**TERMS OF REFERENCE “PROJECT EVALUATION”**

**Project Title: Enhancing Institutional Capacities to reduce Disaster Risk and to integrate Climate Change in Jordan.**

**1. Background and context:**

The project aims to improve governance and strengthen Jordanian institutional coping mechanisms to address disaster risk reduction (DRR) for natural hazards and climate change adaptation ( CCA) as it relates to prevention, mitigation, and preparedness for flash flooding. The project will strive to develop synergies at policy and institutional levels between DRR and CCA, given the strong interface that exists between the two disciplines. The project is also working on strengthen institutional capacity in PDTRA and ASEZA to deal with all aspects of disaster risk reduction, including climatic hazards. An important component will be the review of the Building Code in the light of seismic risk assessment by the National Building Council and enhancing the knowledge and experience in structural resilience so that the Jordanian Civil Defence is enabled to organize post-disaster emergency response operations. Ministry of Education will also carry out structural assessment of schools in Amman. This planned to be achieved through the revision of the construction standards and practices as well as carrying out a seismic and flood vulnerability assessment and retrofit design of selected JCD buildings and public schools.

**2. Evaluation purpose:**

The purpose of the Project Evaluation is to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the project in achieving its intended results. The findings and recommendations of this of Project Evaluation will inform future DRR programme/projects development and assist UNDP increase its effectiveness and impact.

**3. Evaluation scope and objectives:**

The scope of the evaluation is expected to cover UNDP, the implementing Partners: Jordan Civil Defence (**JCD**), Ministry of Public Works and Housing/ Jordan National Building Council (**JNBC**), Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority (**ASEZA**) and Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority (**PDTRA**), Disaster management institutions/organizations, NGOs, UN Agencies and the communities that benefited from the project. The overall objective of this Project Evaluation is to:

* Assess achievement towards the project’s objectives and results,
* Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of implementation,
* Identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation, and
* Provide recommendations on design modifications and specific actions that would increase the effectiveness and impact of future similar initiatives.

**4. Evaluation questions:**

In pursuit of the overall objectives, the following key questions will be addressed during the Project Evaluation:

* To what extent did the project achieve its overall objectives?
* To what extent were the results (impacts, outcomes and outputs) achieved?
* Describe the management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery?
* To what extent did the project’s M&E mechanism contribute in meeting project results?
* What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project?
* Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
* Describe the main lessons that have emerged? and
* Provide a set of recommendations for future cooperation between UNDP and the Implementing Partners in the area of DRM/DRR, including project design and arrangements.

**5. Methodology:**

The methodology for the evaluation is envisaged to cover the following areas:

* Desk review of all relevant project documentation;
* Consultations and Discussions with the Implementing Partners and donors;
* Interviews with relevant Key Informants
* Discussions with the Senior Management of UNDP;
* Consultation meetings and interviews with beneficiaries.

**6. Evaluation products (deliverables):**

The consultant will produce the following deliverables:

* Inception report (that includes a detailed methodology, survey instruments, interview questions, evaluation plan and schedule etc…).
* Draft evaluation report; and
* Final evaluation report.

**8. Evaluation ethics:**

Evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation”. The Evaluation team will take every measure to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of key informants in the collection of data.

**9. Time-frame for the evaluation process:**

The evaluation will take place in (Nov-Dec), 2013 and will be for a term of four weeks (20 working days).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output** | **timeline** |
| * 1. Debriefing meeting on evaluation results with stakeholders
 | After conclusion of necessary meetings |
| * 1. A first draft of the evaluation results, including findings/ recommendations that should be considered in any next phase of the project.
 | within 5 days after debriefing meeting |
| 1. Final evaluation report:
 | Within 5 working days after receipt of comments on the draft report |

**10. Cost:**

The consultancy fees will be based on UN rates. DSA and travel will be paid when there is in-country support.

**Annex 1: List of documentation:**

* Project document: Strengthening national and community resilience to disaster risks in Swaziland
* Quarterly, annual reports and work plans for the duration of the project
* Key documents produced under the project namely:
* Outreach Strategy for Education and Awareness Programme – PDTRA.
* Booklet, Color Book, Guide Book, Posters and other materials produced for PDTRA schools.
* Integrated Risks Assessment for PDTR.
* Feasibility study for setting up Early Warning System for the risk of Flash Flood in Petra.
* Disaster Risk Management Master Plan for ASEZA.
* Institutional Analysis Report “*Mapping and assessing the existing and potential linkages between CCR and DRR in Jordan*“
* Framework for action and 3-year Action Plan “*Strengthening Synergies between Governance of Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Jordan with a View to Reduce Poverty*”
* Project Document “*Adaptive Disaster Risk Reduction in Petra*”
* Training material for Seismic Assessment and Retrofitting of Existing Buildings.

And some other related will be provided on request.

**Annex 2: Evaluation Report Format:**

The Evaluation Report should contain the following:

1. **Title Page:**
* Name of project being evaluated
* Time-frame of the Evaluation and date of the report
* Country of the Evaluation
* Names/organization of evaluators
* Name of the organization(s) commissioning the evaluation
* Acknowledgements
1. **Table of contents, including list of annexes.**
2. **List of acronyms and abbreviations.**
3. **Executive summary:**
* Briefly describes the project that was evaluated
* Explain the purpose an objective of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended use.
* Describe key aspects of the evaluation approach and methodology
* Summarizes principles, findings, conclusion and recommendations
1. **Introduction – Background and context of the project:**
* Summarizes the purpose of the evaluation, the key issues addressed and the methodology employed to conduct the evaluation
* Describes the structure of the evaluation report
* Describes the aims and strategies of project
1. **Description of the project – Its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success.**
2. **Evaluation scope and objective:**
* Provide a clear explanation of the evaluation scope, primary objectives and main questions
1. **Methods and approach of the evaluation:**

Describes the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purpose. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

* Data sources
* Sample and sampling frame
* Data collection procedures and instruments
* Performance standards
* Stakeholder engagement
* Ethical considerations
* Background information on evaluators
* Major limitations of the methodology
1. **Data Analysis.**

Describe the procedures used to analyze the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. Detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results

1. **Findings and Conclusion.**

Present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from the findings.

1. **Recommendations.**

Provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the users of report about what actions to take or decisions to make

1. **Lessons learned.**

Based on the evaluation findings and drawing from the evaluator(s) overall experience in other contexts, provide lessons learned that may be applicable in other situations as well. Include both positive and negative lessons.

1. **Annexes:**
* Attach Terms of Reference for the Evaluation.
* Data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guide, surveys etc…).
* Lists of individuals or groups interviewed, sites visited.
* List of supporting documentation reviewed.
* Summary tables of findings.

All reports should be presented in English languge unless indicated otherwise.

VI. QUALIFICATIONS

- Advanced university degree in a related discipline;

- Fluency in English and Arabic is required

- Full computer literacy

-

General professional experience

- A minimum of 7 years of professional experience in fields relevant to democratic governance and/or youth development

- Preferably 5 years of experience in international development cooperation

Competencies

The candidate should be able to:

- work under pressure against strict deadlines,

- think out- the-box, find innovative solutions to extracting information

- Ability to present complex issues persuasively and simply.

- Ability to contextualize global trends in accordance with the dynamics of the operating (working) environment.

VII. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications technical proposal and proposed methodology and the feasibility of the financial proposal. The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

• Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

• Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Technical Criteria – 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

• Technical expertise – maximum points: 15

• Relevant professional experience – maximum points: 20

• Knowledge and experience in international development – max points: 10

• Previous working experience on similar assignments – max points: 25

Financial Criteria – 30% of total evaluation – maximum 30 points.