

2019

Urban Disaster Risk: Systematization of Neighborhood Practices

Extreme Events Institute, Florida International University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/drr_fac

Recommended Citation

Extreme Events Institute, Florida International University, "Urban Disaster Risk: Systematization of Neighborhood Practices" (2019).
DRR Faculty Publications. 19.
https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/drr_fac/19

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the Extreme Events Institute at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in DRR Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcc@fiu.edu.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Urban Disaster Risk: Systematization of Neighborhood Practices





USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Urban Disaster Risk: Systematization of Neighborhood Practices

Disaster Risk Reduction Program - Extreme Events Institute Florida International University

This publication was prepared by Florida International University's "Disaster Risk Reduction in the Americas Program," under the Cooperative Agreement # AID-OFDA-A-13-00041 with the United States Agency for International Development's Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID/OFDA), regional office for Latin American and the Caribbean.

Editors

Juan Pablo Sarmiento, Florida International University, Extreme Events Institute

Philip Gelman, U.S. Agency for International Development/Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID/OFDA)

Dimmy Herard, Florida International University, Extreme Events Institute

Patricia Bittner, Center for Public Service Communications

Florida International University

Gabriela Hoberman, Florida International University, Extreme Events Institute

Meenakshi Jerath, Florida International University, Extreme Events Institute

ISBN: 978-0-9988489-0-7

Implementing Partners

Catholic Relief Services (CRS)

Project Concern International (PCI)

Save the Children (SC)

World Concern Development Organization (WCDO)



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Urban Disaster Risk: Systematization of Neighborhood Practices is a publication in the Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience series of the Disaster Risk Reduction Program, funded by the U. S. Agency for International Development and housed in Florida International University's Extreme Events Institute.

There is an academic version of this publication:

Sarmiento, J.P., & Herard, D. (2015). Sistematization in urban disaster risk reduction. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, 24(2),221-229.

<http://doi.org/10.1108/DPM-10-2014-0201>



Contents

4	Introduction
7	Chapter 1 The Neighborhood Approach and Urban Disaster Risk
18	Chapter 2 Cross-Cutting Themes in the Initial Phases of Project Implementation
40	Chapter 3 Additional Considerations in the Neighborhood Approach
51	Chapter 4 Project Transfer
63	Chapter 5 Project Outcomes
76	Chapter 6 Reflections on the Systematization Process
85	Chapter 7 Conclusions

Annexes

90	1. Annual Program Statement
90	2. Systematization Matrix
95	3. Monitoring & Evaluation Tools
108	4. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations



Introduction

This report systematizes the experiences of the United States Agency for International Development, Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, Latin America/ Caribbean Regional Office (USAID/USAID/OFDA/LAC) in the application of the Neighborhood



PCI Mixco-Guatemala-
Community at work
Photo: PCI

Approach (NA), a strategy to find practical and workable solutions for disaster risk reduction in densely populated informal urban communities. The principles of the NA had shaped the design of a rehabilitation project in Ravine Pintade, a neighborhood of Port-au-Prince, Haiti, hit especially hard by the January 2010 earthquake. Eager to include urban DRR in its portfolio, and convinced of the potential of the NA as an approach to sustainable disaster risk reduction (DRR) measures in vulnerable and marginal communities, in FY 2012, USAID/USAID/OFDA/LAC funded projects in four urban settings in three countries in the region.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

In January 2013, USAID/OFDA invited the Disaster Risk Reduction Program of Florida International University (FIU) to conduct a systematization of experiences related to the NA in four urban DRR projects spread across Guatemala, Haiti and Peru.

The NA shifts the narrow focus on DRR away from just shelters to the broader spatial context of a neighborhood, acknowledging the complex interconnected reality of risk in an urban environment. It works to strengthen participatory and consultative neighborhood planning processes and local governance mechanisms. The urban DRR initiative was designed to broaden the perspective of the disaster management community, urging for the inclusion of the long-term welfare and safety of highly vulnerable communities.¹

In January 2013, USAID/OFDA invited the Disaster Risk Reduction Program of Florida International University (FIU) to conduct a systematization of experiences related to the NA in four urban DRR projects spread across Guatemala, Haiti and Peru. The purpose of the systematization was to comprehensively analyze and interpret the process of project implementation in a given social context, beyond the traditional process of monitoring and evaluation, which remains restricted to intermediate and final results.

Systematization was defined as the cumulative process of knowledge production derived from the critical interpretation of intervention experiences in social reality. FIU's DRR team set the following objectives for its study on systematization: 1) develop a knowledge base from the systematic analysis of DRR project implementation in informal urban communities; 2) utilize the lessons learned to guide future urban DRR; 3) verify that current project implementation confirms what was learned from the systematization; and 4) validate methods for implementing urban DRR.²

This report is comprised of an introduction and eight chapters.

Chapter 1 details the concept of the NA and how USAID/OFDA applied the approach in the Ravine Pintade community in Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

Chapter 2 describes how the concept of the NA was formalized within USAID/OFDA and the effort to expand its application to future urban DRR projects. The chapter references USAID's 2012 Annual Program Statement (APS).

1 Sarmiento, Juan-Pablo, and Dimmy Herard. 2015. "Sistematización in Urban Disaster Risk Reduction." *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal* 24 (2): 221–29. doi:10.1108/DPM-10-2014-0201.

2 Ibid.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Chapter 3 presents the major lessons gathered from the systematization process of urban DRR projects that adapted the NA. These include four USAID-sponsored urban DRR projects:

- The *Barrios Mas Seguros* project in Quetzaltenango, Guatemala, carried out by Catholic Relief Services (CRS).
- The *Barrio Mio* project in Mixco, Guatemala, carried out by Project Concern International (PCI).
- The *Apoyo a la Reducción de Riesgos en Barrios de Lima* (ARRIBA) project in Lima, Peru, by Save the Children (SC).
- The *Community Initiatives in Disaster Risk Reduction* (CIDRR) project in Port-de-Paix and Anse-à-Foleur in North-West Haiti, by World Concern.

Chapter 4 outlines the special topics that were identified by the FIU DRR team as a result of the systematization process in each of the four urban DRR projects.

Chapter 5 outlines how project transfer to local stakeholders was envisioned and carried out by the project implementers in each of the four projects.

Chapter 6 details the project outcomes.

Chapter 7 shares reflections on the systematization process from the perspective of NGO implementers and project managers and from the USAID project officer.

Chapter 8 presents conclusions.



CHAPTER 1.

The Neighborhood Approach and Urban Disaster Risk

While the experience of the Ravine Pintade project was the basis for USAID/USAID/OFDA/LAC's undertaking urban DRR utilizing the NA, it is important to note that in other regions, USAID/OFDA had previously supported projects embodying similar principles. Two particular cases deserve special mention: (1) the urban-based DRR efforts to address the consequences of the 1999 Bamako, Mali flash flooding, and (2) the 2006-2007 shelter-led project carried out in Kabul, Afghanistan in response to the conflict situation and the resulting explosive population growth.

- Flash flooding throughout Bamako, Mali in August 1999 resulted in death, destruction and significant economic losses for several thousand families. Following the initial emergency response, OFDA approved a four-year mitigation project in the city's most affected commune.

The project focused on watershed management; refuse removal, collection, and disposal, including removal of refuse from waterways, and establishment of a refuse collection system and landfill operation; livelihood generation related to drainage improvements and refuse collection/ disposal; public health and sanitation improvement through enhanced water management, training and awareness raising; and decentralization support to promote democratic governance by engaging local government authorities and project area residents in a process of identifying needs and priorities throughout the project cycle.



The Bamako project was much more than just reducing flood risk; it demonstrated the viability of **highly-participatory, multi-sector DRR** in urban areas, an essential approach to addressing the multi-faceted character of urban risk in developing countries.

- Faced with conflict-driven, explosive population growth in the first years of the millennium, Kabul, Afghanistan struggled to provide decent housing for the waves of people streaming into the capital city. In response, USAID/OFDA funded the Kabul Area Shelter and Settlements (KASS) between May 2006 and October 2007. The project provided 3,774 households safe, adequate and habitable shelters, and an overall total of 6,625 households in seven districts of Kabul benefited directly from integrated shelter activities, including safe water supplies, sanitation, roads graveling, ditch drainage, health education, hazard preparedness and mitigation training, and support of local governance activities. The success of the project rested on bringing key stakeholders such as the Kabul Municipality (KM) and community members into all aspects of the project, from beneficiary selection, choice of project sites and also regular project discussions.

KASS was an example of a **shelter-led intervention**, a programming approach that reflects the understanding that the home is preeminent in restoring, rehabilitating and advancing lives and livelihoods - but requires that other essential, related development activities, be provided simultaneously. As such, KASS was designed to provide water and sanitation facilities, health and hygiene education for households receiving shelter assistance, ditch drainage construction and road graveling for the communities. To ensure community ownership and to improve service delivery, the project established new Community Councils where needed, and also worked to build capacity of existing Community Councils.

KASS adopted a unique strategy – **clustering** – that sought to elevate living standards of all individuals in the target areas, even though direct assistance was provided to a limited number of vulnerable households. This consisted of identifying, through consultation and through the Community Councils, groups of vulnerable families, which formed a geographical cluster. In this cluster area, adjacent side ditches, community wells and road graveling were also rehabilitated and upgraded.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU | FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Through this approach, clusters of families benefited, rather than single families. Group ownership and higher levels of participation and engagement were the direct result of this approach. The integrated assistance to a cluster of families presented larger coverage areas and resulted in more visible impacts when compared to projects offering assistance to individual families.



These projects modeled many of the elements that were incorporated into and built upon in the Ravine Pintade project.

The international humanitarian community was confronted with a staggering challenge in the aftermath of the 12 January 2010 earthquake in Port-au-Prince, Haiti: how to deal with an unprecedented catastrophe in the city of three million people, where transport, livelihoods, and basic services had been paralyzed; where homes were destroyed and rubble clogged the streets citywide; where population density meant space was at an absolute premium; and where the city's social fabric had been torn apart by the disaster. Working to solve these challenges, humanitarian actors pieced together a set of responses that collectively came to be known as the Neighborhood Approach (NA) for addressing the needs of the approximately 1.5 million people affected by the quake.

Neighborhoods are geographic areas of cities, typically defined by social, economic, and physical features. They are often recognized—administratively and politically—within larger jurisdictions. Living in a neighborhood affords residents an identity and a foothold that provides security, safety and familiarity in an often-chaotic urban world. In the wake of humanitarian crises and natural disasters, neighborhoods are valuable to residents

World Concern-Haiti-Health
Promotion
Photo: WCDO



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

To be effective, projects based on the NA must include a highly consultative planning process that reflects residents' needs, preferences, and expectations.

precisely because of these critical features. People displaced from their neighborhoods are highly motivated to return.

The NA is an intervention strategy that responds to a variety of humanitarian needs, including not only shelter, which is usually seen as primarily a post-earthquake need, but also economic recovery; water, sanitation, and hygiene; protection for populations at risk of violence and exploitation; and disaster risk reduction. Community-based decision making that reflects the social, economic, and physical features of the delineated neighborhood informs the NA. Therefore, it is particularly applicable to the design and implementation of disaster response actions in densely populated settings, as it provides a method for breaking down a seemingly overwhelming array of needs into manageable pieces, based on discrete geographic locations.

To be effective, projects based on the NA must include a highly consultative planning process that reflects residents' needs, preferences, and expectations. The process requires an understanding of available local resources, emergent opportunities and potential constraints. It encourages an analysis of community-based mitigation and preparedness activities for the gamut of hazards a neighborhood might face, including geological events such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, landslides and hydro-meteorological events such as floods, droughts, tsunamis, hurricanes, and other extreme weather. As such, the NA is an excellent tool for promoting and including disaster risk reduction as part of post-disaster recovery.

The NA is a significant counter to the prevailing strategy of urban decongestion that is often put forward to deal with disasters in cities: the establishment of new settlements away from existing population centers. In Port-au-Prince, following the earthquake, there were numerous proponents of just such an approach, arguing that 'starting fresh' in a new location was the quickest and easiest way to deal with an urban catastrophe.

As attractive as this vision of a dramatic reorientation of living patterns might be, it ignores several crucial considerations. First, in many cases, the areas proposed for new settlements do not have the basic economic and social elements found in even the most sub-standard neighborhoods—roads, schools, clinics, and markets. Second, in most countries, identifying and securing legal access to land for new developments



is an arduous, time-consuming process that does not favor the early resolution of displacement. Finally, for better or worse, people have made their lives, so to speak, in their neighborhoods; their natural instinct in most cases is to return to them, despite their many flaws and discomforts. In the face of these realities, the NA focuses on achieving rehabilitation of the urban fabric for the benefit of the people who call it home.

Applying the NA – The “Katy” Project

Katy—Creole for ‘neighborhood’— was the OFDA-financed neighborhood rehabilitation project implemented in Ravine Pintade, an especially hard hit neighborhood in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. Ravine Pintade—a densely packed neighborhood with a mix of one- and two-story houses, with a major drainage canal at the base of the ravine and narrow, steep, unpaved walkways—put the NA strategy to the test.

The first step in the project was to map out where the population lived prior to the earthquake and where other facilities, such as clinics, schools, and water kiosks had been located. Due to the absence and/or unavailability of land tenure registers, many people who had lived in Ravine Pintade their entire lives had no objectively verifiable evidence of pre-earthquake land ownership, rental, or occupancy. Therefore, the Katy project initiated a process of participatory enumeration,³ working with residents to gather pre- and post-earthquake data on the population, structures, topography, and other factors essential to identify hazards and plan for transitional shelter construction. Community members participated extensively, gathering information on the location of each dwelling, all footpaths, retaining walls, drainage lines, trees, septic pits, and utility lines. Community maps identified all households and included information about family size, ownership status, and vulnerability. The mapping was then validated via a community verification process.

3 Participatory enumeration is a way of gathering information about informal settlements by involving residents in the data-gathering process. This is an efficient way of generating accurate, up-to-date information about informal settlements that governments need to plan upgrading and resettlement initiatives. *Source: Global Land Tool Network.* Online at: <http://bit.ly/10s6LU3>.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

The Katye settlement map was the result of close collaboration between community members and NGO technical staff. It served as the basis for planning how to rehabilitate the neighborhood. The community-led process yielded much more accurate information than what could have been expected from a professional surveying firm, which was initially contracted to carry out the mapping. Its initial data collection efforts failed to count a large numbers of dwellings, incorrectly located many others, and omitted most data regarding infrastructure, such as walls, drainage lines, and footpaths. Without the data collected as part of the community-led mapping process, the rehabilitation in Ravine Pintade could not have taken place.

Ravine Pintade's topography and haphazard design presented an enormous challenge and, in the aftermath of the earthquake, it was clearly not in the community's best interest to rebuild in exactly the same configuration. Wider pathways and better neighborhood access had to be factored into the process of community rehabilitation and that could only be achieved with the active involvement of community stakeholders, the key component of the NA to post-disaster assistance. Recognizing the need to take into account disaster risk reduction as the neighborhood was rebuilt, and considering the challenging topography, land use, and construction, community members chose, where needed, to give up a small portion of their own land to allow for the construction of safer, wider walkways and other public spaces. Assets are scarce among low-income populations in developing countries and property is highly valued and closely guarded. The fact that the Katye project generated sufficient trust between community members and NGOs and fostered an understanding of a common goal was a remarkable achievement.

During its 18-month duration, the Katye project, which covered 6.5 hectares and housed 1,000 families, generated the following outputs:

- **Demolition of dangerous structures** and removal of 35,000 m³ of rubble.
- **Disaster risk reduction infrastructure, including:**
 - » More than 2.5 km of retaining walls;
 - » More than 2 km of underground storm drainage;
 - » New and improved footpaths and stairs;
 - » New, safe footbridges across the ravine;
 - » Complete rehabilitation/paving of five streets.



- **Water, sanitation, and hygiene infrastructure**, including:
 - » Five community water points;
 - » Improved sanitation based on flush toilets and enclosed septic systems;
 - » Rainwater harvesting equipment installed in all shelters.
- **Health and protection interventions**, including:
 - » Guardrails along ravine and footpaths;
 - » Solar lighting of paths and public spaces.
 - » Shelter solutions, including:
 - 75 metal-frame, two-story shelters;
 - 270 wood/masonry one-story shelters;
 - 200 damaged houses repaired.

The NA and Urban Disaster Risk Reduction

The period following the Haiti earthquake became a critical juncture, an opportunity to make programmatic choices that would significantly affect humanitarian assistance and DRR. This catastrophe made unmistakably clear the need to strengthen urban disaster response capacity and USAID/OFDA/LAC undertook several specific initiatives, including redoubling efforts to strengthen urban search and rescue capacities.

The earthquake also prompted reflection on the subject of urban DRR. Clearly, the Katye project proved the theory that neighborhood revitalization depends on community involvement and support. However, it also allowed USAID/OFDA/LAC to recognize that the post-disaster response conditions the NA was meant to address—inadequate pre-event urban planning; unsafe pre-event living environments; ambiguous land tenure and rights to build/occupy shelter; poor access to neighborhood health, water, and sanitation services; limitations of space and high population density; poverty and largely informal sector economic activity; vulnerability to flooding, landslides, high winds, and seismic activity—are entirely relevant for urban DRR programming as well. The participatory processes used in



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Katye resulted in residents analyzing and identifying potential hazards, reshaping perilous terrain, and improving the neighborhoods' overall design to mitigate risk, thereby reducing their vulnerability to future disasters.

With this in mind, USAID/OFDA/LAC issued an Annual Program Statement (APS) in Fiscal Year 2012, calling for proposals to apply the NA to address urban disaster risk. The APS, included as Annex 1, sets out a number of elements that characterize the NA:

- Compliance with local laws and regulations as well as internationally recognized guidelines such as the Sphere Project;
- Fostering the reduction of the economic and social impacts of present and future disasters;
- Reflecting the needs of the main stakeholders, especially those deemed the most vulnerable;
- Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to collect, analyze, store, and disseminate information;
- Planning and implementing activities, both structural and non-structural, that address the reduction of vulnerabilities identified in assessments and increase the capacity of neighborhood and municipal authorities and actors.

The APS was grounded in the belief that a move away from conventional 'four-walls-and-a-roof' efforts, aimed at households, toward a focus on communities in defined spatial contexts—neighborhoods—would provide a better platform for reducing disaster risk in urban areas. Thus, the NA would define the framework within which housing, infrastructure, transport, environmental management, and future growth occur. By working closely with residents through a participatory neighborhood planning process, informed decision-making on improved land utilization (configuring/reconfiguring land to best accommodate shelter and related services); livelihoods; social connections; and the health and security of populations would serve as the basis for efforts toward sustainable improvement of communities.

To successfully meet the objectives of the APS, applications had to incorporate the following four phases of the NA into the project's technical description:



1. Participatory risk assessments and planning (if needed);⁴
2. Formulation and adoption of DRR plans;
3. Selection and implementation of activities;
4. Systematization and dissemination of project results.

In addition to the general considerations, USAID/OFDA/LAC specified that project activities proposed under the APS must fall within the following OFDA programming sectors (see Annex 1 for details on these sectors):

- Shelter and Settlements (S&S);
- Economic Recovery and Market Systems (ERMS);
- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH).

Sectoral activities for natural and technological risks were also eligible for funding, but had to be clearly linked to the three priority sectors listed above. The three priority sectors were chosen because they required the greatest amount of post-earthquake humanitarian assistance.

USAID/OFDA/LAC established a funding ceiling of \$2 million per grant, within a maximum performance period of 24 months. Geographically, USAID/OFDA/LAC stipulated that applications must identify and target disaster-prone and vulnerable urban areas in no more than one of the following countries: Haiti (except metropolitan Port-au-Prince); Dominican Republic; Guatemala; El Salvador; Honduras; Nicaragua; Colombia; Ecuador; and Peru.

Twenty-four proposals were received and reviewed by three members of the USAID/OFDA/LAC team, based on the selection criteria described in the APS document. Four proposals were eventually selected for funding:

4 Although applications needed to reflect a strong understanding of risks and resources/opportunities in the targeted urban areas/neighborhoods, USAID/OFDA understood that applicants might not have complete information on all risk scenarios. In that case, applicants were asked to detail the project planning process, including participatory risk assessments for validating needs and ensuring that implementation plans appropriately address community needs.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU | FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

- Catholic Relief Services (Quetzaltenango, Guatemala)
- Project Concern International (Mixco, Guatemala)
- World Concern Development Organization (Port-de-Paix, Haiti)
- Save the Children (Lima, Peru)

Systematization and Urban DRR

For USAID/OFDA/LAC, urban DRR represented a new programmatic initiative, one requiring a significant multi-year commitment of resources to generate a body of evidence upon which to reach solid conclusions. To ensure that project experiences were carefully documented, USAID/OFDA/LAC mandated the systematization and dissemination of results as integral project components. Applicants were asked to describe how project results, including lessons learned and best practices, would be shared with community stakeholders, including community-based organizations and men's and women's groups, relevant government authorities, and the humanitarian community.

For USAID/OFDA/LAC, urban DRR represented a new programmatic initiative, one requiring a significant multi-year commitment of resources to generate a body of evidence upon which to reach solid conclusions.

However, even robust documentation of project results would leave certain gaps. First, since each project would naturally focus on itself, there would be little basis for identifying trends across multiple projects. Second, because each project might adopt a unique approach to monitoring and evaluation, standardized information on the same issues might not necessarily be received, and almost certainly not in the same format and timeframe. Finally, a focus on results and ex post evaluation would tend to de-emphasize the process elements of the projects. Given the innovative nature of urban DRR, USAID/OFDA/LAC felt it was extremely important to understand the process required for achieving results.

In order to address these gaps, USAID/OFDA/LAC believed that systematizing the experiences of the four urban DRR projects would be a valuable learning approach, given the relatively limited theoretical basis for urban DRR programming. USAID/OFDA/LAC felt that future efforts to develop effective urban DRR programs would be greatly enhanced if the lessons learned during the implementation of the FY 2012 projects could be applied.



CRS Quetzaltenango-
Guatemala-Coordination
with local authorities
Photo: CRS

Based on an analytical reflection of what actually occurred, as opposed to what was desired, systematization would help to identify the logic of the intervention process, the factors that influenced it, and how/why the elements related to each other in particular ways. Therefore, if systematization is fundamentally the effort to learn from practice, those who lived the experience must lead the process. USAID/OFDA/LAC proposed that its partner, the Disaster Risk Reduction Program at Florida International University, serve as the impartial facilitator of the systematization of these experiences.



CHAPTER 2.

Cross-Cutting Themes in Project Implementation

The first step in systematizing the NA process consisted of identifying four axes of study. The axes identified were: participation, governance, social inclusion, and sustainability.

To aid the projects' implementing partners to standardize the systematization of their work, a matrix was constructed that included the identified axes and the conventional stages of the project cycle. Five stages were proposed: pre-project, sensitization, implementation, transfer, and post-project. A set of suggested questions was prepared

World Concern Haiti
Gabions completed
Photo: WCDO





for each box in the matrix (see Annex 2). This matrix became a necessary reference guide, a permanent work-aid, and a practical tool to monitor the systematization of the project, from the kick-off meeting, through implementation, to the post-project phase.

This chapter outlines the major lessons from the systematization of cross-cutting themes in the projects. The four axes or cross-cutting themes are analyzed across the first three phases: pre-project; sensitization; and implementation; the last two phases—transfer and post-project—are addressed in later chapters.

Pre-Project Phase

The first phase of project implementation, the pre-project phase, involves identifying and nurturing pre-existing relationships that provide a foundation for project activities. The four cross-cutting themes (participation, governance, social inclusion, and sustainability) are addressed below with this objective in mind.

Participation

Participation focuses on the extent to which DRR projects are community-based, in terms of the degree to which project design and implementation are carried out directly with or by community members and local partner organizations. In order to understand how participation is generated in the pre-project phase, the systematization process examined whether or not communities had a history of collective action in general, and of addressing disasters and disaster risks specifically. This entailed outlining how local communities organized themselves to secure their interests and whether or not governments formally recognized the communities' representative bodies.

Experiences

Regarding community mobilization to participate in DRR initiatives, the findings across the four projects are quite intriguing. First, it is not necessarily the community with the



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

longest or most established history of mobilization nor the community with the most formal representation structure that was most engaged in collective action. The contrast between SC's ARRIBA project and WCDO's CIDRR project is a case in point. SC chose the municipality of Villa El Salvador, Peru (VES) as the site of its ARRIBA project because of its legacy of community mobilization for collective action. The municipality of VES was a planned land occupation that was established 40 years ago, and is still known as one of the most organized and community-based districts in Peru. During the pre-project phase, SC's project implementers identified a number of community bodies at varying levels of consolidation. In addition to the Residential Groups (RG) (representative bodies established in each neighborhood during the early years of VES's formation), there were Civil Defense networks; COMULSAVES (District Health Committees); Local Coordination Councils (CCL); Participatory Budget Committees; District Vigilance Committees; and other organizations that coexisted in this geographic area. However, despite the proliferation of local organizations, SC observed a paradoxical lack of activism among the population of VES. It discovered that the level of community mobilization had an important correlation to a perceived lack of basic life needs such as adequate water, food, shelter, security, utilities, etc. In areas of VES such as Sector 10, where the community remains in a state of perpetual flux, the population is highly mobilized with strong and active leadership; in the oldest and most consolidated areas of VES, where basic needs have largely been addressed, less community activism exists.

Beyond an overall drop off in the level of activism, the growth in the number of community organizations also resulted in fractioning the neighborhoods. The RGs are no longer the key representative bodies they once were when the neighborhoods were struggling to address the basic needs of all residents. Instead, charitable organizations such as soup kitchens and 'glass-of-milk' programs have superseded the traditional RGs. By addressing the needs of different segments of the community, these organizations have effectively mobilized VES's population around specific priorities of each demographic group, but not necessarily on issues of community-wide concern.

Unlike VES, the communities in North-West Haiti where the CIDRR project was carried out do not have an extensive history of collective action and are much less formalized. Nevertheless, vibrant grassroots organization exists in these communities. Yet even within the CIDRR project, there were clearly varying levels of activism displayed in



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

These revelations point to the need to understand some critical dynamics that stem from the transition of communities over time.

the participating neighborhoods, which seem to correspond to their different stages of formal development. For example, as a quarterly assessment revealed, there was an active grassroots movement in Démélus (located on the periphery of the official legal boundaries of the municipality of Port-de-Paix) that gave the neighborhood a clear dynamism, while in Ti Port-de-Paix, an area that has been more integrated into the municipality's formal structures, the population appears to be significantly more passive. For community members in Démélus, being active participants in the management of their own affairs, and not simply recipients of outside aid, is of great importance.

These revelations point to the need to understand some critical dynamics that stem from the transition of communities over time. One insight gained is that higher levels of formality may actually lead to less community mobilization. This is particularly true if formal representation produces less actual community representation and participation in decision-making processes, or perhaps due to the community's expectation that the government will perform a wide range of functions. In addition, it is important to consider how formal representation has been established, and how communities orient themselves to fit into this structure.

Second, even where internal community cohesion remains strong, there are often disconnects between formal structures of community representation and the legal governance system. For example, Guatemala has established one system for development planning and another for managing disasters. Ostensibly, these systems link community-based groups with municipal, departmental, regional, and national policy-making and implementing entities. On the development side, Community Development Committees (COCODE) serve as umbrella organizations for the exchange of ideas and coordination of activities among all development stakeholders at the community level. Each community's COCODE is said to have representation on the Municipal Development Council (COMUDE) in matters related to the management of development projects, and on Departmental Development Councils (CODEDE) regarding the allocation of project funding.

Similarly, each community should have a Local Disaster Reduction Committee (COLRED) that works with the Municipal Disaster Reduction Committee (COMRED). The



Municipal Committee is then expected to convene with other municipal entities at the departmental level. Altogether, these form the National System for the Coordination of Disaster Reduction (CONRED).

CRS Quetzaltenango-
Guatemala-CRS Team
and community leaders
Photo: CRS



Approximately 800 COCODE are legally registered with the Municipality of Mixco, Guatemala. However, PCI found that community members working in project implementation responded negatively when surveyed regarding their ability to influence or express ideas in their communities. It found that local leaders did not play a significant role in municipal planning and that expected participatory and consultative planning processes had never been established between leaders and community members. Similarly, CRS' systematization matrix documented that although the COCODE structure in Guatemala was established to promote citizen participation in decision making processes, it appears that the most vulnerable groups, stigmatized by poverty, ethnicity, and/or gender, remain marginalized and excluded from public investment decisions. Worse still, while these populations tend to be the most exposed to hazards such as flooding, cold fronts, tremors, earthquakes, droughts, pollution, and violent crime, many of the neighborhoods where they live simply do not have local Disaster Reduction Committees. And where they do exist, they are extremely weak and lack capacity due to the dearth of external support. These realities exist despite a Development Council



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU | FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Efforts to generate community participation can also be complicated by the fact that the project involves working directly with the local government.

Law, a Decentralization Law, and a government accountability framework managed by the General Auditor. Therefore, so-called 'community-based' representative bodies that are formally recognized and purportedly integrated into municipal processes must be examined carefully. Are these entities democratically structured, and thus viewed as legitimate in the eyes of the populations they claim to represent? How much input do these entities actually have in dictating development policies implemented at the municipal level? Project implementers must be aware of and address the realities of these institutions and the roles they actually play in their communities.

Third, it is important that project implementers act strategically when determining how to promote active participation of residents in marginalized neighborhoods. Often the difficulty encountered in incentivizing communities to take action, through simple dialogue and awareness raising, is the product of a long history of government promises with scant results. Therefore, project implementers must determine, for example, whether infrastructure projects should be initiated immediately as a means of engaging communities through something tangible, or if awareness raising and community mobilization activities should be carried out as precursors to physical works. In the projects reviewed, it seems that WCDO initiated infrastructure work early on in order to generate the community's buy-in, although this may be the result of having worked with an already-mobilized population in Démélus, citizens that knew what kinds of projects they wished to carry out. PCI, on the other hand, worked hard on community mobilization during the pre-project and sensitization phases before entering fully into physical activities or project interventions.

Efforts to generate community participation can also be complicated by the fact that the project involves working directly with the local government. Project implementers face a tricky balancing act between working closely with municipalities and supporting grassroots mobilization, which is often based on some form of opposition to municipal authorities.

The critical objective perhaps is to use the project as a bridge between the municipality and the community, as well as among the various organizations operating within these communities. This means framing the NA and DRR within the context of issues that have a clear daily impact on community members' lives and the municipality's governance of these communities.



Attention was then directed at determining the degree of awareness municipal governments had of local hazards and risks that affect their communities.

Governance

Governance addresses the extent to which local government is active in the design and implementation of the DRR project, and in the long-term, the institutionalization of DRR objectives into community plans and priorities. In the pre-project phase, this entailed outlining the existing governance mechanisms in these communities to understand how they might impact the success and long-term sustainability of projects. Governance refers primarily to official government mechanisms established to ensure public security, well-being, coherence, and continuity.

Emphasis first focused on understanding whether local government officials were directly accountable to the local population. Then a more specific emphasis was placed on understanding the extent to which governance mechanisms had been established to address disaster risks. This required gauging if local government institutions addressed urban planning and development, particularly with regard to the relationship between unplanned urbanization and heightened disaster risk. Attention was then directed at determining the degree of awareness municipal governments had of local hazards and risks that affect their communities.

Experiences

While the context of governance differed from project to project, a disjuncture between policies and laws at the national level and actual conditions found at the local level was a recurring trend.

The ARRIBA project benefitted from strong DRR governance mechanisms at the national level in Peru. These included the February 2011 SINAGERD law that established a new framework for DRR, and the 048-PCCM regulation ensuring territorial planning. Other laws, such as No. 28101 and 28478, outline measures for national and community mobilization during emergencies. SC project reports state that both in the Municipality of VES and, at the district level, an Urban Development Manager and a Counsel of Councilors are responsible for urban planning and development processes respectively. Four municipal development agencies have been established in VES since 2000. Under the SINAGERD law, local governments are directly responsible for applying disaster



risk management measures. Over the past two years, Peru's national government has focused on improving the capacity of regional and local governments to identify hazards and vulnerabilities that threaten communities.

SC's staff dedicated a great deal of effort to establishing a high level of institutional support for the project. They emphasized working closely with the local government, leveraging existing capacities in the municipality and its networks during project implementation. This was seen as a way to increase the likelihood of sustaining long-term gains. SC also focused on building strong relationships with the national disaster risk management system (CENEPRED and INDECI).

In Guatemala, similar institutional and legal disaster management frameworks exist at the national level, but their impact is minimal at the local level. The National Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction mandates that DRR plans and activities be given support at all administrative levels. Article 3 of the Municipal Code establishes that municipal governments are responsible for the welfare of their inhabitants. Municipal governments are also the highest authorities in urban planning and development at the local level. Nevertheless, populations in these communities expressed little faith in the capacity of their municipal governments to ensure their wellbeing against the threat of a disaster. In Mixco, focus groups responded negatively when asked about the municipality's preparedness for past disasters. In its baseline study, PCI found that residents did not believe the municipality would keep its promises, exemplifying the total disconnect that communities felt towards local government.

According to PCI's project reporting, the following conditions characterize the implementation of DRR at the municipal and local levels in Guatemala:

- No permanent and consistent mechanism for disaster risk reduction/management is in place.
- Collaborative partnerships between communities, the private sector, and local authorities are usually ad hoc.
- Generally speaking, no mechanisms exist to ensure resources for implementing DRR policies, or to enforce DRR guidelines locally.
- Technical teams within municipal governments are often untrained, and severely lacking in equipment and supplies.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

- Most municipal governments do not have a systematic way of documenting and institutionalizing processes and mechanisms for addressing, responding to, and preventing disasters.
- High rates of municipal staff turnover impact the continuity of policies and institutional learning.

The *Barrio Mio* project worked closely with the Municipality of Mixco, taking advantage of recent efforts to address gaps between national policy frameworks and policy implementation at the local level. For example, prior to the launch of *Barrio Mio*, the municipality and community organizations underwent a process to strengthen their DRR capacity, including the passage of a Building Code, the initiation of a plan to regularize land use, as well as efforts to update the Municipal Development Plan and the Land Use Plan. In addition, initiatives were launched to strengthen the capacity of the COMRED (CONRED's structure at municipal level) the municipal entity responsible for responding in the event of a disaster. The Municipality of Mixco also carried out the resettlement of a community facing a high risk of landslides, further evidence of a trend towards greater local government activism in disaster risk reduction.

It is interesting to note that from its inception, PCI designed the *Barrio Mio* project so that it could be replicated throughout the Municipality of Mixco. The neighborhoods of Vistas de la Comunidad and Cipresales would serve as the first two neighborhoods (out of a total of 17 selected by PCI, in collaboration with the Municipality), in which the project would be implemented. The remaining 15 neighborhoods would provide the Municipality of Mixco and PCI's other partners with the opportunity to replicate the lessons learned from the two neighborhood demonstration projects, with only limited support from PCI.

Of the four projects, CIDRR project found the least structured governance at the local level. Their baseline study found that although there was an active Communal Civil Protection Committee (CCPC) in Anse-à-Foleur involved in disaster preparedness and post-disaster response, it received little support from local government; in Port-de-Paix, even less capacity existed. More than 80% of the community members surveyed reported that local authorities do not respond to their mission 'to serve the people.' Nearly 60% believe that risks and disasters are poorly managed, while an additional 33% believe that this management is 'quite bad.'



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU | FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Instead of focusing its efforts on working with the municipality, WCDO sought to strengthen capacity at the sectoral level, with the hope that technical knowledge would filter down to the municipalities. At the start of the project, WCDO presented the CIDRR project at the Round Table Consultation, a monthly departmental meeting organized by the Ministry of Planning that brings together all department directorates, local and international NGO representatives, and grassroots organizations.

WCDO's work at the sectoral level provided an opportunity to link the national level to the departmental and local level in a very tangible way. For example, despite the absence of an overarching strategy for DRR, the project was able to make use of existing technical materials to train personnel at the community level. In one instance, WCDO served as an extension service, assisting the Water and Sanitation and Public Works Departments to share their expertise with the local level, helping local sectoral representatives to develop and apply their skills, thus increasing their capacity to carry out this work in the future.

Social Inclusion

The theme of social inclusion focuses on understanding the degree to which traditionally marginalized groups such as youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities, are being integrated into the design and implementation of DRR projects. In order to ensure the inclusion of these groups, project implementers must first ascertain whether these groups are represented in existing community organizations, and the extent to which local government is addressing their concerns and interests.

Experiences

The ARRIBA project was carried out in an environment in which traditionally marginalized groups had substantial levels of formal representation, both within the municipal government and in various civil society organizations. SC found that two percent of the VES local government budget was specifically allocated to address the concerns of youth, women, and persons with disabilities. Municipal offices, such as the *Centro de*



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU
FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Emergencia Mujer (CEM), provide assistance to women; *La Defensoría Municipal del Niño y del Adolescente* (DEMUNA) protects vulnerable children; and *Oficina Municipal de Atención a las Personas con Discapacidades* (OMAPED) aids people with disabilities. Alongside these municipal offices, SC placed particular attention on identifying the civil society organizations that focus on the concerns of the most at-risk youth.

PCI reporting highlighted the fact that a lack of opportunity for Mixco youth, and more broadly for youth in Guatemala, left them more vulnerable to becoming both the perpetrators and the victims of crime, particularly with the increasing prevalence of gangs, an important insight given the large under-15 population in project neighborhoods. Surveys taken in the communities “identified the prevalence of crime and the lack of recreational access for youth [as] serious detractors to the health of the neighborhood.” Despite the desperate situation of young people in Mixco, PCI did not identify any established mechanisms that would allow them to become involved in local government

decision-making processes, nor non-governmental organizations that focused on issues particular to the youth.

PCI further noted they were also particularly concerned with the lack of inclusion of women and young girls in decision-making processes. Women, particularly poor women, often face high levels of discrimination in developing countries and are thus one of the most vulnerable groups in these societies. They often have “the least access to education, are made to work in and outside the home at an early age, and experience the highest rates of abuse, violence and femicide, prostitution, [and] trafficking.”



CRS Quetzaltenango-
Guatemala-Women building
public infrastructure
Photo: CRS



PCI was heartened by the active role played by Mixco's municipal administration in increasing the involvement of women in the local government's planning processes, through the Women's Municipal Office. Race and ethnicity, an aspect of social exclusion and marginalization which was not taken up in the systematization process, was identified as key by PCI. They found that "the Mayan and other indigenous populations were denied active participation and deemed subordinate, which, over time, built institutional beliefs of superiority/ inferiority and allowed for expropriation and alienation by the authority of the State." PCI staff believes that these dynamics continue to impact Guatemalan society in the present, including life in Mixco, and must be taken into account.

Sustainability

Systematizing sustainability as a cross-cutting theme requires an analysis of the variables that affect the likelihood that the gains in DRR made during the project will be sustained beyond the life of the project. Even though sustainability was not a considered theme in the pre-project phase, it should be analyzed from the project's design stage. Project implementers must ascertain what local activities and support systems exist and how these can serve as the base on which to build future advances.

In the pre-project phase, this first requires identifying local organizations that focus on poverty reduction and sustainable development. NGOs have the potential to become champions for DRR, facilitating the ongoing mobilization of communities, and thus sustaining pressure on local and national governments to increase their support for the integration of DRR into development planning. It is also important to identify DRR projects and relevant development programs that have taken place in the recent past, and determine if their objectives have been sustained once these projects had formally ended. The capacity of governance mechanisms to support the local institutionalization of DRR is also of critical importance. And lastly, sustainability is judged on the general level of community buy-in regarding DRR and the NA.



Experiences

From the start of the project, Save the Children identified key activities to assure sustainability: (1) linking the concept of disaster risk reduction to people's basic needs and their daily life, thereby facilitating its internalization and incorporation into their agendas, and stimulating them to continue working on it once the project ends; (2) empowering the community at the neighborhood level so they can advocate for municipal and national interventions on this topic; (3) identifying strategic allies who can support the population and the municipality once the NA project ends, building networks and relationships of mutual support; and (4) carrying out advocacy to ensure that the new disaster risk management legislation includes community perceptions.

In the case of PCI, *Barrio Mio's* collaboration and coordination with other partners was particularly strong from the very beginning. As an initiative designed more to facilitate local partners to generate solutions, rather than implement solutions on their behalf, *Barrio Mio* worked intensively to mobilize private, public, university, and NGO partners. PCI's project was not limited to the neighborhoods; it also supported the creation and/or built the capacity of local institutions, including: the Municipal Development Council – COMUDE; Municipal Coordinator for Disaster Reduction for Disaster Reduction – COMRED, Municipal Food and Nutrition Security – COMUSAN; Community Development Council – COCODE (in demonstration communities); Local Committee for Disaster Reduction - COLRED (demonstration communities); and Community Commission on Food and Nutrition Security Commission on Food and Nutrition Security Commission on Food and Nutrition Security Commission on Food and Nutrition Security Commission on Food and Nutrition Security – COCOSAN (demonstration communities).

Wrap Up

Perhaps the central lesson learned by the implementing agencies during the pre-project phase was the importance of cultivating relationships among the stakeholders who will be involved in project implementation. Many of the agencies felt that they lacked adequate knowledge of stakeholders' relationships with one another, or their general standing within their communities. This is particularly important because, in most cases,



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Each partner organization has its own area of specialization, outreach networks, and level of experience in disaster risk management...

DRR stakeholders have not worked with each other previously. And although this may present interesting opportunities, it also produces many challenges. A detailed map and an analysis of the relevant actors in each community would help to foresee potential roadblocks; plan conflict resolution strategies; build bridges; and foster collaboration. A stakeholder analysis workshop can be a very useful tool in terms of pooling knowledge about the dynamics of the neighborhood, how it is organized, who has the legitimacy to convene the community, and along what lines alliances and oppositions are formed.

It should be noted that a stakeholder analysis workshop for the project implementing partners would also be beneficial. Each partner organization has its own area of specialization, outreach networks, and level of experience in disaster risk management, which points to the need to include project management as a discrete set of activities in proposals, thereby helping to align the working styles and objectives of the project implementers. This increases the likelihood that a level of coherence will be maintained throughout the project's implementation.

In addition to a thorough stakeholder analysis, experience has shown that a sensitization, communication, and messaging strategy should be explicitly established at the outset of the project to facilitate coordination among government, private sector, and community partners. This would require identifying core messages and outlining how information would be shared among stakeholders so as to maximize collaboration, input, and understanding, while minimizing the potential for unintended consequences.

Sensitization and Implementation Phases

During the sensitization phase of the project, all stakeholders are introduced to the project's objectives, scope of work, targets, and expected results in order to generate commitment and buy-in. Stakeholders include local government, community-based organizations, and community members. The transition to the implementation phase takes place fluidly, without interruption. The execution and management of core project activities characterize this phase.



Participation

In the sensitization and implementation phases, project implementers must first analyze the degree to which DRR projects are community-based, ensuring that pre-existing social networks are used to establish meaningful relationships with participating communities. Emphasis is placed on evaluating the extent to which local communities have been informed about the 'neighborhood' project and disaster risk reduction, as well as how community outreach was conducted. Implementers note how regularly community awareness programs on DRR were conducted and whether or not the community was directly involved in defining project objectives and goals. Finally, the systematization process addresses the degree to which the community considers concepts such as urban planning, DRR, or the NA, as objectives worthy of their participation in the project.

PCI Mixco-Guatemala
Stakeholders meeting Photo
JPSarmiento





Experiences

As a means of working through established community networks, SC initially placed emphasis on integrating the RGs in VES into the project planning process. However, as noted earlier, SC recognized that a substantial gulf existed between the broader community and RGs, limiting community participation in the ARRIBA project at the start. Initially, only half of the neighborhood leaders participated in the project, as many did not feel the project offered much in terms of tangible benefits, a sentiment that harkens back to SC's previous observations regarding the decline of popular mobilization in VES once basic needs were met, and the corresponding rise in the number of single-issue organizations providing benefits to a specific interest group.

Realizing that formal structures were not helping to stimulate community participation, SC changed its approach and began implementing a more broad-based sensitization and communication strategy that included elements such as:

- Increased use of door-to-door visits.
- Additional meetings with community leaders.
- Direct integration of community leaders into the sensitization process by having them present questionnaires to their community members.
- Involvement of community members directly in defining project goals and designing risk management plans through participatory planning workshops.

CRS's *Barrios Más Seguros* project was able to engage substantially with community members, relying on the priorities they identified to develop risk mitigation plans for critical public works in the neighborhoods of El Cenizal, Pacajá Alto, and Los Altos. CRS worked closely with the neighborhoods, the COLREDs, and the COCODEs to determine which public works should be undertaken. Project staff coordinated with COCODEs and COLREDs in each of the five target neighborhoods to identify the limits of the neighborhood, COCODE jurisdiction, illegal dumping sites and priority public structures at-risk.

WCDO engaged communities primarily through its Participatory Analysis of Disaster Risk (PADR) and household surveys. Local churches and community groups played an active role in recruiting community members to participate in these surveys. The PADR survey helped define project goals collaboratively with the five target communities. Alongside



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

the PADR, WCDO worked with the community to identify, assess, and map public health risks, as well as community assets such as water points, sanitation services, and potential community shelters. Once the project was outlined, community members accompanied WCDO on site visits to provide input as to how the project should be implemented. This emphasis on a NA to project implementation particularly energized the communities, as it is perhaps one of the few instances in which their views, as residents of informal communities, were being taken seriously. WCDO's approach affirms the great importance these populations place on their right and capacity to participate in the decision-making and management processes that impact their communities.

As a final note, the value of not only listening to people, but also 'living' among them should be acknowledged. In this regard, PCI's decision (as outlined in the phases of implementation of the *Barrio Mio* project) to establish its Mixco field office in close proximity to where the project activities were implemented stands out. This field office served as a space where PCI staff could maintain contact with neighborhood families and other community stakeholders.

Governance

During the phases of sensitization and implementation, a first step to assessing governance is to determine the extent to which the local municipal government has been made aware of the NA and the urban risk reduction project. Determining the degree to which the wider risk management community is informed about the project and the level of support provided by the municipality is the next step.

Experiences

The municipal government of VES fully supported the ARRIBA project, in large measure because it helped the municipality comply with Peru's SINAGERD Law, which assigns responsibility for the implementation of disaster risk reduction policy to local governments. The Municipality of VES was simultaneously a coordinating partner, responsible for important aspects of project implementation, as well as a project beneficiary, in that certain project activities were focused on increasing the municipality's capacity to

During the phases of sensitization and implementation, a first step to assessing governance is to determine the extent to which the local municipal government has been made aware of the NA and the urban risk reduction project.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

implement DRR policy. Through a Statement of Mutual Collaboration, SC embedded a staff member in the municipality to facilitate communication and cooperation between the two entities. The ARRIBA project's activities were integrated into the municipality's planning processes and project goals were included in the municipality's 2103 Institutional Operational Plan. SC also helped the municipality to establish a Civil Defense platform, along with several risk management work groups, in compliance with the SINAGERD Law.

Nonetheless, despite these efforts, DRR-oriented activities were not fully integrated into the operations of the Municipality of VES during the life of the project. First, it proved difficult to broaden the municipality's traditional focus on civil defense, which is directed toward disaster response. In addition, some officials in the municipality did not consider DRR an important public agenda item, either because they did not understand the concept or because they viewed it as additional work for which the municipal government had neither adequate staff nor resources.

Although the other projects were unable to help municipalities meet legal obligations, they did formalize relationships with municipal and other authorities. As part of the *Barrio Mio* project, an agreement was established to define the role of the municipal government in the approval of plans; convening private sector; and co-supervision of and contribution to construction, including site preparation. This agreement spelled out PCI's commitment to increase the capacity of the Municipality of Mixco in these areas: enforcement of local compliance with current national construction regulations; advocacy; financing and planning; and strengthening of COLREDs. Operating under the same regulatory framework, CRS used a similar approach to engage municipal authorities in Quetzaltenango, Guatemala.

WCDO consulted with municipal governments during its project to gain their approval and participation. However, rather than focusing on municipal counterparts, WCDO worked closely with sectoral agencies at the departmental level, increasing their capacity through training in DRR, hygiene, construction, and GIS. WCDO also worked with the Directorate of Civil Protection (DPC) to select emergency shelters; promote hygiene and water management with the Regional Office of Drinking Water and Sanitation; and promote DRR with the Technical Coordinator of the North-West Department of Civil Protection; and with the Ministry of Public Works, Transportation and Communication on infrastructure.



Social Inclusion

An analysis of social inclusion during the project sensitization and implementation phases looked the efforts of project implementers to engage organizations working on issues pertaining to youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities, to make them aware of the project's encouragement their involvement. An assessment was also made of the efforts to raise the awareness of these particularly vulnerable populations regarding the project and its goals.

Experiences

The *Barrio Mio* project took great care to ensure that marginalized groups were incorporated into project activities. As PCI describes, one component of the project focused on organizing women into community-based Women Empowerment Groups (known as GROW). These groups were trained in developing livelihoods. PCI also consulted with women and young girls on improving street lighting at night so as to increase safety in the communities, and emphasized training youth groups and youth leaders to take part in DRR activities within their communities.

WCDO also addressed, to a degree, the issue of social inclusion. Its participatory risk assessments included separate focus groups for women, men, and children, where development issues specific to each group were addressed.

CRS involved youth, women and senior citizens, including persons with disabilities in DRR activities. These included training in shelter hazard mitigation, including construction norms and seismic resilience. CRS carried out a comprehensive institutional mapping exercise to identify organizations working with youth and relevant DRR stakeholders as well as to define relationships, levels of interest, channels of influence, and potential areas of conflict. Organizations working with youth included *Gente Joven*, *Ciudad de Imaginación*, *Expresión Juvenil* and *Organización de Niñas, Niños y Adolescentes Trabajadores* (ONNATS). The institutional map identified potential methods of cooperation with strategic allies including SE-CONRED, the Quetzaltenango Municipal Mayor, neighborhood level entities, as well as multiple local and national organizations



and churches. Several neighborhoods formed youth DRR teams (ECOREDs), which were recognized as formal community structures by SE-CONRED and included in that organization's training plan.

Sustainability

Systematizing the cross-cutting theme of sustainability involves assessing how, in the eyes of local authorities, NGOs, and community members, the NA is being linked to sustainable development concerns, such as urban and economic planning, the provision of health care, community welfare, safety, and DRR.

Experiences

How each project measured the sustainability of its impact was a function of the level pro-DRR governance structures in each location. For example, SC concluded that inserting the project squarely into the municipal work plan would enhance sustainability. Its work with the Municipality of VES to establish a Civil Defense Platform and Risk Management Working Groups was critical to the future of urban DRR planning and implementation. Defined precisely within the SINAGERD law, these groups serve not only as spaces where a variety of institutional actors come together to participate in training and capacity building activities, but also as spaces to strengthen relationships between institutions and members of the community.

In Guatemala, where the DRR framework was not as explicit, implementers executed memoranda of understanding with municipalities, community groups, and households to sustain community-level physical infrastructure established through the project. These operational agreements represented the best means of sustaining the gains made through the current projects, but did not offer any assurance of the longer-term institutionalization of the processes developed.

Finally, recognizing the structural weaknesses of municipal bodies in Haiti, WCDO opted to gauge sustainability almost exclusively at the community level, using indicators



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

to measure the number and percentage of people that retained knowledge of shelter hazard mitigation two months after their training; people trained in hydrometeorological-related activities who retained this knowledge two months after training; civil protection committees trained in hydrometeorological-related activities retaining knowledge three months after training; the number of hydrometeorological policies and procedures modified as a result of the activities to increase preparedness for hydro-meteorological events; and clean water points functioning three months after completion.

Wrap Up

During the sensitization and implementation phases of the projects, as they identified community partners and generated and maintained community buy-in throughout the life of the project, the implementers gained important insights into the neighborhoods in which they were engaged. They found that neighborhood analysis is not something that is simply done at the start of the project and then set aside, but rather is an iterative process of learning. This ongoing process offers an opportunity to make broader segments of the population aware of the project and the potential role they might play in its implementation. High-profile events were critically important in terms of disseminating the significance of the project and broadening the base of support. These events not only inform the population about the project and the topic of urban DRR in general, but also capture the attention of important stakeholders that had not been previously considered as potential partners. For example, following a community fair, SC observed, "... the VES Governor (who reports to the Interior Ministry), managers from other agencies, journalists, leaders of other groups outside of [project neighborhoods] and other leaders from [project neighborhoods], who until now had not been inclined to participate...all demonstrated great interest in the project and in the possibility to replicate it in their own areas."

In addition to attracting new participants, SC noted that it is important to develop strategies to maintain the interest of those who are already participating in project activities. This meant analyzing and tracking workshop participants from the early stages of the project to determine whether or not they return to participate in the more involved community risk management planning processes. Contact needed to be maintained



The more that local partners integrate their efforts, the more likely they will be to do so once the project has concluded.

with those who showed initial interest in the NA and urban DRR. As they noted in their reporting, “the population who is participating understands the importance of being organized in an emergency and this is helping to reactivate community organizations in many areas.” Perhaps these individuals can be encouraged to recruit other members of their communities, acting as community spokespersons for the project and its goals.

Another important component of sustaining the participation of those involved in the project’s implementation is to ensure that they understand how their particular contribution fits into the bigger picture. This can be accomplished by ensuring that local and municipal partners understand how the project’s different moving parts work together to strengthen a sense of neighborhood and urban DRR. It is vital to build cohesion and improve collaborative processes between partner organizations and community-based entities, as this will likely impact the sustainability of project gains. SC noted the importance of “focusing on processes and not just indicators.” The more that local partners integrate their efforts, the more likely they will be to do so once the project has concluded.

Once key stakeholders understand the project holistically, they are in a better position to communicate with the communities where the project is being implemented and generate buy-in. Sensitization of the population must focus on helping community members understand how individual aspects of the project fit into a broader agenda. Project implementers must contextualize the activities being carried out to help the population understand that what may seem like disconnected activities are actually tied to a much broader logic. This also means ensuring that the NA is actively utilized to validate project plans, as was the case with SC, so that people are not simply told that they are taking part in a NA, but are actually living it through the project.

Above all, the implementers learned that this type of project requires trust, and that trust requires an investment in time. The concepts of DRR and the NA are new for many people, as is the way in which the project is implemented, with its focus on building capacities rather than providing goods and services. It is important for people to ‘live’ the process and understand what the project is trying to do so as they gain ownership. This is vital for the sustainability of its impacts.



CHAPTER 3.

Additional Considerations in the Neighborhood Approach

Beyond the formal systematization process, which relied on the key question matrix to track cross-cutting themes across the four projects, during a review of project documents and exchanges with project implementers, the FIU DRR team identified a number of other issues – some general, others context-specific – that bear mentioning. These subjects are presented here, so that future urban DRR projects might be aware of their possible relevance.

Defining Neighborhood: Why It Matters

Approximately one year after implementation had begun, USAID/OFDA/LAC, FIU's DRR team and personnel from the four implementing partners met to analyze progress up to that point. One of the discussions focused on how the implementers had modified their concept of 'neighborhood' as a result of their experiences on the ground.

Having worked to implement DRR in communities using the NA during the previous year, project teams were asked to consider two issues:



1. How to define the composite elements of a 'neighborhood.' Breaking into small groups, participants discussed how their projects initially defined neighborhood and how this understanding was either reinforced or challenged by their recent experiences. The results of the group discussion were shared in an open forum, where the responses helped to identify broad components of the "neighborhood" concept.
2. How future projects utilizing the NA could learn from these various insights.

Findings

The implementers outlined five general aspects of a neighborhood. These ranged from the concrete and physical to the more abstract and intangible. It was acknowledged that these characteristics interacted with one another in a variety of reinforcing ways. **First**, and foremost, the neighborhood was understood territorially, particularly as a geographically delimited physical space. **Second**, neighborhood has a livelihood dimension. In the context of these projects, often migration to these geographic spaces constitutes a desperate coping strategy, as people seek scant livelihood opportunities and possibilities for economic exchange. **Third**, the concept of neighborhood was discussed along the lines of interests. Over time, persons within these geographic spaces develop a sense of common interests, needs, and welfare, a sense that individuals within this space should work together for the collective benefit for all residents. **Fourth**, neighborhoods are defined in terms of their identity. Neighborhoods are given historically significant names, bestowing upon them a distinct identity. This is typically an expression of a strong sense of belonging, social cohesion, solidarity, social capital, trust, inclusion, and acceptance. They also tend to develop organic leadership that can articulate the community's common interests. **Fifth**, neighborhoods become sites for decision-making, where residents express their sense of autonomy and agency over the territorial space.

Analysis

Important parallels were observed between the features of a 'neighborhood' coming from this discussion with the concept of a 'neighborhood' as outlined in the 2012 APS.⁵

5 Annual Program Statement (APS) No. APS-OFDA-12-000004 OFDA-FY-12-000004-APS for Operationalizing a NA to Reduce Urban Disaster Risk in Latin America and the Caribbean.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

However, the added specificity and depth gained from the exercise proved particularly valuable in terms of implementing future urban DRR projects. In operationalizing the NA, the APS conceptualized the neighborhood not only as a geographic area of the city defined by social, economic, and physical features that serve as the basis for administrative and political recognition within a larger jurisdiction, but also as an area where residents have a particular sense of identity. The exercise not only touched upon these characteristics, but also expanded USAID/OFDA/LAC's understanding of them and how they contribute to a sense of neighborhood.

The discussion revealed that the notion of geographic area becomes more complex when it is understood in terms of territory. The idea of territory adds a dimension of ownership. The physical space itself is not a neighborhood until those who live within it begin to feel that it is uniquely their space. The social components of the neighborhood concept reinforce this notion. Through daily interactions with others living within the same geographic space, individuals form emotional attachments to both the space and those living in it, developing a sense of belonging, social cohesion, and inevitably, an identity. These geographic spaces also have economic significance to those who live in them. Many have migrated to these places as a way to cope with hardships elsewhere. Despite what might be sub-optimal conditions, for many people these places offer a sense of possibility, no matter how meager. These are places to which people have come in the hope of a better future.

Once the population living in these spaces develops a sense of shared interests, they begin forming their own governance mechanisms. It is through these mechanisms that the neighborhood is able to address and resolve concerns among its members, and eventually petition government structures for formal administrative and political recognition. This is perhaps the most novel aspect of a 'neighborhood,' as revealed from the exercise. These governance mechanisms also begin formalizing a sense of shared identity and interests that exists within these spaces in the eyes of those who live there, allowing them to engage government as a 'neighborhood.' This is significant to the process of urban DRR, where the relationship between local governments and communities is vital to the long-term sustainability of DRR initiatives.



Recommendations for Future Projects

Perhaps the most significant theme from this session was how an emphasis on 'neighborhood' requires project implementers to first and foremost take the time to **understand the 'human dimension'** before engaging in more technical endeavors. Many of the issues are tied to this particular realization. Central to understanding the human dimension within the NA is **formulating a sound communication plan**. Opening channels of communication between project teams and the neighborhoods in

which they work allows implementers to understand the neighborhoods from the perspective of those who live in them, while also helping neighborhoods better understand the project goals and their roles in achieving them. **Establishing methodologies for generating community participation** is a component of a well-developed communications strategy.

Another aspect of dealing with the human dimension is **facing various forms of uncertainty**. Often, routine changes in management present challenges to the project's continuity. Competition between various community interest groups can also hinder advancement of the project goals. Implementers suggested developing measures to resolve incidents and reduce conflict between neighborhoods. Some pointed to livelihood strategies, an axis that runs through many of the projects, as a possible means for moving these groups beyond narrow short-term political and social considerations and toward long-term shared goals.

The discussion also touched on the need to develop tools to identify and characterize neighborhoods. Such processes help implementers gain a greater



PCI Mixco-Guatemala
improved access to informal
settlements
Photo JPSarmiento



sense of the neighborhood's characteristics, thus facilitating needs assessments. These assessments provide critical support in the design and planning of projects, allowing implementers to tailor them to the particular neighborhood context and thus, strengthening their long-term sustainability, another theme emphasized during the working group session. Participants specifically stated that the question of sustainability needed to be addressed in a deeper and more comprehensive manner.

Participants also identified several institutional challenges that impact project implementation. Often there are substantial incongruities between national and local processes, as well as the project's own timelines. These can impact the success of the project.

There are also legal barriers to neighborhoods' assertions of sovereignty over the spaces they occupy that need to be addressed in order for the NA to have real long-term sustainability. Strategies that specifically address these issues must be considered moving forward.

The centrality of land tenure raises the question of whether significant risk reduction can be realized in the absence of secure legal access. While Shelter and Settlements was one of the sectors available to implementers, perhaps future NA urban DRR should make work in this sector obligatory, if for no other reason than to highlight the relationship between resolving murky land tenure and achieving improved living standards in marginal urban areas.

The discussion noted that the NA requires a relatively high level of flexibility in planning and implementation. Participants suggested that monitoring and evaluation tools should emphasize the complexity of the urban neighborhood context and its social dynamics; and that the development of qualitative indicators is important to understanding these processes.

Building Relationships with Existing Institutional Networks: SC's ARRIBA Project

As noted earlier, this project was implemented in the context of a highly-defined legal framework for DRR. Accordingly, SC opted to create a clear and formal institutional



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU | FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

SC solidified its partnership with local government by embedding an expert within the municipal office.

relationship between the government and the neighborhood and where project objectives were integrated into these formal structures and processes.

From the outset of the ARRIBA project, SC emphasized the importance of building a strong relationship with the municipal government of VES and its extensive network. As reported, SC established this relationship in a number of ways. One of the first actions taken was to sign a contract with the Municipality of VES incorporating the project into its 2013 Institutional Operations Plan, establishing the local government as an active coordinating partner as well as a beneficiary of the project's capacity building activities. Four persons from the municipality's Civil Defense were trained in neighborhood mapping, planning, and DRR; three municipal projects on road improvements incorporated risk analysis into the projects; and two meetings were held to establish a Working Group on Disaster Risk Management in VES. SC solidified its partnership with local government by embedding an expert within the municipal office.

SC shaped the project to assist the municipality in meeting the requirements of Law 29664, established by the National System of Disaster Risk Management (SINAGERD) regarding local government responsibilities for disaster risk management (DRM). The project was involved in modifying the municipality's Organization and Functions Guidelines and strengthening its Budget and Planning Office to address DRM concerns. Also, the ARRIBA project was integrated into efforts being carried out by the broader risk management and humanitarian relief community operating in Peru. SC established agreements with CENEPRED and INDECI, the two primary institutions responsible for risk management at national level, to participate in project implementation. SC also became a member of the Disaster Risk Reduction Management Group (GRIDES) and also worked with the Women and Vulnerable Populations Ministry.

SC's emphasis on strengthening the institutionality of the ARRIBA project was the result of several factors: its longstanding experience working in urban settings throughout Peru, the various networks it is connected to, and the particular history of the VES community. As SC states, from its very founding, VES was an "organized and planned occupation of private land, which took into consideration the need to divide a district into different areas for different uses (residential, industrial, etc.). It is renowned for being the most organized and community-based district in Peru."



These workshops were inclusive, addressing issues of gender and the rights of children and adolescents, while also discussing community members' feelings about their neighborhoods, their homes, the various social actors, and risk.

While SC was able to generate much institutional support for the ARRIBA project, the emphasis on institutionality may have presented barriers to building strong relationships with community members. SC recognized that VES was highly politicized, with various factions vying for power within a context of popular distrust of public figures. These realities often made it difficult to engage the population, so a focus on institutionality, prior to community mobilization, could have been misplaced. Furthermore, they also recognized that the exclusion of one of the most vulnerable communities in the project area, Lomo de Corvina, due to the municipality's efforts to discourage settlement in high-risk areas, seemed to highlight this disconnect between political institutions and community realities. SC also stated that sensitization efforts to inform the community about the ARRIBA project and the NA were not adequate. It seems that community members were not directly involved in carrying out needs assessments or in defining project goals. Rather, leaders in the area were chosen to participate in these processes because it was presumed that they would be more aware of the risks and vulnerabilities facing their communities. This strategy seems to promote a somewhat top-down process that reinforces a paternalistic relationship between the municipality and communities.

As a result of the systematization process, SC made some important changes to address the lack of community participation. It promoted more door-to-door visits throughout VES, held additional meetings with community leaders, and developed a strategy for communicating project goals and activities. Participatory workshops were conducted with Residential Groups (RGs) to assess vulnerability throughout VES. These workshops were inclusive, addressing issues of gender and the rights of children and adolescents, while also discussing community members' feelings about their neighborhoods, their homes, the various social actors, and risk. Important project changes were made based on information shared at these workshops.

Local Recruitment and Staffing:

WCDO's CIDRR project

One of the distinctive characteristics of WCDO's CIDRR project was that local community members made up a significant proportion of the project staff. Two factors motivated



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

WCDO to adopt this staffing approach. First, in the absence of truly engaged municipal staff, it offered a means for ensuring local perspective in project management. Second, it was a logical response to the great importance that some target communities placed on actively participating in the management of their own affairs, rather than simply being viewed as recipients of aid unable to take part in decision-making and management processes.

Although city officials should be directly accountable to these local populations, WCDO's baseline study showed that 81.4% of community members surveyed reported that local authorities did not respond to their mission 'to serve the people.' Nearly 59% of community members surveyed believed that the state does a poor job of managing risks and disasters, while an additional 33% believe that the management is 'quite bad.' Though municipal authorities stated awareness of hazards and disaster risks, they had not taken concrete actions to address them. As stated before, the Communal Civil Protection Committee in Anse-à-Foleur, which exists to address disaster preparedness and response concerns, had little to no resources to effectively engage in DRR; in the other communities, no such institutions existed. Instead, these communities had groups of young and motivated volunteers without any structured or institutional support. Recruiting project staff from this pool of concerned residents may lay the groundwork necessary for developing local institutions with the capacity for DRR.

WCDO recruited its local staff by posting signs throughout the target communities and the municipal government played a central role in the recruitment process. At the end of the selection process, local personnel made up 40% of the project's senior management; the remaining 60% came from outside of Port-de-Paix. Junior staff, which included community mobilizers, was nearly 94% local. In addition, each community had at least 45 volunteers, and WCDO worked with local authorities and civil protection agencies to determine appropriate non-monetary incentives for their participation in the project.

WCDO cited two positive outcomes of recruiting local project staff. By and large, the local population placed more trust in the staff recruited from their communities. This prompted the community to become more engaged in the project's implementation and translated into a greater sense of ownership. Also, in countries like Haiti, where political instability is often the norm, having local staff means that in times of insecurity, they are



likely to remain on the project because they have a vested interest in its success, since it is meeting community needs.

Despite these positive incentives, there are a few risks. Of particular concern is the potential for favoritism and corruption, which WCDO addressed by establishing multiple levels of approval during the staff selection process. Another concern with extensive local recruitment was the potential to limit outside perspectives during project implementation. WCDO believed that its strategy of recruiting two persons from communities outside the project area for each project site (seven percent of total project staff) balanced this concern.

Revisiting the Definition of Neighborhood: CRS' *Barrios Más Seguros* project

CRS made a concerted effort to delineate neighborhoods in its *Barrios Mas Seguros* project. This need emerged due to a lack of quality, updated maps of Quetzaltenango's existing neighborhoods. In addition, where information about these neighborhoods did exist, there were significant differences and inconsistencies in terms of how the municipal government outlined neighborhoods within its jurisdiction and how the neighborhoods defined themselves.

CRS project staff collaborated closely with the Community Development Councils (COCODEs) in the four neighborhoods of the *Barrios Mas Seguros* project to outline the boundaries of their neighborhoods; the jurisdictions of their COCODE; the unique needs of each community; and to establish potential projects to address those needs. Through this process, Pacaja was split into two neighborhoods, Pacaja Alto and Pacaja Bajo, leading to a reclassification of the four neighborhoods into five distinct communities. CRS subsequently generated a new map of these neighborhoods, based on the perspectives of actual community members rather than the formal dictates of the municipal government.

In working closely with the COCODEs to define neighborhood boundaries, CRS engaged communities and increased their participation. This process helped to realign project



goals directly with specific neighborhood needs rather than force communities to accept one-size-fits-all project objectives. This process generated increased trust between CRS and neighborhoods, as well as their sense of ownership of the objectives and goals of the *Barrios Mas Seguros* project.

Utilizing GIS to Enhance Capacity and Leverage Municipal Engagement: PCI's *Barrio Mío* project

A central component of PCI's *Barrio Mío* project was the use of GIS technology to help the Municipality of Mixco understand the basic characteristics of the informal communities within its jurisdiction. In its initial assessment, PCI found that data on the communities was rather poor, particularly risk and hazard data on the rapidly growing informal settlements. The newly-elected municipal government was keen to modernize governance processes that had stagnated during previous administrations, and had particular interest in updating its cadaster. Thus, PCI was able to facilitate the integration of DRR-relevant factors into an overall effort to expand the use of GIS.

In the first phase of its work plan, PCI began to collect existing regulatory, legal, geographic, social, environmental, and economic data from the government, academia, the private sector, and municipal partners to outline project objectives with these key stakeholders. From there, 48 neighborhoods were geo-referenced using GIS disaster risk maps. These maps presented information on landslide risk areas, volcanic ashfall zones, seismic risk, soil capacity, grading, precipitation levels, population distribution, water resources, road networks, topographic information, and land use. GIS maps outlining water and sanitation data were also produced. Working with the Municipality of Mixco's Land Registry Office, PCI reviewed cadastral information on the neighborhoods where the *Barrio Mío* project was replicated in order to help project partners identify high-risk urban areas and key vulnerability trends.

To increase the long-term capacity for the use of GIS for DRM in Mixco, PCI collaborated with the Environmental Systems Research Institute, the international supplier of GIS software and geo-database management applications, to increase the capacity of

These maps presented information on landslide risk areas, volcanic ashfall zones, seismic risk, soil capacity, grading, precipitation levels, population distribution, water resources, road networks, topographic information, and land use.

World Concern
Haiti Gabions
Photo: WCDO

local institutions, as it states, to use “GIS for the management of risk in informal areas, enumeration, and decision making as it relates to urban upgrading.” PCI also launched the Technical Roundtable on Municipal Coordination for Territorial Analysis and Geographic Information (MCTAGI), which included the Municipality of Guatemala; the Secretariat of Planning and Programming of the Office of the Presidency; the Cadastral Information Registry; the National Geographical Institute; CONRED; the Ministry of

the Environment and Natural Resources; and the Department of Agronomy of the University of San Carlos. The immediate objective of the roundtable was to improve the Municipality of Mixco’s capacity to use GIS for mapping, land registry, cross-sectoral analysis, urban planning, and DRR; PCI’s long-term goal was to formalize the MCTAGI so that it could provide technical support to municipalities across the country using GIS in DRM.

PCI saw that using GIS to organize and analyze information about the communities was not only critical to tailoring projects to neighborhood needs, but also to establishing a more formal relationship between the communities and the municipal government. GIS can facilitate a two-way exchange between informal communities and the municipal government, with the former communicating micro-level information regarding risks, vulnerabilities, and capacities upward to government, and the latter communicating information about macro-level trends and processes downward to neighborhoods. This is critical for future DRM policy-making.





CHAPTER 4.

Project Transfer

Early Transfer

Although the projects focused on addressing the immediate disaster risks impacting informal communities in developing countries, the long-term objective of urban DRR projects is to integrate these efforts into a broader sustainable development agenda. This means considering mechanisms for transferring project responsibilities to local stakeholders during the project design or in the earliest stages of project implementation. This section discusses how the systematization matrix sought to guide how implementing agencies addressed project transfer throughout the stages of the project. It also presents the different approaches to project transfer taken by each implementer.

Project Transfer and Sustainability

The systematization matrix (see Annex 2) asked implementers to reflect how, at each stage, stakeholders were being prepared to take the reins once the project's mandate had expired, under the rubric of "Sustainability." During the **pre-project phase**, systematization questions focused on identifying local actors who could potentially champion the project's goals, even after the project was completed. This included determining if local NGOs were already engaged in development activities in general, and DRR more specifically. It was also important to note general levels of community engagement and governance, two elements that were independently addressed in the systematization, but have a general impact on the project's sustainability.

In the **sensitization phase**, the systematization questions addressed whether the NA, as presented to the local authorities, NGOs, and community members, was being linked



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

to a broader framework of sustainable development, which included urban planning, economic growth, public health, community welfare, safety, DRR, etc.

During the project **implementation phase**, questions regarding systematization focused on determining:

- If municipal authorities were being trained in urban planning and risk and vulnerability assessment and developing the capacity for sound DRR policymaking;
- If budgetary mechanisms were being established to ensure the long-term sustainability of the municipal government's DRR capacity.

The questions also sought to understand how DRR interventions were serving everyday basic needs. Did the project include livelihood and skills training components, considering that economic vulnerability and vulnerability to disaster are intimately interrelated? Did environmental and health interventions take DRR factors into consideration?

Sustainability was a cross-cutting theme throughout the life of the projects. As a discrete "moment," the **transfer phase** assessed the likelihood that stakeholders would continue to make progress (and be supported in this goal) once implementation of the project ended. In terms of community participation, emphasis was placed on whether formal mechanisms were established to transfer the project to local community institutions, and whether, prior to implementation, steps were taken to facilitate community ownership. Regarding governance, the focus was on outlining which community organizations or municipal bodies would take charge of which project components; whether plans were made to maintain the emergent government links to informal communities; and what local arrangements were being made to ensure that future development would be less vulnerable to disaster. The analysis of social inclusion centered on understanding what role community organizations that address issues pertaining to youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities would have after the transfer of responsibilities to local partners.

The **post-project phase** sought to understand the activities between partners that would help maintain project outcomes. The systematization process was concerned with exploring what steps were being taken to ensure that some kind of relationship remained between the aid agency and local partners in order to sustain community participation. In



terms of governance, it seeks to outline the measures that ensure that the relationships between and among local community organizations, municipal governments, and the private sector are maintained. In terms of social inclusion, it addresses whether plans were established to ensure that the most marginalized were not further excluded once the project concluded. In terms of sustainability, emphasis was placed on understanding how the relationship between local partners and the implementing agency would be maintained, and whether there is a monitoring and evaluation program to ensure progress on project goals.

Approaches to Project Transfer

Barrio Mío, PCI

Public Sector Engagement

In the case of PCI's *Barrio Mío* project, the transfer of project responsibilities to local stakeholders was formally integrated into the project's mandate. The involvement of institutional authorities beyond the formal end of the project was established from the outset through several signed agreements. *Barrio Mío* was designed specifically as a demonstration project to build the municipality's capacity to implement DRR measures, using the NA, from which lessons learned could be replicated in 15 additional high-risk communities selected by PCI and the municipal government of Mixco. As such, project implementation depended greatly on PCI's close work with the technical departments of the municipal government such as Urban Development, Cadaster, Private Building, and Municipal Development, as well as the office of the deputy mayor. Correspondingly, plans were also developed to strengthen the links between COMRED and its national counterpart, CONRED, to improve the municipal government's capacity for DRR.

PCI worked to strengthen the municipal government's technical capacity and organizational knowledge regarding DRR. The Mixco government learned how to determine the size, location, and basic characteristics of the informal settlements within its territory, as well as the vulnerabilities and risks they face. Twenty-six staff members were trained in the organization and implementation of the enumeration



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Alongside efforts to improve the municipality's technical capacity, emphasis was also placed on strengthening the linkages between the municipality and informal communities.

process. The municipal government also has access to PCI's D-RISK methodology and online information management system, which houses data, risk and resource maps, household information, and data on land boundaries, urban infrastructure and services, allowing it to track key trends related to urban risk, and to engage in informed planning and policymaking. Nine draft urban settlement plans were developed with the assistance of Rafael Landivar University. Final candidate plans were selected based on technical feasibility and cost and input from municipal and national agencies, private sector partners, and community members. And the monitoring and evaluation tools that PCI shared with Mixco's Municipal staff were crucial to tracking their implementation.

As the replication projects began, PCI increasingly took a secondary role behind local partners, working closely with the Municipality of Mixco's community outreach staff. This outreach focused on disseminating knowledge accumulated during the demonstration phase, establishing agreements with community organizations, and developing community risk and resource maps in the areas of project replication. PCI collaborated closely with technical staff from the Presidential Secretariat for Executive Coordination (SCEP) to develop training guides, tools, joint agendas, and institutional strengthening plans for each of the replication communities. In summary, the *Barrio Mio* project was explicitly designed to develop a model for urban DRR in informal communities that could be replicated, first by the Municipality of Mixco, and later, with the support of the national level institution SCEP, in municipalities throughout Guatemala.

Alongside efforts to improve the municipality's technical capacity, emphasis was also placed on strengthening the linkages between the municipality and informal communities. The Government of Mixco supported public works projects connecting informal communities to the municipal drainage and wastewater treatment network. Municipal staff engaged in WASH training to sensitize communities about the importance of water quality to sound health; accessed community properties to determine if they needed upgrading; and supported community risk mapping to identify safe zones for new development.

Private Sector Engagement

In *Barrio Mio*, the private sector was instrumental in supporting public works projects and shelter upgrading efforts. Companies like Cemento Progreso, AMANCO, and the Canarios Company provided supplies and technical support to upgrade shelters; improve drainage networks; and establish sewage systems in the participating informal



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

communities. As stakeholders with established networks and distribution points in these communities, it is likely that the private sector's relationship with local DRR efforts will continue.

PCI worked diligently to educate local stakeholders on resilient construction techniques and to establish local commitments that will secure funding for shelter construction and upgrading in project replication sites. A step in this direction was the formation of the Association for Alternative Development, which includes public sector stakeholders such as the Municipality of Mixco; the Association of Municipalities from Southern Guatemala; local private sector actors such as CEMRPO and AMANCO; international NGOs in the shelter sector, such as Habitat for Humanity; and international financial institutions and development agencies such as the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Other partners include Build Change, an international NGO focused on disseminating knowledge on disaster-resistant construction; Enclude Capital Advisory (formerly Shorebank International), to determine how to provide low-cost loans in high-risk urban areas for relocation, or resilient construction and retrofitting; MICOOPE, a nationwide cooperative that provides access to funding for development projects for the poor; the Rural Development Bank's Housing Department, which coordinates the financing, provision of construction materials, and technical assistance for CEMPRO's Constru-Red; and the Government of Guatemala's Housing Fund.

CIDRR, WCDO

Public Sector Engagement

For WCDO, given municipal governments' lack of capacity to play a leading role in long-term development or DRR planning, transfer revolved around engagement with the Comité de Pilotage, a committee of national ministry representatives engaged in development activity in the North-West Department of Haiti. With all activities orchestrated under the auspices of the Ministry of Planning, the different state departments were able to work together to craft a coherent development policy, better integrating NGO activities into regional development planning efforts. Each committee member carried forward its activities in the critical sectors addressed by the CIDRR project:



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

- Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications continued to evaluate the 249 community builders trained in building safety.
- Directorate of Civil Protection (DPC) assisted in integrating the shelters in Djerilon that were approved for local emergency evacuation needs into DRM planning for the five communities.
- DPC was involved in developing early warning systems for each community, training the newly formed emergency management committees, and conducting regular drills and simulations.
- As a result of the resurgence of cholera in the region, the North-West Health Department worked with WCDO to extend the work of WASH promoters in Port-de-Paix beyond the four zones originally targeted. Additionally, 21 staff members of the Center for Health in Anse-à-Foleur received training.
- In Port-de-Paix, WCDO, local associations, the municipal government, and the Ministry of Environment worked together to establish regular municipal waste collection throughout the city.

Local associations can become instrumental in maintaining pressure on governmental institutions to ensure the continuation and upgrading of waste collection in the region. WCDO reinforced the training of civil protection and shelter committees, to ensure these successes are sustainable and ownership of the processes is in the hands of the communities and their local governments.

Barrios Más Seguros, CRS

Public Sector Engagement

In *Barrios Mas Seguros*, relationships primarily developed among the technical departments within the Quetzaltenango municipal government. The Municipal Director of Drainage was a central actor in the implementation of mitigation works prioritized by the COLREDs, the COCODEs, and community members. In total, six risk assessment-based community structural works projects prioritized by the COLREDs and community members were designed and implemented. To complement these structural works, the Municipal government partnered with the company *Centro de Consultoría Integral* and



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU | FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

the University of San Carlos to carry out hydrological studies of the watershed. Graduate students in civil engineering and land and environment graduate students conducted territorial and topographic analyses. A hydrology expert from the Municipal government reviewed the study.

Another essential technical partner was the Municipal Director of Environment, who helped to organize of the *Clean Xela* program, where residents from the Pacajá Alto and Pacajá Bajo neighborhoods participated in a clean-up campaign along a water channel that affected both communities. Trash was one of the factors contributing to increased flood risks in the area. The municipality contributed trucks and workers for the campaign. The long-term objective was to institutionalize these campaigns through a partnership between the municipality, the COCODEs, and the COLREDs, whereby a portion of the municipal budget will go toward supporting these campaigns.

What is particularly important to the transfer process has been the popular mobilization that the *Clean Xela* Program inspired. Approximately 1,276 community members participated in these cleanup campaigns. This increased pressure on the Quetzaltenango municipal government to continue these initiatives to reduce flooding and provide regular municipal trash collection, a service that community members have stated they are willing to pay for. These mounting demands are bolstered by the growing interaction and exchange between communities impacted by the same flood risks. This is exemplified by the growing collaboration between Pacajá Alto and Pacajá Bajo, two neighborhoods whose relationship, as CRS reported, had previously been mired in enmity. Collaboration in the *Clean Xela* Program led to cooperation in broader DRR efforts. As CRS worked with the neighborhood COLREDs to develop emergency response plans, the COLREDs in Pacajá Alto and Pacajá Bajo came together to develop a joint plan for both neighborhoods. The *Clean Xela* Program could serve as a model for sensitizing communities about flood risk, to spur community mobilization, as well as build linkages between municipal governments and informal neighborhoods.

The COLREDs were also made responsible for the formation of youth brigades (ECOREDs). Capacity building for these youth groups included workshops on community organizing, risk management, risk mapping, global warming, first-aid, and disaster sheltering. Youth leaders underwent leadership training, training in risk management, the CONRED system, and disaster response by delegates of the Executive Secretariat of CONRED.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

These youth leaders were central in the forming Community Disaster Reduction Teams, and therefore played a central role in increasing public awareness about disaster risks and preparedness. They were linked to the Risk Management Committee of the Municipal Youth Council, the Committees on Youth Development within the COCODEs, and the Guatemalan Red Cross volunteer network.

Private Sector Engagement

CRS also worked to develop relationships with local companies such as IEC Segura Construction Material; Cementos Progreso, which trained the communities in construction mitigation measures; and Reciclados de Occidente, which trained youth on innovative recycling techniques.

ARRIBA, SC

Public Sector Engagement

While the ARRIBA project was focused on building local capacities, early on it had not formally outlined the concrete means by which particular elements of the project would be transferred to local stakeholders. The systematization questions made this need apparent to the ARRIBA project implementers, who worked on a plan to identify what needed to be transferred from each component of the project (in terms of planning, community engagement, and private sector partnerships); why these needed to be transferred (with future objectives in mind); to whom these needed to be transferred (the municipal government, local NGOs, or national institutions); how would transfer be facilitated (whether through advocacy, training, coalition-building, or replication); and a timeline for this to be achieved.

As a result, the dissemination of information gathered and the products generated became the centerpiece of SC's project transfer strategy. SC produced communication materials to publicize aspects of risk studies, community DRR plans, the emergency market and mapping analysis (EMMA), soil studies, and other products. These included videos, radio messages, calendars, leaflets, games for children, community-friendly maps, construction manuals, as well as lessons learned and recommendations. Many of these materials were disseminated in other communities with profiles similar to that of



PCI Mixco-Guatemala-
Empowered women
retaining walls
Photo: PCI



VES in order to expand the project's outreach. Also, the results and recommendations stemming from the ARRIBA project were presented to local stakeholders, including the Municipality of VES, other municipalities in Lima, and the general DRR community. A community fair with the residents and the other public and private sector stakeholders was held to close the project. This also helped facilitate project transfer activities.

SC also focused much attention on strengthening links between the municipal government of VES and Peru's national risk management community, working with the municipal government to apply national platforms and laws addressing disaster risks. As noted, ARRIBA was designed to help the municipality develop processes, tools, and plans to reinforce the National Disaster Risk Management System Law 29664, which outlines local government's responsibilities for DRR. To further support this process, national risk management institutions such as Peru's National Center for Estimation,



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Prevention, and Disaster Risk Reduction (CENEPRED) and the country's National Civil Defense Institute (INDECI), were included as partners in project implementation.

Also critical to the transfer and scaling of project objectives was the establishment of a Working Group to ensure that decision-making across varied development policy arenas and levels of government was coordinated and congruent with the National Policy on Disaster Risk Management. The Working Group was primarily composed of officials from public entities and subnational governments, but also promoted private sector and citizen participation. It was a forum for the formulation, organization, execution, and evaluation of DRR policies and plans, with respect to cross-development agendas. SC also assisted the Council of Ministers' DRR Secretariat to revise the National DRR Plan; worked with Peru's Humanitarian Network to install a national level DRR Platform; and collaborated with CENEPRED to craft mechanisms that facilitate cross-sectoral integration.

Private Sector Engagement

ARRIBA visualized a central role for the private sector from the very beginning, particularly through its Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis. The EMMA tool helped DRM stakeholders develop an understanding of local markets, so that they could both increase market resilience to disasters and leverage them in disaster response and recovery efforts. The ARRIBA project trained the municipality and community leaders in the EMMA methodology, helping them to establish baseline reports on the key local market systems. This was then used to integrate private sector actors directly into emergency response plans.

SC also assisted the private sector to develop its own DRR plans, tying mitigation to financing mechanisms. Its local partner, *Tierra de Niños*, incorporated DRR into its microcredit and grant programs, helping entrepreneurs to prepare loan applications that included disaster risk plans, finance plans, and business formalization plans. A particularly successful example of this program was the Union Progreso market, which won an award from the municipality for producing one of the most concrete DRR plans in VES by renewing extinguishers, establishing rescue teams, and carrying out regular disaster response and evacuation drills.



Esto pone de relieve la importancia de garantizar los altos niveles de conciencia pública que son necesarias para el mantenimiento de la RRD en la agenda pública después de finalizado el proyecto.

Beyond DRR, businesses that participated in the grants and credits program were introduced to the concept of the NA. Businesses understood their potential role in helping to increase community resilience to disasters. The private sector has a number of potential roles in DRR efforts, including working with communities and local governments to ensure that prices of critical products not inflated during disasters; providing access to unique resources, whether emergency kits and technical expertise or critical transportation and supply networks; or simply serving as DRR promoters.

Challenges

One of the principal challenges to the successful transfer of project activities to local stakeholders was the project-driven approach and its emphasis on products and indicators rather than the development of joint closing and transfer strategies. Since these projects were multifaceted, often project partners became focused on specific roles and activities within particular sectors, diluting the integration of the various sectoral activities.

Also contributing to the kind of sectoral stove-piping frequently observed in development projects was the disconnect between community leaders directly involved in project implementation and the broader communities which they purported to represent. SC observed that these divergences between communities and their representatives left significant portions of the population inadequately sensitized to the overarching objectives of the NA. Not only did they have little understanding of the concept, they were also predisposed to favor physical works over community mobilization activities necessary to advance the NA. This highlights the importance of ensuring the high levels of public awareness that are necessary for maintaining DRR in the public agenda after a project has ended.

Another obstacle to effective transfer is the lack of institutional memory that is characteristic of many local governments as a result of frequent staff turnover. For example, PCI faced a number of challenges due to the constant changing of municipal directors and technical staff, particularly in their project's efforts to build and maintain working relationships between the municipality and the private sector. This persistent turnover was often paralleled by a lack of formal planning processes, making governance simply an ad hoc,



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

day-to-day endeavor, and DRR nearly impossible. PCI concluded, “the predominant short-term culture means that it is very hard to get people focused on planning and prevention.”

These realities are further exacerbated by the heightened politicization of government decision-making that occurs during election seasons. Upcoming elections typically incentivize a shift by the municipal government away from long-term DRR planning, and toward infrastructure projects that bring short-term political gain.

In order to mitigate the likelihood of this occurring, efforts must be made to get the topic of DRM onto the electoral agenda, particularly in a manner that makes it an issue of concern for both those currently in power and those who aspire to public office. This illuminates the point that the transfer of a NA urban DRR project is not simply about building the technical capacity of local stakeholders, but about facilitating the building of sustainable relationships between them. In WCDO’s CIDRR project, the *Comité de Pilotage* served as a

vehicle for bringing various government and civil society stakeholders together to address development and DRR in North-West Haiti. In SC’s ARRIBA project, the Risk Management Working Groups and the Civil Defense Platform served a similar function. In Mixco and Quetzaltenango, Guatemala, these relationships began as a result of improved communication between COLREDS across communities, fostered by the CRS and PCI projects.

The hope, particularly with regard to project transfer, is that these relationships evolve into more permanent mechanisms for compelling municipal governments to maintain their support for DRR initiatives, regardless of the particular administration in power, ensuring the continuity and sustainability of DRR gains.

PCI-Mixco-Guatemala
Community maps
Photo: PCI





CHAPTER 5.

Project Outcomes

All grantees developed a program monitoring and evaluation plan that contained the required elements outlined in the USAID/OFDA Guidelines for Proposals and utilized sector-specific indicators as required. The grantees were also encouraged to select and monitor ‘custom’ indicators, ones that would give a clearer sense of the full

range of activities and impacts unique to their projects. Finally, the grantees received the USAID indication to implement the systematization process within their projects, addressing a number of cross-cutting themes at different moments during the life of the project.

In the following pages, indicator results are presented for the sectors/sub-sectors in which the projects intervened. Indicators required by OFDA are shown in bold-face in each table, while custom indicators are in regular type. After each sector/sub-sector table, illustrative descriptions of major activities and/or outcomes of the projects are given.



PCI-Mixco-Guatemala
Home vegetable gardens
Photo: PCI



Indicator Results

Sector: **Natural and Technological Risks**

Sub-sector: **Disaster preparedness, mitigation and management**

	SAVE THE CHILDREN			CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES			WORLD CONCERN (WCDO)			PROJECT CONCERN INT'L.		
	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress
Number of people trained in preparedness, mitigation, and disaster risk management	646	650	99%	2,348	1,200	196%						
Number and percentage of beneficiaries that retain knowledge on preparedness, mitigation, and disaster risk management two months after the training	0	520	0%	1,782 (95%)	900 (75%)	198%						
Number of plans, policies, or curriculum developed on DRR	22	18	122%	4	4	100%				17	17	100%
Number of public officers participating in mapping, planning, or neighborhood actions	41	15	273%							53		
Number of COMRED members participating in DRR meetings with municipal authorities (4 members)				23	15	153%						
% increase in municipal funds allocated to neighborhood hazard mitigation				14%	5%	287%						
Number of youth volunteers trained and certified by government				265 (55% female)	240 (40% female)	110%	500					



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY**

COMRED Coordinadora Municipal para la Reducción de Desastres / Local DRR coordinator

- All projects sought to strengthen existing formal and informal community structures at the neighborhood level. WCDO and CRS made specific efforts to engage young adults, serving the immediate project objectives and the longer-term goal of preparing future community leaders. Neighborhood residents themselves proposed this during the risk assessment process of the WCDO project as a means of building more robust early warning systems.
- While the focus was on building capacities at the neighborhood level, all projects had extensive interaction with municipal authorities. The objective of this engagement was to encourage closer linkages with marginal neighborhoods, which are historically underserved. By using a combination of training and technical support, the projects were able to generate increased public sector attention to DRR concerns.

*Sub-sector: **Hydro-meteorological Hazards***

	WORLD CONCERN			
	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress	
Number of people who will benefit from proposed hydro-meteorological activities	18,596	26,092	71%	
Number of hydro-meteorological policies/procedures modified as a result of the activities to increase preparedness for hydro-meteorological events	1	5	20%	
	Target	Number of families surveyed	Correct answer to key questions	% of Progress
Number and percent of people trained in hydro-meteorological related activities retaining knowledge two months after training	500 people	210	175	83%
	Achieved	Target	% of Progress	
Number of civil protection committees trained in hydro-meteorological related activities retaining knowledge three months after training	3	3	100%	
Length of gabions constructed and canals retrofitted to protect Anse-à-Foleur and Port-de-Paix	1,423 meters	1,815 meters	78%	

During the neighborhood risk assessment process, communities criticized the procedures used to inform them about impending disasters – sending people with megaphones minutes before a disaster struck. The project established an Early Warning System (EWS) in five communities, consisting of:

- » Focal points, who will inform and sensitize the community before, during, and after a disaster. In many cases, these focal points are young people trained for this purpose by the project.
- » A trigger, that is to say, a person responsible for activating the crank siren, along the lines of the technical coordinator of the DPC North-West project (a crank siren is a device that produces a powerfully strong sound to signal the public before a disaster).

Sector: **Economic Recovery and Market Systems**

Sub-sector: **Economic Asset Restoration**

	SAVE THE CHILDREN		
	Achieved	Target	% of Progress
Number of people that received assistance through economic restoration activities	246	150	164%
Total USD channeled into the local economy (through bonds, vouchers, livelihoods fairs, etc.)	24,476	24,000	102%
Number of businesses developing risk mitigation plans	71	24	296%

Sub-sector: **Economic Asset Development**

	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL		
	Achieved	Target	% of Progress
Number of people assisted through new livelihoods development activities, *by sex	Demonstration: M 231; F 430 Replication: M 2,914 F 5,499	Demonstration: (460) Replication: (18,000)	Demonstration: 143% Replication: 58%
Percentage of people continuing in their new livelihoods by program completion, *by sex	0	Demonstration: (460/100%) Replication: (18,000/100%)	On Final Evaluation (ex post)
Number of communities where productive spaces are integrated into community design	Demonstration: 2	17 (2 Demonstration and 15 Replication sites)	Demonstration: 100%
Number of households converting to low interest housing loans	0	73	On Final Evaluation
Percent of households that are co-owned by male and female heads of household	Male 82% Female 18%	80% (Demonstration)	On Final Evaluation
Percent of HH in which at least one member is participating in GROW, by sex	69.9% (51)	80% (73 Demonstration)	70%
Average savings per member mobilized	US\$ 55.45	TBD	

Sub-Sector: **Micro-Credit**

	PCI		
	Achieved	Target	% of Progress
Number of households converting to low-interest housing loans	0	73	On Final Evaluation



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY**



PCI Mixco-Guatemala-
Building retaining walls
Photo: PCI

*Sub-sector: **Microfinance Institutions***

	SAVE THE CHILDREN		
	Achieved	Target	% of Progress
Number of individuals/MYPES receiving credits	48	24	200%
Number and percentage of credits paid according to their payment schedule	44	20	220%

MYPES - Medianas y pequeñas empresas / Small and medium-size businesses



Sector: **Shelter and Settlements**

Sub-sectors: **Shelter and Hazard Mitigation**

	SAVE THE CHILDREN			WORLD CONCERN			PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL			CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES		
	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress	Achieved	Target	% Of Progress
Number of shelters incorporating hazard mitigation measures	41	20	205%	5	5	100%	96 2,880	Demonstration: 74 Replication: 2,880	100%	1,393	900	155%
Number of settlements incorporating risk mitigation measures	9	20	45%	5	5	100%	Demonstration 2 Replication 15	Demonstration: 2 Replication: 15	100%	6	4	150%
Number and percentage of people who retain knowledge of hazard mitigation in shelters, two months after training	0	150	0%	249	246	100%	0	Demonstration: (147/80%), Replication: (5,760/80%) Assuming 2 adults per HH and 80% of HH targeted	On Final Evaluation	3,522	4,200	84%
Square meters of land not suitable for housing construction, repurposed for reforestation, urban agriculture, and recreation space							Demonstration: 33,938m2 Replication 243,617	Demonstration: 5,678m2 (20% of area within preliminary demonstration communities)	100%			
Number of families agreeing to move from unsafe to safe sites within their neighborhoods							0	Demonstration: (74), Replication: (2,880) Based on 80% of targeted high-risk beneficiaries	On Final Evaluation			
Percent of settlement households who accept the new settlement design							0	Demonstration: (74) Replication: (2,880) Based on 80% of targeted direct beneficiaries	On Final Evaluation			
Number of households receiving structural shelter hazard mitigation packages										608	600	101%
Number of large and small-scale hazard mitigation projects completed										14	12	117%



The mitigation measures promoted by the projects included interventions such as: installation of eaves and construction of concrete gutters to channel water off the roof and away from homes; replacement of damaged tile or metal roofing with new roofing; elevating floors; installation of metal/iron door barriers; building concrete floors; applying waterproof coating to walls; retrofitting supports to increase seismic resistance of existing walls; replacement of adobe, wood and metal walls with reinforced brick/block walls; and/or reinforcement damaged walls with steel and concrete.

- In the case of SC, the number of shelters incorporating hazard mitigation measures includes 1 PRONOEI (community-managed pre-school for children age 3-5); 15 critical services and 25 small- and medium-size business (SMES), which improved their structural and non-structural infrastructure through the project's subsidy program.
- Initially, WCDO intended to rehabilitate 30 temporary shelters to serve as a refuge in the areas of project intervention and to demonstrate simple construction improvements to communities. After consultation with the Directorate of Civil Protection, only five shelters were identified in these areas and in neighboring communities that needed to be registered and selected to receive substantial retrofitting. All five communities targeted have at least one standard shelter that meets construction norms and requirements made by DPC.
- For PCI and CRS, the number of shelters incorporating hazard mitigation measures refers to the homes of neighborhood residents. CRS' project included a subsidy program to support these upgrades (see below).
- Initially, CRS' project targeted four neighborhoods. However, following the initial planning process, two of neighborhoods were sub-divided further. This redefinition reflected very clearly the non-geographical elements of "neighborhood," such as shared history and common concerns.
- WCDO directed the bulk of its training efforts toward construction professionals. In the five communities, 249 construction professionals were trained in seismic and anti-cyclonic building standards. After two months of the final training, the professionals were evaluated to see if concepts were understood and retained. Of the 249 professionals trained, 156 participated in and passed a final evaluation with 132 achieved a score equal to or greater than 7.5 out of a possible 10.
- The housing repairs in CRS' project were undertaken via a voucher program with four local suppliers of construction inputs. This private sector engagement was an important component of the project.
- PCI paved 176 m² of streets, and 400 m² of ramps and stairs to facilitate access within the neighborhoods.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY**

Sector: **Water, Sanitation and Hygiene**
Sub-sector: **Hygiene promotion**

	WCDO				PCI		
	# families surveyed	Correct answer	Target	% of Progress	Achieved	Target	% of Progress
Percent of population demonstrating good hand washing practices	210	183	50%	87%	0	75% (Demonstration)	On Final Evaluation
Percent of population demonstrating correct water usage and storage	210	184	50%	88%	0	75% (Demonstration)	On Final Evaluation

PCI Mixco-Guatemala-
Septic tank
Photo: PCI

- WCDO: The survey was conducted in five communities with a sample of 210 families on 2252 sensitized (11258) people thanks to the support of volunteers. The sample of 210 families were 136 women and 74 men; 183 on average gave correct answers to the following questions: 1) length of time for handwashing, 2) what you use to wash your hands, 3) the most important time to washing hands.



Sub-sector: **Water supply**

	WCDO			PCI		
	Achieved	Target	% of Progress	Achieved	Target	% of Progress
Number and percent of clean water points functioning three months after completion	4	undefined	N/A	0	90% (Demonstration)	On Final Evaluation
Number and percent of household water supplies with 0 coli form bacteria per 100 ml				Demonstration: 92 Replication: 2,880	Demonstration: (73/80%) Replication: (2,880/80%)	Demonstration: 100% Replication: 100%
Average water usage of target population in liters per person per day				0	15	
Number and percent of water points with measurable residual chlorine exceeding 0.2 mg/l				Demonstration: 73 Replication: 2,880	Demonstration: (73/80%) Replication: (2,880/80%)	Demonstration: 100% Replication: 100%
2.11 Number of people directly benefitting from the water supply infrastructure program, *by sex				Demonstration: M 374 F 406	Demonstration: (370) Replication: (14,400)	Demonstration: 211%
2.15 Number of neighborhood DRR/ neighborhood redevelopment plans that have incorporated water supply solutions that meet or exceed Sphere standards				Demonstration: 2 Replication: 15	17 overall (2 Demonstration, 15 Replication sites)	Demonstration: 100% Replication: 100%
2.16 Number of households with rainwater catchment systems completed				92	92 (Demonstration sites only)	100%

- With the rehabilitation of the drinking water supply system in Anse-à-Foleur, four fountains are now fed with water (three fountains or kiosks in the town of Anse-à-Foleur and one fountain containing two washing places in Kalife (rural locality) to serve the residents of these areas.
- PCI installed 1,370 meters of pipe to improve water supply to the two demonstration neighborhoods.



Sub-sector: **Sanitation**

	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL			WCDO			CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES		
	Achieved	Target	% of Progress	Achieved	Target	% of Progress	Achieved	Target	% of Progress
Number and percent of households disposing of solid waste appropriately	0	0	On Final Evaluation						
Number of people directly benefitting from the sanitation infrastructure program, *by sex and age	780 M 374 F 406	460	170%						
Number of neighborhood DRR/neighborhood redevelopment plans that have incorporated sanitation solutions that meet or exceed Sphere standards	Demonstration: 2	17 overall Demonstration: 2 Replication: 15	Demonstration: 100%						
Number of community sanitation infrastructures completed that meet or exceed Sphere standards	Demonstration: 2	2 (Demonstration sites only)	100%	25	20	125%			
% fewer of illegal public trash dumps versus baseline							86%	60%	143%

- WCDO had planned to build 20 latrine batteries in the five communities targeted. Through discussions with departmental authorities and participating neighborhoods, garbage bins for community rubbish collection and disposal, replaced the latrines. As a result, 25 bins were constructed and installed in communities and surrounding areas. The cleanup was supported with municipal waste collection vehicles from the mayor, who promised to continue working with neighborhood committees established by the project.
- WCDO's intervention in support of trash collection served to stimulate a wider discussion of garbage disposal, with efforts now underway to establish a sanitary landfill for Port-de-Paix.
- Indiscriminate trash disposal in ravines and other public spaces were identified as a primary concern by the neighborhoods participating in CRS' project. Working together, communities and municipal authorities were able to eliminate 49 of 57 non-authorized landfills/garbage dumps.



Catholic Relief Services neighborhood projects included the following:

NEIGHBORHOOD	MITIGATION WORKS
El Cenizal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of ditches, grit removal systems, a sedimentation tank, energy dissipaters, and a retaining wall made of recycled tires to protect the dissipaters, reforestation around the energy dissipaters • Installation of 6 sediment traps, 55 terraces to absorb water and reduce runoff and sets of stairs to improve the evacuation of the high part of the community • Reforestation in areas prone to disasters
Los Altos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 25 lineal meter containment wall and a 55 lineal-meter perimeter wall in the municipal waste water discharge area to mitigate frequent overflow during the rainy season • A 6 lineal meter containment wall in the riverbed (dome overflow) • A 12 lineal-meter containment wall along the riverbanks of Río Seco to prevent flooding
La Ciénaga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 lineal-meter containment wall along the riverbanks of Río Seco to prevent flooding • 15 lineal-meter containment wall along the riverbanks of Río Seco • Dumping site transformed into an ecological park
La Independencia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reforestation to mitigate erosion and reduce flooding and construction of 2 wheelchair ramps to improve evacuation routes for individuals with disabilities • Placement of handrails and construction of a 550 lineal-meter containment wall
Pacajá Alto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a stone retaining wall, a perimeter wall, elevated stairs, a ditch system, extension of a drainage system and replacement of a roof in the public washing basin • Construction of bridge and slope protection to reduce runoff
Pacajá Bajo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of 319 lineal meters of gutters, 3 manholes, 2 storm drains and 29 house connections to the main collector to mitigate flooding • Installation of 106 lineal meters of gutters and 2 manholes to mitigate flooding of homes • Installation of 100 lineal meters of gutters and 2 manholes to mitigate flooding

PCI constructed 955 lineal meters of sewer in the two demonstration communities, including 30 manholes. In addition, the project built a wastewater treatment plant. These works have enabled 122 households to connect to appropriate treatment facilities.



Institutionalization of Disaster Risk Reduction

In addition to the measurable outcomes and impacts presented in the previous section, the four projects engaged in activities designed to aid municipal and other authorities to establish methodologies and procedures to enable them to undertake DRR in vulnerable, low-income urban neighborhoods. The projects intervened at neighborhood, municipal and regional levels in order to build awareness of and capacities in urban DRR.

In Peru, for example, SC assisted the municipal authorities of VES to meet their responsibilities under the SINAGERD law by training community members to take a role in the Neighborhood Committees mandated under the law. These citizens were trained in DRR concepts, citizen participation, risk/hazard analysis, and gender. In addition, SC strengthened the DRR Working Group in the VES municipal government, which is an interdisciplinary committee required by the SINAGERD law.

SC also undertook activities to publicize and multiply project outreach. The project organized two DRR community fairs that attracted some 6,000 people, and included the participation of more than 30 local, regional, and national institutions. The project also trained 70 community disaster management advocates to facilitate replication of the project in six additional residential groups in VES.

WCDO focused its efforts on creating DRR awareness and skills within the communities. Five hundred youth were trained as promoters, with specific responsibilities for early warning. In addition, local builders received training on improved construction techniques. Neighborhood DRR committees were established, trained, and equipped with basic hand tools. The project sought to focus the limited municipal capacities on the subject of solid waste removal, and stimulated the active partnership of the authorities and the target neighborhoods.

In Guatemala, the NGO implementers employed a number of approaches to promote institutionalization of DRR. In Quetzaltenango, CRS strengthened the existing COLREDs and formed new ones for neighborhoods not having this structure. The project also undertook to link COLREDs and COCODEs, with the intention of getting DRR issues onto the community development docket. A further innovation was the establishment of

The project also trained 70 community disaster management advocates to facilitate replication of the project in six additional residential groups in VES.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU

FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

youth DRR teams in each neighborhood, known as ECORED. These teams enable young people to engage in community leadership without threatening traditional neighborhood authorities, thereby preparing them for future roles as adults.

Mobilization of the municipality was focused in two areas. First, the project emphasized the effective management of solid waste, leveraging active community participation and municipal resources to establish a framework for ongoing work in sanitation. Second, the neighborhood mitigation projects were validated and supervised by municipal authorities, and follow-up maintenance plans were created jointly by communities and the municipality.

Save The Children Villa
El Salvador Peru
Evacuation Site
Photo: JPSarmiento

For the project in Mixco, PCI began with an intensive effort to develop tools and a vision with the municipal government. First, the project offered extensive support with

mapping, which satisfied immediate interest in updating the cadaster as well as the broader objective of promoting DRR. The integration of multiple hazard and resource maps with the municipality's GIS provided important input into the selection of at-risk communities. From there, the process of neighborhood selection rested on a matrix of 28 vulnerability criteria in four categories developed jointly between PCI and the municipal government. The 701 neighborhoods of Mixco were evaluated against these criteria, and through successive rounds of data analysis and field visits, the selection of the 17 target neighborhoods (two demonstration, 15 replication) was completed. In addition to these technical interventions, the project worked closely with the municipality in a stakeholder mapping exercise to identify potential partners and contributors from the public and private sectors, as well as academia.

At the community level, the project worked to strengthen the COCODEs of the two demonstration neighborhoods.





CHAPTER 6.

Reflections on the Systematization Process

During the preparation of this report, the need became apparent to include the experiences of different individuals involved in project management with regard to the systematization process. These reflections were requested from persons with three different roles or positions: (1) the individual within the NGO responsible for the project's systematization; (2) the NGO Project Manager, reflecting the NGO point of view; and (3) the USAID Project Officer, who represents the donor point of view. Based on interest and availability, one individual representing the first two roles was selected. The USAID project officer, whose comments appear below, is the focal point for the Neighborhood Approach at the USAID/OFDA LAC regional office.

Responses from an NGO Project Implementer

1. Was the systematization process a new or different experience for you? In what way?

- Yes, because it allowed monitoring and reflection to go beyond the customary project monitoring. It provides complementary qualitative monitoring in real time that allows for processes and information to be captured that normally remain at the more informal level. It also forces a level of attention to detail that is not normally captured when merely monitoring quantitative data.
- It provides an important opportunity to talk to the people we are trying to benefit, while the project is ongoing. It means that we can really listen to their opinions and



take them into consideration. It also serves as an accountability mechanism for giving back information to the beneficiaries and stakeholders.

- Furthermore, considering it is carried out every three months, it is a process in itself and forces you to reread previous reports and see if things have changed, if recommendations are being respected, etc.

2. Was the systematization matrix, other tools, and instructions provided useful?

- To an extent. The question matrix was useful, as it acted as a guide and helped to organize what information to collect out of the vast wealth of information available.
- It was also useful that OFDA allowed for flexibility in the questions and in the methodology. This allowed for the questions to be rearranged or grouped together or even for new questions to be included, if necessary, depending on the context.
- I am not sure that the phases chosen are that useful. Given the fact that the project has a number of different components, it is simultaneously carrying out sensitization, implementation and transfer phases. Therefore, reporting included all phases. Perhaps it would be better to arrange the questions in another way? Or that each project identifies its own phases? Or perhaps just answer questions from all phases simultaneously, as was the chosen option.
- It was considered important to give the reports more structure in order to ensure that all information was gathered and could be used appropriately. Therefore the answer to each question was divided into strengths/achievements; weaknesses/difficulties and recommendations. This was vital for identifying best practices and lessons learned. The recommendations were also key for making the necessary changes in the project and for future projects. They also served as the starting point for the following reports.
- It was important to add a section on general issues at the beginning to give context to the report and to avoid repetition when answering questions. Although this process was to systematize the Neighborhood Approach, it is also important to understand the context of the project and it is unavoidable that more information comes to light that does not fit within the question matrix. Therefore, the general issues section helps to organize and register this information.
- Also, I always started the interview asking the interviewee to mention the overall positive and negative aspects of the last quarter. This was important as it made them



think about what stood out in their mind, which helped identify what was working and what not overall. It meant people gave free answers that weren't conditioned by the questions.

3. Can you identify difficulties in the implementation of systematization?

- Given that people often have short memories, sometimes it was hard to get people to really think about what we have been doing and the wider processes rather than just focus on the activities.
- Initially it is perhaps difficult to gain people's trust. Sometimes people thought that there was an ulterior motive for asking them to answer questions. Also, often people only wanted to thank SC for the work done and felt uncomfortable talking about negative issues, as perhaps they thought that this would mean the project would stop working with them. However, this was easily overcome by explaining that the systematization was to improve the project and that we really wanted their opinions so we could improve what we were doing and be more effective in supporting them.
- Perhaps the process depends a lot on the perspective of the person writing it and therefore it can be subjective.
- Sometimes it was hard to find the time to interview everyone and, also, to discuss the reports in detail with the implementing team in a way that the recommendations are really taken into consideration.

4. How did other project team members regard your role in terms of responsibility for the systematization process?

- Generally well. Mainly it was seen as vital for identifying best practices, lessons learned and giving recommendations that helped to inform a lot of decisions.
- However, sometimes the implementing team could take the observations personally, or become defensive, or merely have different viewpoints, which could lead to tensions. It was important to try and overcome this and try and explain the difficulties/obstacles as lessons to be learned that in fact help improve the project.

5. Did the systematization process reveal specific circumstances that implied important project changes/adjustments?

- There were many, but the most significant ones were (in no specific order):
 - a. The initial weakness in the coordinating committee and the need for more plan-



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU | FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

ning and coordination to ensure that all members understood the project in the same way and were giving the same message. This led to a series of workshops to discuss the project's aims and strategies and the creation of various management tools, such as the stakeholders' analysis, the communications plan, etc. The idea that more communication was needed between implementing partners and the components remained present throughout the project.

- b. The need for the different components of the project to be more articulated. This led to various changes, particularly to try and ensure that the MYPES were part of the neighborhood and to improve relationships with the MVES and all components. It was also one of the reasons for the creation of the Neighborhood Platforms to bring all of the different stakeholders in the neighborhood together.
- c. The need for more communication with the beneficiary population. This led to the communications plan and generally more attempts to involve the community and different project stakeholders in discussions regarding the project.
- d. Our own understanding of the neighborhood. Initially it was believed that a more formal neighborhood structure existed in VES and that the population actively participated in their Residential Groups and coordinated with the Municipality of VES. However it was soon realized that the community spirit had been much reduced once the population had their primary needs met and therefore the more consolidated areas were least interested in participating. This was directly opposite to micro, small and medium enterprises (MYPES), who participated more in consolidated areas because the population is more interested in individual needs. The importance of grassroots organizations was also noticed. All of this led to changes in the strategies for working with the population. It was difficult to get all stakeholders to work together. The creation of the Neighborhood Platforms helped to provide a solution to this, as did organizing bigger community events to bring people together such as the community fairs.
- e. The fact that the neighborhoods, organizations, MYPES etc., were weak and therefore that it was important to include training and methods to help strengthen them before starting to work directly on DRM, as it is not possible to work on something new if there are so many existing problems.
- f. The lack of institutional memory and interest in the topic within the Municipality



of VES at first. The systematization also helped to identify that the Working Group and Platform were the key platforms for working on DRM within the Municipality.

g. The importance of sustainability, which led to producing transfer strategy that identified what needed to be transferred, why, how, by who and when.

- Generally the systematization helped the team to understand the importance of processes and that it is not enough to just focus on implementing activities.
- It is also important to mention that this process has provided a lot of lessons learned for future projects.

6. If you were to be responsible for systematization in a future project, what would you change or make different, and why?

- This is in part already answered in question 2. Some other ideas:
- Ensure there is a systematization working group that allows for more discussion regarding methodologies, ideas, suggestions, content, etc. at the international level between OFDA-funded projects. This would also allow for us to have more input into the overall systematization of all OFDA projects.
- More feedback from OFDA on the reports. What things interest OFDA, what would they like more information on, how does this fit into OFDA's expectations. What is happening with the systematization of other projects?
- Ensure that there is a specific tool that allows for recommendations to be turned into actions and tracked (action tracker). Perhaps even at the OFDA level and not internal?

7. Can you justify/explain in few words why systematization is important in implementing projects such as Urban DRR?

- See question 1.
- It is also vital for feeding back into project design so as projects learn from past mistakes and can maximize best practices.
- Also, on a higher level, I think that the systematization could also be used to identify problems and flaws in the overall DRR and development system and to avoid the same mistakes being made more than once.



Responses from an NGO Project Manager

1. Was systematization a different experience for you? In what way?

- It was definitely an opportunity for the Barrio Mío project. It was a challenge for us to develop this process of systematization that attempts to resume and standardize activities and key processes that were executed during the implementation phase of the project.
- The opportunity was useful to learn the systematization process, an opportunity that allowed me to reflect on a series of activities and processes executed, place them sequentially, and incorporate the skills that were created/adjusted during the project implementation.
- The process of systematization not only demanded a greater use of time from the team that led the process, but also greater effort to research methodologies and experiences at the organization level as well as in other projects.

2. Were the tools and instructions provided useful?

- The structure we received from FIU acted as our guide, particularly the three axes (sensitization, implementation, and transfer). We developed the whole systematization process using this structure.
- A key activity was the dissemination of the systematization process that is aligned to transfer processes. This activity was developed in meetings and events with municipal authorities and staff and at the central levels of government.

3. Could you identify some difficulties in the implementation of systematization?

- More than difficulties, our limitation was the prioritization of activities, and organizing them according to the activity implementation process. We had to analyze which activities would correspond to each of the sectors and which would be secondary, and this process had to be done without creating opposition to the systematization process.

4. Can you identify specific circumstances detected by the systematization process that implied important project changes/adjustments?

- The activity that demanded a considerable amount of time and effort was based on



the creation of COCODEs. Our team insisted that this process should be a prerequisite for the rest of the activities at the community level. However, at the end of the process, we noted that the activities corresponding to the other sectors could have been carried out simultaneously, allowing us enough time and dedication for all project activities. This constituted one of the main findings.

5. If you were to be responsible for systematization in a future project, what would you change or make different, and why?

- It is important to establish, from the beginning of the project, a team that will develop the activity. The efforts of the team should be to:
- Document all project activities, based on simple structures that allow us to organize the documentation that is generated in the project activities.
- Create a classifying process for photographic material, recordings, and testimonials.
- Assign and ensure sufficient resources from the beginning of the project.
- Sensitize the project team (and the organization if necessary) on the importance of implementing this process and the opportunity for the team to be part of this process.

6. Could you justify/explain in few words why systematization is important in implementing projects such as Urban DRR?

- The experiences generated from the projects with a DRR focus, are going to constitute initial guidelines for states and governments as well as international cooperation and development organizations. These guidelines will facilitate the execution of future projects and activities with a DRR emphasis, as a response to the increasing urbanization in Latin America. It is necessary to have systematization processes like this for urban projects with DRR focus.

Responses from the Donor Perspective—USAID Project Officer

1. In terms of project management, was systematization a different experience for you? In what way was it different?

- As a donor, I looked at systematization on two levels. First, the ability to get relatively



PCI Mixco-Guatemala-
Retaining wall using tires
Photo: PCI

standardized qualitative feedback from implementers was very helpful, not so much in making comparisons, but in provoking reflection on the “why?” behind differential outcomes. Second, since urban DRR using the Neighborhood Approach was a new programmatic area for OFDA/LAC, it was useful to have real-time information, as we were able to adjust subsequent calls for proposals based on findings coming out of systematization.

2. Were the tools and instructions provided at the beginning of the project useful?

- I think they were useful in establishing a common basis for analysis across the projects. As time has gone on, certain implementers have progressed far beyond the parameters of the original tools, as they have introduced other analytical frameworks to the process.
- I think it would be valuable to revisit the tools, particularly the key question matrix, in order to sharpen some of the subject areas and reduce repetitiveness.

3. Could you identify some difficulties faced by the project teams in the implementation of systematization?

- The key question matrix is “biased” towards OFDA’s desired outcomes for the projects, as evidenced by the choice of cross-cutting themes. As such, the degree to which implementers felt comfortable working toward those themes comes out in the answers to the systematization questions; the more adept the organization was at promoting those outcomes, the richer the discussion within the systematization.



4. How was the systematization process perceived by your colleagues within the agency but outside the project teams?

- At the level of the LAC team, there is a lot of expectation with regard to the systematization process. Within the M&E group, there was significant interest in the process and tools. Finally, among the technical assistance advisors, there is a great desire for OFDA to be able to engage in the international dialogue on urban issues. The systematization document is seen as an opportunity for OFDA to share findings in these forums.

5. Can you identify specific circumstances detected by the systematization process that implied important project changes/adjustments?

- From OFDA's standpoint, the decision to entertain projects of up to a three-year duration came directly from the findings of systematization on sustainability. In addition, the successive calls for proposals placed increasing levels of emphasis on engagement of/coordination with new actors, with the purpose of developing new "business models" for working on DRR in marginal urban neighborhoods.

6. If you were to ask for systematization in a future project, what would you change or make different, and why?

- I would have thought more about how to present the results. I feel that if we had focused more on what the final document would look like, we probably could have developed stronger tools.

7. Could you justify/explain in a few words why systematization is important in implementing projects such as Urban DRR?

- Given that urban DRR was a new area of programming for OFDA, it was important to pick up tendencies/findings along the way, so as to ensure their documentation; much of the rich detail of implementation is lost when ex post evaluations are the only form of recording the project experience. Also, systematization offered a means of receiving qualitative information in a standardized way from projects operating in different political and developmental contexts. Without systematization as a unifying element, it would have been difficult to engage the projects as a group, and construct based on their experiences.



CHAPTER 7.

Conclusions

The Richness of the Neighborhood Approach

The concept of neighborhood involves much more than a geographic jurisdiction. It is a living fabric of social, economic, and physical features. A neighborhood affords residents an identity and a foothold that provides security, safety and familiarity in an often-chaotic urban world. In the wake of humanitarian crises and natural disasters, neighborhoods are valuable to residents precisely because of these critical features. Protecting the neighborhood and supporting its cohesion and self-determination should be the primary objective of humanitarian and development actors.

In response to challenges experienced by informal settlements, there is clearly a need to balance social interventions that match individual needs and expectations with those that pursue goals associated with a common good. It is the latter that facilitates social mobilization to collectively overcome obstacles such as poverty, marginalization, insecurity and despair. The Neighborhood Approach summons community will on the one hand and changes stereotypical humanitarian responses on the other, to seek participatory processes and innovations in technology and construction and strengthen livelihoods and improve the quality of life in the process. It works to empower communities, helping them become active members of the neighborhood planning processes and local governance mechanisms.



World Concern-Haiti
School-shelter retrofiting
Photo: WCDO

The APS: Inspiring and Convening Significant Change in the Community Relationship

The Neighborhood Approach strives to change the top-down relationship between local governments and communities to build relationships with the private sector and civil society organizations. The approach goes beyond a capacity building initiative. It fosters and facilitates relationships between stakeholders.



The Challenges of the Neighborhood Approach

The Neighborhood Approach inspires and demands a unique set of resources from the implementers.

- The process demands an investment in time. It is hard to envision a Neighborhood Approach project of less than two years in duration.
- There must be a sense of shared responsibility. It is essential to create and stimulate a sense of belonging and commitment among the community and partners so that everyone contributes to the goals of the project, rather than following a programmatic checklist that can result in sporadic and isolated collaborations.
- Working through a Neighborhood Approach demands that project implementers observe, listen, and take the time to understand the 'human dimension' before engaging in technical action.
- Central to understanding the 'human dimension' in the Neighborhood Approach is formulating a sound communication plan accompanied by community participation methodologies.
- Working on a Neighborhood Approach can be challenging because of the inherent uncertainty and lack of continuity in local public administration policies and practices, along with the rapid turnover of public employees.
- Significant incongruities between national and local regulations and processes add to the challenges of the Neighborhood Approach.
- The Neighborhood Approach requires a high level of flexibility in planning and implementation to adapt to permanently evolving circumstances that impact project objectives.

Systematization as a Vehicle for Knowledge Sharing

The purpose of systematizing these projects was to comprehensively analyze and interpret the process of project implementation in a given social context, beyond the traditional monitoring and evaluation, which remains restricted to intermediate and final results. The method was applied in real time allowing timely feedback. As a result, working



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIU | FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

sessions, workshops, field trips, and virtual meetings became a space for reflection and knowledge sharing on planning and implementation, best practices, and difficulties and challenges related to the projects. The process strengthened accountability and generated healthy recommendations for project management and implementation.

The systematization was implemented at two different levels: at the level of the portfolio of NA projects and at the level of each implementing organization. For the former, it provided tools and criteria to analyze a new way of doing business in the humanitarian field, acknowledging that experiences gained are essentially determined by the political, economic, social, cultural and environmental context in which they are implemented. For the latter, systematization facilitated a careful and reflexive review of processes, accompanied by a continued learning process for the implementers. Even though it imposed a significant burden on implementing agencies—in addition to their already heavy project management responsibilities—the four implementing agencies regarded the process as highly valuable.

The donor's decision to incorporate systematization within the terms of the APS and include it as a new item in the implementers' reporting system was instrumental in engendering a collective process wherein implementers actively exchanged knowledge and practices and regularly discussed the projects' progress.

By reflecting on cross-cutting issues such as participation, governance, social inclusion and sustainability, stakeholders were able to note the multilevel impact of the Neighborhood Approach. They observed:

- the level of community member and local partner organization involvement in project design and implementation;
- the involvement of local government in planning processes, allocation of resources, implementation, and regulatory action;
- the extent to which traditionally marginalized groups, specifically youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities were integrated into the project; and
- whether DRR gains (knowledge and skills, physical works and environmental measures) were likely to be sustained after the project was concluded; whether the activities were expanded beyond the original beneficiaries; how these gains influenced new policies, regulatory frameworks, procedures and enforcement mechanisms; and if those were developed.



Annexes

1. OFDA Annual Program Statement 2012
2. Systematization Matrix
3. Monitoring & Evaluation Tools
4. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY**

Annex 1 – USAID/OFDA

Annual Program Statement for Operationalizing a Neighborhood Approach to Reduce Urban Disaster Risk in Latin America and the Caribbean

Read the complete Annual Program
Statement on the web at:

<http://apply07.grants.gov/apply/opportunities/instructions/oppAPS-OFDA-12-000004-cfda98.001-instructions.pdf>

ANNEX 2 – SYSTEMATIZATION MATRIX

Systematization - Questions⁶

Stages	Pre-Project:	Sensitization:	Implementation:	Transfer:	Post-Project:
	Identify and nurture any pre-existing relationships that can provide a foundation for project activities	Introduce project goals to stakeholders to generate buy-in, especially of local and national government agencies	Core project activities and their management	Preparing and actualizing the transfer of responsibility to local partners	Activities between partners to help maintain project outcomes beyond implementation

⁶ Disaster Risk Reduction Program, Florida International University (FIU), supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development’s Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID/OFDA)



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY**

Cross-Cutting Issues	Pre-Project	Sensitization	Implementation	Transfer	Post-Project
Participation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What pre-existing social networks were used to connect with the community? 2. To what degree have local communities been informed about the neighborhoods project and urban risk reduction (indicators: total population/targeted population)? 3. What kinds of community outreach methods were utilized (oral, pamphlets, murals, movies, etc.)? 4. How regularly were awareness-building or education programs on DRR conducted for local communities? 5. How was the community involvement in the definition of the project and its goals? 6. To what degree do communities view urban planning and DRR as worthy objectives to participate in? 7. Was there initial community support once project goals were communicated? 8. Considering of the above, how does the population feel about the neighborhood approach? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What pre-existing social networks were used to connect with the community? 2. To what degree have local communities been informed about the neighborhoods project and urban risk reduction (indicators: total population/targeted population)? 3. What kinds of community outreach methods were utilized (oral, pamphlets, murals, movies, etc.)? 4. How regularly were awareness-building or education programs on DRR conducted for local communities? 5. How was the community involvement in the definition of the project and its goals? 6. To what degree do communities view urban planning and DRR as worthy objectives to participate in? 7. Was there initial community support once project goals were communicated? 8. Considering of the above, how does the population feel about the neighborhood approach? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have local communities been incorporated in the implementation of the neighborhoods approach? 2. Are local communities being incorporated in urban planning and DRR decision-making processes? 3. Are community members being included in skills training for hazard and vulnerability mapping, safe construction, etc.? 4. To what degree did community organizations play a role in selecting mitigation projects, leading community risk mapping, and selection of people for training as well as leading public awareness-raising? 5. How are the most marginalized groups being incorporated? 6. Did programs promote urban risk cultures and associated behavioral change? Describe them. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are there any formalized mechanisms for transition/transfer established? Describe them 2. What kinds of steps were taken to facilitate ownership? 3. Is there a monitoring mechanism in place for the actions transferred? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What kind of measures will be taken to ensure that some kind of relationship remains between the aid agency and local partners? 2. How is it being ensured that the most marginalized are not further excluded once the project concludes?



Cross-Cutting Issues	Pre-Project	Sensitization	Implementation	Transfer	Post-Project
Governance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a government institution responsible for urban planning or urban development? 2. Does a pre-existing legal or organizational framework for risk reduction exist? 3. Are municipal governments legally bound to provide civil protection services? 4. Are there highly visible city officials that are directly accountable to local populations? 5. Are government jurisdictions, responsibilities, and accountability mechanisms clear? 6. What capacities for DRR and urban planning exist within municipal governments (plans, budgets, training, personnel, equipment, and supplies)? 7. Are their local champions for urban planning or DRR in the government? 8. Are there major gaps in DRM and DRR policies and regulations? 9. To what degree are local municipal governments aware of hazards and risks present in their territory? 10. How can you describe the disaster risk governance context—committed, weak, disinterested, or oppositional? 11. To what extent do partnerships exist between communities, the private sector, and local authorities to reduce risk? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what degree have local municipal governments been made aware of the project focused on neighborhoods and urban risk reduction? 2. To what degree is the wider risk management community made aware about the neighborhoods project? Agreement, endorsement? 3. Was there initial municipal support once project goals were communicated? Was there agreement? Was there endorsement? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are municipal governments taking part in the design and implementation of the neighborhoods approach? 2. To what degree did municipal governments play a role in selecting mitigation projects, leading community risk mapping, and selection of people for training as well as leading public awareness-raising? 3. To what degree do municipal authorities view DRR and urban planning as worthy efforts towards which resources should be directed? 4. Are local efforts being tied to new or existing regional and national level campaigns and initiatives? 5. To what degree has this project been politicized by local governments? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What community organizations or municipal governments will be taking charge of what components of the project? 2. What plans were established to maintain the gains of the neighborhood approach? 3. What arrangements remained to insure safe reconstruction? 4. What kind of expectations and responsibilities were established for the local entities that will take responsibility for future developments? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What kind of measures will be taken to ensure that a relationship continues between local community organizations, the private sector, and local governments?



Cross-Cutting Issues	Pre-Project	Sensitization	Implementation	Transfer	Post-Project
Social Inclusion	<p>1. Are development issues specific to the youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities being addressed—such as education, livelihoods, land rights, etc.? Are there previous studies/reports on these matters? Specify by subgroup.</p> <p>2. Are the youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities included in existing legal and organizational frameworks for risk reduction? Or urban planning? Specify by subgroup.</p> <p>3. Are the youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities included in local committees that deal with either development or DRR issues? Specify by subgroup.</p> <p>4. Are their local NGOs that focus on development issues pertaining to the youth, women, the elderly, or persons with disabilities? Specify by subgroup.</p>	<p>1. To what degree are organizations focused on development issues pertaining to the youth, women, the elderly, or persons with disabilities made aware of the neighborhood project? Specify by subgroup.</p>	<p>1. Are local NGOs that address issues concerning the youth, women, the elderly, or persons with disabilities being incorporated in urban planning and DRR decision-making processes? Specify by subgroup.</p> <p>2. Are issues pertaining to the youth, women, the elderly, or persons with disabilities being addressed in the urban planning process? Specify by subgroup.</p> <p>3. Were the perspectives of the young, women, the elderly, or persons with disabilities incorporated in the management and selection of shelters, DRR, or urban planning in general? Specify by subgroup.</p> <p>4. Are the young, women, the elderly, or persons with disabilities incorporated in project planning and implementation? Specify by subgroup.</p>	<p>1. What role will community organizations that address issues pertaining to the youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities have after the transfer of responsibilities to local partners occurs?</p>	<p>1. What plans were established to maintain the gains obtained in this topic under the neighborhood approach?</p>



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY**

Cross-Cutting Issues	Pre-Project	Sensitization	Implementation	Transfer	Post-Project
Sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are there local NGOs that work on development more broadly, and sheltering/housing more specifically? Are there urban social development NGOs that could act as implementing partners? 2. What other development and DRR projects or programs have been implemented in this area? Which organizations participated in these programs' implementation? 3. Have local NGOs been introduced to DRR? Have they done work in DRR? 4. What hazards threaten local communities? Are they associated to environmental or social processes of the community itself? Or processes outside of the community? 5. Participation valuation 6. Governance valuation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what degree is the neighborhood approach being linked to concerns regarding sustainable development (urban planning, economic growth, health, community welfare, safety, DRR) in the eyes of local authorities, NGOs, and community members? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are municipal authorities being trained in urban planning and in DRR—risk and vulnerability assessment, etc.? 2. Are DRR measures being implemented matched to municipal budgets or municipal capacity? How? 3. Is the neighborhood approach attached to livelihoods provisions, skills training, etc.? 4. Are environmental and health interventions considering DRR factors? 5. To what degree do DRR interventions also serve everyday basic needs? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do local hazards and vulnerabilities experienced in urban areas have their root causes in distant environmental and social processes suggesting a need for consideration in any future regional-local and rural-urban projects? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the relationship between local partners and the implementing agency be maintained? 2. Is there a monitoring and evaluation program to ensure progress on project goals?



USAID/OFDA Custom Indicator Reference Sheets LAC Urban DRR Programs

The following tool was developed by the USAID/OFDA M&E team, led by Tiare Cross Eastmond, with inputs from the USAID/OFDA LAC team and FIU. This material was tailored guidance for NGO partners who were awarded under the Urban DRR APS in FY 2014. The intention was to provide templates and guidance to implementers to better capture evidence (data) that help demonstrate the outcomes, not just outputs, of the Urban DRR work.

NOTE: This version only contains the indicators related to the Systematization process



Urban DRR Systematization Indicators

OFDA Urban DRR Custom Indicators	
Urban DRR Systematization Indicators	
1	Percentage of community members involved in project design and implementation
2	Scale of involvement by community-based organizations in the design and implementation of the DRR project (scale is defined)
3	Scale of local government involvement in DRR project (scale is defined)
4	Ratio of vulnerable people (youth, elderly, women, and persons with disabilities) involved in project design and implementation to number of community members involved in these processes. (each group assessed separately)
5	Scale of local activity conducive to sustaining DRR gains (scale is defined)
6	Scale of governance conducive to institutionalize DRR (Scale is defined)
Disaster Risk Reduction and Preparedness	
7	Percent of neighborhood (households) that benefit from results of DRR program
8	Percent of households in neighborhood that report having taken preparedness measures for a natural disaster
9	Percentage of trained people that retain DRR knowledge 3 and 6 months after training
10	Percentage of evacuation centers that meet DRR/preparedness standards
11	Percentage of community members that report at least 3 ways in which their neighborhood is prepared for a disaster
12	Percentage of neighborhood people that receive at least one early warning message—related to real emergencies, drills, or exercises— from local authorities during the life of the project.
13	Percentage of DRR-improvements to community infrastructure that still meet DRR standards 1 year after installation
14	Ratio of functioning to non-functioning preparedness related equipment in neighborhood (radios, communication systems, weather monitoring, etc.) one year after installation
15	Percentage of community members that know at least 3 DRR/preparedness measures to implement in their homes



OFDA Urban DRR Custom Indicators	
Urban DRR Systematization Indicators	
Economic Recovery and Market Systems	
16	Percentage of critical market infrastructure that is vulnerable to disasters or does not meet DRR standards
17	Percentage of households (or local businesses) utilizing formalized financial services
18	Percentage of local small businesses that have a business preparedness or emergency plan that addresses at least two types of hazards
19	Percentage of households reliant on two or fewer sources of income.
Shelter and Settlements	
20	Number of evacuation routes mapped and approved by local authorities
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene	
21	Percentage of neighborhood water or sanitation systems that have DRR-improvements properly working one year after installation
Protection	
22	Percentage of targeted population reporting that the DRR projects, including community protection outcomes, generated a positive change in the protective environment for the target population.



Urban DRR Systematization Indicators

INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #1

Indicator: Percentage of community members involved in project design and implementation

Type of Indicator: Outcome

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percentage of community members from the targeted neighborhood(s) that have participated in the design and implementation of the project. Participation in design of the project can entail attending planning meetings, reviewing proposed plans, voting on various topics related to the project, or attending community meetings on the project more than once. Participation in project implementation includes volunteering time and resources to support the project implementation, in-kind donations. Community members that work as staff on the project will not be counted towards this indicator. Cash-for-work laborers or other community members that receive compensation from the project for their contributions will not be included in this indicator.

This indicator measures the level of community participation, which it is assumed is a critical component to project success and sustainability. This indicator also helps to understand the assumption that people will participate in projects that are meaningful to their lives.

Numerator: Number of people from the targeted neighborhoods involved in project design and implementation

Denominator (if needed): Number of people in the targeted neighborhoods

Unit of Measure: people

Calculation/How to Measure it: numerator divided by the denominator

Disaggregated by (sex, disability, IDP, etc.): gender, neighborhood, HH income, and disability

Disaggregation by neighborhood will help project managers to determine if certain neighborhoods are achieving better involvement from the community. Gender and disability disaggregation will help to measure social inclusion. Household income disaggregation will allow analysis of differing levels of participation based on wealth or poverty.

Data Use: Project managers identify neighborhoods that need more support on community involvement. End of project analysis of participation outcomes.



INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #1

DATA SOURCE & COLLECTION METHODS

Measurement Tool: Meeting attendance sheets, in-kind donation register (time, items, and resources should be recorded)

Data collection method: Review documents on periodic basis to determine calculation.

Data source: Project documents

Location of data collection: Field offices

Frequency and timing of data collection: quarterly

Considerations for seasonality, conflict, and protection issues: There may be legitimate barriers to program participation for the poorest of the neighborhood, women, elderly, and disabled.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Limitations or known issues: Improper recording of meeting attendance and/or in-kind donations. Community members may feel pressured to participate depending on the messaging received, making their participation a measure of obligation rather than choice. As this is a measure in people, this indicator will not capture instances where a few community members have made major contributions to the project. An alternative would be to approximate the labor or value of in-kind contributions that are provided by the community.

Plans for verification: M&E focal point randomly selects several in-kind records to determine if it is accurately capturing what has been donated.

INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #2

Indicator: Score of involvement by community-based organizations in the design and implementation of the DRR project (scale is defined)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #1

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures perceptions of involvement of community-based organizations (CBOs) in the design and implementation of the DRR project using a defined scale. Community-based organizations can be formal non-project organizations, youth organizations, school clubs, informal neighborhood groups, or organizations that have a large geographic coverage but have a neighborhood chapter. Politically aligned community-based organizations are not included in this calculation. This indicator does not include CBOs or organizations that are sub-grantees of the implementing organization.

Scale is defined as follows:

1. Attend project meetings
2. Establish the organization as a DRR counterpart
3. Active (active is defined as leading or participating regularly) involvement in planning
4. Allocation of resources from the CBO to the project
5. Active (active is defined as leading or participating regularly) involvement in implementation

The assumption here is that with wider involvement of CBOs the project will have better participation throughout the community and improve sustainability. The higher the score the more community involvement the project has.

Numerator: Score 1-5

Denominator (if needed): n/a

Unit of Measure: Score

Calculation/How to Measure it: Score each CBO involved in the project individually and then take the average score for all CBOs to provide an average score.

Disaggregated by (sex, disability, IDP, etc.): n/a

Data use: Assess involvement of community during the life cycle of the project. Inform the depth of involvement in the project by CBOs.

DATA SOURCE & COLLECTION METHODS

Measurement Tool: CBO Ranking checklist and score card

Data collection method: Score each CBO individually on the score card and note any supporting information, such as attending meetings on (date/location) or provided XX in in-kind contributions to the project.

Data source: Project files, interviews with project staff, and focus groups.

Location of data collection: Field offices



INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #1

Frequency and timing of data collection: quarterly

Considerations for seasonality, conflict, and protection issues:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Limitations or known issues: This indicator may capture other non-OFDA funded DRR initiatives that are channelled through CBOs.

Plans for verification: Meet with CBOs to confirm level of involvement periodically.

INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #3

Indicator: Participation score of local government involvement in DRR project (scale is defined)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator captures the degree to which local government is involved in the design and implementation of the DRR project. Local government is defined as officials working at the district-level or lower administrative unit. The higher the score, the greater the level of government involvement with the project, which is a positive indicator.

The scale is defined as:

1. Attend project meetings
2. Establish DRR counterpart (point of contact or other official liaison)
3. Active (active is defined as leading or regular participation) involvement in planning
4. Allocation of resources
5. Active (active is defined as leading or regular participation) involvement in implementation
6. Engagement of non-traditional stakeholders
7. Regulatory action

Non-traditional stakeholders are individuals or groups with particular interest in, power or influence on the community, which action can affect (positively or negatively) the project outcomes. (i.e. financial institutions, business and other employment sources, NGO's, civil society organizations, etc.)

Numerator: Score for each municipal government

Denominator (if needed): n/a



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY**

INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #3

Unit of Measure: Score

Calculation/How to Measure it: Provide each municipal government with its own score, take the average of all scores if needed for reporting aggregated scores for the project.

Disaggregated by (sex, disability, IDP, etc.): n/a

Data Use: Analyze the level of government involvement in the project, identify areas where more government involvement could be needed.

DATA SOURCE & COLLECTION METHODS

Measurement Tool: Scorecard for each neighborhood

Data collection method: Review each neighborhood and allocate an appropriate score, include written documentation as to why that score was provided.

Data source: Project staff, interviews with government officials

Location of data collection: Each neighborhood or district

Frequency and timing of data collection: quarterly

Considerations for seasonality, conflict, and protection issues: Depending on the relationship between the government and community, more government involvement could influence the level of involvement from the community or the perception that the project is part of the government.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Limitations or known issues: This indicator may capture additional investments in DRR channeled through local governments. More involvement by the government may not always be a positive outcome for the community. Local governments are limited by available resources to the extent that they can contribute to DRR.

Plans for verification: Verify activities conducted along the scale in person and take photos.





INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #4

Indicator: Ratio of vulnerable people (youth, elderly, women, and persons with disabilities) involved in project design and implementation to number of community members involved in these processes. (each group assessed separately)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator captures the degree of social inclusion in the project among the categories of youth, women, elderly, and people with disabilities. The higher the ratio, the greater the inclusion of each respective group in the design and implementation of the DRR project.

Youth = 15-24 years; Elderly = 59+ years

A person with a disability is someone who has difficulty:

- Seeing, even with glasses,
- Hearing, even with hearing aid(s),
- Walking or climbing steps,
- Remembering or concentrating,
- Caring for one's self, or
- Communicating in their language.

Numerator: # of youth, women, elderly, or disabled involved in project design and implementation. (each group measured separately)

Denominator: # of community members involved in project design and implementation

Unit of Measure: people

Calculation/How to Measure it: Divide the numerator by the denominator.

Disaggregated by: Women, youth, elderly, and disabled.

Data Use: To determine the extent of social inclusion and identify groups that may need additional support or outreach.



INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #4

DATA SOURCE & COLLECTION METHODS

Measurement Tool: Beneficiary registration lists, attendance sheets, etc. All project beneficiary lists must capture these relevant categories. Measurement tools should be designed to ensure that the dignity and confidentiality of the beneficiaries is maintained through use of non-identifiable codes and secure storing procedures.

Data collection method: Review beneficiary lists

Data source: Project documents

Location of data collection: Field offices

Frequency and timing of data collection: quarterly

Considerations for seasonality, conflict, and protection issues: It may be difficult to collect data on these categories in the usual beneficiary sign-in sheets or registration documents due to confidentiality and dignity issues. Care must be taken to ensure the data is collected respectfully.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Limitations or known issues: These groups may have more barriers to participation in the DRR project and may require specific strategies to engage these groups. Double counting may be an issue if the same person participates in three DRR meetings, they might be counted three times. Efforts to avoid double counting should be taken.

Plans for verification: Interview with key informants/leaders from each of these groups to determine if the data is reflective of actual involvement.



INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #5

Indicator: Scale of local activity conducive to sustaining DRR gains (scale is defined)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator captures the degree to which the project's gains in DRR will be sustained after the project is over. This indicator uses a scale to rate the level of local activity (community activity) conducive to sustaining DRR gains. The higher along the scale of activity, the more extensive the local engagement with DRR following project conclusion, and thus the higher the potential for long-term sustainability.

This indicator does not include involvement of CBOs or local government in project planning or implementation, which are captured under other indicators. This indicator aims to capture activity after the project ends and helps to analyze the potential for long-term sustainability.

Scale is as follows (it is a cumulative process):

1. Retain information, knowledge, and skills pertaining to DRR
2. Maintain physical works and environmental measures for DRR (maintenance is defined as regular upkeep and replacement of spare parts needed to ensure continuing functionality)
3. Conduct training, drills, exercises, or community activities related to DRR
4. Expand project to other beneficiaries within the same neighborhood (expansion should be at least 10% of project target population)
5. Expand project to other communities.

Numerator: Score

Denominator (if needed): n/a

Unit of Measure: Score

Calculation/How to Measure it: Review each neighborhood and allocate a score appropriately. To receive a 2, the neighborhood must also have met the criteria for the "1" score.

Disaggregated by (sex, disability, IDP, etc.):

Data use: Determine handover potential and end-of-project areas for support and transition.



INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #5

DATA SOURCE & COLLECTION METHODS

Measurement Tool: Scorecard

Data collection method: Review neighborhoods and allocate a score documenting the criteria met to receive that score. Take average score for project-level reporting.

Data source: Interviews with community members, site visits.

Location of data collection: neighborhoods

Frequency and timing of data collection: after project ends

Considerations for seasonality, conflict, and protection issues:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Limitations or known issues: Partners will have a hard time reporting on this indicator as it is designed to be measured at the end of a project or after a project. This might be more useful for projects that have already been completed.

Plans for verification: Site visits

INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #6

Indicator: Scale of governance conducive to institutionalize DRR (Scale is defined)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This project measures end-of-project governance related to institutionalization of DRR. This indicator should be measured at the district-level or lowest administrative unit in which the project is engaged in. This indicator uses a scale to determine the level of governance that can influence the institutionalization of DRR.

Scale is defined as:

1. Human resources (staff people of the local government) identified
2. Human resources (staff people of the local government) assigned
3. Budget line established
4. Regulatory framework (laws or policies related to improved DRR) established
5. Enforcement of DRR-specific regulations

An assumption here is that regulation by the government will improve DRR long-term institutionalization. The higher along the scale of activity, the more institutionalization of DRR into governance has occurred.



INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET: #6

Numerator: Score

Denominator (if needed):

Unit of Measure: Score

Calculation/How to Measure it: Review each government unit related to the neighborhoods and provide an appropriate score. The scale is cumulative, so the criteria for “1” must be met before ranking a “2”.

Disaggregated by (sex, disability, IDP, etc.):

Decisions to inform: Understand how governance and institutionalization of DRR relate in the project areas.

DATA SOURCE & COLLECTION METHODS

Measurement Tool: Scorecard

Data collection method: Review the neighborhoods government administrative units and provide an appropriate score. Document how the criteria have specifically been met. Conduct interviews with local government officials and observe government meetings.

Data source: local government officials and administrative units

Location of data collection: neighborhoods or government offices

Frequency and timing of data collection: 3,6, and 12 months after the end of the project.

Considerations for seasonality, conflict, and protection issues: Elections and conflict over limited government resources may influence how districts are able to institutionalize DRR>

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Limitations or known issues: This data may capture other non-OFDA investments in DRR in the various project locations. A neighborhood may move up or down the scale over the course of several years. Regulation may not be directly linked to DRR institutionalization in all contexts.

Plans for verification: site visits by M&E staff to verify that the criteria for the score have been met (view regulation documentation, check meeting attendance lists, etc.)



Annex 4.

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACF	Action Contre la Faim
APS	Annual Program Statement
ARRIBA	Save the Children Project: Support to Risk Reduction in Neighborhoods in Lima, Peru. (Apoyo a la Reducción de Riesgos en Barrios de Lima).
CCPC	Communal Civil Protection Committee (Haiti)
CENEPRED	National Center for Estimation, Prevention, and Disaster Risk Reduction (Peru)
CEM	
CISMID	Peruvian-Japanese Center for Earthquake Research and Disaster Mitigation
COCODE	Community Development Committees
CODEDE	Departmental Development Councils
COLRED	Local Disaster Reduction Committee
COMRED	Municipal Disaster Reduction Committee
COMUDE	Municipal Development Council
COMULSAVES	District Health Committees
CONRED	National System for the Coordination of Disaster Reduction (Guatemala)
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
DPC	Directorate of Civil Protection
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EMMA	Emergency Market and Mapping Analysis Tool
ERMS	Economic Recovery and Market Systems
FIU	Florida International University
FY 2012	Fiscal Year 2012
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
INDECI	Civil Defense Institute (Peru)
OMAPED	Municipal Office for Persons with Disabilities (Peru)



PCI	Project Concern International
RGs	Residential Groups
S & S	Shelter and Settlements
SC	Save the Children
USAID/OFDA	United States Agency for International Development, Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
VES	Municipality of Villa El Salvador, Peru
WCDO	World Concern Development Organizaiton
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



FLORIDA
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY