



I. Position Information

Job Title: St Vincent and the Grenadines DRR Evaluation Consultant
Type of contract: Individual Contract (IC)/Institutional Contract
Department: UNDP Barbados and the OECS
Activity: Disaster Risk Reduction
Reports to: The Director, Central Planning Division, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Kingstown, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

II. Background and context

Context

St Vincent and the Grenadines is a Participating State of the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), and as a result has adopted the Enhanced Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM) Strategy 2007-2012, based on a revision of the initial 2001-2006 Strategy. St Vincent and the Grenadines has also ratified the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015 strategy. The initial CDM Strategy was amended to improve monitoring and implementation using a results-based management approach and more importantly, sought to have greater alignment to the HFA which all countries also adopted.

The CDM has the following stated purpose: To strengthen regional, national and community level capacity for mitigation, management, and coordinated response to natural and technological hazards, and the effects of climate change. This is detailed through the 4 priority outcomes and detailed outputs. Beneficiary countries are seeking to incorporate the CDM elements at the national and sub-regional levels. The national policies of the beneficiary countries have therefore been informed by the CDM process.

UNDP Barbados and the OECS has supported the development and implementation of the CDM from the initial version at the regional and national levels. UNDP has also supported countries realizing the commitments defined in the HFA and indeed, the realization of the CDM Strategy will address these commitments.

It is within this context that UNDP Barbados and the OECS has provided support to St Vincent and the Grenadines in the area of disaster risk reduction and specifically through the national partner, the National Emergency Management Organisation (NEMO). Based on the workplan of NEMO and priorities established at the national level including implementing the Comprehensive Disaster Management Strategy (2006 – 2012) and the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005 – 2015), the focus of the support has been in three specific areas, notably:

- Public awareness and education (PAE) in DRR
- Community Resilience
- Enhancing national DRR structures, including in emergency communications, post disaster assessment and recovery.

Support to the national disaster risk reduction programme under the St Vincent and the Grenadines Country Programme Action Plan (2006 – 2009, later extended to 2011) and specifically outcome 7: “Enhanced regional and national capacities for disaster risk reduction associated with natural, environmental and technological hazards, within the broader context of climate change”. Six outputs were identified in the 2005-2009 (extended to 2011) UNDP Sub-regional Programme (SPD) for St. Vincent and the Grenadines to contribute to the referenced outcome:

- Pilot vulnerability and capacity assessment (VCA) regional initiative undertaken with specific recommendations for reducing vulnerability to disaster events and community based priorities;
- Up-scaled national VCA;
- CDM review and recommendations for advancing this initiative;
- Institutional capacity development and awareness building in support of realising the national CDM goals;
- Mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into sector development plans, including PRSPs and Sustainable Development Plans; and
- Enhancing Community Adaptive Capacities through Innovative Environmental Management Approaches

III. Evaluation Purpose

Evaluations are critical for UNDP to progress towards advancing human development. In the case of St Vincent and the Grenadines, the evaluation is important to the Government in order that it can ascertain the impact of the allocation of development funding against the predetermined priorities. Through the generation of 'evidence' and objective information, evaluations enable partners to make informed decisions and plan strategically. This exercise is scheduled at an interesting juncture, noting the new UNDAF 2012 – 2016; the evolving post 2012 and post 2015 CDM and HFA strategies; and the emerging post 2015 development agenda. Furthermore noting that a budget of USD 440,000 was allocated to DRR activities during the review period of which USD 311,000 was implemented, it is important to demonstrate the level of change in the measured variables and level of success of the outputs achieved and contributions to outcome level changes. In addition to the assessment of achievement of products, all UNDP managed evaluations should also assess the contribution of the project to the outcome level results, normally demonstrated as changes in the performance of institutions or behavioural changes. The evaluation will be used by all of the main parties (the Central Planning Division of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, the National Emergency Management Organization as well as UNDP) to assess their approaches to development assistance and to design future interventions. It is expected to serve for accountability purposes as well as generation of knowledge for wider use.

Evaluation results are expected to determine:

- The extent to which the outputs realized are sustainable and replicable.
- Design of future initiatives, including disaster risk reduction, in St Vincent and the Grenadines as well as support to other countries served by UNDP Barbados and the OECS.

IV. Evaluation objectives and scope

Evaluation objectives

This evaluation will identify the outputs produced and the contributions to results at outcome level and positive or negative changes produced along the way, including possible unexpected results. The evaluation will also seek to identify the key lessons learned and best practices.

The evaluation will assess:

- The relevance of the support and in particular its coherence to the national agenda.
- The effectiveness and efficiency with which the UNDP Core Resources for St Vincent and the Grenadines have been used.

- The usefulness and sustainability of the results/project targets for the beneficiaries.
- NEMO and UNDP's performance as development partners.

Evaluation scope

Period of consultancy

- The evaluator is expected to work a total of twenty (20) days during the period 28 October – 20 December 2013.

Period of review:

- 1 January 2008 – 30 December 2012. However prospects for sustainability and potential for longer term impact will be made far beyond this period.

Geographic Scope:

- The assessment will be conducted in St Vincent and the Grenadines with a mission as necessary to Bequia to review the community resilience initiative.
- The main counterparts for engagement will be NEMO and the Central Planning Division in St Vincent and the Grenadines. Other DRR stakeholders in St Vincent and the Grenadines including members of the national disaster committee and beneficiaries of DRR initiatives. UNDP Barbados and the OECS and CDEMA will also be important to consult, either through travel to Barbados or related meetings in St Vincent and the Grenadines or possibly consultations/interviews convened through online mediums or via phone.

Specific issues to consider

The scope is also expected to include documentation of lessons learned, findings and recommendations in the following areas:

- Opportunities and challenges brought by NEMO and relationship to their overall workplan.

V. Evaluation questions

The evaluation should answer, at least, the following questions. However, the selected evaluator shall complement this listing in its methodological proposal in order to comply with the objectives and scope of the evaluation. Additionally the evaluator should propose how the gender aspect will be covered.

The evaluator will seek to answer the following questions:

In assessing **relevance**:

- To what extent is UNDP's engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in this particular development context and its comparative advantage?
- To what extent was the project's selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?
- Was the initiative/project aligned with national and sub-regional strategies and UNDPs mandate?
- Was it consistent with human development needs and the specific development challenges in the countries and sub-region?

In assessing **effectiveness**:

- To what extent have expected outputs been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement?
- How has the project contributed to outcome level changes? Did it at least set dynamic

- changes and processes that move towards the long-term outcomes?
- iii. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs and contributions to outcomes?
 - iv. Has the partnership strategy developed for this project been appropriate and effective?
 - v. What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations, especially beneficiary country organizations, to the outcome, and how effective have been the project partnerships in contributing to achieving the outcome?
 - vi. What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the project?

In assessing efficiency:

- i. To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- ii. Have the components been implemented within deadline and cost estimates?
- iii. Have NEMO, the Central Planning Division and UNDP taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues?
- iv. What impact has political instability had on delivery timelines?
- v. Were the projects resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results?
- vi. Were the monitoring practices efficient and did they permit for on-time adjustments in the implementation of the project

In assessing sustainability:

- i. What indications are there that the achieved results (both at output and outcome levels) will be sustained, e.g. through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
- ii. To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national and regional stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
- iii. To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- iv. To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
- v. What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability? What were the corrective measures that were adopted?
- vi. How has the implementing partner addressed the challenge of building national capacity in the face of high turnover of government officials?

VI. Methodology and Implementation Arrangement

The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies, including UN Standards and Norms for Evaluations¹, UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results², and in particular UNDP outcome-level evaluation a companion guide to the handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators³. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the purpose and objectives of the evaluation.

The evaluator will define the final methodology to be applied and it should include methodologies as outlined in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results The evaluator will be expected to undertake:

- Comprehensive Desk review (indicative but not necessary complete list of documentation at Appendix 2). All needed documentation can be obtained directly from NEMO and

¹ http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4

² <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>

³ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/UNDP_Guidance_on_Outcome-Level%20_Evaluation_2011.pdf

UNDP).

- Field visits will be conducted in St Vincent and the Grenadines including Bequia and Barbados (as necessary).
- Consultations with UNDP and CDEMA can occur via online mediums (skype etc) or telephone.
- Field visits will include semi-structured interviews and/or focus groups (or other data collection methods) and potentially site visits.
- The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

Indicators are specified in the Results and Resources Framework of the Project annexed to the present Terms of Reference. In addition the evaluation should take into account the relevant Sub-regional Programme outcome(s), outputs and related indicators.

While this evaluation should be pitched at outcome level, it should be noted that indicators found in the Project Document at output (and at activity level at least to some degree to cover the most strategic activities) level may be completed/specified with the indicators, which may give a better measure of the project's outputs and most strategic activities.

VII. Deliverables

The Evaluator will produce for approval by UNDP the following deliverables:

Deliverable #1: Inception report

The evaluator will conduct a preliminary scoping exercise and design an inception report (containing an evaluation matrix, evaluation protocols for different stakeholders, and a description of the methodology (using quantitative and qualitative data and means of collection), to be discussed with the Central Planning Division and the UNDP Country office before the evaluation can be conducted.

This represents a general planning document of the Evaluation Mission, which includes a calendar of the main stages and activities planned and deliverables. This report shall detail the understanding of the evaluators on what they are going to evaluate and why, showing how each evaluation question shall be answered and by which means: the proposed methodology, the proposed information sources, and the data recollection procedures. This information shall be reflected in an evaluation matrix, for example:

SAMPLE EVALUATION MATRIX				
Criteria/Sub-criteria	(Examples of questions to be addressed by outcome-level evaluation	What to look for	Data sources	Data collection methods

Deliverable #2: Draft evaluation report

A draft evaluation report shall be submitted. This draft evaluation report shall at least include the following elements as detailed in the Annex 7 of the PME Handbook, and shall not surpass 50 pages:

- The title and opening pages
- Table of contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Draft executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention

- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation approach and methods
- Data analysis
- Findings and conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learnt

The report annexes may be partly provided at the level of submission of the draft report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Addition methodology related documentation
- List of individuals or groups consulted
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Results and Resources Framework
- Summary table of findings
- Short biographies of the evaluator
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators

Deliverable #3: Final version of evaluation report

The final report should be 50 pages (max) analytical report, excluding annexes, detailing key findings, good practices and clear recommendations. The report should be presented in English. The Evaluation report format should meet with the standard Evaluation Report Template of the UNDP and quality Standards established by UNDP and UNEG⁴

The report should be developed with at least the following chapters:

- Executive summary (maximum 4 pages)
- Introduction (including evaluation objectives and scope)
- Description of the Intervention
- Evaluation Approach and Methods
- Analysis and major findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations

The Evaluator will also produce an evaluation brief for the Central Planning Division and UNDP.

VIII. Timeframe

⁴ Annex 7 of the UNDP Handbook (2009), and UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports UNEG/G(2010)/2)

Phase	Activities	Duration in working days
Inception (home based)	Desk review, preparation of the inception report UNDP, Central Planning Division and NEMO to provide contacts	5 days
Primary Data Collection St Vincent & the Grenadines	Meeting with the CPD, NEMO Other key stakeholders Visit to Bequia Review of documentation	4 days
Primary Data Collection Barbados	Meeting with UNDP, CDEMA	2 Days
Primary data collection and elaboration of the draft report (Home based with consultations with key stakeholders. In addition to interviews other data collection methods like surveys may be considered)	Skype or phone interview/consultation with ERC contacts/focal points Skype or phone interview/consultation with other local stakeholders	4 days (may be a bit less if more time is needed for the inception phase)
Home based	Information meeting with UNDP Debriefing with UNDP, CPD and NEMO based on the draft report and the comments received Final report writing Integration of comments on draft report Delivery of Final report	5 days
<p>Payment</p> <p>Payments would be made upon submission and approval of the following deliverables as highlighted in section 6 above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception Report (2 December 2013) - 20% • Draft evaluation report and presentation of the findings, conclusions and recommendations - (27 December 2013) – 40% • Final evaluation report – (31 December 2013) – 40% <p>Payments are contingent on performance which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely achievement of satisfactory outputs • Demonstrated reliability <p>Travel and allowances</p> <p>Travel will be required as part of this assignment. Applicants must ensure that they have in their possession all the necessary visas to travel and must make all of the arrangements themselves to facilitate travel (airline ticket cost, hotel, meals, taxi services). Airline tickets must be the most economical option. The cost for travel and allowances (hotel, all meals, taxi etc) must be included as part of the overall cost to be provided in Appendix 1 below.</p>		

IX. Recruitment Criteria

Education:	Master's degree in Disaster Risk Management, Development Studies or a related field OR Undergraduate degree in Disaster Risk Management, Development Studies or a related field and at least 7 years' experience in project management and evaluation.
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least four (4) years' documented experience in monitoring and evaluating projects and programmes, utilizing participatory approaches. • At least three (3) years' documented experience in disaster risk reduction or related field within the Caribbean or Small Island Developing States (SIDS) – preferably within St Vincent and the Grenadines. • Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods to projects and/or programmes.
Language Requirements:	English
Independence	The evaluator must be independent from any organisations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising on any aspect of the project that is the subject of the evaluation.
Evaluation Ethics	The evaluation must be conducted in line with the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. www.uneval.org/search/undex.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines

X. Instructions to Applicants

Deadline

Deadline for the receipt of applications is **Friday, 15 November, 2013 at 4:30 pm** (Eastern Caribbean time). Applications should be sent electronically to procurement.bb@undp.org using subject "**RFQ131101-1630 SVG DRR Evaluation consultant.**" Alternately hard copies of applications can be sent to:

Procurement Unit
United Nations Development Programme
UN House, Marine Gardens, Hastings, Christ Church, Barbados
Telephone number: (246) 467-6000
Telefax number (246) 429-2448
RFQ131101-1630

Contents and Submission of Applications

Applications must include:

- Detailed resume or company/organisation profile outlining experience conducting evaluations.
- Total quoted amount for service (US Dollar amounts) using the table in Appendix 1. This price must also include and itemise travel and allowance cost.
- The approach proposed for implementation of the tasks described.
- Completed UNDP Personal History Form (For individual applicants only). This form is found on the UNDP website at <http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/jobs/>

Selection, evaluation and negotiation

Submissions must fulfill the profile minimum requirements and comply with the application instructions in order to be evaluated.

Technical evaluation of offers (70 points)

A two-stage procedure will be utilized in evaluating the submissions, with evaluation of the technical component being completed prior to any price component being reviewed and compared. The price component will be reviewed only for those firms/institutions whose

Technical Component meets the requirements for the assignment. The minimum number of points to move to the second stage (evaluation of quotes) is 49.

The technical component, which has a total possible value of 70 points, will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- a. Quality of resume or organisations' profile (15 points) – [Excellent 14 -15 points; Very good 11 - 13 points; Good 8 - 10 points; Fair or Average 6 – 7 points; Below standard 5 points]
- b. Minimum of four (4) years' documented experience in monitoring and evaluating projects. (30 points) - [8 years and over 30 points; 7 years 26 points; 6 years 24 points; 5 years 22 points; 4 years 20 points; 3 years 15 points; 2 years 10 points; 1 year or less 7 points]
- c. Minimum of three (3) years' documented experience in disaster risk reduction or related field within the Caribbean (10 points) – [6 years and over 10 points; 5 years 9 points; 4 years 8 points; 3 years 7 points; 2 years 6 points; 1 year or less 3 points]
- d. The approach proposed for implementation of the tasks described (15 points) - [Excellent 14 - 15 points; Very good 11-13 points; Good 8 - 10 points; Fair or Average 6 -7 points; Below standard 5 points]

Evaluation of Quotes (30 points)

If applicants receive more than 49 points in the technical evaluation, the competitiveness of the quotes will be taken into account in the following manner:

The total amount of points for this section is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among those invited firms which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees; e.g; [30 Points] x [US\$ lowest]/[US\$other] = points for other proposer's quote.

Annexes:

- Government of St Vincent and the Grenadines / UNDP Country Programme Action Plan 2006 - 2009
- Preliminary List of partners and key stakeholders, with contact information
- Preliminary List of key documents and databases to consult
- The format required for the evaluation report
- Code of Conduct for UNEG evaluators