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# List of Abbreviations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **AADMER WP** | ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response Work Programme |
| **ACCORD** | Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development, Inc. |
| **ACDM** | ASEAN Committee for Disaster Management |
| **ACF** | Action Contre la Faim/Action Against Hunger |
| **ADPC** | Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre |
| **AP** | Action Plan |
| **ASEAN** | Association of South East Asian Nations |
| **ASSI** | The ASEAN Safe Schools Initiative |
| **CBAT** | Community Based Action Teams |
| **CBDP** | Community Based Disaster Preparedness |
| **CBDRM** | Community Based Disaster Risk Management |
| **CBDRR** | Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction |
| **CCA** | Climate Change Adaptation |
| **CCDM** | Commune Committee for Disaster Management |
| **CRC** | Cambodian Red Cross |
| **CSO** | Civil Society Organization |
| **DG ECHO** | Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations |
| **DHMA** | Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance |
| **DIPECHO** | European Commission Humanitarian Aid’s Disaster Preparedness Programme |
| **DKI** | Daerah Khusus Ibukota (Special area of the capital city of Jakarta) |
| **DMD** | Disaster Management and Department (Cambodian Red Cross) |
| **DRM** | Disaster Risk Management |
| **DRR** | Disaster Risk Reduction |
| **DRRMO** | Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office |
| **EC** | European Commission |
| **ECHO** | European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations |
| **EPRP** | Emergency Preparedness Response Plans |
| **ERT** | Emergency Response Team |
| **EU** | European Union |
| **EWS** | Early Warning System |
| **EYTD** | Education, Youth, and Training Division |
| **FGD** | Focused Group Discussions |
| **FPP** | Flood Preparedness Program |
| **GIS** | Geospatial Information System |
| **HIP** | Humanitarian Implementation Plan |
| **HVCA** | Hazard, Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment |
| **ICBRR** | Integrated Community Based Risk Reduction |
| **IEC** | Information, Education and Communication |
| **IFRC** | International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies |
| **INGO** | International Non-Governmental Organization |
| **JAG** | Joint Action Group |
| **KSR** | Korps Sukarelwan - Indonesia Red Cross Volunteers |
| **LGU** | Local Government Unit |
| **MARD** | Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development |
| **MOE** | Ministry of Education |
| **MOET** | Ministry of Education and Training |
| **MRC** | Mekong River Commission |
| **NDMO** | National Disaster Management Office |
| **NEDA** | National Economic and Development Authority |
| **NGO** | Non-Governmental Organization |
| **PDRSEA** | Partnerships for Disaster Reduction Southeast Asia |
| **PLUP** | Participatory Land Use Project |
| **PMI** | Palang Merah Indonesia (local name for Indonesian Red Cross) |
| **PWD** | Person(s) With Disabilities |
| **RC** | Red Cross |
| **SATGANA** | Indonesian Red Cross Volunteer Rapid Response Team |
| **SATLINMAS** | Satuan Perlindungan Masyarakat - Community Disaster Risk Reduction |
| **SEDP** | Socio-Economic Development Plan |
| **SOP** | Standard Operating Procedures |
| **SUBU** | Scale Up, Build Up |
| **TOT** | Trainer of Trainers |
| **UNDP** | United Nations Development Programme |
| **UNESCAP** | United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific |
| **VDMC** | Village Disaster Management Committee |
| **VISUS** | Visual Inspection for Safety Upgrading Strategies |
| **WSfC** | Women Saving for Change |

# Executive Summary

The DIPECHO Program in Southeast Asia has generated significant achievements over the past 20 years. With a total EU 70,604,178 disbursed for over 192 projects to support building on partnerships with regional bodies, and consortiums; increasing the capacities of national, sub-national, and local disaster management offices and national government sectors; funding the implementation of disaster risk management (DRM) activities of civil society organizations, United Nations agencies, international, regional and local non-government organizations, inter-governmental organizations; and most especially, building the resilience of communities in Southeast Asia.

DIPECHO has focused on issues and topics on disaster risk reduction (DRR) such as rural and urban flood preparedness, drought preparedness and mitigation, training and capacity building of local, subnational, and national institutions, ensuring sustainability and institutionalization of community-based disaster risk reduction (CBDRR), increasing partnerships for disaster risk reduction, developing and strengthening of early warning systems (EWS), mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development, child-centered and school-based disaster risk reduction, and awareness raising and advocacy. Among the long list of funded projects, DIPECHO has significantly contributed in strengthening the resilience of the communities through the development and evolution of community-based disaster risk reduction, mainstreaming disaster risk reduction, and supporting regional partnerships.

One of most significant contribution of DIPECHO was the support towards the evolution of Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction. From the piloting of different CBDRR approaches and models in different countries and for different areas ranging from drought prone communities, urban areas, and for rural communities, up to the selection of the best CBDRR model which was replicated and up-scaled by the implementing partners in the region. The evolution of CBDRR did not only increase the capacities of the communities, but had also increased the capacities of various agencies and implementing partners such as the National Red Cross societies, and implementing partners such as Action Contre La Faim (ACF), on conducting and implementing CBDRR. Through this, establishments such as the Commune Committee for Disaster Management (CCDM) was created for Cambodia, the strengthening and development of emergency preparedness and response plans (EPRPs) for the provinces, building the resilience by integrating commune investment programs to support DRR mitigation efforts.

Another key achievement of DIPECHO in Southeast Asia is through the Mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Reduction into the development sector – most evidently for the education sector. DIPECHO has effectively supported the advancement of Mainstreaming DRR into the education sector beginning with pilot project supporting Cambodia, Lao PDR, and the Philippines, and towards the upscaling for the whole region through the development of the ASEAN Safe School Initiative which resulted in the creation of the ASEAN Common Framework for Comprehensive School Safety which is now a part of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response Work Programme 2016 – 2020 (AADMER: 2016-2020). In addition, Mainstreaming DRM into Sub-National Development and Physical Planning implemented with the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) in partnership with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in the Philippines was another key achievement. The outputs were able to provide NEDA with a proven and working framework to Mainstreaming DRM and the sub-national level, this pilot project was continued by a different funding agency and was up-scaled, replicated and updated to include climate change adaptation.

Through Regional Partnerships, three key programs presented significant achievements. Firstly, the Partnerships for Disaster Reduction in Southeast Asia (PDRSEA), which was implemented by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) and Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC); the Capacity Building for Preparedness Planning in the Lower Mekong Basin using Flood Information Products, implemented with the Mekong River Commission (MRC) and ADPC; and the ASEAN Safe School Initiative (ASSI). The key achievements under the PDRSEA, include the integration of CBDRR into the National DRM plans of Cambodia, Philippines and Vietnam, which led to the creation of a new disaster management strategy in Vietnam, giving a strong importance to CBDRR. While in the Philippines, CBDRR has been integrated into the local spatial and land-use planning, which was replicated in other municipalities. Through the Mekong River Flood Preparedness Program (FPP), the key achievements include: improved flood preparedness at the local level which contributed to minimizing loss of lives and protection of crops and property while raising the capacities at the district and commune-level. The FPPs were integrated into development plans at the commune and at the district levels, and the NDMOS were able to play a stronger role in coordinating and linking the projects into the national development framework and planning.

With regards to cross-cutting issues, the gender component was integrated into many of DIPECHO projects, and supported child-based disaster risk reduction, and DRR for children with disabilities, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, and drought preparedness for internally displaced populations. The achievements include increased knowledge of and access to DRR information and procedures for disabled children, provision of practice, engaging methods and materials to teachers for disabled children, and improved local authority’s capacity and awareness towards child-focused disaster response and preparedness planning. Children have also increased their knowledge and understanding on disasters, including and increased understanding of their potential roles when disasters strike. These activities have also enabled children to participate in the process of implementation of small mitigation work. In addition CBDRR activities were conducted for ethnic minorities in Vietnam, and drought preparedness were implemented for internally displaced populations in Cambodia.

The key gaps and needs include the following: different forms of capacity building needs, which is specifically tailored to the level of understanding and specific needs and should also utilize monitoring of post-training practices which includes the dissemination of trainings to the districts and to the community; lack of key indicators to understand what makes a community “resilient”; increased understanding on migration, especially in the context of a changing climate; lack of support of other government sectoral departments in program activities; measuring impacts of projects in order to assess the effectiveness of implementations; need to increase focus on supporting sub-national level government units; lack of participation of women at the sub-national and local levels towards DRR; need to support, replicate, and upscale good practices.

The key recommendations and ways forward is to continue to build on the successes of the DIPECHO programming which are focused on sustainability and institutionalization of CBDRR as well as Child-Centered and School Based Disaster Risk Reduction, continued focus on building the capacities of sub-national governments, enhanced focus on poverty reduction which will help decrease vulnerability of communities, continued building the capacities of local NGOs, sustaining the efforts and growth of consortiums so that the reach of DRR implementation are able to increase in geographical scale and thus benefitting more communities; support of small-scale mitigation works and the utilization of appropriate technology which the communities can sustain; continue the advocacy to switch from a reactive mind-set to a pro-active mind-set; use of evidence-based results to support advocacy for the national and sub-national governments to support DRR such as cost-benefit analysis and impact assessments; and continued building on the lessons learned from various DIPECHO projects.

# Introduction

The European Commission Humanitarian Aid department’s Disaster Preparedness Programme (DIPECHO) targets vulnerable people living in disaster-prone regions of the world. The key objective of DIPECHO is to reduce the vulnerability, and future disaster related losses of communities living in the areas most affected by disaster impacts. Focusing on "preparedness" and "mitigation", all DIPECHO projects have a demonstrative purpose. A key element of the DIPECHO strategy is to identify and develop successful models in community-based disaster risk reduction and disaster preparedness that can be replicated elsewhere by vulnerable communities, national or sub-national authorities, other European Commission (EC) funding instruments or other donors.

The Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (DG ECHO) initiated the DIPECHO program in 1996 to improve the capacities of communities at risk to better prepare for and protect themselves against natural hazards. With over EU 70.6 million disbursed for over 192 projects in the past 20 years, DIPECHO has generated significant impacts in disaster risk reduction which resulted in the protection of lives and livelihoods by helping communities and institutions to be better prepared to face disaster risks while promoting disaster preparedness in national and regional frameworks and agendas.

Figure 1. DIPECHO Investments in Southeast Asia

Figure 1 shows that DIPECHO has invested in 23 projects at the regional level, with a total funding of EU 10.3 m in a total of 20 years, along with 3 projects funded through a multi-country program with a total of EU 1.9 m. Under the DIPECHO Programme, Vietnam has conducted the most projects with a total of 43 projects, while Cambodia shows the largest investment with an estimated total of EU 12.9 m, with a total of 31 projects. This is followed by the Philippines with a total investment of EU 10 m, with 24 projects; Myanmar with a total of EU 6.3 m, with only 5 projects, and Indonesia with over EU 5.9 m, with 21 projects. Other countries such as Timor Leste, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), and Mongolia which was covered under the DIPECHO funding has an estimated total investment of EU 2.15 m for 7 projects.

Figure . Total funding of Regional, multiple country and single country projects covered by DIPECHO from 1996 - 2016

Figure . Total number of agencies funded per country

In the past few decades, the impact of disasters has changed in Southeast Asia. DIPECHO partners, local community, civil society organizations (CSOs), and national and sub-national governments, including regional institutions have developed various evolving coping capacities. In the past-20 years, DIPECHO has provided funding for a total of 113 agencies to support. This financial support reached, 25 agencies in Vietnam, 20 agencies in the Philippines, 16 agencies in Cambodia, 15 agencies in Indonesia, followed by 14 regional agencies.

 Figure 3 shows the number of projects that the programme has supported from the regional, to multi-country, and country projects which has generated achievements towards DRR in Southeast Asia. From 1996 until 2016, 13% of DIPECHO’s investments were focused on regional projects with a total of EU 10,316,772; 2% supporting multiple-country projects with a total of EU 1,921,160, and 85% focused on country-based projects with a total of 148 projects and total investment of EU 58,003,395.

In this backdrop, a study has been developed to capture the extent of DIPECHO contributions in the evolution of DRR in the region which draws out good practices, achievements as well as challenges and key lessons learned. The study seeks to provide concrete recommendations for future DRR on how various partners can continue to build on the resilience of communities.

# Study Briefing

The purpose of the study is to document success stories, good practices, lesson learned and challenges in DRR in the Southeast Asia region over the past two decades, and provide the key recommendations for national Red Cross Societies, I/NGOs, civil society, donors and national, sub-national and local governments to build resilience at all levels.

The key objectives are to:

* Assess the overall progress of DIPECHO programmes for the past 2 decades in South East Asia
* Define a criterion to ascertain good practices and lessons learned under strategic themes; and
* To provide significant recommendations for building resilience of local communities by national and subnational governments and donors, within the context of regional and global DRR frameworks

The research team visited 3-countries in the region: Philippines, Cambodia, and Indonesia. These three countries were purposively selected based on the percentage of funding that has been allocated for the country since 1995. Cambodia has received 19% of funding, followed by Philippines who has received 15% funding. The research team has also exhaustively reviewed various DIPECHO funded-projects from the first action plan, up to the most recent humanitarian implementation plans.

### Methodology

The overall methodology falls into four different phases, namely:

***First Phase: Literature review and defining criteria for good practices***

1. Desk review of DIPECHO funded projects in Southeast Asia for the past 20 years
2. Develop report outline with IFRC/Bangkok and ECHO
3. Develop study criteria to determine good practices

***Second Phase: Developing set of good practices and list of respondents***

1. Develop 3W (who, where, why) of DIPECHO projects during the past 2 decades
2. Identify key thematic areas by conducting desk review and consultation meetings with IFRC/Bangkok and ECHO
3. Develop study plan including methodology for data collection
4. Produce a list of potential key partners and potential respondents based on desk review and consultation with IFRC/Bangkok and ECHO

***Third Phase: Data collection, analysis and reporting***

1. Identify specific countries and partners in the region and carry out focus group discussions/workshops to maximize participatory outputs in the selected countries.
2. Selection of good practices, key challenges, gaps, and recommendations based on the outputs of FGDs and workshops
3. Conduct key informant interviews
4. Prepare the first draft of the report for discussion and feedback from implementing partners and experts from each thematic area

***Fourth Phase: Southeast Asia Regional Workshop and final report***

1. Prepare for the Southeast Asia Regional workshop
2. Develop the agenda in-line with the purpose and objectives of the study, identify participants, and facilitate the workshop
3. Finalize report the submit the completion of the final report

### Data analysis process

* In-depth desk study and review of all project documentation gathered from DIPECHO regional office in Bangkok, including strategy papers, EU/ECHO policy, Action Plans, previously conducted external reports, regional and national consultative meeting reports, programme guidelines, partner documents.
* Country focus-group discussions/workshops with in-country project partners focused on thematic areas and assessment/selection criteria
* Key informant interview with key individuals to ensure recovery of institutional memory. Ex. tracking down of project partner national staff, former expatriate staff, local implementing partners, government key persons from NDMOs.
* The desk research, focus-group discussions, workshops, and key informant interviews will be analyzed and drafted and crossed referenced with the pre-selected good practices for validation
* Develop list of good practices, including regional lessons learned and challenges

# Selection Criteria for Good Practices

## Initial Assessment Criteria for Selection of Good Practices

The initial assessment criteria is the preselection step of good practices and was used as key guiding questions for interviews and focused group discussions.

***Achievements***

Understanding the note-worthy results and accomplishments of the projects.

***Impacts***

The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.

***Sustainability***
Concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

***Key Success/Failure Factors***

Understanding the key successes and failures, and the root causes of the success and failure, including the challenges and gaps of the thematic programme.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Guiding Questions |
| Achievements | * What has been done?
* What were the significant changes?
* How has the engagement of the community/schools changed as a result of the project?
 |
| Impact | * What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
* What impact has the project/programme made to the beneficiaries?
 |
| Sustainability | * To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ended?
* Was there an exit strategy that was put in place before the programme finished?
 |
| Key Success/ Failure Factors | * What went well?
* What are the future opportunities for improvement?
* What are the key challenges and gaps in ECHO programming
	+ How have they overcome the challenges and gaps?
 |
| Lessons Learned | * What has been the key learnings of ECHO in the past 20 years?
* What has been the key contribution of ECHO in the region?
* What should be the role of ECHO in the future for the region?
 |

## Final judgement criteria for selection of good practices

A final judgment criteria was utilized for the selection of good practices and helped expand the good practices through the use of specific indicators. The result of the data collection indicated that there has been more good practices outside the pre-selected good practices, this methodology attempts to retrieve the information through the review of previous evaluations and final reports from various project implemented under DIPECHO funding. As a result of the judgement criteria and indicators helped in the second round of good practices selection. The list can be seen on Table 1 below:

|  |
| --- |
| Table 1: Judgement Criteria for Selection of Good Practices |
| Criteria/Judgement Criteria | Indicators |
| 1. Addressing the needs of the most vulnerable communities in the areas most affected by natural hazards
	1. Policies, programmes, and plans addresses the needs of the most vulnerable
	2. Actions are in-line with national priorities
 | * Projects are based on risk and needs assessments with special attention to vulnerable groups
* Actions include an analysis of government priorities and consultation with key stakeholders
 |
| 1. Contribution to reducing vulnerabilities, increasing capacities of at risk populations, local government, and national institutions
	1. Changes in resilience at local, provincial and national-level on DRR
	2. Evidences of positive changes as a result of activities
	3. Replication of DRR actions in other areas
 | * Stakeholders and beneficiaries reporting that projects have increase their resilience and coping capacity
	+ Community, local and national
 |
| 1. Contribution to improving national response capacities, including preparation and awareness of local communities
	1. Project have increased response capacity to stakeholders and partners at the community, local and provincial levels
 | * CBDRR/CBDRM programs were updated/improved/replicated
 |
| 1. Complements national priorities actions, endorsement, and supported by national government
 | * Government is informed and endorses activities
 |
| 1. Cross-cutting issues are taken into account in the implementation (children, environmental impacts, gender, PWD, displaced populations)
	1. Cross-cutting issues identified and considered in the implementation
	2. Consultation with vulnerable groups
 | * Project includes specific vulnerability criteria
* Project planning and implementation uses participatory process
* Actions which are focused on cross-cutting issues
 |
| 1. Project had lasting effects after end of project
	1. Caused direct or indirect long-term effects
 | * Extent to which actions/exit plans have a sustainability strategy
* Evidences of long-term impacts after the end of the project
* Evidences that the project was continued by other initiatives
 |

# Key Achievements

Based from the review of documents, key informant interviews, focused group discussions, consultations, and through the methodology indicated in the selection criteria, DIPECHO’s key achievements in the past 20 years has been focused on 3 key themes: Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction/Management, Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development, and Regional Partnerships.

The achievements under Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction/Management are evident through the good practices of community drought preparedness, child-centered DRR, urban disaster preparedness, replication and upscaling of CBDRR, and integrating CBDRR into local development. These projects include cross cutting issues on children, gender, elderly, persons with disabilities, internally displaced populations, and other issues such as climate change.

The achievements under Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development are evident through the good practices of Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector, which includes cross cutting issues on children with disabilities, ethnic minorities, gender, and persons with disabilities. Other achievements include Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-National Development Planning.

Through Regional Partnerships, the key achievements are evident through projects relevant to upscaling CBDRR, supporting transboundary partnerships, and Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector in Southeast Asia.

The table below maps the various selected good practices under the three thematic areas which includes the sub-themes, good practice number, and the good practice title. To use this table, the good practices are located in the annexes with a box referring to the good practice number, the theme, sub-theme and cross cutting issues that the project covers.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Theme** | **Sub-theme** | **Good Practice #** | **Good Practice Title** |
| Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction |  CBDRR Modelling | 02 | Integrated Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction Programme |
| 03 | A Model for Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction |
| Child-Centered DRR | 08 | Increasing reach of community-based child-focused disaster  |
| Drought Preparedness | 01 | Reducing the Impact of Drought in Oddar Meanchey Province |
| Urban Disaster Preparedness | 06 | Strengthening of Integrated local level disaster risk reduction in three slum areas of DKI Jakarta |
| Upscaling CBDRR | 16 | Disaster Preparedness and Flood Mitigation Project in Cambodia |
| 05 | Scale up, Build Up: Strengthening local alliances and advocacy and empowering champions on disaster risk reduction |
| 14 | Scaling up Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Lao PDR |
|   |   |  |   |
| Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development | Mainstreaming DRR into Education | 07 | Disaster Risk Reduction and Inclusive Schools: Widening access for disable children |
| 09 | Advocacy and pilot project implementation in Education Sector in 3 South East Asian RCC member countries |
| 13 | ASEAN Safe Schools Initiative |
| 15 | Joint Partnership to support the advancement of the National Community-based Disaster Risk Management program and Ministry of Education and Training action Plan on Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change |
| Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-National Development Planning | 10 | Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management (DRM) in Sub-National Development and Land Use/Physical Planning in the Philippines |
| 11 | Partnership for Disaster Reduction in Southeast Asia (PDR-SEA 4) |
| 14 | Scaling up Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Lao PDR |
|   |   |  |   |
| Regional Partnerships | Upscaling CBDRR | 11 | Partnership for Disaster Reduction in Southeast Asia (PDR-SEA 4) |
| Transboundary Partnerships | 12 | Strengthen Implementation of the Flood Preparedness Program at Provincial, District and Commune Levels in the Lower Mekong Basin |
| Mainstreaming DRR into Education Sector | 13 | ASEAN Safe Schools Initiative |

## Thematic Area 1: Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction

The selected good practices under the thematic area: Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction utilizes the sub-themes of CBDRR Modelling, Child-Centered DRR, Drought Preparedness, Urban Preparedness, Integrating CBDRR into Sub-National Development Planning, and Upscaling CBDRR.

### Sub-Theme 1.1. Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction Modelling

A number of good practices has been selected on CBDRR. The good practices that stood out was through the evolution on CBDRR in Cambodia and in Indonesia by developing working models relevant to the context, and how it progressed towards building community resilience. The first good practice selected is entitled “A Model for Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Cambodia”, implemented by Danish Red Cross and Cambodian Red Cross (CRC), which ran from the 3rd AP until the 6th AP, and the second good practice is the “Integrated Community-Based Risk Reduction Programme” in Indonesia, implemented by Danish Red Cross and Palang Merah Indonesia (Indonesia Red Cross).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 03; Annex Page 5 |
| **Title** | **A Model for Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction by the Cambodian Red Cross** |
| **Theme** | CBDRR |
| **Sub-theme** | CBDRR Modelling |

**Key Achievements**

* The CBDRR model was approved by the CRC-Disaster Management Department (DMD), and was disseminated to organizations involved in DRR in Cambodia and in Southeast Asia.
* There has been indications that community awareness and actions to prepare for disaster impacts is high, especially with the villagers who have directly benefitted from the implementation. There has also been evidences that the improvements on the attitudes and practices of the villagers on DRR are visible.
* Communities have benefitted from different DRR measures, and has shown to strengthen their standards of living and by augmenting livelihood sources.
* The core purpose of developing models is so that the activities and approaches used in this project can be institutionalized and replicated by the CRC in other natural disaster-prone areas of Cambodia, which became evident in the Phase 3 of project which aimed to upscale and replicate the CBDRR model.
* The establishment of the direct linkages between the CBDRR and the commune committees for disaster management makes sure that local government continue to play a vital role in the CBDRR processes and activities.
* Some of the key achievements related to the advocacy component is related to disaster management planning, such as the establishment of the emergency preparedness response plans (EPRP), commune DRR plans. Similarly, the development of the school DRR curriculum including the development and dissemination and launching of the education EPRP guidelines was one of key impacts of the advocacy work.
* As a result of capacity building activities, DM plans are in place for sub-national DM institutions for the target areas, and EPRPs and DRR plans are integrated into all commune plans.
* The project produced tangible impacts to improve resilience and a majority of the outcomes are sustained by the targeted communities and institutions.
* The project has had a strong gender focus. This has led to the production of a study on gender sensitivity in DM which can help inform future interventions. Specific leadership training for women has given them additional opportunities to understand how they can contribute as leaders.
* Women have been empowered through their involvement in Women Saving for Change (WSfC) groups and also by promoting more women as members of Village Disaster Management Committees (VDMCs) and by acting as demonstrators of CBDRR models which can be replicated by other community members.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 02; Annex Page 3 |
| **Title** | **Integrated Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction Programme** |
| **Theme** | CBDRR |
| **Sub-theme** | CBDRR Modelling |
| **Cross-cutting** | Children, Women, Elderly |

**Key Achievements**

* The program showed an increased capacity of PMI branches on DRR and was achieved through the empowerment of KSR, SATGANA and CBAT.
* The KSR and SATGANA members has acquired a better knowledge on DRR, and proved better knowledge on risk assessments, and increased skills in community mobilization and conducting participatory approaches and methods.
* Due to the community involvement and participation, public knowledge on DRR has increased regarding their vulnerability and capacities towards various hazards.
* Physical mitigation program was reported as able to reduce the risk of losing assets in time of hazards. Risk map with the evacuation route was considered as effective in reducing the risk of fatal casualties as testified by some families from Sepabatu who were affected by flash floods in Polewali in January 2009.
* The CBAT demonstrated their potential leadership in terms of disaster preparedness in the community. The creation of the CBAT was considered to be the most significant achievement.
* At the branch and regional level of PMI, CBAT has increased regional capacity in developing disaster preparedness and emergency response. It was reported that CBAT was active & well-coordinated with PMI at branch level and support other CBAT groups in other villages.

### Sub-Theme 1.2. Child-Centered Disaster Risk Reduction

Under the sub-theme of child-centered DRR, one of the selected good practice is the project on “Increasing reach of community-based child-focused disaster preparedness and response” by Save the Children in Vietnam.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 08; Annex Page 15 |
| **Title** | **Increasing reach of community-based child-focused disaster preparedness and response** |
| **Theme** | CBDRR |
| **Sub-theme** | Child-Centered Disaster Risk Reduction |
| **Cross-cutting** | Children |

**Key Achievements**

* Improved local authorities’ capacity and awareness to cope with disasters through community based and child-focused disaster response and preparedness planning, increased awareness of children’s rights and knowledge of children’s needs; capacities and resources to deal with disasters; and to raise matching funds for activities.
* Increased awareness for children’s rights.
* Increased the capacity of the local community through development of risk maps and disaster preparedness plans.
* Improved children’s knowledge and understanding on disasters, and their potential roles during disasters, and how they can provide support to parents.
* Increased involvement of teachers, and educationists to be involved and willing to learn new skills to facilitate child participation in the community-based DRM process.
* Active participation of children in the process of developing Disaster Preparedness Plans in which they have performed risks mapping and developed recommendations for the local CBDRR plans and discussed with adults about specific actions, including mitigation works which would help protect children at times of disasters.
* Dynamic participation of children in the process of implementation of small mitigation work. Providing their feedback on the design of the mitigation works to be done and also on the quality of the construction work through regular monitoring exercises. They also participated together with adults in developing the Operation and Maintenance Regulations for safe spaces and small-scale mitigation works.

### Sub-Theme 1.3. Drought Preparedness

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 01; Annex Page 1 |
| **Title** | **Reducing the Impact of Drought in Oddar Meanchey Province** |
| **Theme** | CBDRR |
| **Sub-theme** | Drought Preparedness |
| **Cross-cutting** | Internally Displaced Populations |

Under the sub-theme of drought preparedness, a good practice was evident from the “Reducing the Impact of Drought in Oddar Meanchey Province” under the 4th until the 6th Action Plan, by a project led by ZOA.

**Key Achievements**

* Increased, and stabilized vegetables and cash crops through successful harvests in drought prone areas.
* Established of DRR fund in which the most vulnerable households in the villages had access to fund which were used to reduce their vulnerability to identified hazards, especially droughts.
* Training of government officers and staff increased their knowledge and enabled them to discharge their services better.
* The Participatory Land Use Project (PLUP) which has been adopted by the Ministry of Land Management, and considered as the most appropriate for the ministry’s responsibility of defining boundaries for the whole country.
* The result of the activities increased the enthusiasm of the villagers, and expressed the need to undergo further training to deepen their understanding of droughts, and to participate in study tours and implement their learnings on how these new knowledge can contribute to their ability to mitigate against disasters.

### Sub-Theme 1.4. Urban Disaster Preparedness

Good practices were also evident in Urban CBDRR. Focusing on the implementation of “Integrated Local Level DRR in the Three Slum Areas of DKI – Jakarta” which was implemented by Action Contre La Faim (ACF) under 3rd until the 6th AP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 06; Annex Page 11 |
| **Title** | **Strengthening of Integrated local level disaster risk reduction in three slum areas of DKI Jakarta** |
| **Theme** | CBDRR |
| **Sub-theme** | Urban Disaster Preparedness |

**Key Achievements**

* The Satlinmas from the three Kelurahan were restructured and updated their standard operating procedures (SOP). The capacities of the Satlinmas were increased through ERT trainings and have increased the effective coordination of flood response because of the revised SOP.
* There were evidences of improved early warning systems which is linked to the upper administrative levels and warning providers are effectively and efficiently receiving information.
* The enhancement of community flood response through trainings and equipping of ERT teams has been sustainable and are still evident to date.
* The development of local champions proved to have positive impacts, some residents who have had positive practices was considered an agent of change and are being asked to share his/her lessons learned exchanges in other areas.
* Flood response is well coordinated and managed by SATLINMAS through application of revised SOPs and new skills (acquired from various trainings).
* Early warning system has been upgraded, linked to highest administrative level and all the warning providers have received alert information in due time.
* Local awareness of the communities have increased, and in the sustained maintenance of the preparedness measures that were conducted such as the use of evacuation routes, youth and women groups, and emergency response teams (ERTs).
* The local community has established a strong ownership as a result of the project, and has been confirmed that the trainings and equipment’s such as walkie-talkies, and bullhorns provided to the ERTs still exists to date.
* Flood readiness of the authorities has improved a lot due to the simulation exercises, which have helped communities, for instance, authorities have gained greater clarity about the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders accountable for flood response.

### Sub-Theme 1.5. Upscaling CBDRR

Another key achievement of the DIPECHO programme in Southeast Asia also includes the up-scaling and institutionalization of CBDRR. Which is evident in the countries of Lao PDR (9th AP), Philippines (8th AP), and in Cambodia (4rd AP). Based on the significant experience in supporting the evolution of CBDRR, DIPECHO continued to support the initiative by funding agencies and organizations on building the resilience of communities by upscaling CBDRR so that more communities can benefit from the learnings of various projects.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 14; Annex Page 27 |
| **Title** | **Scaling up Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Lao PDR** |
| **Theme** | CBDRR |
| **Sub-theme** | Upscaling CBDRR |

**Key Achievements**

* Development of a National DRR platform with strong support among the Government of Lao Ministries and the INGO sector.
* Work packages and tools, including formats and guidelines for disaster preparedness at the district and province level were standardized. This also includes standardized guidelines on integrating DRR into Village Socio-economic Development Plans, revision of school DRR materials, guidelines in integrating gender considerations into DRR, development and dissemination of policy briefs, mapping of information, education and communication (IEC) materials, revision of the CBDRR model, and the media kit information.
* DRR skills of district focal points, disaster management focal points, village disaster preparedness units, and teachers and school principals had improved.
* The disaster preparedness capacities of teachers and school principals have increased, and DRR has been integrated into lesson plans.
* Knowledge of the Government of Lao partners at the provincial and district levels have increased as a result of the project activities.
* Trainings for media professionals has been conducted to enhance their role in public awareness.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 05; Annex Page 9 |
| **Title** | **Scale up, Build Up: Strengthening local alliances and advocacy and empowering champions on disaster risk reduction** |
| **Theme** | CBDRR |
| **Sub-theme** | Upscaling CBDRR |
| **Cross-Cutting** | Children, Persons with Disabilities |

**Key Achievements**

* There are evidences that Barangays and Municipalities are now better prepared and are able to proactively intervene during emergencies, this was demonstrated during the impact of Typhoon Haiyan where the targeted Barangays were able to evacuate properly and some Barangays covered under the Scale Up-Build Up (SUBU) project have reacted better compared to Barangays without similar implementation.
* The SUBU project addressed clear gaps at Local Government Unit (LGU) level by providing high standard trainings to Barangays committees and appropriate support to Municipal and Provincial Disaster Risk Reduction and Management offices (DRRMOs) to understand their roles and responsibilities in line with National DRR Law, and to acquire the requested knowledge in CBDRRM.
* SUBU project was able to (i) reinforce the School Disaster Management Framework with proper planning, (ii) improve the quality of the education around disaster risks with appropriate school lessons material, and shall also (iii) benefit to school safety by integrating DRR into their School Improvement Plans (SIP).
* The integration of inclusive CBDRR allowed the SUBU project to also cover the needs of PWDs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 16; Annex Page 31 |
| **Title** | **Disaster Preparedness and Flood Mitigation Project in Cambodia** |
| **Theme** | CBDRR |
| **Sub-theme** | Upscaling CBDRR |

**Key Achievements**

* CRC training team had conducted and increased the capacities of other organizations involved in disasters management, such as Vadhanak,, Action Against Hunger, and Lutheran World Services, all in Kampong Chhang
* CRC was also able to replicate the training for Lao RC, Thai RC, Myanmar RC, and Vietnam RC.
* Community Based Disaster Preparedness (CBDP) program incorporated the CRC knowledge in disaster management for all levels and built up the CRC organization capacity for disaster management.

## Thematic Area 2: Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development

DIPECHO has also significantly supported Mainstreaming of DRR into the development sectors – especially for the education sector in Southeast Asia, which is evident through the Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector in three countries implemented by ADPC/UNDP in 2007, the ASEAN Safe School Initiative, pilot programs on DRR and inclusive schools, and increasing the capacities of the Ministry of Education in Cambodia. Mainstreaming DRR into the Sub-National and Local Development Planning is another key achievement through three key projects under the Mainstreaming DRM into Land Use and Physical Planning in the Philippines, Partnership for DRR in Southeast Asia, and Scaling Up Community Based DRR in Lao PDR.

### Sub-Theme 2.1. Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 09; Annex Page 27 |
| **Title** | **Advocacy and pilot project implementation in Education Sector in 3 Southeast Asian RCC member countries** |
| **Theme** | Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development |
| **Sub-theme** | Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector |

**Key Achievements**

* Effectively advanced the mainstreaming of DRR in the three target countries. Of importance was the recognition for the Ministry of Education (MOE) to take ownership of, and priorities, this crucial initiative.
* Expanded educational technical working groups to address and guide the various activities of the project (including the curriculum, future planning frameworks and guidelines for school construction). Within the three countries the existing DRR supplements for lower secondary schools have been integrated and pilot tested within the school curriculum and approved by the MOE.
* Reviewed suitable IEC materials, where appropriate adapted, and approved along with teaching materials and lesson plans. Additional steps toward institutionalizing DRR in the curriculum have included the successful development of teacher trainer (ToT) modules.
* Progressed the guidelines for inclusion of Hazard Resistant Features in School Construction in all three countries to various stages.
* Increased awareness at the policy level on the need to mainstream DRR into the education sector.
* Enhanced the networking among the government agencies.
* Strengthened commitments of the ministries of education and the national disaster management office.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 13; Annex Page 25 |
| **Title** | **ASEAN Safe Schools Initiative** |
| **Theme** | Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development |
| **Sub-theme** | Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector |

**Key Achievements**

* Development of the ASEAN common framework for comprehensive school safety in ASEAN; launch of this ASEAN Common Framework, rollout/application of the framework in three ASEAN member states through workshops and trainings; development of two sets of school safety resource materials (School Disaster Risk Management Guideline and Overview of Hazard, Vulnerability, and Capacity Assessment Tools);
* During the 4th ASEAN Committee for Disaster Management (ACDM) meeting Prevention and Mitigation Working group meeting, ACDM reviewed the concept note and appreciated the ASSI progress.
* Supported the participation of key stakeholders from MoE and NDMO in key events on Safe Schools and DRR in the region. During the WCDRR, an ASSI roundtable meeting was organized; ASSI brought in MoE representatives from Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Indonesia;
* The ACDM, ASEAN DHMA and EYTD reaffirmed its commitments to ASSI and have fully supported making a programmatic approach for ASSI in the AADMER WP 2016-2020.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 07; Annex Page 13 |
| **Title** | **Disaster Risk Reduction and Inclusive Schools: Widening access for disable children** |
| **Theme** | Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development |
| **Sub-theme** | Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector |
| **Cross Cutting** | Children with Disabilities |

**Key Achievements:**

* Teachers have reported that both non-disabled and disabled students are more confident to face disasters, finding that safe room setting tips were helpful because it was practical and easy to understand and implement.
* Special support teachers have mentioned that ASB’s training has been important and useful, because before the training was conducted, they were unaware on what inclusive schools mean, indicating an increase in the knowledge of inclusive DRR for teachers.
* The project developed working practical models for district and provincial governments. The model provided a structure and system which is being replicated by ministries in other communities and distracters.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 15; Annex Page 29 |
| **Title** | **Joint Partnership to support the advancement of the National Community-based Disaster Risk Management program and Ministry of Education and Training action Plan on Disaster risk reduction and Climate Change** |
| **Theme** | Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development |
| **Sub-theme** | Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector |
| **Cross Cutting** | Ethnic Minorities, Children, Gender, Persons with Disabilities, Climate Change Adaptation |

**Key Achievements:**

* Organized a National Training of Trainers course on DRR/CCA education with participation of teachers, education managers and youth leaders.
* Package of materials, trainings and school activities to document the implementation process for MOET action plan from national to local level.
* DRR/CCA materials on school based training/IEC packages developed from the JANI projects 3 and 4 were printed and shared with educational leaders and teachers at the provincial levels
* 12 technical support groups on CBDRR were established in 4 project provinces, rolling out the national CBDRR and implementing the national CBDRR in project activities.
* Technical working groups and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) group members in four provinces have been trained on M&E, which was applied during the course of the project.

### Sub-Theme 2.2. Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-National Development Planning

Achievements under the Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-national Development Planning is focused on three projects: Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management (DRM) in Sub-National Development and Land Use/Physical Planning in the Philippines; Partnership for Disaster Reduction in Southeast Asia (PDR-SEA 4); and Scaling up Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Lao PDR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 10; Annex Page 19 |
| **Title** | **Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management in Sub-national Development and Land Use/Physical Planning in the Philippines** |
| **Theme** | Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development |
| **Sub-theme** | Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-National Development Planning |

**Key Achievements**

* The Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRM in Sub-National Development and Physical Framework Planning was adopted by the project Board.
* Two hundred seventy eight (278) planners from the national government, regional line agencies and representatives from non-government organizations trained, exceeding the target one hundred ninety (190) trainees.
* Sixteen (16) Regional and Provincial case studies (a.k.a. Preliminary Assessments of Hazard Impacts and Risk Managements) showed how DRR assessments can be inputted into the sub-national plans.
* The result of the pilot project proved to be beneficial – the project was continued and adopted by a different funder, which targeted to increase the pilot project in scale, replicated, and updated to include climate change adaptation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 11; Annex Page 21 |
| **Title** | **Partnership for Disaster Reduction in Southeast Asia (PDR-SEA 4)** |
| **Theme** | Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development |
| **Sub-theme** | Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-National Development Planning |

**Key Achievements**

* In the case of the Philippines the National, Provincial and local authorities started the process of integration of CBDRR into local spatial and land-use planning. The NDMO made replicated the entire process in two other municipalities.
* Three synthesis papers were authored and circulated among 1000 disaster management practitioners, offering a good summary of CBDRR and cited more than 150 references.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 14; Annex Page 27 |
| **Title** | **Scaling up Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Lao PDR** |
| **Theme** | Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development |
| **Sub-theme** | Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-National Development Planning |

**Key Achievements**

* A national DRR platform was developed with strong support among the Government of Lao ministries and the INGO sector.
* Work packages and tools, including formats and guidelines for disaster preparedness at the district and province level were standardized. This also includes standardized guidelines on integrating DRR into Village Socio-economic Development Plans.
* Knowledge of the Government of Lao partners at the provincial and district levels have increased as a result of the project activities.
* Trainings for media professionals has been conducted to enhance their role in public awareness.

## Thematic Area 3: Regional Partnerships

Another key achievements as a result of DIPECHO programming in Southeast Asia is the support of regional partnerships. The major projects in focus is the “Partnerships for Disaster Reduction Southeast Asia (PDRSEA)” implemented by UNESCAP and ADPC, the “Capacity Building for Preparedness Planning in the Lower Mekong Basin using Flood Information Products” with the Mekong River Commission (MRC) and ADPC; and the ASEAN Safe Schools Initiative.

### Sub-Theme 3.1. Upscaling CBDRR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 11; Annex Page 21 |
| **Title** | **Partnership for Disaster Reduction in Southeast Asia (PDR-SEA 4)** |
| **Theme** | Regional Partnerships |
| **Sub-theme** | Upscaling CBDRR |

**The key achievements under the PDRSEA include:**

* A national DRR platform was developed with strong support among the Government of Lao ministries and the INGO sector.
* Work packages and tools, including formats and guidelines for disaster preparedness at the district and province level were standardized. This also includes standardized guidelines on integrating DRR into Village Socio-economic Development Plans, revision of school DRR materials, guidelines in integrating gender considerations into DRR, development and dissemination of policy briefs, mapping of information, education and communication (IEC) materials, revision of the CBDRR model, and the media kit information.
* DRR skills of district focal points, disaster management focal points, village disaster preparedness units, and teachers and school principals had improved.
* Preparedness of teachers and school principals have increased, and DRR has been integrated into lesson plans.
* Knowledge of the Government of Lao partners at the provincial and district levels have increased as a result of the project activities.
* Trainings for media professionals has been conducted to enhance their role in public awareness.
* Hazard, vulnerability and capacity assessments conducted and has been effective in developing disaster action plans.

### Sub-Theme 3.2. Transboundary Partnerships

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 12; Annex Page 23 |
| **Title** | **Strengthen Implementation of the Flood Preparedness Program at Provincial, District and Commune Levels in the Lower Mekong Basin** |
| **Theme** | Regional Partnerships |
| **Sub-theme** | Transboundary Partnerships |

As for transboundary partnerships under the Mekong River Flood Preparedness, the key achievements are:

* Improved flood preparedness at the local (commune, district, provincial) level will contribute to minimize losses of lives and protect the crops and property of the most vulnerable groups in society. It does not directly alleviate poverty, but it prevents poor people from suffering.
* At the macroeconomic level, the reduction in losses frees resources for government and private investments, thereby indirectly contributing to poverty alleviation.
* Raised capacity and securing future implementation at district and commune-level in established project areas and at provincial level in new provinces. A number of FPP activities were incorporated into development plans at commune and at the district level, and in line ministry / department of Lao PDR and Cambodia.
* The project was able to build in the added value and lessons learned of earlier phases, including the networks and relationships built through the phases – many of the activities were an extension and strengthened previous accomplishments.
* NDMOs played a stronger role in coordinating and in linking the project implementation to the national development frameworks and planning.

### Sub-theme 3.3. Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Case Study** | 13; Annex Page 25 |
| **Title** | **ASEAN Safe Schools Initiative** |
| **Theme** | Regional Partnerships |
| **Sub-theme** | Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector |

**The Key Achievements under the ASEAN Safe Schools Initiative Include:**

* Development of the ASEAN common framework for comprehensive school safety in ASEAN; launch of this ASEAN Common Framework, rollout/application of the framework in three ASEAN member states through workshops and trainings; development of two sets of school safety resource materials (School Disaster Risk Management Guideline and Overview of Hazard, Vulnerability, and Capacity Assessment Tools).
* Three countries in the ASSI project second phase were involved: Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar. They implemented the Safe School project according to plan and attained the set objectives.
* Supported the participation of key stakeholders from MoE and NDMO in key events on Safe Schools and DRR in the region. During the WCDRR, an ASSI roundtable meeting was organized; ASSI brought in MoE representatives from Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Indonesia;
* Indonesian MoE representative made a remarkable presence at Children and Youth Forum interacting with children on a session titled ‘critical infrastructure: safe school and hospital’.
* During the 4th ACDM meeting Prevention and Mitigation Working group meeting, ACDM reviewed the concept note and appreciated the ASSI progress.
* The ACDM, ASEAN DHMA and EYTD reaffirmed its commitments to ASSI and are in full support of making a programmatic approach for ASSI in the AADMER WP 2016-2020. Potential collaboration with ASEAN Member States and partners was discussed. Delegates from MoE Indonesia and Cambodia shared their experience and learning on school safety in their countries.

# Key Lessons Learned

The lessons learned from the three key thematic areas, including the sub-themes of CBDRR, Mainstreaming DRR into Development, and Regional Partnerships are the following:

## Thematic Area 1: CBDRR

### Sub-Theme 1.1 CBDRR Modelling

* Conduct a more comprehensive dissemination of DRR concept and practices to all board members.
* Greater involvement of local government units in actual program activities, specifically in joint preparedness planning and subsequent simulation exercises as an entry point for local government cooperation and collaboration.
* Need to have long-term commitment to undertake ICBRR from PMI branches in partnership with the local government.
* Simplification of the ICBRR model especially under the specific program process such as HVCA, DRR planning to make sure the local community can easily take over the project and ensure replicability initiated by the community
* Early focus and emphasis on “preparedness for response” to create stronger linkages towards DRR.
* A cautiously design hand over phase should be implemented for all communes and villages.
* Enter collaborative ventures or partnerships with other NGOs implementing long-term development programs for upscaling and replication of the program in other areas.
* Stronger integration of participatory monitoring and review systems at the village level for CBDRR, which is a recognized critical component of the program.
* The role of technical support groups established at the provincial and district levels is very important – this is the core-technical assistance to facilitate the implementation of the National Program on CBDRR when it is rolled out into the community level.
* The members of technical support groups should be structured from both government officials and technical specialists that ensure decision-making process and technical expertise are integrated for cost-efficient implementation. Defining the role of members, building capacities in CBDRR and providing support for the core group is essential for the success of implementation.
* Multi-stakeholder approach applied in the project was a key factor for the successes, and created the follow up management plan after the project phased out. Joint learning events and local capacity building for various stakeholders helped them work together for CBDRR and DRR awareness.
* Addressing the different needs of women, children, elderly and people with disabilities in CBDRR model have been notified as quality indicators for the National Program on CBDRR. Enabling children to participate and learn from DRR initiatives have been considered as good initiatives in the National Program on CBDRR
* Good documentation offers evidence for the advocacy process. The most significant change stories and study cases collected from the implementation of the project illustrate the cause and effect relations between human behavior, perception, and attitudes, and the disaster risks exposed to the community, and provide evidences to verify recommendations for policy and practice changes.

### Sub-Theme 1.2 Child-Centered DRR

* Continued and scaled up focus on building children’s resilience to ensure more long-term impacts.
* Strengthen collaboration with government partners and with education sector to reach more children.
* Conduct training for teachers and education staff on DRR and integrating DRR into their subjects.
* Continued advocacy and support to Ministries of Education to integrate DRR education into schools (secondary or primary).
* To develop materials/curriculum on child-focused DRR to support teachers.
* Organize child-led activities in school with communities

### Sub-Theme 1.3. Drought Preparedness

* The CBDRR approach had different models, and not one model can be used and prescribed for all. ZOA’s model for Drought Risk Reduction among the communities of Oddar Meanchey is successful in reducing the drought impact on the area and was encouraged for replication for similar areas.
* Early warning systems for drought hazard was not feasible, but attention should be directed to create resources for the drought-affected communities which can be used for relief and/or credit to purchase agriculture inputs in replacement of the destruction caused by the drought
* Farmers and rural dwellers were unable to finish a high level of education and should be given refresher courses and materials which are adopted to their capacity levels.
* Ensuring the support of the other government structures for the village level DRM is ascertained if these entities are allowed opportunities to interact with each other in different situations.
* The ZOA method of bringing Commune DRM officers and Village committees on disaster management in interactive situations were not merely confined to formal meetings or training activities, but has increased the ties between the village and commune officials. Among these are study tours and the reflection sessions that follow.

### Sub-Theme 1.4. Urban Disaster Preparedness

* Too many varied activities in such a timeframe endanger their sustainability and it might be better to reduce their number to invest resources towards targeted set of objectives to attain;
* Strategic partnerships can also be developed to better tackle integrated programming without cramming up too many activities in a short period of time;
* The application of trainings needs to be carefully mentored and monitored; simulation, drills, specific coaching measures should be considered;
* A strategy needs to be included in future work on how to expand the programme activities outside specific project implementation areas. There needs to be more emphasis on expanding public awareness campaigns and small meetings in surrounding areas.
* All implementations need to start and conclude with strategies developed by local stakeholders for future activity so that a schedule of activities is planned and maintained beyond the project.
* Future projects should partner with local NGOs in design and implementation. There should be more communication with other actors in the field, particularly government departments.
* More advocacy for mitigation activities needs to be done, with a clearer identification of sources of funding for implementations. This may be hard for a short duration project.

### Sub-Theme 1.5. Upscaling CBDRR

* The development of a manual for mainstreaming inclusive CBDRR in local planning, involving government units such as the Department of Interior and Local Governance in the Philippines at national level, was not completed at the end of the project and its relevance is questionable with regards to the number of similar existing documents. The non-completion of this activity highlighted the challenges that the SUBU consortium has experienced in engaging with the NDRRMC.
* It is more strategic in the case of the Philippines to reduce the work done at the local level and emphasize on implementing at the sub-national level to increase the effectiveness of scaling up of activities which would focus more on the development aspect.
* There needs to be more active coordination and systematic exchanges of information between the consortium partners.
* Websites such as the DRRKnowledge must be reviewed and its possible added-value for the DRRM framework in the Philippines should be discussed with the regional OCD and provincial DRRMOs; the role of the OCD in managing the regional hubs (or learning centers) is not yet clear nor sustainable and the contextualization of the information centralized on the website could be considered for addressing these gaps.
* A stronger coordination of the consortium with a more systematic exchange of experiences between the partners could have helped engaging more effectively with the national level and ensure the replication of the SUBU methodology at a wider scale.
* Consortium among larger INGO has many advantages, including a stronger advocacy role at the national DRR level to efficiently increase awareness on strengthening DRR at all levels. Consortium also allowed opportunity to learn and to share strengths and expertise, and had greater geographic coverage.
* Conducting baseline and end-line surveys provided an information based to assess the progress and effectiveness of implementation.
* Incorporation of both gender and disability considerations has been unique for the project.
* Mainstreaming DRR requires an integrated approach which includes interrelated strategies and a framework for creating an enabling environment for DRR considerations at various levels.
* Improving community resilience requires commitments from the government, CSOs, private sector, and individuals.
* Need to recognize the factors which shape the coping and adaptive capacities of key vulnerable groups.
* Need to improve national government’s capacity to strengthen sub-national capacities especially provincial and community levels.
* Budget allocation for DRR can be integrated and “absorbed” into existing regular development budgeting process.
* Increasing the capacities of communities is fundamental to support community resilience and encourages self-reliance.
* Organizations such as the Red Cross needs to clearly define what is considered by a disaster prepared community, when a community is considered disaster prepared, or when a community is resilient to disasters.
* A guideline or a checklist which contains critical elements of a disaster prepared or resilient community is needed as an initial step.
* Organizations such as the Red Cross should recognize that given the decentralization and good governance initiatives, the local government the key level where disaster decision-making, resource allocation, coordination and information management can most effectively carried out, and the CBDRR program should commence engagement of stakeholders at the commune level without sacrificing planning and preparedness at the village level.
* CBDRR programs are best implemented using an area-based or area-specific approach. Where every community be covered under the program will formulate its own specific plans, activities and projects including implementation of CBDP program components according to a schedule appropriate to local conditions.
* Refocus CBDRR program activities and interventions towards placing greater emphasis on the establishment of a disaster management planning process at the local levels leading to the development of formal disaster management plans.
* This planning process shall be initiated by the conduct of the HVCA process. Final output should contain a complete list (structural and non-structural) of preparedness and mitigation measures, activities and projects for all hazards faced by the community.
* Design and install a CBDRR program monitoring and evaluation system that focuses on measuring end results and impact rather than accomplishment of tasks and activities or the delivery of inputs. This includes the design and transfer of participatory monitoring and evaluation skills to the community so that it is able to repeat the entire disaster management planning and implementation process every year. Emphasis will be on the disaster preparedness process, it is not a one-time event.

## Thematic Area 2: Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development

### Sub-Theme 2.1. Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector

* Cross cutting projects specifically targeted to vulnerable sub groups were ground breaking.
* Collaboration with institutions outside the field of disaster management, such as line ministries and universities, increases effectiveness.
* Getting local regulatory support from line Ministries and synchronizing actions with their budget cycles is important for sustainability.
* Willingness and commitments of the beneficiaries to sustain the process from the national-level authorities down to the school level
* The institutionalization of DRR into the education sector will ensure continuity and sustainability of the mainstreaming activities which include school construction guidelines, integration and revision of the school curricula to include DRR, and institutionalization of DRR into the teacher’s training curriculum
* The creation of Technical Working Groups in each country proved to be effective and useful for the implementation of the project.
* There is need to develop curriculum support materials for teachers to facilitate learning in the classrooms which is adapted for different grades.
* Developing a study paper on the impacts of disasters to the sector highlighted a wide range of potential actions that needs to be taken by various stakeholders.

### Sub-Theme 2.2. Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-National Development Planning

* Quantification of risk increases the chance of acceptability of mitigation proposals.
* GIS is very helpful in the visualization of DRR assessment outputs.
* Stakeholders noted the insufficient physical inputs and time allocated for training and plan preparation as a constraint to a more effective project implementation.
* Inter-agency coordination was enhanced by creating a relevant Ad Hoc body (i.e. Experts Group Meeting).
* Commissioning a UNDP consultant to harmonize perspectives improved relationships among members of the Experts’ Group.
* The inconsistency in the usage of DRR and DRM terminologies indicates that the DRR concept has not yet been fully internalized among the stakeholders.
* Hazard assessment and hazard quantification operationalize paradigm shift from disaster response to preparedness (i.e. mitigation decreases the cost of project damage and rehabilitation cost).
* Climate change and disaster risk reduction are closely linked. More extreme weather events in the future are likely to increase the number and scale of disasters, while at the same time, the existing methods and tools of disaster reduction provide powerful capacities for adaptation to climate change.

## Thematic Area 3: Regional Partnerships

### Sub-theme 3.1. Upscaling CBDRR

* Institutionalization requires integration of all strategies that recognize and differentiate the roles of a wider range of stakeholders at all levels.
* Before integration of CBDRR into socio-economic strategies can take place, a full understanding of hazards and its possible impact on countries and communities is required, but financial and technical support is sought by these countries in order to create comprehensive risk maps.
* CBDRR can only be implemented successfully if a certain degree of de-centralization and locally collective participatory consultancy and decision-making process has been attained.
* Effective community based risk disaster management should lead to locally tailored action planes.
* Not all NDMOs did have adequate expertise and/or manpower to institutionalize CBDRR at all needed levels.
* An effective risk disaster management requires clarity on long-term directions in order to adapt to change, prepare and implement new strategies and create suitable organizational structures.
* Ownership is more effectively promoted by supporting partners in their efforts to tailor process, tools and mechanisms to their country specific context and priorities.

### Sub-Theme 3.2. Transboundary Partnerships

* Project objectives and indicators should be simple and clear. Project staff and national stakeholders at all levels should have a holistic understanding of the objectives and indicators. Where necessary capacity building of staff and stakeholders in project monitoring should be undertaken.
* Participation by partners must be concrete, recognizing their priorities, schedules and constraints to secure their active participation in workshops and other activities.
* Additional advocacy is required (example Cambodia) to ensure ownership of the project as support for national policies, rather than a standalone donor project.
* There continues to be a need to focus the stakeholders and project on preparedness, and in particular long range preparedness, as well as short term preparedness.

### Sub-Theme 3.3. Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector

* In achieving the desired goals, it is important to maintain good relationship, coordination with and engagement of partner governments, particularly with ASEAN bodies and Member States, at both national and regional levels.
* Participation in regional and global events is crucial in building network, advocacy and promotion of agenda of school safety and reach out key stakeholders’ understanding on school safety;
* ASEAN countries are committed to champion the cause of school safety. Advocacy to policy makers and decision makers is paramount to generate support in various means for the school safety. Public awareness at the school and community levels are equally important, as aware children, teachers and parents are less likely to be in danger.
* High tech kind of safety assessment is worth exploring and learning, as this can be more efficient than basic assessment, even more so at the field level. Strong engagement of the concerned implementers is necessary for tools to take root in a country for example VISUS.

# Recommendations and Way Forward

The primary recommendation and way forward is to continue to build on the successes of the DIPECHO programming. Such as the replication of pilots that are proven to work and is proven to reduce disaster risk, vulnerability and increase coping and adaptive capacity on CBDRR in urban and rural communities, child-centered DRR, and DRR for PWDs and for other vulnerable groups. With regards to regional partnership, it is vital to continue and support the linkages of various global and regional frameworks on DRR, CCA, Sustainable Development, and regional work plans such as the AADMER Work Plan 2015 – 2020.

There is also a need for continued focus on building the capacities of sub-national governments, enhanced focus on poverty reduction which will help decrease vulnerability of communities, continued building the capacities of local NGOs, sustaining the efforts and growth of consortiums so that the reach of DRR implementation are able to increase in geographical scale and thus benefitting more communities, support of small-scale mitigation works and appropriate technology which the communities can sustain, continue the advocacy to switch from a reactive mind-set to a pro-active mind-set, use of evidence-based results to support advocacy for the national governments to support DRR such as cost-benefit analysis and impact assessments, and continued building on the lessons learned from various DIPECHO projects.

The following are the specific recommendations on CBDRR/M, Mainstreaming DRR into Development and Regional Partnerships

## Thematic Area 1: CBDRR

* Continued strong advocacy for de-centralization of DRR budgets to sub-national DM institutions.
* Consortium partners to continue to support their local partners to extend capacity building and planning to cover all districts in the target provinces
* Increased effort on replication of successful CBDRR projects for various areas, such as drought prone, flood-prone, urban poor, multi-hazard prone, coastal, remote, and far flung areas.
* Increased effort and provision of evidence-based success on integrating CBDRR and local development planning.
* Continued technical support by existing Consortium and partnerships to sub-national disaster management offices towards supporting the implementation of CBDRR.
* Linking Vulnerable Communities. Vulnerable communities along river basins need to be linked in preparedness and mitigation to reduce risk from floods.
* Further lobbying needs to be done to government departments to develop mitigation so that communities are less vulnerable. This should be done through the communities themselves, assisting them to lobby for appropriate measures.
* .A much more extensive campaign for public awareness needs to be mounted in vulnerable communities so that all areas of these communities are reached.
* Increase and support the capacity building of local NGOs to conduct standardized CBDRR through trainings and refresher courses – similar to how first aid and basic life support which requires refresher courses.

## Thematic Area 2: Mainstreaming DRR into Development

### Mainstreaming DRR into the Education Sector

* Drills and simulations. Emergency preparedness needs to be promoted through regular drills and simulations so that these become a regular part of activities in vulnerable communities, and coordination with other agencies is fully developed.
* Capacity building for improved gender and disability mainstreaming: It is important to develop a clear and comprehensive strategy on how to mainstream gender and disability inclusion as part of the project design, and train staff among the implementation partners (consortium members’ project staff and national government partners at all levels) on these strategies at the project onset for a more effective approach.
* More active learning methods should be introduced within education projects in general as well as DRR education projects. These “active learning methods” might be unusual in Southeast Asian education systems, but it allows the teachers to increase their capacity towards the participation of students on DRR.
* While there are many materials on DRR are available, there are still strong needs for designing specific materials for children with disabilities, and people with disabilities in general.
* In order to secure sustainable change within the education system, the output from various projects have to be relevant to government at all levels and has to be seen as feasible within their current capacity without too much additional pressure on limited resources in terms of human resources or budget.
* The project should produce more innovative, ‘hands-on’ ways to communicate with children to impart knowledge and drive behavior change.
* The project should continue to increase the overall awareness of the program interventions at all levels, including Ministerial level with both Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) and Ministry of Education and Training (MOET).
* Creative ways to integrate DRR in extra-curricular and formal curriculum activities should be done to motivate teachers. Integrating DRR in the in-service and pre-service training of teachers facilitate the institutionalization and scaling up of a culture of safety in a country
* Develop a mechanism to monitor and evaluate school level resilience. It is important to know what activities and programs are being implemented, and what needs school have in order to know the assistance to be provided. It also helps in prioritization of programs and resources on the part of the MoE.

### Mainstreaming DRR into Sub-National Development

* Improving advocacy and influence at the government level: 1) Influence and shape government policies and practices through organizing and attending meetings and consultations, sharing reading materials and reports and forming alliances and networks of advocates; 2) Incorporate credible and relevant evidence which is, wherever possible, jointly owned. Field visits involve direct observation of practical examples, and an opportunity for discussion among peers.
* Ensuring adequate financial resourcing from the national to sub-national levels: It is important to ensure that government allocates sufficient financial resources to DRR and CCA planning and strategies. This can be achieved by demonstrating how investing in DRR and CCA measures can provide strong economic benefits; more quantitative portrayals of the costs and benefits associated with DRR may be required to persuade others. In the short term, emphasizing less expensive, non-structural DRR, such as integrating DRR into school curriculum can be cost-effective and more sustainable. By integrating DRR and CCA into regular development planning (e.g. District/Village Socio-Economic Development Plans – SEDP), it can be ‘absorbed’ within existing development budgeting processes.
* A standardized system/mechanism/methodology should be developed to integrate DRR, CCA, plans at the national, sub-national, and local levels, while integrated into short-term, medium-term, and long-term development plans. This can be done which could be established or instituted to further enhance inter-agency collaboration, exchange of data and mutual support.
* Increasing the capacities of key officials in key departments at provincial and district level is recommended in order to overcome inertia, through differing priorities or capacity in sectoral line ministries and departments.
* Newly formed initiatives should be harmonized with and integrated to larger initiatives rather than duplicating or running in parallel.

## Thematic Area 3: Regional Partnerships

* + Increase the sharing of experiences and lessons learned among consortium members.
	+ Promote multi-stakeholder partnership approach to improve effectiveness.
	+ Partnership approaches are also important in integrating DRR with other issues and sectors, particularly with national and local government, sustainable development, climate change adaptation and humanitarian response. While multi-stakeholder partnerships can be difficult to develop and manage, their potential for widespread influence if worth the effort, as the results can be very powerful as an agent of change.
	+ Share the practices and successes of national consortiums in Southeast Asia to exchange knowledge and experiences and lessons learned to increase the capacities of other newly created consortiums to increase the effectiveness of implementing DRR.
	+ Continue the efforts of strengthening national and regional DRR cooperation on top-administrative and ministerial levels.
	+ Institutionalization is one strategy to help ensure greater sustainability and replication of the DRR work approach. There is also a need for other factors related to gaining practical experience, for example by enhancement of cross-border exchange and cooperation between peers.
	+ Networking between NDMOs need to be strengthened beyond meetings and forums, and the knowledge exchange between successful practices between NDMOs needs to be further strengthened.

# Annex: Selected Good Practices