Terminal Evaluation Report

'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities' in India'

Report Submitted to
UNDP, India

July 2023

Dinesh Aggarwal, India

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

2

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AAI	Airport Authority of India
AP	Andhra Pradesh (One of the states in India)
APR	Annual Performance Review
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CO	Country Office
CPD	Country Programme Document
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DDMA	District Disaster Management Authority
DEA	Department of Economic Affairs
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
DM	Disaster Management
DMA	Disaster Management Act - 2005
DMP	Disaster Management Plan
DPDHL	Deutsche Post DHL Group
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DSS	Development Support Service
GARD	Get Airport Ready for Disaster
GOI	Government of India
GOI-UNSDF	Government of India - Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
HP	Himachal Pradesh (one of the states in India)
HQ	Head Quarters
HRVA	Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment
IC	Individual Consultant/ Individual Contract
INR	Indian Rupees
IT	Information Technology
LPAC	Local Project Appraisal Committee
NDRF	National Disaster Response Fund
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OP	Operating Procedure
POPPs	Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (of UNDP)
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SDMA	State Disaster Management Authority
SDRF	State Disaster Response Fund
SOP	Standard Operation Procedure
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
UD	Urban Development
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNSDF	United Nations Sustainable Development Framework
USD	United States Doller

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project summary table

Table 1: Project Summary and Outcome Information[1]

Project/outcome title	Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities
Atlas ID	97731
Corporate Outcome and Output	Outcome (UNSDF): By 2022, environmental and natural resource management is strengthened, and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks. Output (CPD): Effective institutional, legislative, and policy frameworks in place to enhance the implementation of climate change and disaster risk reduction at national and subnational levels.
Country	India
Region	Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra
Date project document signed	Feb 2016
Project dates	**Start** Feb 2016	**Planned end** March 2023
Project budget	US$ 3.6 million
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	US$ 3.5 million
Funding source	Governments of, Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra And Airport Authority of India
Implementing party	UNDP

Introduction and brief description of the project

The project 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities' was implemented by UNDP. The objective of the project was to provide technical support to some of the state governments in India and the Airport Authority of India, to strengthen their capacities in fast-tracking implementation of the planning frameworks on Disaster Risk Reduction. The project was implemented as 'Development Support Services (DSS) '. Being a DSS project, the implementation was done by UNDP CO in 'Direct Implementation Modality.'

Specific agreements were signed with the state governments/other service seekers for the provision of the services. Under the project, UNDP CO, India has supported the state governments of Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, and Maharashtra. Specific project proposals were developed in consultation with the state governments being supported. The project also supported the Airport Authority of India. The project proposal was endorsed by the 'Department of Economic Affairs,' Ministry of Finance, Government of India in the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meeting dated 9th Feb 2016. The activities under the project were funded by the respective entities being supported.

As the project implementation has been completed, a 'Terminal Evaluation' of the project has been carried out by an independent consultant (Dinesh Aggarwal) to ascertain the results of the project, measured against its original purpose, and objectives whilst in the process, capturing the evaluative evidence of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the results of the project, which

---

[1] Based on the information provided in the TOR, by the Project Team

will set the stage for future similar initiatives. The evaluation has been carried out as per 'UNDP Evaluation Guidelines Revised Edition: June 2021'. This report presents the findings of the TE, a Summary of which is given in the following paragraphs.

Limitations

The TE was to be carried out as per the provisions in the 'UNDP Evaluation Guidelines Revised Edition: June 2021'. However, considering that the project being evaluated is a 'Development Support Services' project, it was not possible to comply with some of the requirements in the 'Guidelines'. For example, the project does not have a proper results framework/theory of change.

Some of the Components/Outputs (please see Table 2, for details of the Outputs) of the project were implemented, long back, and at the time of TE, all the required documents for carrying out an evidence-based evaluation could not be organised by UNDP project team. Further, the project team could not organise the consultations/interviews with some of the important stakeholders involved in project implementation, due to time gaps and other reasons (e.g., moving on of the government officials, lack of availability of contact details).

The project comprises seven different Outputs (having separate Financing and Service Agreements), which are not related to each other, thus, the evaluation is more of seven sub-projects rather than a single project. The project had issues around its 'Evaluability.'

Project Objectives, Logical Frame Work and Achievements

Being a DSS project, the project does not have a results framework or a theory of change. As was mentioned before, UNDP CO signed separate service agreements with different entities which were provided development support services (DSS). These individual agreements were endorsed by the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC), Department of Economic Affairs, Government of India. The individual service agreements between UNDP and the entities constitute different targeted Outputs of the project. Table 2, provides the details of the Outputs, corresponding service agreements, activities, and other relevant details of the project.

The Table also shows the assessment regarding the achievements for each of the Outputs. The Terminal Evaluation of the project has been carried out keeping in mind the expected results and the activities that were proposed to be carried out. There were no gender specific aspects/considerations either in the project design or project implementation, except that for Output 7, where adequate participation by women was ensured in the training sessions at the community level.

Table 2: Outputs, Service Agreements, and Activities of the Project[2] and the Achievements

Output[3]	Service Agreement	Activities and Scope[4]	Summary of Assessment of Achievements at TE
Output 1: Enhancing community resilience and capacity building of the state in the area of disaster risk reduction in Andhra Pradesh	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of	Proposal: Implement activities to strengthen the districts through updating of Disaster Management (DM) plans in 13 districts, preparation of 10 city DM plans, preparation of DM plans for key departments, and development of Standard Operating Procedures for State Emergency Operation Centres	The project supported the preparation of the DMP for 11cities and the 15 departments as per the service agreement. No other activity was supported by the project. There is no evidence to suggest the preparation of

---

[2] This Table has been prepared at the time of Terminal Evaluation by the Evaluator for TE (based on the documents shared by the project team). The purpose of creating this Table is to facilitate the process of TE.

[3] Outputs of the project as provided in the ToR for the Terminal Evaluation Consultancy.

[4] Based on the 'Project Document' provided by the 'Project Team'

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

7

Output[3]	Service Agreement	Activities and Scope[4]	Summary of Assessment of Achievements at TE
	Andhra Pradesh for Disaster Risk Reduction Date of agreement: 18 December 2015		SOP and updating of DM plans of the districts.
Output 2: Capacity building of urban local bodies under the Comprehensive Capacity Building Programme (CCBP) & National Urban Livelihoods Mission (NULM) schemes to make 13 resilient cities in Himachal Pradesh	Party to the agreement: Urban Development Department, Government of Himachal Pradesh Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of Himachal Pradesh to fast-track utilization of Capacity Building Grants provided by the Government of India for the Comprehensive Capacity Programme (JNNURM) and National Urban Livelihoods Mission (NULM) Date of agreement: October 2014	Proposal: Enhance the capacities of urban local bodies and the respective Mission Directorates and/or Implementation Units by providing technical support in different domain areas. The positions will be filled initially for one year. The number of positions will be filled in as below: • Positions under Comprehensive Capacity Building Programme 72 (6 Posts at State Level, 60 posts at City/Distt Head Quarter Level, and 6 UMC posts at Urban Development Dept.) • Positions under National Urban Livelihood Mission (24 Posts (4 Posts at State Level, 20 posts at City/Dist. Hq Level)	Development support services were provided by way of the provision of skilled human resources for one year. The advantage the development partners got due to the services provided by UNDP, is the procurement of consultancies (hiring of individual consultants on a contract basis) in a fast-track and transparent manner, using the procedures of UNDP. The hiring process of the development partner (the state government of Himachal Pradesh) is more cumbersome and time-consuming. Further, any hiring done by government agencies has issues related to procedures, provisions of the budget, and regulations.
Output 3: Enhancing institutional framework by strengthening State and District Disaster Management Authorities (S/DDMAs) in Jharkhand	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Jharkhand Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of Jharkhand to fast-track utilization of Capacity Building Grants provided by the Government of India for Disaster Risk Reduction Date of agreement: August 2014	Proposal: Provide technical support to the Government of Jharkhand to facilitate implementation of activities outlined in the perspective plan and to support the state Government to undertake various actions as per the legal-institutional framework of the National Disaster Management Act 2005 covering key Departments of the Government of Jharkhand such as State Disaster Management Authority (SDMA); District Disaster Management Authorities (DDMAs), Local bodies including Panchayati Raj Institutions, Municipalities, Administrative Training Institutions and State Institutes of Rural Development. The positions identified are as follows: • Capacity Building Officers (2 posts) • Documentation officer (1 post) • Disaster Management Specialist (1 post) • District Disaster Management Officers (12 posts)	Although, there is no document to support that the activity of provision of skilled human resources was carried out as per the service agreement, presumably the required services were delivered.
Output 4: Enhancing Disaster resilience at two Airports by strengthening institutional mechanisms for disaster	Party to the agreement: Airports Authority of India (AAI) Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the Airport Authority of India for enhancing	Proposal: Support in implementing a disaster management planning and preparedness project in select airports of India on a pilot basis which based on the learning, can be scaled up to all airports in the country. The following specific activities were to be carried out:	The project has delivered the results as per the requirements of the agreement

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

8

Output[3]	Service Agreement	Activities and Scope[4]	Summary of Assessment of Achievements at TE
mitigation, preparedness, and response planning	Disaster Preparedness of Airports Date of agreement: August 2015	Activity 1: Review of Disaster Management plan of airports and preparation of model template Activity 2: Revision of disaster management plans of two (2) select airports as per model template Activity 3: Development of Integrated Training Module for members of Disaster Management Committee Activity 4: Conduct Training for members of Disaster Management Committee of airports	
Output 5: Establishment of climate risk management system in Pune District through Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (HRVA)	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Maharashtra Title: Technical Support to the Government of Maharashtra for conducting, Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (HRVA) Date of agreement: June 2015	Proposal: Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (HRVA) of 14 multi-hazard districts in two phases as under: • Phase I: HRVA of Pune district on a pilot basis • Phase II: HRVA of 13 multi-hazard districts namely; Latur, Osmanabad, Nashik, Dhule, Ahmednagar, Kolhapur, Satara, Thane, Palghar, Raigad, Ratnagiri, Sindhudurg, and Amravati	The project hired a consulting firm to carry out HRVA. The assignment was successfully delivered by the consultant. Phase II of the HRVA did not happen.
Output 6: Enhancing Institutional framework by strengthening SDMA and DDMA in Himachal Pradesh	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Himachal Pradesh [Agreement 1] Title: Provision of Development Support Services to the State Government of Himachal Pradesh for strengthening the capacity of SDMA and DDMAs Date of agreement: Aug 2015	Proposal: Strengthening SDMA and DDMAs in all districts. The objective is to provide trained and experienced disaster management professionals to the SDMA and all 12 DDMAs of the State to facilitate implementation of training & capacity building activities outlined in the SDMP and DDMPs and to support the state Government to undertake various measures as mandated by the Disaster Management Act 2005. The positions identified are as follows: • Training and Capacity Building Coordinator at each district (12 posts) • Disaster Management Specialist (1 post) • Capacity Building and Documentation Coordinator (1 post) • Account and Finance Specialist (1 post) • Information Technology Specialist (1 post) • Assistant Information Technology Coordinator (12 posts)	Although, there is no document to support implementation of the activity pertaining to provision of skilled human resources as per the service agreement, presumably the required services were delivered. The advantage the development partners got due to the services provided by UNDP, is the procurement of consultancies (hiring of individual consultants on a contract basis) in a fast-track and transparent manner, using the procedures of UNDP.
Output 7: Enhancing the resilience of institutions and people through sustainable reduction of disaster risk by developing capacity for disaster prevention,	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Himachal Pradesh [Agreement 2] Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of Himachal Pradesh for	Proposal: Strengthening SDMA and DDMAs in all districts and enhancing institutional and community resilience to disasters. Key components under the proposal are as follows: Component-1: Disaster Management Planning in the State Activity 1.1: Review of State and District Disaster Management Plans:	Following the requirements of the financing agreement, the following activities were carried out successfully • Updating of State and district-level disaster management plans • Disaster management plans were prepared for 30 different government departments

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

9

Output[3]	Service Agreement	Activities and Scope[4]	Summary of Assessment of Achievements at TE
response, and recovery at all levels	Strengthening, Community Resilience (2015-2020) Date of agreement: Jan 2016	Activity 1.2: Preparation of Departmental Disaster Management Plans Component-2: Training & Capacity development programmes Activity 2.1: Formulation of a Capacity Development Strategy for DRR in the State Activity 2.2: Development of Standardized Training Modules Activity 2.3: Training of Trainers Activity 2.4: Guidelines for Certification & Accreditation: Activity 2.5: Training of Government functionaries at State, District, and sub-district levels Component-3: Mass Awareness Activity 3.1: Formulation of Disaster Awareness Strategy for the State Activity 3.2: Carrying out Awareness Campaign in the state Component-4: Enhancing Community Resilience Activity 4.1: Develop Baseline Database at the Panchayat Samiti level Activity 4.2: Develop Panchayat Samiti level Action Plan for integration of disaster mitigation measures into ongoing development schemes Activity 4.3: Develop disaster preparedness and response plans at the Panchayat Samiti level Activity 4.4: Strengthening Response Capacity	• Baseline Studies at the Panchayat Samiti Level were carried out in four districts (Chamba, Kangara, Kinnaur, Shimla). This was followed up with the preparation of action plans at (the Panchayat Samiti Level) for these four districts. This was further followed up with the preparation of response plans (at the Panchayat Samiti Level). • Development of Standardized Training Modules • Training of Trainers • Training of Government functionaries at State, District, and Sub-Division levels • Awareness Campaign at State, City and District levels • Training programs were conducted at the Panchayat Samiti level.

Evaluation Summary

Table 3: Summary of Findings

Evaluation Criteria	Assessment
Results/ Impacts:	
	As it is a DSS project, the project did not have any results framework or a theory of change and did not aim towards achieving a transformational change. Under the seven services agreements, the services were delivered as per the agreements. The project did not have any direct development objectives. However, disaster management per se has several development co-benefits. There are no negative impacts of the project.
Relevance:	
	India was the signatory of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) which provided for strategic goals and actions for the integration of DRR into sustainable development policies, capacity building and preparedness, and vulnerability reduction. India is also the signatory of the follow-up international agreement for disaster reduction, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. In line with its commitments, the government of India came out with the Disaster Management Act 2005, with pan-India applicability. From the government policy point of view, the project is highly relevant.

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

10

Evaluation Criteria	Assessment
	At the time of its implementation, the project was in line with the Outcome/Outputs of UNSDF/CPD for India. From the viewpoint of the UNDP mandate, national priorities of Disaster Management, and the requirements of the state administration, the project is relevant, and the subject matter of DRR remains to be Relevant for any future program in the country.
Effectiveness:	
	For the seven targeted Outputs of the project, the level of services support varied from Output to Output. For most of the Projected Outcomes, the project has been able to deliver as per the financing agreements with the development partners. With the implementation of the project, UNDP CO has facilitated the selected state governments to comply with the requirements of the 'Disaster Management Act 2005' by providing the required skilled human resources and by procuring the services of competent consulting organizations for preparing disaster management plans; do capacity building and training of officials. With the implementation of the project, there is an increased level of awareness amongst government officials and an increased level of preparedness to manage disaster events.
Efficiency:	
	Being a DSS project, specific agreements were signed with the selected development partners for the provision of the services. The Monitoring and Evaluation activities for the project have fallen short of the requirements. At TE, Quarterly progress reports could not be shared. At the time of TE, APRs for different implementation years (from 2016 to 2023) were shared. However, in the APR shared, there is a mix between the activities of the DSS project being evaluated and an earlier project (GOI-UNDP DRRPM project – 2013-2017). As the periodic monitoring reports did not get prepared regularly, the project did not get the opportunity to take adaptive measures to enhance the project results. During project implementation, there was no participation by other UN agencies. The project steering committee did not get constituted and there was no formal platform to engage the national counterparts. The funds for the implementation of the project activities under different Outputs of the project were provided by the respective development partners, UNDP has provided the services as per its standard management fee structure. For the procurement of consultancies, UNDP's procurement procedures were followed, which ensures the effective utilization of resources. The agreed-upon services got delivered to the development partners on time.
Cross-Cutting Issues:	
	In the project design, there were no specific activities targeted at women's empowerment. As the project does not have a proper results framework, there are no gender-segregated indicators. The project implementation realized the importance of gender mainstreaming in the DRR. Accordingly, wherever relevant and possible, the project implementation sought to achieve gender equality through the empowerment of women by including women in the workshops organized for capacity-building and training activities. Also, while preparing the DMPs for the states, districts, and village level, the need to provide for the requirements, which are specific to women was kept in mind. There was no human rights approach in the design and implementation of the project. There is no contribution by the project towards indigenous people and human rights considerations. At the level of UNDP, there is a contribution of the project towards mainstreaming its

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

11

Evaluation Criteria	Assessment
	other priority areas of work like poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change adaptation, etc. The project has no negative impact on any of the other development priority areas of the UNDP.
Sustainability:	
	The project has helped the development partners to comply with the requirements of the Disaster Management Act. The funding for the same was provided as grants by the central government. The fifteenth finance commission has recommended the provision of grant money to the states for disaster management. Thus, the availability of funds for staffing the disaster management departments in the foreseeable future is likely. Further, the grant money can also be utilized for periodic revision of disaster management plans at the state and district levels. Although no specific efforts have been made under the project to establish mechanisms for continued training and capacity-building initiatives, such initiatives are likely to sustain in the future as the critical issue of availability of funds has got addressed, the capacity-building and training efforts can also continue in the future.

Summary of Conclusions

The project delivered the agreed-upon services to the development partners. The impulsion behind the formulation and implementation of the project was the need of the state governments to comply with the provisions of the Disaster Management Act, coupled with the use of the grant money made available by the federal government to the states for this purpose. Not all the states used the services of UNDP for the purpose. It is not clear how the states which did not use the services of UNDP, used the grant money and how they managed the services provided by the project (skilled human resources, preparation of DMPs, training/capacity building on DRR). Thus, it is not possible to assess the advantage provided by UNDP. One of the apparent advantages of the services by UNDP was the use of a transparent and fast procurement process of UNDP, which was used for the procurement of consultancies and for hiring skilled human resources as individual consultants.

In the case of this project, the role of UNDP has been more of a procurement agency for procuring consultancies and skilled human resources as individual consultants. The services were provided by the consulting organisations and the hired individual consultants, without the required quality checks and value addition by UNDP. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the consultants hired had gender competencies. Formation of a higher-level technical expert group to check on the quality of deliverables by the consulting organisations and/or guiding on matters from the technical, policy, and national perspectives, would have provided the required value addition of the services of UNDP. The Constitution of a project board/steering committee which would have reviewed the performance of the project and provided guidance from time to time would have provided additional justification for UNDP's services. The expert group and the steering committee also help in the process of exchange of information, and views across different development partners, and exert peer pressure, leading to an increase in the level of cooperation by stakeholders.

Recommendations

Table 4: Recommendations

#	Recommendation	Rational and Description	Timing for Action	Responsible Party
	Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project			
1	Future project designs of this nature should expand the involvement and role of a wider	Participation by a wider set of stakeholders would	As and when a new project of a	UNDP

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

12

#	Recommendation	Rational and Description	Timing for Action	Responsible Party
	spectrum of non-governmental stakeholders like the private sector, and NGOs/CBOs.	enhance the results of the project.	similar nature is designed	
2	For the future project of this nature, a proper steering committee/project board should be constituted and regular meetings of the steering committee/ project board should be organised	The absence of the project steering committee/project board, deprived the project, of the benefit of guidance from those stakeholders, which are responsible for the management of disasters at the federal level in the country and those who provide the funding, and those who are the subject matter experts at the National Level.	As and when a new project of a similar nature is implemented	UNDP
3	The periodic reporting regarding the progress of project implementation should follow the M&E guidelines of UNDP and to avoid confusion should not include the activities and achievements of other projects (even if they are closely related).	It is important to remain objective oriented while monitoring, reporting, and evaluating the progress of the project and if required take adaptive measures to enhance the results of the project	All times, while preparing the periodic monitoring reports for the project	UNDP
	Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project			
4	To build on the good work done by the project towards the preparedness of the airports, a program may be prepared to enhance the preparedness of the airports and other such infrastructures (transport centers, bus stations, etc.)	The activities for the preparedness of the airports were restricted to training and capacity building, and there was no follow-up action to prepare the airports to handle the relief operations. GARD (get airport ready for disaster) initiative, is one of the achievements of the project, wherein training was provided on different aspects of GARD. However, there was no follow up action to prepare the airports for disaster. This has restricted the effectiveness of this important initiative.	As and when a new project in the domain of DRR is taken up	UNDP
	Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives			
5	For long-term Development Support Services type of projects, UNDP may organise periodic events (maybe biannually or annually) wherein, a presentation about the project, implementation	One of the issues faced during implementation of the project is the frequent change of government officials, responsible for the project	For all the projects involving hiring having multiyear implementation timelines	UNDP

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

13

#	Recommendation	Rational and Description	Timing for Action	Responsible Party
	challenges, and other related topics can be made. Participation of the relevant government officials in such events will ensure that the responsible officials are updated about the project.	implementation. This could lead to a situation where the responsible government officials do not have the required understanding of the ongoing project.		
	Best/worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success			
6	In situations where the hiring of consultants on a contract basis is done for a longer period (say a year or more than a year), the service conditions being offered, be improved (e.g., provision of medical insurance, leaves, etc.)	Better service conditions attract better human resources, even if the remunerations are comparatively lower.	As and when hiring of consultants under IC for project activities is done	UNDP
7	For future projects of this nature (where the procurement of consultancies and human resources is the predominant activity). A high-level technical expert/or a group of technical experts) be hired to check on the quality of deliverables by consulting organisations and/or guide on matters from technical, policy, and national perspectives.	The formation of a higher-level technical expert group, to check on the quality of deliverables by the consulting organizations and/or guiding on matters from the technical, policy, and national perspectives, provides the required value addition of the services of UNDP. This would also lead to an increase in the commitment from the development partners.	As and when a project of similar nature is implemented	UNDP
8	For future projects of this nature, gender aspects should be given due considerations, both the stage of project design and during project implementation	For UNDP, in India Gender Equality has always been a priority and is central to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).	As and when a project of similar nature is implemented	UNDP

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

14

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context, purpose of the terminal evaluation and objectives

The project 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities' was implemented by UNDP, in India, to provide technical support to strengthen the capacities of state governments, communities, and institutions fast-tracking implementation of the planning frameworks on Disaster Risk Reduction in selected four states (Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, and Jharkhand) and Airport Authority of India. The project was implemented as 'Development Support Services (DSS)[5].' As 'development services' are implemented through the DIM modality, the project was implemented by UNDP CO through the DIM modality. The implementation period of the project was from February 2016 to March 2023.

The project proposal was endorsed by the 'Department of Economic Affairs,' Ministry of Finance, Government of India in the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meeting dated 9th Feb 2016. As the project implementation has been completed, a 'Terminal Evaluation' of the project has been carried out. As per the standard practice for UNDP projects, all the Projects with a planned budget or actual expenditure between USD 3 million and USD 5 million must plan and undertake either a midterm or final evaluation. Although this requirement is for projects and not development services[6], UNDP CO, India has decided to go for the Terminal Evaluation of the project.

Annex A provides the 'Terms of Reference' for the Terminal Evaluation. The target audiences for the terminal evaluation are funding agencies, project partners and beneficiaries, UNDP CO in India, UNDP at regional and HQ levels, and UNDP Evaluation Office. The broader defined objectives of the terminal evaluation were to compare planned outputs and outcomes of the project to actual outputs and outcomes and (if applicable) identify the causes and issues which contributed to the non-achievement of the desired results and targets of the project. One of the other objectives of the evaluation was to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from the project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

An independent consultant, Dinesh Aggarwal (India), was selected and contracted by the UNDP, India country office (CO) to carry out the terminal evaluation. Findings of the TE are presented in this report.

1.2 Scope of terminal evaluation

Table 5: Scope of terminal evaluation

Terminal Evaluation Timeframe	April 2023 to June 2023
Project Implementation Timeframe	February 2016 to March 2023
The period being evaluated,	Entire project implementation duration (from February 2016 to March 2023)
Segments of the target beneficiaries included	Targeted beneficiaries included the state government departments and their officials, officials of the Airport Authority of India, and the communities in the four states of India where the project was implemented.
The geographic area included, and which components were assessed	The geographic areas covered are the four states (Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Himachal Pradesh) and the Two Airports (Visakhapatnam and Guwahati)

---

[5] Development services comprise development assistance provided to development partners as recipients of services by UNDP. Such assistance is made available to the Government, or to such entity as the government may designate.
[6] As per the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (Revised edition: June 2021), UNDP Independent Evaluation Office

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

15

	All the components of the projects as mentioned in the project document were covered in the evaluation.
Country	India
Region	South Asia

1.3   Limitations

UNDP CO in India issued the 'Terms of Reference' (ToR) for the 'Terminal Evaluation' (please see Annex A for the ToR). The ToR follows the 'Evaluation Guidelines[7]' of UNDP. The evaluation was to be carried out as per the ToR and the provisions in the 'Evaluation Guidelines.' Accordingly, the evaluation was required to be carried out against evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Apart from these criteria, the evaluation was also required to evaluate the performance of the project against the cross-cutting issues of Gender Equality, Human Rights, etc. The ToR and the 'Evaluation Guidelines for Project Evaluation provided the guiding questions (based on OECD/DAC) for the evaluation criteria and cross-cutting issues. However, in the case of the project being evaluated, it was not possible to completely follow the ToR and the 'Evaluation Guidelines,' due to several issues. This is detailed in the following paragraphs.

The project to be evaluated is a 'Development Services Support' project, due to this reason and due to a couple of other reasons there are issues regarding the evaluability of the project. Thus, the overall approach for the evaluation as provided in the ToR for the evaluation and in the 'Evaluation Guidelines' was modified to take care of the situation. An assessment of the evaluability of the project was carried out as a part of the inception of the Terminal Evaluation. The objective of the evaluability assessment was to examine the extent to which the project, can be evaluated reliably and credibly and as per the requirements of the ToR and the 'Evaluation Guidelines' of UNDP. The assessment of evaluability at the inception stage of TE was based on an early review of the project, to ascertain whether its objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable. Examination of the evaluability was important as the project to be evaluated is a 'Development Support Services' project, wherein all the requirements of a proper UNDP project are not required to be complied with. The assessment of evaluability was based on the provisions[8] in the 'Evaluation Guidelines' of UNDP. Table 6 provides the assessment regarding the evaluability of the project.

Table 6: Evaluability Assessment of the Project

	Assessment Criteria[9]	Assessment (Yes/No)	Comments
1	Does the subject of the evaluation have a clearly defined theory of change? Is there a common understanding as to what initiatives will be subject to evaluation?	No	The project being evaluated is a 'Development Support Services project. DSS projects are not required to have a proper project document (as for normal UNDP Projects). The project being evaluated does not have a proper theory of change.

---

[7] UNDP Evaluation Guidelines Revised Edition: June 2021, Independent Evaluation Office, UNDP

[8] Please see Section 4.2 of the 'Evaluation Guidelines'

[9] As per the Evaluability checklist, provided in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (Table 4 of the Guidelines)

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

16

	Assessment Criteria[9]	Assessment (Yes/No)	Comments
2	Is there a well-defined results framework for the initiative(s) that are subject to evaluation? Are goals, outcome statements, outputs, inputs, and activities clearly defined? Are indicators SMART?	No	The objective of the project is to provide technical support to strengthen the capacities of government, communities, and institutions in fast-tracking the implementation of the planning frameworks on Disaster Risk Reduction. The project implementation is based on individual service agreements between UNDP and the entities being supported. The project does not have a results framework. To facilitate the process for TE, a matrix providing planned outputs, objectives, and planned activities has been prepared, which will form the basis for the Terminal evaluation. The project document has not provided indicators, to be used to assess the achievements.
3	Is there sufficient data for evaluation? This may include baseline data, data collected from monitoring against a set of targets, well-documented progress reports, field visit reports, reviews, and previous evaluations	No	There are no periodic monitoring reports. There are no baseline and end-of-the-project data to validate the achievements. There are no progress reports and field visit reports (back-to-office reports). No project reviews or evaluations of the project have been carried out.
4	Is the planned evaluation still relevant, given the evolving context? Are the purpose and scope of the evaluation clearly defined and commonly shared among stakeholders? What evaluation questions are of interest to whom? Are these questions realistic, given the project design and likely data availability and resources available for the evaluation?	Yes	At the time of TE, the project is still relevant. The TE will provide directions to UNDP and other stakeholders for future programs for development projects in the area of DRR.
5	Will political, social, and economic factors allow for effective implementation and use of the evaluation as envisaged?	Yes	There are no political. Social and economic issues, for effective implementation and use of the evaluation.
6	Are there sufficient resources (human and financial) allocated to the evaluation?	Yes	There are no issues related to the resources for the TE.

The 'Evaluation Guidance' specifies that, in case the answer to one or more of the questions, 1 to 3 above is 'no', the evaluation can still go ahead. However, appropriate adjustments would need to be made. Apart from the issues highlighted in the above Table, there were issues regarding the availability of documents[10]. For example, the project design has not provided a 'results framework'

---

[10] For DSS projects, it is not required to follow the monitoring and perioding requirements of a normal UNDP project/programme. Thus, many monitoring reports like inception report like PIR, Annual Report etc., are not prepared.

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

17

along with the indicators and means for verification; there are no documents supporting the utilization of funds, etc. making it difficult to assess the criteria of effectiveness and efficiency.

One of the other limitations is that there is a significant time gap between the implementation of some of the components of the project and the time of TE, due to this reason, the project team could not organize consultations with some of the stakeholders and project participants for some of the outputs of the project.

The limitations of the Terminal Evaluation include the time available for carrying out the stakeholder consultations. As no field missions could be organised by the project team, discussions with the stakeholders were carried out virtually using online meeting platforms. Despite the number of limitations, the evaluator is of the view that the meetings and consultations carried out were sufficient to provide the required level of clarity and information for the TE.

The project to be evaluated is a DSS project and considering there are issues regarding the evaluability of the project, adjustments were made for the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact and some of the adjustments were made in the set of evaluation questions proposed in the TOR. Apart from these criteria, the evaluation is also required to evaluate the performance of the project against the cross-cutting issues of Gender Equality and Human Rights. Adjustments were also made in the evaluation questions for cross-cutting issues.

One of the other important aspects is that the project to be evaluated is a bundle of seven individual sub-projects. These sub-projects are independent of each other (the only common factor is that all seven of them are in the focal area of DRR). Thus, the evaluation criteria for the TE would need to be applied individually for these seven sub-projects.

1.4 Methodology

As mentioned before, the terminal evaluation has been carried out following 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported Projects.' Before the start of the Terminal Evaluation, an inception report was prepared and shared with the UNDP CO in India and the project team. The inception report provided the outlines of the approach and methodology to be followed while carrying out the evaluation. It also provided the proposed timelines for the evaluation. The inception report included a table providing the criteria for the evaluation and the list of main evaluation questions. The table of terminal evaluation criteria and the questions are given in **Annex B**. Accordingly, the methodology for carrying out the Terminal Evaluation comprised of the following activities:

- **Review of Documents:** Review of 'Project Design Document' and all relevant sources of information. The review of documents included a review of financial data, Project Implementation Reviews (although the availability of documents to be reviewed was constrained), etc. **Annex C** provides the list of documents reviewed. Due to the non-availability of some of the documents for review, greater reliance was put on the information collected during the stakeholder consultations. (Please see the following bullet point as well).

- **Interviews with stakeholders:** Stakeholder consultations were organized from 05 April 2023 to 20 June 2023. The stakeholder discussions started with a briefing by the project team. During the stakeholder consultation process, interviews with different stakeholders and project participants were carried out. The consultations included discussions with the state government officials in the state of Himachal Pradesh and Maharashtra, where the project activities were carried out. Discussions with the officials of other participating states and the Airport Authority of India could not be organised by the project team, as there is a considerable time gap between the time of project implementation and the time of TE, and the officers have moved on. During the stakeholder consultations, discussions were also held with individual consultants and officials of the organisations which contributed towards the implementation of the project. **Annex D** provides the

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

18

overall schedule of the consultations and the stakeholders interviewed. The consultations also served the purpose of collecting some of the missing documents to be reviewedAs was mentioned before (please see Table 6) the project being evaluated does not have a proper theory of change. Further, the project does not have a results framework. The project document has not provided indicators, to be used to assess the achievements. To facilitate the process of TE, a matrix providing planned outputs, objectives, and planned activities has been prepared at the time of inception of the TE. This matrix has been used as the basis for Terminal Evaluation.

The review of documents provided basic information regarding the activities carried out to attain the desired outputs. However, stakeholder consultations were needed to verify the information, get missing data, and learn the opinion of stakeholders and project participants to interpret the information. During the stakeholder consultations, the interviews with the key stakeholders/project participants were based on an open discussion to allow respondents to express what they feel are the main issues. This was followed by more specific questions on the issues mentioned. During the interviews, the evaluation criteria, and the questions (Please see **Annex B**) was used as the checklist to raise relevant questions and issues.

The evaluation was conducted following the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' as given in **Annex E**.

1.5   Structure of the Terminal Evaluation Report

The structure of the report is as per the format suggested in the Terms of Reference for the terminal evaluation. The report starts with a chapter providing an introduction which is followed by a chapter on the project description, and findings. The last chapter of the report provides the conclusions and recommendations. Additional information is provided in the Annexes to the report. An Executive Summary of the report is provided at the beginning of the report. Concerning the discussion of the findings, the report elaborates on three general areas: project formulation, project implementation, and project results. The report is organised as follows;

   Chapter 1: Introduction to the Project
   Chapter 2: Project Description, development context, Project Design and Formulation, Project
             Implementation
   Chapter 3: Findings: Project results.
   Chapter 4: Conclusions, recommendations, and lessons.

Annex B shows where the main criteria and questions of the Terminal Evaluation can be found in different sections of the report.

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

19

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION, DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT, DESIGN AND FORMULATION, PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

2.1 Project information

The overall project is comprised of seven individual service agreements with the development partners. These individual agreements are independent of each other, with each agreement having separate start and end dates.

Table 7 provides information regarding the project, its implementation timelines, and the development context. The start date of the project has been considered as the date of endorsement of the project proposal by the 'Department of Economic Affairs,' Ministry of Finance, Government of India in the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meeting. Initially, the end date of the project was March 2020. The implementation timeline of the project was extended at different points in time. The actual implementation of the project ended in March 2023.

Table 7: Project Information[11]

Project/outcome title	Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities	
Atlas ID	97731	
Corporate Outcome and Output	Outcome (UNSDF): By 2022, environmental and natural resource management is strengthened, and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks. Output (CPD): Effective institutional, legislative, and policy frameworks in place to enhance the implementation of climate change and disaster risk reduction at national and subnational levels.	
Country	India	
Region	Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra	
Date project by endorsed	Feb 2016	
Project dates	**Start** 9th Feb 2016	**Planned end** 31st March 2023
Project budget	US$ 3.6 million	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	US$ 3.5 million	
Funding source	Government of Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra And Airport Authority of India	
Implementing party	UNDP	

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The project is focused on the provision of development assistance to some of the state governments in India and the Airport Authority of India towards 'Disaster Management.' The objective of the project was to facilitate the implementation of the 'Disaster Management Act 2005 (DMA)'. The DMA provides for the effective management of disasters in the country and is applicable to the whole country. The government in India enacted the 'Disaster Management Act 2005'. The Act requires, the constitution of a National Disaster Response Fund (NDRF) and State Disaster Response Funds (SDRF) at the National and State levels respectively.

Based upon the recommendation of the 13th Finance Commission[12], and under the framework of the

---

[11] Based on the information provided by the project team in the TOR
[12] 13th Finance Commission (2010-15)

Disaster Management Act 2005, the Government in India, set up the National Disaster Response Fund (NDRF) and State Disaster Response Fund (SDRF). The Finance Commission also recommended a grant of Rs. 525 Crore for capacity building within the administrative machinery for better handling of disaster response and preparation of district and state-level disaster management plans as envisaged under the Disaster Management Act.

UNDP has been supporting the state governments of Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, and Maharashtra towards formulating and implementing projects (through NDRF and SDRF) for building capacities to strengthen institutional and community resilience on DRR. Under the project being evaluated, UNDP continued to support the state governments in their efforts for strengthening the capacities towards disaster management, specific project proposals were developed in consultation with the state governments in alignment with the ongoing GoI-UNDP project during 2015.

Specifically, the project addressed the capacity building and training needs and the skilled human resources needs of the institutional setup for 'Management of Disaster' at the state government level (of the selected states). The project also supported the assessment of vulnerability; development of Disaster Management Plans; development of Response Plans; at the level of the state government, district level, and sub-district levels. The level of development support provided to different states varied, depending on the needs of the states which were supported.

2.3   Immediate and development objectives of the project

The project is aligned with the development priorities of India. Disaster resilience is one of the development priorities in the country. The project supports the Government of India and United Nations (GOI-UN) Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (GOI-UNSDF) 2018-2022, towards the commitment towards 'Disaster Management' in the country. One of the stated outcomes of the framework is, "by 2022, environmental and natural resource management is strengthened, and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks". The project also supports the CDP Output, " Effective institutional, legislative and policy frameworks in place to enhance the implementation of climate change and disaster risk reduction at national and subnational levels."

The cooperation framework between GOI and the UN is based on the results and strategies that contribute towards development priorities and Sustainable Development Goals of the country. In India, millions of people get impacted by disasters each year. The project supported the establishment of the required infrastructure for disaster management and provided training to those responsible for disaster management, leading to improvement in response to a disaster event. This in turn leads to the survival of the communities and minimizes human and assets losses. An effective plan to manage a disaster also leads to control and management of the post-effects (e.g., diseases, disruption of essential services) of the disaster event.

2.4   Baseline and expected results

In India, since Independence, there has been an established national disaster management framework, for response, relief, and rehabilitation. At the union level, the Ministry of Home Affairs serves as the nodal ministry for all disaster management. However, a legal framework for the organization and operationalization of the structures, personnel, and activities linked to disaster management got established much later in 20025, with the 'Disaster Management Act' getting approved and operationalized. The Act requires the establishment of Disaster Management Authorities at the National, State, and District Levels. The Act also requires the assessment of the Hazards and preparation of Disaster Management Plans.

In the baseline, for the states which were supported under the project being evaluated, Disaster Management Authorities were in place, however, there was a need to upgrade the knowledge and skills

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

21

of the officials responsible for the management of disaster. Some of the 'Disaster Management Authorities at the state level and district levels were not adequately staffed with the required skilled human resources. Further, the Disaster Management Plans at the State level and the district were not in place.

The project while supporting the development partners (the supported state governments and the Airport Authority of India), in meeting the requirements and obligations under the Disaster Management Act, was to facilitate the establishment of an effective management of disasters in the geographical areas covered under the project.

2.5   Results Framework

Under the project, UNDP CO, India has supported the state governments of Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, and Maharashtra towards strengthening the institutional and community resilience of DRR. Specific project proposals were developed in consultation with the state governments being supported. The project also supported the Airport Authority of India, to enhance Disaster Resilience by strengthening institutional mechanisms for Disaster Mitigation, Preparedness, and Response Planning. Different agreements were signed with the entities being supported under the project.

The project does not have a proper results framework/theory of change. As was mentioned before, UNDP CO signed separate service agreements with different entities which were provided development support services (DSS) under the project. These individual service agreements constitute different targeted Outputs of the project. Table 8, provides the details of the Outputs, corresponding service agreements, activities, and other relevant details of the project.

As can be seen from Table 8, there are no gender considerations in the project design. Further there are no considerations for indigenous people or for the people with special needs or for more vulnerable sections of the society.

Table 8: Outputs, Service Agreements, and Activities of the Project[13]

Output[14]	Service Agreement	Activities and Scope[15]
Output 1: Enhancing community resilience and capacity building of the state in the area of disaster risk reduction in Andhra Pradesh	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of Andhra Pradesh for Disaster Risk Reduction Date of agreement: 18 December 2015	At the time of the initiation of the project being evaluated. the GOI-UNDP project "Enhancing Institutional and Community Resilience to Disasters and Climate Change (2013-2017)" was implemented in 2 districts and cities of the Andhra Pradesh state. **Proposal:** The state government requested UNDP to implement activities to strengthen the districts through updating of Disaster Management (DM) plans in 13 districts, preparation of 10 city DM plans, preparation of DM plans for key departments, and for the development of Standard Operating Procedures for State Emergency Operation Centres
Output 2: Capacity building of urban local bodies under the Comprehensive Capacity Building Programme (CCBP) & National Urban Livelihoods Mission (NULM) schemes to make 13	Party to the agreement: Urban Development Department, Government of Himachal Pradesh Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of Himachal Pradesh Date of agreement: Aug 2105	**Proposal:** To enhance the capacities of urban local bodies and the respective Mission Directorates and/or Implementation Units by providing technical support in different domain areas. The positions will be filled initially for one year. The number of positions will be filled in as below: • Positions under Comprehensive Capacity Building Programme 72 (6 Posts at State Level, 60 posts at City/Distt Head Quarter Level, and 6 UMC posts at UD Dept.)

---

[13] This Table has been prepared (based on the documents shared by the project team) at the time of Terminal Evaluation by the consultant for TE. The purpose of this creating this Table is to facilitate the process of TE.

[14] Outputs of the project as provided in the ToR for the Terminal Evaluation Consultancy.

[15] Based on the 'Project Document' provided by the 'Project Team'

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

22

Output[14]	Service Agreement	Activities and Scope[15]
resilient cities in Himachal Pradesh		• Positions under National Urban Livelihood Mission (24 Posts (4 Posts at State Level, 20 posts at City/Dist. Hq Level)
Output 3: Enhancing institutional framework by strengthening State and District Disaster Management Authorities (S/DDMAs) in Jharkhand	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Jharkhand Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of Jharkhand for Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Reduction Date of agreement: August 2014	**Proposal:** To provide technical support to the Government of Jharkhand to facilitate the implementation of activities outlined in the perspective plan and support the State Government to undertake various actions as per the legal-institutional framework of the National Disaster Management Act 2005 covering key Departments of the Government of Jharkhand such as State Disaster Management Authority (SDMA); District Disaster Management Authorities (DDMAs), Local bodies including Panchayati Raj Institutions, Municipalities, Administrative Training Institutions and State Institutes of Rural Development. The positions identified are as follows: • Capacity Building Officers (2 posts) • Documentation officer (1 post) • Disaster Management Specialist (1 post) • District Disaster Management Officers (12 posts)
Output 4: Enhancing Disaster resilience at two Airports by strengthening institutional mechanisms for disaster mitigation, preparedness, and response planning	Party to the agreement: Airports Authority of India (AAI) Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the Airport Authority of India for enhancing Disaster Preparedness of Airports Date of agreement: August 2015	**Proposal**: AAI has sought UNDP's support in implementing a disaster management planning and preparedness project in select airports of India on a pilot basis which based on the learning, can be scaled up to all airports in the country. UNDP has submitted the proposal to AAI for the implementation of below activities: Activity 1: Review of Disaster Management plan of airports and preparation of model template Activity 2: Revision of disaster management plans of two (2) select airports as per model template Activity 3: Development of an Integrated Training Module for members of the Disaster Management Committee Activity 4: Conduct Training for members of the Disaster Management Committee of airports
Output 5: Establishment of a climate risk management system in Pune District through Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (HRVA)	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Maharashtra Title: Technical Support to the Government of Maharashtra for conducting, Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (HRVA) Date of agreement: June 2015	**Proposal:** The Government of Maharashtra sought UNDP's support in carrying out Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (HRVA) in selected districts of the state. A proposal was developed and shared with the state Government for providing technical support. It was decided to carry out HRVA of 14 multi-hazard districts in two phases as under: Phase I: HRVA of Pune district on a pilot basis Phase II: HRVA of 13 multi-hazard districts namely; Latur, Osmanabad, Nashik, Dhule, Ahmednagar, Kolhapur, Satara, Thane, Palghar, Raigad, Ratnagiri, Sindhudurg, and Amravati
Output 6: Enhancing Institutional framework by strengthening SDMA and DDMA in Himachal Pradesh	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Himachal Pradesh [Agreement 1] Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of Himachal Pradesh for strengthening the capacity of SDMA and DDMAs Date of agreement: Aug 2015	The government of Himachal Pradesh signed a financing Agreement with UNDP for the appointment of dedicated human resources at the State level, in 2014 which was operationally over by the time of the start of implementation of the project being evaluated. **Proposal**: The Revenue Department (DM) expressed its interest in further strengthening SDMA and DDMAs in all districts out of funds available with it and has requested UNDP's support. The objective was to provide trained and experienced disaster management professionals to the SDMA and all 12 DDMAs of the State to facilitate the implementation of training &

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

23

Output[14]	Service Agreement	Activities and Scope[15]
		capacity building activities outlined in the SDMP and DDMPs and to support the state Government to undertake various measures as mandated by the Disaster Management Act 2005. The positions identified were as follows: • Training and Capacity Building Coordinator at each district (12 posts) • Disaster Management Specialist (1 post) • Capacity Building and Documentation Coordinator (1 post) • Account and Finance Specialist (1 post) • Information Technology Specialist (1 post) • Assistant Information Technology Coordinator (12 posts)
Output 7: Enhancing the resilience of institutions and people through sustainable reduction of disaster risk by developing capacity for disaster prevention, response, and recovery at all levels	Party to the agreement: Disaster Management Department, Government of Himachal Pradesh [Agreement 2] Title: Provision of Development Support Services (DSS) to the State Government of Himachal Pradesh for Strengthening, Community Resilience (2015-2020) Date of agreement: Jan 2016	**Proposal**: Key components under the proposal: Component-1: Disaster Management Planning in the State Activity 1.1: Review of State and District Disaster Management Plans: Activity 1.2: Preparation of Departmental Disaster Management Plans Component-2: Training & Capacity development programmes Activity 2.1: Formulation of a Capacity Development Strategy for DRR in the State Activity 2.2: Development of Standardized Training Modules Activity 2.3: Training of Trainers Activity 2.4: Guidelines for Certification & Accreditation: Activity 2.5: Training of Government functionaries at State, District, and sub-district levels Component-3: Mass Awareness Activity 3.1: Formulation of Disaster Awareness Strategy for the State Activity 3.2: Carrying out Awareness Campaign in the state Component-4: Enhancing Community Resilience Activity 4.1: Develop a Baseline Database at the Panchayat Samiti level Activity 4.2: Develop Panchayat Samiti level Action Plan for integration of disaster mitigation measures into ongoing development schemes Activity 4.3: Develop disaster preparedness and response plans at the Panchayat Samiti level Activity 4.4: Strengthening Response Capacity

The planned Outcomes of the project, their objectives, planned activities, and targets as given in Table 8 above, form the basis for the terminal evaluation. Actual achievements against the targeted levels will be assessed as per the framework given in the Table.

2.6   Main stakeholders

The project design restricted the stakeholders to the government organizations (ministries and departments) of the development partners (state governments and officials of the two airports which were provided the development support services). Participation by a wider set of stakeholders would enhance the results of the project. It is recommended (please see recommendation # 1) that the future

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

24

project design expands the targeted involvement and role of non-governmental stakeholders like private sector, NGOs/CBOs.

As per the endorsement document of the project, the project implementation was to be overseen by the 'Project Steering Committee, co-chaired by respective states and UNDP. The project results were to be reviewed by the Disaster Risk Reduction Program Management Committee chaired by the Ministry of Home Affairs and presented at the Country Programme Management Board meetings co-chaired by DEA and UNDP.

However, the project steering committee did not get constituted and operationalised. The absence of the project steering committee deprived the project of the benefit of guidance from a broader set of stakeholders (please see recommendation #2).

2.7   Theory of Change

The project being evaluated is a 'Development Support Services (DSS)' project. Being a DSS project, the project design does not provide a proper results framework and a 'Theory of Change' for the project.

As per 'Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures[16] (POPPs),' in the case of 'Development Services,' although UNDP plays a specific and pre-defined role, it is the development partners (recipients of services) which have accountability for strategy, design, oversight, and quality assurance.

The TE of the project, therefore is based on the provisions in the services agreements mentioned in Table 8 and does not use the concept of TOC.

2.8   UNDP comparative advantage

Globally the DRR efforts of UNDP aim to 'risk-inform' development in line with the goals and targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. UNDP works with country partners to strengthen legal and institutional frameworks, national and sub-national policy, and foster coherence of DRR and climate adaptation efforts. The other efforts of UNDP in the space of DRR include the provision of access to risk information and early warning systems; strengthening preparedness; and recovery measures. Globally, UNDP also works with other UN agencies to increase political commitment to integrating disaster risk reduction into economic and social planning processes.

In India, in the past (2002-2009), Disaster Risk Management Programme was implemented in 176 districts in 17 states since August 2002. The program aimed to reduce people's vulnerability to natural and man-made disasters through building community preparedness. After this UPDP supported some of the sub-national (state) governments in their efforts to strengthen disaster management services. The in-house team of DRR experts, coupled with the experience of extensive working in India towards DRR became handy while implementing the DSS project being evaluated.

While implementing the project, the well-established and transparent procurement processes of UNDP were of great help while delivering the desired services and support. This was one of the reasons for the development partners to request UNDP to provide the required support services. As the project was implemented under the DIM modality, UNDP CO procured the services of skilled human resources and consultancies required for the provision of the services.

---

[16] https://popp.undp.org/

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

25

2.9   Gender Responsiveness in project design

In the project design, there are no specific activities targeted at women's empowerment. The project implementation realized the importance of gender mainstreaming in the DRR. Accordingly, the project implementation sought to achieve gender equality through the empowerment of women by including women in the workshops organized for capacity building and training.

Also, while preparing the DMPs for the states, districts, and village level, the need to provide for the requirements, which are specific to women was kept in mind.

2.10   Management arrangements

The project has been implemented using the 'Direct Implementation Modality (DIM)' of UNDP. However, the implementation has been carried out in consultation and participation by government agencies in the development partner organizations. The day-to-day management of the project was carried out by the project team comprising the officials of UNDP CO.

The project proposal was endorsed by the 'Department of Economic Affairs,' Ministry of Finance, Government of India in the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meeting in Feb 2016. As per the endorsement, the project was to be implemented by UNDP in close collaboration with the state governments of Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, and the Airport Authority of India. The project implementation was to be overseen by the 'Project Steering Committee, co-chaired by respective states and UNDP. The project results were to be reviewed by the Disaster Risk Reduction Program Management Committee chaired by the Ministry of Home Affairs and presented at the Country Programme Management Board meetings co-chaired by DEA and UNDP.

As is evident, the project approval/endorsement document, required the establishment of a project steering committee, having representatives from the Ministry of Home and Finance Ministry of GOI and other important stakeholders. However, this could not happen in the actual implementation of the project. The absence of the project steering committee, deprived the project implementation, of the benefit of guidance from those stakeholders, which are responsible for the management of disaster at the federal level in the country and those who provide the funding, and those who are the subject matter experts at the National Level. It is recommended (please also see recommendation #2) that for any future project of this nature in future, the steering committee be duly constituted and regular meetings of the steering committee/ project board be organised.

The project results were to be reviewed by the Disaster Risk Reduction Program Management Committee. However, during the implementation of the project, this committee did not get constitutes. It is recommended that for future projects of this nature, a committee of experts for reviewing the project results should be constituted (please see recommendation # 7).

2.11   Adaptive management and Feedback from M&E used for adaptive management

There is no evidence to suggest that the inception meeting/workshop of the project happened.

The Monitoring and Evaluation activities for the project have fallen short of the requirements. Quarterly progress reports could not be shared at the time of TE. At the time of TE, APRs for different implementation years (from 2016 to 2023) were shared. However, in the APR shared, there is a mix between the activities of the DSS project being evaluated and an earlier project (GOI-UNDP DRRPM project – 2013-2017). It is recommended (please see recommendation # 3) that all the periodic reporting should follow the M&E guidelines of UNDP and to avoid confusion should not include the activities and achievements of other projects (even if they are closely related).

As the periodic monitoring reports did not get prepared regularly, the project did not get an opportunity

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

26

to take adaptive measures to manage the risks and enhance the project results. The services agreements signed by UNDP with the development partners, required sharing of the reports of actual funds utilised and the project closure report, highlighting the activities carried out and the achievements. However, there is no evidence to suggest that such reports were prepared and shared with the development partners. No financial audits were carried out for the project.

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

27

3.   FINDINGS: PROJECT RESULTS

3.1   Achievement of targeted results

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

- **What is the achievement of the objectives against the end of the targeted values as per the contracts?**
- **What is the level of achievement for each of the Outputs?**

The summary of the attainment of the results and project objectives is presented in this section of the report. The achievement of results has been assessed against the Outputs, and planned activities as per the service agreements with the development partners. The attainment of the results has been carried out for the seven individual outputs of the project. The assessment regarding the attainment of results has been carried out in terms of the activities/targets provided in the results table (please see Table 8). Wherever relevant, the reasons for the non-attainment of the targets have also been provided. The attainment of results as assessed at the time of TE has also been compared with the self-assessment (by the project team) of results, as reported in the AIRs.

The evaluation of the attainment of overall results has been carried out keeping in mind the main questions for terminal evaluation, as given in the Box at the beginning of this section.

3.1.1   Attainment of results– Output 1

An agreement was signed in December 2015, between UNDP and the Government of Andhra Pradesh for the preparation of Disaster Management Plans and provision of other related services. The budget provided for the services was INR 17,323,142. As per the UNDP project team the scope of services offered were as follows.

- Updating of Disaster Management plans in 13 districts
- Preparation of DM plans for 10 cities
- Preparation of DM plans for key departments
- Development of Standard Operating Procedures for State Emergency Operation Centres

As per the UNDP project team, the project supported updating the DMP for 13 districts. However, during TE this could not be verified, due to the absence of supporting documents.

The project supported the preparation of DM plans for the following cities. With the support provided by UNDP, the DM plans for the cities were prepared by the respective Municipal Administrations.
- Guntur
- Vizianagaram
- Machilipatnam
- Kakinada
- Rajahmundry
- Kadapa
- Ongole
- Nellore
- Tirupati
- Kurnool
- Anantapur

The project supported the preparation of DM plans for the following departments. With the support provided by UNDP, the DM plans for the departments were prepared by respective departments.
- Agriculture and Horticulture Department

- Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Department
- Civil Supplies Department
- Education Department
- Forest Department
- Home and Fire Services Department
- Irrigation Department
- Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department
- Medical and Health Department
- Panchayat Raj and Rural Development Department
- Power Department
- Revenue Department
- Roads and Buildings Department
- Rural Water Supply Department
- Transport Department

The assessment at TE is that, apart from supporting the preparation of the DMP for cities and the departments as detailed above, no other activity was supported by the project.

APR for the year 2017 has reported updating of the DMPs for the districts, however, at the time of TE, this could not be confirmed due to the absence of any supporting document. It needs to be appreciated that the APR for 2017 mentions that updating of DMPs for districts and a couple of other activities were part of the GOI-UNDP Disaster risk reduction Program (2013-2017). It seems that this activity got completed in the year 2017, and got reported in the APR for 2017, of the project being evaluated. It is recommended (please see recommendation # 3) that all the periodic reporting should follow the M&E guidelines of UNDP and to avoid confusion should not include the activities and achievements of other projects (even if they are closely related).

APR for the year 2016 has reported the preparation of the SOPs. Once again it seems that the preparation of SOPs was an activity in the earlier project (GOI-UNDP DRRP-2013-1017). At the time of TE, no evidence to suggest that the activity of development of standard operating procedures for State Emergency Operations Centres got prepared.

3.1.2   Attainment of results – Output 2

The objective of Output 2 of the project capacity building of urban local bodies under the Comprehensive Capacity Building Programme (CCBP). An agreement was signed in August 2015, between UNDP and the Government of Himachal Pradesh to enhance the capacities of urban local bodies and the respective Mission Directorates and/or Implementation Units by providing technical support in different domain areas. The idea of the project was to build the capacity of the Urban Local Bodies to make 13 resilient cities in the state of Himachal Pradesh. As per the agreement, the development support services were provided by way of the provision of skilled human resources for one year. The funding for Output 2 was INR 65,297,880. As per the UNDP project team (this could not be validated at the time of TE, as no supporting document could be provided) following set of skilled human resources were to be provided.
- Positions under Comprehensive Capacity Building Programme 72 (6 Posts at State Level, 60 posts at City/District Head Quarter Level, and 6 at Urban Management Centre posts in Urban Development Department)
- Positions under National Urban Livelihood Mission (24 Posts (4 Posts at State Level, 20 posts at City/ District Head Quarter Level)

Although, there is no document to support that the activity of provision of skilled human resources was carried out as per the service agreement, presumably the required services were delivered.

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

29

The only advantage the development partners got due to the services provided by UNDP, is the procurement of consultancies (hiring of individual consultants on contract basis) in a fast-track and transparent manner, using the procedures of UNDP. The hiring process of the development partner (the state government of Himachal Pradesh) is more cumbersome and time-consuming. Further, any hiring done by government agencies has issues related to procedures, provisions of the budget, and regulations.

Apart from provision of the procurement services, there is no significant contribution of UNDP. As was mentioned before, in the case of the project no steering committee got constituted, thus, the development partners were deprived of the benefits of higher-level inputs for managing the affairs related to disaster management.

While hiring the consultants, the procurement procedures of UNDP were more predominant and the human resources procedures did not play any significant role. It is recommended (please see recommendation # 6) that in situations where the hiring of consultants on a contract basis is done for a longer period (say a year or more than a year), the service conditions being offered, be improved. As is known better service conditions attract better human resources, even if the remunerations are comparatively lower.

3.1.3   Attainment of results – Output 3

An agreement was signed in August 2014, between UNDP and the Government of Jharkhand. As in the case of Outcome 2, the DSS for Outcome 3 was also to support by way of the provision of skilled human resources. Under the agreement following set of skilled human resources were to be provided to support the implementation of the requirements as per DMA 2005.
- Capacity Building Officers (2 posts)
- Documentation officer (1 post)
- Disaster Management Specialist (1 post)
- District Disaster Management Officers (12 posts)

In the case of Output 3 of the project, the actual implementation of the project started, much before the official start date (Feb 2016) of the overall project. Some of the expenses for implementation of Output 3, happened before the start date of the project. The funds provided by the development partners for implementation of the Output 3 were INR 1,12,90,860, for one year. The services were extended for another year with additional funding.

Although, there is no document to support that the activity of provision of skilled human resources was carried out as per the service agreement, presumably the required services were delivered. As in the case of Output 2, the only advantage the development partners got due to the services provided by UNDP, is the procurement of consultancies (hiring of individual consultants on contract basis) in a fast track and transparent manner, using the procedures of UNDP. The hiring process of the development partner (the state government of Jharkhand) is more cumbersome and time-consuming. Further, any hiring done by government agencies has issues related to procedures, provisions of the budget, and regulations.

3.1.4   Attainment of results – Output 4

An agreement was signed in August 2015, between UNDP and the Airport Authority of India, for the provision of support in implementing a disaster management planning and preparedness project in selected airports of India on a pilot basis which based on the learning can be scaled up to all airports in the country. Under the project following specific activities were to be carried out for the airports at Guwahati and Visakhapatnam.
- Activity 1: Review of Disaster Management plan of airports and preparation of model template
- Activity 2: Revision of disaster management plans of two (2) select airports as per model template

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

30

- Activity 3: Development of an Integrated Training Module for members of the Disaster Management Committee
- Activity 4: Conduct Training for members of the Disaster Management Committee of airports

The total funding for Output 4 of the project was INR 3,915,648. Under the project, UNDP in collaboration with DPDHL conducted the "Get Airport Ready for Disaster" workshop in Guwahati in December 2015 and in Vishakhapatnam in November 2016. As a follow-up under DSS, the following activities were undertaken:
- The Airport Disaster Management Plan template was developed.
- Airport Disaster Management Plan was made for Guwahati and Vishakhapatnam airports.
- 2 trainings of Disaster Management Teams were conducted at Guwahati and Vishakhapatnam airports.
- 1 module for Disaster Management of the airport was developed.
- Training on the preparedness of the airports to handle the relief operations

It is assessed that the project has delivered the results as per the requirements of the agreement.

3.1.5   Attainment of results – Output 5

The objective of this projected Outcome of project was to strengthen Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment in the state of Maharashtra. Later the results of the pilot at Pune were to be scaled up to another district of the state. A stakeholder consultation was carried out and it was decided that the HRVA of 14 multi-hazard districts be carried out in two phases:
- Phase I: HRVA of Pune district on a pilot basis
- Phase II: HRVA of 13 multi-hazard districts namely; Latur, Osmanabad, Nashik, Dhule, Ahmednagar, Kolhapur, Satara, Thane, Palghar, Raigad, Ratnagiri, Sindhudurg, and Amravati.

The financing agreement was signed between the government of Maharashtra and UNDP in June 2015. Wherein the funding of INR 3,559,680, for phase I (covering only the Pune district) was agreed upon. The objectives of the proposed HRVA study were;
- To assess the extent of vulnerabilities and risks in the district of Pune from natural and human-induced hazards, including those emanating from climate change and variability.
- To provide technical support to strengthen the capacities of government, communities, and institutions.
- To fast-track implementation of the planning frameworks on Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation.

An RFP was floated for hiring a consultant for undertaking the task of HRVA in the Pune district. The assignment was successfully delivered by the consultant. Phase II of the HRVA did not happen.

3.1.6   Attainment of results – Output 6

As in the case of Output 2 and Output 3, this Output was also focused on providing skilled human resources to the Disaster Management Authority to the state government to strengthen their capacity towards 'Disaster Management'. A financing agreement was signed with the state government of Himachal Pradesh, in Aug 2015. The quantum of funding was INR 6,52,97,880/- for five years. The funding and the arrangement for the provision of services were extended twice (by one year each time).

Earlier in 2014, (before the DSS project) the government signed a separate financing agreement with UNDP for the appointment of skilled and technically qualified human resources at the State level, which was operationally over by the time of the start of implementation of the project being evaluated.

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

31

For the project being evaluated, the objective of Output 6, was to provide trained and experienced disaster management professionals to the SDMA and all 12 DDMAs of the state to facilitate the implementation of training & capacity-building activities outlined in the SDMP and DDMPs and to support the state Government to undertake various measures as mandated by the Disaster Management Act 2005. The positions identified were as follows:

- Training and Capacity Building Coordinator at each district (12 posts)
- Disaster Management Specialist (1 post)
- Capacity Building and Documentation Coordinator (1 post)
- Account and Finance Specialist (1 post)
- Information Technology Specialist (1 post)
- Assistant Information Technology Coordinator (12 posts)

Although, there is no document to support that the activity of provision of skilled human resources was carried out as per the service agreement, presumably the required services were delivered. As in the case of Output 2 and Output 3, the only advantage the development partners got due to the services provided by UNDP, is the procurement of consultancies (hiring of individual consultants on contract basis) in a fast track and transparent manner, using the procedures of UNDP. The hiring process of the development partner (the state government of Jharkhand) is more cumbersome and time-consuming. One of the other advantages of the services provided by UNDP is the preparation of TOR for the skilled human resources hired as individual consultants.

For this Output, the engagement of UNDP and the state government was for a very long period of about eight years. One of the issues faced during the implementation of the project is the frequent change of government officials, responsible for the project implementation in the state. This leads to a situation where the responsible government officials do not have the required understanding of the ongoing project. It is recommended (please see recommendation # 5) that for the long-term Development Support Services type of projects, the UNDP project team may organise periodic events (maybe biannually or annually) wherein, a presentation about the project, implementation challenges, and other related topics can be made. Apart from the relevant government officials, participation in the event by a wider set of stakeholders can be considered.

3.1.7 Attainment of results – Output 7

In the case of Output 7, 'Development Support Services' were to be provided to the state government of Himachal Pradesh towards strengthening SDMA and DDMAs in all the districts and enhancing institutional and community resilience to disasters. An agreement for the provision of the services was signed in January 2016, between the Government of HP and UNDP CO, India. The funding under the agreement was INR 13,74,64,933. Under the agreement following services were to be provided

- Component-1: Disaster Management Planning in the State
  - Activity 1.1: Review of State and District Disaster Management Plans:
  - Activity 1.2: Preparation of Departmental Disaster Management Plans
- Component-2: Training & Capacity development programmes
  - Activity 2.1: Formulation of a Capacity Development Strategy for DRR in the State
  - Activity 2.2: Development of Standardized Training Modules
  - Activity 2.3: Training of Trainers
  - Activity 2.4: Guidelines for Certification & Accreditation:
  - Activity 2.5: Training of Government functionaries at State, District, and sub-district levels
- Component-3: Mass Awareness
  - Activity 3.1: Formulation of Disaster Awareness Strategy for the State
  - Activity 3.2: Carrying out Awareness Campaign in the state
- Component-4: Enhancing Community Resilience
  - Activity 4.1: Develop Baseline Database at the Panchayat Samiti level

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

32

- o Activity 4.2: Develop Panchayat Samiti level Action Plan for integration of disaster mitigation measures into ongoing development schemes
- o Activity 4.3: Develop disaster preparedness and response plans at the Panchayat Samiti level
- o Activity 4.4: Strengthening Response Capacity

Following the requirements of the financing agreement, the following activities were carried out successfully

- Updating of State and district-level disaster management plans: The existing SDMP and DDMPs (for 10 districts out of 12 districts in the state) were revised after consultations with the stakeholders
- Disaster management plans were prepared for 30 different government departments
- Baseline Studies at the Panchayat Samiti Level were carried out in four districts (Chamba, Kangara, Kinnaur, Shimla). This was followed up with the preparation of action plans at (Panchayat Samiti Level) for these four districts. This was further followed up with the preparation of response plans (at Panchayat Samiti Level). The coverage of the subject matter, in the reports on the baseline study, the action plan, and the response plans are overlapping.
- Development of Standardized Training Modules: The project helped the development of training modules on specific topics; Basic Disaster Management Course for first responders; Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction for PRIs (In Hindi); Role and Responsibilities of NGOs/CBOs/CSOs (In Hindi & English both); Mitigation and Management of Hydro-Meteorological/Climate-induced hazards (In English); Mainstreaming DRR into sectoral developmental planning (In English). These modules were later used for imparting training to government officials and other stakeholders on DRR.
- Training of Trainers: The project organized training of trainers (ToT) courses for different government functionaries at the state and district level to create a cadre of Master Trainers at the state and District levels trainers using the above 5 Standard modules.
- Training of Government functionaries at State, District, and Sub-Division levels: The project organized training for government functionaries at the state, district, and sub-district levels on various generic as well as thematic areas
- Awareness Campaign at State, City, and District levels: The project along with the state government carried out an awareness campaign throughout the state through multiple media including posters, leaflets, wall paintings, rallies, mass meetings, and street plays. IEC material was also developed including short films for the same.
- Enhancing Community Resilience: Training programs were conducted at the Panchayat Samiti level. Community from 27 Gram Panchayats of districts namely Chamba, Kangra, Kinnaur, Kullu, Mandi, Shimla, and Sirmaur were informed and trained on the concepts of Disaster management. Further, with their input, Village level disaster management plans were formulated. A database of the available trained human resources was prepared.

3.2   Relevance

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

- **To what extent is the initiative in line with the UNDP mandate, national priorities of Disaster Management, and the requirements of the state administration?**
- **To what extent was the method of delivery selected by UNDP appropriate to the development context, specific to enhancing resilience at the national and sub-national levels?**
- **To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?**
- **To what extent does the project support relevant/ target SDGs in the country and line with UNDP Operational Programs or strategic priorities?**

The Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015), was adopted globally for the reduction of loss of lives, economy, and assets, due to disasters. India is one of the signatories of the Framework. The framework

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

33

provided for strategic goals and actions for the integration of DRR into sustainable development policies, capacity building and preparedness, and vulnerability reduction. India is also a signatory of the follow-up international agreement for disaster reduction, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, which was adopted in March 2015. This demonstrates the priority of the government of India towards the reduction and management of disasters in the country. In line with its commitments, the government of India came out with the Disaster Management Act 2005, with pan-India applicability.

The government regularly made provisions to fund the implementation of the Disaster Management Act and towards strengthening disaster management capacity in India. The 12th finance commission and the 13th finance commission made recommendations not only for the provision of funds for the management of disasters but also grants to enable compliance with the requirements of the Disaster Management Act, and capacity building/training of the government officials at the state government level. The objective of the project being evaluated was to fast-track the implementation of the requirements of the Disaster Management Act 2005 and to provide capacity building/training in some of the states in the country. The commitment of the government towards disaster management is continuing which is evident from the recommendations made in the fifteenth finance commission for the provision of funds for disaster management as well as grants for capacity building/training etc.

Globally, UNDP aims to 'risk-inform' development in line with the goals and targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. In India, UNDP CO has been working with their National Counterparts to strengthen legal and institutional frameworks, national and subnational policy, and foster coherence of DRR and climate adaptation efforts. In India, in the past (2002-2009), UNDP supported, Disaster Risk Management Programme was implemented in 176 districts in 17 states since August 2002. The program aimed to reduce people's vulnerability to natural and man-made disasters through building community preparedness. After this UPDP supported some of the sub-national (state) governments in their efforts to strengthen disaster management services. The project was in line with the following planned Outcome/Outputs of UNSDF/CPD for India.

- Outcome (UNSDF): By 2022, environmental and natural resource management is strengthened, and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks.
- Output (CPD): Effective institutional, legislative, and policy frameworks in place to enhance the implementation of climate change and disaster risk reduction at national and subnational levels.

From the viewpoint of the UNDP mandate, national priorities of Disaster Management, and the requirements of the state administration, the project is relevant, and the subject matter of DRR remains to be Relevant for any future program in the country.

The project being evaluated is a 'Development Support Services (DSS)' project. Being a DSS project, the project design does not provide a proper results framework and a 'Theory of Change' for the project.

Disaster risk reduction cuts across different aspects and sectors of development. There are targets related to disaster risk reduction in 10 of the 17 sustainable development goals[17], firmly establishing the role of disaster risk reduction as a core development strategy.

- Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere
- Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture
- Goal 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages (3.d Strengthen the capacity of all countries, in particular developing countries, for early warning, risk)
- Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

---

[17] UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR)

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

34

- Goal 6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
- Goal 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization, and foster innovation
- Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable
- Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
- Goal 14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas, and marine resources for sustainable development
- Goal 15. Protect, restore, and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

The project and the activities planned within it are highly relevant to the development needs of India.

3.3   Effectiveness

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

- **To what extent has progress been made toward outcome achievement?**
- **What has been the UNDP's contribution to the observed change at the state level?**
- **To what extent has UNDP improved the capacities of national implementing partners to advocate on environmental issues, including climate change issues and disaster risk reduction?**
- **To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective, in terms of establishing close cooperation between the project and the national/sub-national governments**
- **To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?**
- **What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?**
- **In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements?**
- **Why and what have been the supporting factors?**
- **How can the project build on or expand these achievements?**
- **In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements?**
- **What have been the constraining factors and why and how can or could they be overcome?**
- **Which program areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up or consider going forward?**

For the seven targeted Outputs of the project, the level of services support varied from Output to Output. For most of the Projected Outcomes, the project has been able to deliver as per the financing agreements with the development partners.

For Output 1, the project was to provide support services for updating the DMP for the districts; preparation of DMP for the cities; preparation of DMP for the departments; development of SOP for the emergency operations centers. The DMPs for the cities and departments were prepared by the respective departments and the ULBs of the cities. The project design and implementation were gender neutral and/or did not have considerations towards indigenous people or more vulnerable sections of the society (aged, children, etc.). However, it may be argued generally speaking the DMP invariably need to have such considerations. The highlight of the effectiveness of Output 1 is the delivery of the activities mentioned in the financing agreement between UNDP and the government of Andhra Pradesh, enabling the state government to comply with the needs of the Disaster Management Act. The effectiveness of Output 1, could not go beyond this, as it was a DSS project and there was no proper project design and a results framework, and the delivery scope was restricted to the provisions in the agreement.

For Output 2, Output 3, and Output 6, UNDP prepared the TOR for different categories of skilled human resources and procured the skilled human resources to manage the disaster management departments of the respective state governments. The highlight of the effectiveness is the delivery of services as per the financing agreements with the respective state governments. In the absence of a results framework/TOC, the change at the state level is not monitored during project implementation and cannot be assessed at TE. Project design and implementation for these Output three Outputs was gender-

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

35

neutral and did not have any considerations towards indigenous people and more vulnerable sections. Being a DSS project, the effectiveness of the project is restricted to the delivery of the services agreed between UNDP and the respective development partners. The advantage of UNDP was its procurement processes for hiring individual consultants, which were deputed to the disaster management departments of the states.

Under Output 4 of the project support services were provided to the airport Authority of India to increase the disaster resilience of the Airports in India. Apart from increasing the disaster resilience of the airports, the project also enabled the preparedness of the airports to respond and support the disaster relief operations, as and when required. As is known, in cases of a disaster event, airports play a very important role in relief operations. Thus, the airports as an infrastructure must be resilient so that in case of a disaster the airport operations are not impacted and it supports the surge in traffic (both goods and passengers) as part of relief operations. The disaster management plan of the country has also assigned important roles to the airports in case of disaster. The activities of assessment of vulnerability, preparation of DMPs, and training/capacity building of the airport officials and other stakeholders were carried out at the two selected airports (on a pilot basis). Besides this training was organized for the preparedness of the airports to handle the surge in operations and other needs in case of a disaster. The activities for the preparedness of the airports were restricted to training and capacity building, and there was no follow-up action to prepare the airports to handle the relief operations. This has restricted the effectiveness of this important initiative. To build on this a program may be worked out to enhance the preparedness of the airports and other such infrastructures (transport centers, bus stations, etc.) (Please see recommendation # 4).

For Output 5, UNDP procured the consultancy for HRVA assessment for the Pune district in the state of Maharashtra. A detailed HRVA study for the district got carried out and a report was prepared. It is not clear how this assessment would be used. There is no evidence to suggest any follow-up action being taken based on the HRVA for the district. Thus, the effectiveness of the Output is not wide spread.

For Output 7, services were provided to the state government of Himachal Pradesh for strengthening SDMA and DDMAs and enhancing institutional and community resilience to disasters. The services provided, helped the state government to comply with the provisions of the 'Disaster Management Act.' For the component of the services about enhancement of community resilience, work was carried out at the 'Panchayat Samiti' level, wherein three specific tasks of development of baseline data, development of action plan, and response plan were carried out, using a template-based approach. Some training for the stakeholders at the Panchayat Samiti level was also provided. The effectiveness of the work carried out at the Panchayat Samiti level is only marginal as the panchayat samiti does not have any resources of its own and thus, is unable to sustain itself.

For all the Outputs, with the implementation of the DSS project, UNDP CO has been able to help the selected state governments, comply with the requirements of the 'Disaster Management Act 2005' by providing the required skilled human resources and by procuring the services of competent consulting organization to help prepare disaster management plans; do capacity building and training of officials. With the provision of the services under the DSS project, there is an increased level of awareness amongst government officials and an increased level of preparedness to manage any unfortunate disaster event.

3.4   Efficiency

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

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

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

36

The project being evaluated was a 'Development Support Services (DSS),' project. Specific agreements were signed with the development partners (selected state governments and the Airport Authority of India) for the provision of the services. Being a DSS project, there was no proper results framework/log-frame for the project.

The Monitoring and Evaluation activities for the project have fallen short of the requirements. As the periodic monitoring reports did not get prepared regularly, the project did not get the opportunity to learn and take adaptive measures to enhance the project results.

During project implementation, there was no participation by other UN agencies. The project steering committee did not get constituted and there was no formal platform to engage the national counterparts. The project during its implementation did not get directions or inputs from a larger set of stakeholders (please also see recommendation # 2).

The funds for the implementation of the project activities under different Outputs of the project were provided by the respective development partners, UNDP has provided the services as per its standard management fee structure. For the procurement of consultancies, UNDP's procurement procedures were followed, which ensures the effective utilisation of resources. The agreed-upon services were delivered to the development partners on time.

3.5   Mainstreaming and Cross-Cutting Issues

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

Gender equality
- **To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?**
- **Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?**
- **To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women?**
- **Were there any unintended effects?**
- **Whether gender issues had been considered in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e., project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.)**
- **To what extent did the project adopt gender-sensitive, approaches in the target intervention sector?**

Human rights
- **To what extent have poor, indigenous, and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?**
- **To what extent did the project adopt human rights-based approaches in the targeted intervention sector?**

Mainstreaming
- **How the project is successfully mainstreaming other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, and women's empowerment.**
- **Do the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country program document (CPD) and country program action plan (CPAP)?**

In the project design, there were no specific activities targeted at women's empowerment. As the project does not have a proper results framework, there are no gender-segregated indicators. The project implementation realized the importance of gender mainstreaming in the DRR. Accordingly, wherever relevant and possible, the project implementation sought to achieve gender equality through the

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

37

empowerment of women by including women in the workshops organized for capacity-building and training activities. Also, while preparing the DMPs for the states, districts, and village level, the need to provide for the requirements, which are specific to women was kept in mind.

There was no human rights approach in the design and implementation of the project. There is no contribution by the project towards indigenous people and human rights considerations.

At the level of UNDP, there is a contribution of the project towards mainstreaming its other priority areas of work like poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change adaptation, etc. The project has no negative impact on any of the other development priority areas of the UNDP.

3.6   Sustainability

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

- **To what extent did UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes?**
- **To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?**
- **To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place (Disaster risk management) that will support the continuation of benefits?**
- **To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?**
- **To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights, and human development by primary stakeholders?**
- **To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector, and development partners to sustain the attained results?**
- **To what extent have govt partners committed to providing continuing support (financial aspirations, etc)**
- **Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?**

The project being evaluated was a DSS project, wherein the development services were delivered as per the requirements of the development partners. The project did not have any results framework or a theory of change and did not aim toward achieving a transformational change. Under the seven services agreements, the services were delivered as per the agreements. However, this being a DSS project deliberations on the sustainability of the results of the project is a contentious issue.

The project has helped the development partners to comply with the requirements of the Disaster Management Act. The finding for the same was provided as grants by the central government. Continuation of the staffing of the disaster management departments in the states will depend upon the availability of funds, which may either be provided by the state governments in the budget or by the central governments as grants. The fifteenth finance commission has recommended the provision of grant money to the states for disaster management. Thus, the availability of funds for staffing the disaster management departments in the foreseeable future is likely. Further, the grant money can also be utilised for periodic revision of the disaster management plans at the state and district levels.

Although no specific efforts have been made under the project to establish mechanisms for continued training and capacity-building initiatives, such initiatives are likely to sustain in the future as the critical issue of availability of funds has got addressed, the capacity-building and training efforts can also continue in the future.

The drive towards the creation and maintenance of an effective institutional structure as required by the Disaster Management Act is likely to sustain in the future.

3.7   Impacts

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

38

> - **Whether the project has demonstrated verifiable improvements in ecological status?**
> - **Whether, the project has demonstrated verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems through specified process indicators, that progress is being made toward the achievement of stress reduction and/or ecological improvement?**

There were no direct development objectives of the project. However, disaster management per se has several development co-benefits. There is no negative impact on the project.

Report: Terminal Evaluation of Project, 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities in India"

39

4.   CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

4.1 Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

> - **Did the project provide cost-effective solutions to address barriers?**
> - **Are these solutions provided efficiently?**
> - **What additional/ adaptive measures would have enhanced the results and impacts of the project**
> - **What are the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success?**

The project delivered the agreed-upon services to the development partners. The impulsion behind the formulation and implementation of the project was the need of the state governments to comply with the provisions of the Disaster Management Act, coupled with the use of the grant money made available by the federal government to the states for this purpose. Not all the states used the services of UNDP for the purpose. It is not clear how the states which did not use the services of UNDP, used the grant money and how they managed the services provided by the project (skilled human resources, preparation of DMPs, training/capacity building on DRR). Thus, it is not possible to assess the advantage provided by UNDP. One of the apparent advantages of the services by UNDP was the use of a transparent and fast procurement process of UNDP, which was used for the procurement of consultancies and for hiring skilled human resources as individual consultants.

In the case of this project, the role of UNDP has been more of a procurement agency for procuring consultancies and skilled human resources as individual consultants. The services were provided by the consulting organisations and the hired individual consultants, without the required quality checks and value addition by UNDP. Formation of a higher-level technical expert group (please see recommendation 7), to check on the quality of deliverables by the consulting organisations and/or guide on matters from the technical, policy, and national perspectives, would have provided the required value addition of the services of UNDP. The Constitution of a project board/steering committee which would have reviewed the performance of the project and provided guidance from time to time would have provided additional justification for UNDP's services (please see recommendation 2). The expert group and the steering committee also help in the process of exchange of information, and views across different development partners, and exert peer pressure, leading to an increase in the level of cooperation by stakeholders.

4.2 Recommendations

The main questions for terminal evaluation are; (please see Annex B)

> - **Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project**
> - **Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project**
> - **Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives**

4.2.1 Corrective actions for design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of project

#	Recommendation	Rational and Description	Timing for Action	Responsible Party
1	Future project designs of this nature should expand the involvement and role of a wider spectrum of non-governmental stakeholders like the private sector, and NGOs/CBOs.	Participation by a wider set of stakeholders would enhance the results of the project.	As and when a new project of a similar nature is designed	UNDP
2	For the future project of this nature, a proper steering committee/project board should be constituted and regular	The absence of the project steering committee/project board, deprived the project, of the benefit of guidance	As and when a new project of a similar	UNDP

#	Recommendation	Rational and Description	Timing for Action	Responsible Party
	meetings of the steering committee/ project board should be organised	from those stakeholders, which are responsible for the management of disasters at the federal level in the country and those who provide the funding, and those who are the subject matter experts at the National Level.	nature is implemented	
3	The periodic reporting regarding the progress of project implementation should follow the M&E guidelines of UNDP and to avoid confusion should not include the activities and achievements of other projects (even if they are closely related).	It is important to remain objective oriented while monitoring, reporting, and evaluating the progress of the project and if required take adaptive measures to enhance the results of the project	All times, while preparing the periodic monitoring reports for the project	UNDP

4.2.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from project

#	Recommendation	Rational and Description	Timing for Action	Responsible Party
4	To build on the good work done by the project towards the preparedness of the airports, a program may be prepared to enhance the preparedness of the airports and other such infrastructures (transport centers, bus stations, etc.)	The activities for the preparedness of the airports were restricted to training and capacity building, and there was no follow-up action to prepare the airports to handle the relief operations. This has restricted the effectiveness of this important initiative.	As and when a new project in the domain of DRR is taken up	UNDP

4.2.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

#	Recommendation	Rational and Description	Timing for Action	Responsible Party
5	For long-term Development Support Services type of projects, UNDP may organise periodic events (maybe biannually or annually) wherein, a presentation about the project, implementation challenges, and other related topics can be made. Participation of the relevant government officials in such events will ensure that the responsible officials are updated about the project.	One of the issues faced during implementation of the project is the frequent change of government officials, responsible for the project implementation. This could lead to a situation where the responsible government officials do not have the required understanding of the ongoing project.	For all the projects involving hiring having multiyear implementation timelines	UNDP

4.2.4 Best/worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success

#	Recommendation	Rational and Description	Timing for Action	Responsible Party
6	In situations where the hiring of consultants on a contract basis is done for a longer period (say a year or more than a year), the service conditions being offered, be improved (e.g., provision of medical insurance, leaves, etc.)	Better service conditions attract better human resources, even if the remunerations are comparatively lower.	As and when hiring of consultants under IC for project activities is done	UNDP
7	For future projects of this nature (where the procurement of consultancies and human resources is the predominant activity). A high-level technical expert (or a group of technical experts) is hired to check on the quality of deliverables by consulting organisations and/or guide on matters from technical, policy, and national perspectives.	The formation of a higher-level technical expert group, to check on the quality of deliverables by the consulting organisations and/or guide on matters from the technical, policy, and national perspectives, provides the required value addition of the services of UNDP. This would also lead to an increase in the commitment from the development partners.	As and when a project of similar nature is implemented	UNDP
8	For future projects of this nature, gender aspects should be given due considerations, both the stage of project design and during project implementation	For UNDP, in India Gender Equality has always been a priority and is central to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).	As and when a project of similar nature is implemented	UNDP

These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the titled project "Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities."

1. The Project

The project "Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities was formulated with the aim to provide technical support to strengthen the capacities of government, communities, and institutions in the fast-tracking implementation of the planning frameworks on Disaster Risk Reduction.

Based upon the recommendation of the 13th Finance Commission, and under the legal framework of the Disaster Management Act 2005, the Government had set up the State Disaster Response Fund (SDRF) and National Disaster Response Fund (NDRF) whereby the state governments can seek financial assistance in the wake of natural disaster for immediate relief which included a grant-in-aid for capacity building of Rs. 525 crores for the period (2010-11 to 2014-15). UNDP has been supporting the state governments of Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, and Maharashtra towards formulating and implementing projects (through NDRF and SDRF) for building capacities to strengthen institutional and community resilience on DRR. Specific project proposals have been developed in consultation with the state governments in alignment with the ongoing GoI-UNDP project during 2015.

The project activities were implemented in close partnership with the state governments, governmental institutions and other relevant stakeholders.

The project has the following outputs:

Output 1: Enhancing community resilience and capacity building of the state in the area of disaster risk reduction in Andhra Pradesh
Output 2: Capacity building of urban local bodies under the Comprehensive Capacity Building Programme (CCBP) & National Urban Livelihoods Mission (NULM) schemes to make 13 resilient cities in Himachal Pradesh
Output 3: Enhancing institutional framework by strengthening State and District Disaster Management Authorities (S/DDMAs) in Jharkhand
Output 4: Enhancing Disaster resilience at two Airports by strengthening institutional mechanism for disaster mitigation, preparedness, and response planning
Output 5: Establishment of climate risk management system in Pune District through Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (HRVA)
Output 6: Enhancing Institutional framework by strengthening SDMA and DDMA in Himachal Pradesh
Output 7: Enhancing resilience of institutions and people through sustainable reduction of disaster risk by developing capacity for disaster prevention, response and recovery at all levels

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION	
Project/outcome title	Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities
Atlas ID	97731
Corporate outcome and output	Outcome (UNSDF): By 2022, environmental and natural resource management is strengthened, and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks. Output (CPD): Effective institutional, legislative and policy frameworks in place to enhance the implementation of climate change and disaster risk reduction at national and subnational levels.
Country	India
Region	Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra
Date project document signed	Feb 2016
Project dates	Start Feb 2016 Planned end March 2023
Project budget	US$ 3.6mn

Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	US$ 3.5mn
Funding source	Government of AP, Jharkhand, HP and Maharashtra
Implementing party	UNDP

2. Evaluation purpose, scope, and objectives

Evaluation purpose: The project on "Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities" will be ending in March 2023. In order to assess the impact of the project and extent of the outcomes achieved , UNDP would like to conduct the Terminal Evaluation of the project. The evaluation must aim to address the extent to which the project has been able to enhance the DRR capacities of the states through risk reduction in the context of disaster and climate change. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts The results of the terminal evaluation will be presented to the Implementing partner (State governments) and will be used to highlight success stories and lesson learning for future endeavours.

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

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

Scope: Project intervention areas include four states- Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, and Jharkhand.

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

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

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

Effectiveness
- To what extent has progress been made towards outcome achievement? What has been the UNDP contribution to the observed change at the state level?
- To what extent has UNDP improved the capacities of national implementing partners to advocate on environmental issues, including climate change issues and disaster risk reduction?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? In terms of establishing close cooperation between the project and the national/sub-national governments
- To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?

- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- Which programme areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up or consider going forward?

Efficiency
- To what extent were quality country project outputs delivered on time?
- To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- To what extent did UNDP engage or coordinate with beneficiaries, implementing partners, other United Nations agencies and national counterparts to achieve project outcome-level results?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability
- To what extent did UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes?
- To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place (Disaster risk management) that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?
- To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector and development partners to sustain the attained results?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions

Gender equality
- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- Were there any unintended effects?

Human rights
- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

4. Methodology

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Taking Himachal Pradesh and Maharashtra as the priority states due to the long-term implementation of activities here, the individual will be expected to travel to a few states and assess the project outputs after conducting interviews with the government officials, community members and others. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team is expected to develop a methodology that takes into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager. If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability, or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report. If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.)

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

- **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia **(will be provided to selected candidate on Day 1 of assignment)** o Project document (contribution agreement). o Programme and project quality assurance reports. Consolidated annual reports. (APRs/PIRs) o Project budget o Various documents developed during the project o Results-oriented monitoring report. o Highlights of project board meetings.
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations and implementing partners:
    - **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
    - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
    - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc may be used.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods. o Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

It is preferable that the interviews/questionnaires with the state government of HP and Maharashtra will need to take place on a face-to-face basis. Interviews will also be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:
1. Government officials in Andhra Pradesh and Jharkhand
2. Programme Officer, Resilience, EER, UNDP

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

- **Evaluation inception report:** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review, and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits).
- The inception report should essentially comprise off
    - Background and context illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.
    - Evaluation objective, purpose and scope. A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
    - Description of the Cross-cutting issues: Provide details of how cross-cutting issues (including gender equality, capacity development, climate change mitigation will be evaluated, considered and analysed throughout the evaluation.
    - Evaluation approach and methodology, highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods, sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations. o Detailed mission plan - with dates and locations for virtual interview, schedule of interviews and meetings, draft interview questions, list of stakeholders to be interviewed etc.
    - A revised schedule of key milestones, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting)
    - Detailed resource requirements tied to evaluation activities and deliverables presented in the workplan.

- **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report:** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
- **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.

- **Final evaluation report.**
- **Presentations to the stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group**

6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation will be done by 1 national evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects in the area of disaster risk management and climate change. Experience with working with UNDP is an advantage. The evaluator will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience with post graduate degree in engineering/ environment/ management or related filed domain – Marks 10
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies. – Marks 30
- Experience on handling projects around disaster risk management and climate change – Marks 30

7. Evaluation ethics

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

8. Implementation arrangements

The shortlisted evaluator will compile the final report and will be coordinating with the responsible manager at the UNDP.

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

9. Time frame for the evaluation process

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

Example of working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation (outcome evaluation)

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase One: Desk review and inception report				
Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed)	7 days	At the time of contract signing	Virtual	Evaluation Team and UNDP CO
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team		At the time of contract signing	Virtual	Evaluation Team
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed		Within 5 days of contract signing	Virtual	Evaluation Team
Submission of the inception report		Within 5 days of contract signing		Evaluation team
Comments and approval of inception report		Within 2 days of submission of the inception report	Virtual	UNDP CO
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits (virtual), in-depth interviews (face to face with Govt) and focus groups	13 days	Within two weeks of contract signing.	Virtual. May include visits to a few states.	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1 day		Virtual	Evaluation team
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Draft evaluation report submission	5 days	Within three weeks of the completion of the field mission	Virtual	Evaluation team
Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report		Within 3 weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report	Virtual	UNDP CO
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office	3 days -	Within 3 days of final receiving comments from UNDP	Virtual	Evaluation team
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (		Within 3 days of final receiving comments from UNDP	Virtual	Evaluation team
Presentation of evaluation to Ministry of Home Affairs	1 day			
Estimated total days for the evaluation	30			

10. Application submission process and criteria for selection

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

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

The Consultant is required to submit the following documents, in a single combined PDF file, as the system has provision for uploading only one attachment:
- Personal CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form) with relevant experience to the TOR; and at least 3 professional references
- Short technical proposal (max 2-pages) including methodology, approach & assessment criteria, process followed, data collection and analytical tools.
- No Financials (Daily Fee) to be submitted at this stage.

Important Note: Please ensure that all the documents to be uploaded should be combined in a single PDF file before uploading as the system has provision of uploading only one document

Before undertaking the Terminal Evaluation, an Inception Report was presented, including the proposed tasks, activities, and deliverables, as well as a table of main evaluation questions that need to be answered to determine and assess project results. The evaluation/review criteria and questions are presented in the Table below.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions
• Title page with basic report information • Table of contents • Acronyms and abbreviations	
Executive Summary • Project Summary Table • Project Description (brief) • Evaluation Findings • Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations, and Lessons	
1. Introduction • Context; Purpose of the Terminal Evaluation and Objectives • Scope and Methodology of the Terminal Evaluation • Structure of the Terminal Evaluation Report	
2. Project description and development context • Description of the intervention being evaluated • Project design, general logic, results framework (theory of change), etc. • Evaluation scope, objectives, criteria, and evaluation questions • Evaluation approach and methods, methodological approaches, Limitations • Data analysis methods to answer the evaluation questions.	
3. Findings	
3.1 Project Results: **Achievement of Targeted** **Outcomes/ Outputs/** **Development Benefits**	• What is the achievement of the objectives against the end of the targeted values as per the contracts? • What is the level of achievement for each of the Outputs?
3.2 Relevance	• To what extent is the initiative in line with the UNDP mandate, national priorities of Disaster Management, and the requirements of the state administration? • To what extent was the method of delivery selected by UNDP appropriate to the development context, specific to enhancing resilience at the national and sub-national levels? • To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives? • To what extent does the project support relevant/ target SDGs in the country and in line with UNDP Operational Programs or strategic priorities?
3.3 Effectiveness	• To what extent has progress been made toward outcome achievement? • What has been the UNDP's contribution to the observed change at the state level? • To what extent has UNDP improved the capacities of national implementing partners to advocate on environmental issues, including climate change issues and disaster risk reduction? • To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective, in terms of establishing close cooperation between the project and the national/sub-national governments • To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and the empowerment of women? • What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions
	• In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? • Why and what have been the supporting factors? • How can the project build on or expand these achievements? • In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? • What have been the constraining factors and why and how can or could they be overcome? • Which program areas are the most relevant and strategic for UNDP to scale up or consider going forward?
3.4 Efficiency	• To what extent were quality country project outputs delivered on time? • To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly? • To what extent did UNDP engage or coordinate with beneficiaries, implementing partners, other United Nations agencies, and national counterparts to achieve project outcome-level results? • To what extent have resources been used efficiently? • Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? • To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered on time? • To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?
3.5 Mainstreaming and Cross-Cutting Issues	**Gender equality** • To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project? • Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality? • To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? • Were there any unintended effects? • Whether gender issues had been considered in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e., project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.) • To what extent did the project adopt gender-sensitive, approaches in the target intervention sector? **Human rights** • To what extent have poor, indigenous, and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country? • To what extent did the project adopt human rights-based approaches in the targeted intervention sector? **Mainstreaming** • How the project is successfully mainstreaming other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, and women's empowerment. • Do the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country program document (CPD) and country program action plan (CPAP)?
Sustainability	• To what extent did UNDP establish mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes? • To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities, including sustainability strategies, in place to sustain the outcome-level results? • To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place (Disaster risk management) that will support the continuation of benefits? • To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspirational, etc.)? • To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights,

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions
	and human development by primary stakeholders?
	• To what extent do partnerships exist with other national institutions, NGOs, United Nations agencies, the private sector, and development partners to sustain the attained results?
	• To what extent have govt partners committed to providing continuing support (financial aspirations, etc)
	• Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
3.6 Impact/ Results	• Whether the project has demonstrated verifiable improvements in ecological status?
	• Whether, the project has demonstrated verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems through specified process indicators, that progress is being made toward the achievement of stress reduction and/or ecological improvement?
5. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons	
5.1 Conclusions	• Did the project provide cost-effective solutions to address barriers?
	• Are these solutions provided efficiently?
	• What additional/ adaptive measures would have enhanced the results and impacts of the project
5.2 Lessons	• What are the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success?
5.3 Recommendations	• Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project
	• Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
	• Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
Annexes • TOR • Mission Itinerary and people interviewed • Documents reviewed • Terminal Evaluation Matrix (criteria, questions, indicators) • Other information, as needed	

ANNEX C: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

	Document	Comments
Project Documents		
	Annual Work Plan 2016	
	Year-wise and Output wise Expenditure	Document prepared by a project team at the time of TE
	Minutes of Local Project Appraisal Committee Meeting Report – 9 Feb 2016	
	Overall DSS Report (Achievements)	This document was prepared by the project team as a project closure document. The document is undated.
	Project Document	It is an undated and unsigned document. It is an incomplete document and falls very much short of the requirements of a project document
	Minutes of Meeting between UNDP and Himachal Pradesh government official – Feb 2020	
	Minutes of Meeting between UNDP and Himachal Pradesh government official – Nov 2021	
Country Program Documents		
	Country Office Strategic Priorities for 2018	
	Country Programme Document 2018-2022	
	Country Programme Evaluation Report 2013-17 Summary	
	CPD 2018 - 2022 - Mid Term Report	
	CPD 2013-2017	
	CPD 2018- 2022	
	Results Oriented Annual Programme Reports ROAR 2018	
	UNDAF 2013-17	
	UNSDF 2018-2022	
Output 1: Andhra Pradesh		
	Singed Financing Agreement	
	Departmental Disaster Management Plan	
	Draft City Disaster Management Plans	
	Cover Letter dated 19 May 2019 by UNDP submitting 13 District Disaster Management Plans, 11 City Disaster Management Plans, and 15 Departmental Plans	
	Report on Urban Volunteers Training on Disaster Management	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
Output 2: Himachal Pradesh		
	Signed Financing Agreement	
	Review of Early Warning System - Shimla	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Off-Site Emergency Management Plan – Una - 2018	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Off-site Management Plan – Solan 2018	This document is not related to the project being evaluated

	Document	Comments
	Offsite Emergency Management Plan – Sirmaur 2018	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
Output 3		
	Signed Financing Agreement	
	Govt letter for extension of services July 2016	
	Letter by UNDP to Govt for Jharkhand Positions	
Output 4: Airport Authority of India		
	Signed Financing Agreement	
Guwahati Airport		
	Get Airport Ready for Disaster (GARD) – Guwahati Airport - Templates GARD – A Passenger GARD – B Cargo GARD – C Passenger	
	Airport Assessment Action Plan, LGBI Airport, Guwahati	
	Massages Template	
	Training Module for Airport Disaster Management Committee - Simulation Exercise on Earthquake	
	Communication from Airport Authority to Guwahati Airport regarding training program	
	Training Agenda (5-9 Dec 2016)	
	Training Material (PPT) Airport Disaster Risk Management	
	Training Material (PPT) GARD	
	Training Material (Handout) on GARD – Deutsche Post DHL	
	Training workshop for Airport Disaster Management Committee (ADMC) - 5 to 9 Dec 2016	
	Training Material – Non-Structural Mitigations	
	Suggestions for Review of ADMP	
	Training Material – Surge Cargo	
	Training Material – Surge in Operations	
	Training Material - Table Top Exercise (TTX) - Response by LGBI Airport Guwahati to a flood disaster	
Vizag Airport		
	Training PPTs	
	Pictures of Training Sessions	
	Training Material	
	GARD Templates	
	GARD - Action plan	
	GARD – Cargo – Action Plan	
	Letter for training	
	Training Agenda	
	Training Material – Airport Disaster Management Committee	
Output 5: Maharashtra		
	Singed Financing Agreement	

	Document	Comments
	HRVA Pune District	
	Presentation on HRVA Pune	
	Agreement for preparation of Disaster Management Plans for 25 departments + related services like travel, design, management etc.	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Agreement between UNDP and Yashwantrao Chavan Academy of Development Administration and Department of Revenue (DM), Government of Maharashtra for preparation of the DMP for 25 departments	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Agreement dated June 2021	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Agreement undated	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Disaster Management Plans for 24 different departments of the Government of Maharashtra – March 2020 Prepared by SEEDS Technical Services – New Delhi	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Handouts/Posters/Banners • Steps to Develop Your SDMP • Know Your Emergency Contacts • Is your school safe Check • Annual calendar • How to conduct mock drill • Family preparedness for disasters	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Akola New English High School SDMP - 2022	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Gondia Fulchur High School SDMP- 2022	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
	Development of SOP/Guidelines to Establish SIDM – Nov 2022	This document is not related to the project being evaluated
Output 6: Himachal		
	Signed Financing Agreement – Aug 2015 for Provision of Human Resources and Preparation of Prospective Plan for Enhancing Institutional and Community Resilience to Disasters	
	Extension Letter – 29 Dec 2020	
	Extension Letter – Mar 2021	
	Extension Letter – 27 Jan 2022	
	UNDP Letter 22 July	
Output 7: Himachal		
	Signed Financing Agreement Dated 11 Jan 2016	
	Project Document for HP	It is an unsigned and undated document
	Baseline Study of Panchayat Samiti • Chamba – 6 Samiti • Kangara – 11 Samities • Kinnaur – 3 Samities • Shimla – 10 Samities List of Villages Covered for Baseline Study of Community Resilience in HP	

	Document	Comments
	Consolidated Database of 1096 Sampled Villages of 191 GPs in 30 Panchayat Samitis and 4 Districts	
	Dataset – Training and Data Base of Trained Personals – Community • Chamba • Hamirpur • Mandi • Sirmaour • Blilaspur • Kinnaour • Kullu • Lahul Spiti • Shimla • Shimla 2 • Solan • Una	
	Disaster Management Plans for 31 Departments	
	District Disaster Management Plans • Bilaspur • Chamba • Kangra • Una • Hamirpur • Kullu • Lahaul and Spiti • Mandi • Shimla • Sirmour • Solan • Kinnaur	
	Panchayat Samiti Action Plan • Chamba District • Kangra Distirct • Kinnaur District • Shimla District	
	Panchayat Samiti response plan and training reports • Chamba • Kangra • Kinnaur • Shimla Standard Operating Procedure	
	Posters and Videos • Hindi Posters • Community awareness Video • Earthquake Safety • Floods • Forest Fire • Road Safety Video • School Safety	

	Document	Comments
	• UNDP HP Posters June 2016	
	Training and Capacity Building Material • Basic Course for First Responders • Modules Strategies and Guidelines • Basic and Intermediate Course Module • Community Based Disaster Preparedness-Course Material • Course Material – TOT • Course Material – Comprehensive Course • DRR translation document – Final Draft • Module PRI – Hindi • Participant Handbook	
	State Disaster Management Plan - HP	
	TOR for District Coordinator hired under the project	
	TOR for IT Specialist	
	TOR for Capacity Building Co-ordinator	
APR		
	APR 2016	
	APR 2017	
	APR 2018	
	APR 2019	
	APR 2020	
	APR 2021	
	APR 2022	
Other Documents – Downloaded from UNDP Website		
	Annual Progress Report January – December 2020	
	Annual Work Plan – 2016-17	
	Back to Office Report –Shimla - 05 Feb 2020	
	Back to Office Report –Shimla - 12 Nov 2021	
	Web Page on UNDP - Development Support Services- Himachal Pradesh And Maharashtra	
	Web Page on UNDP India - Development Support Services-Disaster Risk Reduction	
	Annual Work Plan 2021	
	FRM Financial Management and Execution Modalities UNDP Support Services to National Implementation	
	HP DSS AWP 2022	
	Development support Services-Disaster Risk Reduction 2022 Summary Report	
	PPM Design Development Services	
	Project 97731 QPR Q1-2016	
	Project 97731 QPR Q3-2017	
Other Documents		
	UNDP Evaluation Guidelines	
	Disaster Management Act	
	Report of 13th Finance Commission	
	Report of 14th Finance Commission	

	Document	Comments
	Report of 15th Finance Commission	
	Scheme for release and utilisation of grant-in-aid recommended by the Thirteenth Finance Commission (FC-XIII) for Capacity Building for Disaster Response – Ministry of Finance	
	Disaster Management in India - A Status Report - National Disaster Management Division, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India - Aug 2004	
	Government of India - UNDP Disaster Risk Management Programme 2002 – 2009 Evaluation and Review of Lessons Learnt Prepared by the Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre	
	Evaluation Of UNDP Contribution To Disaster Prevention and Recovery – 2010 - UNDP	
	Trainer's Guidebook on Integrating Climate Change in Development Planning in Himachal Pradesh – 2019, GIZ	
	National Disaster Management Plan, National Disaster Management Authority Government of India - Revised Edition - November 2019	

ANNEX D: FIELD VISITS AND LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Date	Meeting	Venue	Attended by
05 April 2023	Kick-off meeting with the project team	Held Virtually	Mr. Manish Mohandas
			Mr. Shubham Tandon, UNDP Project team
17 April 2023	Initial meeting with UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Team	Held Virtually	Mr. Shubham Tandon, UNDP Project Team
			Ms. Anusha Sharma, Monitoring and Evaluation Team UNDP, CO, India
22 May 2023	In-person meeting with the UNDP Project team	In Person	Mr. Shubham Tandon, UNDP Project Team
			Mr. VN Jha, UNDP Project Team
			Ms. Anusha Sharma, Monitoring and Evaluation Team UNDP, CO, India
22 May 2023	Meeting with State Co-ordinator, Maharashtra	Virtually	Mr. Shree Dutt Kamath, State Co-ordinator, for DRR, UNDP
23 May 2023	Meeting with State Co-ordinator, Himachal Pradesh	Virtually	Mr. Vivek Sharma, UNDP, Ex-State Coordinator for DRR, Himachal Pradesh
			Mr. Shubham Tandon
05 June 2023		Virtually	Mr. Ajay Katuri, Consultant, National Disaster Management Authority
08 June 2023		Virtually	Dr. Sumana Bhattacharya, Sr Advisor, IORA Ecological Solutions
08 June 2023		Virtually	Mr. Navneet Yadav, Independent Consultant, DRM
19 June 2023		Virtually	Mr Praveen Bharadwaj, Disaster Management Expert, State Disaster Management Authority, Government of Himachal Pradesh
20 June 2023		Virtually	Mr. Dhupare, Under Secretary, Government of Maharashtra
			Mr. Shree Dutt Kamath, State Co-ordinator, for DRR, UNDP

Evaluators/reviewers:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well-founded
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimise demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrong doing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation/reviewer Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: Dinesh Aggarwal

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

(Dinesh Aggarwal)

July 2023

ANNEX F: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

Following the guidelines, the audit trail, along with the submission of the final TE report, is being submitted as a separate file

ANNEX H: AUDIT TRAIL

Audit Trail: Terminal Evaluation Report 'Development Support Services for Strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction Capacities' in India'

The following comments were provided by UNDP CO, India on the draft Terminal Evaluation Report on 08 July 2023. The comments are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and the comment number ("#" column). Based on these comments and suggestions the TE report was updated by the TE team. The Table below provides how the comments/suggestions were addressed in the final version of the TE report.

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
M & E Team, UNDP CO	1	Executive Summary	Please add evaluators quality standards and assurance ratings in the executive summary	Evaluator is of the view that Annex 4 of the UNDP Guidelines for Evaluation does not require rating to be provided by the evaluator. For the quality standards, evaluator is of the view that it would not be appropriate for the evaluator to do the quality check as per the standards. This is best done either by the CO or IEO. Section 6 of the Guidelines make it quite clear that the review of the evaluation reports, and check on quality standards and assurance rating is done by the IEO.
M & E Team, UNDP CO	2	Table 2: Outputs, Service Agreements, and Activities of the Project and the Achievements	Please add gender related aspects and data, if possible	There were no gender specific aspects/considerations in the project design and project implementation. Additional text is provided in the report to clarify this
M & E Team, UNDP CO	3	Table 2: on the Summary of Assessment of Achievements for Output 1	Please mention the number of cities if possible.	Additional text provided
M & E Team, UNDP CO	4	Table 3: Efficiency On the statement "As the periodic monitoring reports did not get prepared regularly, the project did not get the opportunity to take adaptive measures to enhance the project results.	Regular monitoring reports have been prepared for the project. Please let us know what is missing.	At TE, Quarterly progress reports could not be shared. At the time of TE, APRs for different implementation years (from 2016 to 2023) were shared. However, in the APR shared, there is a mix between the activities of the DSS project being evaluated and an earlier project (GOI-UNDP DRRPM project – 2013-2017). This additional text is now included in the TE report
M & E Team, UNDP CO	5	Table 3: Cross Cutting Issues On the statement	The training programmes under the CBDRM part of the project was conducted	This sentence relates to project design. In the next line it is mentioned that during training gender aspects were taken care.

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
		'There were no specific activities targeted at women's empowerment'	specifically for women in various districts. Additional information on this can be shared	
M & E Team, UNDP CO	6	Executive Summary: Conclusions On the statement "The services were provided by the consulting organizations and the hired individual consultants, without the required quality checks and value addition by UNDP"	Would it be possible to share whether any of the consultants hired had clear gender competencies?	There is no evidence to suggest that any of the consultants hired had gender competencies. This additional text is now included in the TE report.
M & E Team, UNDP CO	7	Executive Summary: Recommendations	Please add gender related recommendation	Agreed, the required addition done
M & E Team, UNDP CO	8	Recommendation 4 On the statement "There was no follow-up action to prepare the airports to handle the relief operations	UNDP supported the Get Airports Ready for Disaster (GARD) programme on these points	GARD initiative, is one of the achievements of the project, wherein training was provided on different aspects of GARD. However, there was no follow up action to prepare the airports for disaster. Additional text is provided to clarify this
M & E Team, UNDP CO	9	Table 6: Evaluability Assessment of the Project On the statement "There are no progress reports and field visit reports (back-to-office reports)"	Back to Office reports have been shared. Please let us know if they should be shared again	No BTO reports has been shared by the project team, however, the evaluator was able to download two such report from UNDP website. These two BOT reports have been included in the list of documents reviewed.
M & E Team, UNDP CO	10	Section 2.10 Management Arrangement On the statement	While the DSS modality doesn't require constituting a PSC, the project did conduct regular reviews and	It is true that it is not mandatory for the DSS projects to constitute a PSC. However, in this case there was a specific provision in the project design (please see the document of

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
		"It is recommended that for any future project of this nature in future, the steering committee be duly constituted and regular meetings of the steering committee/ project board be organized	meetings with stakeholders.	endorsement of the project by LPAC, which has very specifically asked for constitution of a PSC.
M & E Team, UNDP CO	11	Section 2.11 Adaptive management

On the statement "There is no evidence to suggest that the inception meeting/workshop of the project happened" | The Inception meeting or a workshop is a mandatory requirement in case of GEF/GCF projects only. | Yes, Inception meeting is not mandatory, but it is a good practice and helps. |
| M & E Team, UNDP CO | 12 | Section 2.11 Adaptive Management On the statement "At the time of TE PIRs could not be made available | PIRs are only developed for GEF projects. | Agreed, Reference to PIR is removed |
| M & E Team, UNDP CO | 13 | Section 3.1.1 Attainment of results – Output 1 On the statement

"As per the UNDP project team the scope of services (this could not be validated during TE, due to the absence of a supporting document) offered were as follows" | Financial statements have been prepared and shared. Please let us know if additional documentation needs to be shared. | Agreed, the financing agreement provides the scope of services and the corresponding budget. Correction made in the report |
| M & E Team, UNDP CO | 14 | Section 3.1.2 Attainment of results – Output 2 On the statement

"Although, there is no document to support that the activity of provision of skilled human resources was | HR contracts were issued. | The contracts could not be shared at the time of TE. However, it is presumed that the contracts were issued. |

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
		carried out as per the service agreement, presumably the required services were delivered"		
UNDP Project Team	15	Section 3.1.2 Attainment of results – Output 2 On the statement "Apart from provision of the procurement services, there is no significant contribution of UNDP."	The responsibilities shouldered by the consultants and their day to day work are UNDP outputs. The Project design was to provide technical resources.	Yes, the project design was to provide technical resources. Which was done. What is being highlighted here is that there is no value addition by UNDP beyond provision of the human resources.
M & E Team, UNDP CO	16	Section 3.1.3 Attainment of results – Output 3 On the statement "Although, there is no document to support that the activity of provision of skilled human resources was carried out as per the service agreement, presumably the required services were delivered"	Contracts that outlined scope of work have been issued	The contracts could not be shared at the time of TE
M & E Team, UNDP CO	17	Section 3.4 Efficiency On the statement "The Monitoring and Evaluation activities for the project have fallen short of the requirements. As the periodic monitoring reports did not get prepared regularly, the project did not get the opportunity to learn and take adaptive measures	All documentation of the project has been complied with UNDP standards. The team formulated APRs, QPRs, PRMPs and all other documents which were also reviewed by the M&E team of UNDP. Regular meetings have been conducted with senior officials. The new HP project which the team hopefully will start this year will be the outcome of all the interventions done under this project.	During TE, only APRs for all the years were shared. These APRs are signed by the Program Officer. However, there is no evidence to suggest that they were reviewed by M&E team or for that matter anyone else. There is no adaptive action based on the periodic monitoring. QPRs and PRMPs were not shared at the time of TE.

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
		to enhance the project results. During project implementation, there was no participation by other UN agencies. The project steering committee did not get constituted and there was no formal platform to engage the national counterparts. The project during its implementation did not get directions or inputs from a larger set of stakeholders"		
UNDP Project Team	18	Section 4.1 Conclusions and Lessons Learned On the statement

"The services were provided by the consulting organizations and the hired individual consultants, without the required quality checks and value addition by UNDP" | This is valid for the ICs but cannot be stated for all the technical studies commissioned through public call for proposals/RFPs. UNDP accompanied the experts and agencies in every step. There were two full time staff fully working only on the DSS programme (Arun Sahdeo and Shubham Tandon until 2017 December) | Please appreciate accompanying the experts and agencies does not mean provision of meaningful inputs and contributions. There are no documents to suggest that a formal or informal review and or quality checks were carried out on the deliverables from the consultancies. |