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# Executive Summary

This is the report of the Final Evaluation of the Project *Disaster Risk Management Institutional and Operational Systems Development in Timor-Leste.* The Project was implemented by UNDP Timor-Leste over the 10 month period of March 2009 – January 2010 with co-funding from the European Commission Humanitarian Aid department (ECHO). The final project Evaluation was carried out February 2010.

The objectives of the Evaluation were to review progress towards the Project’s objectives and results, assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of implementation, identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation, and provide recommendations on design modifications and specific actions that would increase the effectiveness and impact of future similar initiatives. See Annex One for the Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation.

The *principle objective* (goal) of the Project was to establish basic systems for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) in Dili, Bobonaro and Lautem to minimize casualties, loss of lives, capital and environmental assets in vulnerable communities. The Project had one *specific objective* (objective): to strengthen DRRM systems in Dili, Bobonaro and Lautem districts. Under this objective there were three Result Areas. The first Result Area was to strengthen the Disaster Operations Centre which is intended in the National Disaster Risk Management Policy (NDRMP) to be a centre for (i) collection and analysis of disaster risk information (ii) the provision of early warning communication and (iii) coordination of the preparation and implementation of a disaster response. In addition to strengthening the National Disaster Operations Centre (NDOC) (which had been operational since 2008) the Project also provided support to establish two District Disaster Operations Centres (DDOCs) in Bobonaro and Lautem. The second Result Area of the Project included support for the establishment of communication channels between communities, DDOCs, NDOC, and other line government entities for efficient early warning, contingency planning and results. The third Result Area related to awareness-raising on DRM amongst partners including Suco Chiefs, District Administrators, line ministries, civil society and media, and DRM mainstreamed in Government planning.

The Project Design focused on providing support for the development of systems and tools that are essential to well functioning government led Disaster Risk Management (DRM). Considering the short implementation period, due to the nature of the co-funding arrangement, a large number of deliverable were completed by the Project including the majority of outputs in the Project Document. Key among these were:

* ***Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).*** Operating Manuals which included communications and information management protocols for the National Disaster Operations Centre, and for Ministry DRM Teams.
* ***Guide to Disaster Risk Management.*** Disaster risk assessment methodology and guidelines to support the collation of information related to disaster risk and planning for addressing priority risks.
* ***Damage Observation Form (DOF).*** A standardised methodology for damage assessment implemented through the use of a single form at national and district level.
* ***DRM Info***. A GIS based disaster risk assessment mapping software adapted from the UNICEF Program Dev. Info which allows the user to produce suco, sub-district, district and national level maps of Timor with layers of information about disaster hazards, infrastructure risks and other information.

The Project also helped to improve communication channels between communities the NDOC and government entities in regard to early warning contingency planning and response through the facilitation of four simulation exercises (two in Dili and two in each district) for representatives across a range of government and other organisations. During these exercises participants were presented with a disaster scenario and requested to work through a response. The simulation exercises helped to improve understanding of DRM Policy and further define and consolidate roles and relationships.

In addition, the Project also helped to “mainstream” DRM across government and the community through support for the activation of cross-ministry coordination systems (Ministry DRM Focal Points and Teams), training in DRM for a range of stakeholders and support for DRM communications. The latter involved the production and distribution of DRM promotional materials as well as training in DRM for journalists.

In summary, the Project outputs were completed in an efficient manner in line with the Project Design and the majority of indicators were met. However, at the time of the Evaluation, “take-up” of the outputs of the Project was still quite limited. That is, Counterparts had not yet integrated the use of the manuals and ICT tools, which were the main outputs of the Project, into their work on a regular basis. This limited the success of the Project at the result level.

Reasons for the limited take up can be seen in a number of factors including the short timeframe of the Project and the heavy involvement of NDMD staff in the implementation of the Recovery Strategy for Natural Disasters[[1]](#footnote-1) which impacted on opportunities for involvement of counterparts in project activities. Moreover, aspects of the institutional context such as issues with consensus over roles and responsibilities and undeveloped systems for work planning and management, human resource, financial, logistics and IT management also affected the “absorption capacity” of project outputs.

The tools introduced by the Project have the potential to strengthen the role of and improve the effectiveness of the NDMD. By supporting the systemisation of the collection, management and presentation of data on disaster events and risks in Timor-Leste, the Damage Assessment Database and DRMInfo can provide the basis for the beginning of disaster risk reduction planning, the implementation of which has been limited[[2]](#footnote-2) although it is endorsed in the Policy, and for the NDOC and DDOCs becoming resource centres of information on disasters and disaster risks. However, more time is needed to support the integration of the new tools into staff work practices at the national and district level. Given the current capacity in Timor-Leste, it is not realistic to expect this to occur within the project timeframe of less than a year. It is thus important to continue with a longer-term commitment to reinforce and adapt the project innovations until they are institutionalised. Furthermore there should not be a large gap in support as this is likely to result in lost momentum. Also, in the future, more “strategic” consideration should be given to issues in the institutional context.

It is also important to follow up on the work in supporting DRM coordination and mainstreaming. This has helped the Government to gain some ground in operationalising the links and protocols which have been fairly dormant to date but more external support will still be required if the gains are to be sustained.

Supporting DRM should continue to be an essential priority for support by UNDP. Localised disasters have a significant negative effect on poverty among food insecure communities in Timor-Leste. According to the Timor-Leste Living Standards Survey, conducted in 2007, 78.5% of Timorese experience “shocks” due to natural disasters such as drought, floods, landslides, storms, pest infestations, crop and livestock disease.[[3]](#footnote-3) Improving DRM would contribute to improved food security and poverty reduction. Furthermore, the impact of a large-scale disaster could be devastating and it is a key priority for the Government of Timor-Leste (GoTL) to manage this risk. Supporting DRM also falls well within the UNDP Special Mandate which is described in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) as follows:

“As part of its broader mission to enable sustainable social and economic development, UNDP has been given a clear mandate by the United Nations General Assembly to operate in ‘special development situations’ where disasters and violent conflict have undermined the human, social, physical and institutional capital that underpin development.”

### Key Recommendations

* A future intervention should continue the work in the focus areas of the first project. The project has produced some important tools and innovations such as SOPs, the Damage Assessment Database, the Damage Observation Form and the DRMInfo program that have the potential to strengthen the role, raise the profile and improve the efficiency of the NDOC and the DDMCs/DDOCs. To ensure the innovations are effectively used by Counterparts, support for institutionalising, reinforcing and continuing to adapt the tools should be a key priority for a second phase. It will also be important that there not be a big time gap between the first and second phase as this will be likely to lead to lost momentum.
* To improve coordination of DRM across government, UNDP should encourage the Government to allocate DRM decision-making responsibilities to a higher level as at the current time many of the DRM Focal Points (who are at director or lower level) are struggling to gain traction within their own agencies on decisions made through inter-sectoral DRM coordination forums.
* In regard to potential future involvement in Mainstreaming DRR Planning, UNDP should be mindful of the windows of opportunity presented by the Annual Action Planning (AAP)/ Budget Planning Cycle. AAPs and Budget Plans are prepared in the months leading up to June.
* The design of interventions in the future needs to give more strategic consideration to the effect that issues in the institutional context such as capacity for planning, management, HR, logistics, finance etc are likely to have on the achievement of project outcomes.
* The Project did some important work in activating coordination arrangements across government through the re-activation of the Ministry Focal Points, support for the establishment of DRM Ministry Teams and the Simulation Exercises. However, following the cessation of project activities, momentum has been flagging. Further follow up is required to build on the gains made and ensure they are not lost.
* Care should be taken in working in areas where consensus over roles and responsibilities is lacking among Counterparts (e.g. between Directorates in MSS or between MSS and other Ministries[[4]](#footnote-4)). In such a context the first priority should be to support the building of consensus. For example, UNDP should encourage the Government to resolve some of the duplication in roles between the Security Sector and MSS which is contained between the Organic Law for the Secretariat of State for Security and the NDRMP respectively. At the very least, the pace of project implementation should be designed with this context in mind.
* While a Capacity Assessment has been completed this has not been followed up with a Capacity Development Strategy as was intentioned in the Project Design. The latter is still needed for the NDMD, the NDOC and DRM stakeholders in the districts.
* Ownership can be encouraged by ensuring that project plans converge more closely with Counterpart work plans. This will be challenging as work/operational planning is still under development in Timor-Leste. One strategy might be to allocate certain project responsibilities (which fall within their own work responsibilities) to counterparts. Another strategy could be to support the development of work planning and management in NDMD as part of the Project.
* As part of future interventions, UNDP should support the Government to consider key policy questions such as the timeframe, funding and decentralisation plans for rolling out DRM architecture across the country in line with the NDRMP.
* Part of the “package” of initiatives that involve technological innovations should include support for the development of “systems” for maintaining and running the new tools including identifying and training staff to act as technicians and support for financial planning to include running and maintenance costs in the State Budget.
* Manuals and guides prepared in the future should be as simple as possible, targeted appropriately at the capacity within the NDMD/District Administrations.

# Introduction

This report covers the Final Evaluation of the Project ***Disaster Risk Management Institutional and Operational Systems Development in Timor-Leste.*** The Project was implemented by UNDP Timor-Leste over the period of March 2009 – January 2010 with co-funding from the European Commission Humanitarian Aid department (ECHO). The evaluation was carried out during February 2010.

The objectives of the Evaluation were to review progress towards the project’s objectives and results, assess the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation, identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation, and provide recommendations on design modifications and specific actions that would increase the effectiveness and impact of future similar initiatives. See Annex One for the Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation.

# Methodology

The Methodology of the Evaluation utilized a qualitative approach based on interviews and focus group discussions with key stakeholders and a review of project documents. The Evaluation involved semi-structured interviews whereby a set of open-ended questions were asked to participants but there was also scope for them to raise other topics. Interviews were held with a range of stakeholders including the Secretary of State for Social Assistance and Natural Disasters (SoSSAND), the NDMD Director and Government Adviser, NDOC Staff, representatives of international agencies and DDMC members in the Project districts (Bobonaro and Lautem). Project documentation reviewed included a range of project reports such as monthly reports, consultant reports and training reports. In addition materials produced by the Project such as manuals and tools were also reviewed. See Annex 2 for a full list of interviews and discussions held.

# Background

Timor-Leste is a small country with a land area of around of 15,007 km²located at longitude 123°E and latitude of 9°S and bordered by Indonesia on the southwest with Australia less than 600km south.

***Disaster Vulnerability***

Timor-Leste communities are vulnerable to natural disasters. Timor-Leste’s location north of the subduction zone between the Eurasian and Australian plates makes it particularly suseptible to seismic related disasters such as earthquakes and associated phenomena such as tsunamis. Moreover, Timor-Leste’s combination of heavy monsoonal rain, high winds, steep topography and prevalent deforestation make it prone to floods, landslides, river shifts and erosion. Casualties and severe disruption to road networks are common in the rainy season, the latter having a significant impact on food security and livelihoods. In addition, rural communities face various other hazards affecting agricultural livelihoods such as crop and animal diseases and pest infestation. As well as being suseptible to natural disasters, Timorese citizens are also vulnerable to consequences of “man-made” disasters. Urban areas are unprepared for possible disasters ranging from disease outbreaks, fires, chemical spills and sewerage run off. Timor-Leste also has the potential for political instability. For example, Civil Unrest in 2006 led to the destruction of homes and other property and the displacement of over 150,000 people.

***Development of the Policy and Institutional Framework for DRM***

Recognising the significant actual and potential impact of disasters on the community, institutional arrangements have been put in place by the Government of Timor-Leste to prevent, reduce the impact of and help communities recover from disasters. In 2000, with the support of UNDP and the UN Volunteers programme, the East Timor Transitional Authority (ETTA) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) established the National Disaster Management Office (NDMO) in the Ministry of Interior.

Since this time the NDMO (which, under the IV Constitutional Government, moved from the Ministry of Interior to the Ministry of Social Solidarity, raised in status from sub-directorate to directorate level and became the National Disaster Management Directorate (NDMD)) has developed a clear policy framework along the lines of the 2005 Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA). In 2005, the then NDMO developed a National Disaster Risk Management Plan (NDRMP) which, in line with the HFA, endorsed a multihazard, risk management approach to disaster management.

The Plan also outlined an institutional framework for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) including the establishment of a mutli-sectoral National Disaster Risk Management Committee (NDRMC) which was to include broad high-level ministerial representation and be responsible for DRM policy making. The Plan was also designed as being multi-sectoral and it was intended that different ministries would take a role in leading DRM within their sectors, particularly in disaster risk analysis and mitigation. For example, Government Agencies responsible for management of the natural environment would be responsible for analysing and coordinating action to minimise disaster risks associated with land degradation, the Ministry of Health with disease outbreaks etc etc. Toward this end the Plan thus stated that Government Ministries should prepare their own Ministerial level DRM Plans.

Also in the NDRMP was the stipulation that a Disaster Operations Centre (DOC) was to be established to coordinate disaster monitoring, early warning and risk analysis as well as disaster communication and response. The DOC was to have a reliable power supply and communications that could continue to operate during an emergency as well as different “tiers” of staff (up to three tiers) including staff that could be called in in the event of a disaster to assist with disaster response. In the case of a disaster the DOC was to lead other agencies, such as the Police, Fire Brigade etc, in a response.

The Plan stated that at the Sub-national level, District Administrators were to act as Disaster Coordinators and Disaster Management Committees comprised of representatives of the Government were to be established at district, sub-district and suco level. The Plan also endorsed the approach of Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) whereby communities were to take the lead in reducing the risk and managing disasters in their own lives and it was the role of the Government to support and facilitate this process.

In the Plan, the NDMD has the major role in coordinating all aspects of DRM including coordinating disaster risk monitoring, risk analysis, mitigation, risk communication and education, disaster response and recovery with all stakeholders involved at national and sub-national level.

In 2007, the Plan was redrafted as a National Disaster Risk Management Policy and approved by the Council of Ministers. The major change in this policy from the Plan was that the Vice Prime Minister was given a coordination role in disaster management, notably as the National Disaster Coordinator, a role to be activated in case of a disaster event.

***Development of DRM Implementation Capacity***

Under the Policy framework described above, implementation capacity for disaster risk management within the Government of Timor-Leste has also been developing.

A DOC has been established at the Ministry of Social Solidarity. The DOC carries out regular monitoring of potential disasters including seismic and weather related disasters. District Management Committees have been established in all districts and in many sub-districts and sucos around the Country. District Administrations, the NDMD and the DOC provide response and recovery assistance to community members in case of a disaster including support for evacuation and essential supplies (food and non-food items) for victims of disasters as well as housing materials and cash and record information on disasters. The NDMD also regularly carries out education and training for government representatives at sub-national and national level on disaster management.

However, at the time of the designing of the UNDP Project there were many aspects of the Policy which were yet to be operationalised. The National Disaster Risk Management Committee (NDRMC) had not been established athough on occassions, the Council of Ministers had taken this role by making DRM policy decisions in the course of their meetings. Sub-DRM plans had not been completed by other Government Agencies with the exception of the Ministry of Health. In fact there had been very little undertaken in terms of disaster risk reduction planning within the Government, as there had been very little scope for integrating risk management into Government annual planning and budgeting processes, although DRR planning had been carried out at district and community level in some districts supported by NGOs.

In regard to the DOC, while the Centre had been established and was undertaking regular disaster monitoring and response coordination it was still under-resourced in terms of human and other resources. Only two staff were working there and further development was still needed in early warning capacity and emergency management particularly in regard to clarification of roles and coordination arrangements vis-a-vis other agencies such as the Bureau of Meteorology for weather monitoring and early warning and the National Directorate of Social Assistance for response coordination. Other areas which needed development included standard operating procedures and ensuring the availability and correct use of appropriate resources (transport, relief supplies etc).

***UNDP’s role in supporting DRRM***

Since independence, UNDP has had a prominent role in supporting the NDMO/NDMD through the provision of a number of technical assistance packages which have included support for capacity development as well as assistance with the development of specific policies, plans and training programs.

In 2007/8 a higher than normal incidence of localised disasters associated with the wet season brought issues of disaster risk management to the attention of the Council of Ministers. In particular, the need was identified for institutional and operational systems and procedures development and improving the provision of services to community members and the link between the centre and the district.

In respose to this identified need, the UNDP Timor-Leste in consultation with the NDMD, developed the design for the current project. The Project was intended to focus on improving the procedures and tools for disaster risk management at national and sub-national level as well as coordination and communication arrangements.

The Project was also designed to specifically coordinate with another DRM initiative, the AusAID/IOM Support for Disaster Risk Management in Timor-Leste, which focused on strengthening and institutionalising Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) at the sub-national level through support for a consortium of NGOs and institutional strengthening for NDMD with a focus on general administration, organisational and Human Resource Management functions.

### Project Design

The Project had one principle objective which was to establish basic systems for DRRM in Dili, Bobonaro and Lautem to minimize casualties, loss of lives, capital and environmental assets in vulnerable communities. The Project then had three specific objectives. The first specific objective was to see the NDOC strengthened and 2 new DDOCs established in Bobonaro and Lautem along with necessary operational systems and mechanisms. The second specific objective was to see communication channels well established between communities, DDOCs, NDOC, and other line government entities for efficient early warning, contingency planning and response. The third specific objective was to see awareness raised on DRM amongst partners including *Chefes de Sucos*, District Administrations, line ministries, civil society, and media, and DRM mainstreamed in Government planning.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PROJECT LOGFRAME | | | | |
| **Title of the Action** | Disaster Risk Management InstitutionalandOperational Systems Developmentin Timor-Leste | | | |
| **Principal Objective** | Establish basic systems for DRRM in Dili, Bobonaro and Lautem to minimize casualties, loss of lives, capital and environmental assets in vulnerable communities | | | |
|  | **Intervention Logic** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | **Sources of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Specific Objective** | 1. Strengthen disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) systems in Dili, Bobonaro and Lautem districts. | * NDOC and DDOCs in Bobonaro and Lautem are operational | * Published data (ex. Maps, alerts and regular weather updates) | * Volatile security situation * National budget constraints in 2008 particularly for DRM[[5]](#footnote-5) * Continued political commitment to DRM reflected in the national budget for sustainability |
| **Results** | * 1. NDOC strengthened and 2 new DDOCs established in Bobonaro and Lautem along with necessary operational systems and mechanisms | * Detailed capacity assessment completed to refine the project strategy and define specific equipment and training needs * Standard operating procedures (SOPs) developed * A minimum of 2 stakeholder consultation meetings held per participating district * A minimum of 2 training workshops on SOPs held per participating district | * DRRM capacity assessment report and proposed action plan * Manual of standard operating procedures * Progress report on the implementation of the capacity development plan * Records of meetings * Training modules and workshop reports | * Lack of basic human resources * Lack of basic infrastructure (Internet connection, equipment, continuous power supply, transport, etc.) |
| * 1. Communication channels are well established between communities, DDOCs, NDOC, and other line government entities for efficient early warning, contingency planning and response | * One national workshop to discuss the current and planned DRM institutional machinery as per the newly adopted NDRMP * Guidelines and codes of practice for communication, information management, and coordination developed in a participatory approach * A minimum of 2 simulation exercises per participating district to insure that institutional coordination mechanisms and procedures amongst various government entities and partners are operational | * Workshop report and media coverage * Compendium of guidelines and codes of practice * Records of simulation exercises | * Weak coordination among various Government agencies at central and district levels * Fledgling civil society organisations * Lack of basic human resources * Lack of basic infrastructure (Internet connection, equipment, continuous power supply, transport, etc.) |
| * 1. Awareness raised on DRM amongst partners including *Chefes de Sucos*, District Administrations, line ministries, civil society, and media, and DRM mainstreamed in Government planning | * A minimum of 2 Government plans including references to DRRM * A minimum of 1 training workshop per participating district on DRRM as a cross-cutting issue * A minimum of 1 training for journalists and reporters for better coverage and access to information * 2009 financial planning and budget estimation for DRRM * A minimum of 6 DRRM features in Media and/ or public debates | * Official planning documents including references to DRRM * Training modules and records of meetings * Draft 2009 DRM budget * Media reports and debates on DRRM | * Poor understanding of DRRM issues by lead ministries, media and the public * Weak coordination among various Government agencies at central and district levels * Fledgling civil society organisations |
| **Activities** | * + 1. Map stakeholders and partners both in government and civil society to identify information, coordination and communication gaps and define possible shortcomings in the chain-of-command as identified by rules and regulations both at national and sub-national levels     2. Assess capacity for DRRM both in Government and civil society (NGOs and CVTL) to identify strengths, weakness/needs, opportunities, and threats     3. Based on the assessment results, develop and implement a capacity development plan to strengthen human resources and systems for better information flow, communication and coordination on DRRM     4. Undertake procurement of necessary hardware/ software systems for NDOC and DDOCs for data collection and analysis, and early warning     5. Organize consultation meetings with various stakeholders in participating districts to collect baseline information, and to eventually discuss and validate different proposals or scenarios identified following desk studies     6. Develop SOPs for priority national hazards and corresponding guidelines on communication, information management and coordination     7. Undertake training on SOPs for stakeholders in participating districts     8. Capacity development and on-the-job mentoring of NDOC and DDOCs staff to undertake multi-hazard, and vulnerability risk analyses. | | | Pre-conditions   * Human resources recruited by Government * Physical premises are allocated for DDOCs |
| **Activities** | * + 1. Organise a national workshop to review and discuss existing and planned institutional DRM machinery, including roles, responsibilities, challenges and linkages among different actors     2. Assist the Government in developing basic guidelines and codes of practice for information management, communication and coordination     3. Organise simulation exercises to test and refine coordination mechanisms and procedures     4. Identify linkages with regional international organisations for future cooperation on early warning and DRRM, particularly with neighbouring countries | | | Pre-conditions   * Continued Government commitment and leadership in strengthening DRM coordination and communication |
| **Activities** | * + 1. Organise training on DRRM as a cross-cutting/ inter-ministerial issue in participating districts and develop in consultation with partners a relevant training module for newly elected/ appointed District Administrators and *Chefes de Sucos*.     2. Organize a workshop for lead ministries to discuss mainstreaming DRRM in government planning (ex. National Development Plan, national and sub-national budgets, etc.)     3. Implement a national information campaign to socialize DRM procedures, information points, communication procedures, and coordination mechanisms for more active engagement of the public in the national DRM system.     4. Assist NDMD in undertaking its financial planning and drawing its 2009 budget for DRRM.     5. Develop and deliver a training module on DRM to journalists/ reporters for a wider socialization of DRM issues in collaboration with the on-going UNDP Media Project. | | | Pre-conditions   * DRM continues to be a national priority. |

The Project staffing structure included one Project Manager for the duration of the Project, one DRM Operations Expert for 7 Months and one DRM Analyst for 7.5 Months, one Project Assistant for 8 months, one IT/GIS consultant for 2.5 months and one GIS Mapping Specialist for 3 days.

The Project duration was initially intended to be for 12 Months with a start and finish date of Oct 08 and Sept 09 respectively. However, the project was launched in March 09 with the no cost extension approved until January 2010, with three further months for reporting and wrap-up.

# Findings

## Evaluation of the Project at Objective Level

The Project Design focused on providing support for the development of systems and tools that are essential to Disaster Risk Management (DRM). Procedures for response coordination and mechanisms and computer programs for collecting and analysing information on disasters constitute essential machinery for effective disaster risk management. The Project staff were experienced disaster risk management practitioners and had a good understanding of what was required. They aimed to build the technical foundations of a disaster risk management system in Timor.

Considering the relatively short implementation period due to the nature of the co-funding (Humanitarian funds limited to 12 months), a large number of deliverables were completed by the Project. These included manuals, guides and other documents and ICT tools, as well as training and workshop sessions. The Project can be said to have completed the majority of the activities in the Design. These are discussed in more detail in the section under Outputs/Activities below, however, a brief summary of deliverables completed by the Project can be said to include:

* ***Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)***: Operating Manuals which included communications and information management protocols for the National Disaster Operations Centre, District Disaster Operations Centres, and for Ministry DRM teams.
* ***Guide to Disaster Risk Management***: Disaster risk assessment methodology and guidelines to support the collation of information related to disaster risk and planning for addressing prioritised risks.
* ***Damage Observation Form (DOF)***: A standardised methodology for damage assessment implemented through the use of a single form at national and district level.
* ***Damage Assessment Database***: Linked to the DOF. This MS Access Database is designed to record and report on all incidences of damage to people, property and infrastructure due to disasters and shocks.
* ***DRM Info***: This is a GIS based disaster risk assessment mapping software adapted from the UNICEF Program, Dev Info. which allows the user to produce suco, sub-district, district and national maps of Timor with layers of information about disaster hazards, infrastructure risks and other information. For the disaster hazards the program uses scientific data. For the population information the program relies on data from the 2004 Census.

The Project team was hosted at the NDOC and hence worked on daily basis with the NDOC staff to complete the above tools. In addition, the project staff provided formal and on-the-job training to NDOC staff and District staff in the use of the tools. See Annex 4 for a list of formal training sessions carried out by the Project. The Project provided extensive training in DRM including training to Ministry Focal Points in DRM Concepts and training to journalists and reports. The Project also produced promotional materials for the public about DRRM. The project also organised four simulation exercises: two at national level and one in each project district. These exercises involved meetings with stakeholders from different sectors and agencies, including civilians, police and military, who had a designated role in a disaster response. They aimed to consolidate and strengthen communication and coordination for disaster response across agencies. During these simulations a scenario was provided to participants to problem solve how to coordinate a response during a number of phases. The Project also assisted the NDMD to participate in the Simulation organised by UNESCO for the Indian Ocean Early Warning System. The project also provided equipment for the NDOC and DDOCs which is detailed more extensively under the section on outputs/activities below.

While the Project reached the majority of its targets at output/activity level, the effect on strengthening the NDOCs and DDOCs (the Principle Objective of the Project) can be seen to be mixed as minimal use was being made by counterparts of the tools and innovations that had been introduced by the Project at the time of the Evaluation. For example, the consultations revealed that the SOPs produced by UNDP were not used in the NDOC led 2009/10 wet season response. Moreover, the NDOC adoption of the Disaster Observation Form and the Damage Assessment Database was only partial at the time of the Evaluation as NDOC staff were sometimes using these tools but were also still making use of their previous system of entering data on disasters into an Excel Spreadsheet. Moreover counterparts at the NDOC had made minimal use of the DRM Info program.

The reduced uptake of project innovations is not surprising given the short time period of the Project and the level of development in the institutional context. Towards the end of the Project some momentum was being gained in the use of the Tools however it is not clear that this will continue without additional project support.

Other aspects of the Project were beneficial. The procurement of equipment for the NDOC including a computer server and generator was beneficial to the NDOC as it improved their capacity to operate continuously and effectively. Also, on-the-job training and mentoring was provided by the Advisers to the Counterparts and the provision at the national level of training for a range of stakeholders support for activation of coordination arrangements in DRM was positive. The latter helped the Government to gain some ground in operationalising the links and protocols between various agencies which have existed on paper for some time but have been largely dormant. Further systems development will be required, however, in order for the gains to be sustainable.

During project implementation it became apparent that there still lack of clarity over the roles of the DDOCs as Disaster Operations Centres among the Government. [[6]](#footnote-6) This recognition resulted in a reorientation of the Project toward an objective of establishing the DDOCs as DRM *resource* centres rather than *operations* centres. In regard to this revised objective, the Project was more successful because the Project made an important contribution to resourcing DRM at district level through the provision of equipment and training. Furthermore the simulation exercises were beneficial in improving coordination among DRM stakeholders.

In the districts, take up by counterparts of the systems and tools introduced with support from the Project was also limited. During evaluation consultations, district level counterparts in both districts informed the Evaluator that they were not using the SOPs. In one district (Lautem) counterparts said they were using the Damage Observation Form to collect information on disasters that occurred or entering data into the Damage Assessment Database although in Bobonaro this was not the case. In Lautem the Counterparts reported that they were making use of the DRM Info program although in Bobonaro they said they were not. In the district context where resources available and capacity is low more support will be needed to reinforce the use of the tools and procedures. Moreover, further clarification is required regarding the relative roles of the District and National level in verification and response as currently there seems to be some duplication of roles.

The provision of equipment by the Project was beneficial at the district level as it increased the resources available for DRM in a very low resource environment. The simulation exercises helped to clarify and strengthen cross-sectoral coordination arrangements and the training improved knowledge and skills of DRM.

One of the key issues on the Project was the fact that aspects of the policy and institutional framework are still under development which reduced absorption capacity of the Project support. For example, the UNDP Project introduced the DRM info to assist with risk analysis and management but the GoTL is not yet really engaged in effective disaster risk analysis and reduction planning although this is a key aspect of the NDRM Policy. Inter-sectorally, assessment of risk level and prioritisation followed by the integration of risk management into Agency planning and budgeting processes based on the priorities identified are fairly limited. As a result the potential usefulness of the DRM Info tool to facilitate analysis to support planning and budgeting was less apparent to counterparts than it could be than if the Policy was being implemented to a greater extent.

Moreover, the fact that the institutional framework is still under development meant that support systems necessary to facilitate the implementation of priorities agreed on by the Government and UNDP through the design process were not always in place. Some examples of aspects of the institutional framework which are still developing at MSS and affected implementation of the UNDP Project include:

* Management of the policy - planning – budgeting – implementation cycle. This relates to ensuring that priorities identified in officially endorsed policies are inserted and costed into annual planning and operational planning and management processes so that the work that staff are engaged in on a day to day basis is leading to the achievements of policy priorities. It is often the case that key policies endorsed by the Council of Ministers are not funded through the state budget. Moreover, while all Government Agencies engage in a centrally coordinated annual planning process there is less activity at the level of operational planning which guides the completion of work at a more detailed level through monthly or weekly workplans;
* Logistics management (eg ensuring the availability of continuous power);
* Organisational development (eg achieving consensus on specific responsibilities for policy implementation between different Agencies and Units);
* Human resource management (eg ensuring that human resources are adequate in terms of numbers and skills. Human resource management also covers the use of “levers” such as recruitment, promotion and remuneration policies and performance management to harness the motivation of staff toward the achievement of policy priorities); and
* ICT Management (ie effective development, management and use of ICT systems).

In a sense these issues were outside the scope of the Project which was responding to the need highlighted by the Council of Ministers for developing the tools, systems and procedures needed to operationalise DRM rather than focusing on institutional strengthening. The orientation of the Project away from institutional strengthening was also due to the fact that another Project implemented by the International Organisation of Migration (IOM), with funding from AusAID, known as the *IOM Support for Disaster Risk Management in Timor-Leste,* was being implemented at the same time and was focused on institutional strengthening aspects. However, the scope of these issues went beyond the scope of the IOM Project which was an AUD 1.5 million project with the majority of disbursement targeted at the sub-national level. While these issues were outside the scope of the Project they affected the ability of the Project to achieve its objectives. Therefore, strategically they should have been considered in the planning process as a risk for project achievements. It is essential that more consideration be given to the institutional context in future initiatives in regard to their likely impact on project results, even though there is another donor initiative working in the area of human resource management and administration in NDMD.

Looking forward the Project has produced tools, as stipulated in the approved project document, which could strengthen the role and profile of the NDMD/DOC if more work takes place to encourage their use on a regular basis. By facilitating the collection, management and presentation of data on disaster events and risks in Timor-Leste, the Damage Assessment Database and DRM Info can provide the basis for the beginning of evidence based planning in the DRR sector. The DRM Info program special representation of socio-economic, land use and disaster hazard data could be an excellent planning tool for a range of sectors.

## Evaluation of the Project at Result, Indicator and Activity Level

### Result 1.1

According to the Project Logframe the Specific Objective, Indicators and Activities associated with Result 1.1 are as follows:

Result: NDOC strengthened and 2 new DDOCs established in Bobonaro and Lautem along with necessary operational systems and mechanisms

Indicators:

* Detailed capacity assessment completed to refine the project strategy and define specific equipment and training needs
* Standard operating procedures (SOPs) developed
* A minimum of 2 stakeholder consultation meetings held per participating district
* A minimum of 2 training workshops on SOPs held per participating district

Activities:

* + 1. Map stakeholders and partners both in government and civil society to identify information, coordination and communication gaps and define possible shortcomings in the chain-of-command as identified by rules and regulations both at national and sub-national levels;
    2. Assess capacity for DRRM both in Government and civil society (NGOs and CVTL) to identify strengths, weakness/needs, opportunities, and threats;
    3. Based on the assessment results, develop and implement a capacity development plan to strengthen human resources and systems for better information flow, communication and coordination on DRRM;
    4. Undertake procurement of necessary hardware/ software systems for NDOC and DDOCs for data collection and analysis, and early warning;
    5. Organize consultation meetings with various stakeholders in participating districts to collect baseline information, and to eventually discuss and validate different proposals or scenarios identified following desk studies;
    6. Develop SOPs for priority national hazards and corresponding guidelines on communication, information management and coordination;
    7. Undertake training on SOPs for stakeholders in participating district; and
    8. Capacity development and on-the-job mentoring of NDOC and DDOCs staff to undertake multi-hazard, and vulnerability risk analyses.

As the Result Objective is the same as the indicator for the Principle Objective a discussion on the extent of the achievement of this objective will not occur here as it has been carried out in the previous section.

***Capacity Assessment***

During the Project a Capacity Assessment was completed (Indicator 1.1 and Activity 1.1.1 and 1.1.2). The objective of the Capacity Assessment was to support policy and planning processes of the GoTL in the area of DRM to effectively fulfil its mandate at national and district level. The focus was not just on the NDMD but also on assessing the institutions, coordination arrangements and linkages more broadly across government. The TORs for the Assessment included a range of tasks which aimed to understand the broad capacity development needs and concerns for DRM in the Country. The Capacity Assessment Team, which included representatives from UNDP Regional Office in Bangkok, reviewed materials and documents and undertook key informant interviews as well as focus group discussions and capacity self-assessments among NDMD staff.

The Capacity Assessment identified a number of issues affecting DRM in Timor-Leste including the absence of a national development strategy, a weak awareness of the NDRMP within Government, an over-emphasis on response at the expense of risk reduction and management, a lack of a national disaster monitoring and reporting system, lack of an Early Warning System and an inadequacy of state budget funding for DRM.

The Capacity Assessment was thorough and accurately described the situation with DRM in Timor. It was also participatory in its methodology, particularly through the use of a self-assessment process. It was also positive that the Capacity Assessment took a broad approach to analysing the machinery of DRM across government, rather than just focusing in NDMD.

However, it is difficult to see how the results of the Capacity Assessment have practically benefited the GOTL as it was not followed by a capacity development strategy involving support for strengthening human resources as is stipulated in the Project Logframe (logframe activity 1.1.4). The preparation of a Capacity Development Strategy for DRM that systematically assesses skills needed and gaps for the short to medium turn is still needed. While NDMD staff have attended countless in-country and overseas training programs a systematic program for acquiring the necessary skills through a mix of short to long-term and generic and specific training has never been prepared and followed up on.

***Procurement of Hardware and Software***

According to the Project Logframe, Activity 1.1.4 involved undertaking procurement of necessary hardware and software systems for NDOC and DDOCs for data collection, analysis and early warning.

**Hardware**

In accordance with the Logframe, the Project Team procured a number of items of computer hardware for the NDOC and the DDOCs. These included:

For the NDOC:

* IT Server and back up facilities for data
* Generator (35kva)
* 1 desktop computer and 1 laptop
* 1 colour laser printer
* 2 HF radio base stations and modem (1 for deployment)
* 2 VHF radio base stations (1 for deployment) and 4 handsets

For each DDOC:

* 1 desktop computer and 1 Laptop computer
* 1 monochrome laser printer
* Solar power system
* 1 back-up generator (for Laspalos only)
* 1 HF Radio base station and modem
* 1 fax/copier/printer/scanner (colour)
* 1 VHF radio base station and 4 handsets

The Project team also facilitated the donation by ISF of 32 laptops to the NDMD for the NDOC, DDOCs and NDMD District Officers for supporting disaster management operations.

This equipment was highly beneficial at the National Level as it helped to ameliorate impediments to daily operations caused by an absence of or problems with logistical support systems. For example at the National level the IT Server allowed the Counterparts to share and back up files which they had not been doing previously. The generator enabled counterparts to continue working during the frequent blackouts although there were issues with ensuring adequate fuel for the generator. The radios assisted with internal NDOC communications and with district level and other counterparts.

Similarly, the provision of equipment was useful at the District level. The provision of computers provided a resource for the NDMD officer to use who had been recently placed in the Districts although the officer had only arrived in Bobonaro (and not in Lautem) due to delays in recruitment for this district.

Communications equipment (one HF radio and one VHF radios for each DDOC, with a number of VHF handsets per district) for the districts was in the project design but had not yet been delivered to the Counterparts due to an unforeseen delay which had deferred their receipt from an international supplier. Once this equipment arrives it should be highly useful for strengthening district level disaster response systems, as inability to communicate is one of the major impediments. Currently the major source of communications is mobile phone usage but it is unreliable. In both districts, mobile phone coverage was available but the network did not cover all parts of the district. Many counterparts possess mobile phones but these are personal phones and the use of them relies on the phones having credit which is not always the case. The equipment provided by the UNDP project will improve communications but it is not in sufficient quantity to cover all sub-districts. It would have been more useful if equipment could have been provided in sufficient quantity to establish a district-wide communications system, but perhaps this was outside the project budget.

The solar power systems provided to the District offices in Lautem and Bobonaro were also beneficial as they supplement the generators used to power the district administration offices during the day (state power is only available in the evening). However, the Counterparts have had some difficulty operating the systems and there was also a fault in the system in Bobonaro at the time of the evaluation. The Project Manager immediately sought to get the system in Bobonaro repaired.

While the provision of equipment was beneficial to counterparts, the usual issues that emerge in development projects relating to the counterparts ability to use and maintain the equipment arose on the UNDP DRM Project. Such issues should be taken into consideration in regard to the provision of equipment in the future. It would be better if equipment, funds and skills for maintenance and knowledge of correct usage were considered as part of a package and supported accordingly.

**Software**

**Damage Assessment Database and Damage Observation Form**

Another key innovation of the Project was improvement of the procedure for collecting, recording and retaining information on disasters.

Localised disasters due to heavy rain, drought, strong winds, crop pests and fire are a regular occurrence throughout Timor-Leste. It has been the practice when a disaster occurs for local government representatives to visit the location of the disaster and collect information about the event. They then provide what assistance they could (which is usually very little) and also send a request to MSS/NDMD for support to which MSS would respond if possible.

It was identified as a priority of the Project to standardise the process of collecting and communicating information about disasters. This would help to improve the response and minimise the practice of information being sent directly to Senior Government Officials (rather than to operational units) leading to backlogs and clogging of the system. It would also help to increase the consistency of the data available for building up a disaster history record which in turn can be analysed and used for risk reduction planning.

The project introduced a single format for all disasters (the Disaster Observation Form (DOF)) and procedure for communicating the information from the District to the NDOC. The DOF is designed as a tool for both rapid assessment and collecting more detailed information as might be required at a later time (e.g. for recovery assistance, research and analysis). The DOF includes a single form to capture damage information which ranges from very basic to more detailed information depending on what level of detail is required. The information can be characterized as preliminary, revised or final, according to a field in the form. It is all the same basic data, but subsequent versions may have amended numbers, and or more fields completed.

The Project introduced a database, the Damage Assessment Database to enter and retain information collected through use of the DOF. In the practice of information collection and collation that occurred prior to the Project, the information sent to the centre from the District in relation to each disaster incidence has been compiled by the NDOC and provided in a report to the Secretary of State for Social Assistance and Natural Disasters (SoSSAND) and also entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The introduction of a database should improve the quality of data records on disaster histories which can then be used in risk analysis for risk reduction planning. It should also improve the efficiency of managing data for reporting purposes through the easier generation of reports providing data on particular incidents, types of disasters and locations.

While the Damage Observation Forms and the Damage Assessment Database were designed to facilitate improved practices around disaster assessment and data collection, NDOC officials informed the Evaluator that they had some issues with the procedures introduced and for this reason had only partly integrated them into their work practices. Counterparts mentioned four reasons why their use of the new tools was limited: (i) they did not feel confident in using the database because they felt they had not been sufficiently trained; (ii) they had encountered a technical glitch while entering data; (iii) they wanted more fields in the DOF and the Database on details of house destruction, and (iv) they wanted to be able to amend and manage the database as opposed to just using it.

In regard to the first issue that the counterparts mentioned that they were still unconfident in the use of the new procedures, training in the DOF and the Database for the NDOC staff was provided through on-the-job training and mentoring – a sensible option given that the Project staff and the NDOC staff were co-located in the NDOC on a daily basis (see Annex 4 for a list of formal training provided on the Project). Although the Project staff felt that adequate instruction had been provided to the NDOC in how to use the tools the Counterparts expressed view that they were not fully confident in its use indicates that further training and mentoring is required. In a context where the use of IT has been fairly recently introduced into work practices and educational opportunities have been limited, more training and mentoring may be required to support the integration into work of the use of new tools and technologies than might be expected in some other contexts.

In regard to the “technical glitch” the project team took immediate action to repair this once they became aware of the problem which was at the meeting to present the evaluation findings to the Government. The project team’s efficient response to the problem once they knew of it is mitigated by their delayed awareness of the nature problem which appears to have only come about at the end of the Project.

In relation to the third reason mentioned above of the Counterparts wanting more fields in the Form the concept adopted by the Project in the DOF is that *basic* information on damage to people, property, crops and infrastructure would be collected during the initial rapid assessment and other more detailed information could be collected at a later stage as required. Counterparts, however, wanted some more information included in the initial stage. Specifically, they wanted to know not just whether houses were damaged but also the level of housing damage, type of houses (permanent, semi-permanent, temporary) and other information on owners. This information was important to Counterparts as the GoTL’s *Recovery Strategy for Natural Disasters*, which provides the policy basis for the provision of assistance to victims of natural disasters, stipulates the level of assistance to be provided on the basis of the level of damage to houses: completely destroyed, partly destroyed or only slightly damaged. In 2009 and 2010 NDMD have been allocated a significant budget allocation for the distribution of assistance to victims of disasters. Classifying levels of damage to houses that occurs during disasters is linked to a budget execution imperative and is high on the agenda of Senior Government Officials. In this context the NDOC officials viewed information on the level of damage to houses as priority for a first, rather than later, round of questions.

However, it is accepted international practice in disaster response that in the implementation of rapid assessments that only basic information is requested in the early period following the disaster such as is required to quickly estimate the needs for immediate assistance for food, shelter, medication assistance etc. The DOF was designed in this vein. Thus the first stage of assessment was intended to be carried out at Aldeia (hamlet) level. The information that counterparts wished to collect was household level information that normally would be collected at a later stage.

The difficulty in reaching an agreement on this issue is indicative of the challenges that the project faced in gaining consensus with counterparts in implementation in spite of the joint agreement that had been reached at the design level. A decision by NDMD management on how the DOF should be structured given (competing) technical consideration and policy/political priorities would have resolved the issue. However this does not appear to have taken place. In this case the Project might have advocated to management for a policy decision.

Given the short time frame of the project and the level of capacity in Timor-Leste issues it is important that UNDP and GoTL continue to engage on the topic of the content and procedures for using the DOF/Damage Assessment Database until a mutual understanding and agreement is reached with UNDP and GoTL and between GoTL at management and operational level. Such a process in itself would be an important capacity building opportunity for Counterparts in terms of (i) learning about linking technical recommendations regarding management best practice with policy priorities and (ii) strengthening management practices around *making* and *carrying out* decisions on key aspects of programming (ie in this case when and how to collect what type of information on disasters that have occurred).

In regard to the fourth issue of the counterparts request that they be trained in managing and adapting the database it was the view of the Project staff that before learning to adapt the database by changing the logic or functionality counterparts needed to master the use of the database in terms of regular update (i.e. data entry) and generation of reports. There should not be a great deal of need to change the database for its functionality and furthermore this would require specific IT and programming skills which currently are not present among NDOC staff.

This is true however currently the level of IT management capacity in the Ministry is quite low. In the short term external support will need to continue to provide support or the database is likely to fall into disrepair and disuse. In the medium term capacity to maintain and adapt the database need to be built into the ministry. This is something to be considered in the second phase.

Another issue relates to that of backing up data**.** The project has recovered old data (3 day support by a short-term consultant) and installed a back up server in NDOC; however, it will be important to impress the principle of regular backing up of data as it would be tragic if data which included years of information was suddenly lost due to a computer virus or some other reason. There is a strong likelihood that this would happen if there were not vigilant support on this issue from a development partner.

At district level reporting by Counterparts during the evaluation on the use of the DOF and the Damage Assessment Database was mixed. In Lautem counterparts stated that they had used the DOF to record disaster incidents whereas in Bobonaro they said they had not. This is in spite of a number of training sessions in the use of the tools. There has been no use of the Damage Assessment Database to date. At this stage there is not much point in using the DAB at district level as there is not internet connection so it is not possible to create a web-based database. Rather data would simply have to be entered twice. If it were possible that internet connection could be available in the districts it would certainly be beneficial to create a web-based database.

Realistically, given the current level of capacity in the districts it is unlikely that new procedures could be integrated into work practices without accompaniment and/or strong drive and support from the national level.

It should be noted that the project has originally planned to support and train NDMD Officers in the two districts to assist with accompaniment and support. At the commencement of the Project NDMD had a plan for immediate placement of staff members in the Districts. However, delays have affected NDMD recruitment process and no candidates were posted to these two districts during the lifespan of the project. This was an important drawback that complicated implementation. To overcome this hurdle taking into account budget constraints, an Australian Youth Ambassador for Development (AYAD) with previous DRM experience was recruited to assist DDOC in Bobonaro. No satisfactory candidate could be identified for Lautem.

In order for the tools to be properly useful, continued support needs to be given to operationalising the whole DRM cycle including collecting, analysing and using data for risk reduction planning. If risk reduction planning begins to occur across ministries then NDOC staff may feel more inspired about the Database as it will have a useful purpose. The Project team has re-launched the focal point system in sector ministries and trained representatives on DRM concept. However, this is a long-term process that would require follow up.

In any case, as stated above, while the use of the database is not yet maximized, building it is a very important initiative as it potentially provides for the maintenance of a record of disaster events. Such a history record is essential for risk reduction planning.

**DRM Info**

Counterparts at the NDOC and DDOCs were also provided with the mapping software program DRM Info to provide data on disaster risks to assist with risk reduction programming. Training sessions were provided on the Tool at the national and district level (see Annex 4 for the training schedule). The program uses GIS coordinates to display maps which combine geographical, geological and hydrological scientific data with socio-economic data generated from the 2004 Census. To provide more detailed geographical information, DRM Info was designed to be overlaid with Google Earth Software which uses GIS coordinates and allows different types of information to be represented on a map and analysed is commonly used in disaster risk management around the world (eg ARCGIS). DRM Info is a simplified version of such software as the data has been pre-entered to overcome human resources constraints and facilitate information to be represented in a map format. Newly entered data would require GIS expertise to be analysed and imported into DRM-Info. It should be noted that such scientific data does not change immensely over a short period of time.

As with the other initiatives, during evaluation interviews, the NDOC staff informed the evaluator that they had not yet fully integrated the use of DRM Info into their work. In Lautem the Social Economic Staff Member who was the most active member of the DDMC stated that he has been using the DRM info to compare the incidence of disasters from Participatory Vulnerability Assessment Mapping with that provided through the DRM info to evaluate progress on mitigating disasters. This is not the intended use of the tool but nevertheless can be seen as a positive indication of interest in using it. In Bobonaro counterparts reported that they have not yet commenced using the tool although they hoped to do so soon. It is expected nonetheless, that the continued support of the AYAD DRM Officer will facilitate and encourage its use. On the other hand, Hevos (an NGO which is taking up the work of Concern in Lautem) will be seconding a staff member to work on DRM at the Lautem District Administration. Perhaps part of the TORs of this staff member could be to support operationalisation of the DOF, the Damage Assessment Database and DRM Info. Horizontal cross-linkages should be established with DDOC in Bobonaro.

Similar to with the Damage Assessment Database, Counterparts (at the NDOC) also stated that they after their training they still did not feel confident in using the program. Furthermore, they wanted to be able to update the Program and enter data into it as well as just use it. They also stated that they felt the program was based on data that was not sufficiently up to date because the socio-economic data was from the 2004 Census.

In regards to the issue of management capacity for DRM Info, the Program is designed to require no management unless for some reason it stops working. To mitigate this and keep momentum going on entering data into the Database, some minimal support should be provided by UNDP during the gap between the end of the Project and the commencement of the next phase. In regard to the request for training for updating and programming DRM Info, according to the Project GIS Specialist, this would require a considerable amount of training and IT proficiency and it would be difficult for NDOC staff to obtain these specialist skills over a short period of time. Nevertheless, investing in the development of such capacity in NDOC should be considered in future support. Similarly the capacity to generate risk related data in GIS would require considerable training which is beyond the scope of the Project. It would require including scholarships abroad as there are currently no institutions in Dili that teach this. In regard to the perception that the data is outdated, this should not have too much impact on the usefulness of the Program as the data, particularly the scientific data, will not change much in a period of a few years. When new data becomes available in 2011 a GIS/IT expert can be contracted to update the program.

While there are a number of differences in views between project staff and counterparts regarding technical issues, there is an underlying issue with DRM Info in that the extent of risk analysis and risk reduction that the data it produces are designed to support is limited. The project produced a Guide to Disaster Risk Management to assist with this but it also has not yet been implemented. Thus it is difficult for counterparts to fully grasp the usefulness of the Program. Actually, in the area of risk analysis and reduction planning, there have been more developments at district level where, with the support of IOM and NGOs, SDMCs, SDDMCs and DDMCs have been engaged in participatory disaster risk vulnerability and action planning. Of all the districts, Lautem is the most advanced in these activities having received support from the NGO Concern for DRR since 2005 as well as good championing from the District administration itself. It is thus not surprising that of the three partner agencies engaged in the Project (the NDOC, the Lautem District Administration and the Bobonaro District Administration) the only one where there had already been use made of the DRM Info was the Lauteum District Administration.

While its usage is not yet optimum in the NDOC or the two project districts, DRM Info is an excellent tool that could be used for a range of purposes. With its information on land usage, combined with disaster information and other data on population and the location of homes, schools and infrastructure, DRM Info can be a useful tool for programs in sustainable natural resources management, reforestation, climate change adaptation and improving food security. If the NDOC is able to promote DRM info to other agencies it could be a point around which they can begin to develop their role as a source of information and knowledge on disaster risks and their impact on development.

***Standard Operating Procedures***

The support for the development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and their integration into the work practices of counterparts through capacity building and training was a key element of the project included under Result 1. SOPs are of fundamental importance to disaster response coordination. At the time of a disaster it is essential that there are clear guidelines as to the required actions of the various parties allocated a responsibility in the response. Involved parties should know their role well enough to be able to perform it quickly without thinking. The resources required (transport, fuel, communications, evacuation points) etc should be identified, available and ready to use without glitches or setbacks that slow down the response and reduce the likelihood of saving lives and property. It is no doubt due to their central importance that SOPs were specifically requested by the Government during the design process as a priority for assistance and it was highly appropriate that UNDP provided support in this area.

The SOPs completed by the Project and contained in the Operations Manual are comprehensive and cover a broad range of organisational and practical matters relating to disaster response coordination in Timor-Leste.

In developing the SOPs the Project Team sought to extensively involve Counterparts at the DOC and provide capacity building and training in using them. Interviews with Project staff and review of project reports revealed that the indicators in the Logframe regarding capacity building and training in the SOPs at the national and district level were achieved. However, Counterparts expressed to the Evaluator that they would have liked more capacity building but time available was limited by their involvement in the Natural Disasters Recovery Strategy.

While the SOPs were delivered by the Project, there is still some work to do before it can be said that the NDOC has institutionalised the SOPs. This can be seen in examples of the recent wet season response which acted as a test for the SOPs. The heavy rains that occur annually during the wet season regularly cause flooding and landslides that damage homes and other buildings and infrastructure. In mid-December, a few hundred residents of the Hera sub-district were dislocated due to flooding of the Hera River caused by heavy rain. The NDOC coordinated a response to assist the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs).

A number of respondents reported to the Evaluator that there was considerable confusion within the GoTL over roles and responsibilities in disaster response for instance, relating to the relative roles of the NDMD and the National Directorate for Social Assistance, and other first response actors (such as the Police and the Army). Parties with designated roles and responsibilities according to the Policy are not all aware of and committed to acting in these roles. For example, Ministry of Social Solidarity (MSS) Directorates outside NDMD and other Government Agencies do not all recognise the mandate of NDMD to coordinate them during an emergency.[[7]](#footnote-7) There were also delays and problems with the location of evacuation points which have been a moot point among different Government entities for the last few years and the provision of amenities and distribution of supplies.

These were issues that the preparation of the SOPs was intended to deal with. However, Evaluation respondents informed the Evaluator in the wet season response the SOPs produced by the Project were not used.

There are likely to have been a combination of reasons as to why this was the case many of which relate to the level of development of the institutional framework within MSS. One of the causes (which is not linked to issues relating to the institutional framework) is that the SOPs do not specifically link positions and individuals to responsibilities but rather detail a list of roles and responsibilities which would be required in a response. There is still a need to allocated positions to responsibilities. Information from the Inception Report reveals that in preparing the SOPs, the Operations Expert found it challenging to identify the allocated responsibilities for staff in the DOC and NDMD and in regard to other positions, directorates and agencies that would be involved in a disaster response due to the fact that there wasn’t consensus on these roles. This challenge faced by the Project relates both to internal agreement within NDMD on roles and responsibilities and the issue of new regulatory developments (ex. Organic Law of the SoSS and the National Security Law) emphasizing overlap in mandates and the lack of current consensus over DRM responsibilities within the GoTL discussed above.

In response to this situation, the Project Team chose to include in the SOPs the *range* of roles and activities that would be required with the intention that correlation of specific positions with specific responsibilities should be done at a later date. Further support for SOP development should be provided once consensus on roles and responsibilities is more established. It might also be useful for UNDP to support the establishment of consensus. NDMD management is encouraged to look into the management of the 2009/10 wet season response to distil lessons learned, observations and means for developing approaches in the future.

### Result 1.2

According to the Project Logframe the results, verifiable indicators and activities associated with Result 1.2 are as follows:

Result: Communication channels are well established between communities, DDOCs, NDOC, and other line government entities for efficient early warning, contingency planning and response

Indicators:

* One national workshop to discuss the current and planned DRM institutional machinery as per the newly adopted NDRMP
* Guidelines and codes of practice for communication, information management, and coordination developed in a participatory approach
* A minimum of 2 simulation exercises per participating district to insure that institutional coordination mechanisms and procedures amongst various government entities and partners are operational

Activities:

* + 1. Organise a national workshop to review and discuss existing and planned institutional DRM machinery, including roles, responsibilities, challenges and linkages among different actors
    2. Assist the Government in developing basic guidelines and codes of practice for information management, communication and coordination
    3. Organise simulation exercises to test and refine coordination mechanisms and procedures
    4. Identify linkages with regional international organisations for future cooperation on early warning and DRRM, particularly with neighbouring countries

The completion of the activities under this result area made some important contributions to some improvements in DRR communications and coordination systems. As discussed above the lack of consensus and commitment over roles and responsibilities for DRR across different Directorates and Agencies is one of the largest impediment to the development of efficient early warning, contingency planning and response systems. Under this Result Area, notably through the simulation exercises, the Project supported some steps towards improving consensus. Follow up is needed, however, if the gains are to be maintained.

***National and District Exercises***

Under this component, Activities 1.2 and 1.2.3 were combined so that there was no national workshop to review and discuss DRM machinery. Instead, two simulation exercises were added at national level so that in total there were two simulation exercises carried out at national level and two simulation exercises carried out in each district.

Two National Exercises were held, one of which was on 15 September at Delta Nova and one on 23 November at MSS, where representatives from different Agencies including other Ministries and the Police and Military were invited to participate in a workshop and disaster scenarios were presented in response to which stakeholders were tasked to work through a response. Prior to the first exercise, it was noted that there was generally a low level of awareness across government agencies of the NDRMP. Therefore the first workshop focused on improving understanding of the Policy and facilitating consolidation and further definition of roles and coordination relationships. The first workshop received an overall highly positive response on the evaluation as a useful exercise for bringing stakeholders that need to coordinate to create a DRR system together and informing and highlighting issues about the Policy. It was agreed by participants that there was a need for agencies involved in coordination to conduct targeted exercises for common understanding and practical experience for coordinating operations. It was agreed that operations which would function as “tests” of the system could be conducted as part of the upcoming wet season response. The second workshop focused on practicing a specific disaster scenario and aimed to develop capacity for individual agency resource mobilisation and planning specific tasks. The second workshop also received a positive response but attendance was much lower than the first.

Throughout the national exercise processes it was noted that in order to practically operationalise the relationships that were there on paper, it was necessary to get high level support from within the involved agencies (security sector, various ministries etc). However, representatives at the exercises (and DRM focal points in general) are not generally higher than director level and it seems difficult to feed the message back up the line. There has not been action on the planned 3-6 monthly exercises which points to the need for further support to maintain the the achievements in consensus building and coordination gained through the simulation exercises.

The simulation exercises held in the districts were also useful. Counterparts in Bobonaro commented to the Evaluator that they found the simulation exercise very beneficial, particularly in regard to improving coordination with the security sector. They made a request for additional similar exercises to be held in the future and if they were to be held, for the exercise to more realistically resemble a real emergency where the exercise is conducted in real time with participants taking part perform their actual roles.

***Guidelines and Codes of Practice for Information Management, Communication and Coordination***

The Project Team worked on the above procedures and integrated them into the Operations Manuals for the NDOC and the DDOCs. They also made recommendations regarding essential equipment to be put in place to ensure effective and secure communications such as an independent satellite communication system.

***Identify linkages with regional international organisations for future cooperation on early warning and DRRM***

The Project also provided some assistance in the development of early warning systems. The NDOC staff review weather reports from the Bureau of Meteorology Australia to check for severe weather. There is some confusion over whether it should actually be the job of the Department of Meteorology (DoM) to provide weather information and the NDOC to act on it (rather than monitor information on weather themselves) but the DoM does not currently have a weather forecaster so it is not currently providing timely weather forecasts. The Project attempted to develop an MoU between Meteorology and NDOC regarding their relative roles and cooperative arrangements for receiving and communicating weather information. While a document has been prepared it has not yet been signed. From the discussion during the Evaluation with District Officials, it appeared that the NDOC does not generally provide weather information to Districts about localised severe weather events and in most cases communities still do not receive any warnings about these. There are websites such as which can provide daily weather forecasting at national level. The NDOC should investigate whether it is possible to receive and communicate weather updates relating to specific locations in Timor. Where internet is available in the Districts, District Officials could also be checking for weather forecasts as well.

The Project supported the NDMD to participate in the Indian Ocean Early Warning System simulation exercise. The simulation exercise revealed gaps in the Early Warning System in Timor. The NDMD did not receive the “warning” in a timely manner which was sent by fax, phone and email. The NDMD received only the email, 40 minutes after it was sent. NDMD’s early warning system including links to international early warning agencies should be improved as a matter of priority.

Another issue relating to early warning is that the NDOC staff expressed a view that they needed more training for interpreting data and reports on weather and seismic information. It was the view of the Project team, however, based on international practice that NDOC staff do not really need specialist training. Rather, their role should be to receive and communicate reports from data that has already been interpreted. This is another example of lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities (and skills required) which needs to be sorted out by NDMD and other concerned Government entities.

### Result 1.3

According to the Project Logframe the results, verifiable indicators and activities associated with Result 1.3 are as follows:

Result: Awareness raised on DRM amongst partners including *Chefes de Sucos*, District Administrations, line ministries, civil society, and media, and DRM mainstreamed in Government planning

Indicators:

* A minimum of 2 Government plans including references to DRRM
* A minimum of 1 training workshop per participating district on DRRM as a cross-cutting issue
* A minimum of 1 training for journalists and reporters for better coverage and access to information
* 2009 financial planning and budget estimation for DRRM
* A minimum of 6 DRRM features in Media and/ or public debates

Activities:

* + 1. Organise training on DRRM as a cross-cutting/ inter-ministerial issue in participating districts and develop in consultation with partners a relevant training module for newly elected/ appointed District Administrators and *Chefes de Sucos*.
    2. Organize a workshop for lead ministries to discuss mainstreaming DRRM in government planning (ex. National Development Plan, national and sub-national budgets, etc).
    3. Implement a national information campaign to socialize DRM procedures, information points, communication procedures, and coordination mechanisms for more active engagement of the public in the national DRM system.
    4. Assist NDMD in undertaking its financial planning and drawing its 2009 budget for DRRM.
    5. Develop and deliver a training module on DRM to journalists/ reporters for a wider socialization of DRM issues in collaboration with the on-going UNDP Media Project.

The third Result Area focused on increasing awareness across government of DRM and among the media and civil society and supporting the inclusion of DRM into mainstream government planning. The project made some important gains in facilitating cross-ministry coordination system, supported a large number of training events and initiatives and produced promotional materials for a range of stakeholders. As with the other result areas however, the lack of high-level support for developing and maintaining the systems and lessons developed calls into question the sustainability of the interventions.

***Mainstreaming DRRM***

The project provided training at the District level on DRRM as a cross cutting issue. Although it was included in the Logframe to provide training to Chefe de Sucos the Project Team decided against going ahead with this due to the fact that a large amount of training had already been provided by the NDMD to Chefe de Sucos therefore training materials already existed. It was decided to provide input into the existing training material rather than duplicate it.

The Project reactivated the Ministry Focal Points. The project facilitated a number of training sessions in DRM for ministry focal points and also brought together the focal points to prepare for the national exercises. The project also produced a manual for the ministries in guiding their engagement with NDMD. The national exercises described above were also a key initiative in mainstreaming DRM. In addition the project initiated the establishment of DRM Teams within ministries to address the problem of a lack of institutional support for DRM in terms of the numbers and seniority of staff involved in DRM. Mainstreaming DRM is a central tenant of the NDRMP but to date it has largely been dormant. For these reasons it was highly positive that UNDP became involved in work in this area. However, as discussed above in relation to the national exercise, a lack of high-level support for DRM across the government impairs momentum around moving forward on project initiatives implemented by NDMD. However, the project’s work in mainstreaming DRM appears to have stimulated more interest in disaster management across government. Subsequent to the national exercise a discussion has commenced within the Government on roles in disaster response, including the role of the military. A workshop on this topic was organised by the Secretariat of State for Defence in which the project team participated with NDMD.

In regard to the integration of DRM into government planning processes, the timing of the project was not ideal as the Annual Action Planning process occurs in the first half of the year and the project did not commence engagement with the Ministry focal points until early July. It would be more effective to initiate engagement in this process in the months proceeding the AAP/Budget planning process than after it although the project timeframe did not really allow for this. Timing of engagement in government planning processes should be a consideration for a possible second phase.

***Raising Awareness among the Public***

The Project produced a considerable amount of promotional material to raise public awareness about disaster preparedness and DRR. The project produced a video production and a brochure to promote national DRM structures and, in collaboration with the NDO Concern, a calendar to promote risk reduction in communities and outline emergency procedures. The production of this material is positive to increase awareness and knowledge of DRR risks and mitigation strategies among the community.

***Training for Journalists***

On 1 December the project facilitated a training course for journalists and reporters. This training was designed to inform journalists and reporters about DRM needs and activities, with the goal of encouraging more and better reporting on key DRM issues. The first part of the course dealt with the theory of DRM and explained the DRM arrangements in use in East Timor. The second part addressed current initiatives related to Climate Change, as a topical example of DRM in action. Both segments were delivered by the relevant Government officers, with the NDOC representative being given coaching beforehand and assistance on the day by the Operations Expert. Participants were asked to undertake two discussion activities - one in relation to DRM and the other in relation to Climate Change.

The participants generally found all sessions to be interesting and informative, and the number of questions asked at the end of each session indicated a high level of engagement with the subject material. Both discussion activities were similarly received, and the responses from each discussion group were thoughtful and progressive.

These results indicate that the course achieved the objectives set out for it. Additionally, several attendees published articles on the course shortly after their attendance, which indicates some saturation of the material presented.

# Looking Forward

Support for DRM at the District level should be considered a high priority due to the impact of disasters on livelihoods and food security. In 2007 the World Bank supported the Timor-Leste Living Standards Survey which assessed, among other topics, livelihood shocks. Natural Disasters emerged as the most frequent cause of shocks to livelihoods (78.5 percent of the Population experienced natural disasters as livelihood shocks)[[8]](#footnote-8). Moreover supporting DRM falls well within the UNDP Special Mandate which is described in its Country Programme Action Plan.

There is a big need to support a more systematic approach to DRM. As stated previously, to date the development of DRM has been very piecemeal and opportunistic determined by the availability of project based development assistance funding. Ten years after independence it is time for DRM development to become more sustainable and forward looking and address some key policy questions such as:

* What are the basic costs for establishing and operating response systems in the districts across the country and preparing and implementing disaster risk mitigation plans?
* What are the likely funds to be available for DRM through the State Budget in the years to come? How should needs be prioritised in the context of current and future funding envelopes? How should DRM funding be programmed through the Ministries’ budgets?
* Should the initiatives supported through development assistance e.g. DDOCs, District wide Disaster Mitigation Planning be rolled out to all districts? If so, in what timeframe?
* Where should DRM sit in the context of pending decentralisation? Does NDMD manage DDMCs and DDOCs or should they come under the authority of decentralised district administration? What about funding for disaster risk management, should that continue to come from a central agency or be made available to decentralised district administrations?

As part of an approach that supports institutional strengthening, UNDP should assist the GoTL to consider and make policy decisions on these and other questions and develop programs and plans accordingly. Other recommendations are outlined in the following dot points below.

# Recommendations

## General Recommendations

* A future intervention should continue the work in the focus areas of the first project. The project has produced some important tools and innovations such as SOPs, the Damage Assessment Database, the Damage Observation Form and the DRM Info program that have the potential to strengthen the role, raise the profile and improve the efficiency of the NDOC and the DDMCs/DDOCs. To ensure the innovations are effectively used by Counterparts, support for institutionalising, reinforcing and continuing to adapt the tools should be a key priority for a second phase. It will also be important that there not be a big time gap between the first and second phase as this will be likely to lead to lost momentum.
* To improve coordination of DRM across government, UNDP should encourage the Government to allocate DRM decision-making responsibilities to a higher level as at the current time many of the DRM Focal Points (who are at director or lower level) are struggling to gain traction within their own agencies on decisions made through inter-sectoral DRM coordination forums.
* In regard to potential future involvement in mainstreaming DRR planning, UNDP should be mindful of the windows of opportunity presented by the Annual Action Planning (AAP)/ Budget Planning Cycle. AAPs and Budget Plans are prepared in the months leading up to June.
* The design of interventions in the future needs to give more strategic consideration to the effect that issues in the institutional context such as capacity for planning, management, HR, logistics, finance etc are likely to have on the achievement of project outcomes.
* The Project did some important work in activating coordination arrangements across government through the re-activation of the Ministry Focal Points, support for the establishment of DRM Ministry Teams and the simulation exercises. However, following the cessation of project activities, momentum has been flagging. Further follow up is required to build on the gains made and ensure they are not lost.
* Care should be taken in working in areas where consensus over roles and responsibilities is lacking among Counterparts (e.g. between Directorates in MSS or between MSS and other Ministries[[9]](#footnote-9)). In such a context the first priority should be to support the building of consensus and the pace of project implementation should be designed with this context in mind. For example, UNDP should encourage the Government to resolve some of the duplication in roles between the Security Sector and MSS which is contained between the Organic Law for the Secretariat of State for Security and the NDRMP respectively.
* While a Capacity Assessment has been completed this has not been followed up with a Capacity Development Strategy as was intentioned in the Project Design. The latter is still needed for the NDMD, the NDOC and DRM stakeholders in the districts.
* Ownership can be encouraged by ensuring that project plans converge more closely with Counterpart work plans. This will be challenging as work/operational planning is still under development in Timor-Leste. One strategy might be to allocate certain project responsibilities (which fall within their own work responsibilities) to counterparts. Another strategy could be to support the development of work planning and management in NDMD as part of the Project.
* As part of future interventions, UNDP should support the Government to consider key policy questions such as the timeframe, funding and decentralisation plans for rolling out DRM architecture across the country in line with the NDRMP.
* Part of the “package” of initiatives that involve technological innovations should include support for the development of “systems” for maintaining and running the new tools including identifying and training staff to act as technicians and support for financial planning to include running and maintenance costs in the State Budget.
* Manuals and guides prepared in the future should be as simple as possible, targeted appropriately at the capacity within the NDMD/District Administrations.

## Specific Recommendations

* UNDP should continue to facilitate a process of developing cross government consensus on the roles and responsibilities in disaster response as well as SOPs through a workshop process similar to that which was facilitated in the simulation exercises.
* DRM Info is an excellent resource for presenting data for use in relation to other policy objectives closely related to DRM. As well information on population data and disaster risks, the Program also provides information on land use including 5 different types of land use. This would be useful for the Departments of Environment, Agriculture and Forestry and also for use in programs as such as National Plan of Action on Climate Change (NAPA) and Seeds of Life. The role of managing DRM Info requires specialist GIS/IT skills. It may not be appropriate to train a staff member from the NDOC to take on the responsibility. NDMD and UNDP need to work out how the responsibility will be covered off in the longer-term. UNDP should continue to support the NDOC to maintain this Program as a resource for a broader network of Users.
* More accompaniment will also be needed in the Districts if the use of the tools introduced by the Project is to be integrated into daily work. The placement of an AYAD in Bobonaro is a positive initiative. Consideration should be given as to how to facilitate accompaniment in Lautem as well. There is currently a Concern staff member who is being seconded to the GoTL Lautem District Administration. It might be possible to develop some synergies between the UNDP and the Concern program whereby the Concern staff member also supported the operationalisation of DRM Info, the DOF and the Damage Assessment Database in Lautem.
* In the Districts, the there is potential for use of DRM Info to be linked more closely to community led disaster risk analysis processes which have been facilitated by NGOs.
* An issue that requires clarification is what should be the precise role of NDOC in receiving, interpreting and communicating meteorological and seismic data and therefore, what level of training they require. UNDP should seek clarification with the NDMD on this matter.
* The NDOCs’ early warning system for seismic events, particularly tsunamis, should be urgently improved. This includes ensuring appropriate communications equipment is available, working and correctly manned. UNDP should support the development of such as system as an urgent priority.

# Conclusion

The *Disaster Risk Management and Institutional and Operational Systems Development* project aimed to support the development of the foundational elements of a DRRM system in Timor-Leste through the provision of tools to strengthen the NDOC and establish DDOCs in two districts. The Project supported the development of SOPs, a methodology for disaster risk assessment, a methodology for assessing damage following a disaster (DOF) and a database for entering information on disasters. The project also aimed to strengthen coordination and communication systems for DRRM across the Government and support the mainstreaming of DRRM which is a key aspect of the NDRMP. In addition the project also supported awareness raising of DRRM among the public and the community.

The innovations introduced by the Project have the potential to significantly strengthen DRM and the Project Staff worked hard to produce a large number of outputs. They also facilitated a large number of training events. However, the integration of the tools into the work practices of counterparts was mitigated. There were a number of reasons for this including the short time-frame of the project. There were a range of issues relating to the institutional context including lack of consensus among counterparts over roles and responsibilities and issues with work planning and management as well as human resource, logistics and financial management and lack of an IT culture and communication bottlenecks. These affected the ability of the innovations to be fully absorbed into work practices.

However, with further follow up the Project innovations could be integrated into the work of Counterparts with benefit to their capacity. The continuation of the use of Damage Assessment Database and the DRM Info would enhance the NDOCs capacity to act as a source of information and data on disasters and disaster risks which would enhance disaster reduction and programming in DRM but also in enhancing Food Security, sustainable natural resources management and climate change adaptation undertaken by other sectors. Moreover, the gains made in stimulating interest in cross-agency coordination in DRM could be further developed with more support. More pressure is required, however, for high level engagement to build the necessary momentum on this.

Moreover, DRM should continue to be a priority for UNDP due to the detrimental effect that disasters have on recovery and development including the livelihood of community members in Timor-Leste many of whom are food insecure and the potential devastating effect of a large scale disaster.

A future intervention should seek to build on the innovations introduced through the first project. It should also take more of an institutional strengthening approach, recognising the systems and processes into which DRM is integrated and trying to strengthen these. A Capacity Development Strategy is required. To improve counterpart ownership, Project plans should be linked to Counterpart plans. This will be challenging as work/operational planning is still under development in Timor-Leste. Alternatively, focus should be on strengthening NDMD capacity in work planning and management (which were initially within the scope of the AusAID-funded project implemented by IOM).

A second phase would also do well to focus on strengthening aspects of the National Disaster Risk Management Policy where implementation is more active. UNDP should encourage the Government to think strategically about policy implementation and address questions as to how the timetable and funding for rolling out DDOCs will be implemented.

UNDP needs to take care in moving on aspects of policy implementation where there is actually little consensus on roles and responsibilities between different stakeholders and should prioritise support for consensus building.

# Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

**Position Title:** Consultant:Evaluation, Disaster Risk Management Project

**Mission Duration:** Threeweeks (15 working days)

**Contract type:** SSA

**Expected starting date:** Late January or early February 2010

**Duty Station:** Dili, Timor-Leste (with travel to districts, Bobonaro and Lautem)

**Organisation:** Crisis Prevention and Recovery (CPR) Unit, UNDP

1. **BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Timor-Leste is prone to a number of hazards due to its geographical location, topography and recent history of conflict. Accordingly, the Council of Ministers highlighted the pressing need for developing and strengthening institutional and standard operational systems that link sub-national and central government institutions, vulnerable communities and civil society organizations, and support the operational implementation of the National Policy on Disaster Risk Management and decentralization of services (National Disaster Risk Management Policy, March 2008).

UNDP, in partnership with the National Disaster Management Directorate (NDMD) under the Ministry of Social Solidarity, is implementing a one-year project entitled “Disaster Risk Management Institutional and Operational Systems Development”, co-funded by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid Department (ECHO). The project supports the implementation of the National Policy through capacity development of the National Disaster Operations Centre (NDOC) and establishing District Disaster Operations Centres (DDOCs) in Bobonaro and Lautem districts. The project also intends to facilitate the flow of information from the centre to the district level, and to raise awareness of disaster risk and support preparedness of communities, as well as partners including *Chefes de Sucos*, District Administrations, line ministries, civil society and media.

**2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION**

The overall objective of this Final Evaluation is to review progress towards the project’s objectives and results, assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of implementation, identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation, and provide recommendations on design modifications and specific actions that would increase the effectiveness and impact of future similar initiatives. In pursuit of the overall objectives, the following key issues will be addressed during the Final Evaluation of the project:

* Assess the extent to which the project achieved its overall objectives;
* Assess the extent to which the outputs/results were achieved;
* Assess the extent to which the project contributed to the relevant outputs of the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan;
* Describe the management processes and appropriateness;
* Review the implementation of the project monitoring and evaluation framework and processes;
* Review the risk assessment and management of the project;
* Describe and assess networks and partnerships in support of the implementation of the project;
* Assess the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project;
* Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach;
* Describe the main lessons that have emerged; and
* Provide a set of recommendations for future cooperation between UNDP and the Ministry of Social Solidarity in the area of DRM, including project design and arrangements.

**3. EXPECTED OUTPUTS**

1. **Executive summary and preliminary report:** The consultant will present a summary of evaluation conclusions and preliminary recommendations at a debriefing meeting with relevant stakeholders. This meeting will be organised by the Crisis Prevention and Recovery Unit to share the preliminary recommendations and receive feedback from the national government counterpart.

1. **Evaluation Report:** The consultant will submit an evaluation report on the project highlighting: achievements, constraints, lessons learned and recommendations for ensuring sustainability of project outcomes and for future cooperation.

The final report incorporating stakeholders’ comments shall be submitted by the consultant no later than one week after the end of the in-country mission. The consultants should follow the ‘table of contents’ laid out below detailing the minimum reporting requirements for the final report.

**Evaluation Report Format:**

The Evaluation Report should contain the following:

* Title Page
* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Table of contents, including list of annexes
* Executive summary
* Introduction – Background and context of the programme
* Description of the programme – Its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
* Purpose of the evaluation
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Findings
* Lessons learnt
* Recommendations
* Conclusions
* Annexes

**4. METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION APPROACH**

The Final Evaluation will be done through a combination of processes including a desk study, selected site visits and interviews involving stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The methodology for the evaluation is envisaged to cover the following areas:

* Desk review of all relevant project documentation;
* Consultations with NDMD and relevant partners;
* Discussions with the Senior Management of UNDP and staff of the CPR Unit;
* Discussions with district officials involved with DDMCs/DDOCs, held during field visits to the two pilot districts, Bobonaro and Lautem;
* Consultation meetings and interviews with beneficiaries.

# Annex 2: List of Interviews and Meetings held

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position, Organisation** | **Date** |
| James Hardman | Project Manager, UNDP DRM Project | 27/1/10 |
| Lorenzo Xavier | Head, NDOC | 1/2/10 |
| Sophia Cason | Former Communications Adviser MSS | 2/2/10 |
| Jacinto Gomes de Deus | Secretary of State for Social Assistance and Natural Disaster | 2/2/10 |
| Martino and Joao Carlos | NDOC Staff | 3/2/10 |
| Aurelio Guterres | Policy and Planning Adviser, NDMD | 3/2/10 |
| Philippe Schneider | UNMIT, Humanitarian Coordination Unit | 4/2/10 |
| Jose Monteiro, Coordinator DDMC  Tadin Lopes, Sec. SDDMC Los Palos SD  Domingos Lorquasi, Coordinator SDDMC  Hermangildo Dac, OSAD  Sabino A Samila, DDMC Member  Osorio Pereira, DDMC Member | Lautem DDMC | 5/2/10 |
| Alec | Concern, Los Palos | 5/2/10 |
| Fiona Hamilton | Social Protection Adviser, National Directorate for Social Assistance, MSS | 7/2/10 |
| Francisco Rosario | Director, NDMD | 8/2/10 |
| Peter Agnew | Project Manager WFP | 9/2/10 |
|  | Maliana DDMC | 10/2/10 |
| Rishi Aryal | GIS Specialist UNDP DRM Project | 12/2/10 |
| Fransisco Rosario  Aurelio Guterres  Lourenco Xavier  Joao Carlos | Director, NDMD  Policy Adviser, NDMD  Department Head, NDOC  Staff, NDOC | 12/2/10 |
| Presentation of Evaluation Findings to UNDP | UNDP CPR Unit  UNDP Senior Management | 11/2/10 |

# 

# Annex 3: Project Logframe

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of the Action** | Disaster Risk Management InstitutionalandOperational Systems Developmentin Timor-Leste | | | |
| **Principal Objective** | Establish basic systems for DRRM in Dili, Bobonaro and Lautem to minimize casualties, loss of lives, capital and environmental assets in vulnerable communities | | | |
|  | **Intervention Logic** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | **Sources of Verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Specific Objective** | 1. Strengthen disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) systems in Dili, Bobonaro and Lautem districts. | * NDOC and DDOCs in Bobonaro and Lautem are operational | * Published data (ex. Maps, alerts and regular weather updates) | * Volatile security situation * National budget constraints in 2008 particularly for DRM[[10]](#footnote-10) * Continued political commitment to DRM reflected in the national budget for sustainability |
| **Results** | * 1. NDOC strengthened and 2 new DDOCs established in Bobonaro and Lautem along with necessary operational systems and mechanisms | * Detailed capacity assessment completed to refine the project strategy and define specific equipment and training needs * Standard operating procedures (SOPs) developed * A minimum of 2 stakeholder consultation meetings held per participating district * A minimum of 2 training workshops on SOPs held per participating district | * DRRM capacity assessment report and proposed action plan * Manual of standard operating procedures * Progress report on the implementation of the capacity development plan * Records of meetings * Training modules and workshop reports | * Lack of basic human resources * Lack of basic infrastructure (Internet connection, equipment, continuous power supply, transport, etc.) |
| * 1. Communication channels are well established between communities, DDOCs, NDOC, and other line government entities for efficient early warning, contingency planning and response | * One national workshop to discuss the current and planned DRM institutional machinery as per the newly adopted NDRMP * Guidelines and codes of practice for communication, information management, and coordination developed in a participatory approach * A minimum of 2 simulation exercises per participating district to insure that institutional coordination mechanisms and procedures amongst various government entities and partners are operational | * Workshop report and media coverage * Compendium of guidelines and codes of practice * Records of simulation exercises | * Weak coordination among various Government agencies at central and district levels * Fledgling civil society organisations * Lack of basic human resources * Lack of basic infrastructure (Internet connection, equipment, continuous power supply, transport, etc.) |
| * 1. Awareness raised on DRM amongst partners including *Chefes de Sucos*, District Administrations, line ministries, civil society, and media, and DRM mainstreamed in Government planning | * A minimum of 2 Government plans including references to DRRM * A minimum of 1 training workshop per participating district on DRRM as a cross-cutting issue * A minimum of 1 training for journalists and reporters for better coverage and access to information * 2009 financial planning and budget estimation for DRRM * A minimum of 6 DRRM features in Media and/ or public debates | * Official planning documents including references to DRRM * Training modules and records of meetings * Draft 2009 DRM budget * Media reports and debates on DRRM | * Poor understanding of DRRM issues by lead ministries, media and the public * Weak coordination among various Government agencies at central and district levels * Fledgling civil society organisations |
| **Activities** | * + 1. Map stakeholders and partners both in government and civil society to identify information, coordination and communication gaps and define possible shortcomings in the chain-of-command as identified by rules and regulations both at national and sub-national levels     2. Assess capacity for DRRM both in Government and civil society (NGOs and CVTL) to identify strengths, weakness/needs, opportunities, and threats     3. Based on the assessment results, develop and implement a capacity development plan to strengthen human resources and systems for better information flow, communication and coordination on DRRM     4. Undertake procurement of necessary hardware/ software systems for NDOC and DDOCs for data collection and analysis, and early warning     5. Organize consultation meetings with various stakeholders in participating districts to collect baseline information, and to eventually discuss and validate different proposals or scenarios identified following desk studies     6. Develop SOPs for priority national hazards and corresponding guidelines on communication, information management and coordination     7. Undertake training on SOPs for stakeholders in participating districts     8. Capacity development and on-the-job mentoring of NDOC and DDOCs staff to undertake multi-hazard, and vulnerability risk analyses. | | | Pre-conditions   * Human resources recruited by Government * Physical premises are allocated for DDOCs |
| **Activities** | * + 1. Organise a national workshop to review and discuss existing and planned institutional DRM machinery, including roles, responsibilities, challenges and linkages among different actors     2. Assist the Government in developing basic guidelines and codes of practice for information management, communication and coordination     3. Organise simulation exercises to test and refine coordination mechanisms and procedures     4. Identify linkages with regional international organisations for future cooperation on early warning and DRRM, particularly with neighbouring countries | | | Pre-conditions   * Continued Government commitment and leadership in strengthening DRM coordination and communication |
| **Activities** | * + 1. Organise training on DRRM as a cross-cutting/ inter-ministerial issue in participating districts and develop in consultation with partners a relevant training module for newly elected/ appointed District Administrators and *Chefes de Sucos*.     2. Organize a workshop for lead ministries to discuss mainstreaming DRRM in government planning (ex. National Development Plan, national and sub-national budgets, etc.)     3. Implement a national information campaign to socialize DRM procedures, information points, communication procedures, and coordination mechanisms for more active engagement of the public in the national DRM system.     4. Assist NDMD in undertaking its financial planning and drawing its 2009 budget for DRRM.     5. Develop and deliver a training module on DRM to journalists/ reporters for a wider socialization of DRM issues in collaboration with the on-going UNDP Media Project. | | | Pre-conditions   * DRM continues to be a national priority. |

# 

# Annex 4: List of Training Sessions Facilitated by the Project

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Activity** | **Audience** | **Venue** | **Length** |
| 8 July | Workshop on Ministry DRM development | Ministry Focal Points | MSS | Half day |
| 15 July | Follow-up workshop on Ministry DRM development and action plan | Ministry Focal Points | MSS | Half day |
| 22 July | District introductory session on DDOC procedures and damage observation | DDMC and Chefes de Suco | Maliana (Sub-district Office) | Half day |
| 30 July | District introductory session on DDOC procedures and damage observation | DDMC and Chefes de Suco | Los Palos (in Concern trng course) | Half day |
| 11 Aug | Workshop with NDMD to agree NDOC structure and Ministry involvement | NDOC, DRM proj. & other NDMD staff | ETDA | 1 day |
| 24-25 Aug | Training on NDOC manual | NDOC staff  & MSS extras | MSS | 2 days |
| 27 Aug | District exercise in Lautem, incl. DRM, risk assess’t, DRMInfo | DDOC Lautem | Los Palos | 1 day |
| 3 Sept | Ministry Focal Point meeting to prepare for National Exercise and arrange DRM teams | Ministry Focal Points | MSS | Half day |
| 9 Sept | District exercise in Lautem, incl. DRM, risk assess’t, DRMInfo | DDOC Bob, Chefes de Suco | Maliana | 1 day |
| 15 Sept | National exercise (with all key DRM stakeholders, incl. UNMIT, Clusters, ISF, Civ. Soc.) | All ministries, UNMIT, ISF, Clusters, CS | Dili, Delta Nova | 1 day |
| 30 Sept | Training on damage observation, in conjunction with DDMC meeting in Dili | All district DDMCs | ETDA, Dili | Half day |
| 30 Sept | Exercise on developing DDOC procedures using disaster scenario | Lautem & Bobanaro DDMCs | ETDA, Dili | Half day |
| 15 Oct | MS Access Database training | NDOC | NDOC, Dili | 1 day |
| 4-6 Nov | DRMInfo user training | NDOC and DDOC staff | ETDA, Dili | 3 days |
| 13 Nov | Ministry Focal Point meeting to follow up on Nat Ex 15 Sept and plan next one on 23 Nov | Ministry Focal Points (plus) | MSS | Half day |
| 20 Nov | NDOC exercise. (preparation for 23 Nov) | NDOC/NDMD | MSS | 1 day |
| 23 Nov | National DM Coordination Exercise | All ministries, UNMIT, ISF, Clusters, CS | MSS | 1 day |
| 1 Dec | Journalist training on DRM and Climate Change | Media from Dili and Districts | Dili | 1 day |
| 2-3 Dec | DDOC/DDMC exercise | Bobonaro DDMC | Maliana | 1 day |
| 10 Dec | DDOC/DDMC exercise | Lautem DDMC | Lospalos | 1 day |
| 12 Jan | DDOC/DDMC DRMInfo refresher training | Bobonaro DDMC | Maliana | 1 day |
| 14 Jan | Database refresher training | NDOC | Dili | Half day |
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