

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation of the Global Risk Identification Programme (GRIP) 2007 to 2012

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

During the period 2003 to 2005, the UNISDR Secretariat constituted several working groups chaired by to address specific thematic issues related to disaster risk reduction. One of these, Working Group III focused on Risk, Vulnerability and Impact Assessment. The Group was chaired by UNDP and brought together a range of stakeholders from the national, regional and international levels. The participants in the WGIII deliberations included: international agencies such as WMO, UN-Habitat, UNEP, UNCRD, UNESCO, WFP, World Bank, and ProVention Consortium, IFRC; regional institutions and networks such as Asian Disaster Preparedness Center, Asian Disaster Reduction Center, South Pacific Commission, Network for Social Studies on Disaster Prevention in Latin America (LA RED); research institutions such as Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED), Columbia University, University of Geneva, and private sector companies such as Munich Re and Swiss Re. The Working Group undertook several comparative studies on risk and vulnerability indexing, disaster databases and their applications for risk reduction. While recognizing the global progress on risk identification techniques and their applications, the WGIII identified several gaps and recommended the establishment of a global initiative to address some of these gaps. In January 2005, the World Conference for Disaster Reduction in Kobe agreed on the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) for disaster risk reduction. One of the five priority areas of action of HFA relates to risk assessment and early warning systems.

Building on the work of the Working Group III, and responding to HFA Priority 2, UNDP established the Global Risk Identification Programme (GRIP) in 2007. In June 2007, GRIP was recognized as a UN-ISDR Thematic Platform for Risk Identification at the 1st session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. As a thematic platform, GRIP was adopted by the UN-ISDR system to support worldwide activities to identify and monitor disaster risks.

Concurrently, the UNDP Strategic Plan (2008-11) states one of the key result areas to be “Solutions generated for natural disaster risk management and conflict prevention through common analysis and inclusive dialogue, among government, relevant civil society actors and other partners, (i.e., UN, other international organizations, bilateral partners).” GRIP also responds to this key result area of the UNDP strategic plan. Hosted by UNDP, GRIP is a multi-stakeholder initiative with the ultimate goal of promoting sustainable development by reducing the impacts of natural disasters in high risk countries.

With the **mission** of providing “Better risk information for sound decision making”, GRIP’s **objectives** are twofold: 1) To improve disaster risk information and understanding; and 2) To increase application of disaster risk information in public policy/ decision making processes.

GRIP’s programme design, approved in 2006 by the Programme Steering Committee, includes 5 **Outcome areas**:

- Risk analyses in high-risk countries, in support of public decision making processes;
- Disaster loss data enhancement to learn from past disasters;
- Demonstration in 3 selected priority countries to test GRIP’s practice development and demonstrate its impact;
- National capacity development to ensure sustainability of disaster risk assessment; and
- Global risk update.

Following the programme design and to establish the thematic platform, GRIP’s **activities** have focused on:

- 1) *Practice development* - Development of standard and norms, methodologies, tools, guidelines, and applications of the developed methodologies and tools in high-risk countries;
- 2) *Country support* - Building of a solid portfolio for the provision of technical support and services to high-risk countries in conducting disaster risk assessment;
- 3) *Inter-agency activities* - Establishment of mechanisms for coordination and facilitation of inter-agency activities in practice development and integrated country support;
- 4) *Development of the GRIP structure* - In particular, partnerships with donors, public sectors, and private sectors to expand its capability as a thematic platform and ensure the sustainability of the programme; and
- 5) *Global integration of disaster and risk information through GRIPWeb.*

GRIP's areas of practice in risk assessment include two levels – National and Global. At the national level, GRIP supports high-risk countries through UNDP's Country Offices to develop and implement a comprehensive long-term solution to disaster risk assessment. As of October 2011, GRIP has assisted around 45 high-risk countries in conducting comprehensive disaster risk assessment. In particular, GRIP has supported: 24 countries to implement Country Situation Analysis (CSA) to delineate baselines and create an enabling environment for disaster risk assessment; 8 countries to establish National Disaster Observatories (NDO) to learn from their past disasters; 7 countries to conduct National Risk Assessment (NRA) for revising or formulating their National (DRR) strategy; and 6 countries to conduct Urban Risk Assessment (URA) for preparing contingency plans, DRR action plans, and urban/spatial plans. In addition, GRIP has developed a series of methodologies, tools, guidelines, and standards for disaster risk assessment, including a comprehensive training package. The training package consists of 6 integral training courses: Disaster Risk Assessment for United Nations Country Team (UNCT) and practitioners, CSA, NDO, NRA, and URA. Each course is further divided into 3 levels – introductory, intermediate, and advanced, to address different audiences of different backgrounds. In 2011 (five years after its launch), GRIP has been recognized as a practice leader in the international risk assessment community. At the global level, GRIP, in partnership with World Meteorological Organization (WMO), World Health Organization (WHO), UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UN-HABITAT and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), is committed to facilitate and provide coordinated country support to promote **Delivering as One in Risk Assessment** and increase the synergy among UN agencies in risk assessment at the national level.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of this independent evaluation is to systematically i) review progress and achievements against its expected objectives and outcomes over the last five years, lessons learned, and challenges faced by the programme; ii) review the impact of GRIP's activities and interventions at the national, regional and global levels within the wider context of disaster risk reduction efforts of UNDP and its partners and (iii) identify strategic opportunities for a continued engagement of UNDP and its partners in risk identification related efforts.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

Scope

The **scope** of the evaluation corresponds to GRIP's objectives and outcomes outlined in Section 1 above. In assessing the achievement of outcomes at the national level in GRIP target countries, the evaluation will look at overall national level outcomes rather than specific locations within the countries except when the activities were designed to support specific sub-national issues. The evaluation will take into account GRIP's geographical coverage, with particular focus on the three priority countries.

The evaluation will also examine the relevance/niche of GRIP in light of the current disaster risk reduction context -- emerging needs of high disaster risk countries, risk assessment related technical support needs of UNDP and ISDR system partners -- and identify areas in which a follow up initiative would contribute the greatest value-added.

Objectives

Specific objectives of the evaluation of GRIP are as follows:

- To assess the extent to which the programme has met its two objectives and achieved its five outcomes. The evaluation will systematically review the implementation modality, practice development, country support, inter-agency coordination, and knowledge management;
- To determine the extent to which the GRIP has positioned itself to add value to the implementation of the UN-ISDR's HFA, in response to the needs and demands from high-risk countries. This includes the role and relevance of GRIP in the development or enhancement of the National Disaster Risk Management (DRM)/DRR systems of high-risk countries, including national coordination mechanism, stakeholder engagement, risk awareness, and capacity development.
- To present key findings, draw lessons learned, and provide a set of clear and forward-looking options for the follow up engagement of UNDP in risk identification related activities within the context of the ISDR system.

The evaluation will assess programme performance against the following criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Impact.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This paragraph includes suggested evaluation questions against the 5 criteria listed below:

1) Relevance

- Lack of coordination and integration seriously affects the effectiveness of the assistance provided by the international community to countries in dealing with their disaster risks. Did GRIP address this issue?
- Although many efforts and resources have been devoted worldwide to DRR, natural extreme events continue inflicting huge losses, both human and financial, especially in least developed countries. Did GRIP respond to the need of developing mechanisms to track disaster losses and monitor progress in DRR?
- Currently, there are no standards or quality control mechanisms to guaranty the validity of risk assessment exercises. The variety of forms and contents of risk assessment results just confuse end users and hamper their utilization. As part of the UN system, did GRIP address the need to develop minimum standards and quality control procedures for risk assessment?
- Did GRIP respond to the national priorities and needs in risk reduction? Are GRIP activities aligned with national strategies?

- Many national DRM strategies lack hard evidence and are based on perceptions or political, economic or institutional interests. Did GRIP address the countries' need for evidence-based long-term strategies that have measurable goals and monitoring mechanisms?
- High-risk countries, especially the least developed ones, lack the capacity to carry out comprehensive programs to understand their disaster risk and incorporate risk considerations in sound decision making. Did GRIP respond to the widespread need for local capacity, both at technical and institutional levels, to properly address disaster risk?
- What was the relevance of and possible synergies between GRIP and other four HFA priorities and the cross-cutting areas of gender equality, capacity building and national ownership, particularly in relation to the GRIP programme objectives and principles?
- Lack of integration among DRM initiatives implemented at regional, national and subnational levels has affected their effectiveness and resulted in the duplication of efforts and the inefficient use of limited available resources. Did GRIP respond to the need of integrating isolated initiatives at all levels into long-term, coordinated programmes?

2) Efficiency

- Has the programme been implemented within its deadline and cost estimates?
- Did GRIP resources focus on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results?
- Was there any identified synergy between GRIP activities and other similar interventions that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?
- Has there been over expenditure or under expenditure of the project?
- What key factors underlined the effectiveness, usefulness, strengths and weaknesses of approaches and strategies applied by GRIP? What risks and barriers to success were anticipated at the outset?
- Were there any unanticipated events, opportunities or constraints? Were the anticipated policy influences achieved? Did alternative ones emerge? What could be done differently in the future?
- Are the resources allocated sufficient to achieve the objectives of the GRIP and fulfil the programme's mandate? How well did the GRIP leverage non-core resources towards achievement of results, as defined in the programme document?
- What effect did management and institutional arrangements have on GRIP in terms of programming, delivery and monitoring of implementation of the GRIP at the Headquarters level, at the regional level and at the country level? What measures were taken to assure the quality of development results and management practices, both in relation to process and products, and to partnership strategies? What monitoring and evaluation procedures were applied by UNDP and partners to ensure greater accountability?

3) Effectiveness

- Are GRIP approaches, resources, models, conceptual frameworks relevant to achieve planned outcomes?

- Did GRIP set dynamic changes and processes that have potential to contribute to long-term outcomes?
- Did GRIP accomplish its intended objectives and planned results?
- What were the unintended results (positive/negative) of GRIP interventions?
- What changes can be observed as a result of the GRIP outcomes at both global and national levels?
- To what extent were national governments involved in the design and implementation of GRIP programmes?

4) Sustainability

- To what extent were GRIP initiatives led by a concern to ensure sustainability? How was this concern reflected in the design of the programme, in the implementation of activities at different levels, in the delivery of outputs and the achievement of outcomes? In particular, did the country-based advisory services help build capacities in a sustainable manner or were they more ad-hoc (driven by other factors)?
- Has GRIP's contribution to national capacity development in risk assessment had the focus needed to significantly increase relevant national capacities and, by doing so, ensure sustainability?
- How has the GRIP ensured sustainability of the results to which it contributed? Have there been exit/sustainability strategies developed?

5) Impact

- Did GRIP interventions help countries improve/develop DRR structure, leadership, coordination, multi-stakeholders' engagement? How did GRIP support the development and approval of legal frameworks supporting DRR at National level? Key impacts?
- Has GRIP helped countries to share knowledge, experiences and lessons learnt as well as develop joint initiatives? Have GRIP programmes increased and facilitated South- South collaboration and sharing of good practices?
- Have GRIP interventions assisted countries in mobilizing and leveraging resources, accessing funding opportunities? Key impacts?
- Have GRIP activities enhanced the culture of disaster and risk prevention in high-risk countries? Have GRIP interventions helped countries to effectively shift the paradigm from disaster response to disaster prevention through risk management?

5. METHODOLOGY

Inception: Based on the indicative questions listed in the above section, project and content specific questions will be provided by the evaluation team in its inception report. The inception report should contain an evaluation matrix that displays for each of the evaluation criteria the questions and sub-

questions that the evaluation will answer, and for each question, the primary and secondary data that will be collected.

Data collection: In view of the complexity of GRIP, the evaluation will seek to obtain data from a range of sources, including desk reviews and document analyses, surveys and questionnaires, stakeholder consultations, interviews and focus group discussions at UNDP Headquarters and in a range of programme countries, UN agencies, international organizations, and other relevant institutions. The rationale for using a range of data sources (data, perceptions, evidence) is to triangulate findings in a situation where much of the data, due to the very complex nature of GRIP, is qualitative, and its interpretation thus critically dependent on the evaluators' judgment. Triangulation provides an important tool in filtering evidence by using different data sources to inform the analysis of specific issues. The evaluators will provide empirical evidence to support all conclusions and recommendations, and the evidence will be validated from multiple sources.

Where possible and appropriate, the evaluation should seek to obtain evidence as to what might or might not have occurred in the absence of GRIP. Some of UNDP's programmes or modalities may not, due to the design of GRIP, have benefited from GRIP's support. Such programmes or modalities may thus serve to provide insights into the relative value added of the GRIP.

In launching the evaluation, an important, initial exercise will be to develop a logic model for GRIP, taking into account (i) its expected outcomes, as defined in the project document, (ii) any strategic or operational changes introduced during the implementation process, and (iii) important and apparent milestones and achievements, as outlined in progress reports. The logic model will serve to highlight the theory of change underpinning the GRIP and will assist in identifying, at an early stage, any challenges or bottlenecks that may affect the programme evaluation. The evaluation methodology may thus need to be adjusted accordingly.

The limited time will not permit the selection of a sufficiently large number of case studies that could be considered a 'representative sample' of GRIP initiatives. It will be necessary, therefore, to generalize from findings of case studies that could be considered as most 'typical' of GRIP and thus lend themselves best to generalization. It is expected that individual case studies will comprise the global, regional and country level, in line with the vertical integration that is typical of GRIP's programme approach, i.e., in looking at different practice areas, modalities or principles, it will be important to recognize their linkages from the global, through the regional to the national levels. The evaluation will be carried out following a 3-step process:

Step 1: Documentation Review

The GRIP team will provide a complete list of programme documents and materials that need to be reviewed (Annexes in paragraph 12). The desk review should also take into account the previous evaluations conducted for UNDP, such as "Evaluation of UNDP contribution to Disaster Prevention and Recovery" and any similar ones conducted by development partners.

Step 2: Stakeholder Consultation and Interviews

Based on the desk review, the evaluation will interview key stakeholders to verify and discuss the key findings of the desk review, through the teleconference and visit at HQ level. It is expected the following meetings and interviews will be organized:

- Meetings/ interviews with stakeholders within UNDP including BCPR's management, disaster reduction team, regional and country offices;

- Meetings/ interviews with the member of the Evaluation Reference Group, UN agencies at Headquarter level, donors, and other international organizations such as IFRC, OECD's Global Science Forum, Global Risk Forum, as well as the World Bank and other development banks;
- Meetings/ interviews with GRIP's implementing partners including national agencies and academic institutions; and
- Meetings/ interviews with GRIP's client countries with a particular emphasis on the three priority countries.

The Reference Group is provided in the Annex. As an important initial exercise, the Evaluation Team will work with the GRIP secretariat to determine the list of interviewees and the questionnaire based on a stakeholder analysis in order to identify the institutional entities and individuals within the UN-ISDR system involved in planning, management and implementation of the GRIP; the primary target groups and different partners at the global, regional and country levels.

The main source of information will be through structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews and consultations at UN agencies at Headquarter level, UNDP Country Offices, and other relevant stakeholders. The results of these consultations and interviews are to be documented for internal team analysis. Structured interview methods are also to be used for other consultations. In some cases, focus group discussions may be held to capture the dynamic of information sharing and debate, and to enrich the findings. In other cases, interviews will be carried out by telephone or tele/video conference. The Evaluation Team will select countries and stakeholders to be interviewed based on criteria to be developed in consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group and with suggestions from GRIP team.

The evaluation includes a Reference Group meeting at the end of the evaluation to discuss and finalize the evaluation report.

Step 3: Country Interviews

To evaluate the impacts of GRIP's contributions to establishing effective national DRM/DRR system, a number of country interviews will be arranged. The list of country interviews will be determined by the evaluators in consultations with the Reference Group and with inputs from GRIP team.

6. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)

Deliverables/ Outputs	Estimated Duration of Completion	Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
Inception report— detailing the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report will also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product;	14 – 30 May 2012	30 May 2012	Yes
Draft final evaluation report	31 May – 16 July 2012	16 July 2012	Yes
Final Evaluation report	17 July – 31 August 2102	31 August 2012	Yes

7. REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The evaluation consultant will be externally recruited through UNDP's regular recruitment procedure. He/she should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of GRIP that is the subject of this evaluation.

The evaluation consultant must have demonstrated capacity to think strategically, provide policy advice and manage the evaluation of the global programmes. He/she is expected to have extensive knowledge of issues relating to organizational and institutional change, the UN reform process, principles of results-based management, and should be familiar with the on-going debate on the issue of DRR effectiveness. BCPR M&E Team will provide overall managerial and coordination support to the consultant.

The following are some of key qualifications for the selection of the team members:

- Masters or PhD in a relevant field, and at least 15 years of international development experience or well established and well-functioning organization with at least 10 years of experience in project/programme design and evaluation;
- Sound knowledge of humanitarian response, disaster risk reduction, disaster risk management and risk assessment issues at national, regional, and global levels;
- Background in strategic planning and previous experience drafting or contribution to UN development documents;
- Sound methodological skills and knowledge of evaluation methods and techniques;
- Strong monitoring and evaluation background;
- Proven familiarity with UNDP, the UN system and the international development landscape, as well as the UN architecture for disaster risk reduction;
- Extensive experience in working with the UN/multilateral development agencies, UNDP country offices and/or regional centres is an asset;
- Superior leadership and strategic management skills with an excellent understanding of international development issues and knowledge of the UN system;
- Strong written and verbal communication skills, in a multi-cultural setting; excellent interpersonal skills, objectivity and ability to analyze large multi-country data sets in short period;
- Experience working collaboratively in small teams with tight deadlines.

8. EVALUATION ETHICS

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'⁶⁴ and evaluators must address, in the design and implementation of the evaluation critical issues, critical issues including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, such for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

9. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The Disaster Risk Reduction Team and the Monitoring and Evaluation team (M&E) of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) will jointly manage the evaluation process, provide backstopping support and ensure the coordination and liaison with concerned agencies at the headquarter level as well as the country level. The M&E team will be responsible for overseeing the production of the evaluation report and its presentation to the Evaluation Reference Group and BCPR's management. An Evaluation

Reference Group will be established at the outset of the evaluation, consisting of GRIP's key stakeholders and partners who should be leading authorities on Disaster Risk Assessment, i.e. focal points/representative from UN agencies, IFRC, multilateral development banks (the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank), academia, as well as GRIP's client countries and implementing partners. The Reference Group will play an important role in providing strategic, methodological and substantive inputs into the evaluation process, as well as feedback on the inception and final evaluation report. In addition, the reference group will ensure that the evaluation results are appropriately disseminated and discussed within their respective organizations.

10. TIMEFRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The duration of the evaluation will be approximately 40 working days and expected to start on 14 May 2012 and end on latest by 31 August 2012.

11. DUTY STATION

Duty station is New York – USA and it is a home-based work. However the consultant will be required to present at the UNDP/BCPR office in New York during the regular office working hours if he/she is called upon for further discussions related to evaluation work.

12. TRAVEL

Following field trips may require during the consultancy period depending on the fund availability and preliminary findings of the GRIP evaluation exercise:

- a) Two trips to Geneva - one at the beginning of the consultancy for inception and meeting with Geneva organizations in the week of 21 May 2012, and the other one is expected either in mid July or first week of August 2012 to present the end results of evaluation exercise;
- b) One trip to one country office in Africa region may require. Location will select after submission of inception report;
- c) One trip may take place to Washington DC to meet with other partners depending on the preliminary findings of the evaluation;
- d) Additional trip to another country office may take place based on preliminary findings and availability of funding.

13. TRAVEL COSTS AND EXPENSES

UNDP will cover and reimburse all the travel costs including the airfare at the most direct economy class and per diem allowance/terminal expenses as per UN standard and other official communications costs occurred during the official travel. UNDP will not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket and also reserves the right to undertake verification of the actual costs of travel and may negotiate reduction of such costs where there are evidences establishing availability of more economical options. Payment will be made 80% of expected travel costs prior to travel and for the remaining 20% the consultant/contractor will be reimbursed for travel expenses upon submission of a travel claim (F-10 form) and all necessary supporting documents.

14. MEDICAL RELATED COSTS

Individual Consultants/Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP.

15. SCOPE OF PRICE AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

The payment will consist of consultancy fee at US\$500.00 per day for total of 40 working days during the period 14 May to 31 August 2012. The consultant's daily rate US\$500 is all-inclusive of professional fees and health insurance, third party insurance, medical coverage during travel, risk and inconveniences related to work under hardship and hazardous conditions and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services under the Individual contract.

The payment is subject to a time sheet submitted by the Contractor and approved by the Supervisor. Payments will be made in three installments and upon satisfactory completions of services and deliverables as follows indicated under item no. 6 above.

- 30% after submission and approval of inception report i.e. on 30 May 2012
- 45% after submission of the draft final evaluation report i.e. on 16 July 2012
- 25% after completion of the consultancy along with the submission of FINAL EVALUATION REPORT not later than 31 August 2012.

The payment will be based only upon the certification and acceptance of the outputs by the relevant approval officer.

18. Approval

This TOR is approved by: Jo Scheuer – DRRRT Coordinator.

Signature:

Name and Designation: Jo Scheuer, Coordinator, DRRR Team

Date of Signing:

10/5/2012