
eSINGLE FORM FOR HUMANITARIAN AID ACTIONS

2013/01201/FR/01/01

REFERENCES

HIP/Decision Reference

ECHO/-HF/BUD/2014/91000

Agreement number:

ECHO/-HF/BUD/2014/91044

Action type

Non-emergency action

Document type

Final report

Submission date

04/04/2016

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Name of Humanitarian organisation

UNDP-USA

1.2 Title of the Action

Building Climate Resilience in Drylands through Community-Based Resilience Analysis

1.3 Narrative summary

The project, entitled in short as Community Based Resilience Analysis (CoBRA) Phase II, builds directly on the achievements made through CoBRA Phase I under DRRAP. It aims to strengthen the national/regional and other institutional capacities to align their planning and programming frameworks with the local needs for long-term climate resilient, sustainable development.

In the face of recurrent disasters, tremendous efforts have been made in the region to integrate various actions in different operational sectors under one umbrella of 'resilience building' as highlighted in the Nairobi Strategy adopted in 2011 by the IGAD and its Member States. With increasing investments in the region under the IDDRSI framework, there is need to measure their impacts towards resilience building. However, despite progress made in identifying a set of indicators to be commonly used for measuring the changes in levels of resilience, these analytical works have largely been carried out in a highly top-down, supply-driven manner with limited opportunities for local populations and practitioners to participate in the process in a meaningful way.

In close partnership with relevant partners, the project aims to fill in these gaps using the experiences of the CoBRA Phase I, including the CoBRA methodology, one of the first practical tools developed to measure community level resilience, focusing on the two key result areas:

1) Scope and mode of partnership between the IGAD and its Member States clarified and strengthened in resilience impact measurement and monitoring and future planning;

2) Institutional capacity on climate resilience mainstreaming enhanced at national level in Kenya based on the EDE MTP pillar priorities.

1.3.1 [INT] Narrative summary

The project has successfully formalized the partnership with key government and inter-government agencies, and integrated the planned activities into their broad strategies and plans. At regional level, Component 1 activities have been carried out under the overall framework of the IGAD-led RAU initiative in close synergy and coordination with other RAU partner organizations. At national level in Kenya, Component 2 activities were mainstreamed into the Common Programming Framework (CPF) for the EDE MTP Pillar 6. National Drought Management Authority (NDMA), which acts as the chair of Pillar 6, has been providing the direct technical and logistical guidance on the implementation of the activities both at national level and in the pilot counties as well as the support in enhancing complementarity and coordination between CoBRA II and other related programmes and projects in Kenya. Efforts have also been made to strengthen the linkage of CoBRA II to other ongoing UNDP initiatives so as to ensure that various outputs to be delivered through the project will be adequately absorbed into, taken over and/or expanded by these UNDP/non-UNDP partners.

Some critical delay has been observed in the project implementation within both Component 1 and 2, partially as a result of the slow planning and decision-making processes by the government/non-governmental partners to which CoBRA II had to align to. The project team has been deliberating internally about how to strike an adequate balance between the two need: fast tracking the implementation, and taking time to adopt participatory and inclusive approach and engage a highly dynamic and diverse group of stakeholders. It has also began consulting the matter with the donor focal persons in Nairobi so as to explore the feasibility of various contingency measures, including the no-cost extension of the project.

1.3.2 [FIN] Narrative summary

The project successfully completed all the planned activities and achieved all the envisaged objective and result target as explicated demonstrated by the tangible indicators/deliverables with highly quality, building directly on the experiences of the ECHO-funded CoBRA Phase I project. The project successfully facilitated the development of frameworks and tools concerning drought disaster resilience building - including the resilience measurement/analysis learning manuals, resilience investment mapping user guide, drought resilience M&E frameworks - and built the resilience measurement/analysis capacity of over 80 organizations.

The final project evaluation reconfirmed the project design as adequate with generally good correlation between results, indicators and the reported achievements. The project was found to be relevant to the ECHO 2014 HIP, and is also found to be relevant for the regional (IGAD) and national (Kenya) efforts to prevent or reduce the impact of recurrent disasters, and to ensure a more coordinated and result-oriented approach to resilience activities. Implementation of the project has been effective with professional and participatory consultations at all levels. The GPC was evaluated by the partners to have contributed to produce quality documents, providing a solid foundation for future work.

All the outputs and outcomes generated through the project are fully owned by the respective formal (inter-)government organizations and their partners at regional (e.g., IGAD), national (e.g., Kenya EDE Secretariat) and county (i.e., Turkana and Baringo governments) levels. The project efforts and the follow up points were adequately communicated with and taken over by these counterpart agencies.

Annex 1-1 provides the list of Annexes to this final report and Annex 1-2 outlines the list of acronyms used in this report.

1.4 Area of intervention

<u>World area</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Location</u>
Africa	KENYA	Horn of Africa	County, National & Regional Support

1.4.1 [INT] Area of intervention

The project intervention area remains unchanged: i.e., in the Horn of Africa region with special focus on Kenya.

1.4.2 [FIN] Area of intervention

The project intervention areas remained unchanged as originally proposed in the E-Single Form. The project was implemented: 1) in the Horn of Africa for Result 1; and 2) in Kenya for Result 2 working both at national (Output 2.1 and 2.2) and county (Output 2.2) levels.

1.5 Dates and duration of the Action

Start date of the Action

01/04/2014

Duration of the Action in months

21

Duration of the Action in days

-

Start date for eligibility of expenditure

01/04/2014

Justify the duration of the eligibility period before the start date

-

2. HUMANITARIAN ORGANISATION IN THE AREA OF INTERVENTION

2.1 Presence in the area

UNDP has been long present both at regional (i.e., Horn of Africa [HoA]) and national (i.e., Kenya) levels. With its unique blend of capacity and mandates, UNDP has been playing a key role at disaster recovery stage, as has been demonstrated during the HoA 2010-2011 food and nutrition crisis to date, in a manner to ensure a seamless transition from emergency to normal phases, linking the humanitarian and development actors and contributing to the enhanced coherence between their works.

At regional level, UNDP has been working closely with inter-governmental agencies such as IGAD, UN partners, NGOs and donor communities to support the common thrust of using the recovery phase as a platform for "building back better", thus further promoting risk reduction and long-term resilience. UNDP has been a core member of the Global Alliance for Action for Drought Resilience and Growth since 2012. Recently, UNDP also reaffirmed its strong commitment to the Nairobi Declaration of the Head of State and Government of 9 September 2011 and IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) through the development of the Strengthening the Capacity of IGAD in Building Resilience in the HoA project (USD 6 million).

Furthermore, UNDP, through the Drylands Development Centre (DDC), has been providing leading support to the ongoing regional/national analytical efforts to measure and monitor resilience. In 2012-3, with the financial support of ECHO, DDC facilitated the participatory development of the CoBRA methodology. CoBRA aimed at helping dryland communities prone to drought and other natural/man-made disasters and their development/humanitarian partners in the HoA to better understand the key contributing factors for long-term resilience building and analyze changes in the communities' resilience levels due to various shocks and stresses. Through the extensive field trialling and experiences in Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia, CoBRA has been proven as an innovative and practical decision support tool which provides dryland communities with the opportunities to effectively participate in highly technical resilience debates on:

- How the concept of resilience should be incorporated into planning, programming and monitoring processes at different levels; and

- What types of services and interventions might be prioritized by which agencies/sectors.

Building on the CoBRA experiences, since late 2013, UNDP was selected formally as one of the partners to support the implementation of IGAD-led Resilience Analysis Unit (RAU) initiative.

At national level, UNDP Country Office (CO) in Kenya has been serving as long-term partners to the disaster/drought risk reduction (DRR) focal government agencies, i.e. former Office of the President/Ministry of Special Programme and Ministry of Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands and current National Drought Management Authority (NDMA). The CO assists the government in attaining national/local goals and objectives of climate-resilient green economy through policy advisory services, capacity enhancement support and implementation of DRR initiatives on the ground, etc. based on the comprehensive Strategy for DRR and Recovery 2014-18. It also contributes substantially to the development of annual Humanitarian Action Plans, acting as a bridge between humanitarian and longer-term development efforts, through which to improve harmonized actions among the government and other partners (Emergency Humanitarian Response Plan for 2013 as the latest joint plans). CoBRA assessment in Kenya was implemented within this broad CO DRR strategy and the CoBRA findings and recommendations have been integrated into the COs' catalytic support to enhance government capacity in multi-sectoral DRR policy and institutional framework development, climate resilience mainstreaming, coordination, knowledge management, etc.

2.2 Synergies with other actions

Phase I of CoBRA was implemented in strong synergy with other ECHO funded projects under the DRRAP framework. Coordination within DRRAP as well as with other relevant DRR-focused programmes/projects was largely facilitated by FAO and REGLAP (recently transformed into DLCI) at regional, national and thematic (e.g., Community-DRR, Evidence-based DRR Advocacy, etc.) levels. The project status and progress were regularly updated, and harmonization and synchronization of ongoing/planned project activities was carried out whenever and wherever needed among the partners in response to changing regional, national and local agendas, priorities and circumstances.

The proposed project will continually maintain close coordination and synergies with relevant partners and their projects utilizing various channels of networks to which UNDP belongs both at the HoA regional (e.g., RAU, Food Security and Nutrition Working Group, UN Inter-Agency Group on DRR, etc.) and national (e.g., Working Groups of the Drought Risk Management and Ending Drought Emergencies Medium Term Plan for 2013-17 [EDE MTP], etc.). In view of the nature of the project which places a strong focus on climate resilience mainstreaming, the project's harmonization and coordination efforts will be undertaken based on the clear guidance of the key inter-governmental (i.e., IGAD) and governmental (e.g., NDMA) project partners under the IDDRSI RPP and CPP frameworks.

The project will also maintain flexibility in the scope of the action to allow for timely adjustment, refinement and improvement of the implementation process as the project evolves, in order to maximize its effectiveness, efficiency and impacts. Indeed, CoBRA is by nature a dynamic and evolving methodology, which offers space for continuous review and customization of the implementation modalities. Applying a multi-stakeholder participatory approach, the tool brings together a wide range of voices, perspectives and learning needs of users (i.e., government, UN and NGO partners) into a coherent whole.

The project is fully aware of the other complementary initiatives ongoing which are all perceived to make critical contributions to the region-wide efforts of measuring resilience at different levels, to a different degree and in different disciplinary contexts. As mentioned earlier, UNDP formally became a member of the RAU initiative and is currently working with the IGAD, FAO, UNICEF and WFP to finalize the joint programme document, which includes the discussion on how to incorporate the CoBRA concepts and approaches into the broader RAU framework.

Other relevant partners/initiatives with which UNDP has been in communication include, among others, ILRI-led Technical Consortium for Building Resilience to Drought in the HoA, Norwegian Refugee Council's integrated drought-flood pastoral livelihoods model, IUCN's ecosystem-based resilience management strategies. Positive discussions have been underway with these partners to enhance the coordination among the highly-linked and mutually-reinforcing works with the shared understanding that no single approach can be universally applicable and work for everyone. At the inception of the project,

an in-depth joint analysis will be conducted to: 1) take stock of/consolidate the experiences and lessons learnt from these initiatives, 2) jointly assess their comparative advantages (i.e., what worked) as well as the gaps and weaknesses (i.e., what did not work); and 3) identify the most suitable approach to align and synchronize the tools and models in line with the needs and interests of various potential users of the resilience measurement. This exercise will ensure to avoid the reinvention of the wheel, duplicative efforts and thus possible overlaps between donor supports, while contributing directly and tremendously to the ECHO's objective to increase the resilience of the most vulnerable and exposed people.

2.3 [FIN] Report on synergies with other actions

The project originally planned to maintain partnership and synergies with other actions through the Drought Risk Reduction Action Plan (DRRAP) framework, which was created in the Horn of Africa region under the ECHO 2012 HIP. Most of the DRRAP partners during ECHO 2012 HIP, however, did not receive funding for ECHO 2014 HIP, including the FAO which facilitated the broad DRRAP partnership coordination and communication framework. Accordingly, since the onset of the project, synergies with other humanitarian and development actions related to drought disaster resilience building had been promoted under the formal mechanisms of IDDRSI RPP and CPP.

At regional level, in support of the IDDRSI implementation, IGAD and the UN partner agencies jointly created the RAU initiative with the financial support of the ECHO channeled through FAO). UNDP participated in this joint initiative so that the project will fully build on and complement ongoing FAO-ECHO project. All the regional project activities were implemented as an integral part of the Unit's work so as to maximize the harmonization and coordination of all drought resilience measurement/analysis related works among the RAU partners. The project team also maintained close communication with other relevant ECHO-funded organizations working particularly in the thematic fields of disaster risk reduction (DRR) and disaster resilience. In particular the project worked in strong partnership with UNISDR with the aim to mutually inform and improve the regional DRR and drought disaster resilience building efforts.

At national level, the project support was mainstreamed into the framework of IDDRSI CPP in Kenya, i.e., EDE. Coordination and communication channels with other development and humanitarian partners were created and strengthened using the EDE Pillar arrangements, since most of the ECHO-funded partners are the members of one or some of the EDE Pillars. For example, the ECHO-funded partner of DLCI serves as the co-chair of EDE Pillar 6.

As proposed in Section 2.2, at the onset of the project, the project team participated in the informal joint assessment to take stock of status and progress in qualitative/subjective resilience measurement works/studies/researches with particular focus on the HoA region, together with RAU and other stakeholders. This exercise helped build and strengthen partnership with the key policy/programme/research institutes working on different aspects of drought disaster resilience building and its findings served as a foundation based on which to develop the RAU's analytical approach and principles (Annex 2.3).

3. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

3.1 Needs and risk analysis

3.1.1 Date(s) of assessment

September 2012 - April 2014

3.1.2 Assessment methodology

The assessment has been led by the UNDP and a wide range of government, UN and non-governmental and donor agencies participated. The methodologies applied to this exercise include:

- Review of existing literature on resilience concepts and impact assessment;
- Series of face-to-face consultations at 2nd Africa-Asia Drought Adaptation Forum held on 1-2 October 2012 in Nairobi, Kenya, attended by over 60 participants (Annex 3.1.2-1), and 5th Africa Drought Adaptation Forum held on 11-12 February 2013 in Arusha, Tanzania, attended by some 150 participants (Annex 3.1.2-2), and various other forums at national, regional and global levels;
- Email/online discussions with technical experts working in the fields of resilience analysis/measurements in the HoA and beyond;
- Pilot field trialling of CoBRA methodology in Marsabit, Kenya (November 2012 and June 2013 participated by 18 and 13 local government, UN and NGO partners respectively), Turkana, Kenya (June-July 2013 participated by 21 local partners), Karamoja, Uganda (November-December 2012 and July 2013 participated by 6 and 26 local partners respectively), Kajiado, Kenya (August 2013 participated by 19 local partners) and Yabello, Ethiopia (December 2013 participated by 19 local partners).
- CoBRA results joint review and feedback workshops locally in Marsabit (September 2013), Turkana (October 2013), Karamoja (October 2013), Kajiado (November 2013) and Yabello (December 2013) all attended by the local community representatives (e.g., chiefs, elders, womens'/youth groups, etc.), CoBRA field implementation partner organizations and other technical stakeholders.
- National CoBRA validation workshops in Kampala (November 2013), Nairobi (December 2013) and Addis Ababa (April 2014).

Please also refer to Annex 3.1.2-3 for the detailed descriptions of the results and findings of the CoBRA assessments in Kenya and Uganda.

3.1.3 Problem, needs and risk analysis

The frequency and scale of disasters in the HoA has put the humanitarian system and donor resources under considerable pressure in the last decade. The impact of and recovery from disasters has taken its toll on the development priorities of governments and communities alike. Under these circumstances, the 2010-2011 food and nutrition crisis in the HoA has shone a spotlight on the term "resilience". This is largely perceived as a positive step, since it helps fill in the gaps of traditional "risk" and "vulnerability" oriented approaches, which are often branded with negative connotations, by shifting the focus of the government, UN, NGO and donor partners to potentials, opportunities and capacities of disaster-prone communities and populations to cope with inevitable future shocks and stresses.

Careful assessments during the implementation of DRRAP, however, revealed various controversies surrounding the concept particularly in the HoA region. Firstly, every single organization has its own understanding and interpretation of resilience. While the concept has the great potential to integrate various actions in different operational sectors under one umbrella with a common vision, these divergences tend to make the term an empty shell, leaving the impression that resilience is everything. Consequently, identifying where and how to build resilience in practice is proving to be elusive. Highly broad-based and diverse foci of IDDRSI, in fact, raise questions among implementing partners to what extent the interventions on the ground will actually make changes, in comparison to past humanitarian/development efforts. The existing fragmented and project-based approach in the HoA, as demonstrated in the upsurge of numerous "resilience" projects with little coordination and synergies with each other, clearly shows that there is more confusion than clarity. Even if an organization stress its contribution to resilience building, it continues to work in the field where it has the most experience and greatest expertise, which might not be resilient-building at all for other organizations.

Secondly, existing resilience definitions often place strong emphasis on recovering from the effects of shocks/stresses and bounce back to original status. These interpretations make the concept rather conservative (i.e., resisting change), instead of innovative and progressive. Narrow focus on short-term aspects of resilience with little attention to long-term, non-equilibrium aspects of resilience, such as transformative capacity of the populations to go beyond responding to shocks/stresses and bounce back better, may partially account for the existing challenge of increasing the continuum and coherence between humanitarian and development works under the resilience conceptual frameworks.

The lack of consensus and consistency as to the most appropriate approach to measure resilience undermines the ability of stakeholders to objectively monitor and verify the success (or failure) of their efforts for programming to build resilience. In this context, a number of initiatives emerged in recent years to address the controversies pertinent to the resilience conceptual backgrounds, by identifying a set of composite indicators which can be commonly used to measure the changes in levels of resilience at different levels. Despite much progress made in these efforts conceptually, some of the analytical works have been carried out in a highly top-down, supply-driven manner with the strong leadership of highly academic and technical professionals. Limited opportunities have been provided for the populations who live in multi-stress environments and are simultaneously impacted by interrelated shocks as well as the practitioners working on a daily basis with these affected communities to participate in these highly technical resilience analytical discussions in a meaningful manner.

Concerns have been raised that the standardization and generalization of resilience concepts/indicators may generate a risk of losing contextualized focus and creating blurriness of interventions, masking some of the highly localized key challenges and priorities. There is a strong need to bring in a mechanism through which to address the key divides around the resilience agendas among the stakeholders, between humanitarian and development efforts and between top-down and bottom-up as well as technical/analytical and practical efforts.

3.1.4 Response analysis

CoBRA was introduced in the HoA in 2012 in order to respond to the aforementioned divides and gaps, as one of the first practical analytical tools to measure community level resilience (Please refer to Annex 3.1.4-1 for CoBRA Conceptual Framework and Methodology and Annex 3.1.4-2 for CoBRA Implementation Guidelines). Building on the other existing complementary resilience assessment initiatives, CoBRA intended to identify the key building blocks or characteristics of community/household resilience and assess the attribution of local interventions in attaining these resilience characteristics. Through extensive pilot testing of the CoBRA methodology in Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia, the tool has increasingly been recognized as an essential ingredient to the ongoing resilience analysis and agenda setting processes. Some of the unique advantages and distinct values of CoBRA highlighted by the DRR focal governments in the intervention countries (e.g., DRMFSS in Ethiopia, NDMA in Kenya, OPM in Uganda, etc.) and other agencies, development/humanitarian partners and community representatives during the joint reviews of the CoBRA assessment results at local, national and regional levels include:

- It does not attempt to predefine the components or indicators of resilience. The participatory nature of the approach enables local communities to define their own characteristics of resilience and enables organizations to bypass the technical debates around which components or dimensions must be included to measure resilience.
- A CoBRA assessment identifies the local drivers of resilience (i.e., to bounce back or bounce back better) or non-resilience (i.e., bounce back worse or collapse), which helps practitioners to better plan and prioritize appropriate resources and context-specific interventions.
- The approach helps prioritize a relatively short list of context-specific/broadly applicable resilience characteristics, as compared with other models that attempt to map many more dimensions of resilience. This makes it more practical and feasible to implement.
- The methodology brings in the communities' voice and views with special focus on women and youth on what resilience looks like and which interventions and services they believe have (or would) best build their resilience vis-à-vis highly localized stresses and shocks as well as dynamic socio-economic and environmental changes the communities are witnessing. The assessment covers all the primary livelihood groups in the target location and help shed light on those populations which have largely been ignored in the past/ongoing DRR support such as pastoral drop-outs and urban/peri-urban dwellers.
- The approach identifies 'positive deviance', identifying which households are already resilient and how they achieved this state. This significantly builds our understanding of what resilience looks like in reality.
- CoBRA is one of the few methodologies that is developed to be used by any organization, both development and humanitarian, to practically measure resilience at community/household level. One of

the main comparative advantages of CoBRA stressed by the pilot users is its user-friendliness, which can be undertaken relatively quickly and cheaply without specific requirements in terms of technical and academic expertise. The generic nature of the information generated means it can be equally useful to all government/NGO or development and humanitarian actors in a local area.

With the clear reassurance demonstrated during the project phase I that local communities are able to make critical contributions to the ongoing resilience discourse, CoBRA is seen today as an important channel through which to ensure adequate engagement and ownership of shock/stress-affected populations in the local, national and regional resilience policy, planning and programming processes, including IDDRSI RPP and CPPs. Against this backdrop, the CoBRA project team remains under the high pressure to continuously provide the government, UN and NGO partners with policy and technical support in this field at different levels.

In order to ensure the sustainable results from the ongoing concerted efforts for resilience building in the HoA, further assistance is required, particularly in integrating the CoBRA tool and its results and findings into broader resilience measurement/analysis, M&E and knowledge management systems at national and regional levels. The experiences of and lessons learnt from CoBRA to date will, for example, help strengthen the RAU's qualitative, community-based and participatory approaches and better link the unit's regional efforts with national and local decision-makings and practical actions. Support has been also strongly needed to build the capacities of national/local government and other stakeholders to fully own and manage resilience measurement/analysis and integrate the results into M&E mechanisms without external assistance. As per the request of NDMA in Kenya, for example, UNDP became a member of EDE MTP Working Group 6 to provide technical assistance in areas of resilience measurement and analysis and evidence-based decision-making (Please refer to Annex 3.1.4-3 for the final TOR for the EDE MTP Group 6).

3.1.5 Previous evaluation or lessons learned exercise relevant for this Action

Yes

3.1.5.1 Brief summary

Final project evaluation of the CoBRA Phase I was conducted by an independent consultant on January-March 2014. It concluded that all the project results are relevant for achieving the objectives of the project and various project activities, such as the development of a tool for measuring resilience and related capacity building, awareness raising and policy advocacy works all contributed directly or indirectly to broaden the scope of DRR debates, planning and decision-making both at regional and national levels. It also noted that the project helped link the local communities who have been facing recurrent drought and other disasters and the technical stakeholders who have been leading the DRR policy-making, planning and programming exercises at broader scale. Leveraging from the key achievements and lessons learnt, the evaluation recommended the development of CoBRA Phase II, with the special focus on the areas which were not fully addressed during the Phase I. Please refer to Annex 3.1.5.1. for the full evaluation report.

3.1.6 [INT] Report On Needs Assessment

Building resilience to drought remains the high political priority in the HoA, as demonstrated by the continued commitments of the IGAD and its Member States to IDDRSI. However, there are still confusions and constraints on how to ensure that IDDRSI and other related programmes/projects contribute to improved abilities of affected communities to withstand, cope with, adapt to, and quickly recover from future stresses and shocks. Efforts have been made by the governments and other stakeholders to support RPP and CPPs technically and financially; yet attempts are largely limited to simply incorporating their existing humanitarian/development interventions into respective RPP/CPP pillars without the close examination of whether, how and to what extent these works lead to enhanced resilience of systems, communities and vulnerable populations.

IGAD-UN joint initiative of the RAU, which began its informal operation in May 2014 and was launched formally in November 2014, is considered as one of the key platforms through which to produce resilience assessment and analysis tools and harmonize resilience monitoring and evaluation (M&E) works in the region. It is also expected to inform the IDDRSI implementation processes and provide guidance in developing resilience-related strategies, plans and policies at different levels. Formal

participation of UNDP in the RAU, through the support of ECHO and building on the experiences of CoBRA Phase I, was deemed highly strategic. This move has been well received particularly by the countries where CoBRA Phase I was piloted, since CoBRA Phase II will help ensure that the assessment and analysis works to be undertaken by the RAU are adequately balanced in terms of quantitative and qualitative approaches, top-down and bottom-up processes and technical/academic and user-friendly/practical products.

Under the framework of the RAU and in close collaboration with other partners supporting IGAD Member States, such as the Technical Consortium for Building Resilience in the Horn of Africa, the Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group and various leading research institutes and academia, experimental efforts have been ongoing to establish the contextual disaster resilience baseline in pilot regions/counties/districts/woredas in the HoA. In late 2014, UNDP also supported the RAU team in organizing the Learning Needs Assessment workshop to help IGAD, its Member States and other relevant IDDRSI partners and stakeholders identify capacity requirements and constraints with respect to resilience measurement/analysis and programming. Results and lessons from these and other exercises form the important basis for all the envisaged CoBRA II project outputs and are considered among the critical steps towards the establishment of the evidence-based drought policymaking, planning and monitoring mechanisms in the region.

3.1.7 [FIN] Report On Needs Assessment

Need for continuous support in resilience measurement and analysis remained extremely high both at HoA regional level and Kenya national level throughout the project implementation period. IDDRSI is a long-term initiative with the implementation period of 15 years which is divided into three phases. While the Phase I of IDDRSI (2013-2018) reaches its turning point, there was no formal arrangement to undertake mid-term review of the initiative. IGAD and its Member States had not established a standardized mechanism and a common approach through which to assess the impacts of IDDRSI regional/county programmes on the resilience of communities affected by/prone to drought and other climate disasters.

As highlighted in the final project evaluation report (Annex 8.5-2), different actors have different definitions of what resilience is and how it is achieved. In addition, there has still been a tendency in the HoA to conceptualize resilience as the field of humanitarian actors and design activities within the short-term timeframe. Large number of the project partners who participated in the evaluation interviews, acknowledged the continuous engagement of UNDP in the resilience debate and works in the region, building on CoBRA Phase I experiences, which clearly demonstrate the strong interlinkages between resilience and sustainable development and thus brought to the table additional aspects of resilience. The project's contribution to bring in a longer-term perspective and a more qualitative measurement than the traditional quantitative measurements of resilience has been continually recognized as of critical use by these interviewees.

Support of the project in developing the IGAD-wide resilience measurement and analysis tool and IDDRSI regional/national M&E frameworks was recognized repeatedly as of critical importance at various fora. Given the high interest, the project team was required to constantly update the progress of the project activities to the IGAD Secretariat and IDDRSI Platform Coordination Unit at regional level as well as the EDE Steering Committee at national level. The Project status have also been regularly communicated with the development/humanitarian partners and donor through the EDE Secretariat, the main project counterpart in Kenya, at periodic EDE Pillar meetings and ASAL Donor Group meetings.

3.2 Beneficiaries

3.2.1 Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the Action

Individuals

48.000

Organisations

3.2.1.1 [FIN] Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the Action Individuals

48.000

Organisations

201

3.2.2 Estimated disaggregated data about direct beneficiaries (only for individuals)

	<u>Estimated % of target group</u>	<u>% of female (F)</u>	<u>% of male (M)</u>
Infants and young children (0-59 months)	- %	- %	- %
Children (5-17 years)	- %	- %	- %
Adults (18-49 years)	100 %	50 %	50 %
Elderly (> 50 years)	- %	- %	- %

3.2.2.1 [FIN] Disaggregated data about direct beneficiaries reached (only for individuals)

	<u>Estimated % of target group</u>	<u>% of female (F)</u>	<u>% of male (M)</u>
Infants and young children (0-59 months)	- %	- %	- %
Children (5-17 years)	- %	- %	- %
Adults (18-49 years)	100 %	50 %	50 %
Elderly (> 50 years)	- %	- %	- %

3.2.3 Does the action specifically target certain groups or vulnerabilities?

No

3.2.3.1 If yes, which groups or vulnerabilities?

-

3.2.3.2 [FIN] If yes, which groups or vulnerabilities?

-

3.2.4 Beneficiaries selection criteria

The primary beneficiaries of the project will be 1) the most vulnerable, disaster-affected/prone populations in dryland counties in Kenya and 2) the IGAD, DRR focal government and other partners working at regional level and in the IGAD Member States in the field of disaster/drought resilience enhancement.

In terms of the selection of the geographical target areas for the beneficiary group 1, from the perspective of the continuity of the support and maximization of impacts, the project will maintain its strategic foci of its local capacity development, policy advocacy and mainstreaming support on Turkana county, where CoBRA Phase I support was provided and where UNDP Kenya CO has a strong presence with ongoing DRR and

recovery interventions under the framework of the 3 year project entitled **Governance for DRR in Kenya** (Please refer to Annex 3.2.4 for the summary project document). The project team will consult closely with government partner agency (i.e., NDMA), relevant UN (particularly RAU) and NGO partners to select one additional priority most-at-risk counties to be targeted based on the progress in county devolution process, availability of resilience related baseline data and the willingness of county governments to own and lead the implementation of the project activities. The selection shall be in line with the HIP 2014 target regions for resilience/DRR oriented projects and correspond with the government's strategic priorities set out in the resilience policy/planning frameworks.

Beneficiaries in the beneficiary group 2 will be selected based on the past/current commitments of the individuals and institutions in the DRR fields at regional, national and local levels especially in disaster resilience assessment and analysis.

3.2.5 Beneficiaries involvement in the Action

The project will apply a participatory approach. Beneficiary group 1 will either 1) participate directly in the project activities, e.g., community-based resilience assessment/analysis exercises, such as focus group discussions and key informant interviews, and joint review/validation meetings of the assessment results, or 2) benefit through the process of their represented views and opinions on the local communities' resilience building needs and priorities being consolidated and mainstreamed into local and higher policy, planning and programming processes.

The project did not place particular focus on children but focused on the productive age group of the population, who possess the full capacity to work and hence play primary roles in the resiliency of the households and community. This is based on the assumption that the lowest level to measure disaster/drought resilience would be at household and community levels and it is impossible to measure the resilience of children independently and separately from other household members. Rather, adult members of households would be responsible to ensure that children are also able to cope with/adapt to drought-related shocks and stresses: e.g., continuous access to health and education, food security, etc.

Some of the group 2 beneficiaries will be directly involved in and contribute to the process of developing the guiding principles and operational frameworks on the harmonized and coordinated resilience M&E and knowledge management systems through the participation in the regional/national forums and other consultation meetings. Other beneficiaries will participate in the resilience capacity building sessions at national and county levels in Kenya and receive further technical backstopping support from the project team to mainstream the assessment/analysis results into decision-making processes.

3.2.6 More details on beneficiaries

Group 1 beneficiaries will be counted in Individuals and Households categories in Section 4.3.1, which comprise:

- 48,000 individuals = 8,000 households with average 6 persons per household (Result 2)

Group 2 beneficiaries will be counted in Individuals and Organizations categories in Section 4.3.1, which comprise:

- 100 individuals/organizations (Result 1) and 50 individuals/organizations (Result 2)

The group 2 beneficiaries of the project are expected to include the IGAD and its member states' government agencies, UN and NGO partners operating in the HoA region at different regions. More specifically, the organizations which are expected to benefit directly/indirectly from the project activities may include:

- IGAD and other regional inter-governmental organizations (e.g. AU, EAC);
- IGAD member states' government agencies, such as the national focal government agencies for IDDRSI/CPP implementation and monitoring
- Humanitarian/development NGOs working in the HoA including HIP2014 partner organizations;

- UN agencies, including the RAU partners engaged in the various fields of DRR at different levels;
- Donors in humanitarian and development communities; and
- Academic/research entities and technical working groups and networks leading the resilience assessment and analysis studies and debates in the HoA and beyond.

3.2.7 [INT] Report on beneficiaries

As articulated in Section 4.3, activities undertaken thus far focus largely on preliminary context analysis, scoping and stakeholders consultations at higher (regional and national) level. In this process, the project team reached and interacted mainly with Group 2 beneficiaries, which encompass:

- 36 individuals/organizations under Result 1, including those who engaged in the ongoing Resilience Context Analyses (RCA) in different parts of the region and/or participated in the Resilience Analysis and Programming Learning Needs Assessment Workshop held in Dec 2014, as well as some of the participants in the 2nd International Conference on Evaluating Climate Change and Development in Nov 2014.

-16 individuals/organizations under Result 2, who represent respective EDE Pillars and actively participate in the Technical Team and provide the project team with critical technical and liaison support to the development of the Guidelines to Incorporate Drought Resilience Measurement into EDE M&E Framework and centralized Management Information Systems.

Please refer to Section 4.3.5 for further details on these beneficiaries.

At the stage of the interim reporting, the project does not foresee the need for changes to the overall number of beneficiaries to be reached by end of the project or there may be changes to the overall number of beneficiaries. However, with the current delay in implementation of the activities, there may be a need to modify the target number especially in Group 1 unless the project period is extended. The project team will monitor the situation carefully and consult the matter closely with the donor focal persons in Nairobi in a timely manner.

3.2.8 [FIN] Report on beneficiaries

Based on the consultation with regional, national and county (inter-) government counterpart agencies, the project was estimated to have benefited more than 48,000 individuals, which is equivalent to 8,000 households, as well as 201 international, regional, national and county organizations operating in the HoA region. All the project outputs and outcomes are considered to be gender neutral, benefiting both males and females.

Please note that, as explained in the e-Single form (Section 4.3.4 for both Result 1 and 2), some beneficiary organizations were counted more than once for different result areas, at different levels and in different events. This is because each project activity/event had unique and distinctive geographical/thematic/sectoral/operational foci and thus was participated by different organizational representatives with different responsibilities, functions and capacities

While the individuals who represented the beneficiary organizations and received the series of the respective training support were largely males, the project team was not able to influence the gender of the participants. Invitation letters to the training events were sent out by the (inter-)government counterpart agencies for ownership purposes and the selection of the participants were undertaken by the individual beneficiary organizations.

Please see Annex 3.2 for more information regarding the components of the individual and organizational beneficiaries. Further details on the beneficiaries under Result 1 and 2 are also available in Section 4.3.6.

4. LOGIC OF INTERVENTION

4.1 *Principal objective*

To strengthen the capacities of IGAD, its Member States and other relevant stakeholders to align their planning and programming frameworks with the local needs for long-term climate resilient and sustainable development.

4.2 *Specific objective*

4.2.1 *Specific objective - Short description*

To improve the coherence of resilience measurement/analysis tools and their findings under the shared understanding and operational framework, through which to enhance evidence-based disaster resilience policymaking and investment decision-making in the IGAD region.

4.2.2 *Specific objective - Detailed description*

The "desired change" which the project foresees as the short-/medium term effects of the project interventions is the improved harmonization, alignment and coordination among the governments and other partners in terms of their plans and programme/project implementation processes in the HoA under the common overall guiding principles and frameworks of resilience M&E and knowledge management systems. The project seeks to help bridge the existing gaps between the humanitarian-oriented support which helps the affected communities to bounce back from multiple shocks/stresses and the development-oriented support which helps them to transform their lives/livelihoods to be more robust and sustainable, and help improve these two mutually-reinforcing dimensions of support to be more cost-effective, evidence-based and complementary. Effective and proactive engagement of communities and households, i.e., primary beneficiaries of these support, in the ongoing resilience debates, assessments/analyses and decision-making processes is considered as the key driver to enhance the humanitarian and development continuum and enhance their coherence. The desired change is expected to be witnessed both at regional (IGAD) and national/local (focusing particularly on Kenya) levels in policy, planning and programmes/projects processes including the implementation of IDDRSI RPP and CPP (i.e., EDE MTP in Kenya).

4.2.3 *Specific objective - Indicators*

4.2.3.1 *Specific objective indicator (1/1)*

Description

Number of national and sub-regional project partners/beneficiaries integrating key pillars of resilience building into their plans, strategies and programmes.

Target value

At least 2

Achieved value

2

Source of verification

- Planning, strategy and programming documents of IGAD, its Member States and other relevant stakeholder institutions.

[INT] Progress report on indicator

Through various project activities to date, as outlined in detail in Section 4.3, support has been ongoing to help relevant government and inter-government agencies and their partners both at Kenya national and HoA regional level to map out the resilience change pathways and the theory of change they envisage for respective IDDRSI pillars/sectors. Academic and theoretical exchange on the matter was also made with other stakeholders during the 2nd International Conference on Evaluating Climate Change and Development in November 2014 to explore how the global experiences and processes could inform the regional/national/local efforts. These exercises in turn contribute to identify the potential core resilience outcome/impact indicators towards which the plans, strategies and programmes of the IDDRSI participating organizations can be directed. Please note that, given the context specificity of resilience

building works in different agro-ecological, socio-economic and political environments, the project team places special focus on national and local entities in Kenya as the main partner/beneficiaries for this specific objective indicator.

[FIN] Progress report on indicator

The project successfully helped two project partners/beneficiaries integrate the key concepts, principles and components of resilience building into their plans, strategies and programmes: 1) Resilience Analysis Unit at sub-regional level; and 2) Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) Secretariat hosted by the National Drought Management Authority in Kenya.

At regional level, the project contributed successfully to the official establishment of the Resilience Analysis Unit (RAU) as an integral part of the IDDRSI, with the articulation of disaster resilience measurement/analysis approach to be applied to the HoA region. RAU is a solid mechanism, formally led by the IGAD, politically endorsed by its Member States and technically supported by 5 UN agencies specialized in different aspects of disaster resilience measurement and analysis in the region, namely UNDP, FAO, UNICEF, UNOCHA and WFP. The unit was launched in November 2014 (Article on the launch available on the IDDRSI website at [\[Link replaced / shortened automatically\]](#)) and its Joint Project Document (JPD) was signed by the IGAD and all other UN partners in October 2015 as a formal integral part of the IDDRSI.

Based on the recent proven practices, three qualitative and quantitative methodologies were selected as the main components of the RAU's disaster resilience measurement/analysis approach, and one of them is the Community Based Resilience Analysis (CoBRA) methodology, as highlighted in the RAU JPD (Annex 4.2.3-1). CoBRA was developed through the previous phase (2011-2012) of the ECHO Project and recognized as the only successfully-tested approach in the HoA which allows to bring out the forward looking, positive evidence-based community/household voices on what disaster resilience should be comprised of and what types of investments/interventions should be prioritized to enhance local resilience in a systematic and coordinated manner.

At national level, the project effectively supported EDE Secretariat within NDMA to lead the finalization of the comprehensive Common Programming Framework (CPF) for the EDE (Annex 4.2.3-2), as a formal document attached to the Kenya Vision 2030 Medium Term Plan II. In particular, the project work was directed to the constant refining of the conceptual foundations of Pillar 6, a group responsible for guiding the institutional development and knowledge management works under the EDE framework. One of Pillar 6's main tasks is to develop the operational modalities to assess the progress of the EDE towards the initiative's 10-year goal. CoBRA is identified as the main tool of the EDE Pillar 6 with which to identify drought resilience indicators, progress markers or intermediate development outcomes and impact pathways. The November 2015 version of the EDE CPF was formally launched in November 2015 by Hon. Anne Waiguru, Cabinet Secretary, Ministry of Devolution and Planning.

The independent final project evaluation report (Annex 8.5-2) also concluded positively that "intervention logic of the project is found to be well designed with relevant activities and indicators, and the targets have mainly been met. The project is also relevant to the 2014 HIP in which resilience is highlighted as of 'paramount importance', and in which one of the identified needs are that national stakeholders and partners should develop a better understanding and common analysis of issues related to resilience."

4.3 Results

Result (1/2) - Details

Title

Scope and mode of partnership between the IGAD and its Member States clarified and strengthened in resilience impact measurement and monitoring and future planning.

Sector

Sub-sectors

Institutional linkages and advocacy

Information, communication and public awareness

Estimated total amount

166.216,00

[FIN] Estimated incurred total amount

147.983,00

Result (1/2) - Beneficiaries

Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the Action

Individuals	-
Organisations	100
Households	-
Individuals per household	-
Total individuals	-

[FIN] Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the Action

Individuals	-
Organisations	120
Households	-
Individuals per household	-
Total individuals	-

Beneficiaries type

Others

Does the Action specifically target certain groups or vulnerabilities?

No

Specific target group or vulnerabilities

-

More comments on beneficiaries

The development of a guiding principles and operational frameworks for harmonized and coordinated resilience measurement/analysis, M&E and knowledge management and the establishment of resilience investment database will benefit a number of IDDRSI partners and stakeholders, including the IGAD and its Member State agencies, development and humanitarian actors from the UN agencies and NGOs, donor organizations, among others, tremendously in integrating resilience dimensions into their corporate/programmatic M&E and impact assessment and knowledge management processes. These activities will also support their local/national/regional efforts, helping better link their policymaking, strategic planning and practical implementations with other complementary investments. For the purpose of estimation, the project envisages to target at least one individual from one organization to be involved in the consultations and participatory framework development processes. Please note that project may count the beneficiaries from the same organization separately, if their geographical/thematic/sectoral/operational foci differ markedly (e.g., DRR unit in the regional office and peace and security unit in the CO within the same UN agency).

[INT] Report on beneficiaries

To date, the project reached and interacted with 36 individuals/organizations, which include those who engaged in ongoing RCAs directly or through soft channels and/or participated in the Resilience Analysis and Programming learning Needs Assessment Workshop held in Mombasa, Kenya in December 2014. Beneficiaries under this component also include some of the participants in the 2nd International Conference on Evaluating Climate Change and Development held in Washington D.C., in November 2014. They contributed to the development of the CoBRA tool during the CoBRA Phase I and provided additional inputs on how the tool can be best integrated into the formal government/inter-governmental frameworks and systems in support of the IDDRSI implementation at regional, national and lower levels. Inputs, insights and expertise of these individuals/organizations have been contributing directly to the ongoing process of developing the guiding principles and operational frameworks on the harmonized and coordinated resilience M&E and knowledge management systems.

[FIN] Report on beneficiaries

Concerning Result 1.1, the project team directly engaged and interacted with a wide range of beneficiaries both at regional/national and local/community/household levels so as to solicit their unique and specific resilience capacity needs and decision-support requirements.

1) Regional/national levels: solicited higher level needs and interests of senior-level policy makers and technical experts from selected 33 regional (IGAD Secretariat and other divisions/centres), national (IGAD Member States agencies), UN, donor, research and NGO representative organizations by organizing the "Learning Needs Assessment To Support Capacity Development For Resilience Analysis And Policy Processes In The Context Of Food Security Workshop" in Mombasa, Kenya, in Q4 of 2014 and conducting a series of follow-up interviews with these entities.

2) Local/community/household levels: solicited on-the-ground needs and interests of disaster affected communities, households and local government/partner organizations in Karamoja, Uganda in Q4 of 2014. Karamoja was selected as the sample site for local stakeholder communication, since the region has been serving as the "resilience champion" in the past few years as the recipient of the multi-year UN resilience strategy support. A total of 180 key informants from 23 local government and partner UN/NGO organizations benefited from this consultation process. Furthermore, over 200 local populations in 7 districts participated in the exercise in the form of focus group discussions.

Diverse opinions, comments and recommendations provided by 56 regional/national/local organizations and other stakeholders were carefully analyzed and comprehensively and strategically incorporated into the RAU learning modules on resilience measurement/analysis for the HoA region. The project also helped convene the internal workshop between the RAU, IDDRSI PCU and other leading organizations currently working on resilience measurement/analysis (16 organizations in total) to ensure that the final learning modules be developed in a manner to strike a balance between regional/national/local capacity support demands and IDDRSI/RAU capacity supply abilities.

Concerning Result 1.2, in the process of producing the IDDRSI 3W Resilience Investment Map User Manual, the project team consulted closely with 10 core 3W developer organizations through various channels. These organizations will benefit directly from the user manual, which will help increase the utilization of the 3W platform and enable the developers to conduct a wide range of analyses on resilience investments in the HoA region.

The project also supported the organization of the GAD High-Level Ministers Consultative Meeting on the Impending El Niño Impacts and on Preparation for Early Action in Q4 of 2015. 38 organizations leading the El Niño preparedness and response works at regional, national and local levels attended and benefited directly from the different sessions of the meetings, by being updated on the latest weather projections, exchanging various innovative practices for contingency planning/funding and early recovery works, etc. and strengthening humanitarian-development partnerships.

Result (1/2) - Indicators

Result 1 - Indicator 1

Type

Custom

Reference

-

Description

Analytical framework for resilience M&E and knowledge management systems for IGAD Member States in place.

Baseline

0,00

Target value

1,00

Progress value

0,00

Achieved value

1,00

Source of verification

• Regional/national forum reports • Guiding document for IGAD-Member State(s) partnership on resilience measurement/analysis, M&E and knowledge management . • Project progress monitoring reports

[FIN] Source of verification

RAU Qualitative Resilience Measurement Tool: Procedures, Templates and Best Practices was generated (Annex 4.3-1).

Comments

With the support from RAU, UNDP COs and other partners and through various channels, the project will engage a wide of range of stakeholders in the consultation to discuss and agree on the broad guiding principles and operational frameworks for resilience measurement and analysis to be adopted both by the IGAD and its Member States, with special focus on qualitative dimension.

Result 1 - Indicator 2

Type

Custom

Reference

-

Description

Number of database on resilience investments developed for the IGAD region among the IDDRSI Implementing countries.

Baseline

0,00

Target value

1,00

Progress value

0,00

Achieved value

1,00

Source of verification

• Resilience investment dataset • Project progress monitoring reports

[FIN] Source of verification

As a result of the project activities, 3W Resilience Investment Tracker User Manual (Annex 4.3-4) was developed in order to help operationalize the newly developed "Who is doing What, Where" 3W Investments Tracking database for the HoA region.

Comments

Based on the findings of the initial scoping study to date, the project will support in better linking IDDRSI's resilience researches and practices in the HoA region by integrating UNOCHA's ongoing 3W's resilience investment mapping efforts into the RAU's resilience measurement and analysis works, with IGAD as the core owner of the overall framework.

UNDP will also provide IGAD and its Member States with technical and facilitative support to agree on the mechanisms for the establishment of Trust Funds in the region, through which to better coordinate and harmonize humanitarian and development investments and interventions in preparation for/response to future climate risks such as El Nino.

Result (1/2) - Indicators comments

Additional comments on indicators

-

[INT] Progress report on the indicators of one result

Several preliminary studies and consultation/partnership building exercises have been undertaken together with the RAU partners under the auspice of the IGAD as the important steps towards the achievements of the indicators. Firstly, the project team has been participating in the series of comprehensive RCA exercises within the IGAD Member States to scope M&E data availability and knowledge gaps for understanding resilience in different sectors at national and local levels holistically.

In addition, the team supported the RAU in the organization of the Resilience Analysis and Programming learning Needs Assessment Workshop in Mombasa, Kenya, in December 2015. The workshop brought together the representatives from the IGAD, its Member States and other relevant partners and stakeholders to collectively review and map out their internal capacity gaps and constraints in evidence-based resilience planning and programming. Based on these findings, the workshop proposed the main scope and elements of the resilience measurement/analysis learning tools and training curriculum to be developed by the RAU. Results, findings and recommendations of RCAs and the Mombasa workshop will provide the concrete direction and action points to be incorporated into the M&E and knowledge management coordination framework.

Furthermore, the team has been conducting the initial scoping study of UNOCHA's Who What Where (3W) database in Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia. This is to identify some of the key strengths and weaknesses of the existing system and analyze the key opportunities and challenges in broadening their focus (e.g., further expansion of data in development field), introducing 3W database in other IGAD Member States and linking the data more strategically to the IDDRSI framework and its RPP/CPP investment plans.

The above exercises have demonstrated the multi-sectoral and dynamic nature the resilience M&E and knowledge management in the HoA region as well as the large extent of capacity gap areas to be filled in resilience M&E both in hardware (e.g., equipment) and software (e.g., technical skills, channels of communication, etc.). After the development of the broad M&E and knowledge management framework by the project, there is a need for continuous support to fully operationalize the systems both at regional and national levels. Accordingly, in order to ensure the sustainability the project effort, the team has been discussing the technical advisor of the UNDP's Strengthening the Capacity of IGAD in Building Resilience in the Horn of Africa Project (SCIBR) on how the two project could best complement to each other in the field and how the mid-term SCIBR will take up and carry over the outputs of the short-term CoBRA II.

[FIN] Progress report on the indicators of one result

As for Indicator 1.1., building on CoBRA Phase I experience and related expertise on qualitative assessment approaches, the project team was commissioned by RAU to lead the development of qualitative resilience measurement/analysis tool. Accordingly, the Qualitative Resilience Measurement Tool: Procedures, Templates and Best Practices was generated (Annex 4.3-1). As highlighted in the final evaluation report, this deliverable was highly regarded by the RAU members and other partners in terms of overall quality with "clear structure" and "a number of useful and relevant examples" which "takes the reader through a number of steps in measuring resilience while at the same time presenting different options." It was also incorporated into the broader RAU Learning Modules on Resilience Measurement for Technical experts and Middle Level Policy Makers (Annex 4.3-2 and Annex 4.3-3), which combine qualitative and quantitative measures and is currently synthesized/transformed into the e-learning form.

Concerning Indicator 1.2., in order to enhance the utility of online 3W Map platforms, based on the close coordination with the key partners, the project produced the 3W Resilience Investment Tracker User Manual (Annex 4.3-4). This deliverable was evaluated by the partners and other stakeholders as highly beneficial, "well-structured and to-the-point with easy to understand instructions supported by relevant screen dumps... [with] a number of relevant simulation exercises." The work is ongoing by the platform operation team to transform the document into a clickable electronic version.

In the face of 2015/16 El Niño, the project supported in organizing IGAD High-Level Ministers Consultative Meeting on the Impending El Niño Impacts and on Preparation for Early Action in October 2015. During the event, a strong advocacy work was undertaken to improve the 3W Map utility and enhance information sharing and cross-border cooperation in addressing El Niño related risks and impacts in the region.

Result (1/2) - Activities

Result 1 - Activity 1

Short description

A series of stakeholders consultation exercise held, both face-to-face and online, to develop a shared understanding among the IDDRSI partners at regional and national levels on the guiding principles and operational frameworks for coordination in resilience measurement and analysis framework to inform IDDRSI M&E and knowledge management system.

Detailed description

One of the RAU's key result areas focuses on coming up with the widely-accepted and customized conceptual and methodological framework for resilience measurement and analysis suitable in the contexts of the HoA to be adopted and applied to M&E, impact assessment, knowledge management and evidence-based planning of IGAD and its Member States, including IDDRSI Regional Programming Paper (RPP) and Country Programming Papers (CPPs). The project will contribute to this long-term effort directly by assisting the regional and national IDDRSI partners and stakeholders in jointly developing the broad guiding principles and operational frameworks for coordination and collaboration in the fields of resilience measurement/analysis.

In order to carry out this broad and complex task effectively and efficiently, RAU partners agreed to divide the responsibilities according to the comparative advantages of each participating agency. Building on the recent experiences and expertise of CoBRA, UNDP will lead on the qualitative dimension of resilience measurement and analysis framework in close partnership with UNICEF, while the development of the quantitative dimension will be led by FAO and WFP.

At present, IGAD, its Member States and other IDDRSI partners largely adopt diverse and unique resilience data collection, tracking, analysis and reporting procedures and systems rather independently without synchronizing and harmonizing these systems among each other. In this context, the project will work closely with the RAU partners and other stakeholders to organize the stakeholders consultation meetings and facilitate the participatory review and discussion on how best to integrate and strengthen the existing tools and methodologies for resilience assessment and analysis. Strengthened partnerships between the various knowledge management institutions will help better inform short-/mid-/long-term

IDDRSI investment decisions at regional, cross-border, national and local levels and enhance the complementary impacts on long-term drought resilience building.

The project will explore the need to tailor and contextualize the guiding principles and operational frameworks among the IGAD Member States in view of the unique implementation modalities and arrangements applied to the respective IDDRSI CPPs. For example, Kenya spearheaded to establish a dedicated working group (i.e., Pillar 6) under the EDE MTP which will guide the government and other partners in monitoring the achievements of various resilience interventions towards resilience pathway. If the contextualized approach is deemed necessary, priority will be given to the development of the framework for Kenya.

[FIN] Report on the activity

In close partnership with the IGAD and other RAU partners, the project successfully led the participatory consultative process to develop a region-wide common tools/approaches for resilience measurement and analysis.

More specifically, the project assisted in establishing an internal management structure of the unit (e.g., RAU Technical Team [RTT], Management Advisory Board [MAB], etc.) and holding regular RTT and MAB meetings, developing the RAU internal/external communication strategy, and organizing ad hoc need-based field missions and stakeholders consultation meetings (e.g., Resilience Context Analysis field survey mission in Karamoja, Uganda; Learning Needs Assessment workshop in Mombasa, Kenya, etc.). These works helped the RAU partners enhance internal coordination and collaboration and come up with a common resilience measurement/analysis approach.

The project also provided timely technical backstopping support to ensure the unit's effective representation at various key IGAD/IDDRSI related events (e.g., IGAD annual planning meetings, IDDRSI Steering Committee meetings and Platform meetings, etc.) and organize other periodic publicity events (e.g., RAU launch in Q4 of 2014; RAU JPD signing ceremony in Q4 of 2015, etc.). These efforts contributed to the improved visibility of the RAU initiative and increased awareness of the unit's roles in resilience measurement/analysis in the HoA.

Furthermore, the project team liaised closely with relevant organizations and resource persons knowledgeable about/experienced in qualitative resilience measurement/analysis works within and outside the HoA in order to maximize the feasibility and applicability of the final Result 1.1 deliverable. Annex 8.5-1 provides details on all the meetings/events and other consultation activities undertaken for Result 1 Activity 1 throughout the project period on a quarterly basis.

Result 1 - Activity 2

Short description

Technical backstopping support provided to mainstream the resilience investment mapping/database into the resilience measurement and analysis framework.

Detailed description

Mapping of the investments and activities by IGAD, its Member States agencies and other humanitarian and development partners is highlighted as one of the key priorities across the region both at RPP and CPP levels. UNOCHA has been the lead agency to assist in establishing the investment database using "Who is doing What Where (3W's)" geo-spatial information method. The development of 3W's database responds to the recommendation at the First Meeting of General Assembly of Regional Platform on Drought Resilience and Sustainability held in Addis Ababa in February 2013 as well as by the Global Alliance for Action for Drought Resilience and Growth.

The project's initial scoping study of 3W's to date acknowledged, however, that the efforts of resilience investment planning, implementation and monitoring tend to be carried out in highly sectoral, compartmentalized and fragmented manner with limited linkages to the efforts of past/ongoing/planned resilience researches. In order to improve the situation, UNOCHA recently proposed to join other like-minded UN agencies to support the RAU initiative. The project will provide technical backstopping support to harmonize and coordinate RAU's efforts for IGAD resilience measurement and analysis

framework development (to be supported through Activity 1.1) with the above mentioned resilience investment mapping processes. In particular, building on a series of preliminary studies and consultation/partnership building exercises undertaken so far, the project will provide the platform for the IGAD and its Member States, IDDRSI PCU and other concerned stakeholders and partners to jointly discuss and agree on the institutional and operational arrangement to cross-fertilize resilience researches and practices across the region.

In order to strengthen the linkage between measurement/analysis and investment, the project will support IGAD in organizing a High-Level Ministerial Meeting. The meeting will provide the IGAD Member States with the opportunity to discuss and agree on the Trust Fund modality to better coordinate and harmonize humanitarian and development financings in the region particularly in the face of increasing climatic disaster risks.

[FIN] Report on the activity

As a result of the in-depth consultations with the key 3W Map platform partners (e.g., IGAD Secretariat, UNOCHA, GIZ) it was agreed that the project support be directed to software (i.e., sensitization, advocacy, user support, etc.), taking advantage of the UNDP's strong facilitating capacity, and recognizing existing challenges of limited data contents.

Accordingly the project facilitated a series of face-to-face, conference call and email based technical discussions with stakeholders and developed the 3W Resilience Investment Tracker User Manual. The final document which completed the peer-review process was submitted to the RAU and the IGAD Secretariat for integration into the existing 3W Map related works. The OCHA team is currently transforming the manual into a web-friendly format. Hard form of the manual is also in use and recognized as "relevant for training purposes and for day-to-day use of the database."

The project also engaged the 3W Map Platform team in various project events in order to improve awareness within the IGAD region. For example, UNOCHA was provided an opportunity at the First EDE M&E TWG workshop to make presentation on the role of 3W Map portal in Kenya. In addition, the IGAD Secretariat urged the Member States to utilize various tools and services offered by the 3W Map in the face of El Niño at the High-Level Ministers Consultative Meeting on the Impending El Niño Impacts and on Preparation for Early Action. A session was also organized at the RAU Internal Review Workshop of Learning Modules on Resilience Measurement and Analysis for Technical Experts and Middle Level Policy-makers to discuss how to better harmonize the resilience measurement/analysis and investment efforts.

Annex 8.5-1 provides further details on the activities undertaken for Result 1 Activity 2 throughout the project period on a quarterly basis.

Result (1/2) - [INT] Overall update on activities of the result

Slow process in operationalizing the RAU initiative, into which CoBRA II was agreed to be integrated, caused significant delay in implementation of Component I activities inevitably. The project team also had to spend unexpectedly long time in identifying the qualified technical specialist to facilitate the planned activities under this component, which require profound knowledge and sufficient experiences on highly complex and dynamic issues concerning DRR and disaster/drought resilience building in the region.

Ahead of the arrival of the specialist, which is anticipated in early February 2015, the team went ahead and started the internal scoping and stakeholders consultation process to develop the comprehensive component workplan. This exercise applies scenario-based analysis, taking into account the possibility of continuing some project activities during the wrapping up period and/or extending the project period without additional funding. After the finalization of the detailed workplan with this specialist, comprehensive desk review will be held and interactive discussions will be continued with technical support from the respective RAU partners to prepare the draft output documents and arrange the series of the workshops to jointly review and refine these products for operationalization.

Result (1/2) - [FIN] Conclusions on the result

Dedicated and diligent effort by the project team led to the generation of a number of tangible outputs under Result 1.1 and 1.2, including: the RAU JPD; RAU Learning Modules on Resilience Measurement for Technical experts and Middle Level Policy Makers; RAU Qualitative Resilience Measurement Tool: Procedures, Templates and Best Practices; and 3W Resilience Investment Tracker User Manual. Based on the careful review of these deliverables and taking into account the views and opinions from the key government, UN, donor and other partners, the final project evaluator reconfirmed the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the project's overall works for Result 1.

It is important to note that the project focused not only on the quantity of the results (e.g., number of deliverables, etc.) but also the quality of the results (e.g., transparency, level of participation, sustainability, etc.). As clearly demonstrated by the interviewees' comments, the project team remained committed, professional and attentive to the detail throughout the implementation period. The team facilitated the internal/external consultation, assessment and negotiation processes in a manner to maximize the ownership and utilization of the final deliverables among the IGAD and its member states, RAU, and other stakeholders in the long run.

The project team also made use of its strong technical knowledge on resilience, which had been accumulated since the ECHO project phase I period (2012-2013). The team served as the primary proponent of qualitative tools and methodologies within the RAU and ensured that the resilience measurement/analysis for the HoA region adopt a holistic approach, particularly by integrating the long-term qualitative views and perspectives of climate disaster affected communities and households into decision-making processes.

-

Result (2/2) - Details

Title

Institutional capacity on climate resilience mainstreaming enhanced at national level in Kenya based on the EDE MTP pillar priorities.

Sector

Disaster Risk Reduction / Disaster Preparedness

Sub-sectors

Community and local level action

Institutional linkages and advocacy

Information, communication and public awareness

Estimated total amount

184.133,00

[FIN] Estimated incurred total amount

195.670,00

Result (2/2) - Beneficiaries

Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the Action

Individuals	0
Organisations	50
Households	8.000
Individuals per household	6
Total individuals	48.000

[FIN] Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the Action

Individuals	-
Organisations	81
Households	8.000
Individuals per household	6
Total individuals	48.000

Beneficiaries type

Population - Others

Does the Action specifically target certain groups or vulnerabilities?

No

Specific target group or vulnerabilities

-

More comments on beneficiaries

Desk and field-based training support will be provided both at national level and in the target counties in Kenya to build the capacity of local governmental and other partners to own and undertake community-based resilience assessment/analysis independently beyond the project implementation period. The target counties will include Turkana and one additional priority most-at-risk counties to be identified in consultation with the NDMA, RAU and other relevant government/NGO counterparts in view of the progress in county devolution process, availability of comprehensive resilience related baseline data and the willingness, commitment and ownership of counties.

Each training sessions will target about 30-45 organizations/individuals. Please note that number of organizations will be counted per county and thus there is a possibility of the same organization(s) operating in different locations (but different representatives) to participate in more than one session such as the local officers of specific government departments or international NGOs.

Local populations will directly benefit from the activities under Result 2 through the community representatives' participations in the resilience assessments/analyses processes. Mainstreaming of affected communities' views and perspectives towards enhancing their long-term resilience to climate related shocks and stresses into formal humanitarian/development decision-makings and actions will help both the local populations and the government/NGO/UN agencies working in the region by improving the efficiency and effectiveness of local services and interventions and maximize their short-/long-term impacts.

The criteria for the selection of the beneficiary counties, organizations and individuals will be defined in a transparent and accountable manner under the guidance of the NDMA and the concerned county governments.

[INT] Report on beneficiaries

The project team has embarked on the identification of, and/or consultation with, the key beneficiary organizations and individuals at national (i.e., M&E focal points and other relevant members of EDE Pillar 1-6) and local (e.g., County DRR Platform members in Turkana and Baringo) levels. They will actively participate in the development of the guideline to incorporate drought resilience measurement concept and steps into EDE/MTP M&E framework by providing critical technical inputs and communicating the key information and messages on the project with other concerned stakeholders in their respective sectors/pillars/counties. They are also the main candidates to receive the training support to lead the operationalization and implementation of the guidelines.

The project team has been paying special and close attention to the selection and privatization of local focal persons/beneficiaries so as to make sure that that they will adequately represent the needs and interests of the local populations concurrently affected by drought and other disasters. They are also expected to serve as the mediator who will help the project to reach the Group 1 beneficiaries by directly disseminating the knowledge and transferring the skills gained through the project activities to the different parts of the counties.

In order to systematize and streamline the line of communication with a large number of beneficiaries under this Component, it was agreed to form a Technical Team (TT), a task force to drive the development and implementation of the guidelines. TT will be chaired by the NDMA, facilitated by the UNDP, and participated by the representatives from respective EDE MTP Pillars and the focal persons from the pilot counties. Concept note of the TT has been under finalization and the initial list of membership under development. Thus far, the project team engaged 16 individuals/organizations as the preliminary members of TT. They have been providing, and will continuously provide, the project team with critical sector-based technical inputs on the progress and gaps in individual pillar M&E process as well as liaison support to reach out the rest of the Pillar members/county stakeholders to solicit their collective views and recommendations.

[FIN] Report on beneficiaries

A series of training events and other supplementary capacity building and awareness raising sessions organized by the project under Activity 2.1 and 2.2 benefited a total of 81 organizations and over 100 individuals. They include 16 national government organizations, 3 regional organizations, 15 donor, UN and NGO partners and 47 county government agencies and partner line ministry/NGO organizations (25 in Turkana and 22 in Baringo). Please note that part of this number reflect the same organizations operating in different locations such as NDMA Turkana and NDMA Baringo. This is based on the fact that as a result of decentralization, development/humanitarian planning processes vary significantly between national and county levels as well as among counties, and thus the project undertook the training work for different target beneficiaries in tailored and context-specific manners. The number of beneficiary organizations without double counting amounts to 59.

The beneficiaries improved their knowledge and capacity required for climate resilience mainstreaming by acquiring skills for drought/disaster assessment/analysis and M&E. Indeed the project final evaluation confirmed that "a solid foundation for the future measurement of resilience-related activities and incorporation of resilience-relevant activities into national and local plans has been facilitated."

Inter alia, through the evaluation, the beneficiaries praised the transparent, demand-driven and participatory approach adopted by the project throughout the training works. The project team was described as "truly facilitators, passionate and with a focus on results", leading participatory processes "which nobody else would likely have been in a position to do due to the limited capacity of the EDE secretariat and of the newly established counties."

Tangible outputs of these training works were the EDE M&E framework (Annex 4.3-5) and County Indicator Handbooks for Turkana (Annex 4.3-6) and Baringo (Annex 4.3-7) as the formal national/county government-owned documents. Both at national and county levels, follow up works led by these trained beneficiary organizations are already ongoing to:

- 1) Compile baseline data for 2013/2014 (start of the EDE and the County Integrated Development Plans [CIDPs]),
- 2) Set periodic targets for 2017/2018 (end of current phase of EDE and CIDP in line with Kenya Vision 2030 Mid-term Plan II [MTPII]); and
- 3) Correct data as of 2016 within the framework of EDE and CIDP mid-term reviews.

As part of these data compilation/collection and target setting works, at county level, different sectoral agencies started reaching out directly to the sample community/household groups in order to identify and analyze the local resilience status. Since different sectors (e.g., education, health, agriculture, livestock, etc.) have different sample groups, it was difficult to specify exactly how many households have been involved in these works. However, the county focal points in both Turkana and Baringo counties confirmed that the formal data collections generally require the sample size representing at least 5-10% of the total county populations, and thus that the project's target of 8,000 households/48,000 individuals have been participating directly in the processes for sure in different forms such as structured surveys, semi-structured key informant interviews, focus group discussions, etc. Total populations in Turkana

County is 1,256,152 (according to Turkana CIDP projection for 2015) and that in Baringo County is 677,209 (according to Baringo CIDP projection for 2015). Their opinions, views and positions are the key indicators based on which future county development/interventions strategies will be planned and activities will be programmed.

Result (2/2) - Indicators

Result 2 - Indicator 1

Type

Custom

Reference

-

Description

EDE MTP resilience assessment tools/guideline in place in Kenya.

Baseline

0,00

Target value

1,00

Progress value

0,00

Achieved value

1,00

Source of verification

• National/local consultation reports • Project progress monitoring reports • EDE MTP frame work for M&E and resilience assessment/analysis

[FIN] Source of verification

As a result of the project's leading support to the EDE Secretariat and other EDE Pillar partners, a multi-sectoral results-based EDE M&E framework was produced as the main deliverable (Anne 4.3-5).

Comments

In partnership with the EDE MTP Pillar 6 members, the project team will provide the DRR/resilience focal agencies at national and local levels in the selected counties as well as the relevant EDE pillar group stakeholders including the M&E focal points with the capacity strengthening support on resilience assessment/data collection, impact pathway analysis and outcome mapping, etc. The training support will also focus on the mainstreaming of key concepts and elements of agreed M&E and impact assessment/analysis approaches into various relevant planning and programming frameworks. They may include, among others, EDE MTP Pillar CPFs; county integrated development plans (CIDPs); DRR plans and contingency plans; sectoral guidelines and work plans/programmes, etc.

Result 2 - Indicator 2

Type

Custom

Reference

-

Description

Number of DRR/resilience institutions at national and county levels acquiring the skills in integrating the resilience assessment into DRR planning and M&E systems.

Baseline

0,00

Target value

50,00

Progress value

0,00

Achieved value

81,00

Source of verification

• Training plans • Field exercise analysis reports including the post-training self-assessments by the participants • Project progress monitoring reports

[FIN] Source of verification

Three main training events were held during the project period with the aim to enhance the national/sub-national (as well as regional) institutional knowledge of resilience assessment concepts/principles as well as their capacities to incorporate this new knowledge into practical planning and M&E processes in Kenya. Broad summary of the beneficiaries of these events are as follows: • First EDE M&E TWG Workshop in Kenya (April 2015): 16 national government agencies, 3 regional organizations and 15 partner organizations (e.g., Development Partners/Donors/Academia); • County M&E Framework Development Training Workshop for Turkana (November 2015): 25 county government organizations and line agencies; and • County M&E Framework Development Training Workshop for Baringo (November 2015): 21 county government organizations and line agencies and 1 NGO partner organization. Annex 3.2 provides the detailed information on the participating organizations in each event,

Comments

In partnership with the EDE MTP Pillar 6 members, the project team will provide the DRR/resilience focal agencies at national and local levels in the selected counties as well as the relevant EDE pillar group stakeholders including the M&E focal points with the capacity strengthening support on resilience assessment/data collection, impact pathway analysis and outcome mapping, etc. The training support will be followed by continuous backstopping support to assist for the actual implementation of the agreed M&E and impact assessment/analysis approaches and the mainstreaming of the results/recommendations into various planning and programming frameworks. They include, among others, EDE MTP Pillar CPFs; county integrated development plans (CIDPs); DRR plans and contingency plans; sectoral guidelines and work plans/programmes, etc.

Result (2/2) - Indicators comments**Additional comments on indicators**

-

[INT] Progress report on the indicators of one result

A technical specialist came on board in the 4th quarter of 2014 as a consultant who helps the team to facilitate the development and implementation of the detailed workplan for Component 2. The plan, which elaborates on the steps to be taken to deliver Indicator 2.1 and 2.2. in line with the RAU project document and the EDE CPF for Pillar 6, was presented and cleared by the government and other key partners.

Under the auspice of NDMA, efforts are ongoing to establish TT, comprising the representatives of the EDE MTP Pillars and the technical focal persons from the pilot counties, namely Turkana and Baringo. TT will serve as the main coordinating body to lead the participatory production of mutually agreed Guidelines to Incorporate Drought Resilience Measurement into EDE M&E Framework and centralized Management Information Systems (MIS). Based on the extensive literature review and the series of stakeholder consultations both directly and through the TT members, the process is also ongoing to develop the draft outline of the guidelines. After the collective review and clearance of the outline by the TT, the process to develop the full guideline document will start, which will be followed by the validation workshop and the series of the training sessions for the operationalization of the guidelines.

TT will play a critical role in identifying and prioritizing the key beneficiaries who will be the direct recipients of the project's capacity development support both at national and local level. In the pilot counties, for example, the project team has been liaising closely with the County Drought Management Coordinators and Drought Resilience Officers within NDMA. As the primary county focal points, they help introduce the

project to the county government and the County Platform for DRR, select the priority owners and beneficiaries of the expected project outputs, and ensure their active participation in the implementation process, including in the planned training sessions.

[FIN] Progress report on the indicators of one result

Regarding Indicator 2.1, as a result of seamless sequences of pillar-based/pillar-wide consultations and trainings, a multi-sectoral results-based EDE M&E framework was produced as the main deliverable (Anne 4.3-5). The document was endorsed by the EDE Steering Committee in January 2016 and rated extremely positively by all the pillars as a "a well-structured document based on Theory of Change for the five pillars of the EDE CPF outlining the tasks and responsibilities in a clear manner."

As proven in the final project evaluation, the document has already been adopted by several EDE Pillars for not only progress monitoring but also for planning purpose. At higher level, IGAD Secretariat/EDE Secretariat has jointly been working on the full operationalization of the framework by introducing the IDDRSI Management Information System and organizing the related training workshops in Q1 of 2016.

Regarding Indicator 2.2, as a result of the project activity 2.2, a total of more than 100 people from 59 organizations at national and county levels in Kenya have participated in various workshops and training sessions and improved their knowledge and skills in measuring and monitoring resilience progress and integrating the M&E results into national/county investment planning.

Improved knowledge and skills have been demonstrated by the trainees' proactive follow up actions to refine, finalize and publish the EDE M&E framework (Annex 4.3-5) and County Indicator Handbooks for Turkana (Annex 4.3-6) and Baringo (Annex 4.3-7) with clear identification of resilience-focused indicators and articulation of respective baseline and target data. They are also currently serving as the leading organizations to drive the operationalization/implementation of the multi-sectoral resilience M&E in line with the EDE and CIDP mid-term review process scheduled for mid 2016.

Result (2/2) - Activities

Result 2 - Activity 1

Short description

Participatory consultative meetings organized among the EDE stakeholders from respective pillars to agree upon the programme-wide framework for the EDE MTP M&E and resilience assessment/analysis.

Detailed description

The project team will work closely with the Pillar 6 partners to facilitate the participatory processes of reviewing and refining respective EDE MTP Pillars' Theories-of-Change, identifying resilience impact indicators, progress markers or intermediate development outcomes and impact pathways both for the whole programme and for each Pillar. Once the resilience impact indicators are agreed upon, each Pillar will assess the availability of baseline data for in-depth resilience impact assessment and analysis, identify the data gaps and develop a short-/medium-term plan for complementary surveys to establish the solid resilience baseline for M&E and future evidence-based EDE MTP investment planning.

This activity will be closely linked to Pillar 6 CPF Result 2, Output 2.2. Impact of Kenya's progress towards the 10-year EDE goal assessed. The activity will also be implemented in a highly coordinated and complementary manner with the UNDP's ongoing broader Governance for DRR in Kenya Programme. In addition, it will contribute to RAU joint programme Result 1: Resilience research and monitoring and evaluation at regional level are enhanced - Output 1.6: Key thresholds of resilience and multiple equilibria affecting resilience established and integrated into the existing Early Warning Systems at regional and country office level.

[FIN] Report on the activity

Activity 2.1 was carried out in a coherent and sensitive manner in order to make all the EDE pillars and their relevant members participate proactively in the entire process and make them own the final deliverable (i.e., EDE M&E framework), without giving an impression that the process is manipulated or biased by UNDP. The key consultative/training steps taken for the development of the EDE M&E framework include:

- Situation analysis and road map development for EDE M&E framework within Pillar 6
 - Initial consultation on the EDE M&E framework with national and county stakeholders at the CPF Consultative Meeting in Machakos
 - First round of meetings with respective Pillar chairs, co-chairs and other Pillar members to discuss and agree on the M&E framework development road map
 - 1st EDE M&E Technical Working Group (TWG) Workshop in Naivasha to: provide training support on result-based M&E concepts and principles and develop Pillar TOC maps (Annex 4.3-8)
 - Second round of meetings and follow-up consultations with respective Pillars (TWG focal points and other members) to review and complete the TOC maps and identify the indicators
 - 2nd EDE M&E TWG Workshop in Naivasha to: validate the overall/Pillar TOC maps; refine the Pillar outcome/impact indicators with baseline and target data; discuss the way forward on MIS based on relevant experiences; and review/clarify future TWG roles and responsibilities (Annex 4.3-9)
 - Follow-up Pillar meetings to finalize the EDE M&E indicators lists
 - Circulation of the full draft M&E framework document for collective review and integration of comments from the stakeholders
 - Presentation of the refined full M&E framework to the EDE Steering Committee
- Annex 8.5-1 provides further details on the activities undertaken for Activity 2.1 throughout the project period on a quarterly basis.

Result 2 - Activity 2

Short description

Government and other partner institutions/individuals at national and local levels received intensive training support on resilience assessment, data analysis and integration of assessment/analysis results into M&E, knowledge management and planning processes.

Detailed description

Technical support will be provided to at least 75 people from government/non-governmental organizations, including NDMA, respective pillar groups (e.g., M&E managers) and other relevant DRR stakeholders at national and local levels, to build their capacity in outcome-/impact-oriented resilience planning, implementation and monitoring. Key policy/practice recommendations generated from the combination of desk-based training and pilot resilience assessment and analysis field practices would be integrated into relevant development/humanitarian plans (e.g., CIDPs, DRR plans, contingency plans, etc.), and mechanisms (e.g., county disaster early warning system, county mechanism for systematic disaster information collection, documentation, analysis and sharing including the establishment of county disaster information centres, etc.).

Capacity development support will be provided in close line with ongoing devolution and mainstream government DRR strengthening efforts, including, among others, the efforts to establish the county platforms for DRR and develop the county to county coordination and dialogue mechanisms, and integrate DRR in existing sectoral government management training programmes.

The training sessions will build on the frameworks developed under Activity 1.1 and Activity 2.1 and based on the experiences and lessons from various existing resilience measurement and analysis tools including those of the CoBRA Phase I in recognition of the unique local contextual socio-economic, political, environmental and cultural conditions. Based on the support, the trained institutions and staff are expected not only to lead the local assessment/analysis process in the future as part of EDE/MTP, etc., but also serve as the demonstrators and help transfer the knowledge, skills and expertise to other organizations within and outside the counties.

This activity will make a significant contribution to the overall objective of the EDE MTP Pillar 6 group, directly supporting the Pillar 6 CPF Result 2, Output 2.2. *Impact of Kenya's progress towards the 10-year EDE goal assessed*, particularly the strategic area of "Capacity development on impact pathway analysis and outcome mapping (for EDE pillar groups & EDE M&E personnel)." The activity is also expected to contribute to the RAU joint programme result 3: Technical capacity of IGAD and its Member State institutions, UN and other stakeholders to measure and analyse resilience is enhanced - Output 3.2: On-the-job trainings designed and provided to the various mandated institutions.

[FIN] Report on the activity

At national level, the project organized the 1st EDE M&E TWG Workshop as an interactive learning event, with one full day of training sessions facilitated by Ms. Irene Karani, Director at LTS Africa, a renowned private consultancy group specialized in M&E. Over 30 government, UN, donor and non-governmental organizations benefited from this training event and learnt the core principles of results-based resilience M&E.

At county level, the project team first undertook an in-depth review of existing M&E related literature at county levels and organized a series of face-to-face and online discussions with the respective county focal points (i.e., County Planning Units) in target counties of Turkana and Baringo. This exercise was essential to assess the capacity gaps in the fields of resilience planning, assessment, analysis and implementation comprehensively and identify the priority training areas.

Accordingly, County M&E Framework Development Training Workshops were held jointly by the project team, EDE Secretariat and the respective county governments in Turkana on 16-20 November 2015 (Annex 4.3-10) and Baringo on 25-27 November 2017 (Annex 4.3-11) in highly participatory and practice-oriented manner with a series of lecture sessions, simulation exercises and plenary/group work sessions. A total of 24 government organizations in Turkana and 22 organizations in Baringo learnt the key concepts and principles such as results-based management and theory of change and developed the sector-based change pathway maps and corresponding outcome/impact indicators based on which to systematically and holistically track the progress of numerous ongoing development investments/humanitarian interventions towards resilience building.

Annex 8.5-1 provides further details on the activities undertaken for Result 2 Activity 2 throughout the project period on a quarterly basis.

Result (2/2) - [INT] Overall update on activities of the result

Implementation of the activities under this result area is largely on track, while experiencing some delays due to the need to align and synchronize the project works with the formal government strategy and plans. More specifically, in second and third quarters of 2014, as per the request of the NDMA, the project team had to dedicate a significant amount of time and its technical resources to provide close and direct technical backstopping support towards the development of the CPF for the EDE MTP Pillar 6. This contribution was of critical importance to ensure that the planned activities under CoBRA II Component 2 will be adequately recognized and mainstreamed into the CPF's results framework, particularly Output 2.2., which focuses on "Impact of Kenya's progress towards the 10-year EDE goal assessed" under "Result 2 - Knowledge management for EDE decision-making and impact assessment in place."

As a result of the above efforts, the project won the fully support of the government to lead and guide the implementation process of Component 2, with the NDMA as the main focal point and the owner of the expected project outputs, which will ensure the sustainability of the project. Other key partners, such as the members of Pillar 6's Knowledge Management sub-group and RAU, also confirmed their commitments and technical contributions to the different aspects of the workplan.

The project team has been witnessing extremely high enthusiasm from all the EDE Pillar partners towards the planned project activities. The anticipated outputs of Component 2 is deemed to help them actualize the concept of "do things differently" by critically assessing the outcomes and impacts of their projects/investments on the abilities of affected communities to future risks of drought and effects of climate

change. On one hand, there is a need to fast track the planned activities within the envisaged time frame, given the observed delay. On the other hand, however, the team is required to respond to these overwhelming interests and engaged as many concerned stakeholders as possible in order to make the process truly participatory and inclusive and ensure that the outputs of the activities will be fully owned and utilized by all the implementers of the EDE MTP. With due consideration of all these factors and conditions, the project team will undertake a critical review of the timeframe of the Component 2 workplan and explore various implementation options for the coming months, including the possibility of no cost extension of the project, in close communication with the donor focal persons in Nairobi.

Result (2/2) - [FIN] Conclusions on the result

As reconfirmed by the final project evaluation, the main aim of Result 2 to enhance institutional capacity at national and county levels to mainstream climate resilience in line with the EDE MTP priorities was highly positively rated as a relevant and timely contribution by the partners and stakeholders. The project successfully helped bridge the sectoral divides and improve dialogues and coordination between shorter-term focused humanitarian actors and longer-term focused development actors under the EDE framework.

Using a number of innovative tools and approaches in a demand-driven manner, such as CoBRA methodology, theory of change approach and results-based management concepts and principles, the project team raised awareness of how humanitarian/development works in different sectors are inter-linked and contribute directly/indirectly to shared goals of drought resilience building at different levels. Many evaluation interviewees found the project support very relevant for moving towards results-based monitoring rather than the traditional output-based monitoring.

As a result of the project support, a series of formal strategic framework documents were generated with which to guide the climate resilience planning and regular progress tracking process. The fact that the key project deliverables are already in use at different levels by different beneficiaries assures the continuity and sustainability of the project efforts.

Both at national and county (i.e., Turkana and Baringo) levels, all the resilience related sectors now have the clear resilience indicators with explicit baseline/target figures based on which to measure the successes/failures of their interventions in an open and tangible manner. This, according to the project partner participating in the final project evaluation, "is key to show where we are and to show progress." These works contributed not only to lay a sound foundation for the future work on resilience in Kenya, but also to strengthen the linkages and coherence between national and local initiatives.

-

4.4 Preconditions

- Socio-economic and political stability in the project locations within the HoA, particularly the target counties in Kenya;
- Smooth and timely implementation of the government devolution and decentralization reforms in Kenya; and
- Timely approval of the project and disbursement of budget.

4.5 Assumptions and risks

1. Adequate social, economic and political stability exists in the HoA throughout the project period.
2. Minimal disruptions from natural and man-made catastrophes during the project period.
3. IGAD and Kenyan government maintain their commitments to the implementation of the resilience-related policies and strategic plans (e.g., Joint Declaration from the Summit on the Horn of Africa Crisis: Ending Drought Emergencies and IDDRSI RPP at the HoA level, IDDRSI/CPP and ASAL Development Policy in Kenya, etc.) with the consistent support towards the ongoing devolution and decentralization reforms.
4. Relevant government and non-government entities operate effectively at appropriate levels.
5. Adequate human, physical and financial resources are maintained within the operating team of the proposed action and other implementing partners.

4.6 Contingency measures

The aforementioned risks will be closely monitored and monitored jointly with the RAU partners, UNDP Kenya CO and focal government counterpart agencies (i.e., NDMA, County Government, etc.). In case where the fulfillment of Assumption 1, 2 and/or 4 becomes difficult in the target intervention counties in Kenya, the possibility of shifting the geographic focus will be communicated and assessed. If Assumption 3 cannot be met for some reason by the focal government partners even after the in-depth consultations and negotiations, the option of working with other relevant government agencies will be explored. In order to mitigate the risks associated with Assumption 5, UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) will be fully adopted in the project implementation processes. POPP serves as the guiding document to ensure that appropriate UNDP policies are followed, key stakeholders are kept informed, appropriate project management structure exists, outputs and activity deliverables are monitored, and the project is well managed.

4.7 Additional information on the operational context of Action

Since the project focuses on DRR/resilience, KRI indicators were not applied and custom indicators were identified.

4.8 [INT] Report on precondition, assumptions and risks

Socio-economic and political stability has been maintained and no major disruptions from natural and man-made catastrophes have been experienced in the project locations thus far. The project activities have been implemented with the strong leadership, commitments and guidance from the regional inter-governmental and national government counterparts. At regional level, IGAD has been providing direct oversight support to the project as the leading agency of RAU. At national level, NDMA has been providing the close supervision and facilitative support which allows the project team to liaise and coordinate smoothly with relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders participating in the EDE MTP both at national and local levels.

It is important to note, however, that the project implementation is lagging behind the original time schedule both at regional (Component 1) and national (Component 2) levels, as highlighted in Section 4.3. This is largely as a result of the slow planning and decision-making processes by the regional partners, and government/non-governmental partners, which were observed especially at the onset between Q2-3 of 2014 but not much controllable by the project team. At regional level, major delay was witnessed in setting up the RAU initiative both in terms of the project team (e.g., absence of the Technical Coordinator and other key technical staff to be procured and sponsored by the UN partner organizations within the RAU Technical Team) as well as the conceptual development (e.g., prolonged process for joint drafting of the RAU joint project document because of the lack of aforementioned human/technical resources). Lack of overall guidance and coordination support from the "mother" programme in turn resulted inevitably in the slow implementation of the CoBRA II. For example, the project team faced difficulty in conducting various project activities as scheduled until the RAU results framework was broadly agreed on and the RAU was officially launched in late November 2014, and the linkage/contribution of the CoBRA II to different RAU result areas is clearly presented to/understood by the initiative partners. The team also had to suspend the service procurement taking place in Q3 of 2014 and re-advertise the position in Q4 in order to accommodate the technical recommendations of the newly formed RAU Technical Team in late Q2.

At national level, delay in implementation resulted from the need to align the project fully with the Kenya government plans and strategies. The project team thus concentrated their time and effort till August 2014 in supporting the finalization of the and particularly in mainstreaming the planned project activities into the result framework of the Knowledge Management Sub-group. Furthermore, extensive time has been spent in the internal consultation within the Pillar 6 Knowledge Management Sub-group on the coordinated and harmonized implementation of activities among the sub-group member organizations in order to maximize their cost-efficiency and mutual impacts.

The project team has been working hard to fast track the project implementation process upon the formulation of the detailed component workplans and the filling of the necessary project positions. However, these efforts must not compromise our commitment of the project to the inclusive participatory approach in order to ensure that all the project outputs will be fully owned and sustained by respective partners. There is a need to strike an adequate balance between the broadness of stakeholders' interests and the narrowness of the project time frame. The project team will consult the matter with the donor focal persons in Nairobi and jointly explore the feasibility of various contingency measures, including the no-cost

extension.

4.9 [FIN] Report on precondition, assumptions and risks

Throughout the implementation period, socio-economic and political conditions in the project intervention areas remained largely stable at both regional and national levels. Adequate human, physical and financial resources were maintained to support the operation of the project.

Due to El Niño risks, some of the planned activities at county levels needed to be adjusted in terms of timing and locations of the training.

In addition, the project continually suffered from the slow planning and decision-making processes by various direct/indirect partners, as highlighted in the interim report and modification requests. The project, nonetheless, managed to cope with this challenge, thanks to the kind understanding by the donor and its approval of the project extensions. As a result of dedicated, patient, flexible and innovative works by the project team, all the scheduled activities were fully completed within the project workplan timeframe (including the wrap up period).

5. QUALITY MARKERS

5.1 Gender-age markers

5.1.1 Marker Details

• <i>Does the proposal contain an adequate and brief gender and age analysis?</i>	Yes
• <i>Is the assistance adapted to the specific needs and capacities of different gender and age groups?</i>	Yes
• <i>Does the action prevent/mitigate negative effects?</i>	Yes
• <i>Do relevant gender and age groups adequately participate in the design, implementation and evaluation of the Action?</i>	Yes
• <i>Initial mark</i>	2

5.1.2 Additional comments and challenges

The CoBRA Phase I adopted highly gender/age sensitive approach throughout the project duration and the same model will be utilized for the implementation of the CoBRA Phase II, taking into account well-defined gender roles and responsibilities as well as sensitivity of various gender groups to the impacts of disasters.

CoBRA is a highly gender/age sensitive assessment tool, which was developed with the reflections of specific demands of gender/age groups and in response to their unique challenges. It undertakes separate FGDs for men, women and the youth so that similarities and differences in perspectives, needs and priorities among these distinctive groups for climate resilience building will be elaborated and the results will be adequately integrated into various levels of policy advocacy and mainstreaming process. In order to ensure the balanced representation of each focus group within an assessment area, sampling frame will be developed in close consultations with the partners participating in the CoBRA exercise, who are highly knowledgeable of the local gender/age circumstances. This joint exercise helps prevent the risk of overlooking differences in power and status and influence between the rich and the poor, elites and the marginalized even within the gender/age groups.

Also, in order to extract the frank views and honest opinions from different gender/age groups while avoiding bias or false expectations, community mobilization exercises will be conducted in the sample locations prior to the assessment. In addition, multi-agency approach adopted by CoBRA has proven effective to mitigate negative effects, which carefully combine facilitators from different agencies and sectors and allocate the female facilitators to women focus group discussions, etc.

The project team will ensure that above mentioned gender/age concerns and consideration will be fully mainstreamed into the entire project result areas.

5.1.3 [INT] Additional comments and challenges

Gender/age sensitive approach has been adopted continuously within different project components.

At regional level, it has been agreed that the CoBRA methodology will be fully integrated into the analytical framework for resilience M&E and knowledge management systems currently under development within the RAU initiative and with other partners. CoBRA assessment tool will not only bring out the community views and perspectives on resilience debate in general but also shed light on the unique needs and interests of different gender/age groups within the communities and help link them to higher resilience investment plans by the IGAD and its Member States.

At national level, activities have been carried out under the EDE CPF for Pillar 6, which provides the clear guidance on gender/age mainstreaming. In particular, discussion is ongoing with the relevant EDE MTP stakeholders on the best approach to identify the adequate gendered resilience indicators and integrate them into the respective pillar M&E mechanisms. Planned training sessions at national/county level will also address the issues surrounding gender/age focused data collection procedures and application of gendered indicators to policymaking, planning and programming processes.

5.1.4 [FIN] Additional comments and challenges

Throughout the implementation period, the project team paid special attention at the gender/age dimensions of resilience, and facilitate the mainstreaming of gender/age objectives into regional and national resilience measurement and analysis and M&E processes. The CoBRA is a robust methodology which provides clear guidelines on how to engage typically marginalized/underrepresented groups, such as women and youth, and extract their specific needs and interests. At regional level the project team ensured that the gender and age issues be fully represented in the ongoing and planned resilience measurement efforts by incorporated CoBRA as part of the resilience analysis approach of the IGAD-led Resilience Analysis Unit.

At national level, gender and age aspects were clearly highlighted in the M&E training processes at both national and county levels. In particular, the project team provided technical backstopping support to the EDE Pillar teams and county sector teams so that the gender/age specific results be articulated in the Theory of Change map. Support was also provided to identify gender/age aggregated indicators so that the outputs, outcomes and impacts of development/humanitarian support can be assessed comprehensively and in details in order to promote gender/age-sensitive planning and implementation in the future.

5.2 Resilience

5.2.1 Marker Details

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • <i>Does the proposal include an adequate analysis of shocks, stresses and vulnerabilities?</i> | Yes |
| • <i>Is the project risk informed? Does the project include adequate measures to ensure it does not aggravate risks or undermine capacities?</i> | Yes |

• Does the project include measures to build local capacities (beneficiaries and local institutions)?	Yes
• Does the project take opportunities to support long term strategies to reduce humanitarian needs, underlying vulnerability and risks?	Yes
• Initial mark	2

5.2.2 How does the Action contribute to build resilience or reduce future risk?

The concept of disaster/drought resilience is at the very core of the project. As is noted in the IDDRSI Strategy, traditionally, disaster management measures in the HoA region were characterized by reactive, sector/country-based (in silos) emergency-oriented approach. The project was developed to underpin and support directly the enthusiasm and commitment of the IGAD and its Member States to "do things differently" in order to end drought emergencies and minimize the future humanitarian needs. The project activities will help develop mechanisms which will enable local/national/regional stakeholders in the region to adequately measure and analyze the level and extent of disaster/drought resilience in various sectors at different scales and monitor and evaluate the impacts of various interventions and services on the changes in these resilience levels in the medium and long-term. County decision-makers and DRR institutions in Kenya are among the main target of the project's capacity development support in local disaster/drought resilience assessment, analysis and monitoring.

5.2.3 [INT] Report on Resilience marker

The concept of disaster/drought resilience is at the very core of the project. As is noted in the IDDRSI Strategy, traditionally, disaster management measures in the HoA region were characterized by reactive, sector/country-based (in silos) emergency-oriented approach. The project was developed to underpin and support directly the enthusiasm and commitment of the IGAD and its Member States to "do things differently" in order to end drought emergencies and minimize the future humanitarian needs. The project activities will help develop mechanisms which will enable local/national/regional stakeholders in the region to adequately measure and analyze the level and extent of disaster/drought resilience in various sectors at different scales and monitor and evaluate the impacts of various interventions and services on the changes in these resilience levels in the medium and long-term. County decision-makers and DRR institutions in Kenya are among the main target of the project's capacity development support in local disaster/drought resilience assessment, analysis and monitoring.

5.2.4 [FIN] Report on Resilience marker

All the deliverables produced and results achieved through the project are for the purpose of making sure that the concepts and principles of resilience be adequately integrated into policymaking, strategic planning, and programme/project implementation and M&E processes. Both at HoA/regional and Kenya/national levels, the project served as one of the most vocal proponents of drought disaster resilience.

Together with other RAU and EDE Pillar 6 partners, the project continually led the discussions and advocacy on how best to strengthen the resilience of local communities affected recurrently by drought and other climatic shocks and stresses. All the project outputs, such as the resilience measurement and analysis learning modules, 3W Map User Guide, EDE M&E framework and County Indicator Handbooks, are to help improve the complementarity of numerous humanitarian interventions and development investments in the IGAD member states and maximize their positive effect on community and household resilience levels.

6. IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 Human resources and Management capacities

Mirroring the time-tested CoBRA Phase I project management arrangements, this project will be managed by the robust core team which comprise the following positions with distinctive duties and responsibilities:

- 1 Project Manager (part-time) engaging in the project 21 months (Apr 2014-Dec 2015) responsible for overall project management and quality assurance, oversight and donor reporting, liaison with partners, etc.
- 1 Project Coordinator (full-time) engaging in the project 23 months (Apr 2014-Feb 2016) responsible for the overall coordination and technical support of the project activities particularly at national and lower levels and facilitation of the project monitoring, etc.
- 3 Project Associates (part-time) engaging in the project for 15 months (Jul 2014-Sep 2015) responsible for providing project operations support in financial management, human resources management and logistics management.

The team will liaise closely with the RAU team partners (i.e., IGAD, FAO, UNICEF and WFP) and UNDP Kenya to ensure the smooth and effective implementation of the project and other complementary initiatives such as the RAU initiative and the Governance for DRR in Kenya Programme.

The project will also bring on board the external technical experts and specialists as the international and national consultants on need-by-need basis who will provide the necessary backstopping support to the core team in respective Result/Activity areas.

6.1.1 [INT] Human resources and Management capacities

All the core team staff of the project were appointed between April-July 2014 with full technical/management capacities respectively. Since the project onset, the team has been housed in the UNDP Drylands Development Centre, which was renamed to Global Policy Centre (GPC) Nairobi in October 2014, with adequate equipment and communication facilities. External technical experts have also been recruited to help the team implement different project activities effectively and efficiently. TORs for the two positions are attached for reference (Annex 6.1.1-1 and Annex 6.1.1-2).

6.1.2 [FIN] Human resources and Management capacities

The project was managed highly effectively and flexibly by the robust management team despite the various challenges experienced both externally (e.g. slow process of the partner initiative, weather conditions at county level, etc.) and internally (e.g./, UNDP restructuring). 4 main project staff members with different qualifications, responsibilities and duration of engagement, supported each other efficiently with close daily communications.

Inter alia, the arrangements of the Project Management Manager and the Project Coordinator being the core members of the RAU (i.e., RAU Technical Team and Management Advisory Board) and the EDE Pillar 6 (i.e., Knowledge Management sub-group) worked very strategically and helped to move forward the project agendas forward.

Implementation of respective project activities were supported by several individual contractors with unique set of technical qualifications. Under the close supervision by the Project Manager, these contractors provided necessary technical backstopping support towards different result areas of the project in a timely manner as per clearly articulated TORs.

6.2 EU Aid Volunteers

No

6.2.1 [FIN] EU Aid Volunteers

No

6.3 Equipment and goods

During the wrap up period of CoBRA Phase I in early 2014, a request was made to the donor to allow the project team to continuously utilize the below goods and equipment which were purchased under the below projects:

- Agreement ECHO/-HF/BUD/2012/91015 (i.e., 1 computer and related ICT supplies) through the project); and
- EUROPEAID/DCI-ENV/2008/150127/TPS (i.e., one vehicle).

Under the HIP2014, the below costs are envisaged:

- Maintenance of goods/equipment purchased through the above mentioned previous ECHO/EU projects (i.e., insurance and servicing, etc.): EUR 2,940 in total
- Office expenses including project hosting cost such as rent and common services, communications, consumable, etc.: EUR 5,513 in total

6.3.1 [INT] Equipment and goods

Given the high complementarity of various planned CoBRA Phase II activities at local level in Kenya with those of the UNDP Kenya Office and other partners (e.g., RAU member organizations), discussions have been ongoing to harmonize some of these activities and implement them jointly. This arrangement is expected to allow the project to save part of the envisaged equipment/goods cost, including the maintenance cost of the project vehicle, and reallocate it to other key budget lines.

6.3.2 [FIN] Equipment and goods

During the project period, the following cost was spent:

- Maintenance of office vehicle (i.e., insurance and servicing, etc.): EUR 394 in total
- Office expenses including project hosting cost such as rent and common services, communications, consumable, etc. throughout the implementation period: EUR 14,167 in total

For more information on the equipment and goods cost breakdowns, please refer to Annex 10.2-1 and 10.2-2.

6.4 Use of HPCs

No

6.4.1 [FIN] Use of HPCs

No

6.4.2 [FIN] Name of HPC

-

6.4.3 [FIN] Report on supplies

-

6.6 Specific security constraints

The target counties in Kenya are currently at varying phases of the United Nations Security Plan, ranging from Phase 1 (precautionary phase) to Phase 3 (Relocation). The project team members will be based and undertake daily operations in Nairobi, where the security situation is rather stable. Periodic missions to the target counties/districts for training of/technical backstopping support to local governments and other field activities will be organized in careful consultations with the United Nations Department of Safety and Security with the careful monitoring of the local security phases. The project team will follow the UN security procedures for field missions.

The project team will monitor the risks outlined in Section 4.5 regularly and closely. Risk communication will be mainstreamed as an integral part of the project communication strategy so that the project will be able to respond to the issues through the established risk mitigation or transfer measures, on a timely manner upon the occurrence of risk factors.

If the changes in social, economic and political conditions in the intervention areas in the region (e.g., political instability and insecurity in the fields, disruptions from natural and man-made catastrophes) are considered to have any potential impacts on project activity implementation process and hence overall objectives and expected results, operational framework will be reviewed and necessary amendments will be made. In such case ECHO will be notified on a timely manner and further changes to activities or schedule will be discussed.

6.6.1 [INT] Specific security constraints

Social, economic and political conditions in the project target countries/counties remain largely unchanged.

6.6.2 [FIN] Specific security constraints

Social, economic and political conditions in the project intervention areas remained largely safe throughout the project period. Concerning the county level activities, the project team kept in close communication with the United Nations Department of Safety and Security so as to be regularly updated on the local situations. Decisions on the timings/locations of events, level of project visibility, modes of transport were made carefully based on various socio-economic, political and climatic conditions and related insecurity risks and in coordination with the respective levels of government counterpart agencies. Based on these precaution measures, the project did not experience any security challenges.

6.7.1 Are there Implementing Partners ?

Do not know yet

6.7.2 Implementing Partner added value

-

6.7.2.1 [FIN] Implementing Partner added value

-

6.7.4 Coordination, supervision and controls

-

6.7.4.1 [FIN] Coordination, supervision and controls

-

Implementing Partners

6.8 Are there any subdelegates?

No

6.8.1 Subdelegates explanation

-

6.8.2 [INT] Subdelegates explanation

-

Subdelegates

6.9.1 [FIN] General update on Implementing Partners list

-

6.10 [INT] Report on Implementing Partners

-

7. FIELD COORDINATION

7.1 Operational coordination with other humanitarian actors

Given the multi-sectoral and multi-agency nature of the concept of resilience, which cuts across short-term humanitarian and long-term development arenas, the project team will promote field coordination with wide range of partners and stakeholders without the distinctions between humanitarian actors and development actors at regional, national and local levels.

In particular, the project team will maintain its close communication and coordination with the RAU team as the main partners especially at regional level. In line with internal coordination and communication arrangements stipulated in the RAU Joint Programme Document, regular meetings will be held with the focal persons from the IGAD, FAO, UNICEF and WFP as well as other technical partners from NGOs and research/academic institutions in order to ensure that the project activities will well correspond with and contribute to the RAU objectives and result areas directly. This exercise is also to make sure that the capacity enhancement, knowledge management and policy advocacy efforts pursued by the RAU partners, either individually or jointly, will be carried out in a coordinated fashion building on the comparative advantages and network of each organization. The project will also liaise closely with other relevant development and humanitarian actors operating in the HoA region through different channels and platforms, as outlined in Section 2.2, to update the status of the activities periodically and discuss how best to harmonize the different project implementation processes/modalities and maximize the impacts.

Special attention will also be paid to the enhancement of coordination with the key networks, groups and initiatives carried out outside the geographical scope of HIP2014 framework at sub-regional, regional and global levels in the fields of resilience measurement/analysis. They may include, among others, the Global Alliance for Action for Drought Resilience and Growth, Technical Working Group on Resilience Measurement, and the sub-regional working groups for the development of frameworks for building resilience in Sahel and Southern Africa regions.

7.2 Action listed in

UN Consolidated Appeal Process

-

Flash Appeal

-

ICRC / IFRC appeal

-

Other

-

Not applicable

Yes

If other, please specify

7.3 Coordination with National and local authorities

At national level, UNDP Kenya CO has already established the formal coordination mechanism with the DRR focal government agency, namely NDMA, with the secondment of UNDP advisors and other technical staff to the agency's headquarters in Nairobi and in the target counties, such as Turkana. Liaison with other national level partners will be made in collaboration with NDMA as the owner of the project activities and their results, utilizing various existing channels whenever applicable such as the National Platform for DRR, ASAL Stakeholders Forum, EDE MTP Pillar 6 and other groups, etc.

Coordination at local level will also be ensured in partnership with UNDP Kenya CO and with the close guidance of the government counterpart. As a participatory assessment tool, CoBRA was proven to help bring together the government, UN and NGO agencies operating at local level with the shared interests of jointly assessing the community perspectives and visions on drought resilience building through which to review the effectiveness and efficiency of the individual agency interventions. For example, the pilot CoBRA trainings and assessments were participated proactively by 60 agencies in the three pilot counties in Marsabit, Turkana and Kajiado. Larger number of agencies participated in the CoBRA results validation workshops in these regions. The project will continuously work on the mobilization of the local humanitarian/development partners in the participatory processes of community-based resilience assessment/analysis and mainstreaming of CoBRA findings into country and lower-level planning and budgetary mechanisms.

7.4 Coordination with development actors and programmes

Please refer to Section 7.1.

7.5 [INT] Report on Field Coordination

Upon the approval of the project, the process started immediately to integrate the project components into the RAU results framework and annual workplans for 2014 and 2015 in order to ensure that all the CoBRA II activities will be well linked to and complement other related ongoing/planned actions by the respective RAU partner organizations.

For example, at regional level, Component I of the project (e.g., analytical framework for resilience M&E and knowledge management systems for IGAD Member States) was recognized by the RAU partners, namely IGAD, FAO, UNICEF and WFP, as the integral part of and the key output based on which to create the initiative's resilience measurement and analysis learning manual. CoBRA II activities have also been supported and guided by the RAU Scientific Advisory Board, which consists of leading resilience measurement scientists from academia and regional/international organizations. They include Tulane University, Cornell University, Tufts University, University of Florence, La recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD) and the World Bank. Many of these organizations help disseminate the project experiences and outputs widely and link them with ongoing resilience measurement research, analysis and policy debates taking place not only within the HoA but also in other regions and at global level.

At national level, Component II was acknowledged as one of the main RAU support in Kenya for 2014-2015, which will be implemented hand-in-hand with the RAU resilience context analysis in a complementary manner with Turkana county as the pilot region. In addition, the component activities were incorporated fully mainstreamed into the CPF of the EDE MTP Pillar 6 and has been supported by the NDMA and other Pillar 6 members, particularly the Knowledge Management Sub-group.

Furthermore, efforts has been made internally to link the project to other ongoing UNDP projects so as to prevent duplication and enhance synergy and coherence. Regionally, the main team for the Strengthening the Capacity of IGAD in Building Resilience in the Horn of Africa Project (SCIBR) came on board in December 2014. The logistical arrangement of SCIBR to be temporally hosted in the UNDP DDC/GPC helped the project team to align the CoBRA II activities with those of SCIBR and agree on the structure for complementary implementation. In Kenya, the project was also well integrated into the UNDP Kenya's Fostering Resilient Communities and Livelihoods through Recovery in the ASAL Region of Kenya Project (2015-2017). UNDP Kenya has been long present in the counties where the CoBRA II

will undertake its pilot activities and agreed to support the project team in facilitating various on-the-ground activities planned at local level such as consultations and training sessions.

7.6 [FIN] Report on Field Coordination

Almost all the project activities were considered as of great interest and relevance to a wide range of development and humanitarian agencies operating in the region. Therefore, the project team was required to take a proactive, participatory and inclusive approach by organizing a series of stakeholder awareness raising, consultation and training meetings, while at the same time maintaining the regular communications through soft channels (e.g. email, phone, skype, etc.) The project's success is attributed, to large extent, to its consistent approach to carry out these stakeholder coordination works in close partnership with the formal government entities (e.g., IGAD, EDE Secretariat/NDMA, County Planning Units in Turkana and Baringo, etc.), and through their established frameworks (e.g., IDDRSI/RAU, EDE, County Indicator Handbook working groups, etc.).

On one hand, this approach led to the delay in implementation of the planned activities, due to limited government capacities and bureaucratic decision-making process. On the other hand, as a result of the project team's consistent field coordination effort, all the necessary steps were undertaken in a transparent and accountable manner. The project effort also helped empower the government counterparts at different levels and enhance their coordination and facilitation skills. These counterparts became the main owners of the final project outputs and expressed their full commitment to carry them forward, ensuring sustainability of the project works.

The project team also liaised closely with the other relevant UNDP project teams at regional and national levels, regularly updating the status and progress of respective project activities, supporting one another and sharing knowledge, skills and expertise in different areas. Upon the termination of the CoBRA II project, SCIBR project team and UNDP Kenya team agreed to serve as the UNDP representatives to the RAU MAB/RTT and the EDE Pillar 6 respectively, in order to maintain the continuity of UNDP support in drought disaster resilience building at regional and national levels.

8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

8.1 Monitoring of the Action

Monitoring of the project will be undertaken on a regular basis as per the UNDP's standard monitoring and evaluation guidelines and procedures. The Project Manager will be responsible for the overall oversight of the project, ensuring the effective and timely implementation of the activities as per the work plan in coordination with the key project partners from the government, UN agencies and NGOs, etc. at regional, national and local levels.

The Project Coordinators will be responsible for day-to-day substantive management of the project, utilizing the UNDP M&E tools, to ensure that inputs are adequately provided, procedures are followed and outputs are produced in an accountable, harmonized and timely manner.

To fulfill these purposes, the following products will be delivered:

- Quarterly progress updates: carried out internally by the project team in close coordination with the RAU team, government counterparts and other relevant partners. All the relevant documents including the meeting reports, field reports and other relevant communication resources will be recorded and reviewed. The exercises will verify implementation of activities, examine the project's continued relevance as per the changing DRR needs at local, national and regional levels, consolidate progress towards the fulfillment of the targets and make recommendations and/or actions to be taken to fast track the process.
- An end of project evaluation: conducted by independent consultant(s) upon the termination of the project, which provides a comprehensive assessment of the overall project performances and draw plans for future orientation of possible longer term follow up development activities at different levels.

Monitoring activities will be conducted in close communication with the ECHO Regional/Country contact persons and the UN/UNDP Brussels Office. The project team will share the draft TORs for external evaluation with respective ECHO focal points in advance for review and comments.

8.2 Evaluations

Internal evaluation

-

External evaluation

Yes

External audit

-

8.2.1 Further details

An end of project evaluation will be carried out by independent consultant(s) upon the termination of the project. This exercise will assess the overall project performances by looking critically at: • Relevance of interventions under this project; • Efficiency of implementation (including implementation approaches employed as a basis to guide possible improvements in future project delivery); • Opportunities, constraints/challenges and lessons learnt during the implementation of the project; • Effectiveness and sustainability of the project; • Impact of the project, including assumptions used in the development of the project; and • Recommended actions to be taken in the future building on the project achievements. Please refer to Annex 8.2.1, which provides the sample TOR for the end of project evaluation used for the CoBRA Phase I.

8.3 Studies carried out in relation to the Action (if relevant)

No

Explain the content of these studies

-

8.4 [INT] Report on monitoring and evaluations

Quarterly progress updates were prepared from the 2nd to the 4th quarter of 2014. These exercises help the project team monitor internally the status in the activities implementation in correspondence with the annual workplan and examine the validity, efficiency and timeliness of different operational/managerial procedures undertaken towards the achievements of respective outputs.

The team also communicate and update the status and progress of the project activities to the donor through the local focal points, as per needs, as well as other key partners through regular meetings both at regional (e.g., RAU) and national (e.g., EDE MTP Pillar 6) levels. The documents were used as the main references for the development of the interim report.

8.5 [FIN] Report on monitoring and evaluations

In accordance with the UNDP M&E guidelines, the project produced quarterly progress updates during the entire project period so that the team members are fully aware of the status and progress of the project activities holistically (See Annex 8.5-1 for overview of the quarterly progress reports). This internal exercise was highly useful not only for verifying the implementation process but also for alerting the team about all the observed challenges and anticipated risks. The quarterly reports allowed the project team take early and timely prevention/mitigation/preparedness/response actions and helped minimize the impacts of the challenges and reduce the levels of the risks.

The end of project evaluation was conducted in January-March 2016. An independent home-based

evaluator who meets all the qualification requirements was brought on board in a competitive manner. He led the evaluation process based on the TOR, which was developed by the project team and reviewed/cleared by the ECHO local technical advisors in December 2015.

The evaluation was undertaken using the standard Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria for evaluations: i.e., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, including recommendations and lessons learned for future building on the project achievements. The data used for the analysis was collected through three (overlapping) phases: i) Document review; ii) Skype/telephone interviews with key stakeholders and iii) Reporting. Validation of the data was done through triangulation of data from the different sources and feedback from stakeholders to the draft report.

A total of 31 stakeholders were interviewed of which a third were related mainly to regional level activities and two thirds mainly related to national activities. Interviewees were selected based on several key criteria, which encompass: 1) degree of engagement in different aspects of the project; 2) representation from all the project intervention areas at regional (i.e., IGAD), national (i.e., Kenya) and sub-national (i.e., Turkana and Baringo counties) levels; and 3) different types of stakeholders (e.g., government institutions, UN agencies, NGOs, research institutions, and the donor). This includes the project's two main ECHO focal persons based in Nairobi, Kenya.

The final report was already submitted to and endorsed by these ECHO focal persons (Annex 8.5-2). Key findings of the end of project evaluation exercise are incorporated into different sections of this final report.

9. COMMUNICATION, VISIBILITY AND INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

9.1 Standard visibility

A. Display of EU Humanitarian Aid visual identity on

A1. Signboards, display panels, banners and plaques

Yes

A2. Goods and equipment

Yes

Please provide additional details on section A

-

B. Written and verbal acknowledgement of EU funding and partnership through

B1. Press releases, press conference, other media outreach

Yes

B2. Publications, printed material (for external audiences, not operational communication)

Yes

B3. Social media

Yes

B4. Partner's website (pages related to EU funded projects)

Yes

B5. Human interest blogs, photo stories

Yes

B6. Audiovisual products, photos

Yes

B7. Other

-

Please provide additional details on section B

-

9.2 Do you foresee communication actions that go beyond standard obligations?

No

9.3 [INT] Report on progress

Comprehensive Communication and Visibility Plan was developed at the beginning of CoBRA Phase I in 2012 in accordance with the Joint Visibility Guidelines for EC-UN Actions in the Field. Given the continued feasibility of key themes and elements of the plan to the context of CoBRA Phase II, the project team keeps using the document as the guidance in undertaking various visibility and publicity activities.

All the public project documents developed to date, such as the presentations, terms of references and activity concept notes, highlight the key project messages such as objectives and expected achievements, and display the donor name and logo prominently. Please refer to Annex 9.3-1, a presentation made at the 2nd International Conference on Evaluating Climate Change and Development in Washington D.C. on 4-6 November 2014, as an example of the project's donor visibility efforts.

Please note that, as CoBRA II is now fully integrated into the RAU initiative, the above approach on donor visibility and is also applied to all the RAU related products such as the RAU Brochure (Annex 9.3-2).

9.4 [FIN] Report on progress

According to its Communication and Visibility plan, the project undertook a wide range of visibility, information and communication activities during the project implementation period in both hard and soft formats.

Towards the achievements of the project objectives and other results, a number of public events were organized at regional, national and local levels for the purposes of stakeholders consultation, training, etc., together with the government and other partners. These events served as the primary channel through which to communicate and disseminate the key project messages directly to the beneficiaries. At each of these public fora, the donor name and flag/logo were displayed on the banners, plaques, screens and other event documents in a clearly visible form. Explicit acknowledgement messages to ECHO were also conveyed by both the project team (i.e., UNDP) and the government counterparts during all these events.

All the printed knowledge products produced through the project, such as publications and awareness raising campaign materials, contain the ECHO flag/logo with disclaimer on the inner cover page. Some of the publications also include the acknowledgement section with the prominent written recognition of the support by the donor.

Photographs were taken when and where appropriate to demonstrate the progress and achievements of the project activities. They were disseminated widely through various communication channels. In

particular, the project utilized the twitter to circulate the awareness raising messages on the project activities by tagging the ECHO account (@eu_echo) and/or posting the photos with ECHO logo.

Please find Annex 9.4 provides the samples of communication and visibility activities undertaken and materials produced under the frame of this project.

10. FINANCIAL OVERVIEW OF THE ACTION

10.1 Estimated expenditure

	<u>Initial budget</u>	<u>Revised budget</u>	<u>Interim report incurred costs</u>	<u>Final report incurred costs</u>	<u>Final report final update</u>
Implementation costs	329.995,00	367.379,00	77.633,81	367.378,24	367.378,24
Remuneration (max 7%)	23.100,00	25.716,00	5.434,37	25.716,40	25.716,40
Total costs	353.095,00	393.095,00	83.068,18	393.094,64	393.094,64

10.3 Funding of the Action

	<u>Initial budget</u>	<u>Revised budget</u>	<u>Final budget</u>	<u>Final report final update</u>
Direct revenue of the action	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Contribution by applicant	53.095,00	53.095,00	53.094,64	53.094,64
Contribution by other donors	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Contribution by beneficiaries	-	-	0,00	0,00
Contribution requested from ECHO	300.000,00	340.000,00	340.000,00	340.000,00
% of total funding (*)	84,97	86,50	86,50	86,50
Total funding	353.095,00	393.095,00	393.094,64	393.094,64

(*) Rounding to the second decimal. To compute the final payment, the real percentage until four decimals will be applied.

10.4 Explanation about 100% funding

-

If other, please explain

-

10.5 Contribution in kind

Office equipment, supplies and other resources

10.6 Financial contributions by other donors

-

10.7 VAT exemption granted ? (applicable only to NGO's)

No

Please specify

-

10.8 [FIN] The organisation confirms that the co-financing has not led to a double funding of the activity

-

10.9 [FIN] Report on financial issues

Annex 10.2-1 provides the detailed breakdowns of the project cost per result areas as well as other cost areas.

Annex 10.2-2 provides the detailed breakdowns of the project cost per budget lines such as personnel cost, travel/workshop/study tour cost, knowledge management/publication cost, visibility/communication cost, office expenses, equipment cost and M&E cost.

11. REQUESTS FOR DEROGATION

11.1 Specific derogations

Derogation

11.2 Permanent derogations

Derogation

12. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

12.1 Name and title of legal representative signing the Agreement

Ms Barbara Pesce-Monteiro - Director of UNDP Brussels Office

12.2 Name, address, e-mail and phone of the contact person(s)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Office location</u>	<u>E-mail</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Yuko Kurauchi	United Nations Office in Nairobi, Block M, Middle Level, United Nations Avenue, Gigiri, P O Box 30552-00100, Nairobi, Kenya	yuko.kurauchi@undp.org	+254 20 7624509
Anne Juepner	United Nations Office in Nairobi, Block M, Middle Level, United Nations Avenue, Gigiri, P O Box 30552-00100, Nairobi, Kenya	anne.juepner@undp.org	+254 20 7624642

13. CONCLUSIONS AND HUMANITARIAN ORGANISATION'S COMMENTS

13.1 Possible comments

Please find below the list of the modifications and their justifications:

Section 1.5. Dates and duration of the action

- *Objective of the amendment:* Changes in the duration from 20 to 21 months, bringing the end of the implementation period to 31 December 2015

- *Justification of the amendment:* Implementation period is proposed to be extend for one month in order to allocate sufficient time for the completion of additional activities under Result 1/Activity 1 in the HoA region.

4.3. Result 2

- *Objective of the amendment:* Updating of Indicator 2 possible comments and Activity 2 detailed description

- *Justification of the amendment:* Estimated total amount was revised to EUR166,216.00. A paragraph was added on the extra financial and technical support of the project to be provided for the organization of IGAD High-Level Ministerial Meeting concerning the Trust Fund mechanism development.

6.1. Human resources and management capacities

- *Objective of the amendment:* Changes in duration of engagement in the project for respective core team posts.

- *Justification of the amendment:* Duration of the project engagement for Project Manager and Project Coordinator was extended respectively in response to the extension of the project period, as per their roles and responsibilities.

6.5. Work Plan

- *Objective of the amendment:* Revised work plan in response to the extension of the project

- *Justification of the amendment:* Implementation time frame was amended in accordance with the proposed extension.

10.1. Estimated expenditures

- *Objective of the amendment:* Revised budget in response to the addition of extra activity

- *Justification of the amendment:* Implementation cost and Remuneration were revised to EUR 367,379.00 and EUR 25,716.00 respectively.

10.2. Financial annex

- *Objective of the amendment:* Addition of updated financial annex

- *Justification of the amendment:* According to the increase in the implementation costs and remuneration, financial annex was also amended.

10.3. Funding of action

- *Objective of the amendment:* Revision of contribution requested from ECHO

- *Justification of the amendment:* Contribution from ECHO was revised to EUR 340,000.00.

13.2 [INT] Comments

-

13.3 [FIN] Conclusions

As a result of the independent and participatory final evaluation, the project was clearly proven to be well designed with most clear linkages between objective, activities and indicators, and achievement of all the expected results.

In terms of relevance, the government, donor and other development/humanitarian partners commended that the project remained relevant, responding directly to the priority of the ECHO 2014 HIP for a common understanding and analysis of resilience-related issues. The project team helped bridging the gap between humanitarian and development practitioners, between regional, national and sub-national planning, and between quantitative and qualitative resilience measurement/analysis and M&E, consistently advocating the need to capture affected populations' aspirations and underlying causes of their vulnerability.

In terms of effectiveness, the participatory process facilitated by the project team at regional, national and county levels have been highly positively acknowledged by the partners and tangible outputs of the project/facilitation were recognized as "mostly of high quality". The evaluation interviewees commented that the "team was committed and technically very professional and competent with an eye for the important details and a focus on results. There was agreement among interviewees that GPC-Nairobi was filling an important gap that nobody else would have been able to fill."

In terms of efficiency, it was evaluated that the project has been implemented in a cost-effective manner with the total cost found to be reasonable and good value. The project support was found as timely. The interviewed partners described the project as "not reinventing the wheel, putting support where it is needed", "good value due to their contribution to resilience thinking", and that "if the GPC-Nairobi had not been providing support, the various processes would have taken longer and been 'less smooth'."

In terms of impact, the project was evaluated that, while tangible impacts are yet to be seen at this point in time, the specific objective of ensuring enhancement of resilience-related policy-making and investments have been achieved through development of a more coherent and holistic approach to measuring and analyzing resilience.

In terms of sustainability, the project was clearly proven to have contributed to the beneficiaries' ownership of the outputs. Both at regional and national/county levels, strong interests have been raised in carrying on and replicating the efforts. For example, IGAD wishes to replicate the entire M&E support process successfully undertaken in Kenya to other Member States. In Kenya, both EDE Secretariat and county governments expressed interests in rolling out the County Indicator Handbook development/implementation support in other counties.

13.4 [FIN] Lessons learned

A number of key lessons were learnt during the implementation of the project, which include, among others:

- Importance of applying a participatory approach: While stakeholder engagement and consultations are often time-consuming and tedious, which could cause delay in implementation, including process leads to stronger ownership of the project outputs and sustainability of the project impacts. Individual efforts in resilience measurement/analysis and M&E only leads to confusion regarding competing approaches, duplication of efforts, and a failure to learn from experience.
- Need for broad-based, multi-sectoral approach to address resilience: Project works explicitly

demonstrated that resilience measurement/analysis and M&E cannot be undertaken in a short-term, sector-based narrow-defined manner undertaken in but needs to be conducted in a broad-based context with the clear understanding and alignment of all the contributing sectors/actors and their ongoing/planned projects.

- Continues support in capacity building: Both at regional and Kenya level, while there is a strong wish to find ways to replicating the successful works of the project in other IGAD Member States and Kenya counties. At the same time, however, there is a concern that the capacity of various government institutions are not fully developed to an extent where the future processes of resilience data collection and management will continue smoothly. It is therefore critical to ensure the better coordination of humanitarian/development partners to continually provide need-based technical support so that the achievements of the project will be adequately carried over.

The final project evaluation report (Annex 8.5-2) provides further details on the above and other lessons generated from the project. At national level, the project team also produced a comprehensive report, summarizing the main lessons learnt and the key follow up action points to be addressed at national and county levels. This lessons learned and way forward report (Viewable as Annex 13.4) was share with all the EDE Pillar 6 members in February 2016 after the review and endorsement of the EDE Secretariat. This document is now used as a key decision support tool for the pillar as well as the advocacy tool for more harmonized and concerted support towards the shared drought/disaster resilience building agenda.

13.5 [FIN] Final report final update

-
