

United Nations Development Programme – INDIA
 CPAP 2008-2012
 Annual Work Plan 2010 (January - December)



Project Title	GOI-UNDP Disaster Risk Reduction Project
Award ID:	
Project ID:	
Project Start and end date:	2009 to 2012
Corresponding CP Outcome(s): <i>(Those linked to the project and extracted from the CPAP)</i>	<p>Outcome 4.1 -Communities and institutions have established preparedness mechanisms and partnerships to effectively respond to and recover from the impact of disasters</p> <p>Outcome 4.2 -Communities are aware of their vulnerabilities and adequately prepared to manage (and reduce) disaster related risks</p>
Corresponding CP Output(s): (of this Programme)	<p>Output 1: State and District Disaster Mangement Authorities are better prepared to cope with disasters and to ensure that the recovery activities are equitqble .</p> <p>Output 2: Plans for a coordinated response and recovery mechanisms consolidated at the state and district levels</p> <p>Output 3: Communities are supported by State and district institutions to reduce their risks to natural disasters</p> <p>Output 4: Strengthened capacities at community level for participatory inclusive and integrated planning for post-disaster recovery programmes</p>
National Project and Programme Director	<i>Joint Secretary, National Disaster Management Authority</i>
Implementing Partner:	National Disaster Management Authority
Responsible Parties:	National Disaster Management Authority, DDMA's, UNDP, State Governments and District Administration

AHL TISA
 2010/10/20
 10/20/2010

Project Results for achieving Institutional Strengthening and capacity building for Disaster Risk Reduction

Project outputs	Indicators	Baseline
Establishment of Vibrant and functional State and District Disaster Management Authorities	Number of SDMA's and DDMA's which have become fully functional which could be verified by regularity of their meetings, formulation of State and respective district disaster management policy and other relevant indicators as brought out in the indicators in CPAP 2008-12	0
Building resilience of poor Scheduled castes and scheduled tribes considering their specific vulnerabilities to hazards and develop strategies to enhance the coping capacities	Number of community specific vulnerabilities identified and pilot activities undertaken to enhance coping capacities in select areas which could be field tested and later incorporated in the DM plans at each level to facilitate monitoring of the relevant indicators in CPAP 2008-12	0
Take up focused activities to identify specific vulnerabilities of women to hazards and develop strategies to enhance the coping capacities	Number of women specific vulnerabilities identified and pilot activities undertaken in select areas which could be field tested and later incorporated in the DM plans at each level to facilitate monitoring of the relevant indicators in CPAP 2008-12	0
Integrate disaster risk management with Development Programmes	Number of specific tools and methodologies developed for mainstreaming DRR into development planning/programmes and incorporation of Risk reduction into major development programmes and Number of Guidelines developed for Community Risk Assessment	0
Knowledge Management	Number of Knowledge networks, Knowledge sharing/strengthening and Networking Partnerships with academic institutions and universities and development of Web-based resource centre (similar to IDKN) and expansion of Solution Exchange Community of Practice apart from updating of IDRN in the DDMA's where the programme is implemented.	0

Project and AWP 2010 BUDGET:

UNDP funds	Government funds	Donor funds*	Total
US \$ 6.3 million	-	US \$ 6.3 million	USD 12.6 million (for entire project duration) approx-Rs 63 crores
			USD 4.00 million (for 2010) approx-Rs 20 crores

Agreed by (Implementing Partner):

[Signature] 10-12-09

Agreed by UNDP:

[Signature]
10.12.09

AMIT JHA
Joint Secretary
National Disaster Management Authority
Government of India

ANNUAL WORK PLAN:

Year: 2010

EXPECTED TARGETS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	MONTH OF COMPLETION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	BUDGET(US DOLLARS)
<p>TARGET 1 for 2010 Capacity Building of State and District Disaster Management Authorities and other stakeholders in Disaster Risk Reduction in at least 15 States/SDMAs and at least 45 districts/DDMAs</p>	<p>1.1 Activity Result Capacity building of DM institutions by providing trained human resource support and also initiate community capacity building activities</p> <p>1.1 Activity Actions: 1.1.1 Set up Project team with experts at central, state and district levels, establish National Steering Committee and a project monitoring and evaluation system. 1.1.2 Identify State Project Officers, state teams and state steering committee. 1.1.3. Identify and assess the capacities of responsible parties at state level. 1.1.4. Set up web based monitoring system with comprehensive data and tools at centre and state level to administer and track progress on DRR programmes and schemes. 1.1.5 Initiate Community capacity building exercises 1.1.6 Formulation of model state , district, block and village plans</p>	<p>1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 – June 2010</p> <p>1.1.4 – by Decemeber 2010</p> <p>1.1.5- March 2010</p> <p>1.1.6 - by Decemeber 2010</p>	<p>Selected State Governments, SDMAs /selected DDMAs in each project state</p>	<p>1,000,000</p>

	<p>1.2. Activity Result: Composite Risk Atlas prepared in atleast 4 selected multi hazard prone states and initiate detailed Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (HRVA) conducted in 3 selected districts in each state where the project is implemented</p> <p>Activity Actions: 1.2.1 Selection of four States, one in each region and selection of three districts in each project state 1.2.2. Development of TOR. 1.2.3 Identification of agencies. 1.2.4 Collection and analysis of data. 1.2.5 Consultation Validation workshops. 1.2.6 Final Assessment report and selected district level state strategies</p>	<p>1.2.1,1.2.2, 1.2.3 –BY June 2010</p> <p>1.2.4,1.2.5, 1.2.6 – By December 2010</p>		1,100,000
	<p>1.3. Activity Result: Specific tools and methodologies for mainstreaming DRR into development planning/programmes</p> <p>1.3. Activity Action: 1.3.1 Training manuals and sectoral guidelines for DRR and recovery including manuals on microinsurance for DRR and recovery 1.3.2 State level workshops on mainstreaming DRR into development, Micro-insurance and reconstruction 1.3.3 Decentralised planning for DRR</p>	<p>1.3.1 By December 2010</p> <p>1.3.2 By Septemeber 2010</p> <p>1.3.3 By Decemeber 2010</p>	<p>State Governments /SDMA/DDM A/ATIs</p> <p>State Governments /SDMA/DDM A/ATIs</p>	200,000

	<p>1.4. Activity Result Training conducted for community ,block and district level officials and other stakeholders on preparation and updation of DM plans.</p> <p>1.4. Activity Action</p> <p>1.4.1 Identification of stakeholders 1.4.2 Inclusion of DRR training in the training calendar of the institutions</p>	<p>1.4.1 March 2010 1.4.2 December 2010</p>	<p>State Governments /SDMA/DDM A/ATIs</p>	<p>40,100</p>
	<p>1.5. Activity Result State Level TOT Programme conducted in selected States</p> <p>1.5. Activity Action</p> <p>1.5.1 Development of Training module for TOT 1.5.2 Selection of participants from selected States to build core capacities in ATIs 1.5.3 Organization of training</p>	<p>1.5.1 June 2010 1.5.2 , 1.5.3 December 2010</p>	<p>State Governments /SDMA/DDM A/ATIs</p>	<p>250,000</p>
				<p>2,590,100</p>

<p>Target 2 for 2010</p> <p>Capacity Building of communities and institutions in preparedness, response and recovery at the Centre/selected States by developing Methodologies and guidelines for post disaster damage, loss and need assessment (atleast 1 at National Level and 3 at State</p> <p>Levels and conduct of atleast 3 training programmes</p>	<p>2.1 Activity Result:</p> <p>Methodology for post disaster damage, loss and need assessment at national and state levels</p> <p>Activity Action:</p> <p>2.1.1 Identification and selection of States/SDMAs for development of methodology in post disaster damage, loss and need assessment</p> <p>2.1.2 Selection of institutions</p> <p>2.1.3 Preparation of methodology</p> <p>2.1.4 Validation of methodology</p>	<p>2.1.1,2.1.2, 2.1.3 –June 2010</p> <p>2.1.4 – By December 2010</p>	<p>NDMA/SDMA NIDM</p>	<p>225,000</p>
	<p>2.2 Activity Result</p> <p>Training conducted and sector specific training modules developed for post disaster damage loss and need assessment</p> <p>Activity Action:</p> <p>2.2.1 Training of Trainers</p> <p>2.2.2 Demonstration and training in the use of the methodology</p> <p>2.2.3 Development of Training Modules</p> <p>2.2.4 Validation of Training Modules</p>	<p>2.2.1,2.2.2, 2.2.3,2.2.4 – By September 2010</p>	<p>NIDM, SDMAs, ATIs and other training/resource institutions</p>	<p>50,000</p>
	<p>2.3 Activity Result</p> <p>State specific awareness generation strategy designed, products developed and programmes organised</p> <p>2.3 Activity Action</p> <p>2.3.1 Awareness Strategy developed</p> <p>2.3.2 IEC materials prepare</p>	<p>2.3 –June 2010</p>		<p>260,000</p>

	<p>2.4 Activity Result District level training and capacity building programmes organised for PRI members</p> <p>2.4 Activity Action</p> <p>2.4.1 Review of existing training modules</p> <p>2.4.2 Review of training calendars and availability of budgets vis-à-vis leveraging of resources as well as support under the programme</p> <p>2.5 Activity Result</p> <p>District Level training and capacity programmes for NGOs, CBOs and other community level organisations on CBDRM</p> <p>2.5 Activity Action</p> <p>2.5.1 Identification/Selection of NGOs.</p> <p>2.5.2 Identification of training gaps.</p>	<p>2.4 June 2010</p> <p>2.5.1 – June 2010</p> <p>2.5.2 December 2010</p>	<p>SPIRD,SIRD, DDMA's and SDMA's</p> <p>SDMA/DDMA's/ATIs/SIPRD and SIRD</p>	<p>150,000</p> <p>80,000</p> <p>7,65,000</p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>Target 3 Knowledge networking strengthened by having a target of at least 5 No. of institutions engaged in knowledge networking and information/knowledge sharing</p>	<p>3.1 Activity Result Partnerships with knowledge-based organisations and networks on DRR expanded</p> <p>3.1 Activity Action</p> <p>3.1.1 develop knowledge resource centre at NDMA</p> <p>3.1.2 Hosting of selected information/E-sharing of issues/approaches based on research, consultations</p> <p>3.1.3 Conduct of workshops, training and also undertake initiatives on cross-cutting issues involving national level interventions to be undertaken by NDMA</p> <p>3.1.4 To strengthen knowledge networking/sharing organise experience sharing with local, regional, and international success stories</p>	<p>3.1 --By 2010</p>	<p>SDMA/IITs/local engineering colleges, SERC, HSMI, BMTPC, TISS</p>	<p>250,000</p>
				<p>250,000</p>
	<p>Project Management Support Staff (POs, PMs, SPOs and DPOs)</p> <p>State Coordination Support</p> <p>Travel and Mission Costs</p> <p>Miscellaneous Costs</p> <p>Equipment</p> <p>Communication Costs (1%)</p> <p>ISS(3%)</p>		<p>MHA/NDMA/SDMAs/DDM As</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p></p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>UNDP</p>	<p>100,000</p> <p>30,000</p> <p>50,000</p> <p>10,000</p> <p>50,000</p> <p>240,000</p> <p>3,845,100</p> <p>38,451</p> <p>3,883,551</p> <p>116,507</p>
<p>TOTAL</p>				<p>4,000,059</p>

Project Overview

I. Situation Analysis

i. Disaster Profile of India

India's geo-climatic conditions as well as its high incidence of poverty and socio-economic vulnerability, make it one of the most disaster prone countries in the world. Among the disasters which strike the country on a regular basis are floods, droughts, earthquakes, cyclones, landslides, and fire.

According to the National Commission for Floods, 40 million hectares of land in India is identified as flood-prone. On average 18.6 million hectares of land is flooded annually. More than half of India's total area of 3.28 million km falls in seismic zones, with the Himalaya, the Rann of Kutch, the Assam-Meghalaya Region and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands being the most active regions falling in zone V. India is one of six major cyclone-prone countries in the world. Of the nearly 7,500 km long coastline, approximately 5,700 km is prone to cyclones arising from the Bay of Bengal and Arabian Sea. On average six tropical cyclones form in the Bay of Bengal and Arabian Sea every year, of which 2 or 3 are severe. In fact, the two major cyclone seasons in the North Indian Ocean are from May to June and from mid-September to mid-December. Cyclonic storms and storm surges have been responsible for some severe fatalities along the coasts, the worst of which was caused during the Orissa Super cyclone (1999). The hilly regions of India are susceptible to landslide and avalanche hazards. The most vulnerable are the Himalayan Mountains followed by the North-Eastern hill ranges.

According to India's Tenth Five Year Plan, natural disasters have affected nearly 6% of the population and 24% of deaths in Asia caused by disasters have occurred in India. Between 1996 and 2001, 2% of national GDP was lost because of natural disasters, and nearly 12% of Government revenue was spent on relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction during the same period. As per a World Bank study in 2003, natural disasters pose a major impediment on the path of economic development in India.

ii. Emerging trends in hazards and vulnerabilities

a. Overall Context of Vulnerability

The poor as well as non-poor are both vulnerable to the impact of disasters in India. The impact of over a million *kutchas* houses getting destroyed due to floods and other disasters and large tracts of agricultural land get silted during floods leading to widespread malnutrition, homelessness, disruptions of education, and erosion of livelihoods, often felt by the poor. The growing vulnerability of these large populations which gets affected by both intensive and extensive events leads to exclusion of a large number of people from the expanding market economy.

It is estimated that India's urban population was 25% of the total population of 850 million in 1992 and 28% of 1.03 billion in 2002 and the **World Bank approximates that by 2017** it will reach a staggering half-a-billion people. The increasing concentration of people in metropolises as well as smaller cities has not been matched by the supply of housing and civic amenities. The

demand for land in cities has led to the use of marginal land such as floodplains, unstable slopes and reclaimed land, which are prone to natural hazards. People living in unplanned and unregulated settlements are particularly exposed to floods, which are compounded in urban areas by the obstruction of natural drainage. Severe flooding in India's metropolitan cities in recent years e.g. Mumbai 2005, and Chennai and Bangalore in 2006, indicate the high vulnerability of urban areas to flash floods. Poor construction in urban areas often leads to fires and building collapse during earthquakes.

b. Need for a recovery framework

Soon after the relief phase in a disaster, early recovery phase starts and the focus shifts to restoration of basic services and provision of emergency/ interim shelter so that affected people can return to live in basic, non-critical life-threatening conditions. This is followed by long-term recovery, which is a development phase, where recovery activities, including DRR measures are undertaken. The Government of India has established elaborate mechanisms for coordinating within Government relief activities as well as mechanisms to deal with the emergency requirements. With adequate financial allocation to meet the eventualities, the government has been following a policy of not issuing any appeal for international assistance for relief.

Recovery process requires a common understanding among all partners of various elements such as timeframe, use of material and technology, sharing of resources, stakeholder and community participation, and guidelines and procedures that incorporate appropriate transparency and accountability measures. Often recovery is conducted in an ad hoc fashion without appropriate post disaster damage and needs assessment, technical guidelines for safe (re)construction, insufficient use of local materials, and inadequate financial support and technical expertise. Post-disaster recovery not only aims to restore 'normalcy' but also to 'build back better', to reduce future risks and expand the opportunities for sustainable development. Thus, there is greater value in making extra efforts to promote a wider understanding of recovery as part of the sustainable development process.

NDMA is presently involved in developing a guidelines on Minimum Standards of relief as mandated by the DM Act 2005, which will address the issues related to different challenges faced by socially and economically disadvantaged sections of the population. Not having a uniform format of assessment and reporting on relief, rehabilitation and recovery leads to difficulties in addressing the different needs and situations of different groups such as economically and socially weak segments and poor people. Communities faced with high intensity disasters often receive a higher recovery package than those faced with low-intensity disasters such as drought, landslides, annual floods and fire. A common framework can only be implemented as part of government policy within a clear legislative framework for recovery.

c. Institutional Developments

While districts remain the focal points in the event of a disaster, for all practical purposes the disaster management in India is primarily considered the responsibility of State Governments with the Central government providing financial and logistical support in the case of a major disaster through established mechanisms and procedures. In the aftermath of the Gujarat earthquake in 2001, the need for a shift in approach for disaster management, similar to what has been proposed by the High Powered Committee was felt. This was followed by a government level review, which developed a strategic roadmap addressing disaster prevention,

mitigation and preparedness measures, known as the National Disaster Management Framework. At the Government of India level the Ministry of Home Affairs acts as the nodal Ministry coordinating all the efforts.

The most important development in recent times was the enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005 that has established requisite institutional mechanisms for drawing up and monitoring the implementation of DM plans. The Act established the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister, as the apex body responsible for laying down policies, plans and guidelines on DM so as to ensure timely and effective disaster response. Since its inception, the Authority has issued hazard specific management guidelines as well as initiated several new projects to strengthen capacities for mitigation. The NDMA also has the responsibility of coordinating the enforcement and implementation of the national plan and policy on disaster management.

The Disaster Management Act 2005 also decreed that State and District Disaster Management Authorities be established. This has happened in some States and is on-going in others. An eight battalion-strong National Disaster Response Force has been set up comprising of 144 specialized response teams on various types of disasters. The Civil Defence is being revamped to strengthen local efforts for disaster preparedness and effective response and the Fire Brigade is being strengthened to make it more multi-hazard responsive. The National Institute of Disaster Management (NIDM) was created for training, capacity building, research and documentation on various natural and manmade disasters.

d. Objectives of the GOI-UNDP DRR Programme

The DRR programme is envisaged to support Central and State Government Programmes and initiatives by providing critical inputs that would enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of these efforts. The pillars that have shaped the programme formulation through extensive consultations with the stakeholders are the following:

- DRM actions stipulated in the National DM Act (2005) to be undertaken by DM structures at various levels
- DRR priorities identified in the Eleventh Five Year Plan
- Actions highlighted in the Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA)
- Lessons learnt from the implementation of GoI-UNDP Disaster Risk Management Programme.

Within the above parameters the programme strives to strengthen the institutional structures to undertake disaster risk reduction activities at various levels, including the risk being enhanced due to climate change, and develop preparedness for recovery.

With a view to achieve the two relevant UNDP CPAP outcomes namely

1. Communities and institutions have established preparedness mechanisms and partnerships to effectively respond to and recover from the impact of disasters
2. Communities are aware of their vulnerabilities and adequately prepared to manage (and reduce) disaster and environmental related risks

The programme specific outcomes have been arrived at and are as follows:

- Strengthened SDMAs and DDMAAs to fulfill the responsibilities stipulated in the National DM Act (2005), especially with respect to DRM.
- Methodologies and modalities developed for ensuring risk reduction through development programmes of all partners at national, state and community levels.
- Advocacy for Urban risk reduction by addressing planning and development issues and amendments suggested in the suitable legislative and regulatory mechanisms wherever necessary, undertaken.
- Recovery framework setup through which the people affected by disasters are able to access resources for "building back better"..
- Knowledge and information sharing platform in disaster management are strengthened

II. Project Strategy of the GoI-UNDP DRR Project

As mentioned earlier, under the overall GoI-UNDP DRR Programme 2009-2012 this DRR project would address the priorities and issues underlined in the national development plans, UNDAF and the CPAP. The programme would be implemented by the Government with the involvement of civil society partners with UNDP support at the National, State and local levels. It would seek the support of different government agencies and line departments in mainstreaming DRR into development programs and in developing feasible risk reduction interventions. It would promote community-level interventions, with an emphasis on social inclusion and gender equity and empowerment. It would establish partnerships with NGOs and academic institutions to provide the programme with wider outreach.

Under the project efforts would be made to strengthen the capacities of State and District Disaster Management Authorities (DMAs) to reduce disaster risk proactively, and implement timely, sustainable, and locally relevant recovery activities in post-disaster situations. It would emphasize institution-building and technical capacity-building, including NGOs, private sector and academia. There will also be a focus on the training activities at the community and local body level.

III. Project Deliverables

The project would consist of a number of deliverables and activities which are listed in detail the work plan to cover the expected outputs :

1. Institutional strengthening and capacity building for DRR
2. Capacity-building for recovery;

The deliverables would include -

- capacity building of the DM institutions by providing trained human resource support . Human Resource Support provided under the project will be linked to specific capacity building activities to be achieved by these institutions.
- Take up detailed hazard and vulnerability assessment of in selected states and the districts.
- Specific tools and methodologies for mainstreaming DRR into development planning and programmes would be developed
- State level training of trainers programme conducted to develop capacities. Training activities at the communities and the local bodies level will be focused upon.

IV. Management Arrangements

Role and Responsibility of the Project Steering Committee, National Project and Programme Director:

National Disaster Management Authority would be the implementing partner. A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be set up in the NDMA under the Project and will comprise designated representatives from the NDMA, Ministry of Home affairs, State Governments, UNDP and other relevant stakeholders including representatives from various departments of Central and State governments. NDMA will nominate a National Project Director (NPD) at the national level who will be responsible for managing the project on day to day basis.

The PSC will carry out the following functions:

- Ensure that the project goals and objectives are achieved in the defined timeframe;
- Review the project progress and suggest implementation strategies periodically;
- Review the project expenditures against activities and outcomes; and
- Approve Annual and Quarterly Work Plans.

The PSC will be the group responsible for taking management decisions for the specific programme outcome 'Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Reduction and would report to the Programme Management Board (PMB).

All decision making will be the responsibility of PSC and the Programme Management Board. The UNDP regulations, rules and policy will be adhered to while taking those decisions. NDMA will sign an Annual Work Plan with detailed budget with UNDP on an annual basis.

Responsible Parties: NDMA, UNDP, State Governments' where the project is implemented and the National, State Disaster Management Authority, DDMA's, and the training and academic institutions identified would be the responsible parties

Role and responsibility of the State-level Steering Committees: For the States that are identified for taking up activities under the specific programme outcome areas at the State level, the State level Steering Committees will be set up and will be chaired by the Principal Secretary of the Department responsible for Disaster Management and would be convened by the State Level Project Director. While the overall responsibility of approvals and implementation of project deliverables will be the responsibility of the PSC, in the States the State level programme will be implemented by the State Steering Committee which will have the National Project Director or his nominee as a member. It will include officers from NDMA; the relevant departments at the State level, representative from the State Disaster Management Authority, representatives from DDMA's, and the UNDP representative. Management arrangements below the state level will be determined at the discretion of the PSC as required in consultation with the state steering committee.

Status of State level Steering Committees: In places where state level steering committees are already existing for implementation of the erstwhile GOI-UNDP DRM Programme, the same committees may continue to exist and expanded further to include new members like Project Director, Project manager, representatives from SDMA and DDMA's in accordance with the requirement of the current project.

Role of Project Manger and the Project Management Team: A Project Management Team (PMT) headed by the National Project and Programme Director will be established under the project. A full-time Project Manager may be designated by the implementing partner or recruited on project funds by the appropriate implementing partner for the day-to-day management; monitoring and review of project activities; coordination with Responsible Party(s) and different stakeholders and; decision making and will be accountable to the National Project and Programme Director and the Project Steering Committee. S/he will prepare the detailed activity and monitoring plan based on the Annual Work Plan (AWP) and Budget under the supervision of the National Project and Programme Director and submit it to the PSC for approval. The Project Manager will ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standards of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The Project Manager will prepare and submit the following reports to the project steering committee , the appropriate implementing partner and UNDP :Annual and Quarterly Work Plans, Quarterly and Annual Progress Reports (substantive and financial), Issue Log, Risk Log, Quality Log, Lessons Learnt Log, Communications and Monitoring Plan using standard reporting format to be provided by UNDP. The reports submitted by project manager will be reviewed by Project Steering Committee. The chairperson of PSC will share and circulate the report with other members of the PSC.

The recruitment and staffing process will give due attention to considerations of gender equality and promoting diversity at workplace. Along with the Project Manager, the PMT if agreed will be based within the premises of the appropriate implementing partner otherwise; alternative arrangements will be made and charged to the appropriate projects.

Project Assurance

Project Assurance will be the responsibility of UNDP. The Project Assurance role will support the PMB and PSC by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. During the implementation of the project, this role ensures (through periodic monitoring, assessment and evaluations) that appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed.

The last quarter Project Steering Committee meetings under the specific project outcome areas would provide inputs to the Programme Management Board meeting which would undertake an annual review meeting involving the Implementing Partners and Responsible Parties to review the progress in the previous year and approve the work plan for the coming year. An independent external review may be conducted through resource persons/groups to feed into this process.

Funds Flow Arrangements and Financial Management: The implementing partner may enter into an agreement with UNDP for the provision of support services by UNDP in the form of procurement of goods and services. UNDP rules and regulations as well as charges will apply in such cases. Funds will be released according to the approved AWP and QWPs. The implementing partner will account for funds received from UNDP and/or request UNDP to proceed directly with payments on its behalf on a quarterly basis through the standard Fund Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) Report. The Project Manager will be responsible for compilation and collation of these Financial Reports. Unspent funds from the approved AWPs will be reviewed by the PSC in the early part of the last quarter of the calendar year and funds reallocated accordingly. The detailed UNDP financial guidelines will be provided on signature of the project.

At least 1% of the total project budget will be allocated for communication and advocacy activities undertaken by UNDP and at least 2 % of the total project budget would be allocated for monitoring and evaluation.

Interest Clause: A separate Savings Bank Account will be opened in the name of the appropriate projects and any interest accrued on the project money during the project cycle will be ploughed back into the appropriate projects in consultation with NDMA and UNDP and project budget will stand revised to this extent or refunded to UNDP if there is no scope for ploughing back.

Audit: The project shall be subject to audit in accordance with UNDP procedures and as per the annual audit plan drawn up in consultation with DEA. The project shall be informed of the audit requirements by January of the following year. The audit covering annual calendar year expenditure will focus on the following parameters – (a) financial accounting, documenting and reporting; (b) monitoring, evaluation and reporting; (c) use and control of non-extendable reporting; (d) UNDP Country Office support. In line with the UN Audit Board requirements for submitting the final audit reports by 30 April, the auditors will carry out field visits during February/March. Detailed instructions on audit will be circulated by UNDP separately and on signature.

Cost recovery for project implementation support services by UNDP will be charged as per UNDP rules and regulations. The details of UNDP's support services will be outlined while finalizing the annual work plan and budget for each year by the Project Steering Committee.

V. Monitoring Framework and Evaluation

A monitoring and evaluation system will be established with the approval of the PSC to track the progress of the above interventions in terms of their impact on the poor, particularly those from disadvantaged groups and regions. As far as possible, it will use participatory approaches to assess the impact on the lives and livelihoods of these groups and the degree of satisfaction with UNDP-supported initiatives. It will also help identify lessons and good practices with potential for policy advocacy and replication/scaling up in other states/regions. The monitoring tools used will promote learning (including identification of factors that impede the achievement of outputs). Such learning will be used to adapt strategies accordingly and avoid repeating mistakes from the past. ICTs will be used to provide easily accessible information to various stakeholders.

The monitoring and evaluation system will be set up both at national and state levels and the appropriate implementing partner will have the overall responsibility of monitoring the project, in line with the roles and responsibilities described above and through regular monitoring visits and atleast quarterly review meetings by the PSC.

The National Project and Programme Director will be responsible for day-to-day monitoring of project activities through periodic field visits, interactions with state level project teams/partners and desk reviews. He/she will also prepare and submit periodic progress reports to the PSC. Monitoring will be an on-going process and mid-course corrections will be made if required.

An annual project review will be conducted during the 4th quarter of each year in the last quarter Project Steering Committee meeting as well as the Programme Management Board meeting to assess the performance of the project and the extent to which progress is being made towards outputs, and ensure that these remain aligned to relevant outcomes. Based on the status of project progress, the National Project and Programme Director and the Project Manager will prepare an Annual Work Plan for the subsequent year which will be discussed and approved at the annual review meeting. In addition, UNDP in consultation with the PSC will commission a mid-term project review and annual management and financial audit during the project period. In the last year, the annual review will be the final evaluation of the project and this will involve all key project stakeholders.

Monitoring system and tools

An M&E system linked to the overall results framework of UNDP and as outlined in the project brief will be established. A variety of formal and informal monitoring tools and mechanisms would be used by the Project Management Team. This would include field visits as well as reports such as progress reports, quarterly progress reports, annual reports and annual reviews in standard UNDP formats and as per UNDP's web-based project management system (ATLAS). Within the annual cycle, the Project Manager in consultation with the NPD and the PSC will ensure the following:

Quarterly basis

- The Quarterly Progress Report shall be the major monitoring tool. It will be sent near the end of each quarter in a prescribed format, and shall be discussed in the Project Steering Committee for tracking progress and deciding on further action.
- On a quarterly basis, a quality assessment shall record progress as per established quality criteria and methods towards the completion of key results. It should also capture feedback from the beneficiary perspective as well as information related to timeliness and resources usage.
- An Issue Log shall be activated in Atlas and updated by the Project Manager to facilitate tracking and resolution of potential problems or requests for change.
- Based on the initial risk analysis, a risk log shall be activated in Atlas and regularly updated by reviewing the external environment that may affect the project implementation.
- Based on the above information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) shall be submitted by the Project Manager to the PSC through Project Assurance, using the standard UNDP report format.
- A project Lesson-learned log will be activated and regularly updated to ensure on-going learning and adaptation within the Implementing Partner, and to facilitate the preparation of the Lessons-learned Report at the end of the project
- A Monitoring Schedule Plan shall be activated in Atlas and updated to track key management actions/events

Annual basis

- Annual Review Report: An Annual Review Report will be prepared by the Project Manager under the supervision of the National Project and Programme Director and shared with the PSC and the Programme Management Board. As minimum requirement, the Annual Review Report shall consist of the Atlas standard format for the PPR covering the whole year with updated information for each above element of the PPR as well as a summary of results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level.

- Annual Project Review: Based on the above report, an annual project review with Responsible Party (ies) will be conducted by the PSC during the fourth quarter of the year or soon after, to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the following year. In the last year, this review will be a final assessment. This review is driven by the PSC and may involve other stakeholders as required. It will focus on the extent to which progress is being made towards outputs, and that these remain aligned to appropriate outcomes.
- Field visits: Field visits serve the purpose of results validation, especially when undertaken in the first half of the year. If undertaken in the latter part of the year, the field visit should provide latest information on progress for annual reporting preparation. Field visits should be documented through brief and action-oriented reports, submitted within the week of return to the office. Field visits to be taken will be decided by the National Project and Programme Director.

In addition, a concurrent mid-term (if required) and a terminal evaluation of the project may be commissioned by the PSC. It will be conducted by agencies/experts as approved by the PSC.

VI. Legal Context

This document together with the CPAP signed by the Government and UNDP constitute together the instrument envisaged in the supplemental Provisions.

Consistent with the above Supplemental Provisions, the responsibility for the safety and security of the implementing partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the implementing partner's custody, rests with the implementing partner.

The implementing partner shall:

- a) put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
- b) Assume all risks and liabilities related to the implementing partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.

The implementing partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Programme and project brief.

