1. Introduction

1.1 Country Context

Limited data on multi-hazards is a major barrier to rational disaster risk management in the Philippines. Basic information such as hazard maps are either incomplete or unavailable. Insufficient capacities of the national and local governments, as well as, communities constrain the country, over-all, to prepare for natural disasters.

The “Hazards Mapping and Assessment for Effective Community-based Disaster Risk Management” project aims to address the problem of DRM at the local level while addressing capacity needs of institutions at the national level. To achieve this, however, both national and local capacity development initiatives are necessary. At the national level, therefore, the Project will institutionalize and standardize DRM measures and processes. At the local/community level, the project aims to empower the most vulnerable provinces, municipalities and cities and enable them to prepare for natural disasters through such responses as early warning systems and contingency planning. The project hopes to develop a systematic approach to community based disaster risk management.

This project has also been dubbed the “READY” Project to connote action towards preparedness in terms of natural disasters.

1.2 Project Summary

1.2.1 Goal, Purpose and Objectives

In line with the national government’s priorities for preparedness, mitigation and response as embodied under P.D. 1566 which is the current policy for “Strengthening of the Philippine Disaster Control Capability and Establishing the National Program on Community Disaster Preparedness”, the project was designed to contribute to the goal of strengthening the capacities of key stakeholders in localities vulnerable to natural hazards. Its main purpose is to support disaster risk reduction throughout the Philippines. However, given that some areas are more hazard-prone than others, the project primarily supports hazard mapping endeavors and community preparedness initiatives in vulnerable areas identified by the Philippine Government.

The project has three immediate objectives:

a. Equip key stakeholder groups with the resources (financial, technical, and/or advisory services), knowledge and training that enable them to perform effectively for disaster risk reduction;

b. Strengthen coordination processes and procedures, within organizations and sectors (public, private and community) for effective risk reduction; and
c. Initiate the mainstreaming of risk reduction into local development planning.

1.2.2 Project Expected Outcomes and Outputs

The project is expected to achieve the following outcomes and outputs through strategic activities under the following components:

*Component 1: Multi-hazard identification and disaster risk assessment*

This component focuses on the assessment of natural hazards in the vulnerable areas: a.) hydromet such as floods, storm surges and rain-induced landslides; and b.) geologic such as volcanic eruptions and earthquakes (ground rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, earthquake-induced landslides and tsunamis).

The outputs of the assessment are multi-hazard maps of 1:50,000 scale at the provincial level and 1:10,000 scale at the identified priority municipality/city/barangay levels. The maps plus the spatial location of elements risk (e.g. schools, hospitals, residential buildings) are inputted into a special, open source software developed locally, as a simulation tool, initially for earthquakes and tsunamis, to determine intensities and areas of impact of the hazards. Concerned local government units will be trained on the use of these maps and software for planning purposes.

This component also identifies proposed risk reduction measures (e.g. applicable early warning systems; capacity building needs) and existing institutional mechanisms used to deal with the hazards.

*Component 2: Community-Based Disaster Preparedness*

This component develops and packages specific set of IEC strategies and materials for the following target groups: (i) decision-makers/local chief executives; (ii) technical personnel; and (iii) communities in general. It also forges multi-sectoral partnerships to engage other sectors (e.g. private sector, church) in order to optimize available resources for DRR. This component is also meant to effect coordination with another DRM project, “Strengthening the Disaster Capacities of Communities in the Philippines,” supported by AusAID and implemented by the Philippine National Red Cross (PNRC).

The component also develops and installs early warning systems in priority areas identified in the mapping activities under component 1. These early warning systems try to ensure that the warnings given are timely and understandable to those at risk, with guidance on how to act. These are also integrated into the community’s disaster management program.

*Component 3: Initiate the mainstreaming risk reduction into the local development planning process*

This component seeks to encourage concerned local government units at the municipal/city and barangay levels to incorporate disaster risk reduction in their development planning processes. It makes use of the results of component 1, including the use of the risk assessment software to help local planners and decision-makers to do this. As this is primarily not funded substantially by the project, this component is also used to generate support from other donors and partners for DRR in the Philippines.
2. Project Status and Need for the Mid-Term Review

The READY II Project is now in its Year 3 of implementation since its start in June 2006. The accomplishments and implementation issues of the READY II Project as of December 31, 2008 are documented in its 2008 Annual Report. As part of the UNDP corporate requirements and that of the donor, AusAID, a midterm review of the project needs to be undertaken to determine movement towards attainment of the outcomes. This process is also expected to identify future course(s) of action, post project, to ensure sustainability of gains.

3. Objectives of the Mid-Term Review (MTR)

The specific objectives of this Mid-Term Review (MTR) are in line with the following overarching objectives of the monitoring and evaluation of UNDP projects:

a. Promote accountability for the achievement of project objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes and performance of the implementing partners involved in READY II activities. READY II results will be monitored and evaluated for their contribution to the country’s disaster reduction initiatives;

b. Promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the various players in the disaster risk management and its partners, as basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, program management, and projects and to improve knowledge and performance.

An evaluation is a systematic and impartial assessment of an activity, project, program, strategy, policy, sector, focal area or other topics. It aims to determine the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the involved partners. An evaluation should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes.

4. Scope of the MTR

The MTR will focus primarily on the AusAID funded READY project and its role in catalyzing other related DRR projects such as the DiPECHO and ADB funded projects. It should also look at the status of the Government of the Philippines’ counterpart resources and DRR activities complementary to READY, especially multi-hazard mapping. It would also look at other cross cutting issues like gender mainstreaming and anti corruption within the sector.

It will review and evaluate the Project implementation taking into account the status of the project activities, outputs and resource disbursements from start of its implementation to December 31, 2008.

Specifically, the MTR will assess the project performance in terms of: (a) Progress towards achievement of results, (b) Factors affecting successful implementation and achievement of results, (c) Project Management framework, and (d) Strategic partnerships.

4.1 Progress towards achievement of results (internal and within project’s control)

- Is the Project making satisfactory progress in achieving project outputs vis-à-vis the targets and related delivery of inputs and activities?
• Are the direct partners and project consultants able to provide necessary inputs or achieve results?
• Given the level of achievement of outputs and related inputs and activities to date, is the Project likely to achieve its Immediate Purpose and Development Objectives?
• Are there critical issues relating to achievement of project results that have been pending and need immediate attention in the next period of implementation?

4.2 Factors affecting successful implementation and achievement of results (beyond the Project’s immediate control or project-design factors that influence outcomes and results)

• Is the project implementation and achievement of results proceeding well and according to plan, or are there any outstanding issues, obstacles, bottlenecks, etc. on the consumer, government or private sector or the electricity industry as a whole that are affecting the successful implementation and achievement of project results?
• To what extent does the broader policy environment remain conducive to achieving expected project results, including existing and planned legislations, rules, regulations, policy guidelines and government priorities?
• Is the project logical framework and design still relevant in the light of the project experience to date?
• To what extent do critical assumptions/risks in project design make true under present circumstances and on which the project success still hold? Validate these assumptions as presently viewed by the project management and determine whether there are new assumptions/risks that should be raised?
• Is the project well-placed and integrated within the national government development strategies, such as community development, poverty reduction, etc., and related global development programs to which the project implementation should align?
• Do the Project’s purpose and objectives remain valid and relevant, or are there items or components in the project design that need to be reviewed and updated?
• Are the Project’s institutional and implementation arrangements still relevant and helpful in the achievement of the Project’s objectives, or are there any institutional concerns that hinder the Project’s implementation and progress.

4.3 Project management (adaptive management framework)

• Are the project management arrangements adequate and appropriate?
• How effectively is the project managed at all levels? Is it results-based and innovative?
• Do the project management systems, including progress reporting, administrative and financial systems and monitoring and evaluation system, operate as effective management tools, aid in effective implementation and provide sufficient basis for evaluating performance and decision making?
• Is technical assistance and support from project partners and stakeholders appropriate, adequate and timely?
• Validate whether the risks originally identified in the project document and, currently in the AWP monitoring tool, are the most critical and the assessments and risk ratings placed are reasonable.
• Describe additional risks identified during the evaluation, if any, and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.
• Assess the use of the project logical framework and work plans as management tools and in meeting with UNDP requirements in planning and reporting.
• Assess the use of electronic information and communication technologies in the implementation and management of the project.
• On the financial management side, assess the cost effectiveness of the interventions and note any irregularities.
• How have the Annual Progress Review process helped in monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and achievement of results?

4.4 **Strategic partnerships** (project positioning and leveraging)

• Are the project partners and their other similar engagements in the Philippines, strategically and optimally positioned and effectively leveraged to achieve maximum effect of the READY II program objectives for the country?
• Assess how project partners, stakeholders and responsible partners are involved in the Project’s adaptive management framework.
• Identify opportunities for stronger collaboration and substantive partnerships to enhance the project’s achievement of results and outcomes.
• Are the project information and progress of activities disseminated to project partners and stakeholders? Are there areas to improve in the collaboration and partnership mechanisms?

5. **Review and Evaluation Methodology**

The MTR Team is expected to become well versed as to the project objectives, historical developments, institutional and management mechanisms, activities and status of accomplishments. Information will be gathered through document review, group and individual interviews and site visits. Review of relevant project documents and reports will be based on the following sources of information: Documents related to the Project and structured interviews with knowledgeable parties.

The MTR Team will conduct an opening meeting with the Implementing Partner headed by the Administrator of the Office of Civil Defense, the READY II Project Team, the Team Leaders of the various Responsible Partners (PAGASA, PHIVOLCS, MGB, NAMRIA) and relevant officials of the OCD to be followed by an “exit” interview to discuss the findings of the assessment prior to the submission of the draft Final Report.

Prior to engagement and conduct of visits to the READY II project sites, the MTR Team shall receive all the relevant documents including, at least:

• READY II Project Document
• Annual Work and Financial Plans
• Annual Project Report(s)

To provide more details, as may be needed, the following will be made available for access by the MTR Team:

• Executive summary of all quarterly reports
• Internal monitoring results
• Terms of Reference for past consultants’ assignments and summary of the results
• Past audit reports.
The MTR Team should at least interview the following people:

- READY Project Manager
- Team Leader of each of the Responsible Partners
- OCD Planning and Designated Staff
- Concerned Technical Specialists from the IP and RP for each component
- Administrative Officer
- Financial Officer
- Project Management Board Members
- Technical Working Group Members

With the aim of having an objective and independent evaluation, the MTR Team is expected to conduct the project review according to international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group.

5. MTR Team

The MTR will be conducted by two (2) National Consultants with the following qualifications:

A. Lead Consultant

Qualifications/Profile
- University degree (post-graduate desirable) relevant to disaster risk reduction or minimum of ten years accumulated and recognized experience in disaster risk management
- Experience (at least 3-5 years) in project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Familiarity with similar country or regional situations relevant to that of the Philippines
- Experience with multilateral and bilaterally supported disaster risk management projects
- Comprehensive knowledge of international disaster risk management best practices
- Advanced report writing skills in English.

Responsibilities
- Documentation review
- Lead the MTR Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation.
- Decide on division of labor within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Lead presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Lead the conduct of the debriefing for the UNDP Country Office in Manila, AusAID and READY II Project Management
- Lead the drafting and finalization of the MTR Evaluation Report.

B. Associate Consultant
Qualifications/Profile

- A minimum of five years of project management experience (finance management skills desirable)
- Disaster Risk Management training and technical experience
- Knowledge of Philippine disaster management policy
- Experienced in multilateral and bilaterally funded project development and implementation in the Philippine context
- Familiarity with Philippine agencies involved in DRR, relevant national development policies, programs and projects

Responsibilities

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contribute to the development of the evaluation plan and methodology
- Conduct of those elements of the evaluation determined by the Lead Consultant
- Contribute to the presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations at the evaluation wrap-up meeting
- Contribute to the drafting and finalization of the evaluation report.

The members of the MTR Team must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of the UNDP assistance. Therefore, candidates who had any direct involvement with the design and implementation of the READY II Project will not be considered.

The MTR Team will be complemented by an AusAID Disaster Risk Reduction expert who will be tasked to look at the following:

a) Review the complementation of the READY Project with other AusAID supported DRR initiatives;

b) Provide recommendations on future direction of AusAID support in Disaster Risk Reduction; and,

c) Provide expert input to the team on the evaluation of the project.

6. Schedule and Deliverables

The READY II MTR will commence on 3 August 2009. An evaluation report will be produced after a month, highlighting important observations, analysis of information and key conclusions including recommendations. Based on the scope of the MTR described above, the Evaluation Report will include, among others:

- Findings on the project implementation achievements, challenges, and difficulties to date;
- Assessments of the progress made towards the attainment of outcomes;
- Recommendations for modifications and the future course of action;
- Lessons learned from the project structure, coordination between different agencies, and experience of the implementation, and output/outcome.

The report will be initially shared with the READY II PMO to solicit comments or clarifications and will be presented to the UNDP Country Office (CO) in Manila for further deliberations. Consequently, the final MTR Report (in three copies) will be made and submitted to the UNDP CO with a copy furnished to the READY II PMO.
There will be two main deliverables:

- Mid-Term Review Report, including an executive summary, fulfilling the evaluation requirements set out in this Terms of Reference (TOR). The final report is to be cleared and accepted by UNDP CO in Manila before final payment. The final report (including executive summary, but excluding annexes) should not exceed 50 pages.
- A power-point presentation of the findings of the evaluation. Depending upon the complexity of the findings, the UNDP CO in Manila may consider organizing a half-day stakeholders meeting at which to make a presentation to the partners and stakeholders.

7. **Budget**

All costs to be incurred in the conduct of the MTR shall be charged against the READY II Project. Payment of the MTR Team’s professional fees shall be made in accordance with the Service Contract to be issued for this purpose.
## Suggested Timeline (for our reference -- not to be included in the TOR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>Terms of Reference (TOR) finalised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- 19 July</td>
<td>Advertise positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop itinerary of the MTR Team with READY PMO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24 July</td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27- 31 July</td>
<td>Informing selected candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make travel arrangements for MTR Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 August</td>
<td>First Day of the MTR</td>
<td>Meetings with relevant stakeholders, possibly revising the itinerary if the MTR sees some things they want to see apart from the items mentioned in the initial draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 16 August</td>
<td>Review (including possible site visits) and drafting of the report</td>
<td>An AusAID and/or UNDP BCPR DRR expert can be invited to participate in the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- 21 August</td>
<td>Presentation of initial findings (e.g. Aide Memoir/Note of Findings) to</td>
<td>Initial findings will be circulated in Canberra for comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AusAID, NDCC-CSCAND and UNDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August - 04 September</td>
<td>Drafting and Report Validation</td>
<td>Could be done online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 September</td>
<td>Draft Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 September</td>
<td>Deadline of Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 25 September</td>
<td>Revisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 September</td>
<td>Submission of Final Version of the Report</td>
<td>Ideally this would be the end of the process but we need to put in a clause re: the conditions for acceptance of the final report in the contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>