Terms of Reference

**Mid-Term Evaluation:**

**GON-UNDP Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Programme**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mid Term Evaluation | Grade / Level:Short Term Consultancy |
| Unit : Disaster Risk Management Unit,UNDP, Nepal | Programme:Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Programme (2011-2015) |
| 1. **Background and Context**   The Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Programme (CDRMP) aims to support the Government of Nepal to strengthen the institutional and legislative aspects of DRM in Nepal by building the capacity of the Ministry of Home Affairs, other line ministries and local governments. The programme was formulated to support implementation of the Government of Nepal’s National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management (2009). The programme is part of the Strategic Partnership Framework signed between BCPR and UNDP and is in line with the Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium workplan. In Nepal, UNDP is the coordinating agency for the NRRC Flagship Area Five: Policy and Institutional Support for Disaster Risk Management and is a major contributor to the Government’s agreed work plan and targets for the NRRC.  The programme was developed in line with relevantthe UNDP CPAP (2010-2012) Outcome 4.2: Risks of natural hazards to rural and urban livelihoods and infrastructure reduced.The key result areas for the programme are:   1. Capacities of national and district-level institutions to deal with disaster management strengthened, financial mechanisms and services for DRM strengthened, DRMtraining facilities and courses available 2. Compliance of Building Codes and Land Use Plan improved, national capacities in terms of technical skills and competence in building codes enhanced 3. Sustainable reduction in disaster risk achieved through DRM mainstreaming in key development sectors 4. National and local vulnerabilities arising from climate risks better understood and reduced 5. Strengthened implementation and mainstreaming of Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) in development initiatives 6. Capacities and systems for emergency preparedness and response strengthened 7. Early recovery concepts and tools are integrated into the response mechanisms, interventions and systems of the Government, humanitarian and development actors 8. Lessons, experiences and issues emerging from the programme documents, published and disseminated across different stakeholders   Detailed outputs for these priority areas against which the evaluators should bench-mark progress are outlined in the programme’s results and resources framework (attached).  The programme’s main coordinating Government counterpart is the Ministry of Home Affairs, while partnerships have been developed with a wide range of other Government and non-Government actors including the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development, Ministry of Physical Planning and Works (and the newly formed Ministry of Urban Development), several sectorial ministries, the National Planning Commission and municipal actors. In addition, in 2012 the newly formedKathmandu Valley Development Authority also became a stakeholder in the programme. In addition to working on central level policy and systems, the programme currently has activities in 23 highly vulnerable districts and eight municipalities.  The Programme became operational in February 2011with UNDP inputs of US$ 4million and with resource mobilization target of US$ 11.4million (for an overall budget of US $15.4 million). To date, the Programme has secured funds of over US $13.6 million from a range of donors including DFID, UNDP BCPR, ECHO and the World Bank. Recently the Government of Nepal has requested the programme to extend its activities and to increase its funding target, and this should be considered in the mid-term evaluationprocess. | |
| **2. Mid-Term Evaluation Purpose and Objective:**  The purpose of this programme Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to assess to what extent the Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Programme is on track towards reaching its key results and achieving the programme outcomeconsidering the changing country situation and comparative advantages of UNDP in the country. The MTE will take place in a forward-looking consultative rather than an advisory manner that ensures full participation of stakeholders in the process.As new UNDAF and UNDP Country Programme Action Plans (2013-2018) recently were signed with the Government of Nepal the evaluation is also an opportunity to ascertain the extent to which current outcomes and outputs are in line with these new action plans.  The evaluation results will provide a basis for decision-making on actions to be taken for the remaining years of the programmeand its team as well as in the design of the follow on or new Programmes or activities under the current CPAP (2013-2017). | |
| 1. **Scope of Mid-Term Evaluation**   The evaluation aims to identify existing practices and lessons that can effectively contribute to achieving planned outcomes; analyse challenges in delivering targeted results and recommend both broad strategy and specific output revisions that can further focus and improve effectiveness of the programme.  The mid-term evaluation team will look at progress in each of the eightCDRMP’s component areas outlined above, focusing on the following key questions:   1. Do the project activities and expenditure comply with the project document? 2. Has the CDRMP become able to support GoN on DRM related policy issues? 3. Is there evidence that capacities of national and district-level institutions to deal with disaster management are on track to being strengthened, has the programme contributed to an increase in the availability and quality of DRM training facilities and courses available? 4. Has the programme begun to contribute to increases and a strengthening of the financial mechanisms and services for DRM in Nepal? 5. Has the programme made a contribution to date to increasing compliance of Building Codes and to promoting Land Use Planning in terms of technical skills and competence among key stakeholders, particularly in the Government of Nepal? 6. Has the programme begun to make a contribution to sustainably reducing disaster risk as a result of DRM mainstreaming efforts in key development sectors? 7. Is there evidence that national and local vulnerabilities arising from climate risks are beginning to be better understood and reduced as a result of CDRMP’s work? 8. Has the programme made a contribution to strengthened implementation and mainstreaming of Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) in development initiatives? 9. Has the programme contributed to a strengthening of capacities and systems for emergency preparedness and response? 10. Are early recovery concepts and tools beginning to be integrated into the response mechanisms, interventions and systems of the Government, humanitarian and development actors? 11. Is the programme making a contribution to promoting sharing of lessons, experiences and issues emerging from the programme documents, published and disseminated across different stakeholders? 12. Has the programme become able to demonstrate and document good practices and knowledge products on DRM? 13. Any strategic vision on Post CDRMP (2015) and resource mobilisation?   **Progresswill be assessed based on the following criteria :**   1. Thematic and Strategic Relevance 2. Effectiveness and Efficiency 3. Likelihood of Impact andSustainability 4. Lessons Learned and Future directions   ***Thematic and Strategic Relevance:***   * Assessment of the appropriateness of the implementation strategies under the programme; * Review the relevance of CDRM Programme in the context of national priorities for disaster risk reduction, operationalization of National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management 2009 and the targets envisaged under the relevant priorities of Hyogo Framework for Action * Reviewthe programme added value to other initiatives at the Country Office level * Assess UNDP’s role in the Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium and especially Flagship Area Five as well as linkages with other flagship partners and their programmes   ***Programme performance: Effectiveness and Efficiency***   * Assessment of the effectiveness of the implementation strategies to attain the planned outcomes and broader impact on the ground; * Assessment of progress under the different Programme components including gathering and sharing of knowledge/knowledge products in the country * Assessment of the perception of the implementing partners on the direct and indirect benefits derived from the program both at national and at state level * Assessment of degree of ownership (national and state) * Assessment of the contribution towards implementation of national and state level disaster management policies/programmes/action plans. * Assessment of CDRMP team/ Structure and technical support   ***Likelihood of Impact and Sustainability***   * Contribution of the Programme in strengthening capacities at the national, state, district and below levels to implement agreed DRM strategies * Assessment of approaches/processes adopted for mainstreaming disaster risk management into development and DRM related policy support   ***Future directions and Lessons Learned***   * Identification of good practices of the program for replication * Assess current quality assurance and M&E systems and their contribution to the programme to date * Identify specific recommendation on actions required to address any gaps identified or opportunities for enhancement of systems ; * Ascertain the nature of how actions can be amended, added and adjusted to strengthen further the future programme in the area of disaster risk reduction for the remaining programme duration; * Ascertain the need for further future programme/ projects in the area of disaster risk reduction and highlight their strategic focus and management structure. | |
| 1. **Main stakeholders**   The main stakeholders of this evaluation are the Government of Nepal and UNDP, specifically the:   * Ministry of Home Affairs * Ministry of Urban Development * Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development * National Planning Commission * Selected districts and municipalities within the four regions of the country (to be decided in close consultation with the implementing partners) * Selected academic institutions and national training institutions * Selected Non-Governmental and community-based organizations; and * The selected local communities within the geographical locations of the selected states, districts and cities * UNDP Nepa**l.** | |
| 1. **Mid-Term Evaluation methodology**   During the review, the consultants are expected to specifically apply the following approaches for information review/analysis:   * 1. Desk review of the program document including the RRF and M&E framework with a focus on the outcomes, outputs and targets set for the project, training modules, manuals and the progress reports submitted by the stakeholders   2. Specific analysis of existing reports, indicator tracking tools and other monitoring and reporting information systems maintained within the programme.   3. Discussions with UNDP, Government of Nepal, and relevant stakeholders to gather diverse viewsfrom stakeholders engaged in the programme/projects implementation.   4. Visit to selected field sitesand undertake interviews with district government officials, communities and other stakeholders who have been involved in implementing activities under the program and/or participated in various program activities, and program’s beneficiaries. Focus Group Discussions to be held whenever appropriate.   5. Discussions with technical experts based at national and district level who have been directly/indirectly involved in the CDRM Programme.   6. Discussions with key donors, NRRC secretariat members and Flagship Area lead.   7. Facilitation of group consultations and feedback sessions where feasible.   8. Triangulation of data collected will be done as much as possible and any data gaps identified will be clearly noted. | |
| **6. Evaluation Deliverables**   1. Evaluation inception report: It should detail 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 should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. 2. Presentation of inception report to key stakeholders including UNDP and key Government counterparts 3. Draft Mid-Term Evaluationreport with all major findings and recommendations 4. Presentation of draft report to stakeholders, including UNDP and key Government counterparts 5. Final Mid-Term Evaluation report incorporating comments received, and including a clear succinct Executive Summary 6. Final presentation on the Mid-Term Evaluation for the Government of Nepal and UNDP. | |
| **7. Evaluation Schedule**  The duration of the evaluation will be over the period of 22 July – 6 September, 2013, including field visits, travel time, consultations, desktop research and debriefing of the findings to UNDP and the Government of Nepal. The following indicative time line is suggested for evaluation process (to be verified and amended by the consultant team based on the findings of the inception report):   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Deliverables** | **Time Duration** | | Review of documents and materials | Week1 and 2 | | Briefing of consultant with UNDP on expectations and working arrangements, sharing of documents/data, contact details, etc with the consultant | Week 2 | | Meetings with MOHA, key ministries and finalization of field visit sites | Week 2 | | Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report | Week 2 | | Interviews, FGDs, data analysis,visits to selected project sites | Weeks 3 and 4 | | Preparation of draft report | Week 5 | | Submission of draft report to Programme Board and the Reference Group | Week 6 | | Stakeholders meeting for presentation of the draft report and review of the draft report (for quality assurance) | Week 6 | | Incorporating the comments and finalizing the evaluation reports | Week 7 | | Submission of final report | Week 7 | | |

1. **Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

The evaluation team will consist of a one international expert (Team Leader), two national experts. The ToRs for the individual consultants are attached. Payment and progress will be made based on achievement of the deliverables above.

1. **Evaluation Ethics -** All evaluators must be independent and objective, and therefore should not have had any prior involvement in design, implementation, decision-making or financing any of the UNDP/CDRMP interventions contributing to this outcome. In addition, to avoid any conflict of interest, evaluators should not be rendering any service to the implementation agency of the projects and programme to be evaluated for a year following the evaluation. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG "Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation" and evaluators will take necessary measures to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants.
2. **Implementation arrangements**

The Strategic Planning and Evaluation Unit in Nepal will provide quality assurance will coordinate the evaluation to ensure its independence and impartiality. They will organise at least 2 technical tele-conferences with the Evaluation Tem and the BCPR regional office and UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Unit in Bangkok to ensure the evaluation is in line with UNDP global good practice and relevant guidelines.

The DRM unit in UNDP Nepal will be the Task Manager to support the logistics and administrative arrangements of the team and will provide appropriate contact details to enable the team to schedule consultations with stakeholders as required. They will also arrange office space, access to landline telephones, internet and transport for the team. Evaluators will be expected to provide their own computers and mobile telephones.

The Government of Nepal as the main stakeholder and intended beneficiary of the CDRM programme will centrally consulted throughout the evaluation process.

1. **Annex**

* **Intervention Results and Resources Framework** – Provide more detail information on the intervention being evaluated.
* **Key stakeholders and partners** – A list of stakeholders and individuals who should be consulted. Suggested sites to be visited
* **Documents to be consulted** - A list of important documents (pro doc, all AWPs/QWPs/APRs/QPRs, special study reports, publications, etc.) that evaluators should read at the onset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report
* **Required format for evaluation report** – Format, elements and quality criteria for evaluation reports
* **Evaluation matrix** (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report) – It serves as a useful tool in summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source and the standard or measure by which each questions will be evaluated.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table: Sample evaluation matrix | | | | | | |
| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific sub questions | Data sources | Data collection methods/tools | Indicators/Success standard | Methods for Data Analysis |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |