

Participatory evaluation of the VCA and comparative analysis with the CBDRA

FINAL REPORT



By: Nguyen Thi Phuc Hoa
Melanie Miltenburg

Date: 19 October 2015



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies



German
Red
Cross



Spanish Red Cross
Cruz Roja Española
الجمعية العربية للصليب الأحمر



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection

Content

Abbreviations and acronyms	3
Summary	4
1. Introduction	7
1.1 Context of the evaluation.....	7
1.2 Objectives.....	7
1.3 Methodology	8
2 VCA practice by VNRC	13
2.1 Manual, methodology and tools	13
2.2 Inclusion of vulnerable groups.....	14
2.3 Inclusion of climate change adaptation	18
2.4 Appropriateness in urban context.....	19
2.5 VCA reports.....	19
2.6 Training and facilitation skills.....	20
2.7 Effectiveness of VCA for local follow up and higher level planning	22
3 VCA as compared to CBDRA.....	26
3.1 CBDRA	26
3.2 Differences and similarities	27
3.3 Comparative advantages and disadvantages	28
4 Conclusions and recommendations	33
4.1 Conclusion.....	33
4.2 Recommendations.....	34
4.3 Follow up	36
 ANNEX 1: Detailed TOR	 38
ANNEX 2: Field evaluation plan	44
ANNEX 3: Detailed comparison between the VCA and CBDRA manual	53
ANNEX 4: List of resources.....	61
ANNEX 5: Suggestions for VCA Amendments	70
Amendment 1: How to guarantee proper inclusion of vulnerable groups	71
Amendment 2: Standard schedule for organizing a VCA	74
Amendment 3: Format for VCA tools	77
Annex to Amendment 3: Suggestions for data collection	103
Amendment 4: Format for VCA report	106

Acknowledgement

The evaluation of the Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment has been completed with the involvement and contribution of a large number of stakeholders: Vietnam Red Cross Society, German Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, French Red Cross, Malteser International, Oxfam, other Red Cross national societies and NGOs active in Vietnam, UNDP, government and local authorities and the community people of the assessed communities. We are truly grateful for the valuable inputs of each of them.

In addition, we would like to specifically thank the German Red Cross team in Vietnam for their very nice and supportive collaboration throughout the whole process of the evaluation.

Abbreviations and acronyms

AIT	Asian Institute of Technology
AmRC	American Red Cross
AuRC	Australian Red Cross
CBDRA	Community Based Disaster Risk Assessment (as practiced by DMC)
CBDRM	Community Based Disaster Risk Management
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CNDPC	Committee for Natural Disaster Prevention and Control
CPC	Commune People's Committee
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
DMC	Disaster Management Centre
DONRE	Department of Natural Resources and Environment
DPC	District People's Committee
DPO	Disabled People Organization
DPP	Disaster Preparedness Plan
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GRC	German Red Cross
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
MARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
MONRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NRC	Norwegian Red Cross
PC	People's Committee
PWD	People with Disability
SEDP	Social Economic Development Plan
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TOR	Terms of Reference
VCA	Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (as practiced by VNRC)
VNRC	Vietnam Red Cross Society

Summary

Introduction

Vietnam Red Cross Society (VNRC) has a long history of implementing Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (VCAs) throughout the country, as part of its community based risk reduction programme. Though its capacity in conducting VCA is being appreciated by both Red Cross and non-Red Cross actors, from earlier practice and studies it was acknowledged that certain aspects of the VCA implementation could be further strengthened.

In parallel, in July 2009, the Government of Vietnam approved the programme to 'Enhance Community Awareness and Community Based Disaster Risk Management' under Decision 1002/QĐ-TTg. Under this programme, in May 2014 the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) approved the CBDRA (Community Based Disaster Risk Assessment) to assess vulnerabilities and capacities in 6,000 communes in Vietnam by 2020.

Evaluation objectives: Given this context, the evaluation aimed to look at the following two components:

1. VCA: The main focus was on the VCA, and how it has managed to include vulnerable groups such as people with disability (PWD), elderly, women and children, and adjustment to developments such as climate change adaptation and urbanization. It also looked at the effectiveness of the VCA for local disaster risk reduction planning.
2. Comparison with CBDRA: At the same time, the study looked into the differences and comparative advantages and disadvantages of CBDRA with the objective to learn from it for VNRC's own VCA implementation and its supporting role to the government CBDRA.

The evaluation aimed at getting more insight in the constraints, proposed concrete recommendations and followed up on these by developing amendments to the VCA.

VCA practised by VNRC

Use of the manual: VNRC has adopted the VCA as part of their Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) strategy, as an instrument for better disaster management and planning. Since 2010 VNRC has its own VCA Manual. This manual is a very informative and complete reference guide. It consists of two books, of which one contains the concepts and principles of VCA, and the other is a practical guide to conducting VCA. Despite the wealth of information provided by the manual, learning from both VNRC's VCA reports and the field evaluation, VNRC facilitators do not use the manual to its full potential. Due to lack of sufficient formats and guidance the VCA manual could be considered a reference book rather than a practical trainer guideline. It is therefore less suitable for facilitators that depend on a step-by-step guidance, but requires experienced facilitators who are able to translate the information provided into concrete implementation. Unfortunately, VNRC has only few of these.

Inclusion of vulnerable groups: The VCA manual provides ample attention to specific vulnerable groups. Also, all facilitators interviewed showed a clear understanding of the need to pay attention to vulnerable groups in the VCA. Nevertheless, the VCA reports show that the particular vulnerabilities of PWD, children, elderly etc. are hardly taken into account, and are not translated into concrete measures particularly addressing their needs. A good understanding of gender mainstreaming is lacking. Some VCA reports do mention differences between men and women in economic activities or in other parts of the report, but fail to reflect on this in the data analysis and proposed measures. Though being an extra vulnerable group, only few PWD have been involved in the VCA. VNRC lacks the skills to take away logistical and social barriers to enable their participation. Despite children's eagerness and relevant ideas, also children have

not been involved much in the VCA. The communication seems one-way: VNRC provides information to the children (awareness raising) but does not use their concerns and ideas to feed the disaster preparedness planning. Elderly were positive about their participation in the VCA, and the encouragement given by VNRC's facilitators to join the group sessions. Nevertheless, no specific information on the vulnerabilities and capacities of elderly can be found in the analysis in VCA reports.

Climate change adaptation: Uncertainty about the topic makes that only few of the reviewed VCA reports included information on predicted climate change impact (as per secondary data) or changes in climate observed by commune people, and none used this information in the analysis to come to appropriate risk reduction planning. German Red Cross (GRC) has developed a practical reference guide on how to include climate change in VCA¹. It advises to be reluctant in talking about climate change in the commune, in order to avoid using academic or unfamiliar terms with the community, or overemphasizing the subject in the VCA. Instead, the reference guide advises to focus on trends and changes, whether caused by climate change or other factors, as a basis for 'climate smart' solutions.

VCA in urban context: With more and more people in Vietnam living in urban areas, VNRC has just recently started to pilot risk assessments in urban areas, supported by American Red Cross (AmRC). The first pilots showed that the assessments miss out on a number of critical issues that are characteristic for urban areas (such as including the private sector, addressing migration, and adjusting the planning to the availability of urban local informants). As a result the VCA reports and the suggested risk reduction measures did not show any significant difference as compared to rural VCAs. AmRC hopes that with their pilot in a few years time they will have developed a feasible approach to address the needs in urban areas.

VCA reports: In total 69 VCA reports were reviewed during the evaluation. The main constraint in reporting is the lack of data analysis. The VCA reports are often rather lengthy and general. Most of them are therefore informative rather than useful for concrete risk reduction planning.

Facilitation: VNRC's pool of master trainers is reducing over time. Opportunities for capacity building for less experienced facilitators are however limited, hampering the influx of new master trainers. During the field evaluation, the feedback of communities on the training and facilitation skills of VNRC was predominantly positive. NGOs, UNDP and DMC (Disaster Management Centre) however have some concerns VNRC's skills to mobilize particularly vulnerable groups.

Follow up: Despite the positive words of local authorities regarding the (potential) benefits of the VCA, in reality the VCA reports are often not really used once the VCA has been finalized. VNRC does not monitor the VCA follow up, and often fails to get the results included in the government planning processes. Unless the VCA was part of a donor-funded project, the risk reduction measures proposed in the VCA report have not been implemented.

VCA as compared to CBDRA

At the time of the evaluation the implementation of the CBDRA had just recently started. So far 51 CBDRA had been conducted and all target provinces (20) were trained (mainly people from CNDPC and mass organizations). VNRC's contribution to this achievement has been widely appreciated. Though the first CBDRA revealed that in terms of quality the method still has some limitations, UNDP nevertheless considered it a good start and a huge step forward for the Government of Vietnam to reach more local participation in CBDRM.

¹ Recommendations to the guidelines on Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA)

Differences and similarities: The VCA and CBDRA methods have similarities as well as differences. The objective and expected results of both VCA and CBDRA are very similar. There is however one significant difference between the two methods: the VCA includes both natural and man-made hazards, while the CBDRA includes only natural hazards. The VCA is a tool for conducting by experts, namely trained VNRC practitioners, while the CBDRA is designed for the use by local government and commune people (Commune Working Group supported by the Technical Working Group). This is reflected in the language and content of the manual, with the manual of the CBDRA being more practical than that of the VCA. The number of tools used in the CBDRA (9) is also much lower than that of the VCA (14). The VCA manual contains more information about vulnerable groups than that of the CBDRA, but neither of them have incorporated any practical guidance in the formats for data collection and analysis to capture such information.

Advantages and disadvantages: Though based on the still very limited experience with the new CBDRA, the VNRC master trainers interviewed generally said to prefer the CBDRA tool, if supplemented with some good points from VNRC's VCA method. VNRC leadership however hasn't made up its mind yet whether to keep to the VCA tool, or adopt the CBDRA as most of the NGOs spoken to have decided. Both methods have pros and cons. The CBDRA will be much better connected to local government, and mitigation measures are more likely to be followed up because of its integration in Disaster Preparedness Plan (DPP) planning. One of the concerns raised by Red Cross movement partners is that CBDRA reports fall short in convincing external donors to fund mitigation measures, because the reports are expected to be less in-depth. NGOs address this concern by considering the CBDRA as a core tool which they can still elaborate with additional modules to provide more time for the specific focus of their organization.

Conclusions, recommendations and follow-up

Many other stakeholders, including both NGOs and government, appreciate VNRC's capacity and make use of its facilitator pool. However, the evaluation shows that VNRC's VCA capacity is in need of maintenance. To ensure that the VCAs have a meaningful contribution to effective local community risk reduction planning, especially the following areas need attention: meaningful inclusion of vulnerable groups through better facilitation; better data analysis and reporting; and follow-up on VCA results at different levels. In addition, VNRC needs a better system to maintain and develop its pool of trainers.

VNRC should recognize that even if it would decide to adopt the CBDRA, it would likely keep a core position in community assessments in Vietnam, as its support will be indispensable to the Government of Vietnam to implement the CBDRA. However, also in this case VNRC should strengthen its capacity in the above-mentioned fields.

Based on the inputs of VNRC, other Red Cross movement partners, NGOs, government and local communities, a large number of recommendations could be identified to improve the current VCA practise. Several of these have been translated into four field-tested amendments to the VCA manual:

- Amendment 1: Tips for better inclusion of vulnerable groups in VCA;
- Amendment 2: Standard schedule for organizing a VCA;
- Amendment 3: Format for VCA tools;
- Amendment 4: Format for VCA report.

Other recommendations, especially those related to capacity constraints of VNRC, need further follow-up beyond this study.

1. Introduction

1.1 Context of the evaluation

German Red Cross (GRC) in collaboration with the Vietnam Red Cross Society (VNRC) and funded by the European Union Humanitarian Aid (DIPECHO 9) has been implementing the programme '*Enhancing the capacities of disaster risk reduction practitioners in Viet Nam through the consolidation of best practices and lessons learnt for community based disaster risk management, vulnerability capacity assessment and disaster response mechanisms*'. Part of this programme is to conduct a participatory evaluation of the Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) used by the VNRC and a comparative analysis with the Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Assessment (CBDRA) of the Government of Vietnam, with involvement of relevant stakeholders and vulnerable groups.

VNRC has a long history of implementing VCAs throughout the country, as part of its community based risk reduction programme. Since the year 2000 VNRC has undertaken an estimated 300 VCAs with the support from the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), various other Red Cross movement partners present in Vietnam, and local and international NGOs. This has provided valuable information on vulnerabilities and capacities of these communes, as an input for better disaster management and planning. In 2010, with funding from DIPECHO 6 and with inputs from various organizations, VNRC developed its own VCA manual. Though initially VNRC's VCA had a strong focus on natural hazards, the new manual followed the example of IFRC in having a more holistic approach to VCA (thus dropping the 'H' for natural hazards of VNRC's earlier 'HVCA').

From earlier practice and studies, it was acknowledged that certain aspects of VCA implementation could still use further strengthening. Particularly with regard to gender mainstreaming, disability inclusion and climate change, reports from various organizations (e.g. NLRC, CECI, Malteser International and GRC) pointed out gaps. A VCA evaluation conducted by American Red Cross raised concerns about the effectiveness of VCA on the longer term, after the VCA has been completed.

In parallel, in July 2009, the Government of Vietnam approved the programme to '*Enhance Community Awareness and Community Based Disaster Risk Management*' under Decision 1002/QĐ-TTg. Under this programme, in May 2014 the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) approved the CBDRA (Community Based Disaster Risk Assessment) to assess vulnerabilities and capacities in 6,000 communes in Vietnam by 2020. VNRC has been an important partner to MARD in the development of this method, and in providing training and technical support in the implementation of CBDRA to the involved provincial and local government staff.

1.2 Objectives

Given the issues and developments mentioned in paragraph 1.1, the evaluation aimed to look at the following two components:

1. VCA: The main focus was on the VCA, and how it has managed to include vulnerable groups such as people with disability (PWD), elderly, women and children, and adjustment to developments such as climate change adaptation and urbanization. It also looked at the effectiveness of the VCA for local disaster risk reduction planning. The evaluation aimed to get more insight in the constraints, proposed concrete recommendations and followed up on these through the development of an amendment to the VCA.

2. Comparison with CBDRA: At the same time, the study looked into the differences and comparative advantages and disadvantages of CBDRA with the objective to learn from it for VNRC's own VCA implementation and its supporting role to the government CBDRA.

1.3 Methodology

The evaluation has been carried out by a team of one national and one international consultant, in close collaboration with the team of GRC in Vietnam and VNRC.

The overall evaluation consisted of six phases, each of them resulting in different outputs:

Phase	Expected output
1. Initial preparation	a) Detailed Terms of Reference (TOR)
2. Desk evaluation	b) Brief report on the synergy, differences and added values of both VCA and CBDRA methodologies c) Brief report on the skills and knowledge gaps of VNRC facilitators and trainers with emphasis on gender, disability and climate change
3. Field evaluation	d) Brief report per commune included in the evaluation e) Draft evaluation report f) Power point presentation of the preliminary findings
4. Documentation	g) Draft Amendment (supplementary annex) to the current VCA manual h) Tailored training plan for VNRC trainers and facilitators on the findings i) Outline for the evaluation workshop
5. Field test	j) Assessment of three VCA tests
6. Validation	k) Outline of a lessons learned/consolidation workshop l) Final Amendment (supplementary annex) to the VCA manual m) Final evaluation report n) Final outline for a training of VNRC trainers and facilitators on the findings of the consultancy

Initial preparation and desk evaluation

The initial preparation phase and desk evaluation phase have partly been merged. The consultants have spoken with a large number of organizations and people, amongst which were:

- 24 people from VNRC (HQ, provincial chapters, master trainers), IFRC and other Red Cross movement partners present in Vietnam;
- 8 NGOs;
- 7 people from DMC (Disaster Management Centre) and UNDP.

In total 69 reports of VCAs have been reviewed. All of these VCAs were conducted by VNRC, most with support of GRC, IFRC, American Red Cross (AmRC) and (some) Norwegian Red Cross (NRC). From the VCA reports assessed, 57 reports were according to the VCA method, and took place in rural communities. The remaining 12 reports followed the CBDRA method and tools, and took place in an urban context.

In addition, several documents from NGOs and Red Cross have been studied. Amongst these were the studies that have recently been conducted by IFRC (on advocacy messages related to VCA) and AmRC (on success criteria for VCA).

The initial phase and desk evaluation resulted in:

- A detailed TOR agreed by both VNRC and GRC – see Annex 1. This TOR also included a detailed field evaluation plan;
- An desk study report including an overview of the synergy, differences and added value of VCA and CBDRA methodologies; and an analysis of the skills and knowledge gaps of VNRC facilitators and trainers with emphasis on gender, disability and climate change (internal report, submitted to GRC in January 2015).

Field evaluation

The field evaluation was carried out in correspondence with the field evaluation plan as proposed by the consultants and agreed upon by VNRC and GRC – see Annex 2. Two teams, consisting of both GRC and VNRC staff and led by the consultants, assessed the VCA implementation in six communes spread over six districts in three provinces. In one of the six communes (see below) a CBDRA was conducted instead of a VCA. Also one commune conducted a ‘hybrid’ (mixed) VCA/CBDRA.

Province	District	Commune	Remark
Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa	Ward 6	Hybrid VCA/CBDRA supported by GRC in October 2014. More urban.
	Dong Xuan	Xuan Quang 2	CBDRA in December 2014
An Giang	Tri Ton	Tan Tuyen	VCA supported by GRC in 2013
	Tinh Bien	Vinh Trung	VCA supported by GRC in 2013
Thai Binh	Dong Hung	Hoa Nam	VCA supported by IFRC in 2011, as part of mangrove project with focus on climate change.
	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	VCA supported by IFRC in May 2014, as part of mangrove project with focus on climate change.

The communes were selected to have a good balance of:

- VCAs conducted by VNRC, following purely the VNRC VCA;
- VCAs conducted by VNRC, applying an alternative methodology (mix with CBDRA);
- One CBDRA (supported by VNRC), for the reason of comparison with VCA (not to evaluate the CBDRA itself);
- VCAs with involvement of another NGO (e.g. Malteser International, CARE, etc.);
- Both rural and (semi-)urban VCAs;
- VCAs with good practice in inclusion of gender, PWD and/or climate change adaptation.

An additional criteria was that the selected communes had no recent assessment or evaluation carried out to avoid confusion and ‘evaluation tiredness’.

In each of the selected communes, meetings and focus group discussions were held. The evaluation teams spoke with in total almost 300 people through more than 60 meetings, including the following stakeholders:

Type of Meetings / groups	Stakeholders
1. Provincial authorities	Committee for Natural Disaster Prevention and Control (CNDPC); Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD); Department of Natural Resources and Environment (DONRE)
2. District authorities	District People's Committee (DPC); Committee for Natural Disaster Prevention and Control; DARD; DONRE
3. Commune authorities	Commune People's Committee (CPC); Committee for Natural Disaster Prevention and Control; DARD; DONRE
4. VNRC staff	Staff from VNRC provincial chapter, district and commune/ward
5. VNRC facilitators	
6. Commune working group	Only in the communes where a CBDRA or mixed VCA/CBDRA had been implemented
7. Locally present NGOs and Red Cross movement partners	
8. PWDs	<p>Max. 3-4 household visits per commune. In total 20 families were interviewed that included a family member with disability. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – People that cannot walk or only with difficulty (about 5 women; 12 men); – Blind people (2 women); – Deaf-and-dumb people (2 women); – Mentally and physically impaired (3 people). <p>From the PWD interviewed, only three confirmed to have ever joined a VCA.</p>
9. Children	<p>About 5 per commune, from grade 6 (11 years old) till grade 9 (16 years old).</p> <p>From the children interviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The children in Quang Xuan 2 (Phu Yen) remembered the flood in 2009 that seriously affected their village; – The children from Thuy Xuan (Thai Binh) ever joined hazard mapping; – The children from An Giang joined VNRC's Safe School Model. <p>From the remaining children it was unclear whether they took part in VCA, or had participated in any other disaster preparedness related activity.</p>
10. Elderly; women; poor; ethnic minorities	<p>Mixed groups, consisting of about 2 elderly (generally of 50-80 years old), 2 women, 2 poor people and 2 ethnic minorities.</p> <p>Not all people interviewed took part in a VCA, but generally most of them did. Only in Hoa Nam (Thai Binh) only two people of the group attended a VCA.</p>
11. Other community representatives	<p>Mixed group of about 6-8 people per commune.</p> <p>In Vinh Trung commune (An Giang) no meeting was held with community representatives. In Hoa Nam commune (Thai Binh) the group was mixed with elderly.</p>
12. Debriefing with local authorities	

All meetings used a semi-structured interview technique, for which the consultants had prepared a list of questions per meeting/group (focussing on qualitative data analysis).

The field evaluation phase resulted in the following outputs (all submitted to GRC):

- Detailed meeting notes of each meeting;
- A draft evaluation report with the preliminary findings of the evaluation so far;
- A power point presentation of the preliminary findings of the evaluation so far.

Though initially intended, the consultants did not deliver a brief report per commune as this was deemed not to be necessary anymore considering the above-mentioned available outputs.

Documentation

Based on the findings of the desk and field evaluation, a first draft amendment to the VCA manual was made.

On the 11th of February 2015 a workshop was held to share and validate the findings of the evaluation (desk and field phase), and to gather the feedback of the participants on how to follow up on these. In this workshop also the draft amendment was presented. The workshop was attended by about 45 people from VNRC (master trainers and staff), IFRC, other Red Cross movement partners present in Vietnam (GRC; AmCR; Swiss Red Cross; Spanish Red Cross, and French Red Cross), the Government of Vietnam (DMC, MARC), UNDP and NGOs (Oxfam, Care, Plan, Malteser International, Live and Learn, World Vision).

The consolidated feedback from the workshop was used to further complete the amendment, after which it was pre-tested in a training workshop on 19-22 May 2015. The workshop contained the following sessions, related to the areas identified to be in need of strengthening:

- Qualitative methods and remarks in VCA (facilitated by VNRC)
- VCA overall planning – preparation and follow up (facilitated by the national consultant);
- Gender inclusion in VCA (facilitated by French Red Cross);
- Facilitation skills (facilitated by AIT – Asian Institute of Technology);
- Integration of climate change adaptation (facilitated by GRC);
- Inclusion of PWD (facilitated by Malteser International);
- Data analysis and reporting – practise with the formats (facilitated by the national consultant).

The workshop was attended by 24 VCA trainers and facilitators of VNRC.

The Documentation phase resulted in the following outputs:

- Draft VCA amendment;
- Meeting minutes of the results sharing workshop (by GRC);
- Meeting minutes of the training and pre-test workshop (by GRC).

Field test and validation

The amendment was tested during three field tests, conducted by VNRC trainers, and supported by GRC and the national consultant. The tests took place in Bao Ninh and Mai Hoa communes, Quang Binh province, from 27-31 May and from 21-29 July 2015.

The Field test phase resulted in the following outputs:

- Monitoring reports (by GRC and national consultant)²;
- Adjustment of the draft VCA amendment.

After the completion of the field tests, the amendment to the VCA manual was validated in a final workshop on 5 September 2015 and attended by 34 participants: 9 people from VNRC headquarters, 11 VNRC facilitators and trainers, 10 people from Red Cross movement partners, and 4 people from DMC. The Validation phase was followed by the finalization of the amendment to the VCA, which has been submitted to GRC in August 2015.

Due to the changes in the scheduling of the workshops and trainings by VNRC, the field test and validation phase were delayed with about five months compared to the original planning. Therefore the involvement of the consultants in this last part of the evaluation process was less intensive and backed-up by GRC. Because VNRC still needs more time to decide on how to continue its training for trainers and facilitators, the expected output 'Final outline for a training of VNRC trainers and facilitators on the findings of the consultancy' was decided to be taken out of the assignment of the consultants.



Photo 1: Talking about risks in and around home and at school with children in Vinh Trung, An Giang

² This output has been financed from the GRC project 'Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) in urban and rural settings'.

2 VCA practice by VNRC

Used by the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement since the early 1990s, the VCA methodology is composed of a set of participatory tools and approaches that enable Red Cross Red Crescent staff and volunteers to work together with communities and identify their vulnerabilities, risks, capacities and priorities. The VCA provides an entry point for planning community-based interventions and it promotes an understanding of people's needs and perceptions, of resources that can be used to address their needs and minimize risks and of how a National Society can support communities in strengthening resilience. In other words, the VCA provides a framework to turn communities' assessment of their own vulnerabilities and capacities for minimizing risk, into community-led action³.

In line with this movement approach, VNRC has adopted the VCA as part of their Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) strategy, as an instrument for better disaster management and planning. Since the year 2000 VNRC has conducted a large number of VCAs through a network of trained facilitators throughout the country⁴. VNRC VCA trainers and facilitators are also asked to support the VCAs of other organizations in Vietnam. Since 2010 VNRC has its own VCA Manual.

This chapter provides an overview of the main results of the assessment of the practise of VCAs by VNRC, based on secondary information and the field evaluation.

2.1 Manual, methodology and tools

The VCA manual as compiled in 2010 is a very informative and complete reference guide. It consists of two books, of which one contains the concepts and principles of VCA, and the other is a practical guide to conducting VCA. VNRC's VCA consists of nine data collection tools and five data analysis and collection tools, which can be used for both natural and man-made hazards. For each of the tools the manual pays attention to a number of related topics, such as the inclusion of gender and PWD, climate change adaptation, and urban context.

Despite the wealth of information provided by the manual, learning from both VNRC's VCA reports and the field evaluation, VNRC facilitators do not use the manual to its full potential. This can be related to the following weaknesses of (the use of) the current manual as identified by the facilitators and other people using the VCA manual:

- Some of the information (e.g. on inclusion of PWD, climate change adaptation, etc.) is provided in the form of advice or guiding remarks. It however lacks practical translation into the formats in which collected information is presented, analysed and reported. As a result, facilitators formulate general disaster risk reduction measures, not addressing the specific vulnerable groups.
- Detailed guidance and formats for data analysis are less developed in the VCA manual than the guidance on collection of data (the manual contains nine data collection tools as compared to five data analysis tools). In addition, clear linkages between the data collection and analysis tools are missing. This results in lengthy VCA reports with a lot of information but no link between findings and proposed measures.

"The VCA manual is very useful for VNRC facilitators. However, it lacks detailed instructions on how to consolidate information collected by using the assessment tools. This results in long reports, but the analysis is weak."

A VNRC Master trainer

³ IFRC; 2014

⁴ TOR; Annex 1

- The order in which the information and tools are presented, is not in a chronologically order or logical to the structure of actual implementation of the VCA (e.g.: historical profile follows after the hazard map).
- The way some concepts are being explained is considered lengthy and less comprehensible for local people (e.g.: definition of livelihood).
- The facilitators consider the manual to be too lengthy. Given the type of comments that facilitators gave on the manual, it seems that at least part of them have not read the full manual.

For some aspects, the VCA manual could be considered a reference book rather than a practical trainer guideline. This is acknowledged by several of the VNRC trainers interviewed. The manual is less suitable for facilitators that depend on a step-by-step guidance, but requires experienced facilitators who are knowledgeable in a broad range of topics and able to translate the information provided into concrete implementation. Unfortunately, VNRC has only few of these (see also paragraph 2.6).

2.2 Inclusion of vulnerable groups

As mentioned above (paragraph 2.1), the VCA manual provides ample attention to specific vulnerable groups. Though all facilitators interviewed showed a clear understanding of the need to pay attention to vulnerable groups in the VCA, the VCA reports reviewed during the evaluation showed that the particular vulnerabilities of PWD, children, elderly etc. are not/hardly taken into account, and do not result in measures particularly addressing their needs. The interviews revealed that most facilitators are not very confident on how to better include these groups, and feel that they have insufficient time to do it (more) properly. Most of them invited representatives of vulnerable groups to join sessions with other local informants (mixed groups). This makes them shy to speak out so that their opinion and ideas are missed out on. Some facilitators organized focus group discussions (FGDs) with vulnerable groups or did home visits (in case of PWD). These facilitators were much better in collecting specific information regarding their needs, but the VCA reports were still general and did not include measures addressing particularly PWD, women, etc. In some cases information was presented separately from other information in the VCA report, without any linkage to the analysis or specific follow up.

Other observations, related to specific vulnerable groups, are mentioned below.

Gender

All interviewed Red Cross trainers agree that inclusion of gender in the VCA is very important, as disasters impact men and women differently, and the capacity to reduce risks and needs to reduce vulnerability differ between men and women. However, the VCA reports show an absence of gender-specific risk analysis and risk reduction measures. The following causes seem to underlay this shortcoming:

- Gender specific focus group discussions are not standard practise, and could cause reluctance amongst women to speak out in mixed-gender groups. However, this is not always the case, and varies per ethnic group or commune. One of the trainers mentioned that compared to other vulnerable groups, women join much easier, and are easier to speak out. Actually, according to him, it is sometimes easier to invite women to attend the VCA than men, because men are often out for work, whereas women usually work at home.
- Often, gender is understood as only having to make sure that a certain number of women is attending the VCA. Some VCA reports do mention differences between men and women in economic activities or in other parts of the VCA report, but fail to reflect on this in the data analysis and proposed measures.
- Despite the fact that the VCA manual addresses gender at every tool, some of the trainers think the guidance to the VCA tools does not clearly enough how to include gender aspects. According to them, it comes down to the facilitator's knowledge and skills to really include it properly.

"Gender aspects are very important in a VCA, so facilitators should discuss more about how to integrate gender. Facilitators should fully understand about the roles and responsibilities of both men and women in disaster risk reduction; and their vulnerability and capacity to undertake disaster risk reduction measures."

A VNRC Master trainer

explain

PWD

The interviewed trainers all confirmed the importance of including PWD in the VCA, as their limitations make them particularly vulnerable in times of a disaster. PWD know best by themselves how to address these vulnerabilities. In practice only very few PWD participated in the VCAs that were reviewed. Some trainers acknowledged that the VCA manual provides sufficient guidance. However, even though VNRC has experience with working with PWD, the facilitators haven't received any specific training on how to include these people in VCA. Especially newly trained facilitators are said to face difficulties with this.

In the interviews with PWD during the field evaluation it showed that VNRC facilitators often feel uneasy addressing a PWD. Instead of talking directly to the disabled person him/herself, the facilitators would rather talk about him/her with one of the family members. This is encouraged by the general stigmatization of PWD in Vietnam. For instance, sometimes caretakers are overprotecting their disabled family member and underestimate their capacity to speak for themselves, while at other times the PWD themselves feel they have nothing to add, as according to them they have no meaning to society.

"I was invited to join a VCA meeting but I couldn't attend because I had to take care of my children. My mother went instead of me. I don't know what has been discussed in the meeting because she did not share the information with me when she got back. I would love to join if I was invited again."

A mother of a physically and mentally impaired twin, Phu Yen

To enable the participation by PWD the facilitators of the VCA should also pay attention to logistical arrangements, such as access to the meeting room, special chairs, and using large font. Also this is something that does not come automatically to VNRC facilitators. The field study showed several examples of local authorities and VNRC staff failing to recognize or facilitate for the physical challenges of PWD. A concrete example is that during the field evaluation, in one of the communes a focus group meeting with elderly was held on the second floor of the building (forcing people that have difficulties to walk to climb the stairs), while the parallel meeting with local authorities was held on the first floor.

In Vietnam the NGO Malteser International has a lot of experience with involving PWD in CBDRM. They developed a special manual on how to include PWDs in CBDRA, which could also be applied to VCA. One of the VNRC trainers from Quang Nam province joined a pilot of Malteser International. Though having seen the positive results of the Malteser International approach, the trainer would not apply this in every VCA, as according to him, the decision whether to pay more attention to the inclusion of PWD depends on what is requested by the donor.

The Malteser International approach in including PWD in CBDRA/VCA⁵

According to Malteser International, not all tools are equally relevant to PWD. In their manual, Malteser International focuses on four: hazard map; Venn diagram; household interview and FGDs. While keeping the number of tools low, Malteser International distinguishes a few additional steps to the CBDRA (or VCA) approach to ensure proper inclusion of PWD. First they do a survey on the number and type of disabled people in the commune. Then they approach these PWD, listen to them, and try to motivate them to join the CBDRA. Both PWD and their relatives will receive a separate training in disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, before joining the commune VCA. This helps them to become more confident. Not all PWD join the VCA. They select a few representatives amongst themselves who are confident to talk on their behalf (rather than having the local authorities or VNRC selecting these people). The results of the VCA with active participation of PWD include amongst others practical information on who takes care of PWD during an evacuation, available transportation, etc.

⁵ Malteser; 2013



Photo 2: Home visit and interview with a disabled man in Phu Yen

"I'm not afraid of flood and storm. What I'm most afraid of is shortage of food. I do not have recommendations on how to make my life safer. I'm old and I accept my fate. However, any support in either cash or in-kind would be very welcome."

A man of 65, having difficult to walk and husband of a bedridden woman, An Giang

Though PWD have been poorly involved in the VCAs, all PWD interviewed that did attend the VCA, indicated that they very much appreciated to have been able to attend. Several PWDs spoken with during the field evaluation would love to be involved in future, while others did not, as they felt they had nothing to contribute due to their situation (negative self-image, as mentioned above). In this respect it must also be noted that disaster risk reduction is not always a top priority for

PWD. Several families with PWD visited during the

field evaluation were extremely poor, and living in dilapidated houses. For them, daily survival is already a struggle. Many PWD mentioned that neighbours, relatives and/or the People's Committee would warn them in case of a disaster and would help them to evacuate. This assurance made them feel safe enough.

Children

Disaster risk reduction is not an abstract topic for children. For instance, the children interviewed in Quang Xuan 2 brought up memories from the flood in 2009 that seriously affected their village. But disaster risk reduction is not about large-scale disasters, it is also very relevant to address risks in the daily environment of children. Most of the children interviewed during the field evaluation were eager to give examples of what they considered dangerous or scary for them. Hazards most frequently mentioned were: traffic (on the way to school); drowning; electricity and lightning. When encouraged, they could also think of some risk reduction measures such as staying at home during thunderstorms and learning how to swim. Environmental pollution was also a popular topic among the children, especially in Thuy Xuan.

Despite the children's eagerness and relevant ideas, children have not really been involved in the VCA. As per observation of the evaluators, the communication seems to have been mainly one-way: VNRC provides information to the children (awareness raising) but does not take information from them to get a better understanding on the hazards in the community and to feed the planning for risk reduction measures. None of the VCA reports reviewed made any statement related to the particular risks that children face (and what to do about it), which is a missed opportunity. In An Giang the children joined the 'Safe School model', which however only focuses on the school itself, not on its environment such as the road to school or other places children frequently visit and which could hold potential dangers to them.

Elderly

It was not easy to find out about elderly people's involvement in the VCA, as it was hard for them to remember (most VCAs were conducted in 2013 and 2014). During the interview sessions however often memories came back to them. According to several of the elderly, they had had no difficulties in understanding during their participation in the VCA. Only once language problems were mentioned (in Vinh Trung, An Giang). They said to have found it easy to speak out, as they got encouraged by the VNRC facilitators.

Despite the generally positive feedback of the elderly on their participation in VCAs, none of the reviewed VCA reports included specific analysis regarding risks or risk reduction for elderly.

2.3 Inclusion of climate change adaptation

Climate change is a popular yet obscure subject for most people interviewed during the VCA. When asked about it, quite some people (especially local authorities) mention local changes in climate that according to them are happening and which they address to climate change. Some trainers explain that they look at trends when doing the historical profile, while others admit that they avoid the topic due to feeling uncertain about how to address it properly. The VCA manual is only partly of help to them. It contains a number of guidance notes related to climate change adaptation, but the topic is not referred format for data collection, analysis or reporting. As a result, only few of the reviewed VCA reports included information on predicted climate change impact (as per secondary data) or changes in climate observed by commune people, and none used this information in the analysis to come to appropriate risk reduction planning.

"We focus on awareness on climate change among the local population. The Climate Change Adaption Plan (CCAP) focuses on communication and awareness raising through trainings, radio, and loudspeakers. However the topic is very conceptual. People want to see the reality."

DONRE, An Giang

to in any concrete

result, only few of the reviewed

"Integration of climate change must be done in each component of the VCA process: livelihood, health, environment, housing, etc."

A VNRC master trainer

A number of documents from different organizations show how climate change could be addressed in CBDRM and community assessments, for instance the report 'Integrating DRR and CCA into development programmes guidelines' of CCWG, DMWG and JANI, and the report 'Integrating climate change and urban risks into the VCA' by IFRC. Although not been tested yet at the time of the evaluation, the document that seems most concrete and simple to use, is the one made by GRC based on documents from CARE and the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre. As explained to the consultant, GRC doesn't want to force the topic of climate change upon people, as it will lead to the result that people attribute all negative developments to climate change. GRC rather informs the facilitator only, and asks him/her not to mention climate change right at the start of the VCA, or not mention it at all. Instead, the focus should be on trends that should be translated to 'climate smart' solutions. For instance, the GRC-supported Climate Smart Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction programme in the Mekong delta includes some innovative livelihood models.

2.4 Appropriateness in urban context

With more and more people in Vietnam living in urban areas, risk assessment in urban areas is increasingly important. However, in many ways the urban context is different from the rural context, such as population density, lack of a clear-cut community, more diversity in cultures and languages, more diverse livelihoods, and issues of migration. VNRC facilitators are used to doing VCAs in rural areas. During the time of the evaluation they had only just started to familiarize themselves with the urban context, through an AmRC supported pilot programme on assessment of urban hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities in Hanoi, Quang Nam, Quang Ngai and Ha Tinh. They based their Urban Risk Assessment on IFRC and ISET materials. According to AmRC the initial pilots showed that the assessments miss out on a number of critical issues, such as including the private sector, addressing specific urban problems such as migration, and adjusting the assessment methods and planning to deal with the fact that urban local informants are less willing or able to participate in group sessions (especially not during working hours).

AmRC reported also that due to their fear for the complexity of urban VCA, VNRC tends to select the most rural parts of the city for doing a VCA. Also Ward 6 of Tuy Hoa city (a city with over 200,000 inhabitants), which is part of the GRC-supported risk reduction programme, is more a semi-urban than an urban area. Its VCA report, as well as other semi-urban VCA/CBDRA reports (12) reviewed during the evaluation, did not show any significant difference as compared to rural VCAs. Suggested risk reduction measures did not differ from those proposed in rural contexts.

Whether the VCA could be adjusted to fit urban contexts (in combination with training of facilitators), or other methods and approaches are needed to deal with the challenges of the complex urban environment, is a question that could not be answered during the limited time of the evaluation. AmRC is however addressing this issue in their pilot programme. They hope that in a few years time they will have developed a feasible approach to address the needs in urban areas.

2.5 VCA reports

In total 69 VCA reports were reviewed during the evaluation. This resulted in the following main observations.

Report structure

Even though the VCA guide provides a VCA report format, VNRC facilitators have been using different report structures and formats for compiling and presenting information. These were mostly differences between different facilitators, but sometimes even the same facilitator used different formats. A few reports (in Phu Yen) presented all information in a table format. Almost none of the reports (6 out of 69) included annexes to present the outcomes of the VCA tools.

Several VNRC facilitators mixed elements of both VCA and CBDRA in their reports. This is particularly the case for the problem analysis in the CBDRA reports, in which results are presented according to the problem tree tool (which is a tool included in VCA), instead of according to the table format provided in the CBDRA manual. About 24 VCA reports of VNRC and 3 VCA reports of NRC used the CBDRA general information template. This could be an advantage because it makes information more easily to be used for other purposes, such as for sector planning, Disaster Preparedness Plan (DPP) or Social Economic Development Plan (SEDP), and to be updated annually.

Data analysis

In the reviewed VCA reports data analysis is generally poor:

- Most of the VCA reports contain a lot of general information, but lack proper analysis. Essential links between different parts of information is lacking. For instance, proposed risk reduction measures are often inconsistent with the identified risks.
- Some of the valuable information collected is not included in the analysis. For instance, about 10 reports of VCAs of VNRC conducted in the South included the results of a household survey. However, only one of the reports had included the results of this survey in the analysis part of the report. Also, in almost all reports reviewed the results of the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis were separated from the other results of the VCA and did not feed into the vulnerability and capacity assessment.
- Analysing seems confused with summarizing: VNRC facilitators seem to look for a general picture of the situation, rather than to identify differences between areas and groups of people (social groups). This results in very general risk reduction measures that could be proposed for almost any commune.

Due to the above-mentioned weaknesses, the VCA reports are often rather lengthy and general. Most VCA reports are therefore informative rather than useful for concrete risk reduction planning.

2.6 Training and facilitation skills

VCAs are conducted by VNRC's so-called master trainers, supported by provincial facilitators (who have been trained by the master trainers). The number of master trainers that is most frequently deployed (and thus are the most experienced) is said to be not more than 8 (as per the opinion of the informants in this evaluation). Their number is even decreasing due to people leaving VNRC (e.g. due to old age). Opportunities for capacity building for less experienced facilitators are however limited, hampering the influx of new master trainers. This is partly due to the following reasons:

- Though VNRC has a training centre, there is no system in place for training and retraining of trainers and facilitators. VNRC therefore depends on support from external donors and movement partners. The master trainers have been trained under the different DIPECHO funded programmes (DIPECHO V up to VIII). Training opportunities have however reduced over the recent years. People within and outside the Red Cross speak informally of a so-called 'first and a second generation' of master trainers. The 'first generation' received much more training (8-9 courses) than the 'second generation' (just 2 courses, meaning 16 days). Most of the trainers received additional training on specific topics through projects of

movement partners and other NGOs (such as the project on urban VCA of AmRC and PWD of Malteser International).

- A national system for deployment of master trainers is lacking. There is no up-to-date facilitator list that provides an overview of available trainers/facilitators and their particular skills and experience. Deployment is managed at chapter level, with approval at national level. In practise organizations that would like to use a VNRC trainer or facilitator (both Red Cross and non-Red Cross actors), directly contact the preferred candidate. Because the group of popular master trainers is small, this practise leads to the fact that experienced trainers are often ‘overbooked’ and hard to get.

Some Red Cross actors mentioned that most of VNRC’s master trainers have a strong background in disaster management. Naturally, this scopes their facilitation of the VCA. Other sectors (such as livelihoods) risk therefore to remain underexposed.

During the field evaluation, the feedback of communities on the training and facilitation skills of VNRC was predominantly positive. People found the VCA sessions informative, felt at ease and called the VNRC facilitators friendly. The interviews with NGOs, UNDP and DMC gave however another view to this. VNRC master trainers are highly appreciated for their training skills. Regarding their facilitation skills however, some more critical remarks were made. VNRC facilitators were said not to be strong in mobilizing particularly vulnerable groups, nor do they stimulate them to contribute to the discussion. This weakness is confirmed by several observations during the field evaluation, as described under paragraph 2.2. Also many of the local informants consulted during the field evaluation recalled that they participated in information sessions, rather than in sessions to share experiences and opinions. This would explain the fact that many VCA reports show a remarkable similarity in risk reduction measures for different communes. If VNRC facilitators neglect to use the opportunity to get people’s ideas and opinions, the VCA will contribute mainly to awareness raising, and fails to use people’s ideas and opinions for better disaster risk reduction planning.



Photo 3: Testing the VCA amendment in Mai Hoa, Quang Binh.

2.7 Effectiveness of VCA for local follow up and higher level planning

The VNRC staff and trainers interviewed during the evaluation highly valued the importance of the VCA. Advantages mentioned by them include:

- A VCA helps local people to realize the risks they face, and to find solutions to reduce these risks;
- The VCA process contributes to a better understanding between local authorities and communities. Local authorities learn about the specific vulnerabilities of different villages/sections in their communes/wards and become more aware about communities' opinions, suggestions. At the same time, a VCA makes people more active and responsible, and better responding to disaster management instructions from local authorities (such as an evacuation alert);
- The VCA makes VNRC more visible in the community;
- The VCA could provide useful inputs for DPP and SEDP.

"Before the VCA the disaster preparedness planning was done top down: the district comes with a plan and tells the commune what to do, but they don't know exactly about the needs of the local people. With the VCA the plan is developed at commune level and submitted to the district. Changing the process from top down to bottom up doesn't succeed overnight. However by doing it more often and advocating for it, it will eventually work."

VNRC, An Giang

According to the VNRC trainers interviewed, the results of the VCA are highly appreciated by commune people and involved local authorities. When asked about this, authorities mentioned that the VCA was particularly useful for them and their commune in the following ways:

- Risk reduction measures will be more practical as the VCA provides more precise information on risks;
- Better insight in the needs of particularly vulnerable groups/people, leading to more adapted measures;
- Awareness and responsibility of local people have increased (as opposed to relying fully on the authorities).

"The VCA shows real needs of commune people and measures to reduce vulnerability. Before the authorities also planned for disaster preparedness, but with the VCA it is clearer where the vulnerable areas are."

Local authorities of Tan Tuyen

Despite the positive words of the local authorities, concrete evidence of the added value of VCA in disaster risk reduction planning was difficult to find. After all, as explained in paragraph 2.5, the VCA reports generally did not include such practical and adapted measures. Both VNRC and authorities also admitted that in reality the VCA reports are often not really used once the VCA has been finalized. The following reasons were identified:

- VNRC usually does not monitor or follow up on the results of the VCA if it is not part of a donor-supported project. The VNRC facilitators do not see this as their task, and local VNRC staff (provincial, district, commune level) also do not do so. Without support of VNRC, authorities are less likely to use the report.
- VCA reports are not easy to use for authorities. Reports are said to be too lengthy, contain a lot of general information (which is usually information already known to the authorities), while concrete measures are lacking, too general, or beyond the capacity at local level.
- For local authorities to be able to include VCA results in higher level planning, they need to receive reports that contain results that are easily translated into SEDP or DPP inputs. Also the timing of the VCA report is then very important. If the VCA is done too late, its results cannot be included in the planning process anymore. If too early, people have forgotten

about it when the DPP and SEDP planning is being done (especially since there is no follow-up by VNRC, see the first bullet). Moreover, UNDP and some NGOs note that planning processes at local/provincial level have become quite complex in Vietnam, with many different plans such as SEDP, CBDRM, DP (Disaster Preparedness), CAP, etc. It would help if VNRC would involve the authorities throughout the VCA process (instead of just sending the report), but this is not always the case. Also, VNRC often only provides the commune People's Committee with a copy, and forget to share the VCA results with the district and provincial authorities.

The lack of follow up on VCA results in government planning is also an important conclusion of the recent AmRC VCA evaluation⁶. In practise this means that if the VCA is not part of a donor-funded project, the risk reduction measures proposed in the VCA report will likely not be implemented.

"The disaster preparedness planning would become more practical with VCA. However, if the VCA does not include funding for follow up, the VCA will be less usable."

Local authorities of Thuy Xuan

Good example of use of VCA in government planning

The commune authorities of Hoa Nam commune (Dong Hung district, Thai Binh province) acknowledged using the VCA for local planning. The DPP and SEDP plans from 2012 up to 2014 confirmed this. Despite the fact that the VCA reports for this commune are not that strong (lengthy reports, containing a lot of information but lacking analysis and showing inconsistency in findings and conclusions), proposed measures can be found back in both the DPP and SEDP. It is also worth mentioning that the quality of the commune DPP of 2014 is much better than those reviewed of other communes, in terms of format and content (clear and detailed plan of who does what and which resources to be mobilized before, during and after disasters (material and human resources)).⁷

⁶ Duong Van; 2014

⁷ The evaluators received the DPP and SEDP only at the end of their visit. Unfortunately it was impossible to go back and find out why the results in this commune were more positive as compared to others.



Photo 4: Meeting with authorities in Vinh Trung commune, An Giang

A different view on participatory planning

SNV uses different methods to involve local communities in development planning (usually related to climate change adaptation and mitigation related to livelihoods and agriculture). One of these is a risk assessment tool that is based on PRA and VCA and used to assess risks related to agricultural commodities. The results feed directly into the commune agricultural and crop plan and the SEDP, without creating any separate report.

According to SNV, local authorities often find the VCA a rather complex method, making them confused on how to organize it. Therefore SNV sometimes prefers to go back to the normal village meetings, with which local authorities are familiar and which can include a large number of people. In their perception, this does not need to reduce the level of participation, since local people are used to these meetings and therefore will feel at ease.

Apart from the inadequate follow up of the VCA results by local and higher level authorities, also for community people themselves the VCA ends when they finish their participation in a VCA session. Reasons for this lack of commune follow up include:

- Due to lack of follow-up and monitoring by either their authorities or VNRC people forget about the VCA rather quickly. Any evidence of the VCA is removed out of sight of the commune (maps, drawings, cropping calendar, etc. are often kept somewhere in a VNRC office).
- As noted in paragraph 2.6, VCA facilitators often inform rather than consult local informants during the VCA sessions. In such case the proposed risk reduction measures are not coming from the local people but from the facilitators, which does not contribute to a sense of ownership and activeness.
- Most people interviewed said not to know what the results of the VCA were. They were not informed about these as part of the VCA process. According to the information of local authorities, usually the VCA results are broadcasted through the local loudspeaker system, but this is temporary and doesn't reach everyone.
- Proposed measures are too general and often too large-scale to be within the implementation capacity of local people.

“Local authorities think VCA results are from the Red Cross, not theirs. So they expect more support from VNRC rather than seeing it as their responsibility to use the VCA results.”

A VNRC master trainer

Good example of collaboration between VNRC and local authorities in the VCA process

In Tan Tuyen, An Giang, VNRC held an advocacy meeting with commune and district authorities before starting the VCA. They also invited the authorities to take part in the SWOT analysis. After they had sent the VCA report to the commune People's Committee, VNRC hold a meeting with the local authorities to explain the results and ask for comments.

Also after having finalized the VCA, VNRC remains involved. The VNRC representative at commune level attends the monthly meeting with CNDPC and CPC in which he updates them on the issues mentioned in the VCA.

Tan Tuyen has not yet succeeded in attracting additional district funding, however, they use the priorities as identified in the VCA report to allocate funding that is available.

3 VCA as compared to CBDRA

3.1 CBDRA

In July 2009, the Prime Minister under Decision 1002/QĐ-TTg approved the programme to 'Enhance Community Awareness and Community Based Disaster Risk Management' ('Programme 1002'). Under this programme the Government of Vietnam decided that a CBDRA should be conducted in 6,000 communes⁸, which is about half of the total number of communes in Vietnam⁹. Although there is a number of assessment methods and guides available in Vietnam, being developed and used by different NGOs and organizations, DMC considered these too complex to be conducted by the commune itself. Therefore DMC decided to develop its own tool, the Community Based Disaster Risk Assessment (CBDRA), which was approved in May 2014.

"It should be recognized that the success of the CBDRA so far is due to the knowledge and skills of the VCA facilitators involved."

IFRC

The manual was developed with help of Live and Learn and a consultant. The whole CBDRM process is supported by UNDP¹⁰. Co-partners in this process were/are the Women Union; Oxfam and VNRC. VNRC master trainers have been intensively involved in the development of CBDRA. As a result the tool is largely derived from the VCA. In fact, some people interviewed called it a 'VCA-light' – a tool that very much resembles the VCA, but which is better integrated in government planning¹¹. VNRC has also been actively involved in the trainings on CBDRA. VNRC master trainers facilitated all training at provincial level (in collaboration with other organisations). Also a large number of the people trained at provincial level (who will train the authorities at commune level) are staff from VNRC. At commune level, VNRC has been mentoring the CBDRA facilitation.

UNDP said to be very satisfied with the way VNRC has conducted the provincial training, realizing that this has been a large time investment for VNRC. DMC acknowledges their need for VNRC to support them in CBDRA training and facilitation, but also noted that not all VNRC trainers had received CBDRA training yet, so that during the training of provincial staff these trainers also put in elements of VCA. This seems also to have been the case in the implementation in the field (mentored by VNRC). Some trainers used their own VCA training without adjusting it to CBDRA language and content.

At the time of the evaluation 51 CBDRA had been conducted and all target provinces (20) were trained (mainly people from CNDPC and mass organizations). Several NGOs have criticisms on the quality of the training, because of the large number of participants, the considerable turnover of participants during the duration of the training (so that many of them only received part of the training), and the loss of information due to the TOT model from provincial level to commune level. The district level has not (yet) been involved. The impression of UNDP about these first CBDRA was however positive. According to UNDP, there seems to have been genuine community participation; awareness raising on risks, and gender awareness. The response included quite some structural measures, but also some soft ones. Though there are still limitations regarding the quality, UNDP considers this a good start.

⁸ Communes not yet selected at the time of the evaluation.

⁹ In the opinion of DMC all communes in the country should have a CBDRA. However, this is beyond the country's (financial) capacity.

¹⁰ Under UNDP's SCDM-II programme (Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Disaster Risk Management in Vietnam, including Climate Change related risks – phase II).

¹¹ Source: UNDP

UNDP looks at the approval of the CBDRA as a huge step forward for the Government of Vietnam to reach more local participation in CBDRM. Following the CBDRA approval in 2014, guidelines for M&E got approved and published, and some minor changes to the approach have been worked on to address some of the shortcomings identified¹². In 2015 a guidance circular is expected to be published on the integration into SEDP.

"CBDRA brings VN a participatory planning approach. It teaches the community and gives them a voice."

UNDP

3.2 Differences and similarities

The following are the most important differences and similarities between the VCA and the CBDRA (see Annex 3 for a detailed comparison between both the VCA and the CBDRA, based on their manuals).

Objective and expected results

The objective and expected results of both VCA and CBDRA as mentioned in their manuals are very similar. Both manuals mention awareness raising and identification of hazards, vulnerability, and capacity and the formulation of disaster risk reduction measures as the key objectives and/or expected results. Both also mention that these need to be included in local (development) planning at different levels. However, there is one important difference: the VCA includes both natural and man-made hazards, while the CBDRA includes only natural hazards (staying close to the definition of hazards as provided in the Vietnam Law on Disaster Prevention and Control¹³).

Methodology

- The VCA is a tool for conducting by experts, namely trained VNRC practitioners, while the CBDRA is designed for the use by local government and commune people (Commune Working Group supported by the Technical Working Group)
- Though the number of stages defined in both approaches differ (8 in the VCA versus 5 in the CBDRA, they cover almost the same steps. The difference is that the VCA also pays attention to advocacy (as one of the stages) while the CBDRA does not mention this.
- Both manuals mention the need for an annual update of the VCA. Neither of them however gives any guidance on how to do this.
- Both the VCA and CBDRA take five days to conduct.

Tools

- Most tools of the CBDRA are similar to that of the VCA, only less in number. The number of tools used in the CBDRA (9) is much lower than that of the VCA (14).
- The CBDRA does not have FGDs with specific vulnerable groups. The VCA has a good livelihood analysis.
- The order of the assessment tools and the link between the tools is clearer in the CBDRA than in the VCA.
- In the CBDRA manual the problem analysis is presented in a table format instead of as a problem tree (VCA).
- The CBDRA has concrete examples of completed tools in the annex.
- The tools in the CBDRA manual provide more detailed guidance on the information that should be gathered.

¹² Adding clarifications for the appropriate use of some tools, some wording issues and proper referral to annexes (source: UNDP)

¹³ Law on Natural Disaster Prevention and Control; No 33/2013/QH13, Date 19/06/2013; Effective 1st May 2014; Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development; United Nations Development Programme

Manual

- In many aspects, the VCA manual is tailored to professional users, and the CBDRA manual to commune level users. This is reflected in language, the amount of conceptual information and guidance, etc.
- Whereas both manuals consist of approximately the same number of pages, in the VCA manual key concepts, principles and approaches (Part I) takes most of the volume, while the CBDRA manual spends most pages on the practical guidance of the use of the tools.
- Presentation of concepts and definitions in the VCA mainly reflect those used by Red Cross internationally, while those in the CBDRA follow the Vietnam Law on Disaster Prevention and Control.
- Advocacy for following up on the VCA results is addressed specifically in the VCA manual, but not in the CBDRA manual.
- Though in an annex, the CBDRA manual gives guidance for M&E, while this is not addressed by the VCA manual.

Inclusiveness

- The inclusion of specific vulnerable groups, climate change adaptation and application in urban context gets more attention in the VCA manual. For each tool these topics are systematically addressed. For example, tips and guidance on how to work with children; elderly; PWDs in FGDs are provided on page 35-36 Part II. However, in the outputs (tables and report format) there is little to no guidance on how to include specific data regarding vulnerable groups. This is different for CBDRA. Much less information is provided about inclusion of vulnerable groups and climate change. Also, not all vulnerable groups identified are consistently referred to (main reference is to women, men, youth). In some tools however, vulnerable groups are included in the format.
- The VCA and CBDRA guide have (almost) the same overview tables that provide tips and points for consideration regarding specific vulnerable groups: children; women; PWD; elderly; poor; ethnic minority (for VCA in Part I, for CBDRA in the annex).
- The CBDRA does not address assessment in an urban context.

Report (structure)

- The CBDRA includes a basic information collection template in the annex (5).
- The report formats in neither the VCA manual nor that of the CBDRA refer much to specific vulnerable groups.
- The CBDRA report includes a special section (D) on suggestions and priorities for authorities at different levels.

Documentation (accessibility of the results)

- Neither the VCA nor the CBDRA provide any suggestion of what to do with the direct outputs of the tools (the maps, flipcharts, etc.).

3.3 Comparative advantages and disadvantages

The following paragraphs provide the opinion of different stakeholders regarding the advantages and disadvantages of CBDRA as compared to VCA. It should be noted that this comparison is based on only limited experience with the CBDRA as the tool has only recently been launched and is still being piloted and reviewed.

Opinion of VNRC

During the evaluation VNRC leadership was not available to provide its opinion about the CBDRA as compared to the VCA, or to explain which approach VNRC considers for its future CBDRM work. It would also be quite early for VNRC to have an opinion on this. However, VNRC staff seemed open and interested to see how the CBDRA compares to VCA and what the advantages and disadvantages of both would be.

All VNRC master trainers interviewed had experience in conducting both VCA and CBDRA. When being asked for their opinion on both tools, most said to prefer the CBDRA tool, if supplemented with some good points from VNRC's VCA method (for instance: general information template, historical profile and season calendar). According to them:

- The CBDRA is more practical than the VCA because it contains less assessment tools, while the tools included in the CBDRA are more practical and comprehensive (more information can be gathered in one tool).
- The three components (community safety; health/sanitation/hygiene; environment; production and economic activities) distinguished for vulnerability and hazards are considered more relevant to the Vietnamese context than the five components (livelihood and resilience; people's well-being; self-protection; social protection; governance) mentioned in the VNRC manual.
- CBDRA leads to clear risk reduction measures that local authorities can use to improve their DPP and integrate into SEDP.
- VNRC VCA manuals are well designed, but rather thick and theoretical so that only professional facilitators can use them. They are not so much a practical guidebook like the CBDRA that local facilitators could use (manual should be simplified).
- The VCA manual has no syntheses tables for each tool to compile the results of the discussion, as the CBDRA has. Therefore compiling information for reporting is more difficult.
- The VCA report often has poor follow up, while the CBDRA report is under the government Programme 1002, and would therefore have to be used by the local authorities (however, no evidence of whether and how this would work was available at the time of the evaluation).

The VNRC trainers also mentioned disadvantages of the CBDRA. These include:

- Facilitators have to conduct CBDRA right after they received training. They therefore lack experience, and time for proper preparation.
- The number of days for training of VCA facilitators is 10 (divided in two stages), while that for CBDRA facilitators is only 7 days (CBDRA, training techniques and skills are all included in one 7-day training).
- Different trainers mention different strong points of the VCA that they would like to see added to the CBDRA. These relate to personal preferences for the way tools have been designed, such as the ranking tool and the cause-effect analysis (problem tree in VCA manual, table in CBDRA manual). Some tools they would like to see added to the CBDRA, such as observation and the Venn diagram.

“Covering all types of hazards, both natural and social ones, is helpful to better understand the causes and effects between them.”

A VNRC master trainer

Regarding the focus on only natural hazards (CBDRA) or both natural and man-made hazards (VCA), the VNRC trainers are at variance. Some of the trainers interviewed think the focus on natural hazards only is fine, because the main objective of the CBDRA is to provide input for local Disaster Preparedness Plans (which are under MARD and can therefore only include natural hazards). Others support the idea of covering all types of hazards, because there are many man-made hazards that are of concern to the community.

Also regarding the advantages and disadvantages related to local facilitation (CBDRA) as compared to expert facilitation (VCA), the opinions between the VNRC trainers differ. Local facilitators know well about their local situation, which would be an advantage. However, their facilitation might sometimes not be impartial, and local informants may not feel comfortable to share their opinion.

Opinion of other stakeholders

All NGOs interviewed, except for ISET, Malteser International and SNV, have been applying both the VNRC VCA and their own internal VCA method, the latter often being adjusted to specifically target their focus group (such as children and youth, women, etc.). They however all said to make a move towards using the CBDRA. The main reason is that the CBDRA is a government-approved tool, and that using it will support the government policy, and reach consistency in assessments throughout the country. Another advantage mentioned by most of them is the fact that the CBDRA method is much simpler and its language much less technical, so that it is easier to be understood and remembered by local communities. Nevertheless, also these NGOs are critical regarding the quality of the CBDRA. They however rather work on the improvement of the CBDRA than to keep applying their own tools. These NGOs also think that VNRC should accept the CBDRA for the same reasons as they do.

"We should all adopt the CBDRA and not keep to our own methods. We should strive towards synergy, not differences."

World Vision

UNDP sees no need for VNRC to completely abandon its VCA. UNDP acknowledges that a well-implemented VCA is much more in depth than a CBDRA. According to UNDP there is therefore no question about it that the Government of Vietnam could count the VCAs under Programme 1002, thus contributing to the goal of doing 6,000 CBDRAs throughout the country (however VNRC should then report to DMC, something that hasn't been done so far). However, if VNRC keeps to its VCA, it should do something to create more local ownership, such as adding a few days to the process to sit with the local government to work on integration into the SEDP.

Red Cross movement partners present in Vietnam have different opinions regarding CBDRA. Some consider the CBDRA of much less quality than the VCA. Their main concern is the narrow focus of the CBDRA as compared to that of VCA. Adopting the CBDRA makes them feel like going back to VNRCs HVCA of the past. Though acknowledging that the CBDRA is still under development, concerns are raised about the usefulness of the CBDRA report if its content is not solid enough. This concern is especially shared by people involved in VCAs that are used in projects with external donor support. They are concerned that the CBDRA reports fall short in convincing external donors to fund mitigation measures.

"Just because you do CBDRA and make local authorities facilitator, doesn't mean that you contribute to SEDP. It is also about how to work with local authorities, and how the commune selection takes place."

IFRC

Other Red Cross movement partners recognize some distinguishing advantages of the CBDRA: it is much better connected to local government, and better includes historical knowledge (through local government). Mitigation measures are more likely to be followed up because of its integration in DPP planning. Some people opt for doing both: follow the CBDRA when possible to better link to government planning, and do VCA when the donor asks for a more rigorous, in-depth study. Several of the NGOs interviewed have a slightly other approach to this issue. They consider the CBDRA as a core tool, which they could still elaborate with additional modules to provide more time for the specific focus of their organization. They also see the need for (and opportunities to) widen the scope of the CBDRA to include man-made hazards. DMC does not object to this, though risk reduction measures related to these hazards would not fit into government programmes that are funded by MARD.

One of the Red Cross movement partners raised its concern on the level of participation in the CBDRA approach. Since local authorities are the facilitators, people might not feel at ease to speak out. This would mean that the process of a CBDRA is less participatory than a VCA. Several NGOs with experience

and knowledge of both VCA and CBDRA however oppose this concern, saying that the skills of the facilitator are more important for the success of reaching true participation of commune people than the method used.

In theory the implementation of CBDRA should be less dependent on donor support than VCAs, as they are part of Programme 1002. However, at the time of the evaluation in practise all CBDRA had been supported by UNDP (partly with AusAID funds). According to UNDP, in future also other donors are likely to support, such as WorldBank, ADB and JICA, and NGOs will include CBDRA in their programmes. The Government of Vietnam had not yet financed any CBDRA.

Experiences from CBDRA facilitators and local authorities

The evaluation included only one commune that implemented a CBDRA (Xuan Quang 2) and one commune that conducted a hybrid CBDRA/VCA (a mix of both) (Ward 6). In addition, the CBDRA was still very new to them. The information collected during the evaluation is therefore too limited to draw solid conclusions on the actual practice of CBDRA. Facilitators of both communes however indicated that they are confident about implementing the CBDRA, but still need support from VNRC. The type of support needed differed per commune (either in preparing the CBDRA, or in data compilation/analysis and report writing). Ward 6 mentioned that it faced time constraints when conducting the VCA and reporting its results. Both communes said to appreciate the support of VNRC very much, especially because their support made them feel more comfortable and at ease in conducting the CBDRA.

"I prefer CBDRA because the local authorities are better involved. VCA is implemented by VNRC and only the results are shared with the authorities. However, if good post-VCA advocacy would be conducted, VCA and CBDRA present the same level of relevance for the integration of its results in government planning."

CNDPC of Xuan Quang 2

Due to the timing of the CBDRA conducted, no results could be reported yet about the success of integrating the CBDRA results into government planning. Nevertheless, the authorities mentioned that once the communes all implement CBDRA and thus use the same format for reporting on disaster risk and measures, integration into government planning should become easier.

Positive experiences with the CBDRA approach

In Ward 6 (Phu Yen province) the ward authorities carefully considered the human resources involved in the CBDRA. They chose staff of key divisions that had the capacity and knowledge to participate in the project. All staff was explained about the project objectives and activities. Then the selected people received training and became part of the Technical Support Group. This group worked with the communities.

Once the project has ended, the Technical Support Group will continue consulting CNDPC in all activities, especially in planning. Also, during disasters, they are the ones who directly provide support.

It was quite a new approach for the ward, but the ward authorities and local people were very willing to join the project and work together well.

Source: Authorities of Ward 6



Photo 5: Working with community people of Tan Tuyen, An Giang

4 Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

VNRC, supported by its partners, has throughout the years spent a lot of efforts in building VCA facilitation capacity. It has made VNRC a well-known VCA champion in the country. Many other stakeholders, including both NGOs and government, appreciate VNRC's capacity and make use of its facilitator pool. However, the evaluation shows that VNRC's VCA capacity is in need of maintenance. To ensure that the VCAs have a meaningful contribution to effective local community risk reduction planning, especially the following areas need attention: meaningful inclusion of vulnerable groups through better facilitation; better data analysis and reporting; and follow-up on VCA results at different levels. In addition, VNRC needs a better system to maintain and develop its pool of trainers.

Due to the participative evaluation that included the involvement of VNRC, other Red Cross movement partners, NGOs, government and local communities, a large number of recommendations could be identified to improve the current VCA practice, see paragraph 4.2. Some of them address the functionality of the VCA tool. Several of these have been translated into practical formats to support VNRC – see paragraph 4.3. Other recommendations relate to capacity constraints of the VNRC. For these further follow up needs to be considered, which goes beyond the scope of this study.

Despite VNRC's long history in conducting the VCA, keeping to this tool is not obvious anymore, now that the Government of Vietnam is rolling out their CBDRA in 6,000 communes over the country. It is important that VNRC makes up its mind on how it would like to continue: keep to the VCA, or adopt the CBDRA. Other organizations in Vietnam have been faced with the same question. Most of the organizations interviewed for the evaluation decided to exchange their own tool for the government-approved CBDRA. There are pros and cons to the adoption of CBDRA, and some people see the possibility to have both methods co-existing. If VNRC would choose to change to CBDRA, the areas of attention for the VCA as mentioned in the first paragraph above would still apply. Only follow up through local disaster preparedness planning would likely become easier when using CBDRA. The quality of facilitation (coaching in the case of CBDRA) and data analysis and reporting would still need to be strengthened.

VNRC should recognize that even if it would decide to follow the example of other organizations to adopt the CBDRA, this would not mean that the years of capacity building on VCA would suddenly turn useless, or that VNRC would lose its value as a key-actor in community disaster risk reduction assessments and planning. The fact that the Government of Vietnam has chosen to apply CBDRA is an important step in involving local communities in their own risks reduction and development planning. Due to its VCA practice and extensive experience VNRC has been able to contribute to this important development. VNRC has been intensively involved in the development of CBDRA, resulting in a 'VCA-light'. This should be considered a clear recognition of VNRC's VCA achievements.

Being auxiliary to the government, VNRC could keep a permanent role in supporting the government of Vietnam in the implementation of the CBDRA. VNRC has had years of capacity building to arrive at its current VCA capacity. It is therefore highly unlikely that local authorities, to whom the CBDRA is new and who had only limited training, could manage without support within a few years from now. The Government of Vietnam has therefore clearly indicated to appreciate VNRC's continued support to the CBDRA.

In addition, it is not unlikely that the implementation of CBDRA in Vietnam will remain dependent on donor funding, which could include externally supported programmes of VNRC.



Photo 6: Lack of accessibility for PWD at the commune hall of Hoa Nam, Thai Binh

4.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations relate to the most imminent shortcomings identified during the evaluation. Though they focus on VNRC's VCA, as mentioned in paragraph 4.1 above, most of them would apply as well if VNRC would decide to change to CBDRA.

Manual, methodology and tools

- The VCA should allow more time for data collection and analysis. For instance by being more selective in choosing tools for data collection (reducing the number of tools used) as quality of the information is more important than quantity.
- VNRC facilitators should receive more or better training on the VCA methodology, specifically related to data analysis.
- VNRC facilitators should make better use of all information provided in the current VNRC VCA manual.
- A VCA does not finish when the report has been written. If VNRC does not see a task for itself in monitoring and follow up, it should seriously consider the effectiveness of doing a VCA, especially if not more emphasize is paid to connecting with local authorities.
- Following the example of the CBDRA, the VCA would increase its relevance if authorities at different levels would be involved in a meaningful way from the beginning till the end of the VCA process. This includes consulting the authorities in an early stage, and checking with them when and how VCA results should best be presented to ensure easy integration in government planning processes.
- Ideally, the VCA should be tailor-made to fill gaps and contribute to existing disaster management planning processes rather than replacing it. Good collaboration with local authorities and a proper secondary information study are therefore important. Instead of

duplicating what has already been done, VNRC should focus on the weaknesses in local DM planning (for instance the involvement of vulnerable groups).

- Commune people should be better informed about the results of the VCA. In addition, more should be done to keep the VCA results alive in the commune, also after the VCA has finished. As local people are unlikely to read the VCA report, more creative thinking could be done on how to publish the results of the VCA. This could include the production of visual materials, publication of progress on commune publication boards, etc.

Inclusion of vulnerable groups

- VNRC facilitators should read the practical guidance in the VCA manual on how to better include vulnerable groups. A lot of the valuable inputs on this topic seem to be unknown or ignored by the facilitators.
- Facilitators should be trained in how to better deal with physical and mental challenges of PWD, aiming at their participation in and contribution to the VCA. This includes better development of the trainers' soft skills on how to encourage involvement of PWD, and awareness of how logistical improvements could reduce barriers for their participation.
- VCA facilitators should involve children in a relevant way. This means amongst others inviting children to discuss the risks they face in their direct environment (not just at school, but also at home, from home to school, and in the places they often play). This information, as well as their suggestions how to reduce these risks, should be included in the VCA analysis and proposed measures.
- Facilitators should have better understanding of what it means to include gender. They should be able to assess differences in the way men and women are affected by disasters and include gender-specific risk reduction measures.
- Instead of presenting information about vulnerable groups separately from other information (or leaving it out completely), it should be part of the overall analysis and result in appropriate, targeted risk reduction measures. The VCA formats should provide guidance for this.

Inclusion of climate change adaptation

- Keep it simple. Information on climate change is easily confusing (for both facilitator and participant), might be incorrect, or put disproportionate attention to this cause of risks compared to other (human induced) causes (such as environmental degradation). Talking about climate change at commune level could also be avoided totally, and instead be covered by talking about disaster risk reduction and focussing on trends (whether or not climate change related). VCA formats should include practical guidance.
- VNRC facilitators should be trained in how to address climate change, based on existing materials such as that of GRC.

VCA reports

- Better formats should guide VCA facilitators to write more comprehensive and relevant reports.
- Facilitators that write the report should ensure that the information in the report is consistent. This means that proposed risk reduction measures follow logically from the analysis of hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities.
- VNRC facilitators should avoid summarizing information into a 'one-size-fits-all' report. Differentiation of risks and proposed measures between different sections or wards and social groups in the commune would result in more concrete risk reduction measures. This would facilitate the follow up of these measures.
- When proposing risk reduction measures, VNRC should encourage the VCA participants not just to focus on measures that depend on government implementation, but also specifically include measures that fit within the capacity of community people themselves. This would increase the ownership of the commune in the follow-up of the VCA results.

Appropriateness in urban context

- Development of urban risk assessment tools suitable for Vietnam is important, and requires a careful process of assessing existing tools (in Vietnam and beyond), testing and training. This will be a longer-term process that has already been started by (amongst others) AmRC and could be supported by other Red Cross movement partners.

Training and facilitation skills

- If VNRC would like to keep a key position in the country in facilitating VCAs or CBDRA, VNRC should urgently take action to set up a system to develop, refresh and maintain their (master) trainer pool. This should include promoting the influx of young, new trainers, providing regular refresher training to current trainers, ensuring sufficient practise opportunities for all trainers, and setting-up a coaching system for on-the-job training for less experienced trainers. A better, national managed and well-maintained system of trainer deployment would support this.
- If having a master trainers pool is of key importance to VNRC, it should ensure not to be fully dependent on external donors in maintaining it.
- VNRC should consider ensuring more diversity in technical background of their trainers (i.e. not just disaster management but also livelihoods, health, urban CBDRM, etc.) to be able to guarantee a more balanced VCA and/or better capacity to respond to certain donor focus areas. Another option would be to collaborate more with organizations that have specific expertise in these fields.
- VNRC facilitators should work on improving their facilitation skills. They should understand the differences between training, facilitation and coaching skills, and be able to apply the right set of skills in different situations. This is not just important for new and inexperienced trainers, but also a point of attention for current master trainers.

CBDRA

- Inform all VNRC chapters about Programme 1002 and CBDRA, for them to be sufficiently informed when engaging with local authorities.
- VNRC facilitators involved in CBDRA should be (better) trained in the CBDRA methodology and their specific role as technical advisor. Confusion between VCA and CBDRA methodology should be avoided. Coaching skills should be strengthened to better fulfil the role of technical advisor.

4.3 Follow up

From the above mentioned areas of attention and recommendations, the most pressing ones have been addressed through the development of an amendment to provide VNRC with some practical tools in the following areas:

- How to guarantee proper inclusion of vulnerable groups;
- How to better include information relevant for climate change adaptation;
- How to analyse collected data;
- How to write a short but comprehensive VCA report.

A selected number of VNRC VCA facilitators were trained by VNRC headquarters, GRC, Malteser International, and French Red Cross in using the amendments. After this training the VNRC facilitators tested the amended VCA during a field test in Mai Hoa commune (Tuyen Hoa district) and Bao Ninh commune (Dong Hoi city), Quang Binh province. The results of these tests and the feedback of VNRC facilitators have resulted in the following four amendments:

Amendment 1: Tips for better inclusion of vulnerable groups in VCA: In the VCA manual different groups have been identified that are particularly vulnerable: children, women, people with disability (PWD), elderly, poor people, and ethnic minority groups. Amendment 1 gives some

suggestions to better include women and PWD in addition to the tips and guidance provided in the VCA manual.

Amendment 2: Standard schedule for organizing a VCA: Amendment 2 presents a recommended VCA schedule to ensure:

- Having sufficient time and attention for secondary data collection;
- Keeping groups small in order to allow for more in-depth conversations;
- Having focus groups to ensure that different (social) groups in the community have the opportunity to speak out and be heard;
- Avoid generalization of the commune by having different sessions for different villages (instead of merging them all in one commune assessment).

This amendment also includes some tips on the selection participants and the involvement of local authorities.

Amendment 3: Format for VCA tools: These formats are different from those provided in the VCA manual, in the following ways:

- Less tools (12 recommended tools instead of 14 as is in the VCA manual), in order to allow more time per tool;
- Better formats for data analysis: each tool has a format for data collection and a format for data analysis. In these formats specific guidance is provided to include vulnerable groups and climate change (trends).

Amendment 4: Format for VCA report: This amendment includes a format for the VCA report that provides guidance for consolidating all information from the VCA into one comprehensive report. The format contains clear links to the formats of the VCA tools.

The amendments do not intend to replace the VCA manual and therefore do not duplicate information that is already in the VCA manual, but should be seen as an addition to it.



Photo 7: Workshop to share the results of the field testing of the VCA amendments (5 September 2015)

ANNEX 1: Detailed TOR

This TOR is the output of phase 1, Initial preparation, explaining the main concept, methodologies and work plan between the consultancy team and the GRC.

TERMS OF REFERENCE Consultancy for VCA Evaluation DIPECHO 9 - Vietnam

1. Summary

Title:	Participatory evaluation of the VCA used by the VNRC and comparative analysis with the Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Assessment (CBDRA) with involvement of relevant stakeholders and vulnerable groups.
Position:	1 International consultant (lead), and 1 National consultant
Duration & timing:	Maximum of 34 working days for the international consultant and 25 days for the national consultant, starting 24 th November with the final report completed by the 8 th of May 2015 (final draft by 30 April).
Duty station:	Hanoi, Viet Nam, with travel to selected communes in provinces
Reporting:	German Red Cross DRR delegate

2. Background

The project, *Enhancing the capacities of disaster risk reduction practitioners in Viet Nam through the consolidation of best practices and lessons learnt for community based disaster risk management, vulnerability capacity assessment and disaster response mechanisms*, funded by European Union humanitarian aid, supports disaster risk reduction (DRR) practitioners in Viet Nam to be better equipped and prepared to implement disaster risk management programmes.

The project will be implemented by the Vietnamese Red Cross (VNRC) with support from the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), the German Red Cross (GRC), and the Spanish Red Cross (SRC).

The GRC will directly provide support to the VNRC for the implementation of the Result 2 of the project which can be summarised as follows: The experience and knowledge of VNRC in implementing Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) is consolidated for replication by government staff and non-government DRR practitioners, through the evidenced based documentation of good practices including the incorporation of gender, disability and climate change adaptation approaches. The outputs of the evaluation and the consolidated VCA approach will be widely shared among relevant government and non-government DRR actors.

In Vietnam, for more than a decade, the VNRC has utilized risk assessment in its community based disaster risk management work¹⁴. With the support from the IFRC and various Participating National Societies (PNS) principally the American (AmRC), Australian (AuRC), German, Netherlands (NLRC) Red Cross Societies, as well as from various Local and INGOs the VNRC has undertaken an estimated 300 VCA throughout the country. Since its publication in 2010, VNRC has been implementing VCAs with methods according to the VCA Manual developed by the VNRC and the NLRC in DIPECHO 6. The primary reason for the development of this VCA Manual was to increase the involvement of citizens and to promote participatory planning in CBDRM. Based on the DIPECHO 8 closing workshop, VCA Trainers and Facilitators shared their experience about VCAs being well-structured and a logical tool that has been appreciated by

¹⁴ Vietnam Red Cross Disaster Preparedness Manual, Chapter II, 2000 <http://www.ccfsc.gov.vn/KW376B3F/crp/21.aspx> and 'An introduction to disaster management for people living at the commune level', Vietnam Red Cross, 2002 <http://www.ccfsc.gov.vn/KW376B3F/crp/20.aspx>.

local authorities. However, since its implementation, no comprehensive evaluation has taken place yet to valorise the tool as a key component of the CBDRM programme and to assess the experiences of stakeholders involved in the VCA process inclusive of vulnerable groups. Particularly with regards to gender mainstreaming, disability inclusion and climate change, reports from various organizations (e.g. NLRC, Centre for International Studies and Cooperation (CECI), Malteser International and GRC) have pointed out gaps during VCA implementation on these three topics. Therefore, it is important to evaluate and recommend practical steps on how to improve the current practice of the VCA, when such gaps are confirmed.

In parallel, in July 2009, the programme to *‘Enhance Community Awareness and Community Based Disaster Risk Management’* was approved by the Prime Minister under Decision 1002/QĐ-TTg, which stated that the Disaster Management Centre, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) are the official organisers of the programme. In order to accomplish the given mission, MARD has cooperated with relevant ministries, departments, and social and international organisations in Vietnam and provinces and signed a Cooperation Agreement with Red Cross Vietnam¹⁵ as a part of which, the VNRC committed to undertake 1,000 VCA (one sixth of the total number under the Decision) over the next 10 years. As the MARD has adopted a “condensed” version of the VNRC VCA in May 2014 (Community Based Disaster Risk Assessment – CBDRA), and as VNRC VCA Master Trainers who train governmental officials are to use this new governmental format under the Decision 1002, a second aspect of the evaluation shall look into the added value of and the distinction between both approaches and lead to more clarity for VNRC staff and trainers as well as for CBDRM practitioners in Vietnam. Thus, the evaluation of the two approaches will provide an advocacy leverage for further mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues (GENDER, DISABILITY INCLUSION) into the National DRM programs.

3. Purpose

GRC is seeking for a National and an International consultant **to conduct a participatory evaluation of the inclusion of a number of specific topics in the VCA used by the VNRC, as well as to provide a comparative analysis with the Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Assessment (CBDRA)** by involving relevant stakeholders and vulnerable groups. The main focus of the assessment will be on the VCA, on how it has managed to include vulnerable groups such as PWD, and developments such as climate change adaptation and gender mainstreaming. Good practices and improvements will be documented. It will also look at the effectiveness in the commune in terms of follow up in local planning. At the same time, the existence of CBDRA will not be ignored, and differences in the approach will be used to learn from. As VNRC was/is involved in the development process of the CBDRA of the government, and is expected to keep their involvement in the planned revision of it, VNRC could use the results of the assessment as inputs to CBDRA.

4. Scope and the methodology

The consultants shall undertake a study which is expected to capitalise on the challenges and successes encountered so far in the use of VCA in Vietnam. The consultants will generate solid and comprehensive recommendations for VNRC Trainers and Facilitators on the future use of VCA and CBDRA by paying specific attention to crosscutting issues with regards to the incorporation of gender mainstreaming, disability inclusion and climate change adaptation (CCA) in the VCA process. The expected audiences will be VNRC, DMC/MARD Trainers and Facilitators and other CBDRR practitioners (INGOs, local NGOs,...).

INITIAL PHASE – 4 days

The International consultant will:

¹⁵ <http://www.dmc.gov.vn/tabid/97/language/en-US/item/455/Default.aspx>.

- Meet with VNRC and consortium partners to review the strategic direction of the assignment
- Review available secondary data regarding DRR achievements, best practice and areas for further enhancement, VCA and CBDRA reports, VNRC VCA manuals, case studies, MARD CBCBDRA manual and INGOs VCA manuals
- Meet with non-Red Cross stakeholders (UN, Plan, Save the Children, Oxfam, Malteser International, DMC etc) in Hanoi to feed into the analysis, priorities, and learning
- Provide recommendations to GRC and VNRC on possible alterations to the strategy, result areas and activities to ensure the success of the study

DESK EVALUATION PHASE – 8 days

The International consultant (8 days) and the National consultant (4 days) will

- Conduct a desk comparison of the VCA and CBDRA approaches (objectives, expected outcomes, methodology, manual content and design...) with the aim to look at synergy and differences and to clarify the added values of both methodologies.
- In parallel, through interviews/ questionnaires and group discussions evaluate if and how the VNRC facilitators and trainers have so far incorporated gender mainstreaming, disability inclusion and Climate Change mainstreaming in their approach. Identify gaps and propose criteria (minimum standard) of knowledge and facilitation skills for VNRC trainers and facilitators of VCA and CBDRA.

FIELD LEVEL EVALUATION PHASE – 14 days

The International consultant and the National consultant will (14 days both):

- Based on secondary data and on discussion with INGOs, PNS and VNR, select communes/wards where during the VCA process the issues of gender, disability inclusion, CCA mainstreaming have been considered and in some extend integrated. The draft 'Success criteria for VNRC VCA and community Action Plan' developed by the AmRC could also be considered to select those VCAs where will be carried out the in-depth study
 - some VCAs selected will be from VNRC/PNS projects
 - some VCAs selected could be from INGOs (CARE, Institute for Social and Environmental Transition (ISET), Malteser International ...)
 - some VCAs will be from Urban/peri-urban areas
- **The evaluation will be conducted through an evaluation team which will be led by the 2 external consultants and will include DRR experts from the Red Cross** (GRC, VNRC, other PNS). At this stage, the detailed TOR of the field evaluation will cover:
 - Use of tools: How are the tools used, difference: e.g. between organisations, context (rural-urban), facilitator skills and experiences...
 - Outcomes of VCA: # of local projects, contribution to national programme 1002, transformative aspects, # GoVN officials aware of the VCA
 - How the GoVN can benefit from the VCA in its current formulation
 - How can the outcomes of VCA be effectively linked to higher level planning (SEDP, CBDRM National Risk Assessments, etc.) and expand to agencies outside of MARD (e.g. MONRE)
 - How can we further improve the inclusion of the most vulnerable (women and children and disabled) and the understanding of climate risks through VCA
 - Summary of successes and challenges and recommendations: Capture good practices with a specific focus on gender mainstreaming, disability inclusion, and Climate Change mainstreaming which should be incorporated into an annex to the current version of the VNRC VCA and brought into the CBDRA process.
- Methodology and approach
 - Use focus group discussions, interviews, meetings and analysis of quantitative data

- Ensure full participation of relevant stakeholders through the use of participatory tools and techniques: members from vulnerable groups; authorities from maximum 6 selected communes; VNRC HQ, provincial, district and commune staff, including VCA Master Trainers and Facilitators and the VCA Coordination Group; GoVN representatives involved in DRR and CCA at national, provincial, district and commune levels (e.g. MARD, MONRE); working groups (DMWG, CCWG); UN, NGOs and Partner National Societies.

For the detailed methodology of the field evaluation, please see Annex 1.

DOCUMENTATION PHASE – 8 days (including 2 days workshop preparation and event)

The International consultant (6 days) and the National consultant (2 days) will:

- Based on the evaluation, additional annexes will be incorporated to the existing VNRC VCA manual by the lead consultant. As greater focus is needed on the practical means of the inclusion of the most vulnerable, the amended annexes will also focus on gender mainstreaming, disability inclusion and mainstreaming of CCA. Any ambiguity and unresolved challenges that come out of the evaluation will be further dealt with and explained in the consultancy report.
- The lead consultant will propose a tailored training plan to increase trainers/ facilitators capacity on those cross-cutting issues. This training plan will aim at building their capacity to a minimum standard of skills and practice, and will clarify any ambiguity between VCA and CBDRA approaches and tools.
- At the end of the evaluation, a 1-day workshop (25 participants) will be organised to share the findings of the evaluation and to gather inputs from representatives from relevant GoVN (DMC) departments, working groups (DMWG/CCWG), VNRC staff and trainers from all levels. This event will be conducted in Hanoi on February 9th, 2015, and facilitated by the National consultant, GRC and VNRC. Organisations already working on the topics of gender mainstreaming, disability and CCA such as Vietnam Women Union (VWU), Malteser International, Oxfam, CARE International and the Red Cross/ Red Crescent Climate Centre will be invited to join. The consolidated feedback from the participants will be incorporated into a refresher training for VNRC VCA Trainers and Facilitators, the evaluation report and inform the amendment to the VCA manual.

Depending on the outcome of the evaluation and the workshop, and the number/volume of the amendment(s) proposed, a follow-up write-shop could be considered.

FIELD TEST PHASE – 3 days (training)

- Twenty-five selected VNRC VCA Master Trainers and Facilitators will be trained by the national consultant in the use of the amended VCA manual (3 days, from 10-12 March). The selection of the trainers will be done by VNRC, considering the following criteria:
 - Good trainers that are willing to test an amended approach;
 - Available in the given period of time and in the areas selected for the test (see below).
- To test the amended VCA manual, 3 VCAs will be undertaken in different contexts by the VNRC masters trainers. As the VCA will be led by the community itself, the VCA will follow the participatory approach, promoting community development, capacity building and the intensive inclusion of vulnerable groups. The test sites will be selected in agreement between VNRC, GRC and the consultants and will likely be based on practical considerations (e.g. having a project in place). If possible, the site selected should include both rural and urban context.
- The consultants will develop a tool or format for self-evaluation to ensure that all experiences are captured, as input for the validation phase.

VALIDATION PHASE - 4 days (including a 1-day workshop and 1 day preparation)

- Date: 14 of April 2015
- A consolidation workshop will be organized to identify gaps and challenges in the amended VCA manual. After the completion of the VCAs in the 3 communes, gaps and challenges of the amended VCA manual will be examined and discussed in a lessons learnt workshop, facilitated by the national consultant, GRC and VNRC (1 day). The workshop that will be organized in Hanoi with participation of approximately 25 representatives from the Red Cross, DMC, Malteser International, VWU and Oxfam. The aim of this workshop will be to identify whether the amended VCA manual is understandable, easy to apply in practice and if it could be applied within the CBDRA.
- The findings and results of this workshop will be documented in a workshop report by the national consultant (2 days) and will feed into the amended annexes of the VCA manual finalized by the international consultant (2 days).

5. Outputs/ deliverables

Initial Phase

- a) Detailed TOR (proposal) explaining the main concept, methodologies and work plan between the consultancy team and the GRC (by the 12th of January). Language: English.

Desk Evaluation Phase

- b) 5-8 pages brief report on the synergy, differences and added values of both VCA and CBDRA methodologies (by the 15th of January). Language: English. For a (draft) structure of the report, see annex 2.
- c) 5-8 pages brief report on the skills and knowledge gaps of VNRC facilitators and trainers with a specific emphasis on gender, disability and climate change and proposing criteria (minimum standard) of knowledge and facilitation skills for trainers and facilitators of VCA and CBDRA (by the 15th of January). Language: English. For a (draft) structure of the report, see annex 3.

Field Level Evaluation Phase

- d) 3-4 pages brief report for each commune where have been conducted the field level VCA evaluation (by the 5th of February). Language: Vietnamese and English.
- e) Draft of evaluation report (by the 5th of February). Language: English.
- f) Power point presentation of the preliminary findings of the field level evaluation (by the 5th of February). Language: Vietnamese and English.

Documentation Phase

- g) Draft of Amendment (supplementary annex) to the current VCA manual (by the 14th of February). Language: Vietnamese and English.
- h) Tailored training plan for VNRC trainers and facilitators on the findings of the consultancy and on how to incorporate them into practice (by the 14th of February). Language: Vietnamese and English.
- i) Outline for a one-day evaluation workshop (by the 5th of February). Language: Vietnamese and English.

Validation Phase

- j) Outline of a lessons learned/ consolidation workshop (by the 10th of April). Language: English
- k) Final Amendment (supplementary annex) to the current VCA manual (by the 30th of April). Language: Vietnamese and English.
- l) Final evaluation report/ study including an Executive Summary (by the 30th of April). Language: English. For a (draft) structure of the report, see annex 3.
- m) Final outline for a training of VNRC trainers and facilitators on the findings of the consultancy and on how to incorporate them into practice (by the 30th of April). Language: Vietnamese and English.

A detailed planning of both consultants is available on request.

6. Role of the Consortium Partners

In support of the consultancy GRC and VNRC will make their staff available for discussing the strategic approach as well as to discuss content and review the draft versions of the detailed TOR, the annex to the VCA and the evaluation report.

7. Consultancy Management

The consultant will officially report to the GRC. The GRC DRR delegate will be responsible for coordination with the consortium partners.

ANNEX 2: Field evaluation plan

Expected outcome

a) 3-4 pages brief report for each commune where have been conducted the field level VCA evaluation.

- Language: in English and Vietnamese
- Proposed structure:
 - Location
 - Field assessment team
 - Resource persons and methods used
 - Main findings per session/resource group
 - Preliminary conclusions

b) Draft of evaluation report.

- Language: in English and Vietnamese
- Proposed structure: See Annex 3

c) Power point presentation of the preliminary findings of the field level evaluation.

- In English and Vietnamese.

Evaluation site selection

The field evaluation will take place in at most six communes. The selection of these communes will be done in close consultation with VNRC HQ and GRC. The following criteria will be applied:

- VCA conducted by VNRC, following purely the VNRC VCA
- VCA conducted by VNRC, applying an alternative methodology (mix with CBDRA)
- CBDRA (supported by VNRC)
- VCA with involvement of another NGO (e.g. Malteser International, CARE, etc.)
- Both rural and urban VCA
- VCA with good practice in inclusion of gender, PWD and/or CCA
- No recent assessment or evaluation has been carried out (to avoid confusion and 'evaluation tiredness')

The selected locations, as agreed with VNRC are:

#	Province	District	Commune	Remark
1	Thai Binh	Dong Hung	Hoa Nam	Mangrove project with focus on climate change. VNRC with support of IFRC.
2		Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	
3	Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa	Commune 6,	Project supported by GRC. Is a bit more urban. Also have CBDRA
4		Song Cau town, or Dong Xuan	Xuan Hai, or Xuan Quang 2	
5	An Giang	Tri Ton	Tan Tuyen	VCA implemented in 2013. Also other NGOs are active here (Care, Oxfam, SNV)
6		Tinh Bien	Vinh Trung	

Resource persons and applied methodology

- Secondary data collection: VCA reports of the respective locations; disaster preparedness/CBDRM plans (latest one); SEDPs (preferably one before and after the VCA was done); Community action plans (if any). These documents will be requested (in writing) through VNRC well in advance.
- Primary data collection:
In each commune 11 groups of resource persons/organizations will be interviewed. The assessment in each commune is being concluded by a session in which experiences are being shared and validated, and preliminary conclusions are being drawn together. See the table below for more details.

	Resource organization/person	Type of information to be collected	Estimated time of session	Methodology	Additional remarks
1	Provincial level: CNDPC; DARD and DONRE	1. Inclusion of results in local DPP 2. Comparison with CBDRA (if they know)	1-1,5 hour	Interview	
2	District level: CNDPC; DARD; DONRE	1. Inclusion of results in local DPP 2. Comparison with CBDRA (if they know)	1-1,5 hour	Interview	
3	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	1. Inclusion of results in local DPP, SEDP and other programs 2. Comparison with CBDRA (if they know)	1,5 hour	Group interview	
4	VNRC at all levels (province, chapter, ward)	1. Follow up on VCA results 2. Comparison with CBDRA (if they know)	1,5 hour	Group interview	Separate from interview with VNRC facilitators
5	VCA Commune working group	1. Training of trainers and facilitators (frequency; content) 2. Support from VNRC 3. Comparison with CBDRA (if they know) 4. Facilitation skills 5. Inclusion of special topics: – CCA	2 hours	Facilitated group discussion Probably use: – flipchart/A0 paper	Includes the mass organizations

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender PWD Other vulnerable groups Urban 6. VCA reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content Use Follow up 7. Gaps and criteria (minimum standards) of knowledge and facilitation skills for trainers and facilitators of VCA and CBDRA 8. Constraints and recommendations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> post-its for individual opinion ranking 	
6	Red Cross facilitators	1. Training of trainers and facilitators (frequency; content) 2. Role and responsibilities (in support to WG) 3. Comparison with CBDRA (if they know) 4. Facilitation skills 5. Inclusion of special topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCA Gender PWD Other vulnerable groups Urban 6. VCA reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content Use Follow up 7. Gaps and criteria (minimum standards) of knowledge and facilitation skills for trainers and facilitators of VCA and CBDRA 8. Constraints and recommendations	2 hours	Facilitated group discussion Probably use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> flipchart/A0 paper post-its for individual opinion ranking 	
	Local informants, including:				People who participated in the VCA
7	- PWD (2-3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Potential) Participation Awareness and understanding Follow up 	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel	House hold visits to different type of PWD	
8	- Children (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Potential) Participation Awareness and understanding 	0,5-1 hour	Facilitated group discussion	

		– Follow up			
9	- Elderly (2); women (2); poor (2); ethnic minorities (2)	– (Potential) Participation – Awareness and understanding – Follow up	1,5 hour	Facilitated group discussion	
10	- Other community representatives (6-8)	– (Potential) Participation – Awareness and understanding – Follow up	1 hour	Facilitated group discussion	Selected from different corners of the commune (geographical spread)
11	Locally present NGOs and Partner National Societies (if any)	– Implementation of VCA/CBDRA – Inclusion of special topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CCA o Gender o PWD o Other vulnerable groups o Urban – VCA reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Content o Use o Follow up 	1,5 hour	Facilitated group discussion	
12	Sharing and validation of results	– Main findings – Preliminary conclusions – Adjustments and additions to evaluation approach	1,5 hour	Facilitated group discussion	Attended by both evaluation teams, and additional stakeholders.

The specific content (questionnaire/detailed methodology) for each session will still be worked on.

Based on the above proposed approach, and having two teams working parallel in the same commune, the field evaluation will take 1,5 day per commune. Including travelling this would mean 2 days per commune. The field evaluation will also include Saturdays and Sundays, but on those days meetings with government staff should be avoided.

Note: in practice the sessions proposed above might changed or have to be adjusted as per actual local field conditions and availability.

Field evaluation team

Two field evaluation teams will work parallel from each other in the same commune. Each team will focus on the same resource organizations/persons in each commune. This will ensure more comparative results, and enables the teams to share and learn from findings of each commune.

The evaluation teams will consist of about 4 people each:

Team 1:

- Hoa (responsible)
- Jerome or Marina (in some of the sessions)
- Non Red Cross commune working group people (1)
- ‘Neutral’ VNRC HQ or project manager

Team 2:

- Melanie (responsible)
- Phuong or Hoa Jenny - GRC (also for translation)
- Non Red Cross commune working group people (1)
- ‘Neutral’ VNRC HQ or project manager

To avoid biased answers, it is proposed to include VNRC facilitators and/or other people involved in the actual VCA only at the session for sharing and validation of results.

Field planning (proposed)

Though having to adjust to actual availability, the following schedule is proposed.

Phu Yen Province

Phu Yen province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
19/01/2015 13h30 - 15h00	Provincial level: CNDPC; DARD and DONRE	1-1,5 hour	19/01/2015 13h30 - 15h00	Red Cross facilitators	1-1,5 hour
19/01/2015 15h30 - 17h00	VNRC at all levels (province, chapter, ward)	1,5 hour	19/01/2015 15h30 - 17h00	Locally present NGOs and Partner National Societies (if any)	1,5 hour

Tuy Hoa and commune 6 in Phu Yen Province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
20/01/2015 07h30 – 09h00	<u>Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee) and VCA Commune working group</u>	2 hour	20/01/2015 07h30 – 09h30	<u>Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee) and VCA Commune working group</u>	2 hour
20/01/2015 09h30 – 11h00	District level: CNDPC; DARD; DONRE	1-1,5 hour	20/01/2015 10h00 – 11h00	- Other community representatives (6-8)	1 hour
20/01/2015 13h30 – 14h00	- Children (5)	0,5 hour	20/01/2015 13h30 – 15h00	- Elderly (2); women (2); poor (2); ethnic minorities (2)	1,5 hour
20/01/2015 14h30 – 17h30	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel	20/01/2015 15h30 – 17h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel
21/01/2015 08h00 – 09h30	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour	21/01/2015 08h00 – 09h30	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour

Song Cau town, Xuan Hai commune or Dong Xuan district, Xuan Quang 2 commune Phu Yen Province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
21/01/2015 13h30 – 15h30	<u>Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee) and VCA Commune working group</u>	2 hour	21/01/2015 13h30 – 15h30	<u>Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee) and VCA Commune working group</u>	2 hour

21/01/2015 16h00 – 17h00	District level: CNDPC; DARD; DONRE	1-1,5 hour	21/01/2015 16h00 – 17h00	- Other community representatives (6-8)	1 hour
22/01/2015 07h30 – 08h00	- Children (5)	0,5 hour	22/01/2015 07h30 – 09h00	- Elderly (2); women (2); poor (2); ethnic minorities (2)	1,5 hour
22/01/2015 08h30 – 11h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel	22/01/2015 09h30 – 11h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel
22/01/2015 14h00 – 15h30	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour	22/01/2015 14h00 – 15h30	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour

An Giang Province

An Giang Province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
23/01/2015 13h30 - 15h00	Provincial level: CNDPC; DARD and DONRE	1-1,5 hour	23/01/2015 13h30 - 15h30	Red Cross facilitators	2 hours
23/01/2015 15h30 - 17h00	VNRC at all levels (province, chapter, ward)	1,5 hour	23/01/2015 16h00 - 17h30	Locally present NGOs and Partner National Societies (if any)	1,5 hour

Tri Ton District and Tan Tuyen commune, An Giang province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
24/01/2015 07h30 – 09h00	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	1,5 hour	24/01/2015 07h30 – 08h00	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	0,5 hour
24/01/2015 09h30 – 11h00	District level: CNDPC; DARD; DONRE	1-1,5 hour	24/01/2015 08h30 – 10h00	- Elderly (2); women (2); poor (2); ethnic minorities (2)	1,5 hour
24/01/2015 13h30 – 14h00	- Children (5)	0,5 hour	24/01/2015 10h30 – 11h30	- Other community representatives (6-8)	1 hour
24/01/2015 14h30 – 17h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel	24/01/2015 13h30 – 16h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel
25/01/2015 08h00 – 09h30	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour	25/01/2015 08h00 – 09h30	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour

Tinh Bien District and Vinh Trung commune, An Giang province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
25/01/2015 13h30 – 15h00	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	1,5 hour	25/01/2015 13h30 – 14h00	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	0,5 hour
25/01/2015 15h30 – 17h00	District level: CNDPC; DARD; DONRE	1-1,5 hour	25/01/2015 14h30 – 16h00	- Elderly (2); women (2); poor (2); ethnic minorities (2)	1,5 hour
26/01/2015 07h30 – 08h00	- Children (5)	0,5 hour	26/01/2015 07h30 – 08h30	- Other community representatives (6-8)	1 hour
26/01/2015 08h30 – 11h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel	26/01/2015 09h00 – 11h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel
26/01/2015 13h30 – 15h00	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour	26/01/2015 13h30 – 15h00	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour

Thai Binh Province

Thai Binh province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
28/01/2015 08h00 - 09h30	Provincial level: CNDPC; DARD and DONRE	1-1,5 hour	28/01/2015 08h00 - 10h00	Red Cross facilitators	2 hours
28/01/2015 10h00 - 11h30	VNRC at all levels (province, chapter, ward)	1,5 hour	28/01/2015 10h30 - 12h00	Locally present NGOs and Partner National Societies (if any)	1,5 hour

Dong Hung District and Hoa Nam commune, Thai Binh province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
28/01/2015 13h30 – 15h00	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	1,5 hour	28/01/2015 13h30 – 14h00	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	0,5 hour
28/01/2015 15h30 – 17h00	District level: CNDPC; DARD; DONRE	1-1,5 hour	28/01/2015 14h30 – 16h00	- Elderly (2); women (2); poor (2); ethnic minorities (2)	1,5 hour
29/01/2015 07h30 – 08h00	- Children (5)	0,5 hour	29/01/2015 07h30 – 08h00	- Other community representatives (6-8)	1 hour
29/01/2015 08h30 – 11h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4	29/01/2015 08h30 – 11h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4

		hours incl. travel			hours incl. travel
29/01/2015 13h30 – 15h00	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour	29/01/2015 13h30 – 15h00	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour

Thai Thuy District and Thuy Xuan commune, Thai Binh province					
Team 1			Team 2		
Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session	Day	Resource organization/person	Estimated time of session
30/01/2015 07h30 – 09h00	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	1,5 hour	30/01/2015 07h30 – 08h00	Commune level: CNDPC and CPC (Commune People's Committee)	0,5 hour
30/01/2015 09h30 – 11h00	District level: CNDPC; DARD; DONRE	1-1,5 hour	30/01/2015 08h30 – 10h00	- Elderly (2); women (2); poor (2); ethnic minorities (2)	1,5 hour
30/01/2015 13h30 – 14h00	- Children (5)	0,5 hour	30/01/2015 13h30 – 14h30	- Other community representatives (6-8)	1 hour
30/01/2015 14h30 – 16h00	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel	30/01/2015 15h00 – 16h30	- PWD (1-2)	1 hour per household visit: 3-4 hours incl. travel
31/01/2015 08h00 – 09h30	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour	31/01/2015 08h00 – 09h30	Sharing and validation of results	1,5 hour

ANNEX 3: Detailed comparison between the VCA and CBDRA manual

VCA (VNRC) ¹⁶	CBDRA (DMC) ¹⁷
1) Objective and expected results	1) Objective and expected results
<p>The VCA is developed for <u>VNRC practitioners</u> to help community to identify and understand their <u>vulnerability</u>, <u>capacity</u> and the <u>hazards</u> that they are facing. This helps in identifying local priorities to reduce their vulnerabilities and to develop their capacities. The result of such assessments forms the basis for the community to undertake <u>community based disaster risk management planning</u>. It is also a useful tool for <u>raising community awareness</u>.</p> <p>The VCA outputs are used as inputs for community preparedness, risk reduction plans and also to improve the local development plans.</p> <p>The expected outputs from the VCA process are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community understands its own environment in relation to hazards and disaster risk; – Community realizes its own <u>capacities</u> to cope with the hazards and risks; – <u>Community and local authority agree on actions</u> needed to prevent or reduce the <input type="checkbox"/> effects of disaster; – Relevant measures on disaster risk reduction are implemented and evaluated: <input type="checkbox"/> mitigation, prevention, preparedness; – <u>Baseline assessment information</u> becomes available. This can become the reference <input type="checkbox"/> point to an emergency and disaster preparedness needs assessment, following <input type="checkbox"/> disaster; – <u>Commune People's Committee can use the VCA report</u> to attract funds from higher <input type="checkbox"/> governments and other donors. <input type="checkbox"/> The VCA results will be utilized more broadly at <u>national and international levels</u>. For example, it will provide a chance for community voices to be heard in the development of certain policies (like strategies to deal with climate change). 	<p>The CBDRA has been developed for authorities at commune and village level and local people, to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Types of natural <u>hazards</u> that already hit and may occur in their community; – Community's <u>vulnerability</u> that make them susceptible to the damaging effect of a natural hazard; – Community's <u>capacity</u> in DRR; – Disaster risks and priorities to <u>find suitable solutions</u>, in which vulnerable people are taken into account. <p>Villagers will be capable to develop a hazard map and identify disaster risk reduction measures.</p> <p>The above-mentioned assessment results will provide necessary information for developing a <u>preparedness plan</u> and a basis for <u>integrating DRR into local development plans</u>, for example disaster prevention and control plans, National Target Programme on New Rural Development and social-economic development plans.</p> <p>It should also result in increased <u>awareness</u> and capacity of local authorities and people in the field of DRR.</p> <p>The CBDRA defines hazards as <u>natural hazards</u>, including typhoons, tropical depressions, whirlwinds, thunderstorms, torrential rain, floods, flash floods, inundation, landslides or soil depression triggered by torrential rain and run-off, sea level rise, saltwater intrusion, heat waves, drought, extreme cold, cold waves, hail, frost, earthquakes, tsunamis and other natural hazards.</p>

¹⁶ Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA); Manual for Vietnam Red Cross Practitioners (Part I and II); Vietnam Red Cross; The Netherlands red Cross; 2010

¹⁷ Guideline Community Based Disaster Risk Assessment; Disaster Management Center (DMC); Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development; United Nations Development Program; Hanoi; April 2014

VCA (VNRC) ¹⁶	CBDRA (DMC) ¹⁷
<p>Under hazards the VCA understands <u>both natural and man-made hazards</u>, including armed conflict, intimidation, hostility, etc. Hazards can also be a sort of deprivation, such as environmental and technological deprivation, political or economic deprivation, illiteracy, etc.).</p> <p><u>Vulnerability and capacity</u> are defined in relation to the following four components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Livelihood and its resilience – People's well-being – Self-protection – Social protection – Governance 	<p><u>Vulnerability and capacity</u> take into account the physical, social organizational, awareness and attitudinal/motivational aspects of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community safety – Health; sanitation; hygiene; environment – Production and economic activities
<p>Comparison:</p> <p>The objective and expected results of both VCA and CBDRA are very similar. However, the few differences that are there, are substantial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The VCA is a tool for experts, namely VNRC practitioners, while the CBDRA is designed for use by local government and commune people; ▪ Both VCA and CBDRA mention awareness raising and identification of hazards, vulnerability, and capacity as key objectives and/or expected results, and the formulation of DRR measures. Both also mention that these need to be included in local (development) planning at different levels (VCA even including the international level). ▪ Though hazards and vulnerabilities are defined in different terms, in practice they cover more or less the same elements. The main difference is in the definition of hazards. The VCA includes both natural and man-made hazards, while the CBDRA includes only natural hazards (staying close to the definition of hazards as provided in the Vietnam Law on Disaster Prevention and Control¹⁸). 	
2) Methodology	2) Methodology
<p>Facilitation</p> <p>The <u>community is the main implementer</u> of the VCA, whereas the <u>VCA facilitators</u> have the role to facilitate the whole process.</p> <p>The VCA entails a <u>participatory approach</u>, with engagement of local people, principle sectors, and decision makers as informants. Vulnerable groups such as women, children, elderly people, and people with disabilities, the poor, ethnic minorities, people with HIV/AIDS, should participate in the VCA.</p>	<p>Facilitation</p> <p>The CBDRA is jointly implemented by the technical support group, community group and local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The CBDRA takes a <u>participatory approach</u>, involving commune authorities, representatives from social-economic and mass organizations, and local people who must represent all genders, ages, living standards, livelihoods, religious, locations, social positions and geographical characteristics of a community. It is

¹⁸ Law on Natural Disaster Prevention and Control; No 33/2013/QH13, Date 19/06/2013; Effective 1st May 2014; Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development; United Nations Development Programme

VCA (VNRC) ¹⁶	CBDRA (DMC) ¹⁷
<p>Stages of the process</p> <p>The overall process consists of <u>8 stages</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Preparation – Planning and field pre-assessment work – Advocating – Collecting information – Analysing – Verifying/validating – Planning and advocacy for transformation – Reporting 	<p>important to include women and men representatives from different residential areas and vulnerable people (elderly, children, women and poor people, etc.).</p> <p>The <u>technical support group</u> is decided upon and organized by the People's Committee, and consists of includes representatives from related departments, and local organizations such as: the Fatherland Front, the Red Cross Chapter, the Women Union, the Farmers Union, the Youth Union, enterprises, local NGO, etc.</p> <p>The leadership of the Technical support group is taken by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provincial level: chief or deputy chief of office of the Disaster Control Committee; – Communal level: head or deputy head of the Agriculture and Rural Development department; – Village/hamlet level: Village's vice leader. <p>The <u>Community group</u> is decided upon and organized by the People's Committee. The members of the community group will be nominated by the local community based on knowledge and experience, paying special attention to gender and social relationships between groups.</p> <p>The village leader is the leader of the group.</p> <p>Stages of the process</p> <p>The overall process consists of <u>5 stages</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Preparation – Assessment – Analysis and synthesis of assessment results – Consultation and cross-checking with local people – Development of assessment report
<p>Comparison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The VCA is facilitated mainly by VNRC practitioners, whereas in the CBDRA approach the facilitation is done by the local community/leadership, with support of VNRC and others (Commune working group supported by the Technical Support Group). ▪ Though the number of stages defines in both approaches differ (8 in the VC versus 5 in the CBDRA, they cover the same steps. The difference is that the VCA defines advocacy (both of VCA as of its results) while this is not being mentioned under the CBDRA. 	
3) Manual	3) Manual

VCA (VNRC) ¹⁶	CBDRA (DMC) ¹⁷
<p>Structure</p> <p>The VCA manual is about 100 pages in total, consisting of <u>two books</u>, containing three sections:</p> <p>Part I:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “<i>What is VCA</i>” provides conceptual information, key components and outlines of the main components to guide the VNRC Facilitator in undertaking the VCA process. 2. “<i>Principles of conducting a VCA</i>” highlights important linkages of the VCA tool between development and disaster management. <p>Part II:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. “<i>Practical Guide for conducting a VCA</i>” is a ‘how to’ guide base on section 1 and 2, with practical information on different VCA tools and ways to conduct VCAs with the active participation of vulnerable groups. It also provides information on the process of facilitating a VCA in the field. <p>Some distinctive elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The concept of VCA is explained by vulnerability; capacity; hazard; and risk (in that order). – Key messages clearly stand out in green boxes. – Comprehensive information on inclusion of vulnerable groups (Children, Women, PWDs, Elderly, Rural and Urban poor and Ethnic minority groups), climate change and urbanization (chapter 3 and 4). – Full chapter (5) on linking the VCA with development and government plans, advocacy for VCA. – Clear description of each step, explaining: time; target; involved parties; major activities; output/expected results; methods/tools and equipment; materials. 	<p>Structure</p> <p>The CBDRA manual consist of <u>one book</u> of about 90 pages, consisting of four parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ‘<i>Introduction of CBDRA</i>’ provides information on concepts and core principles of a CBDRA 2. ‘<i>Steps for a CBDRA</i>’ explains the implementation process 3. ‘<i>How to use CBDRA tools</i>’ provides a practical explanation per tool. 4. Annexes on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Tasks and responsibilities of technical support group and community group – Explanation on aspects of vulnerability and capacity – Guidelines for assessing vulnerable groups – Templates for basic information collection and for Disaster risks assessment report – List of DRR measures – Examples of disaster risks assessment results <p>Some distinctive elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The concept of VCA is explained by hazard; vulnerability; capacity (in that order). – Clear guidance on how to implement each tool, with examples and guidance questions, and how to synthesize the information received (with tables to fill out and guidance for each column of it). – Clear table describing for each step: location; time; participants; responsible organization. – Relatively simple language. – Detailed annex explaining the tasks and responsibilities of the Technical Support Group and the Community Group, including M&E. – An example of a CBDRA report has been annexed to the manual.
<p>Comparison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In many aspects, the VCA manual is tailored to professional users, and the CBDRA manual to commune level users. This is reflected in language, the amount of conceptual information and guidance, etc. – Whereas manuals consist of approximately the same number of pages, in the VCA manual key concepts, principles and approaches (Part I) takes most of the volume, while the CBDRA manual spends most pages on the practical guidance on the use of the tools. 	

VCA (VNRC) ¹⁶	CBDRA (DMC) ¹⁷
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Presentation of concepts and definitions in the VCA mainly reflect those used by Red Cross internationally, while those in the CBDRA follow the Vietnam Law on Disaster Prevention and Control. – Advocacy for following up on the VCA results is addressed specifically in the VCA manual, but not in the CBDRA manual. – Though in an annex, the CBDRA manual gives guidance for M&E, while this is not addressed by the VCA manual. 	
4) Time	4) Time
<p>The implementation of the VCA in the community takes 5 days.</p> <p>The VCA could be done annually depending on the situation in the commune.</p> <p>Though it is mentioned that the VCA could be conducted all year round, it is advised to take into account the working calendar and festivals at the commune level. It could be relevant to do the VCA before the disaster season or before composing the Social Development Plan of the commune.</p>	<p>The implementation of the CBDRA in the community takes 5 days.</p> <p>It is recommended to update the CBDRA annually, prior to the hazard season, and prior to the development of the commune DRR plan or SEDP.</p>
Comparison: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Both the VCA and CBDRA take 5 days to conduct. – None of the two manuals gives any explanation how the suggested annual review should be conducted. 	
5) Tools	5) Tools
<p>The VCA includes <u>14 tools</u>:</p> <p>Tools for information collection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of secondary data 2. Direct observation 3. Focus group discussion 4. Mapping 5. Transect walk 6. Historical profile 7. Historical visualization & projection 8. Seasonal calendar 9. Venn diagram <p>Tools for analysis and development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. SWOT 11. Livelihood analysis 12. Problem tree 13. Ranking 	<p>The CBDRA includes <u>9 tools</u>:</p> <p>Tools for information collection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secondary data collection 2. Historical disaster profile 3. Seasonal calendar 4. Hazard risk map <p>Tools for analysis and development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Strengths and weaknesses in disaster management practices 6. Disaster risk assessment result synthesis 7. Causes analysis 8. Ranking 9. Synthesis of disaster risk reduction measures <p>The annexes of the manual provide some concrete examples of the tools.</p>

VCA (VNRC) ¹⁶	CBDRA (DMC) ¹⁷
14. Log frame planning	
Comparison: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The number of tools used in the VCA (14) is much higher than in the CBDRA (9). – Most tools of the CBDRA are the same with the VCA. The CBDRA does not have FGDs with specific vulnerable groups. The VCA has a good livelihood analysis. – The order of the assessment tools and the link between the tools is clearer in the CBDRA than in the VCA – Problem analysis is presented in a simple table format instead of in a problem tree format – The CBDRA has concrete examples of completed tools in the annex. – The tools in the CBDRA manual provide more detailed guidance on the information that should be gathered. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Historical profile: requires information on changes in characteristic and trends of hazards (referring to climate change) o Seasonal calendar also addresses risks and risk reduction measures o Information compilation table after each tools for information collection and reporting o Repetition of hazard trends in all synthesis tables help to collect opinions and raise awareness about climate change. 	
6) Inclusiveness	6) Inclusiveness
<u>Gender and PWD</u> The VCA manual provides both information on the importance of inclusion of vulnerable groups, and guidance for each tool on how to include these groups (children; women; PWD; elderly; poor; ethnic minority). <u>CCA</u> Mentioned as new emerging issue and for every tool some guidance on how to include it is provided. <u>Urban</u> Mentioned as new emerging issue and for every tool some guidance on how to include it is provided.	<u>Gender and PWD</u> Guidance on PWD mainly mentioned in the annex. In the synthesis of proposed DRR solutions differentiation for different groups is requested: women, men, the poor, children, the elderly, people with disabilities, etc. The ranking tool includes a special column for women. <u>CCA</u> Practical and direct guidance mainly related to historical profile (trends). <u>Urban</u> Not mentioned in the manual
Comparison: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The inclusion of specific vulnerable groups, climate change and urban context gets more attention in the VCA manual. They are systematically addressed for each tool. For example, tips and guidance on how to work with children; elderly; PWDs in FGDs are provided on page 35-36 Part II. However, in the outputs (tables and report format) there is little to no clear inclusion of specific data regarding vulnerable groups. This is different for CBDRA. Much less information is provided about inclusion of vulnerable groups and climate change. Also, not all vulnerable groups identified are referred to consistently (main reference is to women, men, youth). In some tools however, vulnerable groups are included in the format. – The VCA and CBDRA have (almost) the same tables that provide guidance and points for consideration for specific vulnerable groups: children; women; PWD; elderly; poor; ethnic minority: for VCA in Part I, for CBDRA in the annex. 	

VCA (VNRC) ¹⁶	CBDRA (DMC) ¹⁷
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Urban context is being ignored by CBDRA. 	
7) VCA report (structure)	7) VCA report (structure)
<p>The VCA report is structured as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Basic information of locality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Geography – Infrastructure (traffic, roads, water, electricity... – History of the commune – Usage of land, water, forest – Demography (number of villages, population) – How is the general SED in last 5 years – Some features of the local government, organizations – Basic information on local natural hazards and disasters and how they prevent plan developed and carried out? 2. Analysing the common background of the commune <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – SWOT of Health, Subsistence, income, food, protect people in disasters, policy, management, system – Pressing issues of community – Expectations and suggested solutions for pressing issues – Link between the socio-economic developing policies/plans. 3. Analysing hazards and disasters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Natural hazards – Impacts-main damages due to disasters – Trend/Tendencies (change of the natural disasters, way to adapt, deal with and adjust to those changes) – Analysing current vulnerability and capacity of community to natural disasters (Livelihood, income, Health, food, Protection condition to protect people: children and other vulnerable groups, Management, system and policy) – Identifying and analysing natural disaster risks – Expected mitigation measures 	<p>The CBDRA report is structured as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Introduction of the commune II. Disaster Risk Assessment Results <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Basic information (as per template in Annex 5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Geographical profile – Population – Usage of land, water, forest (natural resources) – Production and economic activities – Infrastructures – Accommodation – Clean water, health, sanitation, hygiene and environment – Healthcare (diseases related to disaster) – Disaster Control and Prevention activities B. Assessment on Natural Hazards/Disasters, Vulnerability and Capacity <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessment on natural hazards/disasters at the local community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – General assessment: – Historical profile (Table 2.1) 2. Assessment on vulnerability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – General assessment: – Summary of vulnerability (Table 6.1, column 3) 3. Assessment on capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – General assessment: – Summary of capacity (Table 6.1, column 4) C. Synthesis of Disaster Risks and Disaster control and prevention Measures <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Synthesis of disaster risks

VCA (VNRC) ¹⁶	CBDRA (DMC) ¹⁷
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Link between Socio-economic developing policies and community-based disaster preparedness plan. <p>4. Transformation and disaster Risk reduction plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A table of transformation and disaster risk reduction – Analyse (overview of overall issues, disaster risks and mitigation plan, Highlighted the most concerned issues, Analysing results, potential positive and negative impacts, obstacles, contingency plan, Roles and responsibility, implementation of plan...). <p>5. Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – On behalf of VCA group – Signature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Comments: (based on the disaster risk assessment tool, comment on the disaster risk at the local area, according to 3 factors: Community safety; Production and economic; Health, sanitation, hygiene and environment. From the ranking tool, summarize priority concerns at the local area according to different community groups). – Table of Synthesis of disaster risks and ranking (Table 6.1 – column 5 and Table 8.1 – column 1 and 2). <p>2. Synthesis of disaster control and prevention measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Table of Synthesis of disaster preparedness measures (Table 8.1 – column 5 and Table 9.1) <p>D. Conclusion and Suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – At the commune level: (summarize concerns, suggestions and priority measures at the commune level) – At the district level: (summarize suggestions and priority measures at the district level) – Suggestions to the authorities and stakeholders: (summarize suggestions to the authorities and stakeholders to consider support and cooperation) <p>Representing the commune's people's committee</p>
Comparison: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The CBDRA includes a basic information collection template in the annex (5). – None of the report formats refer much to specific vulnerable groups. – The CBDRA report includes a special section (D) on suggestions and priorities for authorities at different levels. 	
8) Documentation (accessibility of results)	8) Documentation (accessibility of results)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – VCA report is sent to the locality; – VCA report has to be posted on the website of VNRC and CNDPC if commune authorities agree (page 23 Part II). 	<p>No information is provided in the manual on this topic.</p>
Comparison: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The CBDRA does not mention where the final report goes. – Neither the VCA nor the CBDRA provide any suggestion of what to do with the direct outputs of the tools (the flipcharts, etc.). 	

ANNEX 4: List of resources

Interviews desk evaluation phase

#	Date	Location	Organization	Name	Position	Method
1	31/12/2014	Phu Yen	VNRC - Quy Nhon provincial chapter	Trần Đình Ký	Vice-Chairman of province RC	Telephone call
2	07/01/2015	TT Huế	VNRC - TT Hue provincial chapter	Phan Giai	Deputy-Head of province RC office	Telephone call
3	11/01/2015	Hue-Quang Tri	VNRC - Quảng Trị provincial chapter	Đoàn Minh Cường	VNRC Master trainer	Telephone call
4	11/01/2015	Hue-An Giang	VNRC – Nghe An provincial chapter	Bùi Thị Mai	VNRC Master trainer	Telephone call
5	12/01/2015	Hue-Thanh Hoa	VNRC – Thanh Hoa provincial chapter	Tô Ngọc Chành	VNRC Master trainer	Telephone call
6	14/01/2015	Phú Yên	VNRC – Phu Yen provincial chapter	Nguyễn Hữu Sửu	RC officer	Telephone call
7	14/01/2015	Cần Thơ	VNRC – Can Tho provincial chapter	Dư Hải Đường	Director of RC Training Centre of Can Tho	Telephone call
8	06/01/2015	Hanoi	VNRC - headquarters	Nguyen Kieu Trang	Disaster Management Department	Meeting
				Mr. Binh	DM Department, Deputy Director	
				Ms. Phuong	HR Department, PM for Climate Smart DRR Project	
				Mr. Vinh	Blood Bank (in charge of Forest and Delta programme)	
				Mr. Thang	Director VNRC Training Institute	
				Mr. Tuan	Forest and Delta Project	
				Ms. My	DM Department	
				Mr. Kien	DM Department	
				Mr. Thuan	DM Department	
9	13/01/15 and 02/02/15	Hanoi	American Red Cross	Ian Wilderspin	Senior Delegate for DRR and CCA	Interview
10	08/01/15	Hanoi	SCDMII (DMC/UNDP)	La Quang Trung	Project Officer	Interview
				Dang Quang Tinh	National Technical Advisor	
11	06/01/2015	Hanoi	IFRC	Rosemary Fenton	Resilience Programme Coordinator	Group interview
			IFRC	Nguyen Thai An		

#	Date	Location	Organization	Name	Position	Method
			IFRC	Dang Van Tao		
			Spanish Red Cross	Do Thi Thuy Hong	Project Officer	
			Swiss Red Cross	Ruth Lane	Country Coordinator	
12	07/01/2015	Hanoi	ISSET Vietnam	Nguyen Ngoc Huy	Technical Staff	Interview
13	08/01/2015	Hanoi	Live & Learn	Do Van Nguyet	Director	Interview
14	05/01/2015		Malteser International	Mai Thi Dung	Inclusive DRR Projects Manager	Skype interview
				Nguyen Nga	Country Representative	
15	09/01/2015	Hanoi	VNRC - Quang Nam provincial chapter	Mr. Bang	Vice-Chairman Trainer/Facilitator	Interview
16	05/01/2015	Hanoi	Oxfam	Le Thi My Dung	Advocacy Programme Officer for Building Resilience	Interview
			CARE	Le Xuan Hieu	Portfolio Manager CARE International in Vietnam	
18	08/01/2015	Hanoi	SNV	Tran Tu Anh	Senior Advisor Climate Change/Project Manager Agriculture Sector	Interview
19	09/08/2015	Hanoi	UNDP	Jenty Kirsch-Wood	International Technical Advisor	Interview
				Bui Viet Hien	Programme Officer Sustainable Development Cluster	
20	07/01/2015	Hanoi	Save the Children	Le Van Duong	National Humanitarian & Emergency Affairs (HEA) Coordinator	Interview
			World Vision	Le Thi Bich Hang	former staff	
21	15/01/2015	Hanoi	IFRC	Michael Annear	Country Representative	Interview
22	16/01/2015	Hanoi	UNDP	Stacey Sawchuk	Disaster Risk Reduction & Climate Change Adaptation Facilitator	Interview
23	16/01/2015	Hanoi	IFRC	Dang Van Tao	Disaster Management Manager	Interview
24	16/01/2015	Hanoi	German Red Cross	Nguyen Dzong	CS-CBDRR Project Manager	Interview
25	02/02/2015	Hanoi	National Disaster Management Center/Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	Nguyen Huynh Quang	Head of CBDRM division/National Coordinator of SCDM Project	Interview
				Khanh Chi	Staff of CBDRM division	
26	02/02/2015	Hanoi	Norwegian Red Cross	Nguyen Xuan Duy	Program Coordinator for Vietnam	Interview

Resource persons field evaluation (Detailed list has been submitted to GRC)

#	Date	Province	District	Commune	Meeting	Organization	# of people	M	F
1	19/01/2015	Phu Yen			VCA facilitators	Phu Yen Red Cross Chapter	4	4	0
2	19/01/2015	Phu Yen			VNRC staff	VNRC	9	6	3
3	19/01/2015	Phu Yen			Authorities	CNDPC	2	1	1
4	19/01/2015	Phu Yen			NGOs	GRC, GIZ	2	2	0
5	20/01/2015	Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa City	Ward 6	Authorities	CNDPC (PC; DONRE)	6	5	1
6	20/01/2015	Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa City	Ward 6	Children	Bach Dang Primary School; grade 5	5	1	4
7	20/01/2015	Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa City	Ward 6	Elderly		6	2	4
8	20/01/2015	Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa City	Ward 6	Representatives		7	3	4
9	20/01/2015	Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa City	Ward 6	Working Group		5	3	2
10	20/01/2015	Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa City	Ward 6	PWD		5	3	2
11	21/01/2015	Phu Yen	Tuy Hoa City	Ward 6	Validation meeting	PC; Women union; Fatherland Front	9	7	2
12	21/01/2015	Phu Yen	Dong Xuan	Xuan Quang 2	Representatives		8	5	3
13	21/01/2015	Phu Yen	Dong Xuan	Xuan Quang 2	Working Group		6	5	1
14	21/01/2015	Phu Yen	Dong Xuan	Xuan Quang 2	Commune CNDPC		6	5	1
15	21/01/2015	Phu Yen	Dong Xuan		CNDPC		2	2	0
16	22/01/2015	Phu Yen	Dong Xuan	Xuan Quang 2	Representatives		6	3	3
17	22/01/2015	Phu Yen	Dong Xuan	Xuan Quang 2	Validation meeting	PC; Youth Union; VNRC	5	5	0
18	22/01/2015	Phu Yen	Dong Xuan	Xuan Quang 2	PWD		3	1	2
19	22/01/2015	Phu Yen	Dong Xuan	Xuan Quang 2	Children	Xuan Quang 2 Primary School; grade 5	5	2	3
20	23/01/2015	An Giang			VCA facilitators		4	3	1
21	23/01/2015	An Giang			NGOs	CARE	1	0	1
22	23/01/2015	An Giang			Provincial CNDPC		3	2	1
23	23/01/2015	An Giang			VNRC staff		6	6	0
24	24/01/2015	An Giang	Tinh Bien	Vinh Trung	Validation meeting	PC; School; VNRC; Women Union	8	7	1
25	24/01/2015	An Giang	Tinh Bien	Vinh Trung	Children	Vinh Trung school; grade 5	6	3	3
26	24/01/2015	An Giang	Tinh Bien	Vinh Trung	PWD		3	0	3

#	Date	Province	District	Commune	Meeting	Organization	# of people	M	F
27	24/01/2015	An Giang	Tinh Bien		CNDPC		2	2	0
28	24/01/2015	An Giang	Tinh Bien	Vinh Trung	Representatives		15	7	8
29	24/01/2015	An Giang	Tinh Bien	Vinh Trung	CNDPC		2	2	0
30	25/01/2015	An Giang	Tri Ton	Tan Tuyen	PWD		2	2	0
31	25/01/2015	An Giang	Tri Ton	Tan Tuyen	Validation meeting	Fatherland Front; PC; VNRC; police; Women Union	9	8	1
32	25/01/2015	An Giang	Tri Ton	Tan Tuyen	CNDPC		13	10	3
33	25/01/2015	An Giang	Tri Ton	Tan Tuyen	PWD		1	1	
34	25/01/2015	An Giang	Tri Ton	Tan Tuyen	Children	Tan Tuyen secondary school; grade 6	5	3	2
35	25/01/2015	An Giang	Tri Ton	Tan Tuyen	Representatives		9	2	7
36	25/01/2015	An Giang	Tri Ton		CNDPC		4	4	0
37	28/01/2015	Thai Binh			CNDPC		5	5	0
38	28/01/2015	Thai Binh			VNRC		4	2	2
39	28/01/2015	Thai Binh	Dong Hung	Hoa Nam	Representative		11	7	4
40	28/01/2015	Thai Binh	Dong Hung	Hoa Nam	Elderly		3	2	1
41	29/01/2015	Thai Binh	Dong Hung	Hoa Nam	PWD		3	3	0
42	29/01/2015	Thai Binh	Dong Hung	Hoa Nam	Validation meeting	PC; VNRC; CNDPC	16	10	6
43	28/01/2015	Thai Binh	Dong Hung	Hoa Nam	Children	student	6	1	5
44	28/01/2015	Thai Binh	Dong Hung	Hoa Nam	CNDPC		4	4	0
45	29/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	CNDPC		6	6	0
46	29/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy		CNDPC		2	2	0
47	29/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	Representative		3	2	1
48	29/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	Elderly		4	2	2
49	29/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	Authorities		10	6	4
50	30/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	Validation meeting	PC; VCA group; VNRC	5	4	1
51	30/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	Children	Grade 6-9	5	1	4
52	30/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	PWD		3	1	2
53	30/01/2015	Thai Binh	Thai Thuy	Thuy Xuan	Representative		7	5	2
Total:							291	190	101

Workshops attended

- GRC mid-term review workshop in Phu Yen (29-30/12/2014)
- AmRC workshop on urban resilience (16-17/01/2015)

VCA reports reviewed - VNRC

#	Document	Location	Red Cross chapter	Author	Date
1	VCA report	Triệu Đại commune-Trieu Phong district- Quang Tri province	Quang Tri RC	Ms. Nguyễn Thị Hương	18 - 22/12/2012
2	VCA report	Phong Hóa commune-Tuyên Hóa- QB	Quang Binh RC	Mr. Cao Quang Cảnh	17 – 21/12/2012
3	VCA report	Hải Cảng ward -Quy Nhơn city	Bình Định RC	Mr. Trần Đình Ký	28/10/2014 - 01/11/2014
4	VCA report	Nhơn Bình- Quy nhơn	Bình Định RC	Mr. Trần Đình Ký	09 - 13/10/201
5	VCA report	Phường Thị Nại – Quy Nhơn	Bình Định RC	Mr. Trần Đình Ký	20 - 24/10/2014
6	VCA report	Ward 1 - Tuy Hòa- Phú Yên	Phu yen RC	Unidentified author	Unidentified date
7	VCA report	Ward 6- Tuy Hòa- Phú Yên	Phu Yen RC	Unidentified author	24/10/2014
8	VCA report	Phu Dong Ward- Tuy Hoa city- Phu Yen province	Phu Yen RC	Unidentified author	03/11/2014
9	VCA report	Chiềng Bôm commune - Thuận Châu district - Sơn La	TT Hue RC	Mr. Phan Dai	24 - 28/05/2011
10	VCA report	Phổng Lập commune -Thuận Châu district- Sơn La province	VNRC	Mr. Nguyen Huu Thắng	29/5/2011 - 02/6/2011
11	VCA report	Ea Trul commune - Krong Bông district - Đắk Lắk province	Đắk Lắk RC	Ms. Tran Thi Yen	28/05/2011
12	VCA report	Hòa Tân commune -Krong Bông district - Đắk Lắk province	Đắk Lắk RC	Ms. Tran Thi Yen	29/5 - 2/6/2011
13	VCA report	Sông Đốc Town - Trần Văn Thời district - Cà Mau province	Ben Tre RC	Mr. Nguyễn Trọng Nghĩa	08/01/2010 - 11/01/2010
14	VCA report	Thanh Hối commune -Tân Lạc district - Hòa Bình province	Hoa Binh RC	Ms. Nguyen Thi Thuy	08/8/2011-11/8/2011
15	VCA report	Tử Nê commune - Tân Lạc district - Hòa Bình province	Hoa Binh RC	Ms. Nguyen Thi Thuy	14/9/2011-17/9/2011
16	VCA report	Khởi Nghĩa commune - Tiên Lãng district - Hải Phòng city	Hai Phong RC	Mr. Bui Manh Phuc	23/7/2013-26/7/2013
17	VCA report	Việt Tiến commune - Vĩnh Bảo district - .Hải Phòng city	Hai Phong RC	Mr. Bui Manh Phuc	17/7/2013-20/7/2013
18	VCA report	Dương Quỳ commune - Văn Bàn district - Lào Cai	Bình Định RC	Mr. Tran Dinh Ky	07/12/2012-10/12/2011
19	VCA report	Nậm Khánh commune - Bắc Hà district - Lào Cai	VNRC	Mr. Võ Đức Kiên	09/4/2013-13/4/2013
20	VCA report	An Hòa commune - Quỳnh Lưu district - Nghệ An province	Nghe An RC	Mr. Nguyen Lam Duyen	25-29/09/2012

#	Document	Location	Red Cross chapter	Author	Date
21	VCA report	Nghi Quang commune - Nghi Lộc district - Nghệ An province	Nghe An RC	Mr. Nguyen Lâm Duyên	18/09-22/09/2012
22	VCA report	Cảnh Hóa commune -Quảng Trạch district - Quảng Bình	Quang Binh RC	Mr. Nguyen Cao Cảnh	16-20/7/2009
23	VCA report	Kiên Thành commune - Trấn Yên district - Yên Bái province	Nghệ An RC	Ms. Bui Thij Mai	30/07/2009-03/08/2009
24	VCA report	Trà Nóc ward - Bình Thủy district - Cần Thơ city	VNRC	Unidentified author	9-13/7/2009
25	VCA report	Hải Thiện commune - Hải Lăng district- Quảng Trị province	Quang Tri RC	Mr. Doan Minh Cường	16/5- 20/05/2011
26	VCA report	Hải Vĩnh commune - Hải Lăng district - Quảng Trị province	TT Hue RC	Mr. Huỳnh Văn Tiến	23-27/05/2011
27	VCA report	Đồng Hiệp commune -Cờ Đỏ district - Cần Thơ city	Cần Thơ RC	Mr. Du Hai Đường	30/05-03/06/2011
28	VCA report	Thạnh Tiến commune - Vĩnh Thạnh district - Cần Thơ city	Hậu Giang RC	Mr. Lê Thanh Trí	25/05-29/05/2011
29	VCA report	Đồng Kho commune - Tánh Linh district -	Ninh Thuận RC	Ms. Nguyễn Thị Anh Hiếu	30/05/2011-03/06/2011
30	VCA report	Đức Thuận commune -Tánh Linh district -Bình Thuận	Bình Thuận RC	Mr. Trần Quân	24/05/2011-28/05/2011
31	VCA report	An Cư commune -Tĩnh Biên district - An Giang province	An Giang RC	Mr. Văn Sang	05/06 - 09/06/2013
32	VCA report	An Tức commune - Tri Tôn district - An Giang province	An Giang RC	Mr. Le Thanh Nhân	24/05- 28/05/2013
33	VCA report	Phú Lợi commune - Giang Thành district - Kiên Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Văn Sang	17/06 - 22/06/2013
34	VCA report	Tân Tuyến commune - Tri Tôn district- An Giang province	An Giang RC	Mr. Lê Thanh Nhân	30/5 - 3/6/2013
35	VCA report	Thoại Giang commune - Thoại Sơn district- An Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Lê Văn Hoàng	15/06/2013
36	VCA report	Thủy Liễu commune -Gò Quao district - Kiên Giang	Minh Thượng RC	Mr Nguyễn Duy Chính	17-22/6/2013
37	VCA report	Văn Giáo commune -Tĩnh Biên district - An Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Nguyễn Văn Sang	30/05-3/06/2013
38	VCA report	Vĩnh Phú commune -Giang Thành district -Kiên Giang	Minh Thượng RC	Mr. Nguyễn Duy Chính	11-15/06/2013
39	VCA report	Vĩnh Phước B commune- Gò Quao district- Kiên Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Huỳnh Thanh Ngọc	11/06-15/06/2013
40	VCA report	Tịnh Trung commune -Tĩnh Biên district - An Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Nguyễn Văn Sang	24/05-28/05/2013

#	Document	Location	Red Cross chapter	Author	Date
41	VCA report	Đồng Hưng B commune - An Minh district- Kiên Giang	UMinh Thượng RC	Mr. Nguyễn Duy Chính	30-03/06/2013
42	VCA report	Vân KhánhTây commune - An Minh district - Kiên Giang	UMinh Thượng RC	Mr. Nguyễn Duy Chính	24-28/05/2013
43	VCA report	Định Thành commune - Thoại Sơn district - An Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Lê Thanh Nhân	05/06-09/06/2013
44	VCA report	Thới Quăn commune - Gò Quao district - Kiên Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Huỳnh Thanh Ngọc	17-21/06/2013
45	VCA report	Đồng Hưng commune - An Minh district - Kiên Giang	UMinh Thượng RC	Mr. Nguyễn Duy Chính	05-09/06/2013
46	VCA report	Thủy Biều ward - Huế city	TT Hue RC	Mr. Huỳnh Văn Tiến	08-12/12/2011
47	VCA report	Hương Sơ ward - Huế city	TT Hue RC	Mr. Phan Dai	01-05/12/2011
48	VCA report	Phong An commune -Phong Điền district - Thừa Thiên Huế	TT Hue RC	Mr. Huỳnh Văn Tiến	24-28/11/2011
49	VCA report	Phong Thu commune - Phong Điền district- Thừa Thiên Huế	TT Hue RC	Mr. Phan Dai	17-21/11/2011
50	VCA report	Thủy Tân commune -Hương Thủy district -Thừa Thiên Huế	TT Hue RC	Mr. Phan Dai	15-19/12/2011
51	VCA report	Thủy Thanh commune -Hương Thủy district -TThiên Huế	TT Hue RC	Mr. Huỳnh Văn Tiến	22- 26/12/2011
52	VCA report	Lương Phi commune - Tri Tôn district - An Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Võ Minh Dũng	13/ 01/2013-17/01/2013
53	VCA report	Ốc eo Town -Thoại Sơn district - An Giang	An Giang RC	Mr. Võ Minh Dũng	08/ 01/2013-12/01/2013
54	VCA report	Châu Hưng A commune - Vĩnh Lợi district - Bạc Liêu	TT Hue RC	Mr. Phan Dai	13-17/01/2013
55	VCA report	Vĩnh Hưng commune - Vĩnh Lợi district -Bạc Liêu	TT Hue RC	Mr. Phan Dai	08-12/01/2013
56	VCA report	Đồng Hưng A commune - An Minh district - Kiên Giang	Bình Định RC	Mr. Trần Đình Ký	07-11/01/2013
57	VCA report	Vĩnh Điều commune -Giang Thành district - Kiên Giang	Bình Định RC	Mr. Trần Đình Ký	12-16/01/2013

VCA reports reviewed - NRC

#	Document	Location	Red Cross chapter	Author	Date
1	Commune General information	An Dan commune, Tuy An district, Phu yen province	Phu Yen RC		
2	VCA report	Nam Khanh commune, Bac Ha – Lao Cai	RC Lao Cai	Unidentified author	Unidentified date
3	Commune General information	Phu Tu commune	PC		
4	VCA report	An Hao Dong commune, Hoai An district, Binh Dinh province	VN RC	Mr. tran Dinh Ky	17-21/2013
5	VCA report	Cat Thanh commune, Phu Cat district, Binh Dinh province.	VN RC	Mr. Tran Dinh Ky	22-26/3/2013
6	VCA report	An Dinh commune- Tuy An district- Phu Yen	VNRC	Mr. Dang Hong Dung	26/2-02/3/2011
7	VCA report	An Hao Tay, Hoai An district, Binh Dinh province	VNRC	Mr. Tran Dinh Ky	5-9/11/2011
8	VCA report	Cat Hanh commune, Phu Cat district, Binh Dinh province	VNRC	Mr. Tran Dinh Ky	22-26/2/2013
9	VCA report	Cat Tien commune, Phu Cat district, Binh Dinh province	VNRC	Mr. Tran Dinh Ky	14-18/5/2012
10	VCA report	Nam Khanh commune, bac ha district, Lao Cai	VNRC	Mr. Vu Ngoc Kien	9-13/4/2013
11	VCA report	Nhon Hoa ward, An Nhon town, Quy Nhon city	VNRC	Mr. Tran Dinh Ky	11-15/3/2014
12	VCA report	Binh Dinh ward, An Nhon town, Quy Nhon city	VNRC	Mr. Tran Dinh Ky	3-7/3/2014

SED and DP plans reviewed:

Commune	SEDP	DPP
Ward 6	2014 - 2015	2014
Xuan Quang 2		2014
Tan Tuyen	2012 and 2014 - 2015	2014
Vinh Trung	2014 - 2015	2015
Hoa Nam		2014
Thuy Xuan		2014

Secondary resources – others

- **Law on Natural Disaster Prevention and Control**; No 33/2013/QH13, Date 19/06/2013; Effective 1st May 2014; Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development; United Nations Development Programme
- **Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA); Manual** for Vietnam Red Cross Practitioners (Part I and II); Vietnam Red Cross; The Netherlands red Cross; 2010
- **Guideline Community Based Disaster Risk Assessment**; Disaster Management Center (DMC); Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development; United Nations Development Program; Hanoi; April 2014
- **Integrating disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into development programmes guidelines**; CCWG; DMWG; JANI; Hanoi; March 2011
- **Vietnam Red Cross Facilitators Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments Analysis**; Final consultancy report; Duong Van Hung; Hanoi, 30 November 2014 (Draft)
- **Applying vulnerability and capacity assessment (VCA) tools in the urban contexts**: Challenges, difficulties and new approach; ISET et al.; March 2014
- **Manual on Disability inclusive Community Based Disaster Risk Management**; Malteser et al.; December 2013
- **Integrating climate change and urban risks into the VCA**; Ensure effective participatory analysis and enhanced community action; IFRC; Geneva; 2014

ANNEX 5: Suggestions for VCA Amendments

Based on the findings outlined in this report and the results of three tests in Quang Binh province, a set of suggestions for amendments to the VCA was developed with the aim of supporting VNRC for further development. The suggestions include the following four parts:

- Amendment 1: Tips for better inclusion of vulnerable groups in VCA;
- Amendment 2: Standard schedule for organizing a VCA;
- Amendment 3: Format for VCA tools;
- Amendment 4: Format for VCA report.

The suggestions for the amendments do not intend to replace the VCA manual, but should rather be seen as an addition. The amendments do not duplicate information that is already in the VCA manual. Therefore it is still relevant and important to read the VCA manual before implementing a VCA.

AMENDMENT 1: HOW TO GUARANTEE PROPER INCLUSION OF VULNERABLE GROUPS

Certain groups in a community are more at risk for disasters, either because they are more exposed to hazards, or because they have less ability to cope with them. In the VCA manual different groups have been identified that are particularly vulnerable: children, women, people with disability (PWD), elderly, poor people, and ethnic minority groups. The VCA manual contains a large number of tips on how to involve these people/groups into a VCA, as can be read on page 30 onwards from Part I, and after each tool in chapter 7 of Part II. In addition to these useful tips and guidelines, below some more tips can be found regarding inclusion of women and PWD.

1) Tips regarding people with disability (PWD)

PWD are a particular vulnerable group in a community, and therefore their particular vulnerability, capacity need to be assessed and included in the VCA report. Also, PWD know best by themselves what should be done to reduce their risks. However, often their disability prevents them from participating in the VCA in the same way as other commune members. VCA facilitators should be aware of this and know what (practical) measures to take to accommodate PWD in such a way that they could still provide a valuable contribution to the VCA.

PLAN CAREFULLY

- Before going to the field, acquire background information on types of disability present in the commune, number of PWD, where they live, etc.
- Don't forget to allow time for clarification on the purpose of the discussion, and what will be done with the results. Also take sufficient time for questions and answers, discussion and 'learning moments' (explanation of concepts that are new to them).
- Ensure that the venue chosen for the session is accessible for PWD. Keep in mind that most PWD cannot stay long in a discussion and need a convenient venue and suitable seats. Therefore the meeting room and facilities (toilets) should be convenient and discussions should be kept short. Think of the seat arrangements: people with hearing or visual impairment should be seated in the front.
- Invite people of different types of disability to participate in the sessions. Let the PWD in the sessions themselves appoint one or more capable persons to represent them in the community meetings and share their needs on behalf of them.
- Needs and risk reduction measures proposed by PWD should be included in the VCA report.
- Invite representatives of Disabled People Organization (DPO) (or from the Bureau of labor, invalids and social affairs) to participate and support the VCA process, particularly in the preparation phase, and preferably those who have got trained on CBDRM and VCA.

BALANCE PARTICIPATION

- Agree with the participants on some basic 'behavior rules' before starting the discussion. This could for instance be that everyone has a chance to share ideas and that everyone should respect each other's opinions. In the case of PWD being represented by a family member it should also be made clear that this person talks on behalf of the PWD only if necessary.
- Explain the process and ensure that all understand the instructions and questions.
- Support those that are timid, and gently silence those that take the floor too much.
- Find ways to allow people to drive the process (e.g. building the map themselves, marking symbols on the matrix).
- Allow participants to raise issues, but keep the process on track (keep to the main purpose). Ensure that you are moving quickly enough to cover the necessary topics in the time allocated.
- Probe for more information if the discussion is lagging, but try not to lead participants.
- Ensure that facilitators are familiar with local dialects, and avoid technical language (jargon).

ASSESSMENT TOOLS

- The main assessment tools to work with PWD are mapping and group discussion.

- The hazard map is an important VCA tool to use when working with PWD as it can mobilize full participation of PWD. It can be done before developing a village hazard map to make sure that the hazard map produced by PWD will be incorporated into the one of village/commune.
- All PWD should be invited to participate in producing hazard map. For people having serious mental, intellectual, or physical impairment and children with disability, it is recommended to invite their family member to join. However, try to talk directly with the PWD as much as you can – do not let family members take over the discussion if not necessary.
- Facilitators should prepare in advance a set of symbols denoting different types of disabilities to put on the hazard map.
- Discussion should focus on the following topics:
 - Dangers for PWD which may not threaten non-disabled people;
 - Strengths and weaknesses of PWD;
 - Households with PWD that require early warning assistance;
 - Households with PWD that require early evacuation assistance;
 - Evacuation routes that are accessible to PWD.
- Follow the following steps for facilitating PWD to draw a hazard map (taken from Malteser's Manual on Disability Inclusive Community-based Disaster Risk Management¹⁹):
 - Step 1: Explain to PWDs and family members the purpose of the hazard map and information to be collected
 - Step 2: Show the base map of their village received from collecting baseline data and ask PWDs and family members to check information available before filling more detailed information in the following steps.
 - Step 3: Guide PWDs and family members to draw the first group of basic information of rice fields, road system, bridge, rivers, streams, loudspeaker and other means of early warning, houses of village stakeholders and rescue team, houses of all PWDs (marked with different symbols representing each kind of difficulty in evacuation)
 - Step 4: Guide PWDs and family members to draw second group of information: disaster prone areas, areas which cannot access public loudspeaker, dangers.
 - Step 5: Guide PWDs and family members to draw final group of information: Houses of PWDs who need assistance on early warning and evacuation, evacuation shelter, evacuation roads, means of assistance.
- Have a checklist of information to be collected when having group discussions with PWD. Prepare a questionnaire related to livelihoods activities and life safety for interviews with household having PWD. The questionnaires in Malteser's Manual on Disability Inclusive Community-based Disaster Risk Management could be taken as an example:
 - Are there any rivers or stream around the village? If yes, where are they? What is the current flow?
 - How many bridges are there in the village? Where? What are their conditions?
 - Are there many strong two-story houses that can be used as shelters in case of flood? How many people can accommodate?
 - Where are the houses of village head, deputy head, etc?
 - Is there a rescue team? Where are the rescuers' houses?
 - Where are your houses? (ask each PWD and help them to stick their house symbol responding to their type of impairments and difficulties on the map and make sure they identify their houses correctly)
 - Does the village have early warning tools such as loudspeakers? If yes, where are they located? What are their conditions? When does the village make use of megaphone (hand speaker), drums, etc.?
 - What areas in the village cannot access to public early warning? Why?
 - Where are the disaster prone areas in the village? By landslide? Why? Flooding (lowest and highest level)? Why? What is the flood flow?
 - What are your potential dangers during evacuation besides your disabilities (e.g. weak bridge, pothole on roads, rigorous running flood water, etc)

¹⁹ Manual on Disability Inclusive Community-based Disaster Risk Management; Malteser International et al.; December 2013

- How do you (PWDs) want to inform of floods? (ask one by one) why?
- Which households that family members cannot manage evacuation on their own and need assistance? Why do you need assistance?
- Where do you want to evacuate to? Why do you select this place?
- What is the most convenient road for evacuation? Why?
- What is the most convenient means of evacuation? Why?

2) Tips regarding gender

Disasters have a different impact on men and women. It is important to understand these differences, and recognize appropriate measure to address particular needs. VCA facilitators should therefore know how to ensure equal participation of both men and women in the VCA.

- Ensure that facilitators are familiar with local dialects, and avoid technical language (jargon).
- Separate sessions of VCA tools for both women and men should be organized to understand the most concerned hazards, vulnerabilities and disaster risks by gender.
- Ensure to recognize gender differences when discussing livelihood issues:
 - Do women and men face risks in accessing natural resources for their livelihood activities?
 - What livelihood risks do women and men face? Would the workload of both women and men be similar before, during and after a disaster?
 - What are the differences in access to paid work between men and women? Are women and men paid the same amount for similar activities?
 - If men migrate for livelihood purposes, how does this impact upon women's workloads at home/ generally?
 - If women migrate for work, what impact does it have on men and their families at home?
 - Is there evidence that women in the locality are taking on high-risk income generation activities (e.g. unsafe working environment)?
 - Are there options for poor men and women to take any form of insurance?
 - Are there existing community support mechanisms (e.g. women's groups, saving scheme, contingency fund)?

AMENDMENT 2: STANDARD SCHEDULE FOR ORGANIZING A VCA

The VCA schedule below is the recommended agenda for a VCA in order to ensure the following:

- Have sufficient time and attention for secondary data collection, which is important to get a picture of what is already in place. This forms an important basis for the VCA;
- Keep groups small in order to allow for more in-depth conversations. However, this means that it is even more important that you ensure to select participants that can provide a good representation of (a certain group of) the commune (see the guidance given in the last columns of the table).
- Have focus groups to ensure that different (social) groups in the community have the opportunity to speak out and be heard;
- Avoid generalization of the commune by having different sessions for different villages (instead of merging them all in one commune assessment).

Number of facilitators: 6 VCA facilitators

Supporting facilitators: minimum 3 local government staff

Time needed to complete the VCA: 7 days

Agenda:

Day	Session	Content	Place	Participants
At least 7 days before		Advocacy meeting and secondary data collection (incl. information on PWD)	CPC's meeting room	Commune authorities and mass organizations
1	Morning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opening - Commune briefs the social-economic situation - SWOT - Presenting SWOT results 	CPC's meeting room	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitators and supporting facilitators - Commune authorities and mass organizations - Representative of PWD organization - Village heads (25 – 30 people)
	Afternoon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mapping - Historical profile - Interview Commune authorities and mass organizations 	CPC's meeting room	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitators and supporting facilitators - Commune authorities and mass organizations - Representative of PWD organization - Village heads (25 – 30 people)
2	Morning	PWD groups: 1. Mapping 2. Group discussion to identify disaster risks and solutions (Facilitators prepare the guiding questions in advance)	Cultural houses in 3 villages	In each clusters of villages: - 15 PWD, ensuring: + Different types of disability + At least 40% are female + Invite the relatives if there are mentally disabled ones. - Representative of PWD organization
	Afternoon	Mixed groups: 1. Historical profile	Cultural houses in 3 villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 17 people, ensuring: + At least 40% are female

Day	Session	Content	Place	Participants
		2. Mapping		+ 2 representatives from PWD groups + From different types of livelihoods + From 20 -50 years old
3	Morning	Mixed groups (continued): 3. Seasonal calendar 4. Livelihood analysis 5. Venn diagram	Cultural houses in 3 villages	- 17 people, ensuring: + At least 40% are female + 2 representatives from PWD groups + From different types of livelihoods + From 20 -50 years old
	Afternoon	Mixed groups (continued): 6. Ranking 7. Problem tree 8. Logframe planning	Cultural houses in 3 villages	- 17 people, ensuring: + At least 40% are female + 2 representatives from PWD groups + From different types of livelihoods + From 20 -50 years old
4	Morning	Elderly groups: 1. Historical profile 2. Mapping 3. Ranking disaster risks 4. Discuss the solutions	Cultural houses in 3 villages	- 15 people: at least 40% are female and from 60 years old or above
	Afternoon	Women groups: 1. Seasonal calendar 2. Livelihoods analysis 3. Ranking disaster risks 4. Problem tree 5. Logframe planning	Cultural houses in 3 villages	- 15 women from different ages and at different levels, including single mom and women with young children
5	Morning	Children: 1. Mapping 2. Ranking disaster risks 3. Discuss the solutions	Cultural houses in 3 villages	- 15 children: 8 males, 7 females from 8 to 14 years old
	Afternoon	- Synthesize information - Observation and interviews of key vulnerable people	CPC's meeting room or hotel	- Facilitators and supporting facilitators
6	Morning	Writing report (group division)		- Facilitators
	Afternoon	Checking and adding information	CPC's meeting room	- Facilitators and supporting facilitators - Commune authorities and related organizations
7	Morning	Finalizing report	CPC's meeting room or hotel	- Facilitators and supporting facilitators
	Afternoon	Presenting the results	CPC's meeting room	- Commune authorities and mass organizations - Representatives of District PC - 30 people from different villages (including PWD, elderly, women and children) - Representative of PWD organization

Note: Involvement of local authorities

It is very important to involve local authorities in the VCA process to ensure that the VCA results will be used and followed up once the assessment has been completed. It is important that the commune

authorities understand the 'why' and 'how' of a VCA, and feels that it is useful. Therefore they should ideally be involved throughout the whole process:

- Explain carefully the concept and process of the VCA,
- Invite them in every step of the process,
- And explain to them why it is important that they are involved.
- Take time to listen to their ideas, answer their questions
- Involve them in a meaningful way in the facilitation of the VCA.
- After having conducted the VCA, take time to sit with the authorities to further work on the results and work towards their commitment to follow up on it.

Preferably not just commune level authorities (members of CFSC) should be involved, but also CFSC members at district (and provincial) level, because:

- Sometimes solutions and follow-up actions identified go beyond the capacity of the commune. If district authorities have been involved in the VCA process, they are more likely to take requests for support into consideration.
- Sometimes a problem (or its solution) does not limit itself to the border of the commune. Authorities of district and province level are indispensable to point out similarities and opportunities in neighbouring areas. For instance: 1) a problem of floods might need an solution in an upstream commune; 2) for certain problems a neighbouring commune might already have a good solution that can be copied, 3) a similar problem is felt in several communes so that for its solution communes can work together and combine efforts.

–

If it is not possible to have district and/or provincial level authorities involved in the start of the VCA, then at least ensure their presence on day 7 of the VCA.

AMENDMENT 3: FORMAT FOR VCA TOOLS

As compared to the VCA manual, the set of VCA tools presented in this amendment has been adjusted in the following way:

- 1) Less tools;
- 2) Better formats for data analysis.

1) LESS TOOLS

By having to use less VCA tools, more time can be spent per tool. This should lead to more in-depth discussions and better participation of the participants. It also allows more time for data analysis (see below). Therefore, in the table below some tools currently included in the VCA are indicated as 'less prioritized'. The 'less-prioritized tools' should only be conducted if it doesn't jeopardize the quality of the implementation of the other (prioritized) tools and if it is really necessary to complement the information that has already been gathered. We however recommend to only use the prioritized tools and therefore this document does not further address the less prioritized ones.

No.	Tool	Prioritized	Less prioritized
1	Review of secondary data	X	
2	Direct observation	X (Direct observation is included in mapping exercise)	
3	Focus group discussion		X (It is not a stand-alone tool, in each tool focus group discussion occurs)
4	Mapping	X (do historical profile first)	
5	Transect walk		X
6	Historical profile	X (do before mapping)	
7	Historical visualization and projection		X
8	Seasonal calendar	X	
9	Venn diagram	X (can also be done after ranking and/or problem tree)	
10	SWOT	X	
11	Livelihood analysis	X	–
12	Problem tree	X (do Ranking first)	
13	Ranking	X (do before Problem tree)	
14	Logframe planning	X	

2) BETTER FORMATS FOR DATA COLLECTION AND SYNTHESIS

For each data collection tool two formats have been produced: one for data collection, and one for data synthesis. Some of them have been adopted from the CBDRA of the Government of Vietnam (for instance the formats for the review of secondary data). These formats should help the facilitators in reporting the collected relevant information in a concise way, and provide guidance in analyzing it. In several of the formats clear reference has been made to climate change and vulnerable groups.

Both formats, for data collection and analysis, need to be filled out during the VCA session, so together with the participants.

In a few cases an additional format has been produced to help getting an overview of the findings of different groups. These formats need to be filled out by the facilitator him/herself after having collected all outcomes of the VCA tools.

Whether the tables should be filled by the facilitators or by the participants (with help of the facilitator) can be seen from the color: tables that should be filled with help of the participants are blue, tables that should be filled by the facilitators themselves (based on the information collected from the participants) are green.

Important notes:

- All (summary) information collected in the formats below need to be included in the annexes of the final VCA report. See for more detailed instruction also the format for the VCA report (Amendment 4).
- The data analysis formats need to be filled directly in the same session as the data collection format. This means that data analysis is done with involvement of all participants and not by the facilitators only.
- The order of the tools below is slightly different than it is presented in the VCA manual. It is recommended to follow the order as presented in this document:
 1. Review of secondary data
 2. SWOT
 3. Historical profile
 4. Mapping
 5. Seasonal calendar
 6. Livelihood analysis
 7. Ranking
 8. Problem tree
 9. Venn diagram
 10. Logframe planning

The vulnerability and capacity should be analyzed based on five components: livelihoods, living condition, self-protection, social protection and Social organization/authorities. In each component, three areas should be considered namely material/physical, organizational/social and attitudinal/motivational aspects. See also the Annex to this amendment.

1) VCA data collection tool: Review of secondary data

Remarks

Presenting secondary data in a narrative format leads to lengthy documents in which it is difficult to find the relevant data. Therefore in this format only tables are used. The tables are copied from the DMC CBDRA manual, with only some minor changes/additions.

During the study of secondary data, if any information is not clear or missing, the facilitators should clarify this with local government staff in the first meeting they have with them.

1.1 Format for data collection

Commune:	
District:	
Province:	

1.1.1 Geographic profile

Topic	Short description
Geographical location and borders	
Type of landscape	
Roads and rivers	
Other relevant information	

1.1.2. Population

#	Village ²⁰	No. of house-holds	Total no. of people	No. of women	No. of men	Number of poor house-holds	Number of near-poor households	Vulnerable people				
								Elderly (>60yrs)	Children	Pregnant women/ women with children <12 months	People with disability ²¹	Chronic ally ill
1.												
2.												
3.												
4.												
5.												
6.												
7.												
8.												
9.												
10.												
11.												
12.												
13.												
14.												
15.												
	Total											

²⁰ Depending on area, village can be called differently.

²¹ Facilitators can collect a separated list of disable people, showing their ages, gender and types of disability. The selection of PWD to involve in meetings will be based on that list.

1.1.3. Usage of land, water, forest (natural resources)²²

No	Type of land	Area (ha)	Describe the current situation ²³
1	Non - agricultural land		
2	Agricultural land		
	<i>Paddy land</i>		
	<i>Other crop land</i>		
	<i>Perennial crop land</i>		
	<i>Specially used forest</i>		
	<i>Protective forest</i>		
	<i>Productive forest</i>		
	<i>Land for sand production</i>		
	<i>Water surface land for fishing</i>		
	<i>Desertification land²⁴</i>		
3	Area reserved for a specific plan/destination		
	Other:...		
	TOTAL commune area		

²² Land use situation can be collected from Division of Natural Resources and Environment at district level.

²³ Describe in details different types of lands such as the areas of two-crop rice land, one – crop rice land and other types of plants/trees.

²⁴ Please describe the reasons in column 3.

1.1.4. Production and economic activities

No	Production, economic activities	Area/scale ²⁵	Number of households participating (%)	Average income (person/year)
1	Cultivation a. Annual plants - <i>Crops (rice, corn, potato...)</i> - <i>Annual industrial plants (sugar cane...)</i> - <i>Vegetables</i> - <i>Annual medicine plants</i> b. Perennial plants - <i>Perennial industrial trees</i> - <i>Fruit trees</i> - <i>Perennial medicine trees</i>			
2	Husbandry - <i>Cattle</i> - <i>Poultry</i> - <i>Aquatic species</i>			
3	Forestry			
4	Fishing			
5	Small scale handicraft			
6	Small scale commerce/ Services			
7	Other			

²⁵ Scale: individual/household or cooperative model

1.1.5. Infrastructure

No	Infrastructures	Current situation	Note ²⁶
1.	Electricity		
2.	Roads		
3.	Schools - Kindergarten - Primary - Secondary		
4.	Medical station		
5.	Committee building		
6.	Village cultural house/ community meeting house		
7.	Religious place (pagoda, church)		
8.	Market		
9.	Communication system		
10.	Water factory/water system		
11.	...		

1.1.6. Housing²⁷

No	Village	Number of households	Number of solid houses	Number of semi-solid houses (level 4)	Number of temporary houses
1					
2					
3					
	Total				

²⁶ Which infrastructure can be used as evacuation centers?

²⁷ According to the definition of General Statistics Office

1.1.7. Clean water, health, sanitation, hygiene and environment

Village	No. of households	Source of drinking water* (Number of households)			Toilet/Latrine* (number of households)		
		Well	Tap water	Other: ²⁸ ...	Flush	Makeshift	None
Total							

1.1.8. Healthcare (common local diseases related to natural hazard/disasters)

Types of diseases ²⁹	Number of affected people ³⁰						Affected areas
	Children	Women	Men	Elderly	People with disabilities	Chronically ill	

²⁸ Rainy water, reservoir, river, stream and artesian water.

²⁹ Diseases related to digestion (diarrhea), eyes, respiration, dermatology, gynecology, malaria, dengue...

³⁰ Based on the most recent year of which data is available.

1.1.9. Disaster management

Topic	Description
Disaster control committee (structure/composition and tasks)	
Cooperation mechanism of organizations and institutions in disaster preparedness	
Availability of plans related to disaster management	
Availability of infrastructures and equipment related to disaster preparedness:	
- Equipment used for disaster management (boat, life saver, cart, etc.).	
- Equipment (loud speaker, telephone, telecommunication, television, warning signs, drum...).	
- Disaster preparedness constructions (dams, drainage system, dyke, road, evacuation centers...).	

1.1.10. Predicted changes in the commune

Sector	Trends ³¹ (observed or predicted)
Hazards	
Agriculture	
Forestry	
Fishing	
Small scale handicraft	
Small scale commerce/ Services	
Health	
Natural resources: - Land - Water - Forest	
Sea level rise	
Other	

2) VCA data analysis tool: SWOT

Remarks

The SWOT is being done with the local authorities. There is no need to also apply this tool in the sessions with other commune people. The format below is a direct copy of that in the VCA manual with in addition a reminder to ensure that under 'Opportunities' and 'Threats' you take into account predicted trends and changes such as those related to climate change. While in the VNRC the concepts 'Livelihoods', 'Living conditions', 'Self-protection', 'Social-protection' and 'Social organization' are being used, the DMC CBDRA uses a different set of concepts, namely 'Community safety', 'Health, sanitation, hygiene, environment' and 'Production and economic activities'. While in the format below the VNRC system is being followed, it is also fine to choose the DMC CBDRA one, as long as it is then applied consistently throughout the VCA.

³¹ Trends: levels of changes and better or worse.

2.1 Format

STRENGTHS / CAPACITY of the community in terms of	WEAKNESSES / VULNERABILITY of the community in terms of
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Livelihoods: - Living conditions: - Self-protection of individuals/families: - Social protection of the community: - Social organization / authorities: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Livelihoods: - Living conditions: - Self-protection of individuals/families: - Social protection of the community: - Social organization / authorities:
OPPORTUNITIES of the community to improve/utilize:	THREATS / IMPACTS of hazards on:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Livelihoods: - Living conditions: - Self-protection of individuals/families: - Social protection of the community: - Social organization / authorities: <p><i>(Include predicted trends and changes such as those related to climate change)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Livelihoods: - Living conditions: - Self-protection of individuals/families: - Social protection of the community: - Social organization / authorities: <p><i>(Include predicted trends and changes such as those related to climate change)</i></p>

3) VCA data collection tool: Historical profile

Remarks

The historical profile format in the VCA manual has been slightly revised to include more details (original version contains year; disaster; impact; coping mechanism).

The facilitator should ensure to have done the secondary data collection already, so that if (relevant) differences occur between what is 'on paper' and what is being told by the participants, the facilitator can ask for clarification (only with the purpose to get better understanding of the situation, not in order to correct participants).

The historical profile can (in an adjusted form) also be used to support the discussion on trends in livelihood, health etc. and discuss its causes. The format should then be adjusted accordingly.

The information should be collected from 5 to 10 years.

3.1 Format for data collection

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD							
Village:							
Year (month) (1)	Type of disaster (natural and other) ³² (2)	Frequency and duration (3)	Most affected areas (4)	Type of damage, scale (5)	Most affected people ³³ (6)	Causes (7)	What did the community do before, during and after disasters? (8)

³² Time of disaster, duration, frequency, level, scale and other features...

³³ Identify the number of affected households and vulnerable groups.

3.2 Format for data synthesis

The following table helps the facilitator to summarize and conclude the information collected in the historical profile session. It should be completed together with the participants of the session. The numbers in the headings refer to the columns of the data collection table from which the information should be taken. Discussing about observed trends should be done for all columns. In this way discussions can be triggered on what people could do to adjust to these trends.

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD						
Village:						
Disasters (from 1, 2)	Frequency and duration (from 3)	Most affected areas (from 4)	Main losses (concerned problems) (from 5)	Most affected people (from 6)	The causes (vulnerability) (from 7)	Effective actions (local DRR capacity) (from 8)
Observed trend: (in type of disaster)	Observed trend: (in frequency and duration)	Observed trend: (in affected area)	Observed trend: (in main losses)	Observed trend: (in affected population)	Observed trend: (in type of vulnerability)	Observed trend: (in type of capacity)

Besides, facilitators can already ask the participants to do a ranking of disasters if time allows.

3.3 Format for data summary – to be filled by the facilitators only

For summarizing the findings of the different groups can be done by simply combining all information from the synthesis tables of each group in one table, leaving out any duplication. The columns 'most affected area' and 'most affected people' give you the chance to indicate differences between different villages and groups of people, if this appears from the outcome of the different focus groups.

Commune:						
Disasters (from 1, 2)	Frequency and duration (from 3)	Most affected areas (from 4)	Main losses (concerned problems) (from 5)	Most affected people (from 6)	The causes (vulnerability) (from 7)	Effective actions (local DRR capacity) (from 8)
Observed trend: (in type of disaster)	Observed trend: (in frequency and duration)	Observed trend: (in affected area)	Observed trend: (in main losses))	Observed trend: (in affected population)	Observed trend: (in type of vulnerability)	Observed trend: (in type of capacity)

4) VCA data collection tool: Mapping

Remarks

Mapping is a powerful tool that can be used for several purposes. It is recommended to do the mapping at village level, with different focus groups:

- Women
- Children
- Elderly
- PWD
- Mixed group (people presenting different livelihoods)

If time allows, the mapping exercise could be combined with direct observation (a less prioritized VCA tool). In between the mapping and analysis of the mapping tool, ask 2-3 people from the mapping group to guide you around and show the issues that came up during the mapping exercise. This could help the facilitators to better understand the issues raised.

After completion of the mapping tool, make a photo of it for reference for the VCA reporting. The map itself can be used as a reference during other VCA tools. Once all VCA tools have been implemented, the map should be left in the commune/village with the request to hang it in a public place. This will make the map a visible reminder of the VCA, and helps people to remember the need to follow-up on its results.

4.1 Format for data collection

The base map does not have to be fully geographically correct, as long as it gives a basis for the mapping tool that is understandable to all. Nevertheless it is recommended to use an existing administrative map as the basis (if available) so that discussions on the correctness of the map will be avoided and all time can be used to discuss on the actual hazard map.

The information on the map should avoid presenting general information. For instance, instead of indicating areas that are in danger for flood, indicate the duration (areas with inundation lasting for 2 days, 3-4 days, etc.) and/or flood levels (1m, 1.5m, etc.).

It is recommended to also include other/man-made hazards such as hazards related to road safety (e.g. places notorious for traffic accidents – especially relevant for children going to school by themselves), diseases, environmental pollution, and major environmental changes (such as deforested zones, flood plains, erosion, etc.).

After the map has been completed, (if time allows) you could ask 2-3 people from the mapping group to guide you around and show the locations of the issues that came up in the mapping exercise. This helps to better understand the issues that were raised and to come to a better analysis.

4.2 Format for data synthesis

Once the map has been completed, the following table is being filled (together with the mapping participants) to summarize the main information/conclusions. One could also fill the table below during the drawing of the map, to stimulate discussion leading to new ideas to include in the map.

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD				
Village:				
Hazard (1)	Areas prone to hazard³⁴ (2)	Capacity (3)	Vulnerability (4)	Disaster Risks (5)

³⁴ Identify areas with different level of impact

Natural:				
Other: such as: traffic accidents, diseases...				

4.3 Format for data summary – to be filled by the facilitators only

Summarizing the findings of the different groups can be done by combining all information from the synthesis tables of each group in the table below, leaving out any duplication.

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD				
Village:				
Hazard (1)	Areas prone to hazard (2)	Capacity (3)	Vulnerability (4)	Disaster Risks (5)
Natural:				
Other:				

5) VCA data collection tool: Seasonal calendar

Remarks

The format for the seasonal calendar has been adapted slightly to collect some more detailed information on risks and trends (the original format contains crops; social events; disasters and month of the year). By putting economic activities rather than crops the format becomes relevant for analysis of different livelihoods. The groups in which the seasonal calendar is conducted, should include people representing different economic activities.

The proposed format also gives more attention to recognizing trends. It provides the VCA facilitators an opportunity to discuss whether seasons in which hazards occur are changing (e.g. periods of diseases, hunger or other vulnerabilities). It is recommended that first you create a seasonal calendar based on 'now' and after the community has completed that task, ask if these seasons have changed compared to the past 30 years or so. For discussing long-term variation it is important to include elderly in the group. Remember also, it is not one past **event**, but **patterns** in the past that you are looking for in the seasonal calendar.

This tool helps to understand livelihood activities and coping measures. Facilitators may examine further to see whether existing coping strategies are working in the context of the changing environment and/or to identify innovative strategies that have emerged as a result of the changes. Consider which livelihoods could be most at risk to the hazards associated with climate change in rural and urban areas. You could cross check the information given about livelihoods with the changes and major climate risks – eg. if they are highly agriculturally dependent and rainfall is decreasing over time, gradual temperature increases and extremes, or seasons are shifting, this could be an emerging issue.

5.1 Format for data collection

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD																
Village:																
Economic activities (Step 1)	Month												What risks (Step 4)	Why (cause) (Step 5)	Experience in DRR (Step 6)	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12				
Hazard (Step 2)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Trends in hazard (Step 3)			

5.2 Format for data synthesis

After the collection of data, the information can be summarized in the following table (with help of all participants). The numbers in the headings refer to the columns of the data collection table from which the information should be taken. By discussing observed trends facilitators can examine whether existing coping strategies are working in the context of the changing environment. It can also help to identify innovative strategies that have emerged as a result of the changes. If observed trends differentiate from trends found in secondary data, this should be verified (e.g. with the local authorities).

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD
--

Village:			
Hazard (from 2)	Capacity (from 6)	Vulnerability (specify for which economic activity) (from 5)	Disaster Risks (from 4)
Observed trends: (in type and frequency)	Observed trends: (in capacity)	Observed trends: (in vulnerability)	Observed trends: (in risks)

5.3 Format for data summary – to be filled by the facilitators only

Summarizing the findings of the different groups can be done by combining all information from the synthesis tables of each group in the table below, leaving out any duplication. In each column you find 'Main differences' which give you space to put a remark if certain findings differ much between the different focus groups or villages (for instance: 'Hazard X is only mentioned by women in village Y').

Commune:			
Hazard (1)	Capacity (2)	Vulnerability (specify for which economic activity) (3)	Disaster Risks (4)
Observed trends: (in type and frequency)	Observed trends: (in capacity)	Observed trends: (in vulnerability)	Observed trends: (in risks)
Main differences between villages or people (if any):	Main differences between villages or people (if any):	Main differences between villages or people (if any):	Main differences between villages or people (if any):

6) VCA data analysis tool: Livelihood analysis

Remarks

Livelihood information is already included in some of the tools (Review of secondary data; Historical profile; Seasonal calendar). Nevertheless it is good to still have a separate discussion on livelihoods. For this the format can be used as provided in the VCA manual.

6.1 Format

Same as in the VCA manual (no changes):

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD Village:									
Livelihood	Who mainly does it? (women, men, children, ...)	Number of doers in the village/commune	Approx. income per day or month	Any insurance or support scheme from government or society?	Dangers, risks from these livelihood/works	Damages, losses, sufferings occurred	Any measures applied to reduce risks/dangers?	Possible replacement (if available)	Remarks

6.2 Format for data summary – to be filled by the facilitators only

Summarizing the findings of the different groups can be done by combining all information from the synthesis tables of each group in the table below, leaving out any duplication.

Commune:									
Livelihood (1)	Who mainly does it? (women, men, children, ...) (2)	Number of doers in the village/commune (3)	Approx. income per day or month (4)	Any insurance or support scheme from government or society? (5)	Dangers, risks from these livelihood/works (6)	Damages, losses, sufferings occurred (7)	Any measures applied to reduce risks/dangers? (8)	Possible replacement (if any) (9)	Remarks (10)
Fishing									
Farming									
Cow raising									
Vending									
Low-paid free work									
Wood collecting (for fuel)									
Rubbish collecting (for income)									
Construction workers									
Carpenters									
...									

7) VCA data analysis tool: Ranking

Remarks

The ranking tool can be used any time that you feel that you need to prioritize to reduce the number of ideas or opinions that are brought on the table. Here we use it specifically to filter down the main problems (disaster risks) that people perceive, so that we can use these (and not all problems/risks) to continue with the problem tree in the next tool.

Ranking can be done in many ways. In a small group, the ranking can be done plenary. In a big group or mixed group it might be better to ask people to rank individually first and then combine the individual scores.

If the number of problems to rank is large (>5) ask people to only rank their first three priorities.

7.1 Format

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD		
Village:		
Disaster risk (taken from risk mapping tool – column 5, table 4.2, livelihood analysis – column 6, table 6.1 and/or seasonal calendar – column 4, table 5.2)	Ranking (1 is most important)	Reasons of the ranking (only for priority 1-3)

7.2 Format for data summary – to be filled by the facilitators only

Summarize the ranking of the findings of each village and focus group in the following table. Limit yourself to the first priority of each group only.

It has been deliberately chosen to let this table show the diversity of opinions in the commune, by village and by focus group. The table does not give space to drawing overall conclusions for the commune. This is because it would not be fair to say that a problem/risk perceived in village A is more important than village B, or that of focus group X is less relevant than that of group Y.

Commune:					
Village	Priorities				
	Mixed group	Women	Children	Elderly	PWD

8) VCA data analysis tool: Problem tree

Remarks

The problem tree should best be done for prioritized problems only. Therefore it is advised to do the ranking tool first.

8.1 Format

Apply one disaster risk per problem tree. After analyzing prioritized disaster risks, facilitators can use the below table to synthesize the information together with the group.

8.2 Format for data synthesis

The outcomes (solutions) will flow into the Logframe planning.

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD				
Village:				
Order of priority	Disaster risks	Vulnerability	Root causes	Solutions
1.				
2.				
3.				

9) VCA data collection or analysis tool: Venn diagram

Remarks

The Venn diagram can be used as a data collection tool and as a data analysis tool.

Data collection tool

If used as a data collection tool (as per original idea in the IFRC/VNRC VCA) it is recommended to do the Venn diagram after the Seasonal calendar, at village level and with different focus groups:

- Women
- Children
- Elderly
- PWD
- Mixed group (e.g. people presenting different livelihoods)

The tool should not just focus on organizations/groups/individuals that are present, but also on gaps that exist (e.g.: no organization to give specific attention to PWD).

Data analysis tool

In practice VNRC sometimes uses the tool as a data analysis tool, to get insight in the stakeholders of the identified problems. We recommend to copy this approach as it makes the Venn diagram more focused and therefore more relevant. It then should follow the ranking exercise and/or problem tree. Its results will support the logframe planning.

9.1 Format for data collection

See VCA manual (no changes).

9.2 Format for data synthesis

Summarizing the information collected in the following table (with help of all participants).

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD		
Village:		
Organization / individual	Role related to identified problem	Limitations related to capacity (if any)¹⁾
Gaps²⁾:		

If the Venn diagram is used for data collection (see remark above), the column 'role related to identified problem' should be changed into 'role related to disaster management':

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD		
Village:		
Organization / individual	Role related to disaster management	Limitations related to capacity (if any)¹⁾
Gaps²⁾:		

1) Make a remark here if for instance the organization is understaffed, lacks capacity, is located far away, etc.

2) Note if certain roles or tasks are not covered.

9.3 Format for data summary – to be filled by the facilitators only

Summarizing the findings of the different groups can be done by combining all information from the synthesis tables of each group in the table below, leaving out any duplication. In the last column you can make a remark if certain findings differ much between the different focus groups or villages (for instance: 'Especially important for PWD').

If the Venn diagram is used for data collection (see remark above), the column 'role related to identified problem' should be changed into 'role related to disaster management'.

Commune:			
Organization / individual (1)	Role related to disaster management (2)	Limitations related to capacity (if any) (3)	Particularly important for: (focus group/village) (4)
Gaps:			Particularly important for: (focus group/village)

10) VCA data analysis tool: Logframe planning

Remarks

The VCA manual provides a 'Plan of transforming Vulnerability to Capacity and disaster risk reduction. This format provides space for linking the measure to the identified risks, but less space for details of the proposed measures. Therefore the facilitator could choose to use the format below (to replace or to add to the format in the VCA manual). The second column of this table (proposed solutions) links to the last column of the proposed format for data synthesis in the problem tree tool.

It is important to do this tool with all focus groups, as it gives them the opportunity to think of own preferred solutions to the problems that they find important. For groups for which the format is however too complicated (e.g. children, elderly, PWD) it could be simplified by focusing only on column 1 (problem, copied from problem tree or risk mapping tool) and 2 (rephrase it into: 'What do you think could be done to solve this problem?'). Other columns could be left empty.

Important: For each focus group, do not only focus on solutions that should be done by others, but try to trigger people to also think of things that they could do themselves.

10.1 Format

Focus group: mixed group / women / children / elderly / PWD							
Village:							
Disaster risks¹⁾	Proposed solutions / activities¹⁾	Quantity	Location & beneficiaries <i>quantity, type²⁾</i>	Proposed time frame	Who takes the lead?	Technical support if needed <i>what / by whom</i>	Financial support if needed <i>by whom</i>

1) Taken from Problem tree

2) Think of special target groups, such as children, women, etc.

10.2 Format for data summary – to be filled by the facilitators only

All information collected from the different groups can be summarized in the following table. Take out any duplication. The column “Location & beneficiaries” gives you the opportunity to put in a remark if a certain problem or solution refers to a particular village or group of people only.

Commune:							
Disaster risks ¹⁾	Proposed solutions / activities ¹⁾	Quantity	Location & beneficiaries <i>quantity, type²⁾</i>	Proposed time frame	Who takes the lead?	Technical support if needed <i>what / by whom</i>	Financial support if needed <i>by whom</i>

ANNEX to Amendment 3: Suggestions for data collection

I. Livelihoods

To each key livelihood activity, information can be collected based on the following aspects:

a. Material:

- Natural resources used for this activity (land, water, species) and their conditions (location, area, quality)
- Related infrastructure (channels, market)
- Equipment and technology

b. Social/Organizational:

- Participants (quality, quantity, gender, location, vulnerability)
- Other services, vocational center, training
- Clubs/groups/Cooperative
- Supportive policies

c. Attitudinal/motivational:

- Experience
- Opinion
- Flexibility

II. Living conditions

1. Traffic

a. Material:

- Types of roads (length, quality, location)
- Traffic signs and special works for special groups (PWD, elderly, children)
- Other functions related to disaster control, agriculture

b. Social/Organizational:

- Supporting programmes
- Clubs/groups to protect/repair

c. Attitudinal/motivational:

- People's Consciousness
- People's understanding about laws

2. Medication

a. Material:

- Infrastructure
- Equipment and means

b. Social/Organizational:

- Staff: quality, quantity
- Village health care staff
- Other programmes

- Insurance
- Number of taken care people

c. Attitudinal/motivational:

- People's Consciousness
- People's experience

3. Education

a. Material:

- Infrastructure
- Equipment

b. Social/Organizational:

- Staff: quality, quantity
- Clubs

c. Attitudinal/motivational:

- People's Consciousness

4. Electricity:

a. Material:

- Infrastructure to provide electricity and to protect.

b. Social/Organizational:

- Responsible units
- Program or policies

c. Attitudinal/motivational:

- People's Consciousness

5. Water and sanitation

a. Material:

- Water infrastructure
- Water quality
- Latrine, shelters for cattles
- Infrastructure for garbage (site, treatment)

b. Social/Organizational:

- Club, group, organization providing services
- Policies/programmes

c. Attitudinal/motivational:

- People's Consciousness

* Note: information related to vulnerable groups

III. Self-protection

a. Material:

- Infrastructure and equipment (houses, stores, means of communication, or means to support vulnerable groups)

b. Social/Organizational:

- Support from community
- Training to raise DM skills

c. Attitudinal/motivational:

- Knowledge, skills to protect life and properties
- Other related skills
- People's Consciousness (in food storage, buying insurances)
- Attitude to vulnerable groups

IV. Social protection

a. Material:

- Equipment for rescue teams and other infrastructure
- Evacuation sites or safe places
- Communication / alert systems

b. Social/Organizational:

- DP plan
- Rescue team: quality and quantity
- Training courses for skills and knowledge
- Supports from mass organizations
- Coordination among communes
- Programmes, projects to support (housing, food)

c. Attitudinal/motivational:

- People's Consciousness
- Care for vulnerable groups

V. Social organization/authorities (especially in disaster management)

a. Organizational mechanism (village and commune levels)

- Quantity, quality
- The level of meeting workload
- Opportunities for training
- Skills and knowledge to mobilize people

b. Operational mechanism

- Direction of the Party
- Annual action plan (participation of special groups)
- Regulations
- Task divisions in DM
- The level of completing tasks
- Take into account conditions to ensure the operation
- Implementation of DM laws

c. Cooperation of different units

- Cooperation of different units in CPC
- Cooperation of different units located in the commune and to other communes

AMENDMENT 4: FORMAT FOR VCA REPORT

The format for the VCA report below provides guidance for consolidating all information from the VCA into one comprehensive report. When compiling the report, it is important to keep in mind that:

- The report should be concise: avoid very lengthy reports repeating information that is already commonly known in the commune, but focus on the information that is relevant for disaster management and planning;
- The report should reflect the differences that are there in the commune regarding risks, vulnerability, and measures to be taken. This is not just related to geographical differences (e.g. certain villages being more at risk or facing different hazards than others) but also to different social groups (think of specific vulnerable groups such as women, children, PWD, etc.).

VCA REPORT

Commune/Ward:

District:

Province:

Time of VCA assessment: fromto

Conducted and reported by (VCA Group):

<i>Full name</i>	<i>Position and Unit</i>	<i>Role</i>

COMMUNE INFORMATION

Short description of geographical location, area, topography, population and key livelihoods. Please restrict to maximum one page only, and focus on the information that is relevant for disaster management only.

You can find information in 'Formats for VCA tools':

- Table 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4 (Review of secondary data).

PART A – ASSESSMENT ON

HAZARDS/DISASTERS, VULNERABILITY AND CAPACITY

1. Assessment on hazards/disasters at the local community

This paragraph is about the commune's concern about disaster/hazards. It's about natural hazards, but could also include other types of hazards, such as diseases and human-induced hazards.

This part can be structured based on types of disasters. Each disaster will have the current situation and the trend. Please do not forget to specially mention hazards and impact for different vulnerable groups.

a) Current situation (Level, scale, frequency, duration, alert signals and impacts)

You can find information in 'Formats for VCA tools':

- Table 1.1 (Review of secondary data), table 1.1.8 (healthcare)
- Table 2.1 (SWOT), threats and impact of hazards
- Table 3.3 (Historical profile), column 1-5;
- Table 4.3 (Mapping), column 1, 2 and 5;
- Table 5.3 (Seasonal calendar), column 1 and 4.
- Table 6.2 (Livelihoods analysis), column 6 and 7;
- Table 7.2 (Ranking);
- Table 8.2 (Problem tree), column 2.

b) What are the observed or predicted trends?

You can find information in 'Formats for VCA tools':

- Table 1.1 (Review of secondary data), table 1.1.10 (predicted changes in the commune)
- Table 3.3 (Historical profile), observed trends in column 1-5;
- Table 5.3 (Seasonal calendar), observed trends in column 1 and 4.

2. Assessment on capacity

This part can be structured based on five components: livelihoods, living condition, self-protection, social protection and social organization.

a) Current situation

You can find information in 'Formats for VCA tools':

- Table 1.1 (Review of secondary data), favorable geographical conditions from table 1.1.1 (geographic profile); vulnerable groups of table 1.1.2 (population); table 1.1.3 (natural resources); table 1.1.4 (production and economic activities); current situation of table 1.1.5 (infrastructure); solid buildings from table 1.1.6 (housing); table 1.1.7 (Clean water, health, sanitation, hygiene and environment); table 1.1.9 (Organizational structure)
- Table 2.1 (SWOT), strengths/capacity of the community
- Table 3.3 (Historical profile), column 7;
- Table 4.3 (Mapping), column 3;
- Table 5.3 (Seasonal calendar), column 2;
- Table 6.2 (Livelihoods analysis), column 4 and 5;
- Table 9.3 (Venn diagram).

Ensure not to generalize for the whole commune, but specify measures per vulnerable group and/or village.

b) What are the observed or predicted trends?

You can find information in 'Formats for VCA tools':

- Table 2.1 (SWOT), opportunities of the community
- Table 3.3 (Historical profile), observed trends in column 7;
- Table 5.3 (Seasonal calendar), observed trends in column 2;

3. Assessment on vulnerability

This part can be structured based on five components: livelihoods, living condition, self-protection, social protection and social organization.

a) Current situation

You can find information in 'Formats for VCA tools':

- Table 1.1 (Review of secondary data), vulnerable geographical conditions from table 1.1.1 (geographic profile); vulnerable groups of table 1.1.2 (population); table 1.1.3 (natural resources); table 1.1.4 (production and economic activities); current situation of table 1.1.5 (infrastructure); semi-solid and temporary housing from table 1.1.6 (housing); table 1.1.7 (Clean water, health, sanitation, hygiene and environment)
- Table 2.1 (SWOT), weaknesses/vulnerability of the community;
- Table 3.3 (Historical profile), column 6;
- Table 4.3 (Mapping), column 4;
- Table 5.3 (Seasonal calendar), column 3;
- Table 6.2 (Livelihoods analysis), column 4 and 5;
- Table 8.2 (Problem tree), column 3, 4.
- Table 9.3 (Venn diagram), gaps;

Ensure not to generalize for the whole commune, but specify measures per vulnerable group and/or village.

b) What are the observed or predicted trends?

You can find information in 'Formats for VCA tools':

- Table 1.1 (Review of secondary data), table 10 (predicted changes in the commune)
- Table 2.1 (SWOT), threats.
- Table 3.3 (Historical profile), observed trends in column 6;
- Table 5.3 (Seasonal calendar), observed trends in column 3;

PART B – SYNTHESIS OF DISASTER CONTROL AND PREVENTION MEASURES

4. Synthesis of disaster preparedness measures and needs

A table to synthesize different disaster risks, needs, and proposed measures. Ensure not to generalize for the whole commune, but specify measures per vulnerable group and/or village. There is no need to focus on big issues only. Also smaller or more local hazards are worth mentioning.

Often one problem can have different solutions, or different groups can contribute to the solution (e.g.: in case of floods: community to take care of cleaning the rubbish from the drainage canals; government taking care of strengthening river banks; and children getting information at school to be careful and stay far from the flooded areas).

As far as possible, specify the measures in terms of:

- What should be done?
- By whom (who takes the lead)?
- When should it be done?

You can find information in 'Formats for VCA tools':

- Table 6.2 (Livelihoods analysis), column 8 and 9;
- Table 8.2 (Problem tree), column 5;
- Table 10.2 (Logframe planning).

PART C – SUGGESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP

Based on Part B per organization/group the follow up should be described here, to facilitate follow-up and M&E.

5. Suggested follow-up on VCA results by the local community

- a. By local people themselves
- b. With help of commune authorities/organizations

–

6. Suggested follow-up on VCA results at higher levels

7. Suggested follow-up on VCA results by Red Cross

8. Suggested follow-up on VCA results by other organizations (NGOs, etc.)

–

9. Other remarks regarding follow-up

(Signature of team leader)

(Signature and Stamp of Commune)

Annexes:

The following information and tables should be annexed to the VCA report:

Annex 1: List of participants (name, age, gender, village)

Annex 2: Assessment schedule at the local community

Annex 3: Copy of VCA outputs:

- All tables from 1.1 Secondary data
- Table 2.1 SWOT
- Table 3.3 Historical profile
- Table 4.3 Mapping
- Table 5.3 Seasonal calendar
- Table 6.2 Livelihood analysis
- Table 7.2 Ranking
- Table 8.2 Problem tree
- Table 9.3 Venn diagram
- Table 10.2 Logframe planning