**Annex 11.1 ToRs For the MTE**

**Terms of Reference**

**Project Title:** UNDP/AF project “Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia “

**Location:** Home based with one mission to Georgia

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Position:** International Evaluator, Team Leader

**Starting Date:** 7 November 2014

**End Date:** 20 December 2014

1. INTRODUCTION

### In accordance with the UNDP and AF M&E policies and procedures, a mid-term evaluation of the full-size project

### “Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia” implemented through the UNDP is to be undertaken in the year 2014. The project started on 01.07.2012 and is in its 3rd year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term evaluation. This TOR also sets out the scope of work, deliverables, timeframe and payment terms for International Evaluator, Team Leader.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | “**Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia”** | | | |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00076540 | **Project financing** | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at MTE (Million US$)* |
| ATLAS Project ID: | 00060698 | AF financing: | US$ 4,900,000 |  |
| Country: | Georgia | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | South Caucasus and  Western CIS | Government: |  |  |
| Focal Area: | Tbilisi | Other (UNDP): | US$ 160,000 |  |
|  |  | Total co-financing: |  |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of  Environmental Protection  of Georgia through the  National Environmental  Agency (NEA) | Total Project Cost  **in cash**: | US$ 5,060,000 |  |
| Other  Partners involved: | Ministry of Infrastructure  and regional  development (MRDI);  Emergency  Management Department;  Pilot municipalities. | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | Date: 11 June 2012 |
|  | Planned closing date:  July 2016 | Revised closing date: |

### **PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVES**

The project objective is to improve resilience of highly exposed regions of Georgia to hydro-meteorological threats that are increasing in frequency and intensity as a result of climate change. The project will help the governments and the population of the target region of Rioni Basin to develop adaptive capacity and embark on climate resilient economic development. The project is comprised of three main components:

1. Floodplain development policy introduced to incentivize long term resilience to flood / flash flood risks;

2. Climate resilient practices of flood management developed and implemented to reduce vulnerability of highly exposed communities;

3. Early warning system in place to improve preparedness and adaptive capacity of population.

**3 outcomes will contribute to this objective:**

| **Project Components** | **Expected Concrete Outputs** | **Expected Outcomes** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Floodplain development policy introduced to improve long term resilience to flood / flash flood risks | 1.1. Hazard and inundation maps produced;  1.2. Reviewed and changed land use regulations (land use planning, including zonings and development controls, e.g. on protection / buffer zones, settlement expansion; economic development categories etc.) to internalize climate change risks into floodplain management and spatial planning.  1.3. New building codes reviewed and streamlined for the housing rehabilitation schemes to flood proof new buildings (e.g. material standards, traditional house raising etc.) taking into account alternative climate change scenarios;  1.4. Targeted training of national and local authorities responsible for climate risk management in advanced methods of forward looking climate risk management planning and flood prevention measures;  1.5. Community-based flood insurance scheme designed and implemented covering highly exposed villages under 6 municipalities. | Floodplain development policies in place to minimize exposure of highly vulnerable people of Rioni river basin to climate change induced flood risks. |
| 2. Climate resilient practices of flood management developed and implemented to reduce vulnerability of highly exposed communities | 2.1. Direct measures of long term flood prevention and risk mitigation designed with participation of local governments and population in 6 municipalities (Lentekhi, Oni, Ambrolauri, Tskaltubo, Samtredia, Tsageri);  2.2. Community-based adaptation measures, such as bank terracing, vegetative buffers, bundles and tree revetments implemented building on an existing municipal employment guarantee scheme;  2.3. Flood plain seasonal productive systems (e.g. short season annual cropping, cattle rearing plots or seasonal pastures, agro-forestry) benefit 200,000 people and improve resilience to flood threat;  2.4. Lessons learned and best practices documented and disseminated to raise awareness of effective climate risk management options for further up-scaling; | Direct investments and local actions in highly exposed and vulnerable communities improve flood management practice on 8,400km2 and build resilience of 200,000 people |
| 3. Early warning system in place to improve preparedness and adaptive capacity of population | 3.1. Long term historical observation data digitized and used in policy formulation and risk management practices;  3.2. Multi hazard risk assessment for the Rioni river basin (floods, flash floods, associated mudflows and landslides, linked with climatic alterations under alternative scenarios);  3.3. Series of targeted training delivered for the NEA staff and partner organizations in the advanced methods of climate change risk assessment and forecasting;  3.4. Essential equipment to increase monitoring and forecasting capabilities in the target basin procured and installed;  3.5. Systems established at the national and sub-national level led by the NEA for long and short term flood forecasting of hydrological risks; including dissemination and communication of forecasts. | Institutional Capacity developed for early warning and timely alert communication to vulnerable communities of the Rioni river basin |

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS MID-TERM EVALUATION (MTE)**

The objective of the MTE is to provide an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTE will also identify any project design issues, evaluate progress towards the achievement of the project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP supported AF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project implementation. The MTE will evaluate early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project’s logical framework **included in this Terms of Reference.**

The evaluation is focused on a comprehensive project assessment and provides a critical evaluation of administrative and technical strategies, problems and restrictions associated with the large-scale international and multilateral initiatives. The evaluation shall also provide the recommendations in relation to the strategies, approaches and/or activities in order to enhance the project capacities of achieving the expected outcomes. The evaluation results will be incorporated in the recommendations to improve the implementation of a given project stage in the forthcoming years.

The MTE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. MTE will be conducted by the Evaluation Team consisting of International Evaluator, Team Leader, who will lead the evaluation process and National Consultant, Team Member, who will assist and provide necessary technical support to the Team Leader. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP-AF Regional Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluation Team Leader is expected to conduct field missions to Georgia (Tbilisi and project target municipalities: Oni, Ambrolauri, Lentekhi, Tsageri, Tskaltubo and Samtredia). Team Leader should be accompanied by the National Consultant in field visits in project municipalities. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

UNDP Country Office management and relevant Programme staff

1. UNDP/AF project staff;
2. Executing agencies (NEA)
3. National Project Director and relevant staff of MoENRP, MRDI and NEA
4. Project Board members and partners: Emergency Management Department, USAID project IWRM, Target municipalities.

The team will evaluate all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, AF Tracking Tools, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide to the team for review is **included in this Terms of Reference.**

Purpose:

(i) To evaluate the overall project activities in relation to the objectives and expected outcomes as stated in the project document and the other related documents

(ii) To evaluate the project effectiveness and cost-efficiency

(iii) To critically analyze the arrangements of project management and implementation

(iv) To evaluate the progress attained so far in relation to the project outcomes

(v) To investigate the strategies and plans intended for the timely achievement of the overall project goal

(vi) To list and document the first lessons learned in respect of the project design, its implementation and management

(vii) To assess the sustainability of project interventions;

(viii) To assess the relevance in relation to the national priorities

(ix) To provide the recommendations for the future project activities and, where necessary, for the project implementation and management arrangements.

In particular, the mid-term evaluation exercise will assess the progress of creating the basic information, alleviation of threats and identification of any constraints to the project implementation and their causes. It intends also to provide the recommendations for corrective measures to be undertaken.

The mid-term evaluation report shall be a separate document which will contain the recommendations and conclusions.

The report will be intended to meet the needs of all the related parties (AF, UNDP, project partners, local communities and other related parties in Georgia and foreign countries).

# SCOPE OF WORK AND DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TEAM LEADER

Team Leader will evaluate the following three categories of project progress. For each category, Team Leader is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined and included in this Terms of Reference.

* 1. **Progress towards Results**

Project design:

* Evaluate the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Evaluate the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions.
* Evaluate the relevance of the project strategy and whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
* Evaluate how the project addresses country priorities.
* Evaluate the baseline data included in the project results framework and suggest revisions as necessary.

Progress:

* Evaluate the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse, beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis. Suggest measures to improve the project’s development impact, including gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
* Evaluate the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners, and how the different needs of male and female stakeholders has been considered. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.
  1. **Adaptive management**

Work Planning

1. Are works planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
2. Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and evaluate any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-AF requirements and evaluate the impact of the revised approach on project management.

Finance and co-finance:

1. Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
2. Complete the co-financing monitoring table **included in this Terms of Reference.**
3. Evaluate the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Monitoring Systems

1. Evaluate the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
2. Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators meet UNDP-AF minimum requirements. Develop SMART indicators as necessary.
3. Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators as necessary.
4. Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

1. Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, PPRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. Give particular attention to critical risks.
2. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted

Reporting

1. Evaluate how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
2. Evaluate how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
   1. **Management arrangements**
3. Evaluate overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the project document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
4. Evaluate the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
5. Evaluate the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
6. **MID TERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES FOR TEAM LEADER**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| Inception Report | clarifies timing and method of evaluation | No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission | submits to UNDP Country Office |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management and UNDP Country Office |
| Draft Report | Full report **(template included in this Terms of Reference)** | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, ICTA |
| Final Report | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report). | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP CO |

The key product expected from this mid-term evaluation is:

## The Mid-term Evaluation Report

The mid-term evaluation report will include:

The facts and conclusions identified in respect of the issues to be reviewed in accordance with The Scope of Evaluation section

Evaluation of project impact on:

* + The institution assisted and its staff;
  + The final beneficiaries including specific groups;

Project sustainability on the basis of:

The commitments of the governmental agencies in relation to the project objectives

Involvement of local organizations (participatory process)

Management and organizational factors

Financing

Staff development

Recommendations for the future implementation of the project activities

Lessons learned

The draft and final report will be prepared in the format **as provided as a template included in this Terms of Reference** hereto. The draft report will be presented to UNDP/AF not later than **2 December 2014**. The final report will be prepared on the basis of the comments to be obtained from the parties related. The deadline for the final report is **20 December 2014**. The report will be presented electronically and in hard copy, in English, and will be translated by the project into Georgian language for distribution to national counterparts.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Tbilisi, Georgia. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of travel costs and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The project team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions to Tbilisi, Georgia including the following target municipalities in Rioni river basin: Oni, Ambrolauri, Tsageri, Lentekhi, Tskaltubo and Samtredia.

1. **TIMEFRAME FOR TEAM LEADER**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 working days in the period of **7 November – 20 December 2014** according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe** |
| Preparation | *(7-11 November 2014 period) (3 workdays)* |
| Evaluation mission and debriefing | *(12-20 November 2014 period) (7 workdays)* |
| Draft evaluation report | *(21 November - 2 December 2014) (10 workdays)* |
| Finalisation of final report | *(no later than 20 December) (5 workdays)* |

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

Evaluation will be undertaken and led by one independent International Evaluator, Team Leader and will be assisted by the National Consultant, Team Member. The consultants will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

| **Objective:** To improve resilience of highly exposed regions of Georgia to hydro-meteorological threats that are increasing in frequency and intensity as a result of climate change.  **Indicator:** number of people protected from the flood and flash flood risks in the Rioni river basin; | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcomes and indicators** | **Baseline** | **Targets and Milestones** | **Source of Verification** | **Outputs and indicators** |
| **Outcome 1:** Floodplain development policies in place to minimize exposure of highly vulnerable people of Rioni river basin to climate change induced flood risks. | Fragmentation and gaps in policies and national regulations for long-term flood/flash floods under climate change | Floodplain land use and development policy which addresses fragmentation and gaps in place by project completion | Official Edition  ,Sakanonmdeblo Matsne” | **Output 1.1.** Hazard and inundation maps produced for whole basin |
| Lack of appropriate hazard maps on which to base floodplain policy | Local-level flood insurance scheme to steer development away from high risk areas in place by project closure | Project annual reports; Mid-term evaluation, final report; training test results; | **Indicator 1.1.1:**  Studies conducted to develop to model and map the hydro meteorological hazards of the whole Rioni basin |
| Low capacity among national and regional staff to undertake hazard mapping and risk assessment to support development of floodplain policy | Accurate hazard and risk maps on which to base development policy | Project annual reports; Mid-term evaluation, final report; training test results; | **Output 1.2**. Enhanced land-use regulations introduced (land-use planning, including zoning and development controls, e.g. expansion, economic development categories etc.) to ensure comprehensive floodplain management and spatial planning |
|  | at least 42NEA staff and 60 municipality staff (at least 50% women) trained in modern hazard mapping and risk assessment techniques | staff training record and certification | **Indicator 1.2.1**. A comprehensive and robust land use and floodplain development policy framework for Rioni basin. |
| **Indicator 1.1:** Floodplain development policies in place, which minimize Climate change vulnerability implemented by close of the project |  |  |  | **Output 1.3.** New building codes reviewed and streamlined for the housing rehabilitation schemes to flood proof new buildings (e.g. material standards, traditional house raising etc); |
|  |  |  | **Indicator 1.3.1.** New building codes including building flood resilience measures |
|  |  |  | **Output 1.4.** Targeted training of national and local authorities responsible for climate risk management in advanced methods of forward looking climate risk management planning and flood prevention measures; |
|  |  |  | **Indicator 1.4.1.** at least 42NEA staff and 60 municipality staff trained in modern hazard mapping and risk assessment techniques |
|  |  |  | **Output 1.5.** Community-based flood insurance scheme designed and implemented covering highly exposed villages under 6 municipalities. |
|  |  |  | **Indicator 1.5.1.** At least 1 pilot community-based flood insurance scheme in place |
| **Outcome 2:** Direct investments and local actions in highly exposed and vulnerable communities improve flood management practice on 8,400km2 and build resilience of 200,000 people | Investment in flood intervention measures limited and annual, falls short of what is required | Implementation of adaptation measures that are a mix of traditional engineering and bioengineering solutions | Project annual reports; Mid-term evaluation, final report; training test results; | **Output 2.1.** Direct measures of long term flood prevention and risk mitigation designed with participation of local governments and population in 6 municipalities (Lentekhi, Oni, Ambrolauri, Tskaltubo, Samtredia, Tsageri); |
| Traditional engineering measures employed which to not take account of climate change and fail in subsequent hazard events. Climate resilience not built into current approach to direct flood intervention measures. | Set up and implement employee guarantee scheme (targeting 200 employees in each municipality, at least 50% women) |  | **Indicator 2.1.1.** Feasibility outline and detailed design studies undertaken to ensure the best climate resilient intervention measures are adopted which will include bioengineering solutions as well as traditional hard engineering options. |
| Current approaches do not involve local communities in the implementation of measures and do not address the recurring problem of loss of agricultural property to flood damage |  |  | **Indicator 2.1.2.** 15 schemes implemented in the 6 municipalities |
| **Indicator 2. 1:** Number of community based adaptation solutions implemented at the local level upon project closure. |  |  |  | **Output 2.2.** Community-based adaptation measures, such as bank terracing, vegetative buffers, bundles and tree revetments implemented through the municipal employment guarantee scheme; |
| **Indicator 2.2:** % of population with improved water management practices resilient to climate change impacts in the targeted regions. |  |  |  | **Indicator 2.2.1**. Municipal employment-guarantee scheme employing local people in the implementation of the adaptation schemes being implemented. Long-term involvement of local population in the maintenance of flood protection infrastructure |
|  |  |  |  | **Output 2.3.** Flood plain seasonal productive systems (e.g. short season annual cropping, cattle rearing plots or seasonal pastures, agro-forestry) benefit 200,000 people and improve resilience to flood threat; |
|  |  |  |  | **Indicator 2.3.1.** Agro-forestry, cattle rearing plots and seasonal cropping measures adopted in all 6 municipalities established |
|  |  |  |  | **Output 2.4.** Lessons learned and best practices documented and disseminated to raise awareness of effective climate risk management options for further up-scaling; |
|  |  |  |  | **Indicator 2.4.1.** Municipal records of employees guarantee scheme and number of people employed per year |
| **Outcome 3:** Institutional Capacity developed for early warning and timely alert communication to vulnerable communities of the Rioni river basin | Monitoring network in the Rioni basin was reduced from 22 to 4 meteorological stations since the early 1990s. The 4 remaining meteorological stations covering all of Rioni basin is inadequate for effective early warning. | Implementation of adaptation measures that are a mix of traditional engineering and bioengineering solutions | Project annual reports; Mid-term evaluation, final report; Community Surveys; | **Output 3.1.** Long term historical observation data digitized and used in policy formulation and risk management practices; |
| **Indicator 3.1.** Flood forecasting and early warning systems introduced to benefit over 200,000 people at risk in the Rioni basin from flood, flash flood and landslide risk in the basin. | There is currently limited capability among national NEA staff for undertaking flood risk assessment and forecasting and limited experience of EW systems implementation and operation | Set up and implement employee guarantee scheme (targeting 200 employees in each municipality, at least 50% women) | Social programme budget statements | **Indicator 3.1.1.** Database of historical observation data for Rioni digitized |
|  | Various out-of-date and inadequate hazard maps are used for emergency planning and response by different agencies | Purchase and install 5 Met stations, 20 Met posts, and 10 Hydrological posts |  | **Output 3.2.** Multi hazard risk assessment for the Rioni river basin (floods, flash floods, associated mudflows and landslides, linked with climatic alterations under alternative scenarios); |
| **Indicator 3.2.** Establishment/rehabilitation of monitoring stations to increase spatial coverage | Emergency plans currently available at MIA but propriety of the information is unknown | At least 10 NEA staff with gender balanced composition trained in risk assessment and forecasting and EWS |  | **Indicator 3.2.1.** Rioni flood forecasting model developed, which will couple outputs from downscaled meso-scale meteorological systems to HEC-HMS hydrological models. Linked forecasting met-hydrological-hydraulic model. |
| Number of associations with improved institutional capacity to deliver water services to target communities. | Currently limited warnings to communities | Provision of access to up-to-date, definitive hazards and forecast information via single GIS-based data management and dissemination system |  | **Output 3.3.** Series of targeted training delivered for the NEA staff and partner organizations in the advanced methods of risk assessment and forecasting; |
| **Indicator 3.2:** % of targeted population with more to early warning in the face of climate change |  | Development of emergency plans |  | **Indicator 3.3.1.** At least 10 NEA staff trained in risk assessment and forecasting and EWS. Municipality emergency staff trained in emergency response. Strengthened capacity of national and local staff in monitoring, flood forecasting, early warning and emergency response |
| **Indicator 3.3.** Number of national and local staff with flood forecasting, early warning and flood risk assessment capabilities |  | 90% of people in Rioni basin to have access to early warning messages/signals by completion of project |  | **Output 3.4.** Essential equipment to increase monitoring and forecasting capabilities in the target basin procured and installed; |
|  | **Indicator 3.4.1.** Purchase and install 5 Met stations, 20 Met posts, and 10 Hydrological posts. Observation network of all hydrological and meteorological variables to provide an appropriate level of spatial resolution of these variables for early warning |
|  | **Output 3.5.** Systems established at the national and sub-national level led by the NEA for long and short term flood forecasting of hydrological risks; including dissemination and communication of forecasts. |
|  | **Indicator 3.5.1.** A fully integrated flood early warning system (Deltares-FEWS) which links forecasting models to telemetered data as input and forecasting reporting and warning systems as output |
|  | **Indicator 3.5.2.** An early warning communication network using different communication links such as telephone trees, SMS and e-mail networks |
|  |  | **Indicator 3.5.3.** GIS-based website for dissemination of hazard maps and associated information, such as hydro meteorological telemetric and Deltares-FEWS data to central and local government stakeholders. |
|  |  | **Indicator 3.5.4.** A public-facing website presenting key layers of information, with the potential to disseminate early warning information to the public. |
|  |  | **Indicator 3.5.5.** Early warning awareness and training workshops for community, NGOs, government and media representatives. |