Terms of Reference (ToR) – Institutional Performance Evaluation of NDRMF (2016-2025)

1. Executive Summary

The National Disaster Risk Management Fund (NDRMF) intends to engage a qualified consulting firm to undertake an Institutional Performance Evaluation covering the period 2016-2025.

The evaluation will provide an independent assessment of NDRMF's institutional performance, operational effectiveness, governance systems, and the results achieved through a representative sample of NDRMF-financed interventions. It will identify institutional strengths, implementation challenges, lessons learned, and practical recommendations to strengthen future operations and support implementation of the NDRMF Business Strategy 2023-2033.

The assignment will adopt a mixed-methods approach consistent with the OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria, combining document review, portfolio analysis, stakeholder consultations, and field verification. The evaluation will assess NDRMF's contribution to strengthening disaster risk reduction, climate resilience, disaster risk financing, and institutional capacity, based on available evidence. It is not intended to establish causal attribution through experimental or quasi-experimental methods.

The assignment shall be completed within sixteen (16) weeks from contract signing.

2. Background and Rationale

NDRMF is a Government-owned, not-for-profit company established in 2016 to finance and support initiatives that strengthen Pakistan's resilience to disasters and climate change. Since becoming operational, NDRMF has financed a diverse portfolio of interventions in disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change adaptation (CCA), disaster risk financing (DRF), preparedness, resilient recovery, and institutional strengthening through federal and provincial government agencies and other Fund Implementing Partners (FIPs).

As NDRMF approaches a decade of operations, it is timely to undertake an independent evaluation to assess both institutional performance and the contribution of its investment portfolio to intended development outcomes. This is the first institution-wide performance evaluation commissioned by NDRMF. The evaluation will provide evidence on how effectively NDRMF's governance, systems, and operational arrangements have supported delivery of its mandate, and the extent to which its investments have contributed to strengthening disaster and climate resilience.

The findings will support organizational learning, strengthen accountability, and provide practical recommendations to improve institutional performance, enhance future investments, and inform implementation of the NDRMF Business Strategy 2023-2033.

3. Purpose and Objectives

3.1. Purpose

The purpose of this assignment is to undertake an independent Institutional and Portfolio Performance Evaluation of the NDRMF covering the period 2016-2025.
The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of NDRMF's institutional systems, governance arrangements, operational processes, and organizational performance, together with the performance of a representative sample of NDRMF-financed interventions. The evaluation will generate evidence on institutional effectiveness, portfolio performance, lessons learned, and development outcomes to support organizational learning and implementation of the NDRMF Business Strategy 2023-2033.

3.2. Objectives

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. **Assess Institutional Performance** by evaluating the effectiveness of NDRMF's governance, organizational systems, operational processes, fiduciary arrangements, and monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems.
2. **Assess Portfolio Performance** by evaluating the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and outcomes of a representative sample of NDRMF-financed interventions implemented during 2016–2025.
3. **Identify Development Outcomes** achieved through NDRMF's investment portfolio and assess the extent to which these interventions have contributed to strengthening disaster risk reduction, climate resilience, disaster risk financing, and institutional capacity.
4. **Identify Lessons Learned and Good Practices** to strengthen institutional effectiveness, improve programme design and implementation, and enhance future investments.
5. **Provide Actionable Recommendations** to improve institutional performance, portfolio management, organizational learning, and implementation of the NDRMF Business Strategy 2023-2033.

4. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation shall cover NDRMF's institutional and portfolio performance during the period 2016-2025. It will assess the effectiveness of NDRMF's institutional systems and the performance of a representative sample of NDRMF-financed interventions across major thematic areas.

The evaluation shall focus on the following three components.

4.1. Institutional Performance

The evaluation shall assess the effectiveness of NDRMF's institutional systems in delivering its mandate. The assessment shall include, but not limited to:

- Corporate governance and organizational arrangements;
- Strategic planning and performance management;
- Operational policies and business processes;
- Financial management, procurement and fiduciary systems;
- Monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems;

- Knowledge management and institutional learning; and
- Internal coordination and organizational effectiveness.

The evaluation shall identify institutional strengths, operational challenges, and opportunities for improvement.

4.2. Portfolio Performance

The evaluation shall assess the performance of a representative sample of NDRMF-financed interventions implemented during the evaluation period.

The assessment shall examine

- relevance of interventions;
- achievement of planned outputs and outcomes;
- implementation efficiency;
- sustainability of results;
- implementation challenges and risks;
- good practices and innovation; and
- lessons learned for future programming.

The Consultant shall develop a sampling framework during the Inception Phase, subject to approval by NDRMF.

4.3. Portfolio Outcomes

Using available evidence, the evaluation shall assess how NDRMF's investment portfolio has contributed to:

- strengthening disaster risk reduction;
- enhancing climate resilience;
- improving disaster risk financing;
- strengthening institutional capacity; and
- supporting national resilience priorities.

The evaluation shall assess contribution of the portfolio to these outcomes based on available evidence and shall not seek to establish causal attribution.

4.4. Geographic Coverage

The evaluation shall include:

- NDRMF Headquarters;
- Relevant federal and provincial stakeholders;
- Fund Implementing Partners (FIPs); and
- A representative sample of project sites selected in consultation with NDRMF.

The final sample shall provide adequate representation of thematic areas, geographical regions, implementation modalities and project sizes.

4.5. Exclusions from the Scope

The following activities are outside the scope of this assignment:

- Financial, procurement or compliance audits;
- Engineering or technical quality audits;
- Detailed economic cost-benefit or econometric analysis;
- Counterfactual or experimental impact evaluations;

- Evaluation of every individual NDRMF-funded project; and
- Comparative benchmarking of international resilience financing institutions.

Note: The Consultant shall prioritize depth of analysis over breadth of coverage.

5. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

5.1. Evaluation Approach

The evaluation shall adopt a **mixed-methods approach**, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques to assess institutional performance and portfolio performance. The methodology shall be consistent with internationally accepted evaluation standards and aligned with the **OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria**.

The Consulting Firm shall propose a detailed methodology in its Technical Proposal. At a minimum, the methodology shall include the following components:

a. Document Review
b. Portfolio Analysis
c. Key Informant Interviews
d. Focused Group Discussions
e. Field Verification
f. Data Analysis and Triangulation

The Consulting Firm shall develop an **Evaluation Matrix** during the Inception Phase, linking the evaluation objectives, key evaluation questions, indicators, data sources, and data collection methods. The Evaluation Matrix shall be subject to NDRMF's review and approval.

The evaluation shall adopt a **representative sampling approach**. The Consulting Firm shall propose an appropriate sampling methodology during the Inception Phase to ensure adequate representation of thematic areas, geographical regions, implementation modalities and project sizes.

Gender equality, environmental and social safeguards, governance, institutional learning and knowledge management shall be considered as **cross-cutting considerations** throughout the evaluation.

5.2. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation shall be guided by the OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria and adapted to the context of NDRMF.

Evaluation Criteria	**Focus of Assessment**
Relevance	Alignment of institutional priorities and portfolio with national needs and strategic objectives.
Effectiveness	Achievement of intended outputs and outcomes
Efficiency	Utilization of institutional, financial and operational resources.
Impact	Contribution of NDRMF interventions to broader development outcomes, based on available evidence.
Sustainability	Likelihood that institutional improvements and project benefits will continue over time.

The OECD-DAC criteria shall be applied proportionately to the institutional and portfolio performance components of the evaluation.

5.3. Quality Assurance

The Consulting Firm shall establish appropriate quality assurance mechanisms throughout the assignment, including internal peer review, evidence validation, and consistency checks before submission of each deliverable.

6. Key Evaluation Questions

The Institutional and Portfolio Performance Evaluation shall be guided by the OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria and the objectives of this assignment. The Consultant may refine these questions during the Inception Phase; however, any proposed modifications shall be subject to NDRMF's approval.

6.1. Institutional Performance

Relevance

- To what extent are NDRMF's institutional mandate, strategies and systems aligned with national priorities, NDRMF Business Strategies and other relevant document?

Effectiveness

- How effective are NDRMF's governance, operational systems, fiduciary arrangements and monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems in delivering its mandate?

Efficiency

- To what extent have institutional resources, processes and systems been utilized efficiently?

Sustainability

- Are NDRMF's institutional systems and capacities adequate to sustain and strengthen future operations?

6.2. Portfolio Performance

Relevance

- To what extent have NDRMF-financed interventions addressed the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and stakeholders?

Effectiveness

- To what extent have the sampled interventions achieved their intended outputs and outcomes?

Efficiency

- Were the sampled interventions implemented efficiently in terms of time, cost and resource utilization?

Impact

- What evidence exists that the sampled interventions have contributed to strengthening disaster risk reduction, climate resilience, disaster risk financing and institutional capacity?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the benefits of the sampled interventions likely to continue beyond project completion?

6.3. Organizational Learning

The evaluation shall also examine the following cross-cutting questions:

- What are the key institutional strengths and good practices that should be retained and expanded?
- What implementation challenges have affected institutional and portfolio performance?
- What lessons learned should inform future programming and institutional development?
- What strategic actions are required to strengthen NDRMF's institutional performance and portfolio management?

6.4. Evaluation Matrix

The Consulting Firm shall prepare a detailed Evaluation Matrix during the Inception Phase. The matrix shall establish clear linkages between:

- Evaluation objectives;
- Evaluation questions;
- Indicators;
- Data sources;
- Data collection methods; and
- Analytical approach.

The Evaluation Matrix shall be submitted as part of the Inception Report for review and approval by NDRMF.

Note: The Consultant is expected to focus on generating evidence that informs management decisions rather than responding to every evaluation question with equal depth. During the Inception Phase, the Consultant may refine and prioritize sub-questions based on the approved methodology, provided that all core evaluation criteria and objectives are adequately addressed.

7. Deliverables and Schedule

The Consultant shall complete the assignment within sixteen (16) weeks from the date of contract signing. A detailed work plan and Gantt chart shall be submitted as part of the Inception Report.

All deliverables shall be prepared in English, submitted in editable electronic format (MS Word, Excel, PowerPoint, and PDF where applicable), and shall become the property of NDRMF upon acceptance.

Deliverable	Description	Timeline	Payment Share
Inception Report	including detailed methodology, evaluation matrix, sampling strategy, work plan and data collection tools.	Within 2 Weeks of contract signing	10%

Interim Progress Report and Presentation	summarizing progress, preliminary observations and completion of fieldwork.	Week 6	20%
Draft Institutional Performance Evaluation Report	including findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Week 13	45%
Validation Workshop and Management Presentation	to present and validate key findings with NDRMF.	Week 15	-
Final Institutional Performance Evaluation Report	incorporating NDRMF comments, Executive Summary, PowerPoint presentation and all supporting datasets.	Week 16	25%

Each deliverable shall be reviewed by NDRMF. Comments shall normally be provided within ten (10) working days of submission. The Consultant shall address all agreed comments before the deliverable is considered accepted. Acceptance of each deliverable shall constitute approval for the corresponding payment milestone.

Note: All reports shall emphasize analytical quality over descriptive reporting. Findings shall be supported by verifiable evidence, clearly distinguish between observations and conclusions, and present recommendations that are practical, prioritized, and linked to specific institutional or operational issues. Recommendations should indicate the suggested priority (High, Medium, or Low), proposed implementation timeframe (Short-, Medium-, or Long-term), and the institutional function primarily responsible for implementation.

8. Consultant Eligibility and Selection Criteria

8.1. Technical Competence:-

The Consulting Firm shall:

- Be legally registered with at least 10 years of professional experience.
- Have successfully completed at least three (3) similar evaluation assignments during the last seven
  (7) years.
- Demonstrate experience in institutional, portfolio, programme, or organizational performance evaluations.
- Propose a multidisciplinary team meeting the requirements specified in these ToRs.

8.2. Experience in Similar Assignments

Similar assignments will be assessed based on the following parameters:

- Institutional and portfolio performance evaluations;
- Disaster risk management, climate resilience, or climate finance;
- Public sector governance and institutional strengthening; and
- Evaluations for governments, IFIs, UN agencies, or development partners.

9. Team Composition and Required Qualifications

The evaluation shall be undertaken by a consulting firm with demonstrated experience in institutional and programme evaluations, preferably in disaster risk management, climate resilience, public sector governance, development finance or related sectors.

The Consultant shall deploy a multidisciplinary team with the qualifications and experience necessary to complete the assignment within the agreed timeframe.

The minimum core team shall comprise the following positions:

Position	Minimum Qualification	Minimum Experience
Team Leader/ Institutional Performance Evaluation Specialist	• Master's degree in Public Policy, Development Studies, Economics, Disaster Management, Project Management, Evaluation, or a related discipline. • Demonstrated experience applying OECD-DAC evaluation criteria and internationally accepted evaluation methodologies. • Proven experience managing multidisciplinary consulting assignments.	At least **12 years** of professional experience in leading complex institutional or programme evaluations.
Institutional Governance and DRR Specialist	• Master's degree in Disaster Risk Management, Climate Change, Public Administration, Environmental Management, or a related field. • Demonstrated experience in institutional strengthening, governance, public sector reform, DRR, climate resilience, or resilience financing.	Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience.
Monitoring, Evaluation and Data Specialist	• Master's degree in Monitoring and Evaluation, Statistics, Data Analytics, Economics, Project Management, or a related discipline. • Demonstrated experience in quantitative and qualitative data analysis.	Minimum 8 years of experience in programme evaluation and data analysis.

Social Inclusion and Stakeholder Engagement Specialist	• Master's degree in Social Sciences, Gender Studies, Development Studies, Anthropology, Sociology, or a related field.	Minimum 8 years of professional experience in stakeholder consultation, social inclusion, gender mainstreaming, or community engagement.
Non Key Experts (2 positions)	• Bachelor's or Master's degree in a relevant discipline. • Strong analytical, communication, and report-writing skills.	Minimum 3 years of professional experience in research, field coordination, data collection, or development programmes.

The proposed team shall collectively demonstrate expertise in:

- Institutional and organizational performance evaluation;
- Portfolio and programme evaluation;
- OECD-DAC evaluation methodologies;
- Mixed-methods research;
- Quantitative and qualitative data analysis;
- Stakeholder consultations and facilitation; and
- Report writing and presentation of evaluation findings.

The Team Leader shall be responsible for the overall quality, coordination and timely delivery of the assignment.
The Consultant may propose additional short-term specialists where considered necessary to strengthen the quality of the assignment. However, the minimum team requirements specified above shall be met.

9.1. Evaluation Principles

The Consultant shall conduct the assignment in accordance with the principles of:

- independence;
- impartiality;
- transparency;
- methodological rigour;
- confidentiality; and
- professional integrity.

Note: Given the implementation schedule, the Consultant shall demonstrate its capacity to mobilize the proposed team immediately upon contract signing and undertake concurrent analytical and field activities.

The Technical Proposal shall include a staffing schedule indicating the level of effort (person-days) for each key expert and the proposed deployment plan throughout the assignment.

10. Contract Management and Reporting Arrangements

The assignment shall be managed by the NDRMF. The Consulting Firm shall report to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) through the designated Project Focal Person, who shall be responsible for day-to-day coordination of the assignment.

NDRMF shall:

- Provide relevant institutional and project documentation required for the evaluation;
- Facilitate access to key stakeholders and Fund Implementing Partners (FIPs);
- Coordinate field visits, where required;
- Review and provide consolidated comments on submitted deliverables; and
- Approve deliverables in accordance with the contract.

The Consulting Firm shall:
- Plan and execute the assignment in accordance with these Terms of Reference;
- Mobilize the proposed team of experts;
- Maintain regular coordination with NDRMF;
- Submit all deliverables within the agreed timeline;
- Ensure the quality and integrity of the evaluation; and
- Address comments provided by NDRMF prior to finalization of deliverables.

10.1. Reporting and Communication

All official communication shall be routed through the designated Project Focal Person. The Consulting Firm shall provide periodic progress updates and immediately notify NDRMF of any issues that may affect the quality or timely completion of the assignment.

10.2. Review and Approval of Deliverables

NDRMF shall review each deliverable and provide consolidated comments within **ten (10) working days** of submission. The Consulting Firm shall address agreed comments before resubmitting the revised deliverable for final approval.

10.3. Independence of the Evaluation

The Consulting Firm shall conduct the evaluation independently and objectively. While NDRMF will facilitate access to information and stakeholders, the findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in the evaluation reports shall remain the professional responsibility of the Consulting Firm.

Note: The Consultant shall submit a brief monthly progress update (not exceeding two pages) to the Technical Focal Person summarizing activities completed, planned activities for the following period, key risks, and any decisions required from NDRMF. These updates are intended solely for project management purposes and shall not constitute formal deliverables under the contract.

11. Ethical Standards and Data Ownership

The Consulting Firm shall conduct the assignment in accordance with internationally accepted professional and ethical standards, ensuring independence, impartiality, transparency and integrity throughout the evaluation process.
All information obtained during the assignment shall be treated as confidential and used solely for the purposes of this evaluation. The Consulting Firm shall not disclose or publish any information without the prior written approval of NDRMF.
All reports, datasets, presentations and other outputs prepared under this assignment shall

become the property of NDRMF. Upon completion of the assignment, the Consulting Firm shall submit all final deliverables and supporting data in editable electronic format.
The Consulting Firm shall declare any actual or potential conflict of interest that may affect the impartiality of the evaluation and shall immediately notify NDRMF if such a conflict arises during the assignment.