive Urban Development Guideline by the GoB/LGD 2023- Stage 7: Policy advocacy initiated for adoption of Inclusive Urban Development Guideline by the GoB/LGD	
Outcome2: Municipal Authorities more effectively manage and deliver inclusive, climate-smart urban development	2.1 Number of Cities/Towns with increased budget allocation/spend for poverty reduction interventions	Baseline -0 2018 - NA 2019 – Analysis framework to be developed 2020 - 10 2021 - 15 2022 - 19 2023 - 20	Baseline & End Line Survey; Government Budgets, Memo, Reports, Annual Outcome Monitoring (AOM)
	2.2 Percentage of people satisfied with Urban Local Government (ULG) services	Baseline - 55.4% 2018 - NA 2019 – 35% 2020 – 60% 2021 – 65% 2022 – 70% 2023 – 70%	Baseline & End Line Survey; Annual Outcome Monitoring Report (AOM)
	2.3 Number of Cities/Towns in which the local government is implementing costed, climate resilient infrastructure (as specified in Infrastructure Development Plan).	Baseline - 55.4% 2018 - NA 2019 – 2 Cities/Towns at Stage 2 - Matching Funds contributed by the Municipalities under CMRIF as part of the Annual Workplan 2020 – 4 Cities/Towns at Stage 2 - Matching Funds contributed by the Municipalities under CMRIF as part of the Annual Workplan 2021 – 10 Cities/Towns at Stage 3 SIF/CMRIF Plan integrated into the Municipal Infrastructure Annual Workplan 2022 – 15 Cities/Towns at Stage 3 SIF/CMRIF Plan integrated into the Municipal Infrastructure Annual Workplan 2023 – 15 Cities/Towns at Stage 3 SIF/CMRIF Plan integrated into the Municipal Infrastructure Annual Workplan	Baseline & End Line Survey; Annual Local Government Plans, Strategies, Budgets
	2.4 Number of Cities/Towns implementing Multi Sectoral Nutrition Plans as part of the	Baseline - 0 2018 - NA	Quarterly Field Reports; Meeting Minutes; Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Plans; AOM

	Municipal Corporation Annual Workplan	<p>2019 – 10 Cities/Towns at Stage 1- Multisectoral Nutritional Coordination Committee established, and ToRs developed.</p> <p>2020 – 20 Cities complete Stage-1 and 15 Cities complete at Stage-2 Multisectoral Nutritional Plans developed and implemented.</p> <p>2021 – 20 Cities/Towns completed Stage-2 and process for stage 3: Multisectoral Nutritional Plans costed and integrated within Municipal Corporation Annual Workplan initiated.</p> <p>2022 – 20 Cities/Towns at Stage 3: Multisectoral Nutritional Plans costed and integrated within Municipal Corporation Annual Workplan</p> <p>2023 – 20 Cities/Towns at Stage 3: Multisectoral Nutritional Plans costed and integrated within Municipal Corporation Annual Workplan</p>	
Outcome 3: Urban poor communities are more resilient and empowered to articulate and demand their needs	3.1 Percentage of people perceive strong community leadership (CDC/Cluster/ Federations) to influence the formal spaces for pro poor climate resilient urban development	<p>Baseline -18.5%</p> <p>2018 - NA</p> <p>2019 – 20%</p> <p>2020 – 45%</p> <p>2021 – 55%</p> <p>2022 – 75%</p> <p>2023 – 80%</p>	Baseline & Endline Survey; Annual Outcome Monitoring (AOM)
	3.2 Percentage of PG members who received benefits feel they have a voice in influencing local government decision making (planning and management)	<p>Baseline -18.2%</p> <p>2018 - NA</p> <p>2019 – 20%</p> <p>2020 – 35%</p> <p>2021 – 55%</p> <p>2022 – 75%</p> <p>2023 – 80%</p>	Baseline & Endline Survey; Annual Outcome Monitoring (AOM)
	3.3 Percentage of pregnant and lactating women grantees and children (7-24 months) grantees who consumed protein in last 7 days (women) and 24 hours (children)	<p>Baseline -31.7%</p> <p>2018 - NA</p> <p>2019 – Grant disbursed to towns</p> <p>2020 – 80%</p> <p>2021 – 85%</p> <p>2022 – 90%</p> <p>2023 – 95%</p>	Baseline & Endline Survey, Impact Evaluation, Annual Outcome Monitoring (AOM)
	3.4 Average number of days to recover from a) Climate and b) non-climate related shocks	<p>Baseline -33 days</p> <p>2018 - NA</p> <p>2019 – 35 days</p> <p>2020 – 30 days</p>	Baseline & Endline Survey, Impact Evaluation, Annual Outcome Monitoring (AOM)

		2021 – 25 days 2022 – 20 days 2023 – 20 days	
	3.5 Percentage of Households reporting they are at risk of eviction	Baseline -24.3% 2018 - NA 2019 – 25% 2020 – 22% 2021 – 18% 2022 – 15% 2023 – 15%	Baseline & Endline Survey; Annual Outcome Monitoring
Output 1: Improved coordination, planning and management at the National level and in programme towns and cities.	1.1 Level of engagement by Municipalities and City Corporations for inclusive climate resilient urban development (mahallah and poor settlement mapping, community action planning, city-wide plans and budgets).	Baseline -0 2018 - NA 2019 – Methodology and Tool Developed 2020 – High – 5, Medium – 10, Low - 5 2021 – High – 12, Medium – 8, Low – 0 2022 – High – 20, Medium – 0, Low – 0 2023 – High – 20, Medium – 0, Low – 0	Baseline & Endline Survey, Annual Assessment Report, AOM
	1.2 Number of Paurashava with functional decentralized committees (Disaster Management Committee/Town Level Coordination Committee/Ward Committee) with representation from Town Federation/CDC Clusters/CDCs.	Baseline -0 2018 - NA 2019 – Methodology and Tool Developed 2020 – 5 2021 – 8 2022 – 8 2023 – 8	Baseline & Endline Survey, Annual Assessment Report, AOM
	1.3 Number of Cities/Towns with Pro Poor and Climate Resilient Urban Strategy under implementation	Baseline -0 2018 – 7, Stage1: Participatory poverty mapping and Climate change vulnerability assessment completed, and findings shared. 2019 – 8, Stage1: Participatory poverty mapping and Climate change vulnerability assessment completed, and findings shared. 2020 – 12 City and Towns, Stage1: Participatory poverty mapping and Climate change vulnerability assessment completed, and findings shared. 1 Towns, Stage2: Strategy developed and piloted in one city 2021 – 8, Stage 3: Strategy developed for other cities. 6 Cities/Towns, Stage 4: Strategy implemented. 2022 – 14 Cities/Towns, Stage 4: Strategy implemented.	Quarterly Field Report; Baseline & Endline Survey; Annual Outcome Monitoring Report; Climate Resilient Urban Strategy

		2023 – 16 Cities/Towns, Stage 4: Strategy implemented.	
Output 2: Enhanced organisation, capability and effective voice of poor urban communities	2.1 Percentage of Community Organisations (a) CDCs; (b) CDC Clusters (c) Federations whose performance is judged "moderately and fully effective " on an objective and agreed scale to assess institutional effectiveness as a result of capacity building.	a) CDCs Baseline -0% 2018 - Methodology and Tool Developed 2019 – 30% 2020 – Fully Effective - 5% Moderately Effective- 65% 2021 – Fully Effective - 20% Moderately Effective- 50% 2022 – Fully Effective - 50% Moderately Effective- 50% 2023 – Fully Effective - 60% Moderately Effective- 40% a) CDC Cluster Baseline -0% 2018 - Methodology and Tool Developed 2019 – 20% 2020 – Fully Effective - 10% Moderately Effective- 65% 2021 – Fully Effective - 25% Moderately Effective- 50% 2022 – Fully Effective - 50% Moderately Effective- 50% 2023 – Fully Effective - 60% Moderately Effective- 40% b) Federations Baseline -0% 2018 - Methodology and Tool Developed 2019 – 30% 2020 – Fully Effective - 5% Moderately Effective- 45% 2021 – Fully Effective - 20% Moderately Effective- 50% 2022 – Fully Effective - 50% Moderately Effective- 50% 2023 – Fully Effective - 60% Moderately Effective- 40%	CDC Assessment Report, CDC Cluster Assessment Report, Federation Assessment Report, AOM
	2.2 Percentage of CDCs implementing Community Actions Plans (CAP) based on the Guidelines	Baseline -0 2018 - Methodology and Tool Developed 2019 – 16% (580) 2020 – 35% (1141) 2021 – 65% (1956) 2022 – 90% (2771) 2023 – 100% (3261)	Monthly CAP Report from Towns; Community Action Plans
	2.3 Number of Savings & Credit Group (SCG) members and their effectiveness to address shocks and stresses.	Baseline - 12, 864 (SCG-1072) 2018 - 19,200 (SCG-1600) 2019 – 1,09,200 (SCG-9100) 2020 – 2,18,400 (SCG-18200) 2021 – 2,84,000 (SCG-23660) 2022 – 3,20,400 (SCG-26700) 2023 – 3,26,400 (SCG-27300)	Online MIS on Savings & Credit; Baseline & Endline Survey; AOM

<p>Output 3: Increased access to socio-economic services by poor urban slum dwellers, particularly for vulnerable groups of people.</p>	<p>3.1 Percentage of education grantees completing the academic year in which they receive the grant (which contributes to Early Marriage Prevention)</p>	<p>Baseline -0 2018 - 13,490 Education grants disbursed 2019 – Cumulative 14,490, Education grants disbursed 2020 – 85% 2021 – 85% 2022 – 90% 2023 – 95%</p>	<p>Quarterly Field Reports; Baseline& Endline Survey; Online MIS , AOM</p>
	<p>3.2 Number of (a) pregnant and lactating women upto 6 months (b) Children (7-24 months) accessing Nutrition Cash Transfer Grants.</p>	<p>a) Baseline -0 2018 - NA 2019 – 7,500 2020 – 16,000 2021 – 17,000 2022 – 17,000 2023 – 17,000 b) Baseline -0 2018 - NA 2019 – NA 2020 – 16,000 2021 – 17,000 2022 – 17,000 2023 – 17,000</p>	<p>Baseline & Endline Survey, Impact Evaluation; Online MIS</p>
	<p>3.3 Number of Safe Community Committees (a subset of CDC Cluster) working with social service providers to address VAWG and early marriage issues.</p>	<p>a) Baseline -0 2018 - NA 2019 – 94 2020 – 160 2021 – 206 2022 – 206 2023 – 206</p>	<p>Quarterly Field Reports, AOM</p>
	<p>3.4 Number of people who have utilized (a) Business Development Grant; (b) Skill Building Grant.</p>	<p>a) Baseline -0 2018 – 13,000 2019 – 19,000 2020 – 27,000 2021 – 35,000 2022 – 38,000 2023 – 38,000 b) Baseline -0 2018 – 5,000 2019 – 11,000 2020 – 15,500 2021 – 19,000</p>	<p>SEF Proposals & Contracts, Quarterly Field Reports, Online MIS, AOM</p>

		2022 – 21,500 2023 – 21,500	
Output 4: Increased access for the poor for climate-resilient housing.	4.1 Number of Community Housing Development Funds (CHDF) established as legal entities.	Baseline -0 2018 – 0 2019 – 5 (Stage 1 & 2) 2020 – 2 (Stage 3), 6 (Stage 1 & 2) 2021 – 12 (Stage 3) 2022 – 12 (Stage 3) 2023 – 12 (Stage 3) (Stage 1 - CHDF Strategy developed Stage 2 - CHDF Committees formed Stage 3 - CHDF registered as legal entities)	Quarterly Field Reports; CHDF Meeting Minutes; Registration Documents
	4.2 Number of Households using their CHDF loan	Baseline -215 2018 – NA 2019 – 300 2020 – 400 2021 – 2500 2022 – 5500 2023 – 6000	Annual Financial Statements of CHDFs, Bank Statements of Beneficiaries, Quarterly Field Reports
	4.3 Number of Households with climate-resilient housing (a) New Housing; (b) Upgraded Housing.	Baseline -0 2018 – NA 2019 – NA 2020 – 300 (Stage 1) 2021 – 1200 (Stage 1), 1000 (Stage 2) 2022 – 2200 (Stage 1 & 2) 2023 – 2200 (Stage 3) Stage 1 - Construction of low-cost housing units started Stage 2 - Selection of beneficiary completed against ongoing construction housing units Stage 3 - Construction of housing completed and handed over to beneficiaries	Quarterly Review Reports, Online MIS, Government Allocation Orders, End line survey
	4.4 Number of Cities/Towns with secured Land Tenure (based on Vacant Land Mapping, Land Tenure Action Plan, Construction of pro poor new housing).	Baseline -0 2018 – 0 2019 – 2 (Stage 1) 2020 – 2 (Stage 1) 2021 – 2 (Stage 2&3) 3 (Stage1) 2022 – 5 (Stage 3) 2023 – 5 (Stage 3) Stage 1 - VLM completed Stage 2 - Land Tenure Action Plan (LTAP) developed	MIS, Land Tenure Security documentation, Impact Evaluation

		Stage 3 - LTAP implemented	
	4.5 Number of Households with secured Land Tenure (based on Vacant Land Mapping, Land Tenure Action Plan, Construction of pro poor new housing).	Baseline -0 2018 – 0 2019 – 0 2020 – 0 2021 – 400 2022 – 11,00 2023 – 12,00	Land Tenure Action Plan, Construction of Pro poor new housing
Output 5: More and better climate-resilient and community-based infrastructure in programme towns and cities.	5.1 Number of persons with access to climate-resilient (i) safely managed drinking water and (ii) sanitation facilities which are hygienic, gender & disability friendly.	i) Baseline - 14,004 (M-47%; F - 53%) 2018 – 0 2019 – 1294 (50% M, 50% F) 2020 – 84,880 (50% M, 50% F) 2021 – 118,099 (50% M-50% F) 2022 – 158337 (50% M, 50% F) 2023 – 198574 (50% M, 50% F) ii) Baseline - 14,004 (M-47%; F - 53%) 2018 – 0 2019 – 9000 (50% M, 50% F) 2020 – 160427 (50% M, 50% F) 2021 – 206128 (50% M, 50% F) 2022 – 261128 (50% M, 50% F) 2023 – 314031 (50% M, 50% F)	Baseline & End Line Survey; Quarterly Field Reports; SIF and CRMIF contracts
	5.2 Number of people supported to cope with the effects of climate change through SIF and CRMIF	Baseline -0 2018 – 0 2019 – 15912 (50% M, 50% F) 2020 – 85469 (50% M, 50% F) 2021 – 203150 (50% M, 50% F) 2022 – 361861 (50% M, 50% F) 2023 – 518648 (50% M, 50% F)	Quarterly Field Reports, SIF/CRMIF Proposals & Contracts
	5.3 Number of Cities/Towns with improved capacity of Municipalities to manage climate resilient infrastructure projects.	Baseline -0 2018 – 3 2019 – 13 2020 – 19 2021 – 20 2022 – 20 2023 – 20	Project Proposals/Contracts; Quarterly Field Reports; Meeting Minutes

	5.4 Number of Climate Resilient Infrastructure projects in Towns/Cities (Climate Resilient Municipality Infrastructure Fund).	Baseline -0 2018 – 0 2019 – 2 2020 – 6 2021 – 14 2022 – 23 2023 – 23	Quarterly Field Reports; CIMRF Reports
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

Annex 2: Theory of Change

NUPRP's Theory of Change contributes to the overall Goal – *“Effective inclusive urbanisation in Bangladesh”* by contributing to the following Outcome and Vision of Change:

NUPRP's Theory of Change states that –

if coordination, planning and management in programme towns and cities is improved through decentralised pro-poor planning supported by local government structures;

if capacities of the poor urban communities are enhanced through mobilisation and organisation to empower them to engage effectively with the local Government on pro-poor planning and implementation;

if the wellbeing of the poor in urban slums, especially women and girls, is improved by preventing early marriage, reducing dropouts, improving nutrition intake and building skills for productive employment through safe, violent free environment;

if the urban poor has increased and equitable access to climate-resilient housing by creating opportunities for the poor to engage and negotiate better land tenure arrangements and by working with Municipalities to prepare longer-term plans for low-cost housing development;

if more and better climate-resilient and community-based infrastructure is built for the poor in climate risk areas

then urban poor communities are more resilient and empowered to articulate and demand their needs at the Community level;

then municipal authorities will more effectively manage inclusive, climate-smart urban development at the Municipal level;

then NUPRP in collaboration with key stakeholders can strategically engage at the National platforms to showcase best practices with the Bangladesh Urban Forum & Municipal Association of Bangladesh to advocate and influence for inclusive, climate-resilient pro-poor urban policy advocacy and programming.