



Terms of Reference (TOR)

Final Performance Evaluation

Community Based Disaster Risk Management Component-Building Disaster Resilience in Pakistan (BDRP) Programme - Phase II

July 2020

1. Background

Pakistan is beset with a plethora of natural and man-made hazards. In the recent years, the magnitude and frequency of natural hazards events such as floods and droughts have increased significantly. These repeated disasters have reversed the recovery of affected communities and may have resulted in permanent changes in livelihood patterns across disaster prone areas. The increase in disaster risk is mainly attributed to climate change but also due to factors including lack of DRR knowledge to construct disaster resilient houses and infrastructures as well as resilient livelihood options and lack of institutional set up.

DFID funded **Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM)** component of the **Building Disaster Resilience in Pakistan (BDRP) programme** is working with the poor and vulnerable households and communities to build their resilience to climate related disaster risk by September 2020. The consortium led by Concern Worldwide (“consortium lead”) in partnership with ACTED, WHH, and IRC (“consortium members”), are implementing this component of BDRP (“programme”) with approximately 218,000 HHs in 930 villages of 9 disaster prone districts of Pakistan. Programme’s Phase I was concluded in September 2018 with a complete programme cycle in 300 villages of 4 districts (Kashmore, Ghotki of Sindh, Rajanpur and Muzaffargarh for Punjab province). Phase I was followed by a new phase implemented in 9 (with new 5) districts including Dadu, Tharparkar of Sindh, Jhang for Punjab province and Chitral and DI Khan in Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa. The programme is following an integrated approach for resilience building measures in CBDRM, Shelter, WASH, infrastructure, on-farm livelihoods and off-farm livelihoods in three different contexts; floods, drought and multiple hazards.

The overall outcome of the BDRP programme is the “increased capacity to reduce disaster risk, through better planning, preparedness, response, and resource allocation at the governmental and community levels.” The delivery of CBDRM programme will assist targeted communities to mitigate and prepare for disasters through improved early warning systems, risk information, community level response mechanisms and improved linkages with disaster management authorities. In addition, community-based disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation measures will also be realised for improving resilience of local communities.

Following are the three outputs of the programme;

Output 1: Target communities have effective disaster risk management structures in place to take up and advocate resilience-building measures;

Output 2: Target communities and households are prepared to (a) cope with climate related natural disasters and (b) adopt risk reduction measures, and

Output 3: Target communities & households are introduced to sustainable livelihoods and environmental management practices for resilience building.

2. Purpose of the consultancy

The overall purpose of performance evaluation is to evaluate the Community Based Disaster Risk Management Component of BDRP Programme. This evaluation will have a particular emphasis on the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the intervention carried out and approach adopted. This will allow the consultant to extract lessons learnt and recommendations regarding both operational and programming aspects. This evaluation should yield some lessons learnt from the perspective of DFID's overall resilience focused programming as well as National Disaster Management Authority's priorities and plans. It should capture achievements of the programme's results and indicators, and the initial impact of the action in the light of theory of change and log-frame matrix. This exercise will primarily focus on Phase II programme implementation however will also take into account the findings of phase I's mid-term review exercise.

Considering DAC criteria for programme evaluation, which includes relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, the major questions to look into throughout the evaluation are as follows. This exercise will also explore the questions related to coordination and cross cutting themes such as human resources; protection; participation of primary stakeholders; coping strategies and resilience; gender equality; HIV/AIDS; and the environment.

Objectives:

1. Assess the relevance, appropriateness and coverage of the CBDRM component.
2. Assess the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the CBDRM component.
3. Assess the sustainability and connectedness of the CBDRM component.
4. Assess the coherence of the CBDRM component, including an assessment of the partnership and coordination mechanisms.
5. Assess the success and impact of participatory approaches in the CBDRM component implementation.
6. Identify lessons to be learned to inform the future program.

Addressing these evaluation objectives will require the evaluator to consider the following guiding questions:

a. Relevance/Appropriateness and coverage:

- Were the programme's objectives and activities relevant to address the real needs in targeted villages particularly in the backdrop of variety of disasters?
- Which activities of the programme showed greater relevance for the beneficiaries? Why?

- Were the areas – geographic (UCs and villages) and programmatic – vulnerable and relevant in terms of selection and in line with national level priorities?
 - I. What was the process of selection of villages and UCs? How this ensured stakeholders' participation?
 - II. How programme sectors are identified and fits into a resilience building programme?
- How well did the programme integrate with and gain advantage from the Government policies, previous similar programmes' knowledge, lessons and recommendations?
- How satisfied are the communities with the programme interventions? Are there instances of community self-initiatives and mobilization as result of the programme?
- Was the programme appropriate for the social and cultural context of targeted areas?
- Was the programme responsive to gender needs, social and cultural values, conditions and practices?
- To what extent did the programme address the environmental or climate issues identified during the design?
- How effectively did the program respond to COVID-19? Was the COVID-19 response mechanism linked to the program components/interventions?

b. Efficiency, Effectiveness and Impact of the programme

- Have the outcome and outputs set in the log-frame matrix been delivered in a timely manner with required quality and quantity? What would have happened without this programme if there would be any disaster (flood, drought and/ or earthquake) in the targeted areas¹?
- Were activities cost-efficient? Have the activities and outputs been delivered with good value for money?
- In particular, what is the return on investments particularly the activities undertaken under CBDRM and Infrastructure sectors?
- What measures were taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used and outputs timely delivered?
- What are the reasons for the achievement, non-achievement or over-achievement?
- Within the concept of the resilience programme adopted, and programme context, how far has the action been successful in building resilience to future shocks and stresses in the targeted communities, specifically to what extent is/ will the programme contributing to minimize losses to various assets (including physical, economic, social as well as environmental, etc.) at household and community?
- Are adequate mechanisms in place for effective monitoring of programme deliverables?
- Is the data, on which the project relies for monitoring and communications including overall results, adequate, coherent and available in the format required and sufficiently robust?
- Are the key results aligned with Donor's methodologies including WASH, humanitarian, resilience and climate change?
- What socio-economic and environmental changes have taken place among the beneficiary community as a result of the programme including both intended and unintended effects?
- Do communities now better understand the relationship between environmental functions, disaster impacts and climate change, and what they (have learnt and) will now do to proactively manage and mitigate its effects.
- Has the resilience of the targeted communities increased as a result of programme support, by comparing baseline results as presented in the logframe to the current situation.

¹ Consultant may develop a counterfactual to assess the situation on more scientific basis.

- How well costings in the Business Case, performance over the years as captured in annual review reports, and Phase I values on indicators have been effective. How much it has costed to shift households from low resilience to high/medium resilience.

c. Sustainability/ Connectedness

- To what extent are the benefits of the programme likely to continue after the completion of the programme? Were the various installations/infrastructures properly handed over to the relevant stakeholders? If not, why not?
- What are the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme? How will the demonstration of various approaches and techniques work for replication at a considerable scale?
- Is the sustainability strategy fully understood by the partners and therefore reflected in their planning?
- What relationships and linkages, if any, have been developed with other programmes (govt. led or private) and how have they impacted on project outcomes. Are there any relationships that should be explored in future?

d. Coordination/ Coherence/Participation of primary stakeholders

- How well did the programme coordinate with Government line departments during design and implementation of programme? To what extent has this cooperation resulted in better programming?
- How effective and successful were the models of partnerships, level of cooperation and communication among the consortium members both at design and implementation level?
- Did the consortium model achieve consistency, where required, between members across its implementation modalities (harmonization of quality, quantity, targeting criteria, technical approaches etc.)?
- Is current programme consistent with the overall policies and action taken by Government and Non-Government Organizations?

e. Identify lessons to be learned to inform the future programme

- What are the key areas needing improvement in terms of design, approaches and implementation with particular emphasis on partnership and integration?

f. Participation and integration

- Did the projects planning and implementation mechanisms include the involvement of communities through Community based Disaster Management Committees To what extent did this participation make implementation smooth? Was the methodology used for the beneficiary selection relevant and were communities involved in the process?
- Were the most vulnerable including extreme poor, women, disabled and elderly included appropriately in programme implementation and results?
- Has this programme had any impact on gender equality?
- Were the standards met and humanitarian principles followed including SPHERE and CHS?
- Did the project establish mechanisms to enable beneficiaries and staff to provide feedback and if any report complaints and seek redress safely?

3. Essential and Desirable Experience/Qualifications

- Post-graduate degrees in Development Studies, Disaster Risk Management, and/or related social sciences field.
- Similar experience of conducting evaluations of integrated programme with particular focus on resilience programmes in flood, drought and multi hazard conditions will be given preference.
- Knowledge of the Pakistani regional context and languages required within the team
- Familiarity and technical knowledge of CBDRM, Infrastructure, FSL and skills development in an integrated programme approach, as well as practical experience of Return on Investment, Value for Money analysis tools and techniques
- Familiarity with international quality and accountability standards applied in emergencies;
- Experience in the use of participatory methodologies and developing gender sensitive evaluation methodologies;
- Excellent Quantitative data analysis skills with proficiency in relevant statistical software
- Excellent written and spoken communications skills in English.
- Previous proven experience of conducting evaluations particularly for resilience focused preferably DFID funded programmes
- Inter-personal and analytical skills with an extraordinary level of diplomacy and tact while dealing with numerous stakeholders

4. Objectives and Specific Tasks to be undertaken by the Consultant(s)

The evaluation is intended to draw lessons for improvement in future resilience programme as well as ensuring accountability to various stakeholders involved. For systematic data collection the methodology will be developed in detail by the consultant(s), and discussed with consortium member in its preliminary/ inception stages. However, during this exercise, evaluator will undertake at least following tasks for data collection and reporting.

- Literature review, including review of secondary sources such as analysis of project monitoring data, PDMs, Baseline/Endline and other related surveys data, Value for Money Analysis data, context analyses and/or needs assessments, review of MOUs, workplans, programme modalities, targeting criteria, review of UCDMPs etc.
- Further analysis of existing data sets (baseline/endline, beneficiaries number sheet, beneficiary tracking sheet) to establish programme's effectiveness quantitatively
- Conduct a comprehensive performance evaluation to gauge the resilience level and resulting number of people belonging to low, medium and high resilience categories.
- Conduct a comprehensive analysis on how much it has costed to shift households from low resilience to high/medium resilience.
- For triangulation of findings, field visits to target areas and collection of quantitative and qualitative data from a sample targeted beneficiaries - process should be participatory and sensitive to research ethics to the extent possible
- Presentation of draft findings (ppt) / debriefing at the end of the field work.
- Writing of a detailed report and submission for feedback from all consortium members
- Incorporation of feedback in the draft report and submission of the final report
- Final payment is dependent on the submission of a good quality, well-written final report or completion of agreed outputs (as detailed in the TOR). This report will be shared with DFID in addition to other relevant internal and external stakeholders.

5. Outputs

The consultant(s) will produce following key outputs

- An inception meeting (either in person or online) with consortium partners
- An inception report
- After a literature review exercise, an inception report detailing more specific questions and methods related to above mentioned key themes
- Data collection from field for triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data.
- A meeting/presentation (or both) to disseminate key (draft) findings with key stakeholders. In addition, if required, consultant will be asked to present his/ her work in Consortium Technical Working Groups for broader understanding and feedback of Consortium Partners.
- A final report detailing the findings based on quantitative and qualitative data analysis, conclusions, recommendations, experiences, and lessons learnt (this should also include the feedback provided on the draft report and feedback during the presentation of findings meeting).
- The final report should be no longer than 35 pages including a 5 page executive summary (excluding annexes). Resilience building should be covered as a separate chapter. This chapter should include findings from endline study, findings from comprehensive performance evaluation to gauge the resilience level and resulting number of people belonging to low, medium and high resilience categories and comprehensive analysis on how much it has costed to shift households from low resilience to high/medium resilience.
- A score per DAC criteria on a scale of 0-4 (as per Concern Worldwide's Evaluation Guidelines).
- A global Zoom Presentation to share key findings and learning with key stakeholders and management at head offices (Ireland, UK & US).

The outputs can be further adjusted based on the need of the programme and donor.

Payments will be made in instalment as per the set milestones agreed in the contract agreement. Apart from this, Digital copies of all reports/documents will be submitted to Concern Worldwide at the end of the set deadline.

6. Lines of Communication

The consultant will report to Concern's Team Leader for CBDRM-BDRP programme and will liaise closely with M&E Specialist, Concern's HQ Advisor/s, Deputy Team Leader, and other Programme Implementation Unit (PIU) technical specialists on livelihood, Infrastructure and DRR. Apart from this regular meetings and interactions with the relevant team of Consortium partners will be made to discuss and finalize each output mentioned in section 2. In addition if required, consultant will be required to present his/ her work in Consortium Technical Working Groups for broader understanding and feedback of Consortium Partners.

7. Timeframe

This survey will tentatively start from July 2020, as per following indicative break up:

Activity	Outputs	Dates
Initial meeting with the CWW TL, DTL, M&E and sector specialist to discuss the methodology and expected outcomes	Methodology and survey work plan finalized	4 rd week July 2020
Literature review, further analysis to produce & validate quantitative findings and Inception Report	Inception Report shared	1 st / 2 nd week of August
Concern's Internal review and inputs	Final Inception Report, Data collection tools	3 rd week of August
Data collection in all nine districts, Data analysis, initial report writing	Data collected & initial findings made and initial report shared	By 2 nd September
Concern's Internal review and inputs	Reviewed report with feedback	9 th September 2020
Final report	Final Report with all feedback addressed	2 nd / 3 rd week of September
Roundtable discussion with key stakeholders including PDMAs/ DDMA's, DFID, consortium partners	Half-day roundtable workshop/discussion (CV19 situation permitting) with key stakeholders to debrief key findings of the evaluation	3 rd week of September

After each output, Concern will take 2-3 working days for review and providing inputs. All field related expenses will be responsibility of consulting team. The plan may be changed due to un-avoidable circumstances. Simultaneous data collection is recommended in a province with essential participation of lead/ co-consultant in each district.

8. Applications

This consultancy is open to National applicants however International applicants having an existing **Visa/NOC** (allowed to work) to work in Pakistan are also encouraged to apply (in case of international consultant, s/he will be required to include a co-consultant (national) having experience of contextual understanding of Pakistan and the targeted districts in particular.

The above mentioned tasks to be performed are intended as a guide and should not be viewed as an inflexible specification as it may be modified following discussion with the selected consultant or firm.

Interested consultants/firms should send the following documents along with their technical proposals (only) on Pakistan.tenders@concern.net by **July 23rd, 2020** before 05:00 pm maximum.

- Cover letter detailing the consultant's/firms' suitability for the assignment and current contact information
- A short description of methodology to undertake the assignment
- Profiles/CVs of key person(s) to be engaged.
- At least one relevant example (sample report) of previous assignment of similar nature carried out preferably in Pakistan with international NGOs/UN agency (Concern will strictly ensure the confidentiality of the reports.)
- The weights for evaluation of technical and financial aspects are 70% and 30% respectively.

- Any queries related to this consultancy assignment can be directed to Pakistan.hr@concern.net before **July 22nd, 2020** before 1600 hrs maximum. Queries submitted after deadline will not be responded.

Notes:

- **Kindly mention the name of Consultancy “Final Performance Evaluation-BDRP” in the subject line of email.**
- **Consultancy companies shortlisted on the basis of Technical proposals will be asked to submit their financial proposals.**
- **Concern Worldwide reserves the right to cancel/reject any or all offers without assigning any reason.**