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Management Response

[This section provides the response by ESCAP management to the evaluation and includes a response to the overall evaluation and to the specific recommendations made. The management response that includes the follow-up action plan will be included as an annex to the evaluation report. To ensure that recommendations that have been accepted by the ESCAP management are acted upon, an evaluation follow-up action plan with responsible units and expected completion dates is submitted separately to the SPMD (See Evaluation Tool 7: Management Response template).]

General response
[To be inserted by ESCAP management after the content of the evaluation report is finalized]

Response to Individual Recommendations
[To be inserted by ESCAP management after the content of the evaluation report is finalized]
Executive Summary

Introduction

This is the evaluation report which has reviewed the “Enhancing knowledge and capacity for the management of disaster risks for a resilient future in Asia and the Pacific” project (DA Code 1415 AN), a project funded under the 9th tranche of the UN Development Account (hence it will be referred to as the DA9 project). It was executed by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) between May 2014 and December 2017. This evaluation was conducted by Dr. F. A. Uriarte, Jr., an academician of the National Academy of Science and Technology, and former Secretary (Minister) of Science and Technology, Republic of the Philippines. This evaluation was conducted between October and December 2017 in Bangkok, Thailand and in Metro Manila, Philippines.

Purpose and Scope

The DA9 project seeks to enhance the capacity of selected developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral development planning for safer communities. In this respect, the project aims to:

- Enhance capacity of policymakers to formulate effective policies and strategies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into multi-sectoral development planning at the national level;
- Improve capacity of policy makers to apply effective damage, loss and risk assessment tools for planning better disaster-resilient risk management, recovery and reconstruction, through a multi-sectoral approach

The scope of the evaluation sought to: (a) determine the level of achievement of project objective; (b) analyze and evaluate the performance of the project against five key parameters: effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, and gender mainstreaming; and (c) formulate specific and action-oriented recommendations. Based on the five key parameters, the evaluation questions were developed. These evaluation questions were posed to participants and stakeholders who were able to take part in this assessment. They were also internally posed by the evaluator when assessing relevant outputs and survey results undertaken in conjunction with this project.
Methodology

The evaluation made use of the following methods of information and data collection and analysis and which were triangulated for purposes of evaluation:

- **Desk review of project-related documents.** A desk review of project-related documents and reports were made.

- **Consultations with relevant secretariat staff and Reference Group.** Consultations with relevant secretariat staff and members of the Reference Group were conducted to get a better understanding of the different aspects of the project.

- **Stakeholder and project partner interviews.** During the meeting of the ESCAP Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Bangkok, Thailand on 10-12 October 2017, face-to-face interviews were conducted. The evaluator visited ESCAP again on 1-8 November 2017 for face-to-face interviews of project partners and Skype or telephone interviews of country representatives.

- **Project evaluation survey.** A project evaluation survey was conducted to solicit the opinion of individuals who had participated in various project activities to help assess the outcome of the project.

Conclusions

The project implemented a total of 21 activities, primarily involving capacity development and technical assistance, with a total of 792 participants, comprising 549 males (69.3%) and 243 females (30.7%). It also produced 8 knowledge products and numerous news articles.

The evaluation parameters are assessed as being “Very Low” (1 point), “Low” (2 points), “Medium” (3 points), “High” (4 points), or “Very High” (5 points). The various stakeholders that participated in the DA9 activities gave an overall average rating of “very high” (4.1) for the combined criteria of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency and sustainability. Thus it may be concluded that the project delivered a strong outcome consistent with the overall objective of enhancing the capacity of selected developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development planning.
Effectiveness

The project has been found to be very highly effective. It achieved the objective of enhancing the capacity of selected developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development planning. It produced a variety of knowledge products including a regional guidebook for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into sustainable development at national and sub-national levels, ex-ante risk assessment tools, ex-post rapid assessment for resilient recovery, quick policy guidebook for earthquake recovery, and SIDS-specific regional guidebook for climate resilience, which were put to use for enhancing the capacities in more than 20 countries. The project enabled ESCAP to produce *Impact Outlooks for El Niño*, which served as key inputs to the development of the El Niño risk assessment methodology and were critical to countries in the region for implementing risk-sensitive strategies to achieve the development goals laid out in the 2010 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2017 (APDR) – the flagship publication of ESCAP on DRR and the parliamentary documentation for the fifth session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction (CDRR5) – has drawn heavily from the knowledge products and lessons from country engagements under the DA9 project.

Relevance

The project has been found to be very highly relevant. The DA9 project provided relevant support to countries hit by major disasters, including the 2015 Nepal earthquake and the El Niño 2015/2016, in the form of manuals, advisories, workshops and dialogues, as well as an El Niño-specific consultation at the regional level. In the midst of 2015/2016 El Niño season, ESCAP along with partners developed an assessment methodology titled “Assessment of El Niño-Associated Risks: The Step-Wise Process,” which was adapted by the key stakeholders from fourteen affected member Countries. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Disaster Management Centre (SDMC) pilot tested the Rapid Assessment for Resilient Recovery in 2015 Gorkha Nepal Earthquake and adapted this guidebook. The DA9 project enabled the quick implementation of ESCAP’s commitment under the ASEAN-UN Joint
Strategic Plan of Action on Disaster Management 2016-2020. For countries with critical vulnerabilities viz., Cambodia, Myanmar and Sri Lanka, ESCAP put in place strengthened monsoon forums (national climate outlook) to communicate ‘actionable’ disaster risk through downscaled climate outlooks, seasonal forecast and in-season drought monitoring using earth observation satellites.

**Efficiency**

The project has been found to be highly efficient. The project delivered all planned outputs within budget and within a realistic timeframe, and in a well-managed and framed manner. Outputs were well-targeted and did not over reach their aims. The project utilized synergies by working with external agencies when appropriate. The use of analytical products to underpin the forums and capacity development activities was a hallmark of the project which resulted in efficient utilization of project resources. While external consultants were used, the project utilized internal capacity wherever possible.

**Sustainability**

The project has been found to be highly sustainable. The project has provided a legacy of outputs that can serve as useable building blocks for the selected countries to continue to provide training and capacity building. It has also put in place necessary institutional arrangements to ensure long-term sustainability. Networks of technical partners and like-minded professionals have been formed through the implementation of the project activities and the coherent implementation of the global frameworks has entered the lexicon of intergovernmental discussions.

**Gender Mainstreaming**

The project has been rated high by the responding participants but actual participation data show modest achievement. Overall, the participants of the various activities implemented under the DA9 project were composed of about 31% women and 69% men, implying a modest achievement in terms of gender mainstreaming. This issue was considered during early planning stages and was significantly incorporated into the design and outputs of this project.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1:** Continue and further strengthen capacity building and awareness enhancing on risk-informed development planning or risk-sensitive investment based on the outcome of the current project.
This recommendation is a logical continuation of the DA9 project and is consistent with the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience: Towards a Risk-informed and Integrated Approach to Sustainable Development, which was endorsed by the United Nations Chief Executive Board for Coordination.

**Recommendation 2:** Further develop close cooperation with sub-regional organizations by delivering programmes and projects on disaster risk reduction and resilience in partnership with them.

Having successfully partnered with sub-regional organizations, ESCAP should further enhance this cooperation and, whenever appropriate, deliver through and partner with, among others, ASEAN, SAARC, PIFS, and ECO, in developing and implementing programmes and projects on disaster risk reduction and resilience. This recommendation is consistent with the work of the dedicated Thematic Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience, which is co-chaired by ESCAP, UNDP and United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. The dedicated Working Group supports the regional implementation of those disaster-related elements of the 2030 Agenda through coherent and coordinated United Nations engagement with regional and sub-regional organizations on disaster risk reduction and resilience, with specific focus on ASEAN, SAARC and Pacific sub-regions.

**Recommendation 3:** Leverage off success of this project to establish the Asia-Pacific disaster resilience network in order to further strengthen the secretariat’s work on disaster risk reduction and resilience.

This recommendation is in line with the decision of the Fifth Session of the ESCAP Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction held on 10-12 October 2017 at Bangkok, Thailand supporting the ongoing effort to bring together different streams of its work related to multi-hazard early warning systems, regional space applications for disaster risk reduction and knowledge-sharing under an Asia-Pacific disaster resilience network to promote greater coherence across the implementation of global development frameworks, as well as coordination among members of the Asia-Pacific Regional Coordination Mechanism and its Thematic Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience.
1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Evaluation

This is the evaluation report which has reviewed the “Enhancing knowledge and capacity for the management of disaster risks for a resilient future in Asia and the Pacific” project (DA Code 1415 AN), a project funded under the 9th tranche of the UN Development Account (hence it will be referred to as the DA9 project). It was executed by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) between May 2014 and December 2017. The original project document lists the following tentative beneficiary countries: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Fiji, Maldives, Myanmar, Mongolia, Nepal, Samoa, and Tajikistan. During the course of implementation some adjustments had to be made for various reasons and the final list of beneficiary countries includes the following: Cambodia, Fiji, Maldives, Myanmar, Nepal, Indonesia, and Sri Lanka. The participation of Indonesia made possible enhanced south-south cooperation in view of Indonesia’s relatively more advanced knowledge and capacity for disaster risk management.

This evaluation was conducted by Dr. F. A. Uriarte, Jr., an independent consultant based in the Philippines, an academician of the National Academy of Science and Technology, and former Secretary (Minister) of Science and Technology, Republic of the Philippines, and also former Director, Information, Communications and Space Technology Division, UNESCAP. This evaluation was conducted between October and December 2017 in Bangkok, Thailand and in Metro Manila, Philippines.

1.2 Purpose, Objectives and Scope

The DA9 project seeks to enhance the capacity of selected developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral development planning for safer communities. In this respect, the project aims to:

- Enhance capacity of policymakers to formulate effective policies and strategies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into multi-sectoral development planning at the national level;

- Improve capacity of policy makers to apply effective damage, loss and risk assessment tools for planning better disaster-resilient risk management, recovery and reconstruction, through a multi-sectoral approach.
These objectives are the central part of the agenda at the regional workshops, as well as the workshops at the national level. The DA9 project also promotes multi-sectoral approaches for optimizing the allocation of scarce resources for development that also helps in reducing vulnerability and exposure, and hence contributes to building disaster resilience in multiple sectors, as well as down the line to the community levels.

The DA9 project principally targets policy makers and government officials. The main target group consists of officials from ministries with mandate and responsibility for national planning who typically hold crucial roles in multi-sectoral and cross-sectoral development planning. Those from ministries of finance and their counterparts in disaster management agencies will be the secondary targets and those from other sectoral ministries/agencies and the disaster management authorities are the other layers of the target.

The key outcomes of the project include:

- Improved knowledge of policymakers on effective policies and strategies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into multi-sectoral development planning;
- Improved capacity of policymakers to organize and undertake multi-sectoral damage, loss and risk assessments; and
- Improved capacity for mainstreaming DRR into socioeconomic development planning.

These outcomes can potentially lead to improved coordination between policymakers of the ministries of planning, finance and disaster management in formulating policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster resilient development planning.

To enhance capacity of developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster resilient development, the project aims to:

- Improve dialogue between policymakers of the ministries of planning, finance and disaster management;
- Create national expert advisory groups on resilience building to disasters to enable better coordination; and
- Improve policies to promote inter-sectoral coordination at all levels.
1.3 Object of Evaluation and Description

The entire study and evaluation process is undertaken from 9 October 2017 to 20 December 2017 in Bangkok, Thailand and in Metro Manila, Philippines.

The evaluation is done for the purpose of promoting accountability and learning, and supporting results-based management. It covers the analysis of the achievement of project results at the level of objectives and expected accomplishments by examining the results framework, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria. It also assesses the design, strategy and implementation of the project to inform future programming and implementation. The evaluation is conducted in line with ESCAP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Guidelines.

As stated in the scope of work, the objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Determine the level of achievement of project objective and expected accomplishments by examining the results chain, processes and contextual factors;
- Assess the performance of the project against evaluation criteria: effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and gender mainstreaming; and
- Formulate specific and action-oriented recommendations to inform management decision-making and improve future project design and implementation.

The evaluation was done in reference to the ESCAP M&E system and evaluation guidelines, and any relevant UNEG guidance, where appropriate. The final deliverables of the valuation are:

- Evaluation Report (following the structure presented in the Annex to the Terms of Reference);
- Evaluation Brief (two-page summary of the evaluation report); and
- PowerPoint presentation on the key findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The target users of the evaluation results include the UN General Assembly, Development Account Fund Manager at DESA, ESCAP management and staff, and stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project.
2. Methodology

2.1 Description of Methodology

The scope of the evaluation sought to analyze and evaluate the performance of the project against five key parameters: effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, and gender mainstreaming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Effectiveness**        | • What evidence exists to demonstrate that the project has achieved its objective and expected accomplishments?  
                          | • What were the key factors that contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of project objective and expected accomplishments?  
                          | • What could have been done better to improve the effectiveness of the project in achieving its results?                                                                                                           |
| **Relevance**            | • What evidence exists to demonstrate that the project’s products and services were used by the target countries?  
                          | • How were the needs and requirements of the target groups assessed or identified?  
                          | • What are/will be the key obstacles for the target groups to utilize the project’s products and services?                                                                                                      |
| **Efficiency**           | • Were the resources (human and financial) effectively utilized to deliver outputs and achieve results?  
                          | • How was the project managed in terms of timeliness?  
                          | • Were synergies gained from partnership with other organizations resulted in cost-efficiency and savings?                                                                                                     |
| **Sustainability**       | • To what extent can results of the project be continued without ESCAP’s further involvement?                                                                                                                         |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | • To what extent was gender integrated into the design and implementation of the project?                                                                                                                           |
Based on these key parameters, the evaluation questions were developed. These evaluation questions were posed to participants and stakeholders who were able to take part in this assessment. They were also internally posed by the evaluator when assessing relevant outputs and survey results undertaken in conjunction with this project.

2.2 Data Collection and Analysis

The evaluation made use of the following methods of information and data collection and analysis and which were triangulated for purposes of evaluation:

- **Desk review of project-related documents**
  A desk review of project-related documents and reports were made including, among others, the documents and reports listed in Annex C.

- **Consultations with relevant secretariat staff and Reference Group**
  Consultations with relevant secretariat staff and members of the Reference Group were conducted to get a better understanding of the different aspects of the project including its design and implementation and provide a useful basis for collecting other relevant data. The list of interviewees is in Annex D.

- **Stakeholder and project partner interviews**
  During the meeting of the ESCAP Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Bangkok, Thailand on 10-12 October 2017, face-to-face interviews were conducted of some government representatives and other stakeholders of countries that participated in the DA9 project. The evaluator visited ESCAP again on 1-8 November 2017 for face-to-face interviews of project partners and Skype or telephone interviews of country representatives that participated in the project activities. The list of interviewees is in Annex D.

- **Project evaluation survey**
  A project evaluation survey was conducted to solicit the opinion of individuals who had participated in various project activities to help assess the outcome of the project. The survey questionnaire is shown in Annex E.

2.3 Limitations

The success of the evaluation was contingent on the support and cooperation of the various informants and stakeholders during the conduct of the survey and interviews. Given budget limitations for the evaluation, it was not feasible to conduct face-to-face interviews with the
wider stakeholder group in each country. Thus an e-mail survey was undertaken to gather feedback from the broader constituency of the stakeholders involved.

Phone interviews
Due to budget and time constraints, face-to-face interviews with all country project participants were not possible. Except for a few, interviews were conducted mainly through Skype or telephone. While not in all cases, it was found that this interview was not as effective as face-to-face interviews in obtaining information particularly when it came to having in-depth discussions on the subject matter. Nevertheless, the difference in effectiveness is marginal, and on the whole the most useful information were successfully gathered.

Lack of field visits
Also due to budget and time constraints, visits to relevant country counterparts and their organizations were not undertaken. The field visits would have allowed a broader group of stakeholders to be approached and spoken to, allowing a broader diversity of views. However, the evaluator feels that this would not have made much difference in terms of the overall findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

3. Findings

3.1 General

The project implemented a total of 21 activities with a total of 792 participants, comprising 549 males (69.3 %) and 243 females (30.7%). These project activities may be grouped into five different types where 60% of respondents participated in the regional forums for the sharing of experiences and lessons learned, 56% in the workshops at the regional level for policy makers and experts, 24% in the regional advisory network of experts and practitioners, and 24% in the national training workshops. Only 8% participated in national expert advisory policy workshops.

The project also produced 8 knowledge products as well as numerous news articles and other information materials that were widely disseminated.

These findings are summarized in Annex F.
3.2 Performance Assessment

In this section, we assess the performance of the DA9 project in terms of the five key evaluation criteria, namely, effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, and gender mainstreaming. They are assessed as being “Very Low” (1 point), “Low” (2 points), “Medium” (3 points), “High” (4 points), or “Very High” (5 points). Needless to say, the assessment of these levels of attainment is inherently subjective, but, whenever possible, we will attempt to back up the assessments with quantitative and qualitative data wherever practical.

There are two sources of data for the assessment: (a) the interview of participants from selected countries; and (b) the responses to the survey questionnaire that was sent out to participating countries. The data tables are shown in Annex F.

Eight out of a total of 12 interviewees from country participants gave quantitative evaluation ratings of the activities that they had participated in, namely, Fiji (1), Indonesia (3), Myanmar (1), Nepal (2), and Sri Lanka (1). The results are presented graphically in Figure 3.1. The interviewees rated the project activities “very high” in terms of relevance (4.7) and effectiveness (4.3), and “high” in terms of efficiency (3.9) and sustainability (3.9).

![Figure 3.1: Overall assessment from country interviews](image)

Although only 8 out of the 12 country participants give quantitative ratings, the qualitative assessments of the remaining 4 interviewees, namely, Cambodia, Indonesia, Maldives and Nepal, are consistent with the ratings given by the eight. They state that the project and its activities and outputs are very useful, particularly for small countries such as the Maldives and the Pacific island countries, the technical assistance provided is effective, and the knowledge products are useful particularly to policy makers. To cite just one example, the
activities of the DA9 project in Nepal were considered to be very useful, relevant and timely, coming after the destructive Nepal earthquake.

In the case of the country survey, a total of 25 responses to the survey questionnaire were received from 11 different countries, namely, Bhutan (2), Cambodia (7), Fiji (2), Indonesia (1), Lao PDR (1), Maldives (3), Myanmar (4), Nepal (1), Philippines (1), Sri Lanka (2), and Vietnam (1). The summary of the ratings given by the country respondents is shown graphically in Figure 3.2. The country survey shows that effectiveness (4.1) and relevance (4.2) are rated “very high” while efficiency (3.9) and sustainability (3.7) are rated “high”.

Figure 3.2: Overall assessment from country survey

It is evident from Figures 3.1 and 3.2 that the results of the country survey, on one hand, and the individual interviews, on the other, are consistent with one another with very little difference in ratings. Both methodologies showed “very high” ratings for relevance and effectiveness, and “high” ratings for efficiency and sustainability.

The overall assessment outcome is taken as the average of the interview and survey ratings. The overall average ratings in terms of effectiveness (4.2), relevance (4.4), efficiency (3.9) and sustainability (3.8) are shown graphically in Figure 3.3. The rating for gender mainstreaming (3.6) is that from the country survey since this question was not asked during the interviews.
Figure 3.3: Overall assessment outcome

- **Overall Assessment Outcome**
  - 3.9 Efficiency
  - 3.6 Gender mainstreaming
  - 4.2 Effectiveness
  - 3.8 Sustainability

The “high” to “very high” rating that the project received in all four evaluation criteria – effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, and sustainability – is further confirmed by the finding that eighty percent (80%) of the participants in the various DA9 project activities state that their participation has increased – to some or to a great extent - their capacity to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development planning (see Figure 3.4), and seventy-two (72%) percent state that they have applied – to some or to a great extent - their acquired skills and knowledge (see Figure 3.5).

Figure 3.4: Increase in capacity to develop policies

Figure 3.5: Able to apply acquired knowledge

Furthermore, the different types of activities implemented under the DA9 project – trainings organized, technical assistance and advisory services provided, and guidelines and assessment tools produced – were all rated “high” to “very high” in terms of enhancing the
capacity of participating countries in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development planning. In addition, 80% to 88% of respondents agreed that the DA9 project had contributed to increasing awareness, engaging, and enhancing capacity of policymakers to mainstream DRR into multi-sectoral development planning as well as getting underway preparations for effective multi-sectoral disaster-resilient risk management, recovery and reconstruction.

Finally, the survey shows that there is consensus\(^1\) among the respondents that the project has a sound communication and dissemination strategy and that there is need for the project to continue. In addition, 93% of the respondents state that the project incorporates approaches to ensure support and commitment to take forward the project outcome.

**Effectiveness**

There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the project has achieved its objectives and expected accomplishments. The project assisted in building the capacity of selected developing countries for implementing the new policy imperative through knowledge products as well as various capacity building workshops. This support is evident from the two Regional Learning Platforms held in 2017 on: (a) mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and resilience into sustainable development with focus on poverty eradication; and (b) on disaster risk reduction and resilience building – ensuring coherence across the global development agendas.

The project produced a variety of knowledge products including a regional guidebook for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into sustainable development at national and sub-national levels, ex-ante risk assessment tools, ex-post rapid assessment for resilient recovery, quick policy guidebook for earthquake recovery, and SIDS-specific regional guidebook for climate resilience. These were put to use for enhancing the capacities in more than 20 countries including Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Republic of Palau, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu and Viet Nam.

An outcome of the DA9 project is the funding support extended to the Regional Integrated Multi-hazard Early Warning System (RIMES) and WMO to scale up the monsoon forums with climate/weather risk knowledge products and services in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Sri Lanka and to establish the national climate outlook forums in Fiji, PNG and Samoa.

---

\(^1\) The finding that there is consensus is based on the fact that none of the respondents said no to the questions: Did the project have a sound communication and dissemination strategy? Should this project continue? It is not unanimous, or 100% yes, however, since a few responded N/A, stating that they were not in a position to answer the question or they were not sure about their answer (96% yes, 4% N/A).
Together with the Global Framework for Climate Services, these initiatives are linked with the efforts in South Asia, ASEAN and Pacific Climate Outlook Forums to operationalize climate risk management practices.

The project enabled ESCAP to produce Impact Outlooks for El Niño, which are policy notes that interpret the global El Niño phenomenon at regional, sub-regional and national levels with sector-specific implications. These notes served as key inputs to the development of the El Niño risk assessment methodology and were critical to countries in the region for implementing risk-sensitive strategies to achieve the development goals laid out in the 2010 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The development of risk assessment tools and guidelines set out a systematic way for assessing how a complex global climate phenomenon like El Niño can affect vulnerable communities. These tools and guidelines are utilized as part of regional and national strategies to mitigate future impacts of El Niño on multiple sectors, particularly the agriculture sector, as well as contribute to achieving multiple SDGs.

A further evidence that the project has achieved its objectives and expected accomplishments is the fact that the Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2017 (APDR) – the flagship publication of ESCAP on DRR and the parliamentary documentation for the fifth session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction (CDRR5) – has drawn heavily from the knowledge products and lessons from country engagements under the DA9 project. The launch of the APDR was found to be a most important aspect of the CDRR5, which noted that “such useful research provides evidence to DRR community to sensitize respective political leadership and decision makers on the needs of giving priority to DRR on national agenda.”

Among the key factors contributing to the achievement of project objective was the level of consultation with development partners to develop a comprehensive understanding of issues, and wherever possible, exploiting co-operation opportunities and synergies with the partners, particularly the synergistic partnership that was developed with UNDP and UNOCHA as well as with the sub-regional organizations in project implementation. The strong support and close cooperation of Indonesia contributed to successful south-south cooperation thus further contributing towards attaining the project objective.

Further improvement of the effectiveness of the project in achieving its results could be achieved by an even closer and more frequent partnering with sub-regional organizations in delivering and implementing the project activities. The project’s experience in successfully working with SAARC and ASEAN is a good example that should be replicated and further enhanced in future projects.
Relevance

There is sufficient evidence that the project’s products and services were indeed used by the target countries. In midst of 2015/2016 El Niño season, ESCAP along with partners developed an assessment methodology titled “Assessment of El Niño-Associated Risks: The Step-Wise Process,” which helped achieve the envisaged short-term objective. This assessment methodology was adapted by the key stakeholders from fourteen member countries that were affected by the El Niño.

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Disaster Management Centre (SDMC) pilot tested the Rapid Assessment for Resilient Recovery in 2015 Gorkha Nepal earthquake and adapted this guidebook to support member Countries for rapid assessment to damage and losses. The guidelines for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in agriculture helped build a south-south cooperation forum, where stakeholders in climate-sensitive agriculture sectors of the Pacific SIDS and selected Asian countries with experience of piloting climate field schools are engaged in knowledge exchange. Maldives used the SIDS specific regional guidebook to develop and adopt its National Disaster Management Plan which supports the implementation of Maldives Disaster Management Law.

The project provided technical capacity building to the National Disaster Management Centre in Maldives to prepare for and conduct its National Consultation Workshop to draft the new disaster management plan. South-south cooperation modalities for knowledge and experience sharing were used to provide valuable guidance to the Maldives Disaster Management Plan. A requirement under the Maldives Disaster Management Act 2015, the Plan is an essential component of Maldives’ aim to raise disaster finance. The World Bank is discussing with the government the possibility of putting in place a catastrophic drawdown option (CAT-DDO), an instrument to increase access to financial resources during an emergency.

The DA9 project enabled the quick implementation of ESCAP’s commitment under the ASEAN-UN Joint Strategic Plan of Action on Disaster Management 2016-2020, particularly those under the risk awareness and assessment pillar that ESCAP is leading. The Plan of Action constitutes a crucial step towards greater coherence in UN engagement with ASEAN on disaster risk reduction and management. It serves as an overall framework and promotes consistency in engagement, covering areas such as preparedness and response; risk assessment, early warning and monitoring; and prevention, mitigation, outreach and mainstreaming.
The needs and requirements of the target groups were assessed and identified through close consultations with the countries involved, where ESCAP sought to provide outputs which were needed by the selected countries and relevant to their particular policy priorities. For example, it was through such consultations with countries with critical vulnerabilities viz., Cambodia, Myanmar and Sri Lanka, that ESCAP put in place strengthened monsoon forums (national climate outlook) to communicate ‘actionable’ disaster risk through downscaled climate outlooks, seasonal forecast and in-season drought monitoring using earth observation satellites. These monsoon forums, owned and adapted by the respective countries, are a multi-stakeholders risk communication platform where scientific knowledge is put to use into practices for disaster preparedness and resilience.

The priority needs of participating countries can change following disaster events. For example, in the case of Nepal, the priority shifted from integrated DRR and climate change adaption for development planning to resilient recovery and reconstruction following the devastating Nepal Gorkha earthquake. Through a series of consultations, the actual needs and requirements of Nepal were assessed and identified.

Needs and requirements are also identified through country requests. Examples include various country requests for regional guidebook on mainstreaming DRR, Maldives’ request for a new Disaster Management Plan, and the consultative workshop on El Niño.

The main obstacles for the target groups to fully and effectively utilize the project’s products and services include lack of sufficient institutional and technical capacity and lack of awareness by the decision makers of the availability and utility of such products and services.

**Efficiency**

The project delivered all planned outputs within budget and within a realistic timeframe, and in a well-managed and framed manner. Outputs were well-targeted and did not over reach their aims. The project utilized synergies by working with external agencies when appropriate. To cite just one example, ESCAP partnered with UNDP, GIZ, IFRC, and ADPC to organize a regional knowledge sharing workshop to deliberate and share existing good practices to operationalization of the global frameworks through mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into subnational development planning and budgeting processes.

**Sustainability**

To a great extent, the results of the project can be continued without ESCAP’s involvement. The spill-over effects of the analytical and capacity development work are being seen in sub-regional cooperation mechanisms. For example, ESCAP is leading a priority program area in
risk awareness under the recently adopted ASEAN-UN Joint Strategic Plan of Action on Disaster Management. The El Niño tools and methodologies developed under the DA9 project are used as part of high impact risk assessment among ASEAN countries. The risk awareness program and the use of the tools and methodologies can continue into the future even without ESCAP’s involvement.

The critical knowledge gained from developing various tools also provided region and sub-region specific knowledge to the global “Blueprint for Future Action” and related inter-agency Standard Operation Procedures (SOPs) for El Niño and predictable slow-onset weather events currently being developed by the United Nations Special Envoys for El Niño and Climate. The Blueprint and the SOPs help ensure a continuing agency wide coordinated and collective approach to respond effectively to future slow-onset weather events. The methodology and tools can continue to be used as part of the “Risk Analysis and Early Warning” section of the global SOPs, leading to a wider application of the tools and guidelines.

Gender Mainstreaming

Gender mainstreaming was considered during early planning stages and was significantly incorporated into the outputs of the project. This is evident from the fact that the DA9 project document stated that: “It is important to identify differences of the impact of disasters on men and women. An understanding of this differentiated impact, in turn, is critical in addressing the challenges women face, in particular those that often go unnoticed and unaccounted for, such as women’s lack of economic independence and autonomy, the reproductive, non-remunerated work that women undertake, and their ever-decreasing share of income, assets and time.” Nevertheless, additional efforts are needed to further enhance the participation of women.

4. Conclusions

This chapter provides the general conclusions of the evaluation as well as the conclusions relating to the specific evaluation criteria, namely, effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and gender mainstreaming.
4.1 General Conclusions

The various stakeholders that participated in the DA9 activities gave an overall average rating of “very high” (4.1) for the combined criteria of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency and sustainability.\(^2\)

Thus it may be concluded that the project delivered a strong outcome consistent with the overall objective of enhancing the capacity of selected developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development planning. The qualitative and quantitative evidence obtained in the course of the evaluation reveal that the following goals have been achieved:

- Enhanced capacity of policymakers of selected developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to formulate effective policies and strategies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into multi-sectoral development planning at the national level.
- Improved capacity of policymakers in Asia and the Pacific to apply effective damage, loss and risk assessment tools for planning disaster-resilient risk management, recovery and reconstruction, through a multi-sectoral approach.

These general conclusions are supported by the specific conclusions and observations, which are presented in the next section.

4.2 Specific Conclusions

Effectiveness

The project has been found to be very highly effective.

\(^2\) This is the average of the ratings of 4.4 for relevance, 4.2 for effectiveness, 3.9 for efficiency, and 3.8 for sustainability.
The project achieved the objective of enhancing the capacity of selected developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development planning. While developed under the MDGs, the project enabled ESCAP to provide timely support to the implementation of targets relating to disaster risk reduction under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other global development agreements adopted by UN member States between 2015 and 2016. ESCAP and its implementing partners were found to be highly effective in guiding, supporting and collaborating with participating countries in the implementation of the project.

Relevance

The project has been found to be very highly relevant.

The project provided relevant and tangible outputs to a number of developing countries.

During the duration of the DA9 project, some countries in the region were hit by major disasters, including the 2015 Nepal earthquake and the El Niño 2015/2016. Countries therefore required support for recovery (in the case of Nepal earthquake) and in analyzing the potential impacts of a complex natural phenomenon (in the case of El Niño 2015/2016) to initiate early action. The DA9 project provided relevant support in the form of manuals, advisories, workshops and dialogues, as well as an El Niño-specific consultation at the regional level. About three out of four respondents stated that they had used the project’s outputs and that the project’s activities had enhanced their capacity to develop DRR policies and strategies.

Efficiency

The project has been found to be highly efficient.
The use of analytical products to underpin the forums and capacity development activities was a hallmark of the project which resulted in efficient utilization of project resources. While external consultants were used, the project utilized internal capacity wherever possible.

**Sustainability**

The project has been found to be highly sustainable.

The project has provided a legacy of outputs that can serve as useable building blocks for the selected countries to continue to provide training and capacity building. It has also put in place necessary institutional arrangements to ensure long-term sustainability.

The likelihood that the benefits of the project will continue in the future is further shown by the fact that networks of technical partners and like-minded professionals have been formed through the implementation of the project activities and that the coherent implementation of the global frameworks has entered the lexicon of intergovernmental discussions.

**Gender Mainstreaming**

In terms of gender mainstreaming, the project has been rated high by the responding participants but actual participation data show modest achievement.
Overall, the participants of the various activities implemented under the DA9 project were composed of about 31% women and 69% men, implying a modest achievement in terms of gender mainstreaming. It is evident, however, from the DA9 project document that the “need to integrate a gender perspective into the design and implementation of all phases of disaster risk management was recognized.”

5. Recommendations

Based on the key findings and conclusions of the evaluation and taking into account the ESCAP strategy for capacity building and the concurrent issues on disaster risk reduction, this chapter proposes three recommendations for the design and implementation of similar projects in the future.

**Recommendation 1:** Continue and further strengthen capacity building and awareness enhancing on risk-informed development planning or risk-sensitive investment based on the outcome of the current project.

The findings of this study clearly show that the DA9 project has effectively enhanced the capacity of selected developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development planning. A logical continuation of this effort is to further strengthen capacity building and awareness enhancing on risk-informed development planning or risk-sensitive investment based on the outcome of the project. This can build on the success of the training workshop on risk-informed development planning held in August 2017 under the DA9 project.

The evaluator’s consultation with UNDP, a DA9 project partner, brought out the desirability and importance of building on the outcome of the current project to build capacity and enhance awareness on risk-informed development planning or risk-sensitive investment. This idea was also supported by a number of countries during the interviews, particularly, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Maldives.
This recommendation is also consistent with the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience: Towards a Risk-informed and Integrated Approach to Sustainable Development, which was endorsed by the United Nations Chief Executive Board for Coordination. This Plan of Action aims to ensure coherence with respect to climate change risk and the broader 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the need to effectively support its universal, integrated, transformative and people-centered approach and its promise to reduce inequalities and “leaving no one behind” in the UN’s development work. It aims to enhance the integration of the UN’s operational preparedness and response capacities into national implementation efforts and to ensure that the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction contributes to a risk-informed and integrated approach to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda.

Risk-sensitive development involves integrating disaster risk reduction into development planning across all sectors of development that help to protect gains made towards achieving development goals. Managing disaster risk is a comprehensive approach that includes assessing disaster risk, reducing this risk to the extent possible within available resources, preparing for residual risks that cannot be prevented, and responding to disasters with comprehensive plans for early and longer-term recovery and reconstruction. All these activities connect disaster risk reduction with sustainable development and must, therefore, be incorporated into the development process.

Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals requires innovative approaches to managing and reducing the risks associated with climate change and natural hazards, including shifting emphasis away from managing ‘disaster events’ to addressing the ‘underlying risks’ that are inherent in the development process. For this purpose, there is need to give greater emphasis on risk-informed development, which requires a functioning risk governance system, in order to protect development investments and ultimately build people’s resilience. It involves “building back better” in recovery operations, scientific and multi-disciplinary analysis combined with local knowledge and risk-informed programming, enhancing the understanding and monitoring of disaster/climate risks as well as learning from past disasters, and, most importantly, capacity development and community involvement.

Risk-sensitive investment is a novel way of collaborating to unlock the potential for public and private sectors who are ready to make a step forward and take leadership on disaster risk reduction. The overall goal is to make all investments risk-sensitive. Factoring risk into investment decisions involves taking into consideration the region’s DRR strategy and preparedness, its capacity to respond effectively to disasters, and its ability to promote post-disaster recovery. It underlines the importance of collaboration between private and public sectors in advancing preparedness and puts the role of policymakers, regulators and
emergency services at the forefront of the DRR effort. Activities may involve, among others, capacity development on risk metrics for economic forecasting, principles for responsible investing, resilience of cities, and resilience of UN programming.

**Recommendation 2:** Further develop close cooperation with sub-regional organizations by delivering programmes and projects on disaster risk reduction and resilience in partnership with them.

It is evident from the findings of this study that the DA9 project has successfully partnered with sub-regional organizations, in particular with SAARC through its Disaster Management Centre and with ASEAN through the ASEAN-UN Joint Strategic Plan of Action on Disaster Management. As discussed below, the sub-regional organizations have in place institutional arrangements to provide synergy to this partnership. Accordingly, it is recommended that ESCAP should further enhance this cooperation and, whenever appropriate, deliver through, among others, ASEAN, SAARC, PIFS, and ECO, in developing and implementing programmes and projects on disaster risk reduction and resilience. This recommendation is consistent with the work of the dedicated Thematic Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience, which is co-chaired by ESCAP, UNDP and United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. The dedicated Working Group supports the regional implementation of those disaster-related elements of the 2030 Agenda through coherent and coordinated United Nations engagement with regional and sub-regional organizations on disaster risk reduction and resilience, with specific focus on ASEAN, SAARC and Pacific sub-regions.

With ASEAN, there already exists the ASEAN-United Nations Joint Strategic Plan of Action on Disaster Management, which aims towards achieving greater coherence in United Nations engagement with ASEAN on disaster risk reduction and management. It serves as an overall framework and promotes consistency in engagement, covering areas such as preparedness and response; risk assessment, early warning and monitoring; and prevention, mitigation, outreach and mainstreaming.

The ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER), which came into force in December 2009, sets the foundation for regional cooperation, coordination, technical assistance, and resource mobilisation in all aspects of disaster management and emergency response. The AADMER is a legally-binding document on disaster management and emergency response that provides a regional mechanism to reduce disaster losses and jointly respond to disaster emergencies. It provides the main common platform while the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) serves as the main driver for ASEAN cooperation in disaster management. The establishment of the Inter-Ministerial Dialogue, the Joint Task Force on Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief, and
the ASEAN Humanitarian Assistance (AHA) Centre as the operational engine of the AADMER to implement operational strategies and procedures are the tangible institutional arrangements to enable rapid, joint, and effective response to disasters within ASEAN. The Secretary-General of ASEAN serves as the AHA Coordinator to coordinate ASEAN’s efforts at the highest political level during the response and recovery stages of a large-scale disaster in the region.

With SAARC, the SAARC Disaster Management Centre provides policy advice and facilitates capacity building services including strategic learning, research, training, system development, expertise promotion and exchange of information for effective disaster risk reduction and for planning and coordinating a rapid regional response mechanism to disasters within the region. It considers awareness building and capacity development as the key enablers to facilitate disaster risk reduction as national priority with strong institutional base. Among its major initiatives include the SAARC Comprehensive Framework on Disaster Management, SAARC Road Maps on Risk Management in South Asia, and Integration of Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in SAARC Region.

In the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) strategic guidance is provided by a Steering Committee comprising representatives from governments, civil society and the private sector. A Technical Working Group provides technical advice and support to this process with representatives from partners, including the Pacific Community, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS), and University of the South Pacific (USP).

A Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (FRDP) 2017 – 2030 has been developed, which provides high level strategic guidance on how to enhance resilience to climate change and disasters, in ways that contribute to and are embedded in sustainable development. It identifies three inter-related goals: (a) strengthened integrated adaptation and risk reduction to enhance resilience to climate change and disasters; (b) low-carbon development; and (c) strengthened disaster preparedness, response and recovery.

DRR coordination has been in place in ECO since 2006 when ECO Member States showed interest and willingness to take necessary joint measures for reducing the risk of disasters at the regional level. The ECO Secretariat has ever since started to identify and expand regional cooperation to this end. The annual ECO International Conferences on Disaster Risk Reduction are among the leading events to discuss enhanced regional cooperation based on experiences gained by the national disaster risk reduction strategies/institutions in the ECO Member States as well as the relevant international processes. The ECO Regional Center for Risk
Management of Natural Disasters (ECO-RCRM) was established in Mashhad (Iran) in March 2007 for the purpose of conducting the functions and discharging the responsibilities in weather-related disasters. The ECO Secretariat has underlined the imperative of disaster risk reduction for the region, upgraded ECO visibility at the international level, and linked up its regional prospects with global trends and relevant international organizations and the UN agencies. The ECO Secretariat, in collaboration with Member States and international partners, has been working on an ECO Regional Framework for DRR, which will cover the objectives and targets of the Sendai Framework.

**Recommendation 3:** Leverage off success of this project to establish the Asia-Pacific disaster resilience network in order to further strengthen the secretariat’s work on disaster risk reduction and resilience.

A significant finding of this study is the fact that the Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2017 (APDR) – the flagship publication of ESCAP on DRR and the parliamentary documentation for the fifth session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction (CDRR5) – has drawn heavily from the knowledge products and lessons from country engagements under the DA9 project. The success of this project should therefore be leveraged off to establish the Asia-Pacific disaster resilience network in line with the decision of the Fifth Session of the ESCAP Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction held on 10-12 October 2017 at Bangkok, Thailand. CDRR5 supports the ongoing effort to bring together different streams of its work related to multi-hazard early warning systems, regional space applications for disaster risk reduction and knowledge-sharing under an Asia-Pacific disaster resilience network to promote greater coherence across the implementation of global development frameworks, as well as coordination among members of the Asia-Pacific Regional Coordination Mechanism and its Thematic Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience.

The objectives of the network are to align the secretariat’s analytical research and norm-setting work with efforts to promote regional cooperation and build capacity, and initiate a new area of analytical research work on disaster prevention and peacebuilding in countries where disasters and conflicts co-exist. The network aims to help strengthen peer learning, sharing of experiences, expertise and training facilities and to enhance the secretariat’s work on disaster risk reduction and resilience coherent across the 2030 Agenda and in line with other global development frameworks.
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**General Remarks by Management**

Management welcomed the overall positive assessment of the relevance, efficiency effectiveness and sustainability of the project. Overall, the interventions by the Development Account project “Enhancing knowledge and capacity for the management of disaster risks for a resilient future in Asia and the Pacific” contributed to increasing capacity of policymakers among target countries to develop effective policies and strategies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into multi-sectoral development planning and apply effective damage and loss risk assessment tools for planning disaster resilient risk management approaches. The final evaluation found the project to be highly effective, relevant, efficient and sustainable. In particular, the evaluation found that the project provided support to countries hit by major disasters including through various knowledge products such as risk assessment manuals and policy guides. The various interventions culminated in a final regional learning platform in October 2017 which provided a way forward for countries to align their national strategic frameworks with the global frameworks adopted for disaster risk reduction and resilience. The outcomes from the final meeting will be used to inform future work in this area.

Management found the recommendations as highly relevant and appreciated the suggested areas for improvement. This includes continuing and strengthening capacity building and awareness of disaster risk informed development planning and risk sensitive investments among policymakers across sectors; developing further the close cooperation with sub-regional organizations by establishing partnerships to deliver disaster risk reduction and resilience programmes and projects; and leveraging the success of the project to support the need noted by the 5th Session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction to bring together different streams of ESCAP’s work related to multi-hazard early warning systems, regional space applications for disaster risk reduction as
well as knowledge sharing under an Asia-Pacific disaster resilience network which will also give priority to support for capacity-building in high-risk, low-capacity countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Response</th>
<th>Follow-up Action</th>
<th>Lead Unit/Collaborating Units</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Indicator of completion of follow-up action¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue and further strengthen capacity building and awareness enhancing on risk-informed development planning or risk-sensitive investment based on the outcome of the current project.</td>
<td>Management agrees with this recommendation. Many countries have expressed their interest in continuing capacity building on operationalizing coherence among the global agendas, including through risk informed development planning and investment.</td>
<td>IDD is developing several proposals under Development Account and XB funds to take forward the work in risk-informed planning, with a focus on providing climate risk information and second-generation impact based forecasting to reduce climate-related disaster burdens on the most vulnerable populations.</td>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Complete at least two follow-up capacity building activities on risk-informed development planning to be funded either through Section 23, XB or DA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ *This information provides evidence of completion of action. Examples include issuance of an official memo, completion of a study or report, launching of a website, etc.*
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Further develop close cooperation with sub-regional organizations by delivering programmes and projects on disaster risk reduction and resilience in partnership with them.</td>
<td>Management agrees with this recommendation. Under the project, ESCAP has already begun developing cooperation initiatives with both ASEAN and SAARC. ESCAP contributed to development and implementation of the Joint Strategic Plan of Action on Disaster Management under the Risk Awareness Pillar. Through the establishment of the Asia-Pacific Disaster Resilience Network (APDRN) at the Fifth Session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction held in October 2017, ESCAP will develop and implement initiatives, programmes and projects on DRR in partnership with subregional organizations.</td>
<td>IDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leverage off success of this project to establish the Asia-Pacific Disaster Resilience Network in order to further strengthen the secretariat’s work on disaster risk reduction and resilience.</td>
<td>Management agrees with this recommendation as APDRN has been agreed by the ESCAP member States as the overarching umbrella that links all disaster risk reduction and resilience work of ESCAP</td>
<td>IDD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

advisories, workshops and policy dialogues which are being planned under Section 23 funds. |   |   |
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1. BACKGROUND

The project seeks to enhance knowledge and capacity of government policymakers and officials to develop policies and strategies into multi-sectoral development planning to manage disaster risks triggered by natural hazards. In this respect, the project will enhance the capacities of policymakers of targeted countries to adapt methods and tools for integrating disaster risk reduction into national development planning; apply evidence-based and multi-sectoral policy analysis toward building resilience against risks from disasters and other external shocks; apply risk, damage loss assessment and risk knowledge for planning resilient risk management, recovery and reconstruction strategies and mainstream disaster risk reduction into long-term multi-sectoral development planning and poverty reduction strategies. These four issues are a central part of the agenda at the regional workshops as well as the workshops at the national level. The project also promotes multi-sectoral approaches for optimizing the allocation of scarce resources for development that also helps in reducing vulnerability and exposure, and hence contributes to building disaster resilience in multiple sectors, as well as down the line to the community levels.

The Project principally targets policy makers and government officials. The main target group consists of officials from Ministries with mandate and responsibility for national planning who typically hold crucial roles in multi-sectoral and cross-sectoral development planning. Those from ministries of finance and their counterparts in disaster management agencies will be the secondary targets and those from other sectoral ministries/agencies and the disaster management authorities are the other layers of the target.

The key outcomes of the project include (1) improved knowledge of policymakers on effective policies and strategies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into multi-sectoral development planning, (2) improved capacity of policymakers to organize and undertake multi-sectoral damage, loss and risk assessments, and (3) improved capacity for mainstreaming DRR into socioeconomic development planning. These outcomes can potentially lead to improved coordination between policymakers of the ministries of planning, finance and disaster management in formulating policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster resilient development planning.

To enhanced capacity of developing countries in Asia and the Pacific to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster resilient development, the project attempted to (4) improve dialogue between policymakers of the ministries of planning, finance and disaster management, (5) create national expert advisory groups on resilience building to disasters to enable better coordination, and (6) improve policies to promote inter-sectoral coordination at all levels.

The long term outcome of the project is to ensure that the impacts of disasters on the economy and society communities and people at risk.

2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1 Purpose
The purpose of the evaluation is to promote accountability and learning, and support results-based management. It analyses the level of achievement of project results at the level of objectives and expected accomplishments by examining the results framework, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria. It also assesses the design, strategy and implementation of the project to inform future programming and implementation. It is conducted in line with ESCAP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Guidelines. The target users of the evaluation results include UN General Assembly (donor), Development Account Fund Manager at DESA, ESCAP management and staff and target beneficiaries of the project.

2.2 Objectives and scope

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

1) Determine the level of achievement of project objective and expected accomplishments by examining the results chain, processes and contextual factors;
2) Assess the performance the project against evaluation criteria: effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and gender and human rights mainstreaming;
3) Formulate specific and action-oriented recommendations to inform management decision-making and improve future project design and implementation.

The evaluation will be undertaken from 4 October 2017 to 15 December 2017.

The following evaluation criteria and questions to assess the results of the project will be addressed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Effectiveness**   | • What evidence exists to demonstrate that the project has achieved its objective and expected accomplishments?  
                        • What were the key factors that contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of project objective and expected accomplishments?  
                        • What could have been done better to improve the effectiveness of the project in achieving its results?  |
| **Relevance**       | • What evidence exists to demonstrate that the project’s products and services were used by the target countries?  
                        • How were the needs and requirements of the target groups assessed or identified?  
                        • What are/will be the key obstacles for the target groups to utilize the project’s products and services?  |
| **Efficiency**      | • Were the resources (human and financial) effectively utilized to deliver outputs and achieve results?  
                        • How was the project managed in terms of timeliness?  |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implement activities, deliver outputs and achieve objectives/outcomes.</th>
<th>• Were synergies gained from partnership with other organizations resulted in cost-efficiency and savings?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sustainability  
The likelihood that the benefits of the project will continue in the future. | • To what extent can results of the project be continued without ESCAP’s further involvement? |
| Gender and human rights mainstreaming  
This criterion assesses the extent to which gender considerations have been incorporated in the project design and implementation. | • To what extent were gender and human rights integrated into the design and implementation of the project? |

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overall approach and data collection

The evaluation will use a mix of data sources collected through multiple methods, with analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Results will be triangulated where possible.

Data collection will include but not be limited to the following:

1. A desk review of relevant documents, including the project document, progress and terminal reports, activity reports, results of survey questionnaires, relevant official correspondences with stakeholders, any strategic documents related to the project;
2. Missions to ESCAP in Bangkok to conduct face-to-face key-informant interviews/focus group discussions with male and female stakeholders;
3. An on-line survey to relevant male and female stakeholders and other relevant groups;
4. Follow-up telephone interviews as may be required to clarify responses provided through the on-line questionnaire;
5. Subject to availability of funds, visits to the participating countries to collect data through interviews and consultations with male and female project/programme beneficiaries and partners subject to the availability of funds.

Data will be disaggregated by sex and other relevant social categories. The evaluation will undertake a transparent and participatory evaluation process that will involve male and female stakeholders identified in the stakeholder analysis, including: the reference group, development partners and target beneficiaries in all key evaluation tasks.

In analyzing the data, the evaluation will use qualitative and quantitative approaches, and provide charts and direct quotations. Using the data to assess evaluation against the selected criteria. Gender and human rights mainstreaming are essential components of data analysis in all ESCAP evaluations and take place on three levels: 1) project design; 2) project conduct;
3) project outcomes. Data analysis will enable useful, evidence based findings, the conclusions and recommendations.

4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 Evaluation manager

The evaluation will be directly managed by the [division/office implementing the project].

4.2 Reference group

ESCAP uses an evaluation reference group to enhance stakeholder participation. Participants are selected by the evaluation manager and can include stakeholders and peers, internal and external to the project and ESCAP. The group should be gender balanced and have an appropriate mix of skills and perspectives. It provides technical and methodological guidance to the evaluation process; reviews and approves the selection of the consultant, terms of reference and inception report; provides quality control of the evaluation report and validation of recommendations; and ensures adherence to ESCAP Evaluation Policy and Guidelines and the use of evaluation outputs, including the formulation of the evaluation management response and follow-up action plan.

4.3 Evaluator

The evaluator will assume overall responsibility for carrying out the evaluation. This includes, among other activities, managing the work, ensuring the quality of interviews and data collection, preparing the draft report, presenting the draft report and producing the final report after comments have been received in line with standard templates provided by ESCAP. The evaluator must have:

- Knowledge of the United Nations System; principles, values, goals and approaches, including human rights, gender equality, cultural values, the Sustainable Development Goals and results-based management;
- Professional and technical experience in evaluation (application of evaluation norms, standards and ethical guidelines and the relevant organizational evaluation policy and promotion of evaluation and evidence based learning).  
- They should also have a good technical knowledge in the Asia-Pacific region, including major development trends and issues, particularly in the areas of [insert relevant sectoral areas].

ESCAP adheres to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct in evaluation and all staff and consultants engaged in evaluation are required to uphold these standards. To this end, ESCAP has developed a Consultants Agreement form that evaluators are required to sign as part of the contracting process.

---

5. OUTPUTS

The following outputs will be delivered to the project manager at ESCAP:

1. Inception report detailing the approach of the evaluator, workplan and evaluation logical framework (see Annex 1)
2. Results of data collection exercise
3. First draft of evaluation report (see Annex 2)
4. Presentation (ppt) on findings, conclusions and recommendations
5. Final evaluation report
6. An ESCAP evaluation brief

The draft evaluation report will be shared with key stakeholders prior to finalization. The final report, which will include a management response from the Executive Secretary of ESCAP, will be submitted to the donor in the correct format. The final evaluation report will also be circulated within the ESCAP secretariat and posted on ESCAP’s public website.

6. WORKPLAN

The evaluation will commence in October 2017 and requires an estimated one work month to complete. The evaluation budget includes a consultancy fee to be determined based on professional qualifications and duration of contract plus the cost of airfares and daily subsistence allowance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>Schedule (2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary consultations and desk review</td>
<td>4-6 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an inception report, including an evaluation plan</td>
<td>4-6 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection, including mission to Bangkok, survey questionnaires, interviews with stakeholders</td>
<td>9-13 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct further interviews (over telephone/skype) and analyze information and data collected</td>
<td>5 days in November (flexible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a draft evaluation report and obtain preliminary feedback from the evaluation reference group</td>
<td>2-4 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings to ESCAP and key stakeholders</td>
<td>5-9 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate final comments and finalize the evaluation report</td>
<td>12-13 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23 Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ANNEXES

Annex 1. Contents of the inception report

This report sets out the conceptual framework to be used in an evaluation and details the evaluation methodology, including the evaluation criteria and questions, indicators, method of data collection and analysis, gender mainstreaming approach and risk and limitations. It allows the evaluation team to clarify their understanding of what is being evaluated and why and to present their preliminary findings based on initial review of documents and consultation with the evaluation reference group and other stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>PAGES (estimate)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title page</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Title, date of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Names of the evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>• Background and context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Purpose and scope of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Methodology</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>• Evaluation criteria and questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Methods of data collection and data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender and human rights mainstreaming approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk and limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preliminary findings</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>• Elaborate on the results of the desk study and other preparatory work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>carried out to this point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workplan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Develop a timeline which shows the evaluation phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Outputs to be delivered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Outputs to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexes</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>• Evaluation logical framework based on an ESCAP template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation terms of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• List of documents reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposed template for questionnaires (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 2. Contents of the evaluation report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>PAGES (estimate)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title page</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Title, date of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Names of the evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of ESCAP or division that commissioned the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prepared by the evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of contents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>List of chapters, sections and annexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of acronyms</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>In alphabetical order; these are written out in full the first time they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are used in the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management response</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>General response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response to individual recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive summary</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Background of the evaluation (one paragraph)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>PAGES (estimate)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and scope (one paragraph)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (one paragraph)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main conclusions (one-sentence conclusions with brief explanation if needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations (one-sentence recommendations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments or concluding sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Background, purpose and scope</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1.1 Background of the evaluation and the topic being evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Purpose, objectives and scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Object of evaluation description and context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Describe object of evaluation – location, target group, budget, timing, relevant norms standards and conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals, objectives of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results of project to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Methodology</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3.1 Description of methodology: activities, timeframe, changes compared to TOR, and reasons for selecting sample reports, countries, sites, case studies, and interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Limitations: limitations of the methodology and scope and problems encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Findings</td>
<td>Varying length</td>
<td>4.1 Overview: supporting information for the performance assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Performance assessment: assessment against relevant evaluation criteria (effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, gender and human rights mainstreaming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Other assessment: assessment against relevant additional criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conclusions</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Main conclusions, both positive and negative, of the evaluation that follow logically from the findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings table with ratings for standard evaluation and additional criteria and a brief justification (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recommendations</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Recommendations based on the conclusions. Can be addressed to ESCAP management, staff, donors and other relevant stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lessons learnt</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Lessons learnt based on the findings and conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexes</td>
<td></td>
<td>I. Management response (to be completed by ESCAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II. Terms of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III. List of documents reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV. List of interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. Data tables and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other annexes as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex C. List of Documents Reviewed

1. ESCAP_DA9 Final Project Document, Enhancing knowledge and capacity for the management of disaster risks for a resilient future in Asia and the Pacific, 1415 AN, 29 April 2014.


3. List of DA9 Activities and Related Documents

4. Knowledge Products:
   - Integrating disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into the agriculture sector in small-island developing States in the Pacific: A policy note.
   - Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation within the agriculture sector in the Pacific: a guide for practitioners.
   - Enhancing Resilience to Extreme Climate Events: Lessons from the 2015-2016 El Niño Event in Asia and the Pacific.
   - Building resilience to disasters in Asia and the Pacific: a briefing note for policy makers.
   - Disaster management planning and strategy: a guidebook for small island developing states.
   - Manual of Rapid Assessment for Resilient Recovery, using innovative tools, techniques and space applications.

5. ASEAN High-Level Policy Dialogue on Risk Assessment held at New World Manila Bay Hotel, Manila, Philippines, 15 September 2017, with the following presentations:
   - Regional Cooperation in Disaster Risk Reduction by Mulyono R. Prabowo
   - Integration of Climate Risk Information into Policy Planning and Implementation by Vicente B. Malano, Marcelino Q. Villafuerte II, Edna Juanillo of Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration
   - Understanding Risks: Key to Living Safely with Nature’s Hazards by Bart C. Bautista of Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology
Annex C: List of Documents Reviewed

- Risk Assessment: Conducting and Utilizing Results for Policy Planning and Implementation by Bui Quang Huy, Deputy Director of Disaster Management and Technology Center, Vietnam.

6. Appreciation notes and success stories:

- ESCAP contribution to the SG’s annual report on the implementation of SFDRR: Building resilience to the socio-economic and environmental impacts of El Niño/La Niña
- ESCAP contribution to the SG’s annual report on the implementation of SFDRR: Strengthened coherence, guidance and innovation in support of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
- Appreciation note from Central Java Disaster Management Agency
- ESCAP Development account achievement and impact
- Monumental Convergence for Disaster Resilience in Asia: A UN and Partners case study for the world


8. Report of the open-ended intergovernmental expert working group on indicators and terminology relating to disaster risk reduction”, UN General Assembly, Seventy-first session, Agenda item 19 (c), Sustainable development: disaster risk reduction, 1 December 2016.

9. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, UNISDR.

10. E/ESCAP/CDR(5)/1, Disaster risk reduction and resilience in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Fifth session, Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, 10-12 October 2017.

11. E/ESCAP/CDR(5)/INF/2, Thematic Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience of the Asia-Pacific Regional Coordination Mechanism: implemented activities and future direction, Fifth session, Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, 10-12 October 2017.
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13. E/ESCAP/CDR(5)/3, Disaster risk transfer mechanisms: issues and considerations for the Asia-Pacific region, Fifth session, Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, 10-12 October 2017.
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Annex D. List of Interviewees

Country Participants

Mr. Hadi Suprayoga, Director-General for Special Region, Ministry of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Region and Transmigration, Indonesia.

Mr. Umar Moosa Fikry, Project Manager, National Disaster Management Center, Maldives.

Dr. Suman Kumar Karna, Special Advisor, National Reconstruction Agency, Nepal.

Mr. Rinto Andriano, Senior Specialist, UNDP, Indonesia.

Mr. Ledua Vakalolama, Principal Economic Planning Officer – ODA, Ministry of Finance, Fiji.

Mr. Alex Armin Nugroho, Head, Sub-Directorate for Programme, Disaster Management Agency, Central Java Province, Indonesia.

Ms. Anoja Seneviratne, Director, Mitigation Research and Development, Disaster Management Center, Sri Lanka.

Mr. Kyaw Lwin Oo, Director, Department of Meteorology and Hydrology, Ministry of Transport and Communications, Myanmar.

Mr. Sophak Phoeun, Advisor of NC-ESCAP, National Committee for ESCAP, Council Minister, Cambodia.

Dr. Purushottam Ghimire, Climate Change, DRR and SDGs Consultant, Former Joint Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Nepal.

Mr. Anshu Sharma, Co-Founder and Chief Mentor, SEEDS, India, served as expert, Disaster Management Plan of Maldives.

Ms. Vandana Srivastava, SAARC Disaster Management Center, New Delhi, India.
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**Partners**

Dr. Rajan Gengaje, Head Preparedness and Response Operations Unit, UNOCHA Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand.

Mr. Sanny Jegillos, Senior Advisor, Disaster Risk Reduction, UNDP Regional Hub, Bangkok, Thailand.

**Secretariat Staff**

Ms. Tiziana Bonapace, Chief, ICT and Disaster Risk Reduction Division, ESCAP.

Dr. Sanjay Srivastava, Chief, Disaster Risk Reduction Section, ICT and Disaster Risk Reduction Division, ESCAP.

Dr. Puji Pujiiono, Regional Adviser on Disaster Risk Reduction, ICT and Disaster Risk Reduction Division, ESCAP.

Dr. Edgar Dante, Chief, Evaluation Unit, Strategy and Programme Management Division, ESCAP.

Ms. Madhurima Sarkar-Swaisgood, Economic Affairs Officer, ICT and Disaster Risk Reduction Division, ESCAP.

Ms. Kareff Rafisura, Economic Affairs Officer, ICT and Disaster Risk Reduction Division, ESCAP.

Ms. Kelly Hayden, Economic Affairs Officer, Space Applications Section, ICT and Disaster Risk Reduction Division, ESCAP.

Mr. Nokeo Ratanavong, Consultant, ICT and Disaster Risk Reduction Division, ESCAP.
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Project Evaluation:
Development Account Project
Enhancing knowledge and capacity for the management of disaster risks for a resilient future in Asia and the Pacific

Dear key informant,

You have been identified in the context of the ESCAP Evaluation of the Development Account Project: Enhancing knowledge and capacity for the management of disaster risks for a resilient future in Asia and the Pacific. In order to provide your feedback to the project evaluator, you are kindly requested to fill up the following questionnaire, which should take no more than 30 minutes to complete, and return it latest by ______________ to ______________.

Kindly note the questionnaire should be filled in the English language. Your feedback is critical for the evaluation. For each question, you are requested to tick the box corresponding to your answer, and provide a brief explanation of your response.

Thank you very much for your precious collaboration and your efforts in providing feedback.

Filemon A. Uriarte, Jr., PhD
ESCAP Project Evaluator

Date: 
Name: 
Gender:  □ Male  □ Female
Organisation: 
Title: 
Since (year in this position):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Please explain why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much has this project enhanced the capacity of participating countries to</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning for safer communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the project contributed to any of the following? (Tick all that apply)</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Increasing the number of national policymakers with enhanced capacity to</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulate policies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into national development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Engaging policymakers jointly engaged in formulating strategies to mainstream</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaster risk reduction into multi-sectoral development planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Increasing awareness of policymakers of tools to better assess risk, damage</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and loss and prepare for effective multi-sectoral disaster risk management,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recovery and reconstruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Getting underway preparations for effective multi-sectoral disaster-</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resilient risk management, recovery and reconstruction in participating countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How relevant was the project in the context of enhancing participating</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries’ capacity to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaster-resilient development planning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How timely or efficient was the project in the context of enhancing</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participating countries’ capacity to develop policies and strategies for multi-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sectoral disaster-resilient development planning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.1 In which of the following type of activities did you take part? *(Tick all that apply)*

- Workshop at the regional level for policy makers and experts
- National training workshops
- National expert advisory policy workshops
- Regional advisory network of experts and practitioners
- Regional forum for the sharing of experiences and lessons learned

### 5.2 In particular, in which of the following activities did you take part? *(Tick all that apply)*

#### Activity in 2014 (1)
- Regional Expert Group Meeting on Capacity Development for Disaster Information Management, 21 Oct 2014, UNCC, Bangkok, Thailand

#### Activities in 2015 (3)
- Regional Conference on DRR, 19-20 Feb 2015, UNCC, Bangkok, Thailand
- Sikkim Capacity Building Workshop - Nepal knowledge exchange with India, 21-24 Dec 2015, Sikkim, India

#### Activities in 2016 (12)
- High-level consultation inception meeting on implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism, 4-5 Feb 2016, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
- National working group meeting on the Regional Drought Mechanism, 24-25 Mar 2016, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
- High-Level Inception Meeting on the Implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism, 06 Apr 2016, Nay Pyi Taw, Myanmar
- High-level meeting on progress of Implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism, 28-29 Apr 2016, Colombo, Sri Lanka
- Project working group meeting on the implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism and the RIMES/ESACP Monsoon Forum, 10-11 May 2016, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
- Workshop on Space Technology Applications for Drought Monitoring, 5-7 Jul 2016, Nay Pyi Taw, Myanmar
- Workshop on Space Technology Applications for Drought Monitoring, Jul 2016, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
- Post Disaster Needs Assessment Workshop for SAARC Countries, 26-29 Apr 2016, Chilaw, Sri Lanka
- Capacity Building Workshop: Building Climate Resilient Agriculture in Pacific SIDS, 9-11 Aug 2016, Nadi, Fiji
- El Nino regional consultation, 7-9 Jun 2016, VIE Hotel, Bangkok, Thailand
- Regional Capacity Building Workshop by ESCAP & NIDM, 13-16 Sep 2016, New Delhi, India
- Technical Evaluation National Consultation Workshop, 20-21 Dec 2016, Male, Maldives

#### Activities in 2017 (6)
- Regional Learning Platform: Disaster risk reduction and resilience-building: Ensuring coherence across the global development agendas, 9-12 Oct 2017, UNCC, Bangkok, Thailand
- Mainstreaming of DRR in the Subnational Development Planning, 25-27 Apr 2017, Solo City, Indonesia
- Regional workshop on translating the global frameworks into practice
6. Did your participation in any of the project activities increase your capacity to develop policies and strategies for multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development planning? *(Please tick your selection and elaborate)*

- Yes, to a great extent
- Yes, to some extent
- No
- Not applicable

Please elaborate:

____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

7. Did you apply the skills and/or knowledge you acquired through participating in the project activities to multi-sectoral disaster-resilient development planning? *(Please tick your selection and elaborate)*

- Yes, to a great extent
- Yes, to some extent
- No
- Not applicable

Please elaborate:

____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

8. How effective were the combination of trainings organized, technical assistance and advisory services provided, and guidelines and assessment tools beneficial in enhancing the capacity of participating countries in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development planning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Please explain why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Regional training</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 National training</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Technical assistance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Advisory services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Guidelines and assessment tools</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Please explain why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. How effective was ESCAP in guiding and supporting participating countries in the implementation of this project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How effective were ESCAP implementing partners in guiding and supporting your country/ the project countries in the implementation of this project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Please explain why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How effective was ESCAP’s collaboration with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To what extent did ESCAP collaborate with other international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and national organisations, including UN agencies to ensure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent is gender equity and human rights reflected in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities and results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How visible has the project been?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Did the project have a sound communication and dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are there any approaches to ensure support and commitment to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take forward the project outcome?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Should this project continue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. If you answered “Yes” to question 17, how should this project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please elaborate:**

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Any comments or suggestions?

Many thanks for your kind collaboration.
### Annex F. Data Tables

#### Table F.1: Project Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title of Activity</th>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-18 Feb 2015</td>
<td>Regional conference on strategies and tools for integrating disaster risk reduction into development planning and financing, Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
<td>48: 33 M / 15 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20 Feb 2015</td>
<td>Training session on damage and loss assessment methodology, Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
<td>18: 14 M / 4 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Oct 2015</td>
<td>The regional earthquake recovery dialogue for building back better, Kathmandu, Nepal</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>45: 39 M / 6 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 Feb 2016</td>
<td>High level consultation inception meeting on implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism - Cambodia</td>
<td>Technical assistance to set up regional drought mechanism</td>
<td>86: 53 M / 33 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25 Mar 2016</td>
<td>National working group meeting on the Regional Drought Mechanism - Myanmar</td>
<td>Technical assistance to set up regional drought mechanism</td>
<td>38: 28 M / 10 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Apr 2016</td>
<td>High-level inception meeting on the Implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism - Myanmar</td>
<td>Technical assistance/consultation to set up regional drought mechanism</td>
<td>47: 27 M / 20 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29 Apr 2016</td>
<td>Post-disaster needs assessment workshop for SAARC countries, Chilaw, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>47: 30 M / 17 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29 Apr 2016</td>
<td>High-level meeting on progress of implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism - Colombo, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Technical assistance/consultation</td>
<td>29: 20 M / 9 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11 May 2016</td>
<td>Bilateral meetings for development of joint capacity building programme on mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into sustainable agriculture development, Beijing, China</td>
<td>Technical consultation with partners</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 Jun 2016</td>
<td>Regional consultative workshop on El Nino in Asia-Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>39: 29 M / 10 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16 Sep 2016</td>
<td>ESCAP-NIDM regional capacity development workshop: mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in sustainable development planning</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>37: 29 M / 8 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Sep-1 Oct 2016</td>
<td>Technical assistance on mainstreaming DRR for Fiji government</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-31 Mar 2017</td>
<td>Regional learning platform: mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and resilience into sustainable development with focus on poverty eradication</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>42: 29 M / 13 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27 Apr 2017</td>
<td>Mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction in subnational development planning and spatial planning</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>49: 39 M / 10 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-30 Aug 2017</td>
<td>Regional forum on translating the global agenda frameworks into practice</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>13: 10 M / 3 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Aug 2017</td>
<td>Continuation of the regional forum on translating the global agenda frameworks into practice - training workshop on risk-informed development planning</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>13: 10 M / 3 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sep 2017</td>
<td>ASEAN high-level policy dialogue on risk assessment</td>
<td>Technical consultation</td>
<td>58: 35 M / 23 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27 Sep 2017</td>
<td>Provide inputs to the validation of the draft Maldives Disaster Management Plan with national stakeholders as part of the forecast user segment of the Eleventh Session of the South Asian Climate Forum (SASCOF)</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>11: 9 M / 2 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Oct 2017</td>
<td>ASEAN@50: Celebrating achievements in regional cooperation, innovations and lessons learned in disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing platform</td>
<td>70: 46 M / 24 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 Oct 2017</td>
<td>Regional learning platform on disaster risk reduction and resilience building-</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>35: 20 M / 15 F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ensuring coherence across the global development agendas

| Total Percent | 792: 549 M (69.3%) | 243 F (30.7%) |

Table F.2: Knowledge Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Aug 2017</td>
<td>Integrating disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into the agriculture sector in small island developing States in the Pacific: A policy note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Aug 2017</td>
<td>Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction for Sustainable Development: A Guidebook for the Asia-Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Aug 2017</td>
<td>Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation within the agriculture sector in the Pacific: a guide for practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Aug 2017</td>
<td>Enhancing Resilience to Extreme Climate Events: Lessons from the 2015-2016 El Niño Event in Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be published online</td>
<td>Building resilience to disasters in Asia and the Pacific: a briefing note for policy makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be published online</td>
<td>Assessment of El Niño-Associated Risks: The Step-Wise Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Oct 2016</td>
<td>Disaster management planning and strategy: a guidebook for small island developing states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2015</td>
<td>Manual of Rapid Assessment for Resilient Recovery, using innovative tools, techniques and space applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F.3: Participation in Various Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional forum for the sharing of experiences and lessons learned</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop at the regional level for policy makers and experts</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional advisory network of experts and practitioners</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National training workshops</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National expert advisory policy workshops</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total exceeds 100 percent since many respondents participated in several activities.
### Table F.4: Summary of Ratings by Country Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table F.5: Summary of Ratings by Country Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent No.</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Gender Mainstreaming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F.6: Rating by Type of Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional training</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National training</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines and assessment tools</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory services</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table F.7: Responses to Supplementary Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary Question</th>
<th>Response/Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effective was ESCAP in guiding and supporting participating countries in the implementation of this project?</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective were ESCAP’s implementing partners in guiding and supporting your country/the project countries in the implementation of this project?</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective was ESCAP’s collaboration with you?</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How visible has the project been?</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table F.8: Responses to Confirmatory Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Has the project contributed to any of the following?</th>
<th>% of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Increasing the number of national policymakers with enhanced capacity to formulate policies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into national development planning.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Engaging policymakers jointly engaged in formulating strategies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into multi-sectoral development planning.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Increasing awareness of policymakers of tools to better assess risk, damage and loss and prepare for effective multi-sectoral disaster risk management, recovery and reconstruction.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Getting underway preparations for effective multi-sectoral disaster-resilient risk management, recovery and reconstruction in participating countries.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table F.9: News Articles and Other Information Materials

### Products

**ESCAP-UNDP El Niño Impact Assessment Methodology**
- El Niño 2015/16: Impact Outlook and Policy Implications
- El Niño 2014/15: Impact Outlook and Policy Implications for Pacific Islands

http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/El%20Niño%20Advisory%20Note%20Dec%202015%20Final.pdf

### Media Coverage

**Resilient agricultural practices** *(Fiji Times, 9 August 2016)*  
**Workshop on adaptive practices in Asia and the Pacific** *(Fiji Times, 10 August 2016)*  
**Concerted Effort Needed to Combat Risk in Agri Sectors** *(Fiji Sun Online, 10 August 2016)*  
**Resilient Agriculture Sector Key for Growth** *(Foreign Affairs, 9 August 2016)*  
**Asia-Pacific countries assess the impact of El Niño at UN consultation** *(Pacific Islands News Association, 8 August 2016)*  
**Powerful El Niño intensifying in Asia and the Pacific region: UN** *(Big News Network, 11 December 2016)*  
**El Niño Linked to Heavy Rain in Sri Lanka**  
**El Niño 2015/2016: impact outlook and policy implications** *(India Environmental Portal; 9 December 2016)*

http://foreignaffairs.co.nz/2016/08/09/resilient-agriculture-sector-key-for-growth-hon-seruiratu/  
http://www.pina.com.fj/?p=pacnews&m=read&o=66526982357589523c72e401628dbb  
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http://colombogazette.com/2015/12/10/el-Niño-linked-to-heavy-rain-in-sri-lanka/
http://www.indiaenvironmentportal.org.in/content/422408/el-Niño-20152016-impact-out/
http://attracttour.com/2015/12/el-Niño-phenomenon-to-continue-until-2016/

Archived Articles

http://www.newsroomamerica.com/story/535455/powerful_el_Niño_intensifying_in_asia
http://www.ndtv.com/south/southern-india-likely-to-see-higher-than-normal-rainfall-un-1...
http://www.hindustantimes.com/india/southern-india-likely-to-see-higher-than-normal-rain
http://attracttour.com/2015/12/el-Niño-phenomenon-to-continue-until-2016/
### Meeting Reports and Related Materials

- Regional Capacity Development Workshop on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in Sustainable Development Planning
- Capacity Building Workshop: Building Climate Resilient Agriculture in Pacific SIDS
- Regional Consultative Workshop on El Niño in Asia-Pacific
- Post Disaster Needs Assessment Workshop for SAARC Countries
- High Level Meeting on the implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism in Myanmar
- High Level Consultation Inception Meeting on Implementation of the Regional Drought Mechanism in Cambodia