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# **1. Introduction and context**

The Philippine Red Cross (PRC) and German Red Cross (GRC) jointly implement a project titled “Empowering the Philippine Institutions and Communities in Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (EPIC DRRM Project – Phase III)” from January 2020 until December 2023. The project is the third and final phase of a longer-term programme funded by the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) under their Social Structural Funding Scheme (SSF). The first project phase was implemented between January 2014 and December 2016, the second covered the period January 2017 to December 2019.

Overall, all three projects aimed to contribute to the implementation of the Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010” (RA 10121) and to strengthening the resilience of communities, while setting individual specific objectives in the respective project phases.

This third project phase seeks to contribute particularly to the consolidation and implementation process of the Philippines institutional and operational framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) and to increase resilience of local communities. As the current project is ending in December 2023, the partners, GRC and PRC, jointly plan for an external evaluation of the project in October and November 2023.

## 1.1 Background

Due to its location within the Pacific Ring of Fire, the Philippine archipelago is prone to destructive earthquakes, tsunamis and volcanic eruptions while also facing several typhoons, heavy rains, floods, landslides and/or tidal waves throughout the year. As a result, the Philippines is ranking 1st in the World Risk Index (2022) with the highest prevalence of Disaster Risk, also due to high vulnerabilities, susceptibility and lack of sufficient coping and adaptation capacities. The Philippines, among Southeast Asia’s poorest countries, ranks 116 (of 191 countries) in the UNDP Human Development Index 2022. Continuous environmental degradation and the anticipated future increase of climate change-induced natural hazards and their intensity will likely lead to an overall increased disaster risk.

In order to strengthen the Philippine’s capacity in the field of mitigation, prevention and preparedness and increase disaster resilience of local communities, the above mentioned “Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010” (RA 10121) was enacted by the Government of the Philippines. It recognizes DRRM as a comprehensive approach and shifted the previous focus towards disaster prevention and risk reduction (pre-disaster). This act seeks to strengthen the capacities of the national government and the local government units (LGUs), supported by partners, to build the communities’ disaster resilience, and to institutionalize measures for reducing disaster risks (incl. projected climate risks) and enhancing disaster preparedness and response capabilities at all levels. It links all government units with a set of roles and responsibilities, provides guidance for their DRRM governance and on how to integrate Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) in their regular planning process. The Philippine Red Cross, as auxiliary to the Government of the Philippines, has been mandated to sit in the National as well as local Disaster Risk Reduction Management Councils (DRRMC).

The previous phases 1 and 2 of this programme focused more on the community level (micro level), strengthening vulnerable communities and their LGUs particularly, while the efforts to bridge the gap between the government’s policies and PRC´s DRR strategy(macro level) and to also enhance its implementation capacities in order to maximise PRC’s role in the national DRRM system (meso level) have increased over time only.

Based on the recommendations of previous evaluations/reviews, the current phase 3 followed a strategy to continue, consolidate and expand activities from Phase 1 and 2 in terms of capacity building and to support further development, standardization and institutionalization of the DRRM guideline and tools of the PRC. On top of that, the project sought to strengthen the PRC’s advocacy capacity.

## 1.2 Project (phase 3) introduction:

On macro level, the project aims at strengthening the PRC´s position in the national DRRM structure by advocating for a more relevant and substantial role in the implementation of specific DRR components as an auxiliary to the Philippine government. PRC is placed on the DRRM Council on national, provincial, and municipal levels as a member, and the project supports PRC in maximizing its roles by advocating for more specific roles in inclusive and participatory implementation of DRRM actions required by Philippine law. Through strengthening PRC's coordination with other DRRM organizations and academic institutions at various levels the project intended to contribute to effective advocacy and lobby on DRR issues in the country.

On meso level, the project supported PRC in enhancing its own capacity in DRRM to be a strategic partner to the government in various thematic areas. The project aimed at reviewing and developing PRC DRRM guidelines system and tools, as identified in the roadmap developed in the previous phase of the program (phase 2), and at providing necessary technical trainings to the relevant staff, volunteers, and other relevant DRRM stakeholders, including the government. Other outcome of the meso level is that the PRC national headquarters strengthens their coordination with other stakeholders, effectively guiding all the PRC Chapters in its DRR implementation and enables project-specific chapters to continuously deliver quality outputs and share their knowledge and experience with other chapters for learning and replication and be more engaged with other stakeholders.

On micro level, the implementation focused on the community level, incl. schools, through the establishment of volunteer structures and networks and by supporting the local authorities in the provision of services linked to DRRM. These services comprised of e.g. vulnerability and capacity assessments (VCAs), the development of DRR plans, simulation exercises, the provision of DRR equipment and implementing mitigation measures, with the aim of increasing the resilience of targeted communities to the most common hazards.

All activities and measures implemented on macro, meso and micro levels intended to influence each other.

**Project regions**: 30 Barangays[[1]](#footnote-2) and 24 schools in six municipalities in Zambales, La Union and Ilocos Norte provinces in Northern Luzon. Additional 15 PRC chapters where DRR minimum activities are implemented.

**Direct beneficiaries:** Government officials at national, regional, provincial, municipal and barangay level and NGOs etc., PRC staff and volunteers (incl. schools), community members, school students, teachers and administrative officials

# **2. Evaluation purpose and users**

The evaluation is being conducted at the end of the project and will focus on the entire implementation period (January 2020 to December 2023) of the EPIC (phase 3) project.

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the achievement of stated project objectives and results, to determine the efficiency, quality and impact of the project, and to draw lessons for future programming.

## 2.1 Purpose

The final evaluation has four main purposes:

1. Ascertain achievement of objectives and expected results (output, outcome, impact) and assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of the intervention and the impact, sustainability and coherence of the intervention and, where possible, of the 3-phases programme.
2. Collect and analyze data related to selected project indicators.
3. Draw key lessons, best practices and recommendations to ensure sustainability and guide future interventions of both partners. Clearly define possible key areas for future improvement and ways and means for its achievement.
4. Inform the project stakeholders and the donor on the project achievements, non-achievements and potential impact, as an accountable measure.

## 2.2 Users of the evaluation

Primarily, the main users of the evaluation are the PRC and the GRC and the main project stakeholders. Beyond these, the project donor (BMZ), other Partner National Societies, IFRC and future projects donors might be further users of this evaluation.

# **3. Task description**

## 3.1 Evaluation scope

The evaluation team will cover:

* The implementation period from 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2023 resp. a week prior to the evaluation
* Project-related activities at the level of PRC national headquarters (result 1 and 2.1)
* Progression of/linkages between the three phases
* Project-related activities in the three provinces in Northern Luzon (Zambales, La Union, Ilocos Norte, results 2.2 and 3.2) and the 15 chapters (result 3.1)
* All project target groups including beneficiaries, Red Cross volunteers, PRC NHQ and Chapter staff and volunteers, LGU officials (barangay, municipality, province level) and relevant government agencies and departments at national, regional and provincial level, (e.g. Department of Interior, Office of Civil Defense, Department of Education)

## 3.2 Evaluation criteria including specific evaluation questions related to the project

### Relevance

1. To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
2. Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
3. Are the outputs/outcomes consistent with the beneficiaries’ actual needs? How were they engaged in the project cycle?

### b) Effectiveness

1. To what extent were the objectives achieved?
2. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
3. Did coordination with other relevant actors and partners contribute to avoiding overlapping and complementing efforts to achieve outputs?

### c) Efficiency

1. Were resources such as financial, human and material adequate for the successful implementation of the project.
2. Did the project encounter obstacles which delayed the implementation of planned activities? How were resources used to mitigate these?

### d) Impact

1. What has happened as a result of the project and why?
2. What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries at the different levels?
3. Were there unexpected negative outcomes?

### e) Sustainability / Connectedness

1. To what extent could the positive effects of the project continue after donor funding ceases?
2. Which measures were implemented to achieve sustainability of the intended effects?

f) Coherence

1. To what extent is the intervention complementary or contradictory to policies of different concerned government actors (P/MDRRMC, Office of Civil Defense, Department of Education etc.)?
2. How did the project fit with the PRC strategic plans (with special focus on DRRM)?
3. Did the project build upon the achievements and lessons learned from previous phases? How well were the three phases of the program integrated and coordinated in terms of planning, implementation, and evaluation?

# **4. Evaluation design and methodology**

The team composition as well as the design and methodology of the evaluation are subject

matters of the negotiations with the evaluator/s.

## 4.1 Evaluation team

The final evaluation will be conducted by external consultant/s. The project team will support data collection in the field.

## 4.2 Participation of stakeholders

Resource persons:

* PRC-GRC Project Team (Delegate, project coordinators and officers, CDOs, volunteers)
* PRC Management (Secretary General, ASG for Programs, Disaster Management Services including DPRR unit and MEAL unit, IHL office, PMER unit, Volunteer Services unit, Red Cross Youth unit, HR, Chapter Development unit etc.)
* PRC Chapter Representatives (Chapter Administrators and Chapter Services Representatives)
* GRC Philippines country office in Manila
* Governmental partners at National level (OCD, DILG etc.)
* P/MDRRMC representatives, representatives of the MoA/DepEd, Barangay and school representatives
* IFRC and other Red Cross Partner National Societies Representatives in country

## 4.3 Sources of information

The evaluator will have access to all relevant project documents like project proposal, project management documents (Log frame, activity plan, budget), monitoring tools, project reports (narrative and financial), evaluation and mid-term review reports from the previous two phases, audits etc. These documents are confidential but can be cited and used in the evaluation process. Information which could do harm to any stakeholder if published should be treated in a confidential way. The decision about the publication is the right of GRC and PRC.

## 4.4 Methodology

The evaluator should use the available secondary data for analysis. For the collection of primary data, participatory methods should be applied. The choice of methods will have to be presented and described by the evaluation team and will be approved by PRC and GRC. The IFRC standards for evaluation[[2]](#footnote-3) should be respected and are the framework and basis for any evaluation activity executed by a consultant under GRC contract. The methods should aim at including a wide range of stakeholders to the projects into the evaluation.

# **5. Evaluation process with timetable and reporting**

The evaluation process has different phases and is described in the following paragraphs.

The process will be guided by the contracting parties. The timetable will be proposed by the consultant at the time of the submission of the technical proposal through the application process and further adjustments will be done upon review of the inception report upon agreement by both parties. The consultancy is expected to be finalized in **27 working days**, this is expected to be reflected in the financial proposal which is part of the application process. Further reporting will consist of a preliminary report, to be validated in a workshop to produce the final report.

## 5.1 Timetable

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Task | Responsible person | Days |
| October | Introductory meeting/telcon with evaluation team | GRC/ PRC and  Consultant | 1 |
|  | Analysis of relevant documents | Consultant | 3 |
|  | Delivery of inception report | Consultant | 2 |
|  | Kick-off meeting | GRC/ PRC and  Consultant | 1 |
|  | Travel to and from the Philippines | Consultant | 2 |
|  | Implementation of evaluation in-country | Consultant | 10 |
|  | Preliminary report delivery | Consultant | 3 |
|  | Validation Workshop | Consultant | 1 |
|  | Final report preparation | Consultant | 3 |
| 30 November 2023 | Report reception and final discussion | GRC/ PRC and  Consultant | 1 |
| **TOTAL** | | | **Ca. 27** |

## 5.2 Reporting

### 5.2.1 Inception report (max. 5 pages)

An inception report offers the opportunity for the evaluator and GRC to clarify the contract and the ToR after a first study of the existing project documentation. The inception report of the evaluator should not be longer than 5 pages. ***The evaluator will give feedback to GRC about the ToR and their feasibility. This is the point where the evaluator, based on the information from the secondary data, can clarify open questions and possibly change the content or direction of the evaluation as well***. The inception report should be delivered before the evaluation starts.

It should contain:

* The key data of the evaluation (Project title, project data, commissioner of the evaluation, Contractors)
* Feedback / Amendment of the ToR – suggestions for ToR amendments if necessary
* Status of the evaluation preparation (team, timetable, distribution of tasks, reporting)
* Evaluation design: Chosen methods, approach, steps for their implementation.
* Tools for their implementation (questionnaires, data processing and analysis etc.)
* A draft implementation plan for the evaluation

The inception report will be discussed with GRC, PRC and the evaluator. Any changes of the ToR need an agreement of both parties, because they might change the conditions and thereby the contract between GRC and the evaluator.

### 5.2.2 Preliminary report

All findings, conclusions and recommendations including the evaluation methodology should be described and presented by the evaluator in a short preliminary evaluation report. The results of the preliminary report will first of all be discussed with GRC and the partner/s and will serve as a basis for the preparation of the evaluation workshop. The report will be presented by the evaluator in the evaluation workshop.

### 5.2.3 Evaluation and validation workshop

Representatives of stakeholders and the evaluator will come together in the evaluation workshop. The workshop will be organized in order to discuss and validate findings, lessons learned, and recommendations proposed by the evaluator. Stakeholders might formulate additional recommendations if necessary. Possible content of an evaluation workshop:

* Presentation and discussion of the preliminary evaluation report
* Validation of lessons learnt and recommendations by all stakeholders
* Collection of additional observations or recommendations

It is expected that the evaluator team will present a structure for the workshop as part of their preliminary report. GRC and partners are responsible for the workshop preparation and all related logistics. The presentation and methodology for the validation workshop are expected to be delivered to GRC.

## 5.2.4 Final report (max. 35 pages, excl. Annexes)

The final evaluation report should consider the validation of the stakeholders during the final workshop. All consultant works, inception-, preliminary- and final report should be delivered in English language.

The consultant will give his/her recommendations but should incorporate the validation process during the workshop in the final report, including additional recommendations from the workshop participants. The report will have to be approved by German Red Cross. **The final report should, as a minimum, include the following elements**:

* Key data of the evaluation (from the inception report)
* Executive summary – a tightly drafted, to-the-point, free standing document (about 5pages max) with the following, fixed structure:

1. Short project description

2. Key questions of the evaluation

3. Key findings (Structured along the OECD DAC criteria)

4. Lessons learned

5. Major recommendations (Mainly general recommendations)

* Introduction – with purpose of the evaluation, scope, key questions, short description of the
* project to be evaluated and relevant framework conditions.
* Evaluation design and methodology.
* Key findings with regard to the questions pointed out in the ToR
* Conclusions based on evidence and analysis
* Recommendations as expected in the ToR, which are relevant and feasible and targeted to the respective audience
* Lessons learnt, as generalizations of conclusions for a wider use
* Management response plan
* Annexes (ToR, list of consulted persons/organizations, consults documentation, literature, etc.)

Key findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a clear and transparent

way, possibly put next to each other in a table to demonstrate the logic.

The report can be extended by the evaluator by additional points if necessary.

GRC HQ, the project team and the partner will analyse the final report, especially the feasibility of the recommendations proposed by the evaluator.

## 5.3 Responsibilities and duties

GRC, with the support of PRC:

* Will assign a primary coordinator for the selected consultant(s) for all technical, administrative and financial requirements
* Will provide all necessary program documents
* Will provide all logistics in country related to the implementation of the final evaluation, including transport and accommodation in the field, meeting locations, workshop organization etc. For international consultants, costs for international flights will be reimbursed, accommodation in the capital will be provided as well as support for visa
* Will provide staff and volunteers to support (including, but not limited to, data collection/enumeration) the final evaluation process in line with the agreed methodology proposed by the consultants
* Will provide timely feedback after receiving the draft reports and will be responsible for the approval of the final report
* Will pay the consultants according to the agreed contract and as per the payment methodology (section 8 of the ToR)
* Through the PRC will provide security briefing for the consultant and take care that security regulations are applied

The consultant:

* Will be responsible for the implementation, including workshops, the methodology, data analysis and the reporting
* Will follow the timeframe agreed with GRC and shall communicate any unforeseeable change as soon as possible to GRC country office and GRC NHQ
* Will prepare and facilitate the validation workshop
* Will timely deliver the draft and final report to GRC NHQ
* The consultant shall ensure that all activities are conducted in accordance with relevant and mandated technical guidance related to the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) as advised by the Philippine Red Cross, Government of Philippines, and the World Health Organization (WHO).

# **6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards**

The evaluator/s should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluator/s should adhere to the evaluation standards of the IFRC.

The consultant will be required to establish mechanisms to ensure data quality and compliance to technical writer standards and should be clearly indicated and described as part of the inception report. and compliance to technical writer standards and should be clearly indicated and described as part of the inception report. The intellectual property of the products and other supporting documents generated therefrom, shall be owned by the Philippine Red Cross and German Red Cross.

The final report will be evaluated by PRC and GRC based on a checklist of criteria. The evaluator will receive feedback from GRC before the final payment of the consultant contract is approved.

# **7. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application**

The following institutions will receive the final report: German Red Cross, Philippine Red Cross, the project donor BMZ.

The executive summary of the report can be published on the GRC webpage and PRC’s internal dashboard.

The accepted recommendations should be used by PRC and GRC to improve the implementation process of other DRR projects of PRC and GRC in the country and the partner organizations and stakeholders for their organizational learning.

A follow up should be organized and a respective plan be developed and implemented in an agreed timespan, to ensure the application of the recommendations by the user group of the evaluation.

**8. Payment modality**

The full amount negotiated by the parties will be disbursed to the consultant based on deliverables as per the points below:

* 25% of the consultancy fee will be paid upon signature of the contract.
* 25% of the consultancy fee will be paid one week after the Inception Report’s approval
* 50% of the consultancy fee upon approval of the Final Report

The fees will be paid by cash/cheque/bank account transfer upon agreement with the consultant. VAT and tax will be deducted as per local government policies.

# **9. Annexes**

* Annex 1: BMZ Social Structure Aid (SSF) funding information

Annex 1: BMZ Social Structure Aid (SSF) funding information

Since its inception in 2014, the 3-phases programme is funded by the Social Structural Funding (SSF) Scheme of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The overall objective of the SSF funding title is the creation of long-term structures in the supported countries through a multilevel approach (micro, meso and macro). Levels are interlinked from the beginning as it is expected that the combination of the three levels will lead to long-term development policy effects in the respective funding priorities of the funding title (in case of GRC, the relevant funding priority is “Support of National Aid Societies”).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Micro level** | In this context, the micro level is understood to mean the local unit or direct target group; particularly on this level measures with a model character can be promoted | | |
| **Measures and approaches:** training; practical training/continuing education; vocational trainings/ practical skills (e.g. volunteers) | | **Impacts**: e.g. improved access of beneficiaries to (RC-)services (adult education, welfare services, first aid, DRR etc.). Ideally these measures lead to an increased income/ reduced poverty of the target group (single persons and social groups e.g. households or communities) |
| **Meso level** | The meso level is the level of organizations, institutions and networks that are to be strengthened in their capacities | | |
| **Measures and Approaches:** institutional strengthening of the partner organizations and their networks (organizational development). Training and professional development of specialists/ experts (who will be multipliers) | | **Impacts**: e.g. improved quality of services (for ex. at local level) and strengthened capacity of service providers (e.g. vocational training centers); as well as their networks, including the capacity of consulting with governmental agencies |
| **Macro level** | The macro level is the (usually national) systemic or societal level at which the long-term impacts of the projects take effect (e. g. improvement of the political, legal, budgetary framework conditions in the funding area) | | |
| **Measures and Approaches**: e.g. political dialogue and lobby work. Consulting and strengthening governmental institutions, establishment of standards and norms in the thematic field of support: setting standards to allow good quality of provided services. | **Impacts**: e.g. capacity building on government level, development of standards and norms (e.g. curricula, social standards), statutory and budgetary anchoring of the funding area in the system | |

1. A barangay is usually the lowest administrative level in the Philippines. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The IFRC Evaluation Standards are:

   1. Utility: Evaluations must be useful and used.

   2. Feasibility: Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost effective manner.

   3. Ethics & Legality: Evaluations must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with particular regard for the welfare of those

   involved in and affected by the evaluation.

   4. Impartiality & Independence; Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that takes into

   account the views of all stakeholders.

   5. Transparency: Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.

   6. Accuracy: Evaluations should be technical accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined.

   7. Participation: Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate.

   8. Collaboration: Collaboration between key operating partners in the evaluation process improves the legitimacy and utility of the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)