

**Evaluation of the
World Bank
Global Facility
for Disaster
Reduction and
Recovery
(GFDRR)**

Volume I – Final
Evaluation Report

By:
Universalial Management Group



January 2010

A c k n o w l e d g m e n t s

The Evaluation Team wishes to extend thanks to the staff and management of the GFDRR Secretariat. The time frame for this assignment was very ambitious due to the requirement to provide interim findings at the time of the 2009 Consultative Group meetings in Stockholm in order to assist in planning beyond 2009; in such a context, the cooperation of the GFDRR staff and representatives was essential and much appreciated. We would also like to thank members of the Consultative Group and Results Management Council for useful contributions at the inception stage and again in the data collection phase of the evaluation. We would also like to thank all the clients, partners and other stakeholders in the selected countries and communities for their participation and kind collaboration during meeting and interviews.

Universalialia also wishes to thank the members of the Evaluation Team who led the different components of the work, undertook the field missions and desk reviews did analytical work, and provided logistical and administrative support. The main findings of the evaluation result from their collaborative efforts.

Executive Summary

Background and Scope

Universalialia is pleased to present this report on the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), one of the more recent donor-supported partnership programs of the World Bank. Established in 2006 as a cooperative effort of the World Bank and the United Nations International Strategy on Disaster Reduction (UN ISDR), GFDRR has evolved in size and strategic focus, and is establishing a solid foundation for scaling up its operations for both ex-ante support to vulnerable developing countries and ex-post assistance for sustainable recovery and risk reduction in post-disaster situations.

The GFDRR is guided by a consultative group (CG), comprised on donors and partners, and a Results Management Council (RMC) which includes representatives of donors, country level members, partner organizations, sector experts, the World Bank, and the ISDR. The GFDRR Secretariat employs some 12 full-time staff at its Washington D.C. headquarters, and relies on a network on World Bank and UN ISDR staff to support its three Tracks of programming. During the period of this review (FY2007-FY2009), the GFDRR experienced significant growth in both funding and programming which had a number of implications for management and the scale of activities.

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide the GFDRR and management with an independent assessment of GFDRR performance since inception (i.e., its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency) in the context of reducing a country's vulnerability to natural hazards and climate variability. In this light, the evaluation was undertaken with a view to identifying lessons to improve the Facility in the future, and providing recommendations to improve the program approach and business model, and optimize its partnering arrangements in anticipation of future growth.

GFDRR Context

The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) is a partnership of the ISDR system to support the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA). The HFA, endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 60/195 is the primary international agreement for disaster reduction. One hundred sixty-eight (168) countries and multilateral organizations including the World Bank and the United Nations (UN) system participated in the UN World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan in January 2005. The principal strategic goal of the HFA is to effectively integrate, in a coherent manner, disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning, programming, and financing at all levels of government.

The GFDRR is managed by the World Bank on behalf of the participating donor partners and other partnering stakeholders. The GFDRR provides technical and financial assistance to high risk low- and middle-income countries to mainstream disaster reduction in national development strategies and plans to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

GFDRR works to foster and strengthen global and regional cooperation among low- and middle-income country governments, international financial institutions, UN agencies, research and academic institutions, intergovernmental organizations, civil society organizations, and the private sector to leverage country systems and programs in disaster reduction and recovery. It promotes global and regional partnerships to develop new tools, practical approaches and other instruments for disaster reduction and recovery, foster an enabling environment at the country level that can generate greater investment in disaster mitigation practices within a sustainable legal, policy, financial and regulatory framework, facilitate knowledge sharing about reducing disaster risks and sustainable disaster recovery, and create adaptive capacities for limiting the impact of climate change.

Evaluation Findings

Overall, the evaluation provides an assessment of the GFDRR on each of the criteria being analyzed for first three fiscal years of its operation.

Relevance – GFDRR mainstreaming is underway in vulnerable countries and is aligned with national priorities via PRSPs and national development plans. In all regions, stakeholders noted the many comparative advantages of the involvement of the World Bank in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): its ability to leverage knowledge and funds, the high calibre of staff with knowledge of key DRR issues, strong country presence, and its ability to forge partnerships, particularly that with the UN ISDR. These advantages mean that GFDRR plays a unique role in helping to bridge knowledge, policy, and practice in DRR services.

Efficiency – GFDRR has some way to go towards an efficient use of its partnering arrangements and resources in creating an enabling environment for DRR mainstreaming. GFDRR's operating model – based on strong participation of UN ISDR staff for regional activities and World Bank staff in the country offices – can provide value in terms of the mainstreaming and coordination multiplier effects that it can achieve in regions and countries. However, the tools to ensure efficiency in monitoring and evaluation are not fully functional.

Alongside the benefits of the relationship with the World Bank (technical knowledge, credibility and influence at the government level), comes the challenge of matching needs with demands in terms of staffing for priority countries and ensuring that training is in place for the RBMS; this remains a work in progress.

Effectiveness – In its early phase of functionality, GFDRR is showing signs of being able to achieve results on the ground. While many of the projects have only been approved in the last 18 months, they have generated, validated, and communicated innovative solutions to DRR management challenges through regional knowledge products, such as the PDNAs, but also by facilitating horizontal South-South learning activities within and across regions.

GFDRR is grounded by the HFA and the outcome results defined therein. The development of a Results based Management system is a significant step in setting the framework for results management. With additional time for projects to near completion, the application of this framework in the next few years should begin to provide richer performance information on GFDRR effectiveness.

Governance and Accountability – The CG and the RMC has played an important role for GFDRR since inception. The current governance model is adequate for GFDRR as a trust-funded program, and is notable for the strong engagement by CG members. Perspectives and opinions expressed by CG members on strategic direction and priorities are closely considered by the GFDRR Secretariat, as evidenced by the selection of priority countries. What has emerged is a flexible and adaptable GFDRR Secretariat with programming that responds, to a high degree, to the priorities and needs of the donors. It should also be noted that on-going goals for the CG include a stronger role for developing countries as well as the private sector.

The Results Management Council (RMC), mandated to provide technical guidance, review strategy and contribute to the evaluation of the impact of GFDRR, is a useful governance structure comprising highly qualified technicians and experts from developed and developing countries.

Sustainability – GFDRR has gone through significant growth and expansion of programs during the first three years of its existence, with implications for programming, staffing, and systems. Of note, is that it has already gone through a phase of redefining its policies and strategies for expansion through which the selection of priority countries and the allocation of 80% of funds to these countries was ensconced. Its partnership strategy sets out principles for engagement, country ownership and coordination, as well as an exit strategy.

World Bank-administered trust funds have, alongside the DGF, increased the funds available to projects under the three tracks of the GFDRR. These donor arrangements, be they through earmarked funds or otherwise, will continue to be an important component of the Facility's funding. Sustainability of the DRR programs within vulnerable countries or regions relies on much more than the start-up funds allocated by GFDRR. In most cases, sustainability will be assured by the close collaboration and leadership of government partners as well as the leveraging achieved by GFDRR in its programs. By bringing other donors and partners on board alongside governments, DRR can be mainstreamed across sectors, thus becoming fully integrated with government planning. This sign of sustainability is only starting to emerge in countries reviewed.

Recommendations

From the above general conclusions, it is evident that in its short lifespan, the GFDRR has played a marked role in the achievement towards the Hyogo Framework and that it has established both a presence in itself and has promoted the mainstreaming of DRR within the World Bank. The recommendations that follow are designed not so much to retrospectively correct any of the shortcomings which this evaluation may have uncovered. Rather, they have been developed in the spirit of organizational learning to look forward to complement and support the GFDRR as it moves to expand from, in essence, a collection of pilot projects to a global force that will serve to considerably raise awareness of DRR and the integration of climate change adaptation changes into broader disaster reduction planning.

In this light, it needs to be emphasized that many of the recommendations which follow are largely formative and procedural in nature. They concentrate on suggesting ways to build a stronger platform. The overall avenues of operation are generally effective given the current scope. The methods of partnership and liaison, again in relation to the GFDRR's relatively small scale at this time, have laid solid foundations for future expansion.

The recommendations that follow concentrate on three primary areas that correspond to this evaluation's topology of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. In addition we have set out a primary and overarching recommendation which recognizes that the need for the services of the GFDRR vastly exceeds its existing resource base. While we are unable to ascertain with any degree of certainty the complete magnitude of future need, we are comfortable in concluding that at least several-fold more resources than have been available will be required over the next three to five years. This implies that the existing donors and the World Bank itself will have to recommit themselves to the GFDRR and as well, new major entities like the European Commission may need to considerably increase their level of support.

- Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the GFDRR continue to pursue a proactive campaign of fund raising with international partners, including consideration of mutually supporting activities with other multi-lateral development banks.
- Recommendation 2: The GFDRR should develop a more formalized means of coordination across the network of multi-lateral development banks, with the view to the eventual promulgation of more common and harmonized approaches.
- Recommendation 3: The GFDRR should, in any expanded environment and with specific reference to its 20 priority countries, take a leadership role in promoting donor and development bank coordination and harmonization.
- Recommendation 4: In planning for the next project cycle, GFDRR should consider giving special attention to new programming designed to strengthen national coordinative capacity.
- Recommendation 5: The GFDRR should develop standardized and results-based reporting templates so as to regularize, streamline, and focus the cyclical reporting that is inherent in modern project management.

- Recommendation 6: The GFDRR should develop and circulate more formalized selection criteria.
- Recommendation 7: GFDRR should develop a multi-faceted training program for Headquarters and field personnel.
- Recommendation 8: Assuming a substantial increase in the overall size and scope of the GFDRR portfolio, the GFDRR will need to considerably increase its personnel both at Headquarters and in the field.
- Recommendation 9: The World Bank, at Headquarters especially, should review the level of resources and their regional distribution that have been allocated to the mainstreaming of DRR.
- Recommendation 10: The GFDRR should to develop a more rigorous multi-year strategic plan that includes a broad-based results and performance indicator framework.
- Recommendation 11: The GFDRR should develop a more hierarchical approach to its set of performance indicators.
- Recommendation 12: The GFDRR should develop a multi-year evaluation plan.
- Recommendation 13: The GFDRR should engage with ISDR in a dialogue about how to clarify what appear to be some ambiguities with regard to their individual functions.

Acronyms

ADM	Municipal Development Agency
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BCPR	Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery
CAPRA	Central American Probabilistic Risk Assessment
CAS	Country Assistance Strategies
CG	Consultative Group
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CPGU	Cellule de Prévention et de Gestion des Urgences
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DaLA	Damage and Loss Assessment
DfID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
DGF	Development Grant Facility
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EM-DAT	Emergency Events Database
EU	European Union
FY	Fiscal Year
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
GP/DRR	Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
HQ	Headquarters
IAGU	African Urban Management Institute
IFIs	International Financial Institutions
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ISDR	International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
IT	Information Technology
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency

Acronyms

MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDTF	Multi Donor Trust Fund
NAPA	National Adaptation Plans of Action
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODFA	Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PDNA	Post Disaster Needs Assessment
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RBMS	Results Based Management System
RMC	Results Management Council
SEEDRMAP	South Eastern Europe Disaster Risk Mitigation and Adaptation Program
SDN	Sustainable Development Network
SRFF	Standby Recovery Financing Facility
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
TTLs	Task Team Leaders
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNECLAC	United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UN ISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
YRRF	Yemen Recovery and Reconstruction Fund

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology	3
3. Overview of GFDRR	8
3.1 Context	8
3.2 GFDRR Profile	9
3.3 Funding of the GFDRR	10
4. The Relevance of the GFDRR	12
5. The Efficiency of the GFDRR	23
5.1 Efficient use of Human Resource Partnerships	23
5.2 Efficient use of Systems	26
6. The Effectiveness of the GFDRR	29
6.1 Mainstreaming	29
6.2 Leveraging	30
6.3 Partnerships	31
6.4 Capacity Building	31
6.5 Tools	33
7. Conclusions	36
8. Recommendations	38
8.1 Introduction	38
8.2 Relevance	38
8.3 Efficiency	40
8.4 Effectiveness	41
9. List of Findings	43

Exhibits

Exhibit 2.1	Summary of the Methodology for Data Collection	3
Exhibit 3.1	Member contributions to GFDRR from FY2007 to FY2009 (in US\$ Thousands)	11
Exhibit 4.1	Stocktaking on disaster reduction, the environment and climate change – session of the 3 rd African Drought Adaptation Forum (Addis Ababa, September 2008)	17
Exhibit 4.2	GFDRR Budget for FY09-11 by Region	18
Exhibit 5.1	Approved Activities under Track II for the period FY07 – FY10 as of June 30, 2009 (by Region) (in US\$ Thousands)	25
Exhibit 5.2	Approved Activities under Track III for the period FY08 – FY10 as of June 30, 2009 (by Region) (in US\$ Thousands)	26
Exhibit 7.1	Overall Strengths and Challenges	36

1. Introduction

Universalialia is pleased to present this report on the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) one of the most recent donor-supported partnership programs of the World Bank. Established in 2006 as a cooperative effort of the World Bank and the United Nations International Strategy on Disaster Reduction (ISDR), GFDRR has evolved in size and strategic focus, and is establishing a solid foundation for scaling up its operations for both ex-ante support to vulnerable developing countries and ex-post assistance for sustainable recovery and risk reduction in post-disaster situations.

The GFDRR is guided by a consultative group (CG), comprised of donors and partners, and a Results Management Council (RMC) which includes representatives of donors, country level members, partner organizations, sector experts, the World Bank, and the ISDR. The GFDRR Secretariat employs some 12 full-time staff at its Washington D.C. headquarters, and relies on a network on World Bank and UN ISDR staff to support its three Tracks of programming. During the period of this review (Sept. 2006- June 2009), the GFDRR experienced significant growth in both funding and programming which had a number of implications for management and the scale of activities.

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide the GFDRR and management with an independent assessment of GFDRR performance for FY 2007-2009 (i.e., its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and institutional arrangements), identify lessons to improve the program in the future, and provide recommendations to improve the relevance and results of the program and optimize its use of resources.

Background

The need for a global disaster reduction strategy was underscored by a string of disasters in the first decade of the new millennium, most notably the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami which claimed over 250,000 lives, but also the earthquakes in Pakistan and Indonesia; persistent droughts in Africa; heat waves and fires in Europe; hurricanes in Central America and the United States; and landslides triggered by typhoons in South East Asia. A commitment for an action-oriented response to international concern about the growing impacts of disasters on individuals, communities and national development was envisioned by the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA). Based on careful study of trends in disaster risks and practical experience in disaster risk reduction, the HFA was brought to fruition and adopted by 168 Governments at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, held in Kobe, Hyogo Prefecture, Japan, 18-22 January 2005. HFA 2005-2015 aims to build the resilience of countries to disasters through integrating, in a coherent manner, disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning, programming, and financing at all levels of government¹.

In line with the HFA and an alarming trend in the frequency and severity of disasters, the World Bank, the UN, and major donors launched the GFDRR in September 2006 with the aim of supporting efforts of the vulnerable developing countries to include reducing and preventing disaster risks as an integral dimension of their national poverty reduction and sustainable development.

The GFDRR was launched with a mix of global, regional and country programming. Its mission is to mainstream disaster reduction and climate change adaptation in country development strategies to reduce vulnerabilities to natural hazards. GFDRR is a partnership of the ISDR system and is managed by the World Bank on behalf of donor partners and other partnering stakeholders. The partnership includes countries such as Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the UK as well as organizations such as the European Commission, ODA/USAID, UN ISDR and the World Bank. The entire list of GFDRR partners can be found in Appendix I.

¹ Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters. www.unisdr.org.

GFDRR is a commitment of the international community to build stronger, more effective partnerships that enable countries prone to natural hazards and climate-induced extreme events to realize their disaster reduction goals.

Evaluation Objectives

The motivation for this evaluation has its roots in World Bank policy as well as ideal timing for a formative evaluation of this nature. As well as a manager of GFDRR, the World Bank is also a key financial partner of the Facility. The World Bank's Development Grant Facility (DGF) contributed \$15 million over three years, or \$5.0 million a year to GFDRR's global and regional cooperation program. In providing these funds, DGF requires that for all programs receiving funding of \$300,000 or more, an independent evaluation (i.e. undertaken by evaluators who are not associated with the program) must be conducted every 3-5 years.² In line with this requirement, the GFDRR charter contains a commitment to undertake an evaluation in the final year of the DGF three-year funding allocation. This report fulfils that commitment. This evaluation will cover the period from inception to operations ending June 30, 2009.

This evaluation is also rooted in the need for a formative evaluation of progress, given GFDRR's rapid development and growth as a facility. Therefore, this evaluation aims to ensure that GFDRR's mission to build national capacities for mainstreaming and expanding disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation is achieved in the most effective and efficient way. It also intends to account GFDRR's strategic impact and value added in the following mandates:

- Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction for sustainable development;
- Mainstreaming technical assistance facility in broadening country level upstream policy dialogue on disaster risk reduction;
- Meeting demand for scaling up its support to disaster prone priority countries.

The evaluation is intended to inform three key audiences: 1) Countries vulnerable to disasters; 2) The GFDRR Results Management Council members and Consultative Group partners and; 3) The GFDRR Secretariat itself. The evaluation reviews the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of GFDRR in the context of reducing a country's vulnerability to natural hazards and climate variability, evaluation criteria including the effectiveness of GFDRR's program approach and design in advancing disaster risk reduction and recovery in priority disaster hotspot countries; the efficiency of its partnering arrangements and; the relevance of its business model in meeting the challenges posed by the HFA and integrating disaster risk reduction into a country's economic growth and poverty alleviation strategies.

The evaluation also identifies constraints, and recommends refinements to mainstreaming disaster risk reduction for sustainable development and economic growth in support of the implementation of the HFA. Specific key questions of this evaluation are included in Appendix VIII. The complete Terms of Reference (TOR) are presented in Volume II, Appendix VII.

Upon completion of the Inception Mission, evaluative questions were refined in a final Evaluation Matrix which was provided in the Inception Report and which organised the questions within the categories of relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness. This Evaluation Matrix appears in Volume II, Appendix VIII.

As indicated by some of the key questions and by the timing of the evaluation, the focus of this evaluation was more than retrospective. Central to this assignment has been the development of recommendations and options for the future. Prior to the completion of the Inception Report, interviews with members of the Consultative Group (CG) confirmed the need for an evaluation that can help to guide future programming decisions. Accordingly, an important element of this report is forward looking.

² Taken from DGF guidelines at <http://go.worldbank.org/OGQO8U0XN0> and <http://go.worldbank.org/55NT4KOFT0>

2. Methodology

Evaluation Process

The evaluation took place between August and December 2009 with data collection conducted at the GFDRR Secretariat in August, September and November and at the ISDR in Geneva and at the field level from mid-September to December 11th, 2009. The evaluation was undertaken by a team of five consultants from Universal Management Group – one team leader and four core team members.

Data Collection

The evaluation was based on an Evaluation Matrix, approved by the Evaluation Management Committee (see Volume II, Appendix VIII), which outlined the evaluation questions and included data collection methodologies, data sources, and key respondents. The data collected were primarily qualitative and were triangulated to validate data from more than one source. The methodology for data collection consisted of project sampling from Track I, II and III Projects, document review, interviews, on-site field mission and virtual field missions, as shown in Exhibit 2.1:

Exhibit 2.1 Summary of the Methodology for Data Collection

Task	Details
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Project Sampling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Track I Projects - 10 sampled Track II Projects - 35 sampled with a total value of \$21 million Track III Projects - 10 sampled
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core GFDRR and WB documents ISDR documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telephone and face-to-face interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CG and RMC membership Key ISDR stakeholders GFDRR managers and staff GFDRR regional coordinators located in Washington A selection of World Bank Task Team Leaders (TTLs) Senior level (Director and above) World Bank stakeholders.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four on-site field missions of four/five days duration each 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indonesia, Nepal, Haiti and Madagascar
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three “virtual” field missions wherein the same range of stakeholders as an on-site mission are engaged by teleconference, email, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Djibouti, Ghana and Malawi

The methodology utilized is described in more detail below:

- Document review of: a) background documentation, b) correspondence and meetings, c) donor-specific documents, and d) external reports and assessments. For more details see Volume II, Appendix VI.
- Semi-structured interviews and small group meetings: Interviews were conducted with personnel of the GFDRR at their headquarters (HQ), with Track I and ISDR representatives located in Geneva, and with members of the CG and RMC and with other partners working in disaster reduction and recovery. In many cases, follow-up interviews were carried out in order to cross reference and validate findings. See Volume II, Appendix X for a full list of people interviewed.
- On-site field missions: On-site field missions were conducted in four nations where GFDRR does work: Indonesia, Nepal, Haiti, and Madagascar. During the field visits, the evaluators spent around five working days in each country, and interviewed a wide variety of stakeholders from different sectors and organizations as illustrated in Appendix X. Dates of field visits are also shown in Volume II, Appendix V, Schedule of Key Activities.
- Virtual field missions: In addition to interviews of HQ personnel and desk reviews, telephone interviews with country staff and stakeholders were conducted in three targeted GFDRR country operations in Malawi, Djibouti, and Ghana.³ In selecting these countries, the evaluation sought to cover a breadth of programming regions as well as types of programs.

Interview guides were developed based on the evaluation questions and addressed the strategic, organizational and operational evaluation questions. Interview guides were tailored to obtain data from the broad categories of informants.

Availability of Data

A significant amount of information was collected from interviews at the GFDRR Secretariat and ISDR in Geneva. Data obtained from respondents in the field provided a key source of information on relevance of GFDRR programming within the country, effectiveness in meeting the targeted objectives of the HFA and also on efficiency of the partnerships between projects, the World Bank staff in the field, and the GFDRR. Many of the documents provided by the GFDRR for analysis were those coming from the GFDRR Results-Based Management System (RBMS). These were triangulated with information collected during field visits and virtual missions.

Limitations

As with any early stage formative evaluation of an entity such as the GFDRR, there were a number of considerations that affected the assignment. Both procedural and methodological considerations are mentioned below.

A major procedural consideration was the fact that the GFDRR is evolving and growing at a tremendous pace. For example, since the beginning of the data collection period, GFDRR governance apparatus and internal administrative systems evolved in a way that already began to respond to initial findings. Therefore, a retrospective formative process that was fixed in time did not accurately assess this entity for the purposes of the CG meeting, and for the purposes of a forward-looking evaluation. Instead, the evaluation needed to reflect new realities, including those that were somewhat beyond the initial scope of the evaluation.

³ As outlined in the inception report, the countries were selected on the basis of the following criteria: a) Geographical balance and priority status of countries; b) Track II projects underway at this time; c) Participation in Track III activities; d) Participation in Track II Regional Projects; e) Future needs; f) development status;

To that end, the findings we present largely reflect the conditions of the GFDRR through to June 2009, with findings amplified in some instances by references to more recent developments such as finalization of the GFDRR Partnership Strategy 2009-2012, and the expansion of the RBMS to include Track I projects.

There were also some methodological considerations that affected the evaluation. The evaluation matrix, which was approved by the in September 2009, was based on the assumption that project proponents and project recipients would make themselves available to provide information of use to the evaluation. This assumption held true in regard to the GFDRR Secretariat as well as World Bank staff at headquarters and in the field missions. However, this was not the case with regard to responsiveness of the electronic survey and to a lesser extent, the virtual field mission, both of which were intended as key data collection tools for the GFDRR evaluation. The electronic survey was developed and sent to all World Bank TTLs administering GFDRR projects, UN ISDR staff supporting Track I projects as well as the key beneficiaries of the GFDRR supported projects, totalling 180 potential respondents. Low response rates for this electronic survey persisted, despite several attempts by the evaluation team as well as the GFDRR Secretariat to encourage a higher level of response. Due to an overall survey rate of response below 10%, the electronic survey data could not be used. We therefore had to rely to a greater extent on testimonial data in this evaluation, and had a less consistent means to triangulate such testimony.

For virtual field mission reviews, the main difficulty encountered was to reach enough stakeholders to be interviewed. This difficulty was aroused from a mix of factors, including the rotation of a GFDRR regional staff at moment of planning, mixed to a short given timeframe to find the contacts and schedule the interviews and a set of other external circumstances such as absence during the weeks of review. Again, this meant that there were fewer respondents to corroborate data that was available.

The assignment was undertaken in a very tight timeframe. Only a week and a half ensued from the inception mission conducted in Washington, D.C. on August 18-20, 2009 and the delivery of the Draft Inception Report on September 3rd. Following the approval of the Inception Report and Evaluation Matrix by the Management Committee, the major data collection and interview activities occurred between September 14 and October 9 with the delivery of the Interim Report on October 25. It was thus less than eleven weeks from the start of the Inception Mission in late August to the first presentation of general conclusions and areas of strengthening on October 25 in Stockholm.

A number of factors influenced the highly formative character of this evaluation. Firstly, the GFDRR charter was only ratified in April 2007 and the majority of the GFDRR activities were launched in 2008/09. The RBMS, used for much of the project level data, has only recently evolved to a fully operational status. Key aspects of the GFDRR continue to evolve such as reporting requirements. Moreover, project authorization and the identification of priority nations occurred less than a year ago. Therefore, the GFDRR remains at a very early stage of both its external and internal development. As a result of the short time-span of the GFDRR program, a large majority of GFDRR-supported activities in Track II remain incomplete. Most projects have a time horizon of several years, and the majority of these were not launched until mid to late 2008. Accordingly, only a few completion reports are available. Most information thus had to come from proposals and activity details sheets, which are insufficient to assess a project. For all Track projects, only few complementary documents were available for analysis. Because some key documents were missing, many gaps remained in the analysis of each project. For instance, it was often impossible to compare planned activities with actual ones or to determine the actors involved in the project. This results in an appearance of slow project advancement, while what may be occurring is the development of multi-faceted DRR activities. Nevertheless, outcome attainment has yet to occur in most instances.

Where documents were available in the RBMS, many did not provide the sufficient information for a clear analysis of projects. Authors of documents and their dates of submission, helpful to track key dates in project cycle for instance, or list of activities and their timeline, were often unavailable. In some cases such as with many Track III projects, almost no document allowed confirming the budgets (including leveraging) of projects. Similarly, although the Track I projects reviewed were completed, none of them provided a completion report nor clear and detailed reporting of results achieved. Overall, progress reports do not provide sufficient and relevant enough details, and no evaluation report is available. Some documents also lacked adequacy, leading their information to become irrelevant or unclear. For instance, proposals' forms were often filled out incorrectly, with many repetitions and badly structured information. As another example, in some projects, the roles undertaken by each actor involved in a project are unclear. For instance, the involvement of some World Bank sectors and their relation with GFDRR is impossible to assess.

Secondly, the new designation of Priority and Earmarked nations, requested by the CG in late 2008, has yet to fully mature. The timeline to develop strong project buy-in and coordination at the national level for Track II programming appears to be lengthy - the translation of commitment into action is a slow process that is dependent on many external factors (national budget, political and economic climate, etc.). For many of the new "Priority Nations", especially in West Africa, DRR is a new concept for them, notwithstanding their participation in Track I regional activities.

In addition, the evaluation assesses the contribution of the GFDRR to development results rather than attempting to attribute results to any single initiative or activity of the GFDRR. In many instances, at the country level, either a) the scale of GFDRR current initiatives is quite small in comparison to the totality of the work of other donors/lenders in the DRR field, or b) there are many other actors involved in DRR – related work.

Organisation and Structure of the Report

Following the introduction, methodology and contexts, Universalialia divided findings under three main chapters, covering the principle areas required by the TORs and under the OECD DAC evaluation guidelines: relevance, efficiency and effectiveness⁴. The structure of the report includes several of the overarching questions as outlined in the original Terms of Reference. These remain in the text to provide reference points to the key questions posed for this evaluation. This report then presents the evaluation, conclusions and recommendations. In full, the evaluation is organised as follows:

- Chapter 1 introduces the assignment, its purpose and goals;
- Chapter 2 provides a description of the evaluation methodology;
- Chapter 3 presents a description of GFDRR;
- Chapters 4, 5, and 6 present the findings of the evaluation in relation to relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness respectively;
- Chapter 7 presents the conclusions;
- Chapter 8 presents the recommendations;
- Chapter 9 lists the complete set of Findings.

⁴ OECD DAC criteria for evaluating developing assistance also include sustainability and impact, those these were not explicitly requested in the TORs. For this evaluation, sustainability has been addressed under effectiveness.

A second volume (referred to as Volume II) is annexed to this evaluation report and contains the following appendices:

- Appendix I GFDRR Partners;
- Appendix II - Priority and Earmarked Countries;
- Appendix III Amount of Funding Leveraged;
- Appendix IV Evaluation Data Sheet;
- Appendix V Schedule of Key Activities;
- Appendix VI List of Projects Reviewed;
- Appendix VII Terms of Reference;
- Appendix VIII Evaluation Matrix;
- Appendix IX Bibliography;
- Appendix X List of People Interviewed.

3. Overview of GFDRR

3.1 Context

The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) is a partnership of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) system to support the achievement of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) priority areas⁵. The HFA, endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 60/195 is the primary international agreement for disaster reduction. One hundred sixty-eight (168) countries and multilateral organizations including the World Bank and the United Nations (UN) system participated in the UN World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan in January 2005. The principal strategic goal of the HFA is to effectively integrate, in a coherent manner, disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning, programming, and financing at all levels of government.

The GFDRR is managed by the World Bank on behalf of the participating donor partners and other partnering stakeholders. The GFDRR provides technical and financial assistance to high risk low- and middle-income countries to mainstream disaster reduction in national development strategies and plans to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

GFDRR works to foster and strengthen global and regional cooperation among low- and middle-income country governments, international financial institutions, UN agencies, research and academic institutions, intergovernmental organizations, civil society organizations, and the private sector to leverage country systems and programs in disaster reduction and recovery. It promotes global and regional partnerships to develop new tools, practical approaches and other instruments for disaster reduction and recovery, foster an enabling environment at the country level that can generate greater investment in disaster mitigation practices within a sustainable legal, policy, financial and regulatory framework, facilitate knowledge sharing about reducing disaster risks and sustainable disaster recovery, and create adaptive capacities for limiting the impact of climate change.

The creation of GFDRR was pre-dated by the 2004 Tsunami, which had a devastating effect on populations and livelihoods from Indonesia to Sri Lanka to Somalia. In 2005, in response to this global catastrophe, the World Bank called for new thinking to integrate predictable disaster risks into poverty reduction and country development strategies. A document published by the World Bank drew an increasingly dire portrait of global natural disasters. It stated that the economic costs of major disasters in constant dollars are now estimated to be 15 times higher than they were in the 1950s—\$652 billion in material losses in the 1990s. The human cost is also high: One report, entitled *Hazards of Nature, Risks to Development*⁶ cited research that over the 1984–2003 period, more than 4.1 billion people were affected by natural disasters. The number of people affected has also been rising, from 1.6 billion in the first half of that period (1984–93) to almost 2.6 billion in the second half (1994–2003), and has continued to increase in the current decade. This growth in damage to built environments and to the societies that use them is viewed to be a product of human actions.

⁵ These priority areas include 1) Making disaster risk reduction a priority; 2) Improving risk reduction information and early warning; 3) Building a culture of safety and resilience; 4) Reducing the risks in key sectors; and 5) Strengthening preparedness for response.

⁶ IEG Report, World Bank, Washington, DC, 2006.

More recently, a body of research confirms that the need for global coordination in disaster reduction and recovery is growing. One study⁷ points to a disaster-related death toll that averaged about 66,000 every year during the period 2000-2007. By 2008, this figure had tripled. In 2008 alone, 321 disasters caused 235,816 deaths and affected 211 million others, costing over \$181 billion in damage and losses.

The United Nations is contributing to the growing research on Disaster Risk Reduction, with a biennial report entitled “Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction”⁸ In its 2009 Report, it analyses data from the International Emergency Disasters Database (EMDAT). Between January 1975 and October 2008 and excluding epidemics, EMDAT recorded 8,866 events causing 2,283,767 casualties. Of these, 23 mega-disasters caused 1,786,084 deaths, mainly in developing countries. In other words, less than 1% of the events accounted for almost 80% of the mortality. In the same period, recorded economic losses were in excess of US\$1.5 trillion; 25 mega-disasters represented only 0.28% of the events, yet accounted for 40% of that loss, again, mainly in developed countries. Of the ten disasters with the highest death tolls since 1975, no fewer than half of these have occurred in the five year period between 2003 and 2008.

Thus, the impetus for coordination in disaster reduction and recovery was based on the following premise: the growth in the number of disaster events and magnitude of economic losses attributed to the impacts from disasters can be reduced, by adopting prevention and pro-active ex-ante measures such as more disaster-resilient infrastructure, appropriate land use, effective risk financing instruments, effective early warning systems and community preparedness, among others.

The collective resolve of 168 governments embodied in the 2005 Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) set the stage for the launch of the GFDRR, a partnership to help meet the global demand for proactive disaster risk reduction, increased investments in disaster prevention and enhance the global preparedness for sustainable recovery.

3.2 GFDRR Profile

GFDRR’s business model for advancing disaster risk reduction combines ex-ante support to high risk developing countries and ex post assistance for sustainable recovery. Its services are delivered through three tracks to mainstream⁹ disaster risk reduction in developing countries. These include Track I to enhance Global and Regional Cooperation; Track II to mainstream Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) into country development strategies, includes South-South Cooperation, and the Economics of Disaster Risk Reduction initiative, and Track III, also known as the Stand-by Recovery Financing Facility (SRFF) to provide sustainable disaster recovery assistance. These are presented in more detail below:

Track I, or the Global and Regional Cooperation Program promotes well-functioning international capacities and cooperation arrangements in the ISDR System to support national disaster risk management including climate adaptation and accelerated post-disaster recovery. Support includes enhanced capacities of regional inter-governmental organizations such as the Organization of American States, the League of Arab States and the African Union Commission to include disaster risk reduction in its cooperation agenda.

⁷ Center for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED), Department of Public Health, Universite catholique de Louvain, Belgium, 2009.

⁸ 2009 Global assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction Risk and poverty in a changing climate.

⁹ Mainstreaming is a term often used in gender programming, as in “gender mainstreaming”; the term also has resonance with HIV/AIDS mainstreaming, environmental mainstreaming, and now in DRR mainstreaming. OECD, in its publication, *Adaptation to climate change: key terms, (2006)* states that for disaster adaptation programming, the term ‘mainstreaming’ is used interchangeably with ‘integration’. Mainstreaming refers to the integration of adaptation objectives, strategies, policies, measures or operations such that they become part of the national and regional development policies, processes and budgets at all levels and stages. In all types of mainstreaming, re-evaluation of current policy is implied.

Examples such as the "Safe Schools and Hospitals" campaign undertaken with the World Health Organization and UNESCO and the "Climate Resilient Cities" primer help local officials plan for potential impacts from climate variability and disasters.

Track II or the Disaster Risk Reduction Mainstreaming Program supports ISDR's global and regional processes to enable leveraging country resources for ex-ante investment in prevention, mitigation and preparedness activities, particularly in low and middle-income countries. Under this business line, GFDRR works closely with the World Bank regional teams, UN agencies, and governments of countries vulnerable to natural hazards to integrate disaster risk reduction in national poverty reduction strategies and strengthen national capacity. Sub-business lines supporting ex-ante programs include: Risk Assessment, Risk Reduction, Risk Financing, and Climate Change Adaptation. A number of national development strategies have included disaster risk reduction components with GFDRR's support.

Track II's South-South Cooperation Program supports activities that enhance collaboration among Southern Governments, institutions, networks, and communities. The South-South Cooperation Program for Disaster Risk Reduction was initiated to foster greater developing country leadership and ownership of the disaster risk reduction agenda. Considerable interest has been generated in forming such collaboration in the areas of city planning, civil defence and early warning, among others.

Another special initiative under Track II is the Economics of Disaster Risk Reduction Program. Commissioned jointly by the World Bank and the United Nations, this first ever joint World Bank-UN assessment provides compelling economic arguments for integrating disaster risk considerations in sustainable development policies. This study undertakes an analytical, conceptual and empirical examination of the following themes: (i) balancing *ex ante* and *ex post* actions for disaster risk reduction, and the rationale for public intervention, (ii) ABCs of Disaster Impacts: Disasters – Aberrations, Barriers, or Catalysts for long-term development prospects, (iii) Cost Benefit Analysis in Disaster Risk Reduction, (iv) Disasters and Conflicts, (v) The Urbanization of Disasters, and (vi) Climate change and disasters.

Track III assists disaster affected countries with timely, efficient and sustainable recovery assistance to plan for and implement recovery and reconstruction. Assistance under this track includes disaster risk reduction measures to "rebuild resilience." Bangladesh, Madagascar, Bolivia, Myanmar, Haiti and Yemen received technical and financial assistance to conduct their respective Post Disaster Needs Assessments and provided recovery financing in post-Sidr Bangladesh for livelihood recovery. In China, GFDRR facilitated knowledge sharing in best practices in post earthquake recovery and reconstruction.

3.3 Funding of the GFDRR

GFDRR is a partnership under the ISDR and is housed under the World Bank's Finance, Economic and Urban department, which is part of the Sustainable Development Network. Its origins within the World Bank stem from the Development Grant Facility (DGF), which was created by the World Bank to encourage innovation, catalyze partnerships, and broaden the scope of Bank services. GFDRR is managed by the World Bank on behalf of donor partners and participating stakeholders.

The GFDRR is supported by several funding mechanisms:

- Development Grant Facility funds from the World Bank, which provided \$15 million over the three fiscal years between 2007 and 2009. This money is directly allocated towards Track I projects in coordination with UN ISDR.
- Multi donor trust funds (MDTF) allocated towards projects in Track II and Track III. For Track III, one MDTF is for the Standby Recovery Financing Facility (SRFF) while another MDTF is for the SRFF Callable Fund. Contributions through to June 30, 2009 are shown in Exhibit 3.1 below.

- A number of Single Donor Trust Funds whereby specific donors dedicate additional resources for particular “earmarked” disaster prone countries. This may be to accelerate DRR within a particular country program, respond to emerging themes that require strengthened attention for disaster risk management or support sectors that may best showcase disaster risk reduction but lack resources from the MDTF. In the past three years, three Single Donor Trust Funds have been created under Track II¹⁰.

Exhibit 3.1 Member contributions to GFDRR from FY2007 to FY2009 (in US\$ Thousands)

Member	Contributions as of June 30, 2007	Contributions as of June 30, 2008	Contributions as of June 30, 2009	% of overall funding
Australia	1,403	3,931	3,936	5.6%
Canada		1,511	3,113	4.4%
Denmark		3,050	6,534	9.3%
EC			330	0.5%
France			1,149	1.6%
Italy		1,397	4,474	6.4%
Japan		6,000	6,000	8.6%
Luxembourg		2,936	3,287	4.7%
Norway		2,951	3,754	5.4%
Spain		6,234	6,234	8.9%
Sweden		3,637	6,103	8.7%
Switzerland	850	1,024	1,957	2.8%
United Kingdom	1,957	5,607	8,148	11.6%
World Bank	5,147	10,000	15,000	21.4%
TOTAL	9,357	48,278	70,019	100.0%

Sources: GFDRR Annual Report 2006, 2007, and 2008; GFDRR HQ for 2009 data

¹⁰ Donors for Single Donor Trust Funds include: Australia, focusing on Bangladesh, Cambodia, Philippines and Vanuatu ; Japan focusing on Lao PDR, Sri Lanka, and Pakistan; and Spain focusing on Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Guatemala. These 11 countries alongside 20 core priority countries form the 20 + 11 priority countries that the donors agreed to be the focus of the GFDRR work program following the 5th and 6th Consultative Group meetings in Copenhagen and Geneva.

4. The Relevance of the GFDRR

Relevance reflects the extent to which the objectives of a GFDRR are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.¹¹ Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are appropriate given the circumstances within which the programming or intervention takes place. Coupled with relevance are elements of GFDRR impact, which captures overall utility of the GFDRR's work.

Relevance was assessed in this evaluation using the widest scope possible – DRR partners, donors and experts at the global, regional and country level offered their views on the relevance of GFDRR and its three tracks of programming. Documentation from a range of DRR actors and a review of projects through field missions, virtual missions and desk review complement the findings for this chapter.

Finding 1: Global, regional and donor partners share common and mostly positive views about the overall utility of the contributions made by the GFDRR to the reduction of vulnerability to natural hazards.

DRR and Disaster Risk Management (DRM) have evolved greatly in the past five years since the Indian Ocean tsunami and the subsequent HFA. As well as a nascent interest in many vulnerable countries, a range of bilateral and multilateral partners, agencies and NGOs developed or deepened their involvement in DRR, thus adding to the commitment towards DRR at a global level. Three key organizations that work in DRR are presented in the accompanying box. Based on interviews with these global and regional partners as well as major development donors, an overall positive view of GFDRR and its role and contribution towards DRR emerges. The consensus is that the World Bank's involvement in DRR is a crucial factor for success and that GFDRR has come to occupy a unique "space" in DRR through its range of service and technical capacity focusing on ex-ante preparedness and ex-post recovery.

UN ISDR¹²: The UN ISDR is the focal point in the UN System to promote links and synergies between, and the coordination of, disaster reduction activities in the socio-economic, humanitarian and development fields, as well as to support policy integration. It serves as an international information clearinghouse on disaster reduction, developing awareness campaigns and producing articles, journals, and other publications and promotional materials related to disaster reduction. The secretariat is based in Geneva, with various regional offices around the world. UN ISDR is the lead actor in convening and organizing the main worldwide forum on disaster risk reduction, the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (GP/DRR) which brings together representatives of governments, UN agencies, the World Bank, regional bodies, international financial institutions, civil society, the private sector and the scientific and academic communities to raise awareness on disaster risk, to share experience and to guide the ISDR system in supporting countries to implement the HFA.

BCPR: Created in 2001 by UNDP's Executive Board, the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) provides a bridge between the humanitarian agencies that handle immediate needs and the long-term development phase following recovery. Operating through some 100 country offices, it works around the world to restore the quality of life for people and communities that have been devastated by natural disaster or violent conflict. It is an active member of the ISDR system.

Red Cross: The IFRC is a key player in the DRR community and the ISDR system, not only because of the secretariat's own capacity in disaster preparedness, response and relief, but also because of its powerful global network of National Societies. One member of IFRC (Mr. Mukier) is a member of the GFDRR's Results Management Council.

¹¹ Source: OECD Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.

¹² The acronyms ISDR and UN ISDR are used interchangeably for the purposes of this evaluation.

In particular, its operational model is aiding the formation of numerous partnerships at the global, regional and country level. The partnership mantra of the GFDRR is ubiquitous in the parlance and presentations of the Facility¹³, the basis upon which is outlined in its charter.

“To the maximum extent feasible, complementarities and collaborations will be sought with other programs of participating donor partners, country governments, IFIs, UN agencies, research and academic institutions, intergovernmental organizations, CSOs, and the private sector, regional development banks, regional inter-governmental organizations, and other low- and middle-income country governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).”¹⁴

The most important partnership that GFDRR has fostered is the unique partnership between the United Nations ISDR and the World Bank. It combines the strengths of both organizations, and has harnessed partnership opportunities with a wide range of stakeholders in the multiple areas of disaster risk reduction, through its integration within the ISDR system. Through Track I funding from the World Bank’s DGF, the GFDRR has increased the resources available to disaster prone areas via the ISDR, and allowed the ISDR secretariat to play a more operational role in its advocacy, management and coordination functions at a regional level. Indeed, it has given the ISDR a new impetus in the common efforts of all its partners to engage in the implementation of the HFA. ISDR and other global stakeholders also noted the usefulness of the contribution to raising global/regional and sub-regional awareness and “buy in” generated by the World Bank’s Development Grant Funding. The UN ISDR-GFDRR partnership is viewed by many as nothing less than groundbreaking within the international community, and a needed partnership for success to occur. While there remain areas for improvement, as will be discussed in subsequent findings, there is wide appreciation by the UN and donors that the Facility, representative of the World Bank, and the United Nations have found common ground to coordinate at the global and national levels, pool resources, and worked collectively in finding innovative solutions. For donors, including members of the CG interviewed for this evaluation, GFDRR, with the weight of the World Bank, can leverage their influence with decision makers to advance DRR mainstreaming.

Concretely, what does this mean “on the ground” for GFDRR? As an illustration, the World Health Organization is a partner in the ISDR system, closely linked to UN ISDR and GFDRR Track I through the Safe Hospitals campaign. The theme of a two-year campaign was to “Reduce Risk, Protect Health Facilities, Save Lives”; it is a partnership of UN ISDR, WHO, GFDRR with governments, international and regional organizations through which local, national and international partners collaborate on actions to reduce deaths, injuries and illness from emergencies, disasters and other crises. While the amount of funding in real terms was only scratching the surface of the overall global needs, GFDRR participation through Track I was seen as a key entry point for the World Bank to engage with the WHO. The partnership means that the United Nations, the World Bank and other actors, are using the consistent terminology related to DRR, measuring results and performance using the same five HFA priority areas and 61 core HFA indicators while coordinating global, regional and national level interventions.

International Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and civil society are also generally supportive of the engagement of the GFDRR in DRR for reasons mentioned above; however, in interviews with these stakeholders, some organizations believe that GFDRR’s role should primarily be to help to widen the pool of resources available for DRR related activities. Others suggest that partnership should be the overarching mandate of GFDRR and not the delivery of projects or programs. Still others find the rules and procedures governing World Bank funding cumbersome, and don’t see the entry point for civil society. The twining relation between the Bank and UN ISDR appears to some to benefit only UN ISDR and not its partners in the ISDR system. Quite simply, for some actors interviewed, it is unclear what they have to gain from a partnership with GFDRR.

¹³ Throughout this evaluation, GFDRR may also be referred to as the Facility.

¹⁴ The GFDRR Charter can be accessed at www.gfdr.org.

Interviews indicate that the range of Track II and Track III services, along with other interveners, serve to strengthen national capacity. While Track II mainstreaming efforts are still in implementation phase, GFDRR efforts to integrate DRR in national development plans or PRSPs is fully in-line with its longstanding experience with these plans at the country level. In relation to Track III, the Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) process, originally designed by the UN Economic Commission for Latin American and Caribbean (ECLAC), is a process that has particular value in harmonizing all actors towards a well-designed recovery and development plan, altering considerably the traditional norm of recovery programming. Examples from Track III post-disaster recovery tools Madagascar and Indonesia reinforce the unique role played by Track III in the post-disaster environment. In particular in Madagascar, the PDNA was the centerpiece of a collaborative effort between GFDRR and the United Nations family in Madagascar which has enhanced coordination and cooperation amongst parties working in DRR in the country. Moreover, this collaboration has extended to sharing experiences and methodologies across Africa and even beyond, where those trained in Madagascar have been called upon to share their knowledge in other disaster-stricken countries. Another such example illustrates the flexibility and responsiveness of the PDNA - the ASEAN delivered a Post Cyclone Nargis Joint Assessment which demonstrated strong collaboration between a regional body and national level DRR institutions.

Finding 2: National level stakeholders are uniformly positive about the contributions made by the GFDRR.

In all the countries reviewed, national level stakeholders have pointed to two main values that GFDRR support has influenced. The first is the increase of the political awareness of DRR as a national development objective. This is related to the establishment or heightening of national DRR capacity, depending on the level of advancement within the country itself. Ghana, for example, is a country with DRR infrastructure in place, yet at a capacity level, it was still at the early stages of DRR development. GFDRR's early contribution was to bring the different stakeholders together and to create solid analytical foundations on DRR and its essential role in poverty reduction. Madagascar is another example; the GFDRR Track II mainstreaming project there provided the impetus to bring government stakeholders from various Ministries, including Health, Education, Rural Development, Agriculture and Meteorology and Finance, together to harmonize their DRR activities and plans, under the overall strategic framework of the PRSP. Senior national level stakeholders in Indonesia point to the catalytic effect of the GFDRR programming on their national DRR institutional capacity and on the decision to further integrate DRR principles in the upcoming revisions of the national development plan.

A final example in Djibouti clearly elucidates the way GFDRR has supported the political movement in favour of GFDRR. The opportunity of a project funded by the GFDRR in Djibouti was appropriate to address the country's needs, at a time when it was organizing its risk management arrangements with the creation of a State Secretariat for Disaster Risk Management. The plan to provide Djibouti-ville with a detailed methodology to develop a risk map was enhanced with the support provided by GFDRR. In a non-bureaucratic way, GFDRR aimed at building partnerships and synergies. Through its work in Djibouti, GFDRR helped the country to open to regional processes – and to give visibility to some of the good work carried out in the country. Despite its limited funding, in its first phase the GFDRR project responded to clearly identified needs, and Djibouti authorities expect that donors will be encouraged to provide further support to the State Secretariat.

The second value brought about by GFDRR is the specific technical assistance that has met the immediate need of the nation in question. At the country level, what is heard again and again from government leaders and DRR actors is that the GFDRR, through the conduit of the World Bank, adds technical expertise and leveraging of funds to DRR. The responsive and flexible callable funds in Track III are an example of a more immediate contribution of GFDRR within a country. Many donors, both at the country level and within headquarters corroborate this positive contribution, noting the responsiveness of the GFDRR to meet local needs in a flexible “made in country” fashion as opposed to a “one size fits all” approach. South-South collaborations underline considerable sharing of common experiences whilst allowing countries the leeway to develop innovative approaches that fit the country’s particular needs.

Finding 3: An affirmation of overall relevance however, is limited to some degree by apprehension about the clarity of roles and responsibilities among major interveners and level of coordination/harmonization, including the GFDRR and elements of the UN system.

The 2009 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction states that: *“Current progress in implementing the HFA is failing to address these underlying risk drivers and the translation of disaster impacts into poverty outcomes. Efforts to reduce disaster risk, reduce poverty and adapt to climate change are poorly coordinated.”*¹⁵

In several of the countries reviewed, there remains a lack of understanding about the roles and responsibility of the various actors, including GFDRR. Specifically, there seems to be a lack of understanding of “how they all fit together” and in some instances, a lack of understanding of the relative contributions being made by the UN ISDR and UNDP BCPR *vis à vis* GFDRR.

At the global level, international organizations and the key partners themselves have noted some confusion with the roles and responsibilities between the key UN agencies and GFDRR. The accompanying box contains the mandate or mission of each of the three entities, the similarities of which goes some way to explain this confusion and heighten the need for an agreement and communications strategy between the actors that clarifies roles of each actor.

UN ISDR Mission: The ISDR aims at building disaster resilient communities by promoting increased awareness of the importance of disaster reduction as an integral component of sustainable development, with the goal of reducing human, social, economic and environmental losses due to natural hazards and related technological and environmental disasters.

UNDP BCPR Mandate: UNDP helps countries prevent and recover from armed conflicts and natural disasters through advocacy, capacity building, conflict sensitive development, development of tools and methodologies, gender equality, knowledge networking, strategic planning and programming, and policy and standard setting.

GFDRR Mission: The GFDRR’s mission is to mainstream disaster reduction and climate change adaptation in country development strategies, such as poverty reduction strategies (PRSPs), country assistance strategies (CASS), United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), and National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPAs), to reduce vulnerabilities to natural hazards. At the national and local levels, it also includes other sectoral development strategies that low- or middle-income countries may undertake to alleviate poverty and address sustainable growth.

The GFDRR’s mission is also to foster and strengthen global and regional cooperation among various stakeholders under the ISDR system, such as low- and middle-income country governments, international financial institutions (IFIs), UN agencies, research and academic institutions, intergovernmental organizations, civil society organizations (CSOs), and the private sector, to leverage country systems and programs in disaster reduction and recovery. It promotes global and regional partnerships in (i) developing new tools, practical approaches and other instruments for disaster reduction and recovery, (ii) fostering an enabling environment at the country level that can generate greater investment in disaster mitigation practices within a sustainable legal, policy, financial and regulatory framework, (iii) facilitating knowledge sharing in reducing disaster risks and sustainable disaster recovery, and (iv) creating adaptive capacities for limiting the impact of climate change.

¹⁵ 2009 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction Page V.

Moreover, given the cross-funding between the World Bank's DGF and UN ISDR, and funding opportunities available separately through both entities, NGOs and other partners have requested for greater clarity on how each intends to operate with and fund other international organizations.

Clarifying roles and responsibilities also is a requirement expressed by those DRR partners at the country level. This may be dependent, in large part, upon the extent to which the GFDRR and World Bank personnel engage in pro-active outreach to partners operating in-country to promote greater harmonization.

In Madagascar and also in Nepal, those not directly linked to GFDRR projects were not clear on the coordination aspects intended by the GFDRR Track II project. More specifically in Madagascar, some international partners interviewed felt that the World Bank was developing a stand-alone project rather than reinforcing existing structures. Furthermore, the UN Resident Coordinator's office in Madagascar was receiving requests for training opportunities for government partners under Track I, but did not have clear instructions to whom to direct such requests.

In Indonesia, by contrast, World Bank personnel involved in GFDRR programming have actively reached out to other development partners, operating a sort of coordinating/outreach/ information sharing network that serves not only to raise the profile of the GFDRR, but also to enable the World Bank to more closely link its work (and in particular, in relation to national and sub-national capacity building) to those of other larger development partners.

Has the GFDRR supported the needs of vulnerable countries and has its work contributed to increased resilience?

Finding 4: The GFDRR has made a contribution to increase the resilience of nations to respond to natural disasters and the impact of climate change.

Given the interlinkages between disaster risk, poverty and climate change, the principal recommendation outlined in the *2009 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction* is that "countries need to adopt overarching policy and strategy frameworks for risk reduction, focused on addressing the underlying risk drivers described above, and supported by both resources and political authority. In risk prone countries, the implementation of such frameworks must be the key development priority of the state as a whole, rather than of a particular department or ministry."¹⁶ In line with the overarching priority of the Global Assessment Report, the GFDRR has strengthened national planning capacity in a number of instances in virtually all the engaged countries so far. Here again, the term mainstreaming can be employed. In many cases this has been through support to national DRR institutions or national planning bodies (as seen in Madagascar, Indonesia, Haiti and Nepal). In others, more technical assistance has strengthened resilience (as was the case in Nepal, Haiti, Djibouti). This is the essence of the term "mainstreaming". A key consideration is that in many of these examples and based on the desk review of other Track II projects, many are only now moving to a fully operational status, in large part due to "pre-launch" education and awareness raising activities that reinforced knowledge of DRR at the country level. This implied finding therefore needs to be viewed in light of much of the GFDRR's programming not yet completed.

¹⁶ 2009 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction .Page 15.

One clear example of this contribution is linked to the integration of DRR within the national planning documents of vulnerable countries. This occurs at both the national PRSP development phase, as well as a contribution to the Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) of the World Bank. GFDRR, particularly through Tracks I and II, offers technical advice to country task teams through a proactive and upstream review of national strategy documents to reflect the underlying risks and vulnerabilities, and policy actions to mitigate those risks. Comments are provided through existing institutional procedures that entail minimal costs. Moreover, the practice of intensive upstream engagement marks an important shift in dealing with country strategies in the global DRM community, that is, from analyzing past strategies to participating in formulating the strategies, which tends to have a greater policy impact. A stocktaking of the mainstreaming progress in Africa developed under the HFA framework is summarized below in Exhibit 4.3 and is evidence of the mainstreaming progress underway in Africa:

Exhibit 4.1 Stocktaking on disaster reduction, the environment and climate change – session of the 3rd African Drought Adaptation Forum (Addis Ababa, September 2008)¹⁷

Country	Progress in National Planning
Benin, Comoros, Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Liberia, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania and Togo	Countries whose PRSP includes an analysis of the interaction of natural hazards and environmental vulnerabilities, and incorporate strategies to reduce disaster risk within environmental and natural resource management frameworks
Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Togo and Zambia (with Swaziland and Ghana to follow shortly)	Countries whose planning documents have made linkages between social development and disaster reduction, and are implementing social protection programs for the most vulnerable sectors of their populations, and in some cases this includes significant progress in protecting economic and productive sectors from disaster risk.
Sierra Leone and Togo	Countries which adopted new environmental legislation, the latter with a climate change adaptation program
Angola and Mozambique	Countries which address urban risk by incorporating disaster reduction elements including enforcement of building codes in planning and management of human settlements.

Finding 5: The current level of GFDRR funding does not meet the growing demand from low and middle-income countries in relation to Track II activity.

As noted at the outset, the demands for DRR in vulnerable countries are significant; the costs for inaction on DRR have been borne by the victims of past disasters. The needs assessment conducted by the GFDRR in mid-2009¹⁸ responded to a request to the Secretariat by the CG to focus its actions on a group of core countries, which led to a prioritization of operations in 20 core countries, for which 80% of funds would be dedicated, and an additional eleven donor earmarked countries.¹⁹ The needs assessment was carried out by GFDRR in close cooperation with government partners and other stakeholders. It showed that there are outstanding needs among the priority and earmarked nations that well exceed the level of support that the GFDRR possesses in the 2007/2010 window.

¹⁷ Source: GFDRR Track I Building Global and Regional Partnerships: Giving Risk Reduction a Regional dimension.

¹⁸ Disaster Risk Management Programs for Priority Countries Summary 2009.

¹⁹ These countries are listed in Appendix II.

The total of about \$247 million in anticipated requirements for DRR-related activity, as shown in Exhibit 4.2, elucidates the magnitude of this need when compared to the total contributions to GFDRR of roughly \$70 million at the end of FY2009 (as shown in Exhibit 3.1); also note that the assessments covered 25 of the 31 priority and donor-earmarked countries, so the requirements for the full set of countries is even greater. It should be noted that the GFDRR assessment process included a stocktaking of on-going risk reduction and climate change adaptation programs by key stakeholders, including UN agencies, multilateral and bilateral donors, and other partners.

Exhibit 4.2 GFDRR Budget for FY09-11 by Region

Regions	Budget (US\$ thousands)
Africa	53,450
East Asia and Pacific	37,450
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	10,000
Latin America and Caribbean	9,794
Middle East and North Africa	14,288
South Asia	10,400
Global	-
Earmarked Countries	71,224
Flexible Grants	41,321
Total	247,927

A certain degree of caution needs to be used to interpret the implications of the needs assessment. In examining the priority countries reviewed as part of this evaluation, it is clear that care must be taken to ensure that future GFDRR interventions at larger scales will harmonize with the work of others and not result in a competitive environment. It will be essential to ensure harmonization, assuming that the GFDRR receives the level of support to undertake its planned activities.

The contribution to strengthening resilience at the national level needs to be viewed in light of the sum of the support for DRR-related activity that others, including governments themselves, are committing to DRR. In some of the surveyed nations, the work of other donors significantly exceeds the programming base of the GFDRR. For example, in Indonesia, two parts of the GFDRR's \$1.25 million project are directed toward institutional strengthening at the national level of the public service, while AUSAID and DfID, collaborating on a UNDP-sponsored activity, are contributing \$18 million to an initiative to integrate DRR concepts into sub-national levels of government. As well, in Haiti, the GFDRR's current \$500,000 to support national level institutional capacity is accompanied by the work of CIDA, UNDP and others to equally strengthen other national bodies. As a donor dependent facility, the GFDRR continues to look at leveraging its contributions to encourage follow on work resulting from its initial undertakings in countries. Indeed, GFDRR seeks to engage governments early and often with small investments to open up the dialogue in mainstreaming DRR in country policies and strategies.

Do countries follow-up to integrate the capacities or the knowledge that the GFDRR has contributed to providing?

Finding 6: There is evidence to show that recipient countries have begun to integrate knowledge and capacity that the GFDRR has provided via its current project portfolio.

In all the eight countries covered by field or virtual missions where contact was made with national authorities, we found evidence of integration of the DRR-related knowledge and capacity by the national or sub-national authorities. National or sub-national planning or DRR agencies have utilized the support provided by the GFDRR to enrich their planning capacity and to better integrate DRR into national disaster or national development plans. Technical agencies as varied as national housing authorities to educational authorities, climate change adaptation modelling and land/resource management agencies had begun to do so. This knowledge and capacity building takes many forms. Technical reports, studies, surveys and DRR assessments help to set the stage for subsequent DRR planning at the country level.

As this occurs, a national “expertise” emerges – often those who have the institutional knowledge and ability to link the various DRR efforts of the government and its partners. It is too early to identify whether recipients had begun to integrate the outputs of projects. Follow-up monitoring via the RBMS would enable a periodic stock-taking assessment of the level of contribution of outputs to the attainment of initial outcomes.

Has GFDRR contributed to strengthening DRR in World Bank country operations?

Finding 7: There is mixed but tending to positive evidence that the GFDRR has contributed to the strengthening of DRR in World Bank country operations.

GFDRR Secretariat has engaged itself strongly to build and strengthen DRR within World Bank operations. This occurs at two levels – within Headquarters and at the country level.

World Bank Headquarters

There is evidence that the GFDRR Secretariat at the Headquarters of the World Bank in Washington have engaged in mainstreaming DRR. An illustration of knowledge sharing and generation is GFDRR’s involvement in catastrophe risk financing in developing countries. This is the result of a joint effort by two World Bank vice presidencies – the Financial and Private Sector Development Network and the Sustainable Development Network – in collaboration with the GFDRR. It aims to promote catastrophe risk financing as an integral part of a country’s economic policy and an important component of a proactive and strategic framework for disaster risk management. The World Bank has led the agenda on country-level disaster risk management by developing a disaster risk management approach, in which catastrophe risk financing is an important component. Examples include the Turkish Catastrophe risk Insurance Pool, the Mongolia Livestock Insurance Pool, and the Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility. As part of the Sustainable Development Network, GFDRR is well-positioned within the World Bank to support such global initiatives, in line with knowledge generation in DRR.

Central American Probabilistic Risk Assessment (CAPRA) is another example of where the World Bank has become proactively engaged in DRR and climate change adaptation. CAPRA is a Disaster Risk Information Platform for decision making, using a common methodology and tools for evaluating and expressing disaster risk. Developed by regional experts in Central America, CAPRA builds on, and strengthens existing initiatives, with the objective of consolidating methodologies for hazard and risk evaluation, and raising risk management awareness in the region. In interviews with technical specialists at headquarters, the collaboration between the Bank, GFDRR, ISDR and also the Inter-American Development Bank elucidated the harmonization and support within these institutions to support the Central American governments and the Central American Coordination Centre for Disaster Prevention in DRR.

World Bank Country offices

As mentioned earlier in this evaluation, one of GFDRR's areas of focus within the World Bank structure is where it offers suggestions to country task teams via a proactive and upstream review of CAS/PRSP documents as part of the World Bank Sustainable Development (SDN) Network Corporate Review System. In its feedback, GFDRR highlights the disaster risks to the economic growth and poverty reduction strategy agenda, advises on priority interventions that the new strategy should take into account based on global good practices in DRR, links the strategy document with planned/ongoing GFDRR programs and offers suggestions to strengthen DRM agenda in the results matrix. As part of this effort, guideline and a checklist for integrating DRR into PRSPs/CASs were developed.

As part of its on-going monitoring efforts, GFDRR reviewed 42 country documents for 42 countries – regionally, 20 were in Africa, 4 for East Asia and Pacific, 5 for Europe and Central Asia, 10 for the Latin American and Caribbean, 2 for South Asia and 1 for the Middle East and North Africa region²⁰. In terms of the nature of documents, 19 were PRSP related for 19 countries and 50 were CAS related for 32 countries. PRSP related documents are the Joint Staff Advisory Notes prepared by the Bank and IMF, while CAS related documents are Interim Strategy Notes, Country Partnership Strategies, and Country Assistance Strategies at various stages. Except two, all PRSP related documents were from Africa.

In Indonesia, Haiti and Madagascar, there is solid evidence of a greater awareness of DRR as a cross-cutting issue within the whole-of-country operations thanks to the mainstreaming of DRR within the Bank at a country level via CAS, PRSPs and sectoral engagements. This appears to be so in Djibouti to a lesser degree and not so much in Nepal, where those not directly involved in DRR projects had very little knowledge of DRR.

One of the determining factors for this mixed, yet tending to positive, conclusion may lie in the extent to which the Bank country office in question has proactively engaged in donor coordination and liaison activities. In Indonesia and Haiti, the higher level of donor coordination provides a venue wherein more elements of the World Bank can be engaged. Similarly, the acceptance by national leadership of the importance of DRR to long-term national development and/ or the existence of a national DRR focal point with a clear national coordinative mandate seems to be linked to the degree to which Bank country operations have mainstreamed DRR. Haiti, Indonesia and Madagascar provide positive examples wherein in Bank country operations in areas as diverse as transport, health, education, environment and housing, have begun to mainstream DRR. The evidence from our desk top project sample is less conclusive due to the fact that existing records focus on the immediate outputs of projects and the GFDRR has not yet constructed an approach for measuring capacity of World Bank operations.

²⁰Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in National Development Strategies : Summary of GFDRR Upstream Effort (January-December 2008)

Are GFDRR investments advancing learning, research and knowledge management for current and future risks in priority and earmarked nations?

Finding 8: At the national level there is clear evidence that DRR knowledge management, networking, knowledge transfer and research are making a positive contribution to the strengthening of national capacity.

Applying knowledge to work is integral to most activities, in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors. Research, knowledge management and transfer of knowledge imply generating, identifying and mapping intellectual assets that can be of value for an organization. All three GFDRR Tracks engage partners in knowledge management, research and knowledge transfer. Material such as the GFDRR's work on the economics of disaster risk reduction, the fostering of more resilient public buildings like hospitals and schools, and climate resilient cities, all have been recognised by national spokespersons as valuable additions to their overall capacity and knowledge. Technical activities such as land use and varying types of risk mapping have been similarly praised as having made positive contributions to setting an enabling environment for national capacity building.

GFDRR support for Track I collaboration with ISDR network and knowledge transfer has been similarly recognised. A few examples below elucidate the contributions made by the Track I interventions that were reviewed during this evaluation:

Over 30 disaster risk reduction networks and communities have been initiated to promote professional collaboration with PreventionWeb.net tools and information management guidance;

- Online workspaces on PreventionWeb.net are facilitating opportunities for disaster risk reduction professionals to connect and exchange experiences;
- Web-based monitoring and reporting for risk updates and progress indicators were developed for national, regional, and global needs;
- A report was developed on regional disaster risk mapping and on progress in implementing DRR and HFA;
- Regional knowledge networks were established in Africa on 3 selected thematic areas;
- An Asian Report was developed on trends in disaster risks and progress in implementing HFA.

While not all knowledge generation in DRR necessarily leads to the development of national capacity, it is often a prerequisite for bringing DRR mainstreaming forward into action on the necessary scale.

Finding 9: There is initial, albeit limited evidence, to show that GFDRR supported activities are producing higher degrees of South-South cooperation in relation to sharing of knowledge.

This finding speaks to the degree to which some GFDRR supported activities like catastrophic risk insurance and Post Disaster Needs Assessment have “migrated” to some initial degree. Experts from Madagascar, for example, have been called upon to participate in PDNAs elsewhere in Africa, thus reinforcing the expertise acquired at the time of the initial PDNA training. In the Caribbean, some DRR lessons learned and tools have migrated to more contemporary projects in Latin America.

Caribbean experts were called upon to advise Madagascar about the implication of risk insurance. The Ministry of Finance officials were briefed on setting up a contingency fund as well as the potential of a pooled insurance system. The mission from the Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility met with the Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and a number of other stakeholders, underlying the seriousness with which the meeting was viewed. While the learning and training offered was viewed positively, the results achieved were limited due to widely varying economic conditions between the Caribbean region and Madagascar. Nevertheless, a way forward on the development of an operational guide for the government's contingency fund and a risk profile for the country were established. What's more, historical information on risks and exposure would be required, including the data collected during the 2008 Damage, Loss and Needs Assessment. Thus, work developed with the Track III SRFF had direct implications for further capacity development work for the government.

Knowledge acquired by participation in Track I activity can also migrate as in the case of the Foreign Ministry of Indonesia, which is requesting assistance to develop sub-regional working groups and plans the exchange of experts among four or five South East Asian nations, along with India. Another example is shared by the World Meteorological Organization, through which GFDRR contributed to a highly valuable program in South-East Europe Disaster Risk Management and Adaptation Program (SEEDRMAP). Interviews with WMO confirm that plans are underway to replicate in other southern regions, including Central Asia and in the Caucasus. The monetary investment by GFDRR is therefore multiplied by the expansion of expertise to new partners.

5. The Efficiency of the GFDRR

In the OECD definition of efficiency,²¹ there are inputs and results – the more significant the positive result of an intervention for every unit of input, the greater the efficiency. According to the OECD, this generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted. The challenge for GFDRR, and for an evaluation at this time, is that many of the activities and projects underway do not yet generate data that helps to understand the link between uses of resources and the outputs or outcomes produced.

To review the question of efficiency, this evaluation, in line with the TORs, assesses GFDRR's efficient use of its partnering arrangements and resources in creating an enabling environment for DRR mainstreaming. The question can be phrased as follows: how efficiently does the GFDRR's operating model – based on strong participation of UN ISDR staff for regional activities and World Bank staff in the country offices – provide value in terms of the mainstreaming and coordination multiplier effects that it can achieve in regions and countries. For this we used document analysis and key stakeholder interviews to assess to areas: the management of partnerships and resources under the purview of the GFDRR and; the development of systems and standards to monitor these resources, systems that are in place for monitoring and reporting of projects and which have some bearing on resource efficiency. We divide this chapter into two parts: efficient use of resources (including human and financial) and development of systems to efficiently monitor and track progress.

5.1 Efficient use of Human Resource Partnerships

Finding 10: While commended by many for its responsiveness and ambition, the overall staffing resources of the GFDRR partnership do not always meet the growing and changing needs.

As a fundamental partnership, GFDRR's operations have multi-faceted human resource demands. These demands include the Secretariat staff and CG, RMC and consultants; significant support from World Bank Regional Coordinators based at HQ and covering World Bank geographic regions²²; Task Team Leaders (TTLs) and consultants in the country offices and; ISDR partners carrying out and managing Track I international and regional activities. This model's advantage is by maximizing its application of existing World Bank geographic structures and the World Bank's existing field presence, which therefore significantly extends the reach of the GFDRR. When considering the global and regional reach gained through Track I and collaboration with ISDR, GFDRR manages to leverage its resources significantly, thanks to its human resource and partnership mix. However, given the selection of Priority Countries and other changes within the GFDRR structure, this human resource and partnership mix must be closely monitored. This section divides and evaluates that mix under three broad groups: the country office level, regional coordinator level and the Secretariat level.

²¹ "Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results." Source: OECD Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management

²² Africa, East Asia and Pacific, Europe and Central Asia, Latin America & Caribbean, Middle East & North Africa, and South Asia.

World Bank Country offices

At the country level, our field visits have revealed that beyond TTLs who are engaged directly in GFDRR programming, the projects can draw on World Bank permanent existing staff as well as local consultants, which helps both to manage expenses while contributing to country office DRR mainstreaming. Those staff working on the Education file, for example, might be brought in to provide expertise on better application of building standards in schools, as part of Track II mainstreaming programs, as was the case in Madagascar. In regard to Track III, Economists within the Bank may be asked to guide the PDNA, given their knowledge of the local economy. This is a win-win for GFDRR, for the World Bank, and for the government, to the extent that GFDRR can take advantage of these indirect human resources without putting undue burden on overall workload. As the overall size of GFDRR programming grows, the stand-by staffing needs at the country level will undoubtedly need to be reviewed.

Regional Coordinators

Regional coordinator teams, based at Headquarters and who cover the larger programming environment at a regional level, have wide ranging roles and are largely financed by the World Bank itself. Regional Coordinators provide GFDRR with a strong linkage to the regional bureaus at headquarters as well as a vital link to the country offices. This combination gives GFDRR a strong presence within the World Bank structure. More than this, regional coordinators have significant World Bank experience; as one coordinator put it, they are very familiar with the “normal operations and constraints” of the Bank, and therefore have an important role to play in manoeuvring on behalf of GFDRR.

We have noted that while some Bank regional teams like Asia and Latin America & Caribbean (LAC) are well resourced and active, Africa, the priority geographical region for GFDRR with 9 out of 20 priority countries (see Appendix II), has only 25% of a person year invested in its lead coordinator. GFDRR in Africa region appeared to need more staff and have a higher priority both with management in Washington but also with country directors and country teams. In this regard, Bank staff allocation need to better match the priorities – a growing GFDRR program strategy would imply a need to increase coordination resources for all regions, and those priority ones like Africa in particular.

GFDRR Secretariat

GFDRR Secretariat has maintained a relatively small core team of 12 and has recruited consultant staff with the purpose to meet the growing needs of the program. Our interviews with partners (including World Bank partners, UN partners and donors) highlighted a responsive and dynamic Secretariat; respondents were particularly positive about the transparency of GFDRR decisions. Nevertheless, some felt that GFDRR programming and expectations have grown faster than its ability to establish some of the systems and processes needed for a very complex operation. The early growth and development phase of the Facility was significant, included setting up of systems, a GFDRR website, the Results Based Management System, key publications and the expanded work program, including the need for strengthening of the Secretariat Staff and World Bank staff on DRR, and strengthening of the thematic leadership in the key areas such as communications and outreach.²³ Much of this task-oriented work has been carried out by consultants; the GFDRR Secretariat started with only two permanent staff, this grew to roughly 7 staff by the end of 2008 and to 12 permanent staff by the end of 2009. Overall Secretariat and Administrative costs, however, more than quadrupled between 2007 and 2008 to account for the systems development needed for GFDRR; relative to total program expenditures, Secretariat and Administrative costs jumped from 8% of total program expenditures in 2007 to 19% in 2008 and back down to 10% in 2009.²⁴

²³ GFDRR End of Year Report FY2006, p. 10

²⁴ GFDRR Annual Reports

The “burn rates” or disbursement as a percentage of total funds transferred are displayed in Exhibits 5.1 and 5.2. These rates reflect the extent to which the GFDRR partnership at all levels was able to match ambition with reality in its programming. For Track II and III, burn rates of 57% and 73% respectively reflects relatively good progress of GFDRR programming at this stage, given that the work of the GFDRR is only commencing in a large number of instances.

Another key objective in partnership efficiency is related to the approval process and the time required from project identification to first disbursements. Our examination of individual project files found a number of projects that were emerging from a lengthy lead / coordination / planning period; actual work in terms of the support to national bodies was just beginning. This, to some extent, reflects the reality of working within the ambit of the World Bank where the time between project authorization and the actual launch of work can be lengthy in order to accommodate the necessary planning and liaison. It should also be added that the 2009 changes in administering GFDRR projects, including the selection of priority countries and the concomitant country-by-country assessments, has adjusted the bar for measuring response times. Thus, the concept of burn-rate as an indicator of performance may be somewhat flawed and not clearly indicative of the actual rate of progress that has occurred. An additional tool, a Track II indicative timeline on the application process, has been established for the turn around time for projects, or the speed with which the Secretariat should respond to project requests. The timeline estimated between 15-17 weeks between initial application to an agreement between a team leader and GFDRR. These types of standards should be monitored in order to guide appropriate response times within the Secretariat and ensure adequate resources at all levels (HQ, Regional, and Country level).

Exhibit 5.1 Approved Activities under Track II for the period FY07 – FY10 as of June 30, 2009 (by Region) (in US\$ Thousands)

Regions	Approved	Transferred	Disbursement ^{a/} (Actuals + Commitments)	Burn Rate ^{b/}
Africa	8,136	6,085	2,374	39%
East Asia and Pacific	10,554	3,958	2,348	59%
Europe and Central Asia	1,565	1,365	801	59%
Latin America and Caribbean	7,873	5,058	2,145	42%
Middle East and North Africa	2,442	2,013	760	38%
South Asia	4,287	3,142	1,223	39%
Global	7,162	7,162	6,656	93%
Total	42,020	28,783	16,308	57%

^{a/} This would refer to actual payments made and contracts already entered in the Bank's SAP system.

^{b/} Disbursement rate as a percentage of actual amount transferred from inception to June 30, 2009

Source: GFDRR HQ

Exhibit 5.2 Approved Activities under Track III for the period FY08 - FY10 as of June 30, 2009 (by Region) (in US\$ Thousands)

Regions	Approved	Transferred	Disbursement ^{a/} (Actuals + Commitments)	Burn Rate ^{b/}
Africa	211	209	209	100%
East Asia and Pacific	1,960	1,229	923	75%
Europe and Central Asia				--
Latin America and Caribbean	296	296	250	85%
Middle East and North Africa				--
South Asia	2,423	623	362	58%
Global	255	255	153	60%
Total	5,146	2,613	1,897	73%

^{a/} This would refer to actual payments made and contracts already entered in the Bank's SAP system.

^{b/} Disbursement rate as a percentage of actual amount transferred from inception to June 30, 2009

Source: GFDRR HQ

5.2 Efficient use of Systems

GFDRR has developed a number of tools and systems for tracking progress from project inception through to project completion. The Results Management Council (RMC) has participated in the development and review of these systems.

Does the GFDRR's Results Based Management System (RBMS) meet the reporting needs of stakeholders including donors and management?

Finding 11: While RBMS contains a number of state-of-the-art elements to support reporting for results, its day-to-day relevance is hampered by uneven project reporting.

The GFDRR's Results Based Management System (RBMS) has been designed as a cornerstone of the GFDRR operational structure. In line with its mandate, the GFDRR has grounded the RBMS within the priority areas of the HFA. The RBMS links project inputs and outputs—through a set of outcomes—to respective HFA priority area. The RBMS stands out as state-of-the-art, as a results-driven Management Information System, in comparison to others used by analogous facilities or used by other multi-donor platforms housed elsewhere. As a web-based system, it is comprehensive and enables a wide ranging of data entry and manipulation techniques. Three elements comprise the RBMS: An *application element* which sets out the needs being addressed by the project, baseline status of risk and risk reduction activities, management methods, financial and other inputs and project risk management contingencies. A *tracking element*, which facilitates the monitoring of the progress of project activities ensuring transparency and permitting realignment of activity where this is deemed necessary and; an *evaluation component*, under preparation, that will critically assess the outcomes of each project in terms of project goals and in terms of relevance to GFDRR's charter (by track), national priorities, the HFA and sustainable development.

The RBMS focussed primarily on Track II and Track III activities. However, over the course of the evaluation, it was learned that Track I projects were also integrated into the system and that Track III would also be integrated into the system. Nevertheless, its overall utility is marred by the uneven quality of the information it contains and the similar uneven quality of project reporting as a whole.

Our desk top review of projects uncovered a general pattern of uneven record keeping in relation to project files and the material that was entered into the RBMS to report on results. More specifically:

- Gaps in the required program documentation in nearly all of our reviewed files;
- A high degree of repetition (cutting and pasting prior information);
- Gaps in project reporting in relation to Track I activity, although this may, in large part, be due to the fact that the GFDRR's role in Track I project execution is somewhat second-hand at best with the responsibility for executing lying with ISDR. As pointed out above, Track I was recently integrated into the RBMS system;
- Incomplete data on key dates in the approval process.

The implication of this uneven record keeping is that the GFDRR in fact does not have a complete set of records on which to base a full assessment of its effectiveness or its relevance, let alone its efficiency. It should be noted, however, that because many of the projects are on-going, some documentation like "end of project" reporting has yet to be required.

In discussion with personnel located in the field, some indications arose that the personnel completing the reporting had only a passing understanding of what they were doing so and did not see, or have not been sufficiently oriented towards, the benefits of strong results-based reporting. Some of these challenges in documentation and quality of reporting may also be due to the fact that the RBMS system as a system and the GFDRR as an entity, have evolved very rapidly, with progressive enhancement of the RBMS itself. This kind of change makes it difficult to orient field level personnel to evolving reporting requirements.

Finding 12: The use of the GFDRR's set of Core Indicators, while conceptually an advancement, has not taken root through cyclical project reporting.

The GFDRR's set of 61 common indicators of outcome performance (first level outcomes for the most part) are linked to the attainment of the five priorities of the Hyogo Framework. This constitutes an encouraging conceptual design, which ensures that GFDRR remains grounded within the wider partnership of the ISDR. However at the time of our review of project files, we have concluded that few project files have made use of the core indicators and few have articulated performance indicators beyond the reporting of basic output performance – what was being done and for how much money and time spent.

The causes for this performance reporting shortfall may lie in the rapid evolution of the GFDRR with the present RBMS system only reaching its current state in late 2008, with further updates in 2009. As many projects are in their early stages, little can be discerned from projects that would link themselves to the 61 core indicators. Moreover, personnel in the field who are responsible for reporting do not seem to have been sufficiently oriented to the need to ensure greater consistence and the greater use of the core indicators as the basis for performance reporting. This lack of buy-in on the RBMS and on the set of 61 core indicators has been confirmed in numerous interviews with TTLs and consultants in the field.

Finding 13: Although few GFDRR-supported Track II projects have reached their completion, there does not seem to be a consistent pattern established for post-project monitoring.

This issue is of considerable importance because the degree of success of the GFDRR may, in large part, come after the completion of the project in question during the immediate period of time when the recipients have taken the knowledge and capacity acquired as a result of the GFDRR contribution and integrate it or "used it". This situation is common to entities that use the individual project as the denominator of planning and reporting.

Finding 14: To date, the GFDRR has yet to develop an on-going evaluation plan.

The GFDRR does not possess an evaluation plan that would drill down to exploit in more detail the longer-term implication of its work. For example, it might be possible to explore in more detail GFDRR programs that supported building capacity within national or sub-national DRR focus agencies to ascertain what kind of programming was most effective and what prevailing conditions either supported or hampered “uptake”. The RBMS system itself, cannot answer such a complex question. Rather, if more accurate and complete, the RBMS system can be the data foundation on which issue-specific evaluations can be undertaken. As the GFDRR contemplates expansion, the importance of an evaluation plan increases. An evaluation plan would give an expended GFDRR a needed additional set of performance assessment mechanisms required to manage potentially a very much larger entity.

6. The Effectiveness of the GFDRR

The question of effectiveness²⁵ touches on whether or not the primary objectives of the GFDRR interventions have been achieved. For this chapter of the evaluation, a heavy reliance was placed on a review of the progress of the projects as outlined in the RBMS as well as on what was seen and reviewed during the field missions. As per the TORs, the evaluation team was asked to consider a range of topics in order to assess the effectiveness of the GFDRR. This section examines GFDRR effectiveness in terms of: the extent to which GFDRR had well defined and measurable objectives for the period; GFDRR has progressed with regard to its objectives; the factors that have contributed to or limited effective programming and; how new products or approaches introduced during the period have contributed to GFDRR's mission, as well as the benefits and challenges associated with them.

For the purposes of reviewing effectiveness, this chapter is divided into several sub-sections: effectiveness of mainstreaming, leveraging, partnerships, capacity building, tools, and sustainability.

6.1 Mainstreaming

Has the GFDRR fostered the mechanisms and tools that are needed to “mainstream” DRR at the global and regional level and as well, at the national level?

Finding 15: The GFDRR's suite of programming, including its support for Track I, has contributed to “putting DRR on the map” and to mainstreaming DRR at all levels.

Our desk top reviews and our country studies both show that GFDRR has contributed to mainstreaming DRR at the national level via its Track II programming portfolio. Support for the building or strengthening of national capacity, such as national DRR focus agencies, has been a widespread and flagship initiative of the GFDRR.

Overarching DRR considerations that have been integrated into World Bank country assistance strategies, PRSPs or national development plans have provided a basis and framework for national governments to take ownership of their DRR mainstreaming priorities. Our review of Track II projects combined with our interviews and other documentary resources shows that the GFDRR has made contributions to the broadening of awareness, the integration of DRR into planning and the building or strengthening of networks. Evidence shows that the Track II mainstreaming projects have gone some way towards putting government partners and DRR actors on the same page for DRR planning and mainstreaming.

Track I activities have not only indirectly contributed to the mainstreaming activities of Track II, they have also contributed to identifying a particular niche for the GFDRR, especially in relation to national level capacity building. Technical advice and technically focused capacity building (e.g. planning tools, risk mapping, development of standards, modeling, research, etc.) shared and disseminated through regional and international fora have increased the awareness of DRR and furthered the acceptance of DRR as an element in sustainable development. Hence, the GFDRR's annual contribution of \$5 million from the World Bank's DGF towards ISDR proves its worth in advancing collaboration and partnership towards mainstreaming.

²⁵ “Effectiveness: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Also used as an aggregate measure of (or judgment about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact.”
Source: OECD Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.

In relation to post-disaster activities, mostly supported via Track III but sometimes undertaken via Track II, while the project pool is smaller, there is an emerging body of evidence that initiatives such as Post Disaster Needs Assessments have contributed to the broadening of understanding of DRR and of new approaches to integrate DRR into recovery activities, another dimension of “mainstreaming”. We noted these positive characteristics in our country reviews of Madagascar and Haiti. In fact, what we have seen in the field is recognition of GFDRR, and by extension the World Bank, through the collaborative and technical role played in supporting government alongside the United Nations with the planning and implementation of the PDNA.

6.2 Leveraging

Has GFDRR contributed to the Bank’s strategy of promoting ex ante investment in DRR to reduce poverty?

Finding 16: In spite of its short lifespan, there is evidence that the GFDRR has been able to lever additional investment to support DRR-related activities and thus promote increased ex ante investment, including investment by the World Bank itself.

The table presented in Appendix III shows two dimensions of leverage. First, a modest degree of leverage in the kind that could be best characterized a “matching funding”. For the most part, this approach to the leverage of new investment has occurred via Track II activity. It also shows in two or three instances (Indonesia and Yemen), a much more powerful form of leverage in that DRR principles have been integrated into on-going World Bank lending activity.

In Indonesia some \$150 million of housing-related World Bank lending now incorporates DRR principles as a result of the intervention of the GFDRR supported staff in the Indonesia country office. A subsequent \$115 million in additional housing lending in the pipeline for 2009/2010 will integrate similar DRR-related considerations. This example is also one which demonstrates how GFDRR programming has fostered widespread “mainstreaming” within the World Bank at the country level.

In Yemen the GFDRR post disaster needs assessment (in this case executed via a Track II project) resulted in DRR considerations being built into an on-going recovery grant.

Our review **in Haiti, Nepal and Madagascar**, while not showing immediate leverage, points to the likelihood of the mainstreaming of DRR into on-going World Bank lending activity across a broad range of sectors. The extent of this latter form of leverage is, in large part, determined by the pipeline of World Bank lending activity. With a lifespan of less than three years, and with a small portfolio of programs that in many respects is “proof of concept” in nature, it would not be reasonable to expect that a large number of World Bank (or other IFIs) loan action would be positively impacted by the interventions of the GFDRR to date. However, as time progresses, this latter characteristic – the ability to integrate DRR considerations into broader lending activity may become one of the benchmarks of the degree of “success” of the GFDRR.

6.3 Partnerships

Are the partnering arrangements and harmonization supported by the GFDRR effective?

Finding 17: The present approach to partnering and harmonization is uneven in some instances, and poses a potential risk to the overall effectiveness of the GFDRR.

The design of the GFDRR's role in Track I, namely a collaboration on global and regional capacity building on DRR and climate change adaptation is an example of effective harmonisation; the potential for overlap and duplication has been eliminated by this allocation of roles and responsibilities. At the global and regional level, harmonisation has been enhanced by collaboration through Track I.

In relation to Track II, our eight completed country investigations point to a more uneven pattern of effective harmonisation. In Haiti and Indonesia there is strong evidence that GFDRR personnel have been active in clarifying roles and responsibilities and in promoting donor collaboration. In Djibouti, Madagascar and Nepal there appears to be more of a project focus rather than an effort to shape a pan-donor partnership. It should be noted that in Madagascar, greater pan-donor partnership has been hindered by the political crisis since early 2009. In Nepal we encountered major donors that had little if any awareness of the work that the GFDRR was undertaking.

The underlying cause for this unevenness may be that the GFDRR's current small resource base remains conceptualised on a project-by-project basis and less conceived on the basis of a full-scale GFDRR country strategy. This may evolve if the GFDRR secures the resources to mount the expanded programming in its priority and earmarked countries. It also may lie in the realization that, while progress has been made in "mainstreaming" DRR across the World Bank, the small scale nature of the GFDRR's current portfolio, coupled with some of its actions being "proof of concept" in nature (testing validity and utility of use within a country context), does not provide a sufficient critical mass to catalyze more active partnership and harmonization at the country level.

6.4 Capacity Building

What institutions are in place at the country / regional / global levels as a result of GFDRR programming and how have their capacities been strengthened to promote the integration of disaster risk reduction?

Finding 18: Even at this early stage, there is evidence that GFDRR programming not only has supported capacity building among existing institutions, it also has contributed to the establishment of new ones.

In relation to the eight country studies reviewed, we have witnessed a stronger capacity by vulnerable countries to respond effectively to disasters:

In Indonesia for example, the establishment and expansion of the national disaster planning agency was, to a significant degree, fostered by the GFDRR. In addition, the capacity of the national Ministry of Public Works was expanded to include DRR considerations in large on-going community housing projects. The capacity of the Ministry to Finance to address risk insurance considerations is being expanded and a new unit was established to address this issue. In Nepal, a new national capacity in the Ministry of Home Affairs has been supported in DRR. In Haiti, although only at the launch stage, GFDRR programming will likely make a major contribution to the establishment of a national DRR focal point agency. In Madagascar, despite political uncertainties, GFDRR support has contributed to the strengthening of the national DRR focal point agency, CPGU, which has integrated with key Ministries in DRR mainstreaming and which is gaining the acceptance of the UN and some donors. Meteorological capacity has been strengthened and some of the building standards that have been developed in the country are filtering through to different regions of the country.

Our desk top review also uncovered instances of capacity building- primary training - at the national level. In Senegal, Track II project entitled- Spatial analysis of natural hazard and climate variability risks in peri-urban areas of Dakar” ensured capacity building through producing reports, brochures, posters, and a spatial database in both digital and printed formats. These products were then disseminated to key stakeholders in Dakar including local governments, various public agencies, the African Urban management Institute (IAGU), academies, and the WB Country Office. A face-to-face dissemination workshop was also organized at the Municipal Development Agency (ADM) in Dakar in addition to a consultation workshop for partners.

In Yemen, through project “Comprehensive Damage and Loss Needs Assessment”, GFDRR expert Roberto Jovel imparted a Damage and Loss Assessment (DaLA) training (based on the UN ECLAC methodology) to key government officials. The training sessions were attended by 47 government officials, sector ministries, and municipalities. Similarly, in India, Track III project, 26 persons were trained on conducting a damage and loss assessment.

In China, workshops were given to country officials to train them on thematic DRR areas during Track III project “Supporting Sustainable Post-Earthquake Recovery in China”

Still in relation to Track I projects, at the global level, we uncovered some new institutions or networks: Some knowledge networks were created through project “A virtual clearinghouse (Prevention Web)”, where over 30 disaster risk reduction networks and communities have been initiated to promote professional collaboration with PreventionWeb.net tools and information management guidance. Similarly, there was creation and strengthening of partnerships in the project “Global partnerships with the private sector, the media, the parliamentarians, and research and scientific” where initial consultations with parliamentarians and intergovernmental organizations were held and modalities for partnership were developed in Asia and Africa involving the Inter-Parliamentarian Union.

In Indonesia, we also encountered a new sub-regional network that is being coordinated by the Foreign Ministry which will bring together specialists from five South East Asian nations and which will also explore sharing of experts and specialists via regular conferences and workshops. This new sub-regional network was sparked by participation in ISDR/GFDRR supported Track I activities.

6.5 Tools

What tools, concepts, methods, instruments have been introduced for consideration by disaster prone countries to enhance their institutional capacities to assess their risk, to reduce their vulnerability and to establish legal and regulatory frameworks?

Finding 19: The GFDRR possesses a broad range of tools and services to strengthen the institutional capacity and at the national level, all of which appear to be of good quality and are highly resourced and some of which may constitute state of the art practices.

The GFDRR has a highly responsive and flexible suite of activities that it has supported and that recipients appear to highly value. These measures are largely in relation to Track II. They include, but are not limited to:

- Specialised technical assistance for public sector bodies to build new planning, managerial, legislative and regulatory capacity, as well as new technical capacity in fields as diverse as risk modeling, DRR sensitive land use planning, catastrophic insurance systems to meteorology, hydrology and natural resources usage. This form of assistance is usually delivered by consultants hired to assist government agencies directly.
- Capacity building for sub-national level governments and DRR related planning assistance including programming to advance climate change adaptation at the local level by “resilient cities” programming.
- Community-based capacity building to raise awareness and increase “buy in” of the benefits of DRR.
- Direct assistance and “coaching” by GFDRR-supported personnel located in country offices.

Our data collection at the country level, found nearly unanimous support for the quality of the programming offered and strong indications that it was highly relevant to the recipients.

Specifically have the tools and support provided by Track III, including the TA Fund, the Callable Fund and Post Disaster Needs Assessments provided timely assistance in recovery planning and capacity development?

Finding 20: The range of Track III tools including Post Disaster Needs Assessments constitute very valuable instruments which are not available elsewhere

The GFDRR expansion of the use of Post Disaster Needs Assessment has permeated DRR reflections throughout the World Bank and the wider DRR community. PDNA methodology is creating country “buy-in” for the importance of prevention and risk mitigation. The capacity building, technical assistance and training on PDNA via the Track III Standby Recovery Financing Facility (SRFF) has gone some way towards harmonizing the nature of discussion on post-disaster recovery amongst donors, government ministries and UN agencies and the World Bank. According to some government proponents of the methodology, PDNA provides the framework for ex-post recovery planning which was previously more closely linked with humanitarian response rather than the economic costs. In the case of Madagascar, while there was little donor financing of the actual early recovery, medium term rehabilitation or long-term reconstruction plans outlined in the Joint Damage Loss and Needs Assessment, it was nevertheless viewed it as a positive tool for post-disaster planning in that it brought actors together on an agreed methodology and elucidated just how significant the economic costs of natural disasters can be. This also brought an important element of the “poverty reduction” benefits of DRR to the forefront of government reflection.

Underlying the PDNA process is a need to contextualize the results in terms of the prioritization of recovery activities and the donor and government acceptance and participation in the recovery itself. More examples are required in order to see a PDNA process lead to an implemented government-led recovery plan.

Are the contributions that the GFDRR has made sustainable?

Finding 21: There is a risk that some of the contributions that the GFDRR has made may not be sustainable over the longer term.

We encountered a number of examples where a follow-on project designed to deepen and strengthen an evolution to a full pilot or beyond remained unfunded. We encountered this in several of the countries that we examined in detail. The recent global needs assessment of the Priority and Earmarked countries contemplates significant expansion, or follow-on in key areas. For example, in Indonesia, Yemen, Nepal and Haiti, the initial projects contained a number of elements to strengthen national capacity; the planned future funding then subsequently expands on these initial activities. This leads to a question as to the management of future demands and the challenges that the GFDRR may face if unable to secure new resources. This was highlighted in the relevance chapter earlier in this evaluation.

Because most of the projects of the GFDRR are ongoing, and thus are still in the implementation phase, it is hard to fully assess the sustainability of GFDRR initiatives. Capacity building, mainstreaming and national ownership are at the heart of the GFDRR partnership Strategy, however, from the desk review, it appears that most projects do not have an explicit strategy for sustainability. Only some evidence within the project documentation may lead to think that the projects will be sustainable:

- Many projects focus on building individual capacities and training;
- All projects work on supporting institutional capacities, thus improving the ability of national actors to manage disasters;
- Some projects concretely ensure that national government allocate resources for DRR, for instance through the creation of the YRRF in Yemen;
- Some projects are linked with other World Bank projects, such as the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Pool Feasibility Study, which reinforces its potential for sustainability;
- A few projects also have multiple phases planned and thus plan to do each step a bit more in depth, which might possibly ensure a greater sustainability;
- Some projects seem to integrate a gender component, which is often viewed as an essential factor in sustainability;
- Other projects explicitly highlight sustainability measures. One highlights the nature of the methodology as being sustainable because it is action-oriented and requires ownership and broad consultation; another has as one of its activities, a goal to identify resources for sustainability;
- Some projects mention a commitment of government before the project is approved

It should be noted that many of the project documents simply do not clearly elucidate the sustainability strategy, or the measures that will be undertaken to ensure sustainability. Moreover, where government engagement is weak, there is no clear means of disengagement. The 2009-2012 partnership strategy outlines the basis for an exit strategy, in cases where country ownership is advanced or alternatively in situations where “the political situation no longer favors a sustained country policy dialogue”. In the case where the latter scenario exists, greater clarity is needed. The GFDRR Partnership Strategy is further discussed below.

Finding 22: The overarching strategic direction for GFDRR has been achieved through the identification of priority and earmarked countries, the recent set of country level plans for the next three year and the GFDRR Partnership Strategy 2009-2012; however, more rigour will be needed in these strategic elements as GFDRR expands beyond the current timeline.

The identification of priority and earmarked countries only occurred in early 2009, with the subsequent development of national action plans for the next three years as presented, in part, at the June sessions of the CG. Because of the nature of the Hyogo Framework and the links between the GFDRR and UN ISDR, an argument can be made that the GFDRR did not need its own strategic plan during its inception phase. However as the GFDRR contemplates a significant degree of expansion over the next three year and as the global community becomes more engaged in DRR related activity, including climate change adaptation, the present planning framework of the GFDRR contains a “gap” in that its denominator seems to be largely based at the country level. The management of a much larger resource pool, or in another scenario, the inability to secure a significant degree of additional resources over and above the 2007- 2009 levels, pose considerable challenges to the GFDRR such as: a) what type of programming generates the best level contribution to “mainstreaming” at the national level? b) What programming characteristics are best suited to ensure sustainability? c) How can GFDRR supported programs “graduate”? d) In a scenario of limited resources, what type of programming can best support the reduction of vulnerability?

Likewise, in a scenario of limited resources the following issues emerge: which priority or earmarked nations offer the best chance of both “mainstreaming” as well as reduction in vulnerability? What actions does the GFDRR and the World Bank need to take to broaden the degree of mainstreaming? What linkages or synergies exist, or may be fostered among various sectors of the World Bank that would multiply “mainstreaming” and what synergies can be fostered with sectors such as health, education, transport and public sector renewal? These questions and scenarios are touched upon in the current GFDRR Partnership Strategy. However, the details as to how these issues will be tackled by the GFDRR partnership still need to be fully elaborated.

7. Conclusions

The GFDRR is a young organisation. The magnitude of its achievements in this relatively new area of development cooperation needs to be emphasized, as do some of the challenges that it faces on the road to future expansion and responsiveness to the growing global need. To that end, we have laid out four preliminary conclusions.

- 1) The GFDRR has played a contributory role in the attainment of the goals of the Hyogo Framework, with its greatest level of present contribution coming at the country level via Track II.
- 2) The GFDRR and its programming portfolio constitutes a very young enterprise which faced some initial scaling up challenges in relation to some of its administrative, decision-making and reporting systems; but which now is developing a more mature internal managerial and administrative paradigm.
- 3) Although considerable progress has been made in a short time in “mainstreaming” DRR across the World Bank as a whole, the task remains a work in progress, especially in relation to the long-term goal of integrating DRR considerations into World Bank lending activity.
- 4) The long-term contributions of the GFDRR and those of other donors and lenders at the country level, including elements of the UN, could be enhanced if there were to be clearer understandings about mutual roles and responsibilities.

These four general conclusions lead to this initial and interim synthesis of overall strengths and challenges:

Exhibit 7.1 Overall Strengths and Challenges

Strengths	Challenges
The GFDRR possesses a well respected and valuable portfolio of programming, including some elements like the Post Disaster Needs Assessment that provide unique products.	Given that the demand for DRR related programming, either that to be provided by the GFDRR or by others is quite large, unless expanded by several orders of magnitude, the GFDRR may face challenges in the management of expectations and challenges in relation to its decision-making paradigm.
Recognising the size of its current portfolio of programming, the GFDRR has been able to catalyze a number of national governments to better integrate DRR considerations into national planning and to give greater emphasis to DRR principles	The mainstreaming of DRR within the World Bank as a whole may need to be better systematized so as to ensure that overall World Bank internal resource allocations match the geographic focus of GFDRR priority nations.
The GFDRR provides timely, responsive and sensitive services to requesting nations, limited to some degree by a complex operating procedure involving many actors within the World Bank.	While the GFDRR's internal planning and reporting systems, most notably RBMS, have now evolved, there remains a challenge in improving the overall quality of project reporting, and especially the systematic use of the highly valuable set of 61 Core Indicators.
The World Bank's Development Grant Funding support for ISDR via the GFDRR has provided a valuable augmentation of the support of others, and has made a contribution to the advancement of the Hyogo Framework.	Recognizing the relative youth of the GFDRR and the level of positive contributions it has made, given its resource base at the country level, there is a challenge to ensure coordination and harmonization of efforts.

Strengths	Challenges
<p>GFDRR supported activities have increased the knowledge base of DRR-related issues at country levels via its Track II work, and at the regional and global levels, have contributed via Track I support to ISDR's increased knowledge base and network formation .</p>	

8. Recommendations

8.1 Introduction

From the above general conclusions, it is evident that in its short lifespan, the GFDRR partnership has played a marked role in the attainment of the Hyogo Framework and that it has established both a presence in itself and has promoted the mainstreaming of DRR in vulnerable countries and within the World Bank. The recommendations that follow are designed not so much to retrospectively correct any of the shortcomings which this evaluation may have uncovered. Rather, they have been developed in the spirit of organizational learning to look forward to complement and support the GFDRR as it moves to expand from, in essence, a kind of large pilot project to a global force that will serve to considerably raise awareness of DRR and the integration of climate change adaptation changes into broader disaster reduction planning. From there, the real benefits of DRR should be seen in more practical terms – that is, the effect of disasters on vulnerable populations, on the infrastructure and on the economies should be notably reduced, leading to greater resiliency and overall poverty reduction.

In this light, it needs to be emphasized that many of the recommendations which follow are largely formative and procedural in nature. They concentrate on suggesting ways to build a stronger platform. The strategic thinking that underpins the GFDRR is sound and the overall avenues of operation are generally effective given the current scope. The methods of partnership and liaison, again in relation to the GFDRR's relatively small scale at this time, have laid solid foundations for future expansion.

The recommendations that follow concentrate on three primary areas that correspond to this evaluation's topology of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness.

Relevance – the strengthening of coordination and harmonization;

Efficiency – improving the standards, timeliness and quality of reporting;

Effectiveness – strengthening planning systems so as to improve immediacy and promote sustainability.

Overall, in addition we feel it appropriate to lay out a primary and overarching recommendation. As noted in Finding 5 above, we have concluded that the need for the services of the GFDRR vastly exceeds its existing resource base. While we are unable to ascertain with any degree of certainty the complete magnitude of future need, we are comfortable in concluding that at least several-fold more resources than have been available will be required over the next three to five years. Keeping in mind that the GFDRR Partnership Strategy assumes a broad partnership constituency, the resource demands imply that the existing donors and the World Bank itself will have to recommit themselves to the GFDRR and as well, new major actors like the European Commission may need to considerably augment their level of support to the partnership.

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the GFDRR continue to pursue a proactive campaign of fund raising with international partners, including consideration of mutually supporting activities with other multi-lateral development banks.

8.2 Relevance

Our findings with respect to relevance pointed to the degree to which the first wave of GFDRR programming had been well-received, seen as having made valuable and unique contributions, and seen as having expanded the state of the art. However, as the GFDRR faces potentially a much larger future environment, it faces the challenge of managing in a much more complex environment. In Finding 3, we have noted that the level of cooperation among partner bodies tends to be uneven in some cases. Therefore, a first consideration with respect to strengthening the relevance of the GFDRR for the future lies in the promotion of more active means of coordination. We will suggest four specific ways.

Recommendation 2: The GFDRR should develop a more formalized means of coordination across the network of multi-lateral development banks, with the view to the eventual promulgation of more common and harmonized approaches.

This recommendation speaks to a core reality in contemporary development cooperation: namely, the centrality of the collective work of multi-lateral financial institutions. The GFDRR through its partnership with UN ISDR has addressed the question of coordination on the broader scale to some degree. What appears to be absent however, is a similar degree of coordination with sister development banks. As the climate adaptation agenda grows in importance as a key issue for development cooperation, it would appear sensible that the World Bank, through the GFDRR, assume a leadership role in promoting a greater degree of harmonization.

The importance of harmonization not only in relation to the adherence to the Paris Declaration but in a more practical sense on the ground, is likely to increase should the GFDRR be successful in considerably expanding its resource base. It is at this point where harmonization with others can lead to increased synergies and strengthen the possibility for long-term sustainability. This leads to a second related recommendation.

Recommendation 3: The GFDRR should, in any expanded environment and with specific reference to its 20 priority countries, take a leadership role in promoting donor and development bank coordination and harmonization.

While our first recommendation spoke to, in essence, to a strategic level of coordination among multi-lateral development banks, this recommendation speaks to what we have found to be a potential shortcoming on the ground (see Finding 3). At present and given the somewhat pilot project nature of GFDRR interventions in any given country approximately in the range of only \$US 1 million, the need for the GFDRR to take a more aggressive role in promoting harmonization probably has not been required. However, to expand exponentially in a country to the range of between \$ 10 – 15 Million, naturally implies additional coordinative responsibilities.

The model in Indonesia can serve as a prototype for the kind of inter-agency coordination that is being proposed. In Indonesia, the GFDRR staff led coordinative efforts in a very practical way through exchanges of information, regular formal meetings and on-going informal liaison. These processes, because they are highly practical in nature, do not impinge on the global role of OCHA. Rather, in effect, they give more focus to coordination. To that end, we would propose that as GFDRR in-country operations expand, it take the leadership role in reaching out to bi-lateral and multi-lateral development partners.

Recommendation 4: In planning for the next project cycle, GFDRR should consider giving special attention to new programming designed to strengthen national coordinative capacity.

This recommendation, in some ways, mirrors the already outlined country plans in many instances. However, we noted in a number of these country plans the tendency to look toward a diverse range of programming and not to sufficiently focus on strengthening national and sub-national planning and response capacity. This recommendation, therefore, gives extra emphasis to our Finding 6 that has concluded that one of the most successful elements of the current GFDRR programming suite is its capacity building work at the national and frequently, sub-national levels.

There is as well a natural synergy among the above three recommendations. While it is impossible to forecast the future, it is reasonable to assume that if the GFDRR plays a stronger coordinative role and if it were to highlight the benefits of capacity building in planning, there might be greater collective opportunity for sustained national and sub-national capacity building.

8.3 Efficiency

Our findings with respect to the efficiency of current GFDRR planning reporting and managerial systems highlight the degree to which it is, in effect, a rapidly evolving entity. The recommendations which follow are designed to strengthen the internal capacity of the GFDRR itself at Headquarters, the capacity of World Bank personnel in the field, and the capacity of ISDR as a valued partner. We noted earlier in Finding 11, that the potential of RBMS was not being realized to some degree. We also noted in Finding 12 that patterns of reporting and record keeping were uneven and did not lend themselves to the demonstration of the actual level of stewardship that the GFDRR has attained over the past three years.

Recommendation 5: The GFDRR should develop standardized and results-based reporting templates so as to regularize, streamline, and focus the cyclical reporting that is inherent in modern project management.

One of the major findings of our desktop review of all three Tracks of GFDRR programming is the degree of variance in the quantity and quality of cyclical reporting (see Finding 11). This recommendation would address this potential accountability gap through a process of standardization.

Part of this new standardization would need to address the present tendency in cyclical reporting to “tell the story” of the project and not to concentrate on what is truly important; namely, the short and long-term consequences or changes that can be linked to GFDRR programming. This implies therefore, that the RBMS system would need to be somewhat modified so that it could integrate standardized formats and as well, reject reporting that was not in compliance with such new procedures.

Recommendation 6: The GFDRR should develop and circulate more formalized selection criteria.

While, in its early years, the GFDRR probably did not require a comprehensive approach to selection standards, the level of anticipated growth will naturally increase its profile and potentially increase the level of demand it faces. Based on discussions in several of our field missions, we came to find that the suggested country plans reflect a highly internalized approach to project selection. This is not to say that the suggested suites of programming at the national level are not relevant; it is to emphasize that as the GFDRR advances, the requirements for transparency and objectivity increase.

This recommendation relates equally to Track I and Track II programming. Indeed, it is only recently (see Finding 22) that the GFDRR has begun to be more selective in the allocation of Track II resources. This recommendation also implies that the GFDRR, in setting selection criteria, will need to establish a hierarchy among its goals and objectives so that it can begin, should it be necessary, to differentiate among possible programming and equally among priority countries with respect to the overall magnitude of a planned portfolio. As well, this recommendation also implies a more active approach to linking what could be seen as success with future prospects. In this way, the GFDRR would become more results-oriented and have the tools to link performance with future programming.

Recommendation 7: GFDRR should develop a multi-faceted training program for Headquarters and field personnel.

The Findings we have noted above with respect to the unevenness of reporting are in large part, in our estimation, due to two contributing phenomena. First, the GFDRR’s planning and reporting systems have evolved at an extraordinarily rate producing in some instances quantum shifts in complexity. Second, the GFDRR, given this moving framework, has not been able and has not had the resources to develop and sustain comprehensive and multi-dimensional training activities for World Bank staff. Naturally, we recognize that the turn-over in World Bank personnel in the field and at Headquarters is a broad phenomenon which is clearly beyond the ability of the GFDRR to influence. However, it is within the GFDRR’s span of responsibility to strengthen its orientation and training capacity so as to provide at a minimum a more comprehensive set of learning tools, manuals or even on-line training capacity.

We recognize that in making this recommendation that this will increase the administrative overhead of the Secretariat. However, such an investment in performance measurement is more than warranted given the overall likely increase in the size of the GFDRR's total portfolio. This also leads directly to our next Recommendation.

Recommendation 8: Assuming a substantial increase in the overall size and scope of the GFDRR portfolio, the GFDRR will need to considerably increase its personnel both at Headquarters and in the field.

While this recommendation may seem to be self-evident, in our experience in evaluating similar multi-donor platforms, there is a natural tendency on the part of the donor members to wish to limit growth in administrative or managerial overhead. However, as we have learned in assessing similar platforms, there is a limit to the ability of personnel to do "more with less" or to even do more with the same. Our desktop review (see Finding 10) showed the long length of time that is frequently required to launch a new project. As well, our on-site and virtual field missions have shown that the apparently more successful projects at the national level are those which have been resource-intensive and which have required on-going coordination and liaison. This recommendation also has implications for the World Bank itself as it moves toward more firmly mainstreaming DRR.

Recommendation 9: The World Bank, at Headquarters especially, should review the level of resources and their regional distribution that have been allocated to the mainstreaming of DRR.

One of our most important Findings (Finding 4) relates to the degree to which the World Bank has been able to begin to mainstream DRR. However, any significant growth in the breadth and scope of GFDRR's portfolio will put pressure on these Bank resources. As we noted in Finding 10, there appears to be disproportionate levels of resources allocated by the World Bank across the various geographic regions. As well, the allocation of these resources on a regional basis does not seem to take into account the relative proportion of priority countries in each region. For example, nine of the 20 priority nations are located in Africa. This would tend to imply that the African region should have the largest dedicated staff. Such does not appear to be the case.

8.4 Effectiveness

Our principle focus in making recommendations with respect to effectiveness is directed toward the nature of GFDRR planning and performance measurement mechanisms. These recommendations differ from those made in relation to Efficiency presented above, in that those above focused largely on process and resources while the ones to be presented below are firmly focused on management for development results.

Recommendation 10: The GFDRR should to develop a more rigorous multi-year strategic plan that includes a broad-based results and performance indicator framework.

We recognize that the GFDRR's partnership strategy in some ways constitutes a medium term planning framework. However, on closer inspection, this framework (as we have noted in Finding 22) is not sufficiently detailed so as to lay out a clear medium to long-term strategic vision for the role and position of the GFDRR. An updated strategic plan also would enable the GFDRR to lay out its priorities and the risks that it faces within the context of the new funding portfolio for the next several years. In this way, the plan would strengthen the relevance of the GFDRR and sharpen its programmatic focus.

Recommendation 11: The GFDRR should develop a more hierarchical approach to its set of performance indicators.

At present the GFDRR utilizes the 61 Hyogo Framework performance indicators. While this set is comprehensive and tends to be focused on medium-term outcome attainment, its scope has not been picked up in the project reporting via RBMS. We are of the view that should the GFDRR decide to more standardize project reporting, there would be considerable benefit in seeking from the Results Management Council (RMC) advice on how to develop a GFDRR-specific set of indicators for both short and medium outcome performance. These new indicators naturally would feed into those of the Hyogo Framework.

Recommendation 12: The GFDRR should develop a multi-year evaluation plan.

This current evaluation is the first undertaken by the GFDRR and was launched in large part as a result of the undertakings described earlier to conduct a comprehensive evaluation at the end of the first programming cycle. However, should the GFDRR expand to the size contemplated for the next programming cycle, the breadth and scope of this expansion will require an investment in monitoring and evaluation well above the notion of a once-a-cycle overall review. For example, as the scope of the programming expands, there would be a clear benefit in assessing the relative efficiency and effectiveness of various kinds of programming; for example, support for national or sub-national capacity building versus support for insurance measures. In addition, a periodic stock-taking exercise to assess the extent to which outputs are contributing to project outcomes will add formative value. This recommendation therefore implies that an enlarged GFDRR will need to invest in more internal monitoring and evaluation capacity.

A new more focused strategic plan combined with the suggested new approach to performance indicators would constitute the platform on which to build a new multi-year evaluation plan. Such a plan also might encourage some donor members to contribute or participate in specific evaluations and thus strengthen the ownership of the plan and any attendant results.

Recommendation 13: The GFDRR should engage with ISDR in a dialogue about how to clarify what appear to be some ambiguities with regard to their individual functions.

While on the surface the differentiation between ISDR and GFDRR may seem clear, this evaluation uncovered ambiguities and potentials for missing links. Findings 3 and 17 address some of these concerns. Most importantly, there would appear to be a need to better clarify how GFDRR resources are being directed toward support for Track I and also to clarify the role at the country level of ISDR and that of GFDRR.

9. List of Findings

- Finding 1: Global, regional and donor partners share common and mostly positive views about the overall utility of the contributions made by the GFDRR to the reduction of vulnerability to natural hazards.
- Finding 2: National level stakeholders are uniformly positive about the contributions made by the GFDRR.
- Finding 3: An affirmation of overall relevance however, is limited to some degree by apprehension about the clarity of roles and responsibilities among major interveners and level of coordination/harmonization, including the GFDRR and elements of the UN system.
- Finding 4: The GFDRR has made a contribution to increase the resilience of nations to respond to natural disasters and the impact of climate change.
- Finding 5: The current level of GFDRR funding does not meet the growing demand from low and middle-income countries in relation to Track II activity.
- Finding 6: There is evidence to show that recipient countries have begun to integrate knowledge and capacity that the GFDRR has provided via its current project portfolio.
- Finding 7: There is mixed but tending to positive evidence that the GFDRR has contributed to the strengthening of DRR in World Bank country operations.
- Finding 8: At the national level there is clear evidence that DRR knowledge management, networking, knowledge transfer and research are making a positive contribution to the strengthening of national capacity.
- Finding 9: There is initial, albeit limited evidence, to show that GFDRR supported activities are producing higher degrees of South-South cooperation in relation to sharing of knowledge.
- Finding 10: While commended by many for its responsiveness and ambition, the overall staffing resources of the GFDRR partnership do not always meet the growing and changing needs.
- Finding 11: While RBMS contains a number of state-of-the-art elements to support reporting for results, its day-to-day relevance is hampered by uneven project reporting.
- Finding 12: The use of the GFDRR's set of Core Indicators, while conceptually an advancement, has not taken root through cyclical project reporting.
- Finding 13: Although few GFDRR-supported Track II projects have reached their completion, there does not seem to be a consistent pattern established for post-project monitoring.
- Finding 14: To date, the GFDRR has yet to develop an on-going evaluation plan.
- Finding 15: The GFDRR's suite of programming, including its support for Track I, has contributed to "putting DRR on the map" and to mainstreaming DRR at all levels.

- Finding 16: In spite of its short lifespan, there is evidence that the GFDRR has been able to lever additional investment to support DRR-related activities and thus promote increased ex ante investment, including investment by the World Bank itself.
- Finding 17: The present approach to partnering and harmonization is uneven in some instances, and poses a potential risk to the overall effectiveness of the GFDRR.
- Finding 18: Even at this early stage, there is evidence that GFDRR programming not only has supported capacity building among existing institutions, it also has contributed to the establishment of new ones.
- Finding 19: The GFDRR possesses a broad range of tools and services to strengthen the institutional capacity and at the national level, all of which appear to be of good quality and are highly resourced and some of which may constitute state of the art practices.
- Finding 20: The range of Track III tools including Post Disaster Needs Assessments constitute very valuable instruments which are not available elsewhere
- Finding 21: There is a risk that some of the contributions that the GFDRR has made may not be sustainable over the longer term.
- Finding 22: The overarching strategic direction for GFDRR has been achieved through the identification of priority and earmarked countries, the recent set of country level plans for the next three year and the GFDRR Partnership Strategy 2009-2012; however, more rigour will be needed in these strategic elements as GFDRR expands beyond the current timeline.