



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION OF STRENGTHENING NATIONAL CAPACITY FOR DISASTER RISK REDUCTION & LIVELIHOOD RECOVERY

GENERAL INFORMATION

IC Reference:	ETH/IC/2018/076
Work Description:	Recruitment of local Consultant to Conduct Final Evaluation Of Strengthening National Capacity for Disaster Risk Reduction & Livelihood Recovery
Post Title:	IC/ National Consultant
Consultant Level:	Level A (Specialist)
Duty Station:	Addis Ababa with travel to regions
Expected Places of Travel:	Four Emerging Regional States
Duration:	30 working days in two months
Expected Start Date:	Immediately after signing the contract

BACKGROUND

Due to the variation in climate, topography and vegetation, Ethiopia has a very diverse set of ecosystems ranging from humid forest and extensive wetlands to the desert of the Afar depression. The Country is exposed to a wide range of hazards associated with the country's diverse geo-climatic and socio-economic conditions. Drought and floods represent major challenges, but a number of other hazards affect communities and livelihoods. Ethiopia has experienced 15 drought events in the last 50 years, more than all other countries in Africa. The country's vulnerability to natural disasters is due to a number of inter-linked factors. These include dependence on rain-fed agriculture, under-development of water resources, land degradation, high population pressure and other related structural factors.

Ethiopia's climate is highly variable and is projected to become more erratic due to climate change, with the potential of increased frequency of extreme weather events including floods and droughts. These hazards are predicted to increase with the impact of climate change, which will further worsen the incidence of associated disasters in the country. Climate change is also projected to increase disaster displacement as extreme weather events become more frequent and intense, particularly in Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL). Thus, these recurring natural disasters have resulted in persistent, high level of food insecurity, chronic emergency situations and a weakening of the social fabric.

Recognizing the need to systematically address disaster risks and to protect Ethiopians from the loss of lives, livelihoods and income, the GoE has taken significant steps to systematically manage disaster risks. Ethiopia's national disaster management architecture has traditionally been relief-oriented. A paradigm shift has taken place, making a change in approach from relief to risk management. Since the early 2000s the country has made significant progress in terms of revamping its DRM system and in mitigating the impact of shocks on vulnerable populations. Key achievements are the launching of the PSNP in 2005, the 2013 policy emphasizing a more pro-active risk-reduction oriented approach to DRM and since then, the creation and strengthening of DRM institutions and agencies at national and subnational levels. The Government has taken great strides to move from crisis management to a multi-sectoral and multi-hazard disaster risk management approach so as to be better able to achieve the targets articulated in the Growth

and Transformation Plan (GTP), through its new disaster risk management policy and strategic programme investment framework.

In support of the Government of Ethiopia's commitment and efforts to reduce disaster risk, UNDP designed and implemented a project entitled "*Strengthening National Capacity for Disaster Risk Reduction and Livelihood Recovery*" (2010 -2017), which aimed to strengthen the application of DRR practices throughout Ethiopia. The project is well aligned with GTP, United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the UNDP Country Programme Document. The project supported the government in its efforts to systematically reduce disaster risks and impacts of disasters and to improve food security by developing capacity of national, regional and district level institutions as well as communities. At the upstream level, the project supported the government in creating the building blocks for the national DRM architecture. At the grassroots' level, the project has provided support to communities to enhance resilience building by promoting the build-back-better approach and addressing the underlying causes of disasters. With the operational closure of the project in July 2017, UNDP will engage a team of evaluators to carry out the Project's terminal evaluation.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of an independent terminal evaluation is to assess the project's achievements against the set objectives and indicators , identify and document lessons learnt (including design issues, lessons and best practices that can be up-scaled or replicated), and quantify the project's contribution to the Government of Ethiopia's efforts vis-à-vis national and international commitments to disaster and climate risk reduction and the implementation of the National Disaster Risk Management Policy and Strategy as well as the DRM-Strategic Programme Investment Framework.

As an integral part of the project cycle, the evaluation will analyze effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and potential for sustainability of the project. It will also identify factors that have affected project implementation and facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives and attainment of results. Findings from the evaluation are expected to be used by UNDP, the National Disaster Risk Management Commission (NDRMC), Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureaus of respective regional states and local communities who are the main beneficiaries of the project.

SCOPE OF WORK AND FINAL EVALUATION QUESTIONS

In order to achieve the above objective, the main tasks of the consultant is to:

- Conduct a comprehensive desk review of relevant project-related documents and UNDP evaluation policies and, based on this information, draft and submit an inception report with appropriate methodology to be applied during the evaluation, the evaluation matrix, as well as the work plan and any technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment, while being guided by the set of evaluation questions as presented below;
- Conduct on-site field visits, meetings, discussions, and interviews with relevant stakeholders and project beneficiaries in four project target regions (namely Afar, Gambella, Oromia and Ethiopia Somali regional states). The Evaluation Team is expected to share the list of interviews to be conducted beforehand and receive feedback and clearance from UNDP. An initial briefing meeting with the UNDP team will be held in order to finalize the evaluation design;
- Hold a debriefing workshop at the end of the mission with main stakeholders to summarize initial findings and recommendations;
- Incorporate the feedback received during the debriefing workshop, draft a final evaluation report containing the methodology applied, a presentation of findings, presentation of the lessons

learned and clear strategic recommendations to the UNDP and its partners for future interventions of similar nature in the target areas and beyond. These recommendations should contain specifically to whom of each of the partners of the project they are addressed.

- The consultant need to properly address the relevant evaluation criteria and questions annexed

METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION ETHICS

The consultant may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative or qualitative methods it deems appropriate to conduct the project final evaluation. Methods should include: desk review of documents; interviews with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries; field visits; use of questionnaires or surveys, etc. However, a combination of primary and secondary, as well as qualitative and quantitative data should be used. The Evaluation Team is expected to revise the methodological approach in consultation with key stakeholders as necessary, particularly the intended users and those affected by final evaluation results. The Team should present its findings in both quantitative data and qualitative recommendations.

The consultant is expected to hold interviews and meetings with the relevant staff of UNDP, implementing partners, and beneficiaries. The Team will be expected to share the list of interviews to be conducted with UNDP beforehand. The suggested methodology should be compatible with the UNDP approach to evaluations as described in the *Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation*.

Prior to the consultant's arrival, it will receive a list of documents to be consulted for its review. The Team will have latitude to design a detailed evaluation scope and methodology and will present a proposed work plan as part of the inception report to UNDP in order to optimize the time spent during the field mission.

The final evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG *'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.'* The Evaluation Team must address any critical issues in the design and implementation of the evaluation, including evaluation ethics and procedures to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

DELIVERABLES / FINAL PRODUCTS EXPECTED

The selected Evaluator will be accountable for producing the following documents:

1. Evaluation Inception Report. Inception report containing appropriate methodology to be applied during the final evaluation, as well as the work plan and technical instruments to be used during the course of the assignment is drafted, submitted, and endorsed by UNDP. To be submitted within a week from the official start of engagement (i.e. signing of contract agreement or issuance of Notice to Proceed) and should outline the evaluation's framework of analysis, schedule of activities/tasks/milestones/deliverables, responsibilities of technical and admin support personnel (if any), and an evaluation matrix which shall contain the following column headings: (1) Relevant Evaluation Criteria; (2) Key Questions; (3) Specific Sub-Questions; (4) Assumptions to be Assessed; (5) Data Sources; (6) Data Collection Methods/Tools; (7) Indicators/Success Standards; and, (8) Methods for Data Analysis. **For further information kindly see the annexed evaluation matrix.**
2. PowerPoint Presentation on Preliminary Findings. To be presented a week after end of evaluation mission and will highlight actual coverage of mission, initial findings, additional requirements (if any) and next steps.

3. Draft Evaluation Report and PowerPoint Presentation. The document will be circulated to Project stakeholders for review and comments. The PowerPoint presentation shall contain the highlights of the report.
4. Final Evaluation Report and Power Point Presentation. A Final version of the Final Evaluation report accounting for the UNDP, and stakeholders' feedback on the first draft is produced and validated by UNDP. The Evaluator is also expected to turn over to UNDP all materials related to the evaluation exercise (i.e., raw and processed data, pictures, list of respondents and written/signed consents).

TIME FRAME

Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
TOR completion and approval	Programme Analyst	Internally Finalized
Selection of consultants	M&E Specialist	Immediately
Phase 2: Desk analysis		
Preliminary desk review of reference material	Consultant	5 days
Phase 3: Primary Data collection		
Travel to regions & conduct field level data collection	Consultant	12 days
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis of data and submission of draft report	Consultant	5 days
draft shared with the government and national stakeholders	Consultant	1 day
Draft management response	M&E Specialist	1 day
Final report and evaluation brief	Consultant	1 day
Dissemination of the final report	Programme Analyst	5 days

DURATION OF THE WORK

This is a two months assignment for 30 working days. The consultant is required to undertake field missions to target areas in four regions. The duty station will be Addis Ababa. UNDP will provide an office space and internet for the consultant while in Addis Ababa and provide transport during the field mission to engage with the stakeholders in the proposed intervention regions.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BEST OFFEROR

Upon the advertisement of the Procurement Notice, qualified consulting firm is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Accordingly; the firm will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
 - a. Technical Criteria weight is **70%**
 - b. Financial Criteria weight is **30%**

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))	70%	100 pts
Criteria a. Understanding the Scope of Work (SoW); comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal		50 pts*
Criteria b. Minimum educational background as per the requirement in the ToR		20 pts**
Criteria c. Proven competencies in programme design, monitoring and evaluation as well as in compilation of good practices and lessons learned		20pts **
Criteria d. Fluency in English and a working knowledge of one of the local languages in Project target location.		10 pts**
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	30%	30
Total Score	Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score * 30%	

* It is mandatory criteria and shall have a minimum of 50%

**Regarding the rest criteria, you may select from the following or include which is/are relevant evaluation criteria as per the ToR and fix allocated weightage corresponding to each criterion. Examples:

RESPONSIBILITIES, LOGISTICS AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT / REPORTING RELATIONSHIPS

The consultant will report to the Team Leader (Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development) but also work in close collaboration with the Programme Analyst (DRM and Resilience Building) as well as with team members working in the unit. The consultant is also expected to periodically consult with government bodies such as National Disaster Risk Management Council (NDRMC), and respective regions Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureaus.

The consultant shall work under the supervision of UNDP's Disaster Risk Management Advisor with close support from PMSU

- The draft evaluation report shall be presented to UNDP and Government stakeholders no later than 45 days after start of the assignment. Comments and feedback from all stakeholders should be incorporated into the final version of the report.
- The consultant shall submit the final evaluation report to the UNDP for certification of completion of work. The consultant will have the responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the deliverables to the UNDP Country office.
- UNDP will provide logistical support to the consultant in the form of a vehicle for up-country project visits, and an accompanying project officer, if required.
- The selected consultant will be expected to adhere to a code of conduct (Statement on Ethics) and conduct him/herself according to the expected ethical standards.

REQUIREMENTS AND QUALIFICATIONS

Education:

- Master's degree in Development Studies, Development Management, Disaster Risk Management and Sustainable Development, Economics, Social Sciences, Community Development or related social science fields;
- At least ten (10) years of progressively responsible experience in development research, evaluation of development projects, or project management in the areas related to DRM and Resilience

Building, Early recovery and rehabilitation assistance, Livelihood, Natural Resource Management and Climate Change Adaptation.

Experience:

- Extensive knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as of participatory M&E methodological and practical considerations in conducting evaluations of DRM and development interventions is required;
- Demonstrated strong knowledge and experience in the application of monitoring and evaluation methods for development projects; experience in conducting terminal evaluation, specially UNDP managed projects, an advantage
- Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and prepare well-written reports in a timely manner;
- Demonstrated experience in both quantitative and qualitative data collection and data analysis techniques, especially in complex protracted humanitarian emergency scenarios;
- Familiarity with integrated/multi-sectoral development projects in the field of disaster and climate risk management, either through managing or evaluating donor-funded projects.
- Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, if possible with UNDP or other UN development agencies and major donors, is required.
- Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to analyze critical issues succinctly and clearly and draw forward-looking conclusions.

COST OF EVALUATION AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT

Budget for the engagement will be charged under the 2018 Disaster and Climate Risk Governance AWP Budget Line (Final Evaluation). The selected Evaluator shall be remunerated based on the following payment schedule:

Payment Schedule	Percentage of Contract Amount	Payment Condition
1st Payment	30%	Upon Signing of Contract Agreement and immediate after Submission of Inception Report
2nd Payment	30%	Upon submission of draft evaluation report and issuance of the certificate of acceptance
3rd Payment	40%	Upon submission of final evaluation report, other related documents, and issuance of the certificate of acceptance

CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROPRIETARY INTEREST

The consulting firm shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consulting firm under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

ANNEX 1: Evaluation Questions

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Key Questions	Assumptions to be Assessed	Specific Sub-Questions	Indicators	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Methods for Data Analysis
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of UNDP and to DRR and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?							
1							
2							
3							
4							
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?							
1							
2							
3							
4							
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?							
1							
2							
3							
4							
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or DRR risks to sustaining long-term project results?							
1							
2							
3							
4							
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?							
1							
2							
3							
4							

Annex 2: Relevant Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

The following evaluation criteria and related evaluation questions are proposed for the evaluation process; however, these can be expanded and modified by the evaluator. Each evaluation criteria must be ranked as per UNDP ranking methodology.

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions Suggested
<p>Relevance The extent to which the objectives of this intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities such as the Sendia Framework on DRR.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the project address country priorities? Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country? What is the contribution of the project towards the National Policy and Strategy on Disaster Risk Management, the Disaster Risk Management-Strategic Programme and Investment Framework (DRM-SPIF), UNDAF and UNDP CPP outcomes and outputs? ▪ To what extent was the project aligned to the immediate needs and priorities of the target groups (including vulnerable groups)? ▪ Has the initiative tackled key challenges and problems? ▪ How did the project link and contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals?
<p>Effectiveness <i>To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what level has the project reached the project purpose and the expected results/ indicators as stated in the project document (results framework)? ▪ What challenges have been faced? What has been done to address the potential challenges/problems? What has been done to mitigate risks? ▪ In what ways did the project respond to the findings/recommendations of the mid-term evaluation in the second half of project's implementation? ▪ What factors contributed to achieving or not achieving intended results and outputs? ▪ How effective was the project's Monitoring and Evaluation mechanism?
<p>Efficiency A measure of how economically resources / inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have the resources been used efficiently? How well have the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness? (in comparison to the plan) ▪ Was the overall coordination properly ensured in strengthen the Disaster Risk Management architecture? ▪ Were the management and administrative arrangements sufficient to ensure efficient implementation of the project? ▪ What factors and constraints have affected project implementation including technical, managerial, organizational, institutional and socio-economic issues in addition to other external factors unforeseen during the project design? ▪ How was the quality of the execution of an implementing partners at federal and regional level?
<p>Impact The positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there any emerging impact on communities for both men and women? To what extent the impact is identified? Are communities likely to initiate other disaster risk reduction initiatives in the vulnerable community? ▪ What changes (intended/unintended, positive or negative) can be observed in relation to the objectives of the various components of the Programme? ▪ How did the project contribute to (more) sustainable management of natural resources? ▪ Is there evidence that institutional systems/mechanisms are in place which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supports further capacity development at local level; and

<p>Sustainability The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promotes sustainable and inclusive development ▪ How is the project ensuring sustainability of its results and impacts (i.e. strengthened capacities, continuity of use of knowledge, improved practices, etc.)? ▪ Did the project have a concrete and realistic exit strategy to ensure sustainability and has it been well communicated all around? ▪ Are there preliminary indications that the project results are likely to be sustainable beyond the project’s lifetime (both at the community and government level)? Assess the degree of sustainability. What are the dimensions of sustainability: economic/financial; social/organizational; technological; environmental? ▪ What relationships/engagements have been formed through project implementation to date that are likely to continue beyond the life of the project? ▪ Are there any jeopardizing aspects that have not been considered or abated by the project actions? In case of sustainability risks, were sufficient mitigation measures proposed? ▪ Has ownership of the actions and impact been transferred to the corresponding stakeholders? Do the stakeholders / beneficiaries have the capacity to take over the ownership of the actions and results of the project and maintain and further develop the results?
<p>Stakeholders and Partnership Strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How the project implemented the commitments to promote local ownership, alignment, harmonization, management for development results and mutual accountability?
<p>Theory of Change Or Results / Outcome Map</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the Theory of Change or project logic feasible and was it realistic? Were assumptions, factors and risks sufficiently taken into consideration? ▪ Were intended results (outputs, outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and are the results verifiable?
<p>Gender</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What effects were realized in terms of gender equality and women’s empowerment? ▪ Were women and men distinguished in terms of participation and benefits within project?

Annex 3: Reporting Outline

The minimum requirements for the content of the final version of the final evaluation report are but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined below:

- Title and opening pages
- Table of contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive summary
 - Brief description of project
 - Context and purpose of the evaluation
 - Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Methodology and scope of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation
- The project and its development context
 - Project start and its duration
 - Problems that the project seek to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Main stakeholders
 - Results expected
- Findings and ratings
 - Project implementation:
 - Results:
 - Output I
 - Output II
 - Output III
 - Output IV
 - Output V
- Lessons learnt
- Conclusions and recommendation
- Annexes