<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>GOI-UNDP Urban Risk Reduction Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award ID:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Start and end date:</td>
<td>2009 to 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding CP Outcome(s):</td>
<td><strong>Outcome 4.1</strong> - Communities and institutions have established preparedness mechanisms and partnerships to effectively respond to and recover from the impact of disasters. <strong>Outcome 4.2</strong> - Communities are aware of their vulnerabilities and adequately prepared to manage (and reduce) disaster related risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding CP Output(s):</td>
<td><strong>Output 1</strong>: Safer built environment promoted to reduce urban risks. <strong>Output 2</strong>: Strengthened capacities at community level for participatory inclusive and integrated planning for post-disaster recovery programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National programme Director</td>
<td>Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs/Any officer designated or appointed as Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Partner:</td>
<td>Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Parties:</td>
<td>DDMAs, UNDP, State Governments, Urban Local Bodies, and District Administration, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project outputs</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Risk and vulnerability assessments established.</td>
<td># of cities in which Hazard Risk Assessment and Vulnerability Analysis conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened capacities of various stakeholders in urban disaster risk reduction.</td>
<td>Framework for Urban Risk Reduction developed involving multi stakeholders. Training Manual developed on urban disaster risk management for various stakeholders. No. of Urban Planners trained on mainstreaming DRR into urban planning and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity strengthened for Urban Disaster Risk Management.</td>
<td># of training programmes conducted for the Mayors, Corporators and key municipal officers on mainstreaming DRR into city development planning. No. of City Emergency Operation Centers strengthened for disaster preparedness and response. No. of institutions engaged into partnership for knowledge building and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of communities in disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>No. of Civil Society Organisations/Resident welfare organisations trained on CBDRM. No. of Community Awareness Programmes conducted on Structural safety and disaster preparedness in selected cities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project and AWP 2010 Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US $ 3.7 million</th>
<th>US $ 3.7 million</th>
<th>USD 7.4 million (for entire project duration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USD 2.00 million (for 2010)
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Agreed by UNDP:

[Signature]

Deirdre Boyd
UNDP Country Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Targets for 2010</th>
<th>PLANNED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>INDICATIVE MONTH OF COMPLETION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>BUDGET (In USS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1:</strong> Urban Risk and vulnerability assessments established.</td>
<td><strong>1.1 Activity Result</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hazard Risk Assessment and Vulnerability Analysis conducted in selected medium sized cities of India.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Activity Actions:</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Selection of Cities.&lt;br&gt;2. Identification of Technical Organisations.&lt;br&gt;3. Development of TOR.&lt;br&gt;4. Risk Assessment Reports developed.</td>
<td>1.1.1 March 2010&lt;br&gt;1.1.2 March 2010&lt;br&gt;1.1.3 March 2010&lt;br&gt;1.1.4 December 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Activity Result</strong>&lt;br&gt;Assessments conducted to understand the existing compliance and enforcement mechanism of the building byelaws, development control regulations, Land Use Zoning Regulations and Master Plan in selected cities of India. Follow up the actions to get the model bye laws/zoning regulation adopted by effecting suitable amendments to the relevant Acts and Rules.</td>
<td>1.2.1; 1.2.2- March 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Activity Actions:</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Identification of Technical organisations to conduct the study.&lt;br&gt;2. Formulation of TOR.&lt;br&gt;3. Preparation of Assessment reports.</td>
<td>1.2.3 December 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 2.1:</td>
<td>Atleast 100 planners and Municipal Officers trained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 2.2:</td>
<td>Framework for Urban Risk Reduction developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Activity Result:
Urban Planners and other municipal officers trained on mainstreaming DRR in urban development planning.

2.1 Activity Actions:
1. Development of Training Agenda.
2. Identification of the training partners.
3. Organisation of training programme.

2.2 Activity Result:
A Framework developed for Urban Disaster Risk Reduction.

2.2 Activity Actions:
Hiring of an expert institution.
Developing a TOR.
Validating the framework through multistakeholders consultation.

2.3 Activity Result:
Guideline developed for integrating Disaster Risk Reduction into Urban Planning and development.

2.3 Activity Actions:
1. Development of a TOR.
2. Hiring of Consultants/Appointing Resource Institutions for developing the guideline.

2.4 Activity Result:
Annual National Level Advocacy Workshop on strengthening of TLM Regime to ensure structural safety.

2.4 Activity Actions:
1. Identification of Stakeholders.
2. Thematic areas for discussions.
3. Conduct of workshop.

| 2.1 - By June 2010 |
| 2.2 - By September 2010 |
| 2.3 By September 2010 |
| 2.4 By December 2010 |
| 120,000 |
3.1 and 3.2 Activity Result:
1. Selection of cities
2. Emergency Control Room strengthened (City EOC) in selected cities.
3. City level DM Plans revised/updated.

3.1 and 3.2 Activity Actions:
1. Baseline status of current EOC assessed in the selected cities.
2. Needs assessed for strengthening and essentials provided
3. Human Resource support utilised as city support officer
4. City level DM Plans revised/updated in consultation with relevant stakeholders

3.3. Activity Result:
Training manual developed on urban disaster risk management and trainings organised.

3.3. Activity Result:
1. Mayors, Corporators and other municipal officials sensitised on mainstreaming DRR into city development planning in selected cities of India.
2. Municipal Officers trained on effective Disaster preparedness and Response in selected cities.

Activity Actions:
1. Orientation programmes for the Mayors, Corporators and other municipal officials.
2. Review of the training modules and development of a comprehensive training module.
3. Training Manual developed on Urban Disaster Risk Management
4. Organising the training programme.
5. Demonstrative mock drills conducted.
### 3.4 Activity Result

Partnership developed for knowledge building and research with key institutions across the country working on urban affairs and Disaster Management

**Activity Actions:**

1. Development of a strategy for knowledge networking.
2. Identification of key areas of research.
3. Identification of thematic areas of discussion.

---

### Target 4: Capacity building of communities in disaster risk reduction in the selected cities.

#### 4.1. Activity Result:

Civil Society Organisations trained on urban CBDRM.

**Activity Actions:**

1. Identification of Ward committees/Resident Welfare Organisation
2. Review of the training modules.
3. Organising the training.

#### 4.2. Activity Result

Community Awareness Programmes conducted on structural safety and disaster preparedness in selected cities.

**Activity Actions:**

1. Awareness Strategy to be developed.
2. IEC materials to be produced.

| Project Management Support Staff Cost (Thematic Specialists/PoS) | 100,000 |
| City Level Coordination Support | 180,000 |
| Travel and Mission Cost | 30,000 |
| Equipment | 25,000 |
| Miscellaneous Cost | 8,000 |
| **Sub total** | **1,923,000** |
| Communication Cost (1%) | 19,230 |
| ISS(3%) | 58,267 |
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 km² 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 kutcha 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 eventuality, 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 guideline 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 DDMAs to fulfill the responsibilities stipulated in the National DM Act (2005), especially with respect to DRM.
- 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

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

- Strengthened SDMAs and DDMAs to fulfil 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.
- Urban risk reduction undertaken by addressing planning and development issues through suitable legislative and regulatory mechanisms.
- Recovery framework setup through which the people affected by disasters are able to access resources for rebuilding their lives and to revive their livelihoods.
- Knowledge and information sharing platform in disaster management are strengthened

II. Project Strategy of the GoI-UNDP Urban Risk Reduction Project

As mentioned earlier, the GoI-UNDP DRR programme 2009-2012 the Urban Risk Reduction Project would address the priorities and issues underlined in the national development plans, UNDAF and the CPAP. The project would focus on urban risk reduction in a holistic way by strengthening the Urban institutions, undertaking risk and vulnerability analysis of select cities. It will also have a capacity building component and would have a focus on improvement of the enforcement mechanism on the techno-legal regime and zoning regulations apart from a component to involve the communities and the Civil society organizations in community based disaster risk management practices in urban areas and to seek their participation in urban risk reduction.

III. Project Deliverables

As mentioned earlier, the GoI-UNDP DRR programme 2009-2012 the Urban Risk Reduction Project would address the priorities and issues underlined in the national development plans, UNDAF and the CPAP. The project would focus on urban risk reduction in a holistic way by strengthening the urban institutions, undertaking risk and vulnerability analysis of select cities. It will also have a capacity building component and would have a focus on improvement of the enforcement mechanism on the techno-legal regime and zoning regulations apart from a component to involve the communities and the Civil society organizations in community based disaster risk management practices in urban areas and to seek their participation in urban risk reduction.

IV. 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 i.e Urban Risk reduction

The deliverables would include –

- Urban Risk and Vulnerability assessments established in select cities
- Guidelines developed for mainstreaming DRR into urban planning and development.
- Strengthened capacities of various stakeholders in urban DRR
- Support to strengthen the enforcement of techno-legal regime and zoning regulations
- Strengthened institutional capacities for Urban DRR
- Capacity building of elected representatives, communities and CSO’s for Urban DRM and DRR.

V. Management Arrangements

The Ministry of Home affairs would be the implementing partner for the programme. The Joint Secretary (DM) MHA will be the National Programme Director of the entire programme which also covers the Urban Risk Reduction component for which the Ministry of Home Affairs will appoint/designate a Project Director at the National level (for the project), who will be responsible for overall management. The Implementing Partner will sign a Annual Work Plan and budget with UNDP on an annual basis, as per UNDP rules and regulations.

Responsible Parties UNDP, Ministry of Urban Development, State Governments’ where the project is implemented, the urban local bodies of the cities where the project is taken up, the training and academic institutions identified would be the responsible parties.

Role and Responsibility of the Project Steering Committee: A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be set up under the project and will comprise designated representatives from Ministry of Home affairs, disaster management authority at the National and state level, UNDP and relevant stakeholders including state level representatives and will be chaired by the respective Project Director. 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 making, by consensus, management decisions for the specific programme outcome area of the projects and would report to the Programme Management Board.

In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, the final decision making rests with UNDP in accordance with its applicable regulations, rules, policies and procedures. Project reviews by the PSC will be carried out on a quarterly basis during the running of the project, or as necessary when raised by the Project Manager.

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. The members of the Committee will include officers from MHA, the relevant departments at the State level, representative form the State Disaster Management authorities and 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 Existing Committees: In places where committees proposed for the new programme have already been constituted and are in place for the implementation of the current GOI-UNDP DRM programme, they need not be freshly reconstituted and would play the required role intended for them in the proposed programme. It would be suitably expanded to include relevant stakeholders.

Role of Project Manager and the Project Management Team: A Project Management Team headed by a Project Manager will be established under the projects which are taken up under the overall Programme. A full-time Project Manager will 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 NPD and the PSC. S/he will prepare the detailed activity and monitoring plan based on the Annual Work Plan (AWP) and Budget 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 to the Ministry of Home affairs, the appropriate implementing partner and the UNDP the following reports/documents: 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. S/he will provide technical guidance to the responsible parties as and when necessary in consultation with the Project Assurance function.

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 National Programme Director and 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. UNDP in exercising its Project Assurance role and the Project Manager will meet quarterly (or whenever guidance/decision is required by an implementing agency) and will be responsible for:

- Facilitating timely decisions on project management issues such as budget structure, annual work plan, financial management including advance of funds, implementation issues, audit follow-up.
- Exploring opportunities for flexible management, in tune with the ongoing rationalization in governmental procedures and the fast-evolving UNDP reforms.
- Implementing the monitoring, evaluation and research strategy, particularly ensuring that participatory monitoring and evaluation (PME) at the grassroots is the base on which the overall M&E superstructure is built.
- Assessing development outcomes vis-à-vis the planned targets.
- Identifying policy lessons from the Project, which are replicable.

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 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 the Ministry of Home Affairs 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.

VI. Monitoring Framework and Evaluation

A monitoring and evaluation system will be established 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 quarterly review meetings by the PSC.

The Project Manager 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 or 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 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 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 UNDP 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 ongoing 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 on an annual basis.

- Annual Review Report: An Annual Review Report will be prepared by the Project Manager(s) and shared with the respective PSC(s) and the Outcome 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 predefined annual targets at the output level.

- Annual Project Review: Based on the above report, an annual project review with Implementing Partner(s) and Responsible Party (ies) will be conducted 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: A representative from the UNDP office will visit each project periodically. 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.

In addition, a mid-term (if required) and a terminal evaluation of the project will be commissioned based on approval of the respective PSC's. It will be conducted by external agencies/experts.

VII. 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 brief.