

Terms of Reference for evaluation of Dutch Risk Reduction-Team

Final version 15 January 2020

Inhoud

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Background of the Dutch Risk Reduction-Team.....	1
3. Evaluation purpose, scope and research questions.....	5

1. Introduction

This tender is part of the Framework Contract for the performance of evaluation studies of international development programs of the Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO.nl, hereafter RVO). RVO supports private and public organizations with funding, connecting international business partners, knowledge-sharing, and sharing information about (trade) regulations. This support is mainly focused on international business in emerging markets and developing countries and is primarily commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). RVO has signed framework contracts with 14 contractors to undertake evaluations for the international development programs. This Terms of Reference provides specific details for an evaluation study of the Dutch Risk Reduction-Team (DRR, 2013-2019). This study falls under Lot 2 'Qualitative evaluations & reviews' as described in the Evaluation Framework. All parties included in the framework lot 1 and lot 2 are invited to respond to this tender.

2. Background of the Dutch Risk Reduction-Team

The Dutch Risk Reduction-Team (hereafter DRR-Team) was established in 2013 to respond adequately and at short notice to requests for assistance from foreign governments in the case of water-related disasters and / or urgent water issues.

The mission statement of the DRR-Team program is: *"increasing resilience of areas/population groups by reducing the risk of water disasters and limiting the consequences of a possible disaster."*

The main objective of the program for the period 2017-2020 is largely identical to that for the DRR-Team team in the 1st phase:

- DRR-Team aims to limit or prevent future damage in countries by deploying high-quality water experts on short notice in areas where water disasters have occurred, or to prevent water-related disasters.

An intended additional side effect is the international positioning of the Netherlands as a country with top expertise in the field of water. Positioning contributes to the financing of Dutch deployment by mobilizing non-Dutch public financing.

The deployment of the DRR-Team must lead to one or more of the intended outcomes:

1. Reduced socio-economic and environmental damage due to the reduction of risks associated with water-related disasters and thereby reduced expenditure in the field of emergency aid;
2. Reduced loss-of-life; especially among the poorest and most vulnerable (women, children);
3. Prevention or reduction of "regret" measures that are taken under pressure and which can have major negative effects on the development of the affected area in the (medium) long term;
4. Strengthening the use and effectiveness of sustainability principles;
5. Strengthened international position for the Netherlands as a knowledge centre for water expertise, disaster risk reduction, integrated planning and area development with an eye to water nuisance;
6. Involvement of the Dutch water sector in implementing measures as a result of the DRR-Team missions.

The DRR-Team is open to a worldwide commitment (all countries with which the MFA can start a political relationship) and has a budget of 4.6 million for five years (2016-2020) . The available Official

Development Assistance (ODA) funds (€ 2.5 million) are only used in countries that are eligible for Dutch development aid. The funds made available by the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management (I&W) € 2.1 million through Partners for Water), and the sector itself can also be used in other countries.

The DRR-Team program finances missions for Dutch water experts, who are deployed for short-term missions. These missions are coordinated by RVO which is also responsible for managing the expert pools.

2.1 Policy context

There are two main policy documents to which the DRR-Team responds. The first one is the policy document “[Investing in Global Prospects – for the world, for the Netherlands](#)”, from the MF). This is the main policy document on foreign trade and development cooperation (**BHOS**) and has been published in May 2018. The second policy document is the [Netherlands International Water Ambition \(NIWA\)](#), the 2019 sequel to the 2013 International Water Ambition (IWA). Concerning the IWA the BHOS policy document includes the following paragraph in which the broader strategic context is described. The BHOS policy documents is enclosed with this TOR. The excerpt below is taken from the BHOS document and describes - in short - the framework of the DRR-Team instrument.

Mobilising Dutch knowledge and expertise worldwide

The government wants to use Dutch knowledge and expertise worldwide to help achieve the SDGs and to take advantage of new business opportunities. The SDGs call for both ‘minor’ and ‘major’ innovations. Minor innovations may include, for example, modifying existing technology to suit a specific context; major innovations could entail system-wide breakthroughs on energy and other transitions. The market for such innovations is growing rapidly. The Business and Sustainable Development Commission’s report Better Business, Better World predicts that the market value related to implementing the SDGs between now and 2030 will rise to \$12 trillion. The Dutch business community also sees opportunities, for example the Dutch Sustainable Growth Coalition.

Thanks to its top sectors, the Netherlands is well positioned to contribute to integrated, creative and high-tech solutions to worldwide societal problems. Based on our specific strengths, the government wishes to focus on sustainable agriculture (SDG2), water (SDG6), healthcare (SDG3), logistics and transport (SDG9), smart cities (SDG11), sustainable energy (SDG7) and the circular economy (SDG12). We will also promote key enabling technologies like micro- and nanoelectronics, nanotechnology, industrial biotechnology, advanced materials, photonics, advanced manufacturing technology and ICT. This ties in with the top sector policy. It will require investment in innovation and research in the Netherlands, but also international cooperation with prominent high-tech businesses and knowledge institutions. In this way, we are able to strengthen our innovative capacity and our competitive position, while applying and marketing new insights and solutions for the SDGs worldwide. The government is therefore directing its economic diplomacy more specifically towards knowledge and international innovation cooperation and, with that in mind, is developing multi-annual programmes with public and private parties.

Our aim is also to apply our knowledge and expertise in developing countries, in cooperation with local partners. These countries are often not at the top of businesses’ agendas, but can certainly use Dutch knowledge and expertise. We want to make support for these countries a permanent component of national agendas like the Dutch national climate agreement, and of multi-annual public-private programmes. This can be designed in a similar way to the interministerial programme Partners for Water, which is part of the International Water Ambition (IWA). The IWA focuses on water safety and security in urban deltas in Bangladesh, Colombia, Egypt, Indonesia, Myanmar, Mozambique and Vietnam.

The NIWA focuses on how the Netherlands cooperates to contribute to water security and water safety worldwide. It also outlines the Dutch earning capacity in which it acknowledges the expertise and innovative strength of the Dutch water sector of the Netherlands as a country and expresses the ambition to further enhance the Dutch international role in addressing water challenges. In the NIWA a clear link with Climate Change, -mitigation, -adaptation and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 2, 5, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17) has been made of which SDG 6, 11 and 13 are directly linked to DRR-Team. The NIWA distinguishes three pillars of objectives and activities:

- (1) Contribute to enhancing local implementation capacity, including financing.
- (2) Advocate the integrated all-embracing approach to water safety and water security;
- (3) Strengthen the Netherlands as a “Centre of Excellence”;

Essentially, the pillars remain similar to the IWA, though the first and third pillar have changed position. The NIWA (Dutch version) is also enclosed with this TOR.

2.2 Management structure

As far as the day-to-day management of the facility is concerned, the decision making on sending teams to the field and recruitment of experts, is the responsibility of RVO, advised by the “Regieteam”. The *Regieteam* consists of policy advisors from the MFA (IGG and DIO) and I&W, and RVO. The Netherlands Water Partnership (NWP) is a participant of the *Regieteam* but is not a member. The *Interdepartementale Stuurgroep* - in which the directors of IGG, DIO and I&W/DGWB participate - is the overarching body and mandates the execution of missions. RVO is responsible for all necessary actions involved in coordinating a mission, herein it closely works together with Dutch embassies and consulates in the recipient countries.

The selection criteria for a DRR-Team request are:

- (1) Request from central government in recipient country (although DRR-Team has on occasion responded to EU and UN requests as well);
- (2) The intervention before or after a disaster, or structural solution of a threatening disaster, there must be urgent;
- (3) Intervention should be water related;
- (4) Dutch knowledge should have an added value;
- (5) According to the MFA, The Netherlands already have, or can start political/economic relations

Netherlands Water Partnership (NWP): program management, database management (recruitment), communication stakeholders and involvement of the water sector.

Enclosed you will find the report about the activities of the NWP from April 1 2017 until December 31 2018. This report gives a detailed description of their activities. This TOR highlights some relevant aspects of the database management, communication and involvement of the water sector. The DRR-Team coordinator meets regularly with the NWP representative who also participates in the meetings of the DRR-Team regieteam to discuss the progress of the activities carried out by NWP.

In order to deploy experienced and capable team-leaders and experts at short-term notice, NWP has been mandated to establish a database in which a pool (35) of team-leaders (450) and experts are registered. The pool of Team Leaders consists of only 35 persons in order to a.o. create a community to share knowledge and experience and function as water ambassadors for the Dutch water sector in

particular, DRR-Team. The small group of Team Leaders have also given their consent – in advance - to be deployed on a short-term notice.

NWP has equally been mandated by RVO to facilitate communication concerning the DRR-Team programme. To that effect, NWP has set up and maintains a website for DRR -Team (www.drrteam-dsswater.nl). The Dutch Embassies, next to the participating experts, also play an active role in the communication as they maintain contact with local authorities and stakeholders in the country. Their involvement is preconditional for the achievement of a mission.

Lastly the NWP informs the Dutch water sector on the outcomes of the mission and possible opportunities for follow-up and if relevant, organises meetings for the Netherlands water sector after a DRR-Team mission has been carried out.

2.3 Midterm evaluation

A mid-term evaluation was conducted in 2016, the main conclusion on the implementation of DRR-Team were as follows:

- The DRR-Team is appreciated. All Dutch persons interviewed appreciate the DRR-Team as an instrument. Its purpose, accessibility, and flexibility are valued.
- The DRR-Team is appreciated. The recipient organisations have appreciated the availability and quality of the DRR-Team missions. However, there are also indications of misunderstanding of what can be expected from DRR-Team especially in the context of further Dutch funding.
- The management of the DRR-Team and the conduct of missions is done to a commendable standard. The process of preparing for missions (demand articulation, local ownership, terms of reference, team selection) and the after-care (reporting, follow-up actions both in the Netherlands and abroad) require a great amount of attention. This has led to high management costs.
- The missions are carried out well. Their terms of reference are ambitious, reflecting the multiple wishes and ambitions of the DRR-Team. The expertise of the missions is high, but the time allotted to the mission may not be commensurate to the ambitions of the ToR. The possible follow-up process to advice given is often duly addressed, but hardly in the hands of DRR-Team.
- The embassies play a most important role: both in the preparation for, the conduct of and the follow-up to DRR-Team missions.
- The effectiveness and efficiency of DRR-Team will probably always be hard to establish, given its broad objective (creating momentum), its broad scale and scope, its hesitance to set priorities and dependence upon others for follow-up of advice given.

Selected main recommendations on implementation of DRR-Team. Some of these recommendations already have been implemented:

- Develop a common language on objectives and priorities. Currently the mix of opinions on objectives and priorities of the DRR-Team is far-ranging. There was no need to set priorities as supply of funds exceeded demand. This situation has already been changed in the course of 2016.
- The quality of the missions requires continuous attention. A clear articulation of the demand is required. Make an effort to be clear on objectives and expectations. Consider the quality of advice as the primary concern of the DRR-Team.
- Be creative in shaping scoping missions. Provide for flexibility in the terms of reference.

- Consciously seek alliances for follow-up (of implementation of solutions, bankable projects).
- Be in all cases prepared to conduct a “follow-up” mission if the situation warrants that. Manage DRR-Team funds to be able to do so.
- Strive for good involvement of the Dutch water sector representatives, which requires an effort from both the fund managers and the representatives. The current discussion tends to be too much on funding and consultancies, rather than content.
- Be cautious / critical about DRR-Team overhead costs. Improve monitoring. Consistently ask for feedback from recipient organisations.

3. Evaluation purpose, scope and research questions

This evaluation should establish whether or not the programme achieved what it set out to accomplish. Furthermore, the evaluation serves to inform possible continuation of the DRR-Team programme, and thus should provide recommendations on how to improve upon existing processes.

3.1 Purpose

This study of the DRR-Team programme serves as a learning evaluation to provide insights on the outcomes of the DRR-Team programme, specifically related to the missions that were realised between 2013 and 2020, and to what extent they contributed to the main objective. The evaluation is expected to cover both phases of the DRR-Team programme, 2014-2016 and 2017-2020.

Secondly, the study should establish which components (and to what extent) have proven to be an effective approach to realise (provide conditions for) results. This part of the research is process oriented, and should specifically look at the actions prior, during and after the mission conducted by RVO, MFA, I&W, NWP, embassies, and other involved facilitators and how these actions relate to the success of a mission.

Both the outcome- and process-oriented parts of the research should provide insights in the success of the DRR-Team instrument and how to improve the existing DRR-Team instrument for its next phase.

The intended key stakeholders of the evaluation are:

- DRR-Team
- MFA policy advisors (IGG and DIO)
- I&W policy advisors
- Netherlands Water Partnership
- RVO

3.2 Rationale for the evaluation

To ensure this evaluation will add value to already existing research, reviews and evaluation reports, in this learning evaluation RVO aims to:

- Establish the success the DRR-Team programme in regards to its main objective;
- and establish how processes -from incoming request to mission execution and follow-up- influence and determine the success (outcome) of a mission.

3.3 Scope

Timewise, the scope of the evaluation spans a period from 2014 until 2019 (and perhaps early 2020), including both the first and second phase of the DRR-Team programme. The first phase lasted from 2014 until 2016, the second phase will last from 2017 until June 2020. During the evaluation, it may be possible that new missions are executed, this will likely lay outside of the scope of this evaluation.

At the time of writing, DRR-Team had organised missions to 44 countries. Some countries have welcomed a DRR-Team mission more than once, this can be a follow-up mission to the first mission and/or a new mission based on another request.

This evaluation should include desk research into a large number of missions in order to establish a broad understanding of what DRR-Team has achieved. This includes a review of existing documents (provided by RVO) and interviews with stakeholders involved in the DRR-Team instrument e.g. RVO, MFA, I&W, NWP, Dutch embassies, and mission leaders and water experts that have been sent on mission for DRR-Team. Adding to this we are looking for several reviews of missions, for which we would like to see a more in-depth approach; e.g. interviews with the inviting government authorities and observations of actual follow-up (possibly with beneficiaries and International Financial Institutions). Furthermore, this extra step should verify what has been found in the desk research and provide an insight into the factors that led to and/or prevented follow-up (please refer to section 3.5 for elaboration).

3.4 Evaluation questions

This evaluation will provide a thorough analysis, the answers to the questions will inform future policy decisions and identify lessons learnt for future instruments and programmes. In several individual consultations with policy advisors from MFA, I&W and RVO, and during a breakdown, one leading question was identified:

What has been the contribution of the DRR-Team instrument in the prevention and mitigation of water-related calamities and structural water problems?

To support the leading research question, three sub-questions were formulated:

1. Which results have been realised after completion of the missions?
2. Which factors (internal and external) can be identified as supportive and disruptive for obtaining these results?
3. How has DRR-Team contributed to the positioning of the Dutch water sector?

The evaluators are expected to translate the evaluation findings into recommendations that respond to current policy issues and can be applied/incorporated in the continuation of the DRR-Team programme after June 2020.

EXPLANATION OF EVALUATIONS QUESTIONS

Leading question: what has been the contribution of the DRR-Team instrument in the prevention and mitigation of water-related calamities and structural water problems?

The leading research question aims to evaluate to what extent DRR-Team has contributed to its main objective. In this respect, the answers to this question should establish whether or not this instrument has given impetus to countries to act upon the recommendations given by water experts to prevent or reduce the impact of (future) water-related disasters. It should also look at the underlying reasons why local authorities have acted upon the recommendations, or why not.

Sub-question 1: which results have been realised after completion of the missions? Sub-question 2: which factors (internal and external) can be identified as supportive and disruptive for obtaining these results? Sub-question 3: how has DRR-Team contributed to the positioning of the Dutch water sector?

It is underlined that the evaluation should pay sufficient attention to the extent to which DRR-Team has reached its main objective through local government action. The DRR-Team instrument can provide advice, but it is up to the requesting governments to act upon the recommendations. Which conditions determine whether or not a government or local authority acts, and are there similarities to be found in these conditions among the varying settings in which the recommendations were made? To delve into this aspect, sub-questions 1 and 2 have been formulated.

The evaluation should indicate what the enabling as well as disrupting factors to achieving results are. These factors can be found in the mission coordination and all (internal) underlying steps (request, process *regieteam*, preparation, the mission itself, after care, follow-up), and in factors that are perhaps outside of the scope and influence of the DRR-Team instrument but which do have an influence (external). The evaluation should provide an overview of these conditions/factors and establish the similarities and differences, and provide recommendations on how to improve the instrument. In doing so, the evaluation is also expected to look at the relationship between costs/inputs on the one hand, and outputs/outcomes on the other as well. The evaluation is expected to establish what key steps are needed to organise these missions, evaluating the role of all processes involved from request till follow-up.

In addition, this evaluation should establish what role the DRR-Team instrument has played in the positioning of the Dutch water sector (companies, knowledge institutes, NGOs, and Dutch government organisations in foreign markets) as a whole, and how this sector has benefitted from the instrument. Were Dutch parties involved in the follow-up, and what were the reasons thereof?

Answers to the questions above should lead to an indication of what is going well, and what could be improved. In addition, the evaluation should provide recommendations how these processes can be improved upon, therewith making the planning of the missions more efficient. Moreover, it should establish whether or not the current design of the DRR-Team instrument is still aligned with policy and developments such as climate change, climate mitigation, climate adaptation, and how it contributes to the current result frameworks of RVO, the MFA and I&W.

3.5 Methodology

To answer the evaluation questions, the research ought to be a mix of qualitative research methods. The contractor is expected to collect qualitative data from the *Regieteam* members, RVO, MFA, I&W, NWP, Dutch embassies, International Financial Institutions, and mission leaders and water experts that have been sent on mission for DRR-Team. The contractor is also expected to use the available project documentation, monitoring data, data from the mid-term evaluation, and internal reviews; documentation will be made available by RVO. This part of the research is referred to as desk research. In addition to the desk research, the contractor is expected to carry out an in-depth research into a select number of missions, for which interviews with the requesting governments are to be held and where (possible) field visits are to be conducted.

The contractor is expected to develop a method for the use of case selection. Due to limited time and resources, it is not possible to evaluate all missions that were carried out under DRR-Team since 2014. Hence, a selection needs to be made. During the midterm review, the *Regieteam* was responsible for making this selection (see the box below for the selection criteria), but to ensure impartiality it is required for the contractor to carry out this task. The contractor is expected to come up with a selection method for both the desk research and the in-depth research. This should be elaborated on in the methodology section.

The triangulation of data; 1. documentation, 2. interviews with those involved in DRR-Team e.g. RVO, embassies, and 3. Interviews with governments, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders should establish an accurate picture to what extent the DRR-Team instrument has achieved its main objective.

The cases or the midterm evaluation were selected based on these five criteria: (i) regional spread, (ii) spread of country characteristics such as market potential, water sector financing situation, link to parallel activities, (iii) development cooperation context, (iv) budget, and (v) reported by Regieteam members to be interesting from a lessons-to-learn perspective. The selection was discussed with and approved by the Regieteam at the start of the review.

3.6 Management of the evaluation

RVO is the commissioner of this evaluation. In turn, RVO has assigned Lisa Hartog as the principle coordinator for the full evaluation process. She will also be the main contact for the contracted consultant.

RVO organized a reference group assigned with the following tasks:

- Assessment of technical proposals and selection of contractor;
- Assessment and approval of Inception report;
- Provide Input for the selection of sample for interviews and field visits;
- Provide support when organizing field visits;
- Input and support with organizing validation sessions with stakeholders;
- Assessment and feedback on Draft Final report;
- Approval Final report;
- Participation in feedback sessions.

The reference group consists of:

- MFA: Piebe Hoeksma
- RVO / M&E: Angela van den Broek
- RVO / DRR-Team: Lisa Hartog, Liske Verheij, Julius Seinen
- IOB: Pim de Beer

3.7 Description of the research team

The proposed evaluation team has to be able to address the evaluation questions in a methodologically sound and timely manner, in accordance with the foreseen planning and research questions. The candidate contractor should describe the composition of his proposed team and the roles of the team members in the execution of the evaluation. The evaluation team should reflect the expertise needed to fulfil the assignment, e.g. experts in qualitative methods (qualitative evaluation skills, including in depth field research skills and field experience) should be represented in the team, including thematic knowledge about the aid and trade agenda, as well as relevant sector-knowledge.

The responsibility for this assignment rests with the team leader, in collaboration with the evaluation team. This responsibility includes the development of a research approach and associated methodology, ensuring a proper conduct of the evaluation process, and producing accurate evaluation reports that meet quality standards and answer the evaluation questions. The main tasks of the team leader include:

- Designing the evaluation approach and methodology;
- Submitting the draft inception report that includes the evaluation methodology and elaborates an evaluation matrix;
- Planning, coordinating and performing quality control;
- Submitting evaluation reports;
- Proactively communicating with RVO and ensure participation of RVO in the process.

The team leader should have extensive experience in conducting similar evaluations and avail of a network of experienced evaluators in relevant countries and sectors.

Please elaborate on the composition of the proposed team, the expertise and roles of the team members as well as its coherence. The evaluation team should demonstrate experience with similar assignments. Please note that country and sector experience is considered essential and involvement of local experts is strongly encouraged.

RVO will contract the contractor in compliance with the general framework agreement for tendering evaluations. The team leader proposed by the contractor will, in turn, contract the evaluators. The team leader and evaluators must not have been involved in any way in the design or implementation of DRR-Team nor may they have commercial interests that compete with DRR-Team interests.

The evaluator should furthermore adhere to the guiding principles and ethical standards described in Chapter 5 of the IOB 'Evaluation policy and guidelines for evaluations' and should make explicit in the proposal which code of ethics they adhere to (and attach a signed version).