# Terms of Reference

**Post Title:** International Consultant for Independent Evaluation (Mid Term Evaluation for four years agreement)

**Project:** Getting Airport Ready for Disasters

**Duty station:** Home-based with two missions to Geneva office and two country missions within the region (Asia-Pacific, Europe & CIS, LAC and Arab States).

**Duration of Assignment:** 30 Working days

**Type of Contract:** IC Contract

**Educational Background:** Advanced university degree in technical, economics, DRR or environment related issues.

**Work Experience:** At least 10 years extensive experience in disaster risk reduction mainly in preparedness and recovery areas or other relevant fields, experience with evaluations of UNDP Projects; Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven projects; Experienced in project cycle management.

**Background and context**

The last decade has been marked by an increase in the recurrence and intensity of disasters with catastrophic impact on peoples’ lives and livelihoods. During this period, there have been over 4,000 disasters recorded, with over 2 billion people affected and economic losses are estimated at USD 960 billion. In 2011 alone, natural disasters caused record USD 366 billion in damages and 29,782 fatalities in 302 disasters. Typhoons and floods accounted for up to 7 percent of catastrophes but earthquakes and tsunami, such as the one that struck Japan, were the biggest killer. While the number of disasters and their catastrophic consequences grow, national governments face numerous challenges in delivering aid and other humanitarian services to affected people to prevent further loss of lives. Critical to quick delivery of aid is transportation lifelines such as airports, cross border road-ways and access by sea. In island countries or archipelagos, the absence of cross border roadways makes airports a critical facility for delivering external aid to countries. Managing the logistics of a large scale humanitarian operation can be complex particularly if it involves both military and civil agencies, assistance from several countries offering different types of aid. One of the reasons is the lack of capacities to manage the huge inflow of relief materials from various sources. Airports are key links to delivering humanitarian assistance on ground. Unfortunately, in many situations capacities are often overwhelmed due to the sudden surge in incoming flights, lack of equipment for offloading relief goods, and limited warehousing for storing relief items. Other factors that can derail the delivery of humanitarian services are the capacity for servicing the needs of the flights landing such as refuelling capacities, apron capacity etc. These impediments reduce efficiency and speed of delivery of services and goods to people. Airports need to be equipped with surge capacities to manage large scale humanitarian operations. In addition to airports having the logistical capacities to manage flow of relief items, the airport management coordinates with other ministries in complying with customs regulations, immigrations, storage and movement of goods, relief distribution etc. The host country’s capacity to manage the influx of humanitarian aid and personnel determines to a large extent the quality of humanitarian assistance to affected people. While the scale of disasters is unpredictable, capacities for preparedness can be developed beforehand to ensure an effective humanitarian response which can help minimize loss of lives and curb physical damage of the disaster.

Preparedness also includes the development of standard operating procedures (SOPs) delineating roles and responsibilities of the airport management with other entities to ensure that functions, which support the movement of relief aid are pre-arranged and in place prior to the disaster and are situated within the National Government preparedness and emergency response plans.

UNDP works through a network of 177 country offices and is one of the largest global public-sector actors in the area of natural disaster reduction. UNDP’s disaster risk reduction and recovery programmes spread over 60 high risk countries with average annual expenditures of over $ 150 million. UNDP's position as the UN system's global development agency positions it to play an important and unique role in supporting high risk countries to achieve their development goals by reducing disaster risks and loss to life and assets and strengthening long term resilience. UNDP works with the Governments at the National and Local level to ensure that Disaster Risk Reduction is a nationally led and owned process that is integrated into the national development planning. UNDP’s Bureau for Programme and Policy support (BPPS) is the practice lead for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery within the organization. It works to build capacities and provide timely and appropriate technical guidance for conflict and disaster risk reduction and post conflict and post disaster recoveryUNDP works together with other agencies of the IASC in particular with UN-OCHA on capacity development for Disaster Preparedness. As a result of this partnership on Preparedness, UNDP and OCHA have jointly developed training programmes for Government officials on Disaster Preparedness and assist National Governments in developments of National Disaster Preparedness plans. The two agencies have also developed other communication materials on disaster preparedness.

The Tripartite MOU on Disaster Preparedness and Response signed in [December 2005 ]between UN-OCHA, UNDP and DP-DHL has resulted in the development of a project for airport preparedness. This unique training programme titled “Getting Airports Ready for Disasters” has evolved from the need to ensure that airport personnel have skills and airports are equipped with facilities to respond to large scale natural disasters. Since the development of this training module, it has been run in four countries for personnel from 25 airports. The results of the training have been as follows:

* Airport surge capacity assessments conducted in selected hub airports;
* Personnel trained in skills of managing logistics (cargo) and surge in personnel deployed for emergency aid;
* Airport contingency plan/disaster relief surge plan including standard operating procedures developed;
* Coordination and network with National Disaster Management authorities established.

The success of the training can be attributed to the joint expertise and inputs of the two organisations. DP-DHL’s expertise in logistics management, past experience in international relief combined with UNDP’s competencies in Disaster Risk Reduction and its pre-existing partnership with the National Government has ensured that the investment in training is received well and it is sustained in the country through its linkages with on-going programmes. The demand for training has increased, particularly in countries where the training modules have been run. The Government of Indonesia has replicated the training in two regional airports and has requested a third training.

This programme is designed to optimize preparedness levels of airport facilities and key personnel to ensure surge capacities to manage additional flight loads to facilitate humanitarian services to people affected by natural disasters. Since the development of the GARD (2005-2012) the programme has been implemented in 25 airports in four countries: Indonesia, Nepal, Bangladesh and Turkey. Encouraged by the success and demand for such trainings in countries, it is decided to extend the training to other regions covering four airports a year.

 In the year of 2013-2014, the initiative was implemented in 8 additional countries over a period of two years. The two years proposal is designed to strengthen capacities of airports to manage large-scale disaster response operations. It helps to prepare airports to better respond to disaster relief surge by building up local capacity through training of airport staff and management thus enabling them to better plan and coordinate relief efforts. The overall objective of the project is to support National governments in high disaster-risk countries and airport authorities to have enhanced in-country capacities to facilitate quick delivery of post disaster support services to people affected by natural disasters.

The specific outputs of the project are as follows:

* Capacity of Airport personnel enhanced to manage disaster relief surge and respond efficiently to humanitarian needs;
* Airport Preparedness plans developed and aligned with National Disaster Preparedness plans.

The project was implemented with close coordination between the UNDP HQ and UNDP country offices, DP-DHL and National Governments. UN-OCHA and WFP will also be invited to support the implementation of the programmes given their role in disaster response, development of contingency plans and expertise in logistics. The roles and responsibilities of the three main entities are as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **UNDP HQ & UNDP Country Offices** | **DP-DHL** | **National Governments** |
| Selection of countries and liaison with National Governments for an agreement on conducting the training  | Development of GARD training programme including training materials, assessment procedures and templates for the training.  | Authorization for UNDP and DP-DHL to conduct training and use Airport premises for conduct surge capacity assessments. |
| Facilitate and support logistics and finances for training. | Deployment of experts and delivery of training module on GARD. | Selection of airports and participants/officials for the training.  |
| Support delivery of the training through its adaption to local needs and other services such as translation of materials and sessions.  | Assessment of Airport surge capacities and report to National Government.  | Co finance workshop costs if required.  |
| Workshop report and follow through to ensure that the Airport preparedness plans are aligned with National Disaster Preparedness plans.  | Training evaluation and follow up.  | Follow up on training through development of detailed airport preparedness plans & alignment with National Preparedness plans.  |
| Support GARD refreshers training if requested by National Government.  |  | Host GARD refreshers training if required.  |

**Evaluation purpose**

The objectives of this evaluation is to (a) identify project design and management issues, (b) assess progress towards the achievements of the output targets, as well as the results and impact at national government level, UNDP country office and UNDP HQ (c) identify and document lessons learned that would inform the formulation of a proposal covering the years 2015-16 (including lessons that might improve linkages and/or interactions with other UNDP projects and (d) make recommendations regarding specific actions and project adjustments that might be taken to improve the next phase of project, and support needed to contribute to longer-term and sustainable results, and also develop a work plan and new strategy to better engage with national authorities . It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring.

This evaluation is initiated and managed by the Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction team, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS), based in Geneva. The project management focal points within the team will provide assistance and support to the evaluator by providing logistical support including arranging for meetings/contacts with stakeholders including, local governments, other agencies, DHL GARD team etc.

The evaluation should build on results of the GARD training workshop reports for the 8 countries that was implemented during the year of 2013-2014.

The evaluation should focus on the main project outputs 1 and 2 below) as well as on border issues as described below() :

* **Output 1**: Capacity of Airport personnel enhanced to manage disaster relief surge and respond efficiently to humanitarian needs.
* **Output 2**: Airport Preparedness plans developed and aligned with National Preparedness plans.
* **Issue 1**: Alignment of the GARD follow up plan with UNDP’s Disaster Risk Reduction projects, when applicable.
* Issue 2: Impact of the GARD training on the actual preparedness of airports to face disasters through the implementation of actions plans

Issue 3: the role of GARD events on better positioning UNDP with national authorities.

* Issue46: UNDP DHL partnership agreement: What has worked? And areas to be improved?
* Issue 5: Involvement of other UN partners in GARD programme

Specific aspects to be addressed by this evaluation should include but are not limited to:

1. Project design and its relevance in relation to:
	1. UNDP HQ and country office involvement, approach and support in conducting GARD training
	2. Development priorities at the regional and the national level;
	3. Stakeholders – assess if the specific needs were met;
	4. Country ownership – participation and commitments of government, local authorities
	5. UNDP’s involvement and government approach in terms of the longer sustainability of the initiative.
	6. Adequacy of the allocated financial budget to the GARD project .
2. Performance - progress made by the GARD project relative to the achievement of its objective and outputs:
3. Effectiveness - extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and the desired outputs, and the overall contribution of the project to national strategic objectives;
4. Efficiency - assess efficiency against overall impact of the project for better projection of achievements and benefits resulting from project resources, including an assessment of the different implementation modalities and the cost effectiveness of the utilization of UNDP resources and actual co-financing for the achievement of project results; assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation;
5. Timeliness of results.
6. Management arrangements focused on project implementation:
	1. General implementation and management - evaluate the efficiency of the project management in including the effectiveness of partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement from the perspective of “good practice model” that could be used for replication;
	2. Financial accountability – extent to which the sound financial management has been an integral part of achieving project results, with particular reference to adequate reporting, identification of problems and adjustment of activities, budgets and inputs;
	3. Monitoring and evaluation at project level – assess the adoption of the monitoring and evaluation system during the project implementation, and its internalisation by competent parties and service providers after the completion of the project; focusing to relevance of the performance indicators.
7. Overall success of the project with regard to the following criteria:
8. Sustainability - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project;
9. Changes: Establish any changes that may have resulted from the project implementation at this point;
10. Beneficaries and Stakeholder participation: Review the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism has been successful, its strengths and weaknesses. Particular attention should be paid to the level and type of participation by various stakeholders at different stages of the project implementation;
11. Contribution to capacity development - extent to which the project has empowered target groups and have made possible for the government and airport authorities) to use the positive experiences; ownership of projects’ results;
12. Replication – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in country outlining of possible funding sources; replication to date without direct intervention of the project; assess whether the project has potential to be replicated based on implementation progress so far, either in terms of expansion or replication either in the country and whether any steps are being taken by the project to do so and the relevance and feasibility of such steps; assess whether there are specific good practices that can be replicated and what has made them successful;

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory with the following guidance for the rating:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The GARD programme is expected to **achieve or exceed all** its outcomes, major goals and objectives, and yield substantial benefits in terms of strengthening resilience of economies and population in CA, without major shortcomings. The Programme can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | The Programme is expected to achieve **most** its outcomes, major goals and objectives, and yield substantial benefits in terms of strengthening resilience of economies and population in CA, with only minor shortcomings. |
| Marginally Satisfactory (MS) | The Programme is expected to achieve **most** of its outcomes, major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. The Programme is expected not to achieve **some** of its major goals and objectives. |
| Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU) | The Programme is expected to achieve **some** of its outcomes, major goals and objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major goals and objectives.  |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | The Programme is expected **not to achieve most** of its outcomes, major goals and objectives or to **yield any satisfactory** benefits. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The Programme has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its outcomes, major goals and objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

Issues of special consideration

The Evaluation Report will present the experience and recommendations for the benefit of design and implementation of new phase of the programme (2015-2016) and to source funds from donors for UNDP public -private partnership initiative.

Identification of measures including economic and financial mechanisms of risk transfer will be learned,

The Evaluation Report will present recommendations and lessons of broader applicability for follow-up and future support of UNDP highlighting the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to the evaluation scope.

**Evaluation methodolgy**

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluator is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluator.

The evaluation methodology shall include information on documentation reviewed, interviews, field visits, and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the GARD programme donor proposal, training report, airport assessment reports, project reports – incl. donor reports, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that s/he may consider useful for evidence based assessment. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Offices in GARD training implemented countries, DHL GARD team and government counterparts in the countries. Guidance on individual stakeholders will be provided by managers and staff of the corresponding projects under GARD. All relevant project documentation will be made available by the project management teams.

Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders will happen through circulation of initial reports for comments or other types of feedback mechanisms.

Throughout the period of the evaluation, the consultants will liaise closely with the Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction and UNDP Geneva office, where appropriate, the consultant should liaise with the national interventions of UNDP on disaster risk reduction initiatives (i.e. DRMP Programmes/Projects). The consultants can raise or discuss any issue or topic it deems necessary to fulfil the task, the consultants however is not authorized to make any commitments to any party on behalf of UNDP or the Government.

**DeliverableS**

After about a week after signing the contract, the consultants is expected to provide a detailed assignment work plan with clear estimation of workdays spent on each activity, timing, and itinerary of missions. This deliverable will be the basis for the 1st instalment.

The output of the Programme review will be the Programme Evaluation Report in English. The length of the Report should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including the annexes).

Initial draft of the Evaluation Report will be circulated for comments to UNDP (both CO and Regional DRR Advisors) and the Programme Management. After incorporating the comments, the Evaluation Report will be finalised. If any discrepancies have emerged between impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

One mission to Geneva and and to Bonn as well as missions to 2-3 GARD implemented countries will be conducted.

**Timing and duration**

The programme review will be conducted within eight weeks (30 working days), starting from 01 December 2014 to 31 January 2015, according to the following activities and time frames:

Preparation (to be conducted within the first 2 weeks in home office):

* Familiarisation with the project through related documentation and information;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* Develop work plan and discuss with UNDP for approval.

Develop a zero draft version of the programme review report. Mission to Geneva (not more than 2 weeks, week 3-4):

* meeting with the GARD DHL team, UNDP Geneva team, Region and country stakeholders
* present and discuss initial findings with UNDP, and the key stakeholders
* in order to save resources, distant media, e.g. online questionnaires, email, skype, etc., are to be utilised to the maximum extent

Elaboration of the draft report (within 3 weeks, weeks 5-7):

* Additional desk review;
* Completing of the draft report;
* Presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions;
* Additional information and further clarification with UNDP, Programme management and project staff.

Elaboration of the final report (within 1 week, week 8):

* Incorporation of comments and additional findings into the draft report;
* Finalisation of the report.

**Management, Logistics and Accountability**

The reviewer will work under the supervision of the Partnership Advisor, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction.

Although UNDP is administratively responsible for the conduction of the review, UNDP shall not interfere with analysis and reporting, except where requested and at opportunities for comments/feedback. UNDP will share the final version of the mid-term review report with the DHL GARD team and other partners as necessary.

#### PAYMENT SCHEDULE

The consultant fee will be as per UNDP norms and will be commensurate with qualifications and experience.

I on submission of a detailed assignment workplan – 20% of the total value of the contract;

II on submission of draft report – 50% of the total value of the contract;

1. on acceptance of final report – 30% of the total value of the contract.

**Competencies**

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism;
* Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment

**Functional Competencies:**

* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change Adaptation, and Climate Risk Management;
* Ability to plan and organize his/her work, efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback

**Required qualification**

* Advanced university degree in technical, economics or environment related issues;
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven projects;
* Experienced in project cycle management
* Recognized expertise in the field of Disaster Risk Reduction, including Preparedness, Recovery;
* Work experience in relevant areas for at least 8 years;
* Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
* Advanced skills in analysis, reporting, facilitation of meetings, and team coordination
* Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Excellent English communication skills, working level of French and Spanish languages;
* Computer literacy.

The evaluator must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance.