

## **Swiss NGO DRR Platform**

### **Synthesis of evaluations – DRR in a post-disaster context**

**Franziska Schmid, RisikoWissen, Bern, mandated by Swiss Red Cross**

Bern, 24<sup>th</sup> of August 2020

## Table of content

1	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Background.....	3
1.2	Purpose of synthesis .....	3
1.3	Clarification of concepts and terminology.....	4
2	Methodology.....	5
2.1	Desk study.....	5
2.2	Workshop.....	7
3	Findings.....	8
3.1	Characterisation of applied DRR practices.....	8
3.2	Effectiveness of the applied measure and approaches.....	9
3.3	Success factors for effectiveness .....	11
3.4	Limited contribution to effectiveness.....	13
3.5	Evidence on the sustainability of the applied DRR approaches .....	15
4	Conclusions.....	17
5	Suggestions.....	18
6	Literature references .....	19
	Annex 1 – Overview of projects.....	21
	Annex 2 – Workshop.....	23

## List of abbreviations

ADRA	Adventist Development and Relief Agency
BBB	Build Back Better
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
HEKS-EPER	The aid organization of the Swiss Protestant Churches
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SFDRR	Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
SRC	Swiss Red Cross
SwS	Swiss Solidarity
TdH	Terre des hommes
UNDRR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (formerly UNISDR)
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

# **1 Introduction**

## **1.1 Background**

The mandate of a synthesis of evaluations bases on the dialogue of the Swiss NGO DRR Platform with Swiss Solidarity (SwS) on the importance, success and sustainability of disaster risk reduction (DRR) in reconstruction and rehabilitation projects as well as in longer-term development projects.

In 2015, the Swiss NGO DRR platform elaborated a discussion paper highlighting the role DRR in humanitarian aid in general and the possible role of DRR in the SwS portfolio in particular. This was done based on a request from SwS in 2014, following the discussion about SwS financial contribution for DRR measures in the context of the Philippines typhoon Haiyan recovery programme.

In this discussion<sup>1</sup>, to forms of risk-informed actions have been identified:

- Integrated DRR: this involves protecting interventions against future hazards or ensuring that interventions actually reduce risk to people.
- Targeted DRR: this refers to interventions with a primary focus on DRR, either as specific DRR projects or DRR components of projects with a more comprehensive focus.

In its reply, SwS highlighted the importance of integrating DRR in reconstruction and rehabilitation projects. SwS however raised questions on the success and sustainability of stand-alone DRR projects in a “typical SwS context” and in the frame of a humanitarian mandate. SwS welcomed a continuation of the dialogue focusing on evidence-based findings, i.e. what types of DRR interventions are successful in what types of situations and circumstances.

To get a clearer picture on the role of DRR in the recovery that goes beyond “integrated DRR”, the Swiss NGO DRR Platform commissioned an evaluation synthesis.

## **1.2 Purpose of synthesis**

The evaluation synthesis aims to provide documented evidence on good practices in DRR in the reconstruction and recovery phase. It thereby focuses on SwS co-funded projects for the past major disasters including the 2010 Haiti earthquake, 2010 Pakistan floods, 2013 Philippines typhoon, and the 2015 Nepal earthquake.

More specifically, the evaluation synthesis:

- a) is summative and retrospective in nature and focusing primarily on effectiveness and sustainability,
- b) shall contribute to enhance overall quality of interventions through documentation and learning from good practices,
- c) shall contribute to clarifying the role of DRR in the post-disaster context, with a special focus on SwS funded projects, thus answer the question why SwS should contribute funding to DRR measures and approaches that require a project time frame beyond its humanitarian mandate,
- d) shall be potentially used by the Platform in its interaction with SwS and other actors to showcase impact.

---

<sup>1</sup> Documented in Discussion Paper by Swiss NGO DRR platform and reply form SwS

### 1.3 Clarification of concepts and terminology

In this chapter, the elements of the synthesis aim, providing “*documented evidence on good practices in DRR in the reconstruction and recovery phase*” are explained.

#### Reconstruction/ recovery<sup>2</sup>

The phases after an event are seen as a continuing process, reaching from rehabilitation/ early recovery that aims at restoring basis services and facilities for the functioning of a community towards recovery that contribute to long-term development. In the words of UNSIDR<sup>3</sup>, recovery interventions aim at restoring or improving of livelihoods and assets, systems and activities, to avoid or reduce future disaster risk. That means, they should not simply reconstruct the existing risk.

Ideas about how to do this have been discussed widely for a number of years, in various forms (the ‘relief-development continuum’ or ‘developmental relief’ in the 1990s; ‘recovery plus’ or ‘build back better’ in more recent times<sup>4</sup>).

The principle of “Build Back Better” (BBB) comprises the integration of DRR measures into the restoration of physical infrastructure and societal systems, and into the revitalization of livelihoods, economies, and the environment. In this sense, BBB clearly goes beyond safe reconstruction of e.g. shelter but is considered as a process, which was strongly underlined by the workshop participants<sup>5</sup>.

The synthesis may contribute to the debate on the linkages between (short-term) humanitarian aid and (long-term) development. The compartmentalisation of the domains persists in form of different organisational and institutional structures, funding mechanisms and programming. However, these considerations are not the main focus. The evaluation synthesis report rather looks closer on DRR practices in order to better understand the role of DRR in the recovery phase and to have a clearer picture of the characteristics of successful DRR activities.

#### Disaster Risk Reduction

There are many concepts and definitions on DRR. Broadly, it is understood to mean the development and application of policies, strategies and practices to reduce vulnerabilities and disaster risks throughout society. It is often linked with a risk management approach, i.e. a systematic approach to identifying, assessing and reducing risks associated with hazards and human activities.

A global, agreed policy of disaster risk reduction is set out in the United Nations endorsed Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, whose expected outcome is: “*The substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries*”. To pursue the set targets, 4 priorities of action have been defined:

- **Priority 1: Understanding disaster risk.**  
Among others: Risk assessments, database of losses, awareness raising, education, innovation/technology.
- **Priority 2: Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk.**  
Among others: Coordination, collaboration, definition of roles and responsibilities, legislation/ policies, mainstreaming of DRR in all sectors.
- **Priority 3: Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience.**  
Among others: Allocation of (financial) resource for concrete structural and non-structural mitigation measures.
- **Priority 4: Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction.**  
Among others: Capacity building, planning for response and recovery, learning of events, establishment of early warning systems.

---

<sup>2</sup> According to Twigg, 2009 and UNSIDR, 2014

<sup>3</sup> UNGA, 2016: Terminology

<sup>4</sup> Twigg, 2009

<sup>5</sup> Workshop of Swiss NGO DRR Platform, 20.5.2019

These priorities serve as framework for categorising the DRR practices found in the documents.

#### Good practices

“Good” practices are those that are effective and sustainable. This evidence is given by evaluations.

## **2 Methodology**

The findings of the present report have been compiled through a desk study of documents on the effectiveness and usefulness of DRR in the post-disaster context, coupled with a workshop of members of the Swiss NGO DRR Platform.

### **2.1 Desk study**

The desk study consists of following working steps:

#### Collection of documents

Information is collected in the form of evaluations, studies, reports etc., e.g. mid-term reviews, end-term evaluation, final project reports, specific studies, and including the project proposal. Member organisations provided their relevant information, which totalled in over 70 documents (see list in chapter 6).

#### Screening and selection of the documents

The received documents have been screened in order to have a selection for the analysis. Criteria for selecting a project are:

- Project implementation within recovery phase  
For the analysis, a project timeframe of 5 years after the event is chosen. As this period usually covers the phase of activity of humanitarian actors. Afterwards, interventions often pass over to development projects with changing implementers, actors and funding. In reality, the time span may be different, as it is very context-specific and depends on the characteristics of the event.
- “Targeted DRR”:  
The project includes a specific goal or an explicit DRR component that go beyond “integrated DRR” or “safe construction”.  
Many of the projects of the platform member’s received aim at safe (re-) construction of (physical) infrastructure, basic services and facilities or housing. They take design principles, existing building codes and regulations into account. Awareness raising and capacity building are complementing the interventions. In this sense, the projects make use of the window of opportunity to introduce DRR measures in the (early) recovery of an event.
- Availability of an evaluation:  
Evaluations give external observations and allow for extracting evidence and identifying success factors. Final reports and other documents are only considered as complementation to an available evaluation.

The screening is documented in Table 2 in the annex that also gives an overview on the selection criteria. It resulted in 10 projects, which were analysed closer:

Organisation	Project title	Description of project	SwS co-funded project	Type of document/ evaluation	Remarks on evaluation document
<b>Haiti</b>					
Swiss Red Cross	Gestion des risques des désastres, Palmiste-à-Vin	Full DRR programme (preparedness and mitigation), starting 4 yrs. after earthquake after a recovery and a DRR pilot project	Yes	External evaluation at end of project. Capitalisation and recommendations that gives qualitative description of results	Focus on achievements of projects and perception of beneficiaries as well as recommendation for similar project based on document analysis and qualitative interviews
<b>Philippines</b>					
HEKS-EPER	Rehabilitation of livelihoods and resilience on Panay Island	Rehabilitation project starting an yr. after typhoon Haiyan; 3 components, 2 of them focusing on livelihoods and resilience, 1 on disaster preparedness	Yes, but not DRR-component	External evaluation at end of project; impact evaluation	Review of the relevance, effectiveness and impact of the livelihood and DRR components as well as recommendation for similar project End-line survey and document analysis.
Swiss Red Cross	Shelter and WASH recovery in Capiz	A recovery project that includes WASH and disaster preparedness/ management.	Yes	Mid-term review of the by German Red Cross focus on integration of project components	Focus on achievements, efficiency and relevance. Gives recommendations. Results/ effectiveness statements can not directly be attributed to projects.
<b>Pakistan</b>					
Helvetas	Building back better project 2015 -2018	The project starting 5 yrs. after the event, covered 3 components: WASH, livelihoods and Disaster Risk Management. Considered because it addressed the damages from the flood 2010 as well as prepared communities for similar recurrent events. It also showcases a project that bridges the gap between humanitarian and development assistance.	Yes	Collective experience capitalisation with focus on different aspects of project.	Prepared and documented by a team, 3-day stock-taking workshop with different stakeholders, aimed at learning. Looks at success factors, results, project management and draws conclusions.
Caritas	Rehabilitation after Pakistan Floods: Revitalizing Livelihoods of Vulnerable Communities through the Rehabilitation of Critical Infrastructure	Rehabilitation of irrigation/ water supply schemes. A further project in not yet covered areas, starting 3 yrs. after floods. Some already rehabilitated structures were damaged in subsequent events.	Yes	Impact study by the Aga Khan rural support programme, focus on impact of project on livelihoods	Quantitative and qualitative methods to determine the levels of impact for various issues/ sectors. Does not follow the evaluation criteria, presents findings and gives some comments.  Caritas states that the study did not fulfil their quality standards for a final evaluation.
Swiss Red Cross	Recovery and DRR in Manoor Valley	Project beyond 5-year timeframe, considered because located in non-attended region.  Focus on (re) construction of structural measures.	Yes, but not DRR-component	Final evaluation by Danish Red Cross, Swiss Solidarity and Swiss Red Cross	Follows evaluation criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and gives recommendations Results are measured against project objectives.
<b>Nepal</b>					
World Vision	Nepal Recovery Evaluation Report	Project that followed relief and emergency response of WV, focus on livelihood assistance, reconstruction of schools and starting of primary education programmes.	No	Programme evaluation by World Vision International after project end	Survey on a variety of wellbeing indicators, quantitative calculation of capacities (according to OECD resilience system analysis). Short answers for effectiveness against indicators.
ADRA	Building resilience to disaster by Promoting and Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management and	DRR programme after immediate recovery by ADRA	No	Evaluation by ADRA Nepal after project end	Follows evaluation criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and gives recommendation.

Organisation	Project title	Description of project	SwS co-funded project	Type of document/ evaluation	Remarks on evaluation document
	Resilience Initiatives in Earthquake Affected Communities: Kavre and Dhading District Province 3				Very comprehensive study.
<b>Andaman Islands</b>					
Terre des hommes	Water Sanitation and Health improvements for children on Barantang Island	DRR project focusing on schools as part of a broader Tsunami recovery programme, implemented from 2009 to 2011		Capitalisation, lessons learnt of whole project "DRR in school"; carried out 5 yrs. after project end	Capitalisation of experiences gained by focus groups, individual interviews. Comments on the achievements along the logframe.

Additionally, the SwS evaluation of projects in Haiti (2016) and the post-Matthew evaluation (2017) were examined in order to support the conclusions.

### Analysis of documents

The selected projects are examined in more detail along the following questions:

Criteria	Key questions
Effectiveness	1. Which DRR measures and approaches were applied by member organisations in the frame of recovery programmes after major disasters?
	2. To what extent did DRR measures and approaches in the frame of recovery programmes contribute to effectiveness?
	3. And why, what are the success factors for effectiveness of recovery by integrating DRR measures and approaches?
	4. Which DRR measures and approaches had limited or no contribution to effectiveness? And why, what are the reasons?
Sustainability	5. Which evidence indicates that the achieved effects will continue after the completion of the project? Which factors might enhance or hamper the persistence of the achieved effects?

To answer question 1 and to have an overview, the approaches and practices applied are attributed to the 4 priorities of the SFDRR. Referring to the second question, the author could not directly assess to what extent the approaches were effective. Therefore, the statements made in the documents are taken up and presented here in extracts. The success factors as well as the hampering factors for effectiveness (questions 3 and 4) base on the documents and are clustered and complemented by the feedback of the workshop participants. The same approach is chosen to distil factors for sustainability.

The evaluation synthesis mainly relies on the provided documents. However, these show certain limitations. The evaluations follow their logic and the mandate of the leading organisation. For instance, some evaluations looked only at the whole programme and not at the DRR component in detail. Others – like the mid-term review of the German Red Cross in the Philippines – addressed issues like the level of integration of 3 projects. Some documents are capitalisations of experiences and lesson learnt, which include answers on effectiveness and sustainability but in another, already condensed form. Also, some of the documents do not provide detailed/ enough evidence.

## 2.2 Workshop

A workshop involving DRR advisors and desk officers in charge of programs in disaster-prone countries took place on Monday, 20<sup>th</sup> of May 2019 in Bern (see Annex 2 – Workshop) for the list of participants and programme). It aimed at validating preliminary findings of the evaluation synthesis report and collecting good practices.

A draft of success and hampering factors for effective and sustainable approaches was presented, discussed and complemented. Furthermore, the participants shared good practices in DRR in reconstruction and recovery from their projects and contributed to the discussion on the Humanitarian-Development-Nexus.

The workshop's results informed the present report, but were not systematically analysed. The good DRR practices are documented in Annex 2 – Workshop.

## 3 Findings

### 3.1 Characterisation of applied DRR practices

The DRR measures and activities applied in the projects are compiled and attributed to the 4 SFDRR priorities. The categorisation is not very exact as especially the DRR programmes show interventions in more than one priority.

#### SFDRR priority 1: Understanding risk

- Awareness raising in schools/ of councils (SRC, Philippines)
- Awareness raising in schools (SRC Haiti)
- Identification of at-risk zones (SRC Haiti)
- Awareness raising in schools (World Vision Nepal)
- Awareness raising in schools and communities (ADRA Nepal)
- Awareness raising in schools and communities (TdH, Andaman Island)
- Village DRR assessments (Helvetas, Pakistan)

#### SFDRR priority 2: Risk governance

- Establishment and recognition of community-based disaster risk management organisations (Helvetas, Pakistan)
- Local recognition of disaster risk management plans (Helvetas, Pakistan)

#### SFDRR priority 3: DRR measures

- Soil conservation/ protection, afforestation, terra preta – technique (composting) in community gardens (SRC, Haiti)
- Structural measures (retaining walls, check dams, ...) (SRC, Pakistan)
- Rehabilitation of critical infrastructure incl. protective walls (Caritas, Pakistan)
- Rehabilitation of mangroves/ tree plantings through households (HEKS, Philippines)

#### SFDRR priority 4: Preparedness for response

- Establishment of emergency committees and capacity building (SRC, Haiti)
- Establishment of early warning system, contingency planning, establishment/ building of evacuation routes and shelters (SRC, Haiti)
- Establishment, training and equipment of DRR committees, up-dating of evacuation plans (HEKS, Philippines)
- Capacity building of emergency committees, contingency planning (SRC, Philippines)
- Elaboration of contingency plans incl. local early warning systems (Helvetas, Pakistan)
- Search & rescue, first aid trainings (Helvetas, Pakistan)
- Capacity building of local disaster management structures, contingency planning, equipment (World Vision, Nepal)
- Disaster management plans of schools and communities (ADRA, Nepal)
- Disaster management plans of schools and communities (TdH, Andaman Island)

The categorisation shows, that most of the DRR activities are found in improving the preparedness of various stakeholders, be it school children, households, DRR committee members or local governments. These activities are often coupled with awareness raising, (joint) assessment of risks and vulnerabilities. Risk-aware people can take action before a next event and are able to better respond. In this sense, they can be considered as non-regret measures. Fewer practices cover structural DRR measures, perhaps because they are labour intensive and require technical knowledge. Only some activities were planned as risk governance activities, however, also the establishment and recognition of emergency committees or the elaboration and adoption of contingency plans can be seen as contributing to the institutionalisation of DRR.



### 3.2 Effectiveness of the applied measure and approaches

The question to what extent the approaches and measures are effective is usually answered by assessing if the activities have attained the objectives set at the project beginning. The evaluators assessed the effectiveness quite differently: Some strictly according to the indicators by carrying out an end-line survey or by calculating specially designed factors. While some show a mix of quantitative and qualitative statements, others are more descriptive. These distinct approaches make it difficult to compare the project results.

The information on the effectiveness is extracted from the evaluations at hand and depicted in the following table.

Organisation	DRR goals of the project	Achievements	General appraisal by evaluator
<b>Haiti</b>			
Swiss Red Cross	<p>Outcome :</p> <p>Les communautés sont mieux <b>préparées</b> pour faire face aux désastres et sont <b>mieux protégées</b> par des mesures de prévention.</p> <p>(impact : La résilience des communautés aux désastres est augmentée.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Des <b>Equipes d'Interventions Communautaires</b> ont été mis en place .... Les autorités locales la Croix Rouge Haitienne, les Comité Local de Protection Civile ont été impliqués et renforcés par des formations. Les EIC travaillent sur une base volontaire et la stratégie doit être renforcée pour assurer la pérennité du système.</li> <li>Ces deux activités [<b>plans de contingence/ cartographie pour des abris</b>] rencontrent un grand succès dans les communautés et peuvent permettre de mobiliser les populations autour des EIC en leur donnant une certaine crédibilité. ...</li> <li>Des organisations de base ont été identifiées et sélectionnées pour la mise en place de pépinières et d'<b>activités de stabilisation des terres et des ravines</b>.</li> <li>Un travail d'introduction de la <b>technique de terra preta</b> a été également effectué. Il demande de lourds efforts aux paysans pour la mise en place mais les résultats de la méthode semblent encourageants .... Des bacs de <b>lombricompost</b> ont été mis en place au niveau des pépinières... La technique semble rencontrer moins d'engouement et le support utilisé rend le système difficile à reproduire.</li> </ul>	<p>L'équipe du projet est bien intégrée dans sa zone d'intervention et les résultats observés sont prometteurs. Il existe une certaine dynamique qui s'est créée dans les localités ciblées et les efforts doivent être poursuivis.</p>
<b>Philippines</b>			
HEKS-EPER	<p>Specific objective 3 (of 3): Affected communities in the 6 targeted municipalities are <b>better prepared and have adequate knowledge and awareness</b> on coping mechanisms to mitigate risks and effects of hazards</p> <p>(overall goal: rehabilitation of vulnerable households)</p>	<p>Aside from having 17 Barangay Disaster Risk Reduction Management <b>Committee established</b> in 17 barangays<sup>6</sup>, the council members have shown a <b>good knowledge</b> and understanding of what the role and functions of the committees are. They were also familiar with the requirements and processes needed to have their DRR and evacuation plans approved and obtain budget allocations from their barangay annual investment plan. ... Beneficiaries were mobilised for <b>mangroves rehabilitation</b> as well as <b>tree planting</b> in backyards.</p> <p>When <b>typhoon Marce</b> hit the province in November 2016, 54% had <b>prepared</b> emergency kits before its landfall, while 32% braced their houses.</p>	<p>The evaluation sees the DRR component to have met its objectives.</p>
Swiss Red Cross (Capiz)	<p>Outcome 3 (of 3): The population of the targeted Barangays and PRC Chapter apply their <b>improved skills and instruments</b> for effective disaster management and <b>are aware</b> of climate risks.</p> <p>(overall goal: strengthened resilience of affected communities)</p>	<p>Output statements from final report:</p> <p>The Philippine Red Cross continues to work with authorities regarding DRR activities in <b>schools</b> and several <b>trainings</b> were conducted in communities and schools. School Based DRM training was conducted as well as Council Management Training.</p> <p><b>VCA implementation</b> and re-echo sessions on school and Barangay level; drills at schools and communities; <b>tree planting</b>, workshops for DRR and <b>contingency planning</b>.</p> <p>From Midterm Review (attribution to single project not possible): Trend analyses conducted ... show that women and men see their overall situation as having at least recovered to the pre-Haiyan level. In most cases, community members assessed the aspects of sanitation, disaster preparedness and community strengths as improved.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>The project team in Capiz is well aware of the importance of integration in the project. ... excellent progress with regard to the quantity and quality of activities...</p>
<b>Pakistan</b>			
Helvetas	<p>Community <b>resilience</b> and <b>preparedness</b> to respond to and</p>	<p>Based on the partners' and beneficiaries' feedback, the project interventions reached the intended direct effects (immediate results).</p>	

<sup>6</sup> Barangay is the smallest administrative division in the Philippines.

Organisation	DRR goals of the project	Achievements	General appraisal by evaluator
	manage future disasters effectively is <b>improved</b> .	Furthermore, it contributed to other positive effects (indirect results), which are essential for communities' environment and local development planning. With the <b>setup and institutionalisation of the CBDRO</b> , these initiated indirect effects have the potential to be <b>continued beyond the project's duration</b> .	
Caritas	Goal: To contribute to increased food security and improved living standards of the rural population through the <b>rehabilitation</b> of flood-affected <b>critical infrastructure</b> projects (irrigation channels, water supply schemes and <b>protective walls</b> ).	Overall progress and implementation of the project demonstrates that the <b>livelihood</b> of the vulnerable and marginalized communities ... <b>has improved</b> considerably ... Structures build with CARITAS assistance are durable and <b>management system of irrigation channels have become self-sustained</b> . <b>Building protective wall saved the agricultural economy and assets</b> of the rural population and more importantly prevented food insecurity which was a major threat. More fodder and crops are made available for livestock and lot of barren land was cultivated.	The project intervention has resulted to bring considerable changes in the livelihood of the people as observed, in terms of agriculture productivity, equitable water distribution.
Swiss Red Cross	Outcome 2 (of 4): Communities in the Manoor Valley are better protected against natural hazards and have improved access to public/communities' facilities.  (overall goal: full recovery from the impact of the 2010 floods in the Manoor Valley and to re-built and improvement of the valley infrastructure)	The <b>structural and non-structural measures</b> to enhance the community resilience are in place, though less in numbers due to funding constraints, and the <b>communities have taken charge</b> of the same to operate and maintain. The programme has made significant achievement in completing infrastructure schemes (construction (or reconstruction) of bridges, foot-tracks, gabion walls, retaining walls and check dams). The <b>structural mitigation</b> programmes such as the walls and check dams have also considerably reduced the risks related to frequent flooding and landslides. The construction activities have, in most cases, achieved the objective of providing improved and safer access to communities.	Overall, the Programme has been quite effective in addressing the DRR needs of the Manoor Valley communities.
<b>Nepal</b>			
World Vision	Outcome 2 (of 4): Earthquake-affected families have restored their livelihoods and <b>have better preparedness and ability</b> to manage future disasters.  (overall goal: strengthened resilience)	<b>Implementation of DRM plans:</b> Unclear. ... In this sense, the strong <b>DRR component has been mainstreamed</b> across all sectors to ensure that communities' resilience is improved and they are better prepared to respond and manage future shocks. The evaluation team found that in Dolakha, Nuwakot and Dhading, <b>DRM plans</b> were developed and implemented at VDC level. However, the Korea project evaluation findings indicate that the DRM plans were drafted but at the time of the evaluation not yet implemented.. <b>Awareness raising events:</b> All these three events of implementing DRM plan were successful in coordination with the local government and community people.	N/A
ADRA	Outcome 1: The community and the local government of the project area will understand the DRR, educate and familiar with the DRR process and adopt the proper risk reduction measures.  Outcome 2: The children, teachers, parents and the educational authorities understand the importance of School Safety and adopt the Safe School Framework to educate, prepare and act for resilience in education sector.  Outcome 3: The government, policy makers, civil society and public in general will be familiar with and act to adopt the SFDRR 2015-2030 priorities at the local level planning adopting the policy frameworks.  (Overall goal: to build the communities back to normalcy)	More specifically, the project has improved the <b>knowledge</b> of school children, teachers, and communities on the process to identify their surrounding hazards, risks, and mapping the vulnerabilities. Accordingly, schools and adjoining communities were empowered to <b>prepare their local disaster management plans</b> including risk reduction, mitigation, prevention, and emergency preparedness. Following the plan, it was found that project provided number of supports to <b>implement those plans</b> remaining within the available resources. Project launched various <b>capacity building measures and awareness campaign</b> combined that with hands-on practical training, awareness raising, transferring DRR knowledge and skill, which were found extremely useful for the communities and schools in their everyday life. As an impact of knowledge and skills that each school children and teachers shared with their respective communities, community perspectives on their safety measures were found extra ordinarily effective. ...After the hazard and risk assessment and capacity building on developing school safety plan, most of the schools in project communities have developed <b>School Disaster Risk Management Plan (SDRMP)</b> and are implementing.	The project has been able to successfully achieve the intended goal and objectives.
<b>Andaman Islands</b>			
Terre des hommes	The work focussed on supporting school children and teachers to reduce the risk of earthquakes, including: Non-structural mitigation measures, school disaster management plans and mock drills.	<b>Safe Learning Facilities:</b> There is very little awareness among school staff of the level of risk around the physical premises. ... The project's non-structural mitigation measures (i.e. actions focused on non-weight-bearing elements that are either attached to or kept in a building) remain in some schools. <b>School Disaster Management:</b> Prepared School Disaster Management Plans, in all 8 schools of Baratang Island. This included risk analyses, teachers' training, awareness raising among students and involvement of local stakeholders. The collaboration with	Though it was challenging to measure the expected outcomes of the project after five years, it was encouraging to see that some footprints of the project and its impact are visible. It is clear that the project met the contractual obligations.

Organisation	DRR goals of the project	Achievements	General appraisal by evaluator
		<p>government departments was exceptionally good and the outputs were "as per plan." However, in Baratang schools there remains a lack of DRR awareness and "culture"...</p> <p><b>Risk Reduction and Resilience Education:</b> The ... course was the first technical training on DRR provided to teachers in the Andaman's. ... It could have been more effective had there been proper link up with a Government programme to use the trainees as master trainers.</p> <p><b>Community Resilience linked to Schools:</b> Combining DRR in schools with community outreach was a good concept. However, the project team allocated far less time to execute activities in communities, and the project failed to sensitize communities and stakeholders adequately on how community resilience is enhanced via school DRR actions.</p>	

According to the evaluations, the applied approaches and practices seem, in general, to be effective. This is mainly true for awareness building and trainings as well as for the establishment and strengthening of local emergency committees. In the projects, where structural measures were implemented, the evaluators assess them to be effective. However, the expected effect in terms of risk reduction is not quantified.

### 3.3 Success factors for effectiveness

#### Applying a multi-stakeholder approach in the project management

The involvement of key actors across various levels, from government and the community, in the planning as well as in the implementation of activities is mentioned explicitly as one of the success factors.

The projects of HEKS or SRC in the Philippines involved both actors from government and civil society.

Also in the case of Helvetas in Pakistan, the collaboration among different actors is seen as success factor. Needs and vulnerability/ risk assessments seem to facilitate the access from project implementers towards the relevant stakeholders.

#### *Quotes<sup>7</sup> from the project evaluations:*

*The project already applied this approach in the DRR component where key actors from the government and local resource organizations were involved not just in planning activities but also in the implementation and review of the results from the activities conducted in the municipalities covered. The evaluation already identified this approach **as one of the vital elements** that allowed the DRR component to successfully implement its interventions. (HEKS Philippines)*

*The **collaboration among different actors** and joint actions in the project were identified as **success factor No. 1**. ... [The Build back better project] worked in close collaboration with the government line agencies and communities for joint implementation especially in case of infrastructure. It also helped in joint planning and organisation of preparedness trainings in first aid & rescue. The importance of such mechanisms in conflict sensitivity and prevention through regular transparent communication cannot undermined. (Helvetas Pakistan)*

*All three project teams show a **strong effort to coordinate** with municipal governments and respective units. ... Engagement with specialized agencies ... appears to be particularly close; the programme plays a supportive role of these agencies in addressing respective mandates. (SRC Philippines)*

#### Working with multiplier (school children)

The programme of ADRA in Nepal focused at the preparedness of communities and had activities that targeted at school children. The evaluation states that "working with children as an entry point was much effective approach as it could disseminate knowledge and information much rapidly than any other means". They involved also teachers and the school management to ensure that DRR was integrated in the curricula and to allocate certain funding.

<sup>7</sup> Bold font by the author.

*Quotes from the project evaluations:*

*It was found that working with children as an entry point was much effective approach as it could **disseminate knowledge** and information **much rapidly** than any other means. (ADRA Nepal)*

*Engaging school teachers and management was important **to improve local buy-in**, integration of DRR plan in school annual plans, and ensure allocation of certain funding for future DRR work. (ADRA Nepal)*

DRR as cross-cutting issue on the programme management level

The Red Cross actions in the Philippines followed an integrated approach, combining WASH, shelter, livelihoods and DRR interventions. The mid-term-review by German Red Cross revealed that benefits of the integrated approach are: 1) that it can increase efficiency by avoiding overlaps and duplication, or even counteracting efforts. 2) If all 'sectors' work in an integrated fashion, they are more likely to detect and address cross-cutting concerns and build on overall local capacity and resilience.

Relationship between NGO and local authorities

The good and already established relationship with the local authority is seen in several projects an important contribution to its success. It helped for the starting and the acceptance of the intervention efforts and smoothed the way to actively involve the authorities in the project. In Pakistan, Helvetas could rely on their long presence in the region and their experience. The project of SRC in the Philippines could base their links to the municipalities on the early response activities in the same region. Also in Nepal, ADRA states, that the involvement of the local authorities was important to achieve the objectives.

*Quotes from project evaluations*

*The early response of Philippine Red Cross (PRC) to Typhoon Haiyan and the **links created** with the respective municipalities were identified as opportunities to position PRC as an auxiliary authority of the Government of Philippines." (SRC Philippines)*

***Good rapport** established with the local authorities brought about good result. (establishing DM fund by allocating resource for the same and it was possible through their active engagement during the local level planning for mainstreaming DRR into it) (ADRA Nepal)*

*As Helvetas already enjoyed **well established contacts** in [the region] due to its long-term development presence ... acquiring goodwill and support for BBB was not a major challenge. (Helvetas Pakistan)*

Linking with/ to local government

Closely related with the paragraph above, the involvement of the local authorities is underlined also in view of the future. It is considered key to continue activities after the end of the project and for the institutionalisation of DRR. The capitalisation of TdH on the Andaman Islands underlines the importance to work with and through government schemes. In Pakistan, Helvetas considers its project as having acted as facilitator to connect communities and governmental actors. Also in Nepal, ADRA was able to work with the local authorities in order that they assumed their role in DRR. SRC in Pakistan could mobilise and organise the community in a very conflict-sensitive context.

*Quotes from the project evaluations:*

*BBB [Building back better project] **acted as a facilitator** to connect communities and governmental partners for an improved communication, coordination and mutual understanding of their needs and duties. (Helvetas Pakistan)*

*The project was successfully been able **to make municipalities to play a central role in** coordinating and sustaining a multi-level, multi-stakeholder platform to promote DRR in the project municipalities by forming a municipality level disaster risk management committee in Municipalities and Palikas, Disaster Management Committee at Ward and Community Level. (ADRA Nepal)*

*The community of Manoor Valley has been labelled as almost impenetrable – closed, rigid and difficult to work with. The mere fact that the Programme **was able to build rapport**, convince the communities to open up and participate in the Programme in different ways, and achieve its physical target (though reduced), is a big achievement. Challenges notwithstanding, community institutions have provided a way of social organisation, and interaction where none existed earlier, particularly for women, and in a context of internal conflicts and divisions. (SRC Pakistan)*

### 3.4 Limited contribution to effectiveness

#### No consideration of other than manifested hazards

In particular, structural protective measures but also hazard-proof (re-)construction of housing are designed to address a specific hazard. Evidently, the event that occurred serves as reference. Particularly in context with multiple hazards, it is crucial that other hazards are also taken into account. The recovery phase allows for broader understanding of the risk situation. In this sense, the evaluation of SRC in Haiti recommends to take drought into account, which is recurrent in the intervention zone. The evaluation of ADRA in Nepal comments that along with earthquake-resistant school construction, hazards such as windstorms or fire could have been considered too.

#### Quotes from the project evaluations:

*Along with earthquake-resistant school building construction, more attention could have been given and **highlighted to other hazards** like windstorms, fire, lightning and epidemics. A project could have included some resources to install fire alarm, an earthquake alarm, and lightning rods to reduce the risk. Not to have insisted on this measure is a significant missed opportunity. (ADRA Nepal)*

*La mitigation des risques [sustainable land use management in this case] pourrait développer les aspects suivants : La prise en compte du risque lié à **la sécheresse** : **c'est un risque majeur** et récurrent dans la zone, des mesures peuvent être prises pour la rétention d'eau, un meilleur usage, le stockage des semences, la production de contre saison. (SRC Haiti)*

#### Lack of integration of DRR in overall programme

The lack of consideration of DRR aspects in other project components (such as livelihood or WASH) is considered as missed opportunity. For instance, in the project from HEKS in the Philippines, the evaluator points out that the achieved results are at risk. DRR activities would have an added value in safeguarding assets. The mid-term-review by German Red Cross in the Philippines states, that in the context of the typhoon Haiyan programme, DRR is best understood as both a sector (e.g. strengthening response capacity) and as a cross-cutting issue (mainstreaming into all aspects of the overall operation). The latter, however is not always implemented.

#### Quotes from the project evaluations:

*As communities will continue to be impacted by natural disasters, the DRR component should also include safeguarding the livelihood of the affected families. The project evaluation saw the lack of coordination and collaboration between the two components as the two components were implemented independent of each other. Some of the elements that were missing were interventions that **would safeguard the livelihood** assets, farm animals, and crops of the affected households.*

...

*Although the livelihood component was able to provide climate smart farming technologies and crop insurance this came about outside of any joint planning or undertaking between the livelihood team and the DRR team. In projects that incorporated livelihood concerns in the DRR component, interventions such as **early warning systems** for farmers against heavy rains or winds were installed to help farmers reduce the damage wrought by typhoons, **business continuity planning** for the microenterprises were conducted to help them plan and prepare on how to protect and secure their small business." (HEKS Philippines)*

#### Hardware without software

Structural measures enhance the physical protection. Without supportive activities to raise awareness or capacity building, indirect effects as well as communal ownership cannot unfold. The evaluation of SRC in Pakistan identified a clear need for awareness, preparedness and contingency planning. In contrast, in Haiti, it was taken advantage of the construction of shelters and evacuation routes to mobilise the communities.

#### Quotes from the project evaluations:

*Given the high frequency of disasters in the Valley, it was noted that it is unlikely that the programme will achieve its ultimate aim of resilience building and protection against future disasters without inclusion of at least key DRR activities. This finding remains true as not much has been done in terms of non-structural mitigation measures, disaster risk reduction, awareness, preparedness and contingency planning. (SRC Pakistan)*

ADRA in Nepal identified as good practice that the software activities that lead hardware activities promoted community empowerment. At the beginning, however, it was difficult to reach the community with only software activities.

*Quotes from the project evaluations:*

*Weak participation of school, community and the municipality in the beginning of project due to its software in nature: Most of the project activities planned under BURDAN Project were soft components in nature, therefore, was difficult for the project team and the partners to attract school children, school management, community and the municipality officials. (ADRA Nepal)*

#### Not building on permanent structures

Due to contextual restriction, projects may build-up temporary action groups. It is important, however, that established structures gain legitimacy by the population. Furthermore, they need to be recognised and integrated in the state level system as it is pointed out for the emergency committees in Haiti.

*Quotes from the project evaluations:*

*Au niveau local, si la mise en place des Equipes d'Intervention Communautaires se justifie en raison de la fréquence des catastrophes et le besoin de rapprocher les services aux personnes. Le fonctionnement de ces organisations à long terme doit cependant faire l'objet d'une réflexion. Il est nécessaire de renforcer leur légitimité et que le public reconnaisse leur rôle. (SRC Haiti)*

*Les Equipes d'Intervention Communautaires ne sont ni tout à fait intégrées dans le dispositif national ni dans le système Croix-Rouge. Leur statut devrait être clarifié à l'échelle nationale et localement. ... Bien que le projet se concentre sur le niveau local, il pourrait contribuer plus activement à une réflexion sur le fonctionnement du système dans son ensemble. (SRC Haiti)*

#### Lack of comprehensive assessments as starting point of the operation

The identification of vulnerabilities, risks and capacity should be prior to the beginning of the project. This would allow for an early involvement of the community and reflect their needs.

*Quotes from the project evaluations:*

*The implementation of vulnerability and capacity assessments late in the programme stole much of the potential towards a community-led planning process. (SRC Philippines)*

*All relevant needs assessments and vulnerability analyses should be carried out as an integral part of the programme planning and design process. (SRC Pakistan)*

#### Sequencing of project components and late start of DRR actions

Both evaluations of SRC in the Philippines as well in Pakistan highlighted a different sequencing of project components, which also would allow a better combination of hardware and software. For SRC in the Philippines, it was stated that if DRR activities started earlier in the programme, it could have unfolded its full potential in reinforcing changes in risk-related attitudes and practices.

*Quotes from the project evaluations:*

*Some activities were launched later than others - as a rule of thumb, hardware preceded software ... While understandable under then prevailing limitations, the discussions during workshops showed that opportunities for mutual reinforcement of software and hardware were missed. Sequencing of Safe Shelter Awareness prior to Shelter Recovery Assistance, Participatory Approach to Safe Shelter Awareness and/or DRR prior to shelter completion, PHAST prior to latrines, and - importantly - of integrated VCAs and CAPs early on would have been ideal to harness **mutual reinforcement of software and hardware**. (SRC Philippines)*

*As rightly pointed out by MTR, the inadequate "sequencing of activities," whereby the hardware component preceded the software component, has led to less than adequate communal ownership of the Programme and its interventions, seriously impacting the long-term sustainability. (SRC Pakistan)*

Interestingly, also the programme of Helvetas in Pakistan started with "hard" elements (like the rehabilitation of infrastructure) and later transformed to "soft" elements in terms of capacity building, which apparently was not limiting.

### 3.5 Evidence on the sustainability of the applied DRR approaches

In the following, evidence that the project activities will sustain and where critical points are, is given. It draws on the evaluations. Some of the factors are overlapping with the success factors for effectiveness as i.e. the involvement of and the collaboration with the authorities in place. Here again, enabling and hampering factors are different sides of the same coin: While in some projects certain factors are considered to ensure a longer-term sustainability, the same factors in other contexts showed limitations.

#### Ensuring maintenance of structural work

Infrastructure like bridges or water supply schemes and structural protection measures require periodical maintenance to ensure their long-term functionality. The evaluation of World Vision in Nepal as well as those of SRC in Pakistan point out, that the projects were able to build-upon or form committees, that took over the management and maintenance responsibility of the built structures. However, it is pointed out in the evaluation of SRC in Pakistan as well as in the experience capitalisation of Helvetas, that communities are not in a position to spend money if cost intensive material or skills are needed. Helvetas supported the community organisations to mobilise funds and linked them with the authorities.

#### *Quotes from the project evaluations:*

*One of the important aspects of CARITAS supported project implementation is that, it has developed a **sense of ownership** in people; they are committed **to take responsibly of channel management**. For instance, majority of the project areas have fee collection system on monthly basis that is deposited by beneficiaries with the main intention to contribute in channel or pipe maintenance. (CARITAS Pakistan)*

*Some of the key infrastructure interventions are likely to be highly sustainable because of benefits to communities who are at constant risk of disasters. These include foot-tracks, bridges and drinking water supply schemes which in fact **require minimal maintenance using local labour or material**. The Operation and Maintenance Committees are formed and auger well for sustainability but overall capacity for maintaining anything that requires purchased inputs or specialised skills are likely to face problems. (SRC Pakistan)*

*The **ownership and institutionalisation** of the Community Based Disaster Risk Management Organisation allows continuity of established models - related to maintenance, dissemination and advocacy after the project phase out. (Helvetas Pakistan)*

#### Handing-over to local authorities

As already mentioned in the section on success factors for effectiveness, the relation to and the engagement of the local level is crucial for the institutionalisation of the project efforts. The collaboration among different actors creates ownership and leads them to assume responsibility. Furthermore, it contributes to long-term sustainability of DRR. In the case of ADRA Nepal, the project reached that the authorities allocate funds for DRR.

#### *Quotes from the project evaluations:*

*Local level capacity building, engagement of local stakeholders, and co-financing are key to success of disaster related work. The project has been able to **actively engage local governments** and **make them committed** to include DRR in their regular plan. This has led to local level ownership and long-term sustainability of DRR. (ADRA Nepal)*

*With the intervention of Caritas, to ensure sustainability of the structures, local communities with the help of Local Support Organisations **have developed their own mechanisms** to counter emergency situations. The **committee has a diverse membership**, it has inclusion of farmers, teachers, skilled labours and old notables of the village, and this mixed group is responsible to avoid discrepancies in water distribution, counter conflicts, ensure maintenance and guarantee equal participation of local community. (Caritas Pakistan)*

*The institutionalisation of the project's results (II) is often less visible but highly relevant to ensure the continuity of activities and results at the project phase out. The high relevance is of the **improved linkages between communities and government institutions**, this fact was underlined by all project partners and staff. (Helvetas Pakistan)*

*There are other positive changes that came about as a result of the project interventions and one of these is the **various linkages that were established** by the project with established with key government agencies, other local development organizations and resource institutions as well as market actors. (HEKS Philippines)*

### Work with available assessments and governmental frameworks

It was pointed out by several evaluations that the DRR activities should built upon existing risk assessments and governmental strategies in order to be sustainable. Furthermore, established or strengthened structures have to be integrated in the national system. This is especially true for the emergency committees in Haiti – a recommendation also made by the Post-Matthew Review: community organisations must be linked and accredited by the Civil Protection Directorate.

#### *Quotes from the project evaluations:*

**VCA form the basis for future activities** of the committees and are financially supported by the barangay and municipality council as well as Ministry of Agriculture. (SRC Philippines)

World Vision worked with communities and local governments ... to ensure that 28 Local Disaster Risk Management Plans (LDRMP) were developed and linked to livelihoods and community development plans. These plans are beginning to enable the community to understand disaster risks specific to them and **strengthen** disaster risk **governance** for management of risk so that they are able to take action. (World Vision Nepal)

### Timeframe of project

DRR activities require time, especially for mobilising the stakeholders, establishing relationships, building up structures and mechanisms. Several evaluations pointed at these time-consuming processes.

#### *Quotes from the project evaluations:*

The **unrealistic timeframe** of the Programme—just 36 months with almost 9-12 months of inaccessibility to the programme area—grossly affected the programme efficiency. Due to harsh weather and closure of the Valley, the Programme Team did not have much to do in terms of programme implementation. The social mobilisation was hurried, resulting in weak community institutions. There was not even enough time to complete the infrastructure schemes and properly hand over the same to the community. (SRC Pakistan)

With six more months available ..., there is greater opportunity to further sustain existing outcomes, and to consolidate 'software' related outcomes in DRR and livelihoods. (SRC Philippines)

Long project duration, thus, is an enabling factor as also the Post-Matthew Review states:

Les projets n° I et IV ont une durée de plusieurs années, le projet n° II a eu une durée de 18 mois. La présence continue des organisations – soit avec les projets en GRC ou d'autres – permettait à établir des relations de confiance entre l'équipe de projet et les bénéficiaires.



## 4 Conclusions

The present evaluation synthesis shows the importance of DRR in the recovery context with a variety of applied approaches and practices by the different organisations in various contexts. Most of them are considered by their evaluators to work well.

Most of the applied DRR activities are found in the awareness raising and improving the preparedness of various stakeholders, be it school children, households, DRR committee members or local governments. Awareness raising and preparedness activities play a vital role in recovery as they reinforce changes in risk-related attitudes and practices. These changes in mind-set are crucial in contexts with recurrent hazards as underlined by several evaluations as they enable the people to act proactively. Only risk-aware people can take action before a next event and are able to better cope. Joint assessments of risks, vulnerabilities and existing capacities – preferably at the very start of the project – show the prevailing deficiencies and lay the ground for further activities. All actions to understand the risks, to reflect them in plans (be it hazard maps, contingency plans), to reinforce or build up community organisation and committees contribute to a better preparedness. Thus, they can be considered as non-regret measures in any context. When it comes to the approval of the organisations or the alignment with and integration into governmental structures, the evaluations show mixed results: Some projects succeed well thanks to their presence in the field, their good relationship with local actors or thanks to pre-existing structures like this is the case in the Philippines. Other projects had more difficulties, which, however, cannot only be attributed to their performance but also to the difficult general conditions in the country as i.e. in Haiti.

Structural or bioengineering measures (apart from the reconstruction of infrastructure) to mitigate adverse events were applied only in few projects. They effectively reduce the prevailing risk and have positive long-term effects: They protect people and their assets. Soil conservation or afforestation also positively influence the natural resources, which gain in importance in view of climate change. As the evaluations state, the implementation of mitigation measures are often labour intensive, need a longer period of time and an organisational structure, especially for ensuring the maintenance.

Disaster risk governance is understood as the system of institutions, mechanisms, policy and legal frameworks and other arrangements to guide, coordinate and oversee disaster risk reduction policy<sup>8</sup>. Building or improving governance is a long-lasting endeavour, which goes beyond the project duration, but need to be initiated already in the recovery phase by taking advantage of the window-of-opportunity that the event presents. Of course, actors involved in the response might be absorbed by the actual event, however, there are many opportunities to base (DRR) activities – be it school disaster management plans, emergency committees or mitigation measures – on the respective government schemes. The projects were successful to strengthen local structures, procedures and capacities. Furthermore, the evaluations emphasise that these efforts are seen key to institutionalise the project results.

The overview of applied and effective DRR approaches reveal that “disaster risk reduction” has much more facets than mere disaster management or response to adverse events. Insofar, DRR has to be understood rather a cross-cutting issue than a stand-alone sector. All the more, as the examined recovery projects often aim not only at the restoration of but also at resilient livelihoods. That means, communities should be prepared to experience less damage and recover more rapidly in future event. The common focus of a programme or project on overall resilience allows integrating or complementing activities (e.g. establishment of early warning systems for farmers or risk-sensitive land cultivation) with little additional effort.

Understanding DRR as a development concern might be atypical to be tackled in a post-disaster humanitarian project. However, as shown, DRR interventions have an added value as they may ensure

---

<sup>8</sup> UNGA, 2017

linkages towards resilience and making humanitarian efforts more sustainable. Hence, DRR assumes an important role as link to the transition to development actions.

## 5 Suggestions

The following suggestions focus on project as well as on evaluation designing. The first draws on the success and hampering factors outlined in the present report. The latter intends to answer the question how to better capture evidence on effective DRR activities in different contexts.

To plan for effective DRR in the recovery phase of an event, it is recommended to:

- *Do risk, vulnerabilities and capacities assessment after first response*: They may be included in the needs assessments. If jointly carried out with the affected community, they can lay the ground for sound relationships. Furthermore, they inform the implementation of the most appropriate measures.
- *Consider also other risks than primary event*: One tends to take the past event as measure in terms of type and scale for all actions. In order to make the population better prepared and more resilient, a broader view should be adopted. Be it for trainings and capacity building or for (re-) construction work. In the latter case, sometimes little effort is needed to make buildings multi-hazard proof (i.e. earthquake and storm proof shelters).
- *Follow an integrated approach*: Mainstreaming DRR into humanitarian interventions is as important as linking the different components of a programme by joint actions. Furthermore, integrated approaches are better embedded in the local context and gain higher ownership in the long run, while isolated thematic interventions (like the construction of a mitigation measure) might faster contribute to reduce risks.

To gain more evidence on the effectiveness and sustainability of DRR efforts, it is recommended to:

- *Carry out post-event reviews*: DRR interventions, and prevention activities in particular, are difficult to communicate, as they only prove valuable during or after a natural event. In context with recurrent events, the opportunity should be taken to analyse the project efforts in the light of the past event. The post-disaster review of disaster risk reduction interventions implemented by different Swiss NGO DRR Platform member organisations in the aftermath of hurricane “Matthew”, which hit Haiti on October 4<sup>th</sup> 2016 is such an example. It provides learning and indications for potential adjusting. In such a review, not only structural mitigation measures or the level of preparedness can be assessed but also the functioning of emergency committees.
- *Apply standard evaluation criteria and tools to measure the effectiveness of DRR*: The present study had to overcome certain limitations of the available evaluations. Only few followed the standard evaluation criteria, which made the synthesis work difficult. However, this would also require a sound result-oriented planning. Furthermore, it was noticed for projects with an (additional) DRR component, that the evaluators could have better made use of existing tools and methods to assess the risk reduction and effect of DRR measures.

The present synthesis report shows a narrow scope as it relies primarily on the project evaluations provided and answering questions on effectiveness and sustainability. A more in-depth study to gain more evidence and to support the above outlined arguments, could have a closer look at contextual aspects of the projects (risk context/ social, political, institutional context) and at factors of enabling environments. Besides document analysis, this would require interviews with project staff or even field visits. Also an effectiveness analysis could be envisaged: Following a pre-defined methodology, various projects in the same region/ country or of the same type could be assessed in the field through a mix of methods.

## **6 Literature references**

- Évaluation de la consolidation des interventions financées par la chaîne du Bonheur en réponse au tremblement de terre en Haïti. 2016
- Évaluation post-Matthew de l'efficacité GRC en Haïti. Rapport final. 2017
- Swiss NGO DRR Platform discussion paper: Disaster Risk Reduction, Humanitarian Aid and Swiss Solidarity. 2015
- SwS response to the Swiss NGO DRR Platform discussion paper. 2015
  
- Twigg, John, 2009: Disaster Risk Reduction. Good Practice Review 9.
- UNISDR, 2017: Build Back Better in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2016. Report of the Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology Relating to Disaster Risk Reduction.
  
- Evaluations, assessments, reports reviewed (excel list, see following page)

Country	Organisation	Project Title	Documentation			
			Evaluation	Study	Report	Proposal
Haiti	Terre des hommes	Réponse aux besoins de préparation et prévention des risques auxquels sont exposées les populations affectées par le séisme dans la zone de Grand-Goâve				
	Helvetas	Consolidation de la résilience des populations locales et de la gouvernance dans la commune de Petit Goâve.			x	x
	Swiss Red Cross	Gestion des risques des désastres, Palmiste-à-Vin	x		x	x
	Caritas	Cabaret, Léogâne - Second Phase	x		x	x
	Medair	"DRR and reconstruction" (?)				
	INNOVABRIDGE	RÉPUBLIQUE D'HAÏTI BILAN DES INTERVENTIONS 1996-2014 ET PROSPECTIONS À MOYEN TERME DANS LE SECTEUR DE L'EAU POTABLE, DE L'ASSAINISSEMENT ET DE L'HYGIENE	x			
Pakistan	HEKS/EPER	Restoration of safe and disaster resilient WASH for flood affected population in Dadu District			x	x
	Helvetas	Building Back Better (Province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Dera Ismail Khan				x
	Swiss Red Cross	Shelter, CBHFA (and DRR) in Dadu - 443650 / 443652	x		x	x
	Swiss Red Cross	Recovery and DRR in Manoor Valley - 443656	x	x	x	x
	Caritas	Rehabilitation after Pakistan Floods: Revitalizing Livelihoods of Vulnerable Communities through the Rehabilitation of Critical Infrastructure	x		x	x
	CBM Schweiz	Accessible health services for people with disabilities (consolidation phase), Charsadda district	x			x
	CBM Schweiz	Accessible health services and WASH Pro-gramme for the Flood Affected Population in Muzaffargarh District South Punjab (Kot Addu)	x			x
Philippines	HEKS/EPER	Rehabilitation of livelihoods and resilience on Panay Island	x		x	x
	Caritas	Rehabilitation of Typhoon-affected Elementary Schools in Northern Cebu	x			
	Swiss Red Cross	Shelter and WASH recovery in Capiz - 443813	x		x	x
	Swiss Red Cross	Shelter and Recovery in Calamian Islands - 443814	x		x	x
	Swiss Red Cross	Shelter and Recovery in Ormoc (phase II) - 443819			x	x
	CBM Schweiz	Relief and recovery operation	x		x	
India	Terres des hommes	DRR in school project - Anadaman Islands - Tsunami Recovery		x		
Nepal	World Vision	Nepal Recovery Evaluation Report	x		x	
	World Vision	Nepal ADH5 Summary Evaluation Report	x		x	
	Swiss Red Cross	Red Cross Earth Quake Recovery Programme	x			
	Adra	Building resilience to disaster	x			
	CBM Schweiz	Health Service Strengthening Project (HSSP)	x			x

## Annex 1 – Overview of projects

In Table 1 the approaches are positioned in alignment with the 4 SFDRR priorities:

SFDRR 1: Understanding risk  2, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 25	SFDRR 2: Risk governance  1, 7
SFDRR 3: DRR measures*  2, 7, 4, 9, 10  3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 24	SFDRR 4: Preparedness for response  6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25

Table 1: Positioning of the DRR approaches of the Platform members in the 4 SFDRR priorities of action. The numbers refer to the list in table 2 annex. In red font are the projects considered in the report. In black font are those projects or project components considered as “integrated DRR” and not considered here. In grey font are those approaches that do not fulfil the selection criteria of availability of evaluations or are beyond set timeframe.

Some approaches are positioned in two fields as e.g. a preparedness project often has an awareness raising component or risk assessment element.

Table 2: Overview of projects with DRR measures and selection criteria

Country	Organisation	Nr.	Project	DRR measures Are they beyond safe construction?	Evaluation available?	Included for analysis
Haiti, earthquake 2010	Helvetas	1	Consolidation de la résilience des populations locales et de la gouvernance dans la commune de Petit Goâve.	Strengthening local governance/ protection of natural resources Yes	No, only final report	No
	Swiss Red Cross	2	Gestion des risques des désastres, Palmiste-à-Vin	Preparedness and mitigation measures Yes	Yes	Yes
	Caritas	3	Community-Driven Reconstruction Project of 330 Earthquake and Hurricane Resistant Permanent Houses in Cabaret, Léogâne	Safe construction of houses complemented with capacity building of workers No	No, only final report	No
Haiti, storms 2011 + 2013	Medair	4	Emergency Food Assistance, Côtes-de-Fer, Haiti	Rehabilitation of roads, soil conservation measures Yes	No, only final report	No
	Innovabridge	5	République d’Haïti bilan des interventions 1996-2014 et prospections à moyen terme dans le secteur de l’eau potable, de l’assainissement et de l’hygiène		Long-term impact study with broad thematic scope (not specifically DRR)	No
Pakistan, floods 2010	HEKS-EPER	6	Restoration of safe and disaster resilient WASH for flood affected population in Dadu District	Awareness raising and preparedness Yes	No, only final report	No
	Helvetas	7	Building back better project	DRM practices, mitigation measures, Yes	Capitalisation of experiences	Yes
	Swiss Red Cross	8	Shelter, CBHFA (and DRR) in Dadu	Safe construction in health sector with awareness raising, skills development for first aid in disaster response No	Impact assessment	No Assessment considers DRR as part of the build back better approach

Country	Organisation	Nr.	Project	DRR measures Are they beyond safe construction?	Evaluation available?	Included for analysis
	Swiss Red Cross	9	Recovery and DRR in Manoor Valley	Rehabilitation of critical infrastructure Repair and enhancement of mitigation measures Yes	Yes	Yes
	Caritas	10	Rehabilitation after Pakistan Floods: Revitalizing Livelihoods of Vulnerable Communities through the Rehabilitation of Critical Infrastructure	Rehabilitation of critical infrastructure Repair and enhancement of mitigation measures Yes	Post project impact study	Yes
	CBM	11	Accessible health services for people with disabilities (consolidation phase), Charsadda district	Improving access to health care for people with disability No	Yes	No (not focusing at DRR)
	CBM	12	Accessible health services and WASH Programme for the Flood Affected Population in Muzaffargarh District South Punjab (Kot Addu)	Rehabilitation of health and WASH facilities No	Yes	No (not focusing at DRR)
Philippines typhoon Haiyan 2014	HEKS-EPER	13	Rehabilitation of livelihoods and resilience on Panay Island	Awareness raising and preparedness Yes	Yes	Yes
	Caritas	14	Rehabilitation of Typhoon-affected Elementary Schools	Safe construction in the education sectors, complemented by awareness raising in schools No	Yes	No
	Swiss Red Cross	15	Shelter and WASH recovery in Capiz	Awareness raising and preparedness Yes	MTR	Yes
	Swiss Red Cross	16	Shelter and WASH recovery in Calamian Island	Awareness raising and preparedness Yes	No, only final report;	No IFRC-wide review with limited evidence
	Swiss Red Cross	17	Shelter and WASH recovery in Ormoc	Awareness raising and preparedness, mitigation measures Yes	No, only final report;	No, British RC Evaluation with limited evidence
	CBM	18	Relief and recovery operation	Safe construction complemented by awareness-raising on disability-inclusive DRR No	Yes	No (not focusing at DRR)
Nepal, recovery from earthquake 2015	World Vision	19	Nepal Recovery Evaluation Report	Preparedness Yes	Yes	Yes
	World Vision	20	Nepal Earthquake Response Rehabilitation	Awareness raising and preparedness Yes	Yes, but only executive summary	Yes
	Swiss Red Cross	21	Red Cross Earth Quake Recovery Programme	(no Information)	No, only MTR of overall Red Cross actions	No
	ADRA	22	Building resilience to disaster	Preparedness in schools Yes	Yes (internal evaluation)	Yes
	CBM	23	Health Service Strengthening Project	No	Yes	No Not focusing at DRR
Bangladesh, recovery from floods 2017	Terre des homes	24	Emergency Recovery Support to the Flood Affected Families in Kurigram District	Rehabilitation of infrastructure and houses; raising grounds and plinths No	Yes	No
Adaman Islands	Terres des homes	25	Water, Sanitation and Health improvements for children on Baratang Island	School-based DRR: safe facilities, DRM plans, awareness raising, Yes	Capitalisation	Yes

## Annex 2 – Workshop

The workshop took place on 20 May 2019 at Helvetas in Bern.

### Workshop Agenda

Time	Content	Methodology	Facilitation
09:15	Welcome and introduction		Toni Jöhr
09:25	Session 1: The draft evaluation synthesis report	Presentation, discussion in plenary	Franziska Schmid
10:45	Coffee Break		
11:15	Session 2: Good practices in “DRR in reconstruction and recovery”	Presentation by member organisations	Franziska Schmid
12:00	Success factors for “DRR in reconstruction and recovery”	Discussion in plenary	
13:00	Concluding remarks, outlook		Toni Jöhr

### Participants

Judith Macchi, HEKS

Cindy Jandl, ADRA

Eveline Studer, Helvetas

Eric Chevalier, Helvetas

John Brogan, Terre des hommes

Chandra Bikash (Terre des hommes, by skype)

Fabienne Weibel, Swiss Red Cross

Toni Jöhr, Swiss Red Cross

## Documentation of the workshop

Hypothesis

- HELVETAS as facilitator in a systemic approach.
- BBB as process for improved long-term development

Success Factors

- Solid context knowledge (pre-disaster): actors, institutions
- Mix soft and hard for capacity building
- Multi-stakeholder + Multi-level approaches
- Link rehabilitation with economic opportunities

Good practices

- Strengthening existing structures (community + state) (advocacy... (Pak, HTI, ...)
- Institutionalisation of BBB processes and capacities (Nep)
- Rehabilitation of productive assets/infrastructures (Nep, HTI, ...)
- Avoiding secondary disasters through latrines/biogas cooking (Bgl)
- Considering of host and refugee actors (Bgl)

Good practices by Helvetas

GOOD PRACTICES SRC

→ Community-based preparedness in recovery, for:

- awareness + CB + preparedness
- community empowerment + resilience strengthening
- SF: build on existing structures + systems
- "include school level DHA"
- work with LPAs

→ Hardware as entry point for soft-components, e.g.

- skills development, PCM
- increased preparedness
- inclusiveness + cohesion
- SF: existence of community leaders
- volunteerism as part of community DNA

→ TERRA PRETA in recovery

- faster + bigger yields
- risk mitigation + CCA



- Do HVCA's after first response
- In designing your project consider other risks than primary event
- BBB SHOULD INCREASE NATURAL ASSETS AND INCLUDE MULTIPLE SECTORS (PLINTH RAISED, GARDEN WASH, ANIMAL SHELTER, ROADS SAFELY-MANAGED SANITATION)
- UNRESTRICTED CASH FOR WORK ACCELERATES RECOVERY
- Management Committees can help to influence policies and create a sense of ownership of the community and facilitate the dialogue between authorities and communities (VOICE)
- Awareness raising on duties of authorities in DRM/DRR  
"READY-TO-USE"
- SELECT TECHNOLOGIES + APPROACHES FOR MULTIPLIER EFFECTS  
→ NBS (WOCAT examples) "CONTEXT RELEVANT ... LEARNING BY DOING"  
LEADS TO "LESS IS MORE" • PROVEAU  
LOCAL MATERIALS + VARIETIES "MULTI-PURPOSE WIN-WIN"
- AWARENESS → LINK WITH NATIONAL IEC MATERIALS - OR - INFLUENCE THE SYSTEM TO CREATE THEM.

Good practices by Terre des hommes, HEKS and ADRA

## Characteristics of safe construction

- DRR + CCA resilient design with capacities building of workers
- making accessible + applying construction regulations
- spectrum build. codes ↔ prep.
- BBB as process, not product ('house')
- "soft components"
- BBB is more than safe construction

Reflections on „safe construction“ and „building back better“  
by the workshop participants