The report provides a detailed evaluation of GFDRR's disaster risk management (DRM) program results over the 2006-10 period. The evaluation takes an innovative approach for results measurement, marked by a fusion of qualitative and quantitative techniques and tools. Based on GFDRR's Results Framework, approved by the Consultative Group (CG) in October 2010, the evaluation draws extensively from the Results Model which:

a) combines qualitative information from multiple sources offering a ‘360 degree’ view on impact;

b) links the ‘DRM results-chain’ with international developmental standards and benchmarks such as the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) climate change standards;

c) uses a ‘contribution/partnership based results measurement approach’ for evaluating GFDRR’s multi-donor, multi-recipient program; and

d) promotes end-user participation and complete procedural transparency through efficient oversight mechanisms for results management that are fully aligned with contemporary good practices and standards.
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Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION & PROGRESS ON THE GFDRR RESULTS AGENDA

- The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), established in 2006, is a partnership of 36 countries and 7 international organizations, committed to helping developing countries reduce their vulnerability to natural hazards and adapt to climate change. GFDRR initiated operations in 54 countries during its first two years of operation (2007-2009). However, in 2009 there was a strategic shift of focus towards implementing longer term DRM and climate adaptation country programs in 20 priority countries and 11 donor earmarked countries.

- The report provides an executive summary of the detailed evaluation performed of GFDRR’s DRM and climate adaptation results over the 2006-2010 period. The Results Evaluation Report will be presented for discussion at the GFDRR 10th CG meeting to be held on May 9th, 2011 in Geneva, Switzerland. It should be noted that the full report provides a more detailed narrative (anecdotal account) of GFDRR’s DRR and climate adaptation mainstreaming program to support and supplement the findings of the quantitative results analysis.

- The report has a strong focus on measuring both ‘GFDRR Contributions’ and ‘Country Performance’ towards the mainstreaming of DRR and climate change adaptation (CCA) in the development policies of GFDRR priority countries, and the HFA priority of “ensuring that disaster reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation”. In addition, detailed results analyses on other key dimensions of the Mainstreaming DRR and Climate Adaptation Program (Track II) work program is provided, albeit in lesser detail – since some of these indicators still reflect work in progress and require further validation. The report also touches upon a few key indicators from its other business lines, including International and Regional DRM Partnerships (Track I) and its Standby Recovery Financing Facility (SRFF – Track III).

- Progress on Results Operationalization Action Plan: GFDRR is currently implementing the Results Framework over a 6-12 month time horizon, since the CG endorsement of the Results Framework, following the Results Operationalization Action Plan that was submitted to CG members in October 2010. GFDRR has made significant strides towards the operationalization of key DRM & CCA mainstreaming indicators, including both program level and intermediate indicators. The team has in the process created standard business processes and structured results analysis templates, which greatly facilitates the operationalization of other indicators. Due to this streamlined process, GFDRR has been able to operationalize the majority of Track II indicators in addition to a proportion of key indicators from Tracks I and III.

GFDRR’s INTERNAL RESULTS MANAGEMENT MECHANISM

- GFDRR’s CRT has set up an internal results management mechanism to ensure that the evaluations carried out are objective, transparent, and arbitrate the subjective aspects of the evaluation process. This involves circulating the methodology of results analyses to all stakeholders in advance and the setting up of a Rules Setting Committee (RSC) consisting of both internal and external subject matter experts. The first meeting of the RSC took place on April 14, 2011, and was chaired by an external Disaster Risk Management / Monitoring and Evaluation (DRM/M&E) expert and was attended by representatives from all 3 GFDRR Tracks,
the CRT and the GFDRR Program Manager. The main objective of the meeting was to seek an independent or neutral view and endorsement of the various ‘measurement yardsticks’ used in the analysis for ‘locking-in’ the rules of results operationalization. The attendees discussed several issues pertaining to indicators from each Track before arriving at decisions that were duly recorded. Detailed minutes from participants of this meeting will be added as an annex to the full report. The CRT seeks guidance and involvement from GFDRR’s Results Management Council (RMC) in such exercises going forward.

RESULTS OPERATIONALIZATION AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

- **Developmental impact evaluation for DRR has hitherto remained relatively unchartered territory and conventional analysis techniques and data limitations pose significant challenges towards meaningful and quantitative results analyses.** GFDRR’s CRT has been able to overcome these challenges by employing innovative operationalization techniques given the unique nature of each intermediate and program indicator, particularly in respect of measuring DRM mainstreaming performance. The GFDRR Results Operationalization Model makes optimum use of the ‘Contribution/Partnership based approach’ for measuring results for its multi-donor, multi-recipient DRM program, instead of the conventional attribution technique for results measurement. Under this methodology each indicator provides a quantitative measurement of both ‘Country Performance’ and ‘GFDRR Contribution’ towards that particular DRM agenda. The following is an abstract of the detailed analysis methodology, which will be comprehensively covered in the full report.

- **Parameters for assessment of country DRM performance** are based on: (a) country self-reported HFA scores (on a level of 1-5) for corresponding (selected) indicators and by setting a conservative threshold of 4, signifying ‘substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources’; (b) DRR budgetary allocation in the National Development Budget during the 2006-2010 period, and; (c) integration of DRR into the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and Country Assistance / Partnership Strategies (CASs/CPSs) during the same period.

- **The analysis of GFDRR contribution is based on a quantitative assessment** of: (a) GFDRR efforts towards the integration of DRR into country PRSPs and CASs; (b) strategic relevance and financial efficiency of DRR mainstreaming projects in GFDRR’s Track II and III portfolios, and; (c) strategic relevance and financial efficiency of DRM projects with mainstreaming contributions in the World Bank lending portfolio.

- **The measurement of the CCA mainstreaming indicators** follows a similar approach as above while retaining existing international standard definitions of what constitutes CCA, importantly including the OECD DAC definitions of adaptation. The operationalization of other indicators such as those pertaining to budget allocation, risk assessment and early warning systems is based on in-depth reviews of several international reports and development plans including the 2009 UN Global Assessment Report, the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (Kobe, January 2005) reports, HFA Monitor reports, latest PRSPs and other publicly available documents from international organizations.
TARGET SETTING FOR RESULTS

In the absence of quantitative targets that should have been preferably set in the baseline program year (2006), the approach makes use of the opportunity to set targets retroactively, but with the distinct advantage of such targets being much more realistic and closely aligned with present day conditions, in addition to the clarity brought in by GFDRR’s DRR mainstreaming strategy by the introduction of the Global Partnership Strategy (GPS) 2009-12. Such target setting is premised on the longer-term strategic goals envisioned under the GPS, and beyond for a period of 10 years since program inception in 2006. This is in consonance with the generally accepted fact that DRM, being an evolving and relatively new area of developmental activity, would only take root and show real impact in the longer term. Accordingly, for the purposes of target-setting, GFDRR longer term, 10-year program has been divided into 4 quarters. Two options for target-setting have been compared, including: (a) Equal Distribution that assumes that yearly performance remains constant across all 10 program years, and (b) Differential Distribution based on the “Development Program Cycle Approach”. The latter approach, which is based on the well-known dynamics of program implementation, has been preferred over the former, since it takes into account the particularities of each phase of developmental activity. This method calculates that in the year 2010-2011, GFDRR should be significantly contributing in around 30% of its 31 priority countries in its mid-program year. The linear approach would have led us to a 50% target in direct correspondence to the halfway program stage. The latter linear approach would be deemed more suitable for a more project-based or projectized approach under which longer term developmental impact is not being pursued.

KEY EVALUATION RESULTS

Track I – The Global and Regional Cooperation Program

GFDRR has ensured significant growth and diversification of its partnership, financing base and governance structure, as advised by the CG. Over the 2007-10 period, the total number of formal CG members, which constitute GFDRR’s key governance and decision-making forum, increased 5 fold to a total of 26. The GFDRR partnership base and governance structure has also significantly diversified. The number of its developed country partners has risen from 5 to 21; the number of developing country partners has increased from none to 15, and the number of partners from international organizations has increased from 2 to 6 over the 2007-10 period. Furthermore, although GFDRR’s donors remain predominantly from developed countries, FY 2010 saw the first developing country, Brazil, becoming an official GFDRR donor member, and in FY 2011, the Republic of Korea has also pledged funding to GFDRR. GFDRR’s financing has significantly strengthened the GFDRR partnership base, with pledges amounting to a cumulative total of USD 258 million up to FY 2013.
This broadening and strengthening of the GFDRR partnership is one of the intermediate indicators that supports Track I’s overall mission to enhance donor coordination and aid effectiveness on DRR, in support of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.

**Track II – The Disaster Risk Reduction Mainstreaming Program**

- There has been an increase in the number of priority countries with a budget for DRR initiatives, with 66% of GFDRR priority countries reporting having an annual budget for DRR in 2010 compared to 34% in 2006. This means that the number of priority countries with an allocation for DRR activities has nearly doubled over 3 years.

**Key Results on DRR Mainstreaming:**

- It appears that GFDRR has satisfactorily achieved the mainstreaming targets envisaged by it for the program period 2006-2010. GFDRR’s results-based analysis reveals that GFDRR has satisfactorily contributed towards the DRR mainstreaming objective of ‘ensuring that DRR is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation’ in 84% of the number of priority countries it had targeted (using a linear target) to achieve such impact by the year 2010-11. The corresponding result for the same indicator using a differential target stands at 140%.

Panama’s new CPS now recognizes disasters as a risk to implementation of the strategy, and calls for greater investment in institutional capacity in DRM and CCA.
The analysis also reveals that 39% of GFDRR’s priority countries have made significant progress towards the DRR mainstreaming objective of ‘ensuring that DRR is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation’. This is manifested in the increase in the percentage of priority countries with substantial DRR mainstreaming from 6% in 2006 to the current value of 39%.

As shown in the charts below, while GFDRR has made significant achievements on certain fronts such as the institutionalization of risk assessment tools in its priority countries, it is evident that more emphasis needs to be placed towards advancing other initiatives such as safe schools and hospitals and disaster risk financing initiatives.

In the case of Risk Assessments, both country performance and GFDRR contribution has seen a marked increase since 2006, with 68% of priority countries now meeting the performance criteria set for this indicator, compared to 13% in 2006. GFDRR contribution has been important - 55% of priority countries have carried out risk assessments with GFDRR support to underpin their Risk Reduction/Mitigation strategies.

In Ethiopia, a GFDRR grant funded the production of a weather-based risk management framework is helping national authorities better plan for the likely costs of food crises and mitigate their impacts.
For Early Warning Systems, 84% of priority countries now have made investments in strengthening their early warning systems, up from 26% in 2006. 45% of priority countries have these systems supported by GFDRR. In total, a large majority of priority countries (26, up from 8 in 2006) now possess early warning systems.

In Disaster Risk Financing and Insurance, GFDRR has introduced or leveraged innovative work and/or knowledge products in 16 priority countries (52%). However, engagement of government in active dialogue on risk financing has happened in only 7 priority countries (23%). Similarly, GFDRR has been able to introduce innovative risk financing strategies in 3 priority countries (10%) since 2006. However, GFDRR has also been able to significantly contribute in non-priority countries in this area.

In Urban Development and DRM, country performance has been substantial, with 11 priority countries (35% of total) having integrated DRM into their urban development planning, which is an increase of 2 countries from 2006. GFDRR has significantly contributed in 3 of these priority countries (10% of total). Besides this, GFDRR has also supported 6 countries (19%) in conducting Urban Risk Assessments and 4 (13%) in flood mitigation measures.

Safe Schools and Hospitals: GFDRR has supported or developed 7 knowledge products on inter alia, Safe School and Hospitals, from which 4 were developed in priority countries. 1 priority country (Nepal) has institutionalized safe schools programs with GFDRR support.

Key Results on Climate Change Adaptation and Risk Management:

According to early estimates (that are still being finalized), the GFDRR portfolio is beginning to deliver CCA/CRM mainstreaming results in around 26% of its priority countries. A preliminary analysis, essentially reflecting work in progress, on the results on GFDRR’s performance on CCA mainstreaming shows that GFDRR has played a significant role in mainstreaming CCA into both PRSPs and CASs with a substantial achievement level in 13% and 29% of priority countries respectively. Overall, a corresponding 42% and 39% of priority countries have integrated CCA into their PRSPs and CASs respectively. It is particularly noteworthy to highlight the key role that GFDRR has played in these efforts. GFDRR’s proactive engagement has contributed considerably to greater recognition of CCA and climate risk management (CRM) being addressed in disaster-prone nations.
This commitment to CCA results will be further strengthened via the forthcoming ‘World Bank-GF-DRR Country Profiles on Climate Change’ which will serve as a comprehensive tool to access critical information to enhance understanding on adaptation options.

Track III – Sustainable Recovery Program / Standby Recovery Financing Facility (SRFF)

GFDRR provides knowledge and learning support, innovative capacity building, DRM trainings and technical assistance through its SRFF. **GFDRR has assisted post-disaster recovery in 43 disaster events over FY08-11**, with the number of GFDRR disaster responses per year having increased at least 3 times (from 5 in FY08 to 15 in FY11).

In low-income disaster-hit countries (with more than 5000 people affected per disaster), GFDRR assistance has grown from around 10% to 36%, which marks a threefold increase over FY08-11. However, GFDRR post-disaster assistance is not limited to low income countries. For example, GFDRR has provided rapid post-disaster assistance to countries such as Jamaica, China, Fiji, El Salvador, Indonesia, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Albania, Barbados, Guatemala and Brazil.

Since FY08, GFDRR has provided timely and targeted trainings across the globe in the use of post-disaster damage, loss and needs assessments. Since FY 2007, almost 2,500 individuals have been trained in 45 separate trainings, out of which 19 trainings (42%) have been in post-disaster countries.

With every passing year, GFDRR has progressively improved its performance in the provision of these trainings in-country, on-line and to regional organizations. FY 2010 saw the largest number of individuals being trained in-person, with over 1000 individuals gaining increased expertise in post-disaster recovery. Furthermore, 37 online courses have trained over 2200 individuals in the broader DRM community since February 2010.
THE WAY FORWARD & SUGGESTED ACTIONS FOR CG REVIEW AND ENDORSEMENT

The Way Forward on GFDRR Results Management:

- **GFDRR is in the process of establishing mechanisms for improved data gathering and independent validation of results on the ground.** Besides improvement of the RBMS to capture project-level results information, an independent M&E agent is being engaged for project-level corroboration of results and operationalization of country-level DRM results frameworks.

- **GFDRR’s Results Monitoring System can be used as a decision support tool for the CG** to progressively review and determine: (a) the selection of priority countries; (b) areas for deepening GFDRR’s portfolio in selected countries, and; (c) possibilities of GFDRR disengagement in specific countries. GFDRR’s country wise results performance provides tools for such review and determination, as shown below.

### Strategic Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How can we deepen our impact here? At what point should we be thinking about disengagement?</th>
<th>How can we contribute more towards the success of these countries?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFDRR Contributed Significantly “YES”</td>
<td>GFDRR Contributed Significantly “NO”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Substantial Achievement “YES”</td>
<td>Example Country A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Substantial Achievement “NO”</td>
<td>Example Country C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations on GFDRR Portfolio Management - based on Preliminary Results Analysis:

- **GFDRR, with support from its donors and wide range of partners, needs to significantly scale-up its investments and efforts** towards institutionalization of disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation in both countries of relative success and those in which GFDRR contributions are not currently rated as significant.

- **GFDRR to increase evidence-based country dialogue to elevate DRR and climate adaptation agenda in PRSPs and other national development plans:** Around 40% of GFDRR’s priority countries have not sufficiently mainstreamed DRR in their PRSPs. Even in the 39% of priority countries that have made significant progress towards overall DRR mainstreaming, only about half have sufficiently mainstreamed DRR in their PRSPs.
- **GFDRR to deepen cooperation with sectoral ministries to support implementation of the 5 priorities of the HFA:** Around 60% of GFDRR’s priority countries have not been able to achieve adequate levels of overall DRR mainstreaming and need to take action on multiple fronts. This not only includes heightened efforts towards DRR mainstreaming in national development plans, but also the implementation of other sector-level DRM agendas in consonance with HFA priorities.

**Proposals for CG Consideration:**

- **Improved Results Governance Structure:** GFDRR’s Results Management Council (RMC) should play a more proactive role towards the quality assurance and oversight of GFDRR’s results operationalization process. This may require: (a) **restructuring of the RMC membership to bring in global M&E experts, representatives of donors and civil society organizations as members of the RMC**, and; (b) functional streamlining of RMC for strategically guiding the results measurement process, and independently validating GFDRR results.

- **Operationalization of Country Results Frameworks:** The planned replication of GFDRR’s results framework and model in its priority countries is likely to pave the way for integrated and multi-stakeholder DRM Results Frameworks at the country level. CG endorsement and facilitation of this process shall significantly enhance the likelihood of the adoption of such uniform and integrated DRM results frameworks at the country level. If endorsed by the CG, a critical next step would be for GFDRR to arrange results dissemination and experience sharing events for CG Members.

- **Towards a Global DRM Results Model:** The GFDRR Results Model can provide an innovative way forward and a quantification methodology to be considered for adoption by GFDRR partners and donors. The current GFDRR-specific model can be further refined and replicated into a more generic, pre-programmed ‘Global DRM Results Model’. The biggest value-addition of such a model is that it would be able to quantify DRM mainstreaming progress and impacts across all countries, using multiple international standards such as the HFA and climate adaptation standards.