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# Executive summary

1. This report shows the findings of the final evaluation of the Safer Communities through Disaster Risk Reduction in Development (SC-DRR) Phase II Project. The main objective of second phase of SC-DRR is to make disaster risk reduction as normal part of the development process embedded in core functions of the central and local government and its public and private partners. The SC-DRR Phase II has two main outputs: (i) Output 1 – Policy guidance developed to support the integration of DRR in development planning and specific sectors; and (ii) Output 2 – Technical capacities of disaster management actors strengthened to plan, implement and monitor DRR. The project consists of three sub-projects to achieve the goal, including: (i) Enhancing Policy and Planning for Disaster Risk Reduction (EP-DRR), (ii) Integrated Climate-induced Disaster Risk Management (IC-DRM), (iii) Urban Climate Risk Management (UCLIM).
2. The findings of the reports are obtained from the analysis of key documents and interviews with key project stakeholders and beneficiaries. Due to limited funding, SC-DRR Phase II project has been scaled down from its original proposal. While there has been this adjustment, the consultant finds SC-DRR II has made important achievements in providing DRR-based policy guidance involving key stakeholders at the national level, particularly BNPN, the MoHA, and BAPPENAS, who have important authorities to issue policies related to planning and budgeting in DRR. SC-DRR also brought a big step to the current DRR policy in Indonesia by promoting the convergence of CCA and DRR. SC-DRR Phase II has developed a guideline for conducting Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment (CCVA) at urban level and a guideline for Urban Risk Management Plan.
3. While SC-DRR has made important contribution, more works are needed to make sure the the policy and guideline produced are in place. SC-DRR Phase II produced various policy guidance and manuals related to DRR and CCA policy-making, but those still have limited outreach. Certainly some of them were used as basis for the policy-making. However, the products could have had widespread impact for those are not directly involved in the project. There is a need to have knowledge management strategy to deliver the results of the project for wider audiences.

## Introduction

1. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which SC-DRR Phase II has achieved its intended results. The evaluation covers the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation. It also assesses the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. The evaluation is strategic—i.e. its focus is on the outcomes and impacts of the project rather than on the implementation of project activities. Findings will serve as a reference for the design of future DRR projects in Indonesia and in other disaster-prone countries.

## SC-DRR Phase II Background and Overview

1. While Indonesian territory is often struck by earthquakes and volcanic eruptions due to its geological situation, the number of climate-induced disaster events in the country has increased significantly. According to the Indonesian Disaster Data and Information Database (DIBI), floods and landslides have been more frequent since 2000. Thus, the growing attention should be addressed to minimize risk that could be triggered by extreme weather events and hydro-meteorological hazards. In the meantime, the awareness and initiatives for climate change policy in Indonesia has been increasing.
2. The Government of Indonesia (GoI) has put serious effort to reform and strengthen their disaster management system since the 2004 Indian Ocean Earthquake and Tsunami. That event became the turning point for GoI to increase their and public capacity to reduce disaster risk through enabling policies and regulatory framework.
3. The progress of improving disaster management in Indonesia has shown substantial milestones. This movement represents what some have called a paradigm shift in disaster management—i.e. from disaster ‘response’ to disaster ‘risk reduction’. GoI has achieved some notable achievements to reform Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) policies and regulatory framework:
   1. The adoption of the United Nation Hyogo Framework Action on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA - DRR) 2005 – 2015 and the United Nation Sendai Framework on DRR (SF – DRR) 2015 - 2030;
   2. The enactment of Law 24/2007 on Disaster Management and its supporting legislation, including Government Regulation 21/2008 on the Implementation of Disaster Management and Government Regulation 22/2008 on Funding for Disaster Management;
   3. The establishment of the National Agency for Disaster Management (*Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana* - BNPB) and the Local Agency for Disaster Management (*Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah –* BPBD) that both have authority to coordinate and to implement disaster management policies;
   4. The mainstreaming of DRR into development programs through the Mid-Term National Development Plans (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional* – RPJMN) and the Disaster Management Plan (*Rencana Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana* or it is recognized as Renas PB).
4. GoI has put their serious efforts in making the policy over the past decade, including the release of National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) or *Rencana Aksi Nasional Adaptasi Perubahan Iklim* (RAN-API)and the mainstreaming of CCA into spatial planning. However, CCA has not been fully considered as an integral part of DRR and vice versa. Theoretically, both DRR and CCA have similar spectrum and charateristics in approaches and practices. Both focus on dynamic interaction between environmental hazard and on-going development. Both themes use the concept of vulnerability and capacity to identify the community ability to cope with disaster risk and climate change impact Therefore both have cross-cutting aspects in term of risk assessment methodology and practical manners. There are still limited policies that integrate both themes whereas both activities are intended to deal with risk that might occur in a region.
5. Previously, UNDP has delivered the project “*Safer Communities through Disaster Risk Reduction in Developmen*t” (SC-DRR) Phase 1 from 2009 – 2013. The SC-DRR Phase 1 directly contributed to the paradigm shift of Indonesian disaster management by mainstreaming DRR principles into the development process. The project is a nationally implemented project through a partnership between the GoI and UNDP. The main aim of the project is to ensure that a culture of safety becomes the norm in Indonesia, both within government and within communities vulnerable to disasters. The project has contributed to:
   1. The establishment of policy, legal, and regulatory framework for DRR, including in the National RPB 2010 – 2014 and the RPJMN 2010 – 2014;
   2. The establishment of institutional supporting DRR, including the National Platform on DRR (*Platform Nasional Pengurangan Risiko Bencana -* PLANAS PRB);
   3. Promote public DRR awareness, including Safer School pilot project; and
   4. The establishment of community-based DRR interventions in 44 communities.
6. UNDP considered the result of SC-DRR Phase I evaluation that recommends further empowerment for the capacities of government, especially at local level, to formulate and implement DRR policies, regulations, and programs and the capacities of communities to take measures to reduce risk on their own. In addition, the promotion of a culture of safety is required to change the fatalistic view of disasters that still prevails amongst the general population. Therefore, in 2013, UNDP decided to extend its supports to promote DRR as part of development process in Indonesia through the SC-DRR Phase II.
7. The main objective of second phase of SC-DRR is to make disaster risk reduction as normal part of the development process embedded in core functions of the central and local government and its public and private partners. With an increasing frequency of climate-related hazards, the project also support the GoI to more effectively plan interventions to reduce emerging risks in urban, small islands, and coastal regions. Furthermore, particular emphasis is given to local communities where the most direct actions can be taken to reduce people’s vulnerability to the adverse impact of disasters. The SC-DRR Phase II has two main outputs:
   1. Output 1 – Policy guidance developed to support the integration of DRR in development planning and specific sectors; and
   2. Output 2 – Technical capacities of disaster management actors strengthened to plan, implement and monitor DRR.
8. To achieve the outputs, the project consists of three sub-projects to achieve the goal, including:
   1. Enhancing Policy and Planning for Disaster Risk Reduction (EP-DRR).
   2. Integrated Climate-induced Disaster Risk Management (IC-DRM).
   3. Urban Climate Risk Management (UCLIM).
9. The second phase of SC-DRR was implemented through BNPB with strategic partnerships nurtured with the National Development Planning Agency (*Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional* - BAPPENAS), Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA) and the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF). Non-government partners and a handful of local governments are engaged to promote engagement and influence policy change. UNDP has provided support for project implementation.
10. The second phase of SC- DRR activities are aligned with the UNDP Country Programme and the United Nations Development Partnership Framework (UNDPF), which was developed in consultation with the Government of Indonesia. The programme relates to UNDPF Outcome No. 3, “*Protecting the vulnerable and reducing vulnerabilities*”. SCDRR was also designed to contribute to one of the targets in the UNDP Indonesia Country Programme Action Plan (2011-2015) as *“The GOI and communities throughout the country have minimized the risk of adverse impacts of disasters, through the application of DRR policies, regulations and practices”.*
11. The project has been funded by various sources, including the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub, UNDP TRAC (Target for Resource Assignment from the Core), UNDP BCPR (Bureau for Crisis and Prevention and Recovery), UNDP SPARC (Strategic Planning and Action to Strengthen Climate Resilience of Rural Communities) project and UNDP BPPS (Bureau for Policy and Programme Support)/TTF (Thematic Trust Fund). The project’s overall estimated budget is about US$ 2 Million. As of 31 December 2016, US$ 1,805,958. 09 of project funds had been spent. The breakdown of funds per project component is described in the table below:

Table 1 Project Expenditure

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Component** | **Expenditure (USD)** |
| I - Policy guidance developed to support the integration of DRR in development planning and specific sectors | 896,420. 03 |
| II - Technical capacities of disaster management actors strengthened to plan, implement and monitor DRR. | 909,538. 06 |
| **Total** | 1,805,958. 09 |

# Evaluation scope and objectives

1. Since this is a final project evaluation, the emphasis is on project outcomes and impacts rather than on project implementation, although some implementation issues are also addressed. The evaluation considers the effectiveness of the project at the national level as well as at local level, in Makassar (South Sulawesi) and Kupang (East Nusa Tenggara).

## Evaluation criteria

1. In accordance with the UNDP guidelines on Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results1, the evaluation applies six basic criteria: (i) effectiveness, (ii) efficiency, (iii) relevance, (iv) appropriateness, (v) sustainability, and (vi) impact. The evaluators have assessed SC-DRR’s achievements as well as the project’s strengths and weaknesses against these key criteria. Key questions for each criterion, data sources, data collection methods and indicators are outlined in the evaluation matrix below.

Table 2 Evaluation Criteria

| **Evaluation criteria** | **Key questions** | **Data sources** | **Data collection method** | **Indicators** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effectiveness** | To what extent has the project achieved its intended results? What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended results? | Project reports; internal monitoring reports; stakeholders’ views | Document analysis; interviews with stakeholders | Extent to which outputs have been achieved; extent to which changes/outcomes can be attributed to project outcomes |
| **Efficiency** | How efficiently were resources converted into results? Was project funding well spent? | Project reports; internal monitoring reports; stakeholders’ views | Document analysis; interviews with stakeholders, especially donors and partner government agencies; | Extent to which resources have been used wisely to achieve the intended results; extent to which partnership strategy has leveraged other resources or initiatives that have contributed to project’s intended outcomes |
| **Relevance** | To what extent was project design SC-DRR Phase II consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries? How did the project adapt to the changing development context? | Project reports; internal monitoring reports; stakeholders’ views; reports and information on other DRR projects | Document analysis; interviews with stakeholders; interviews with partner agencies | Extent to which intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries; degree of congruency between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the initiative planners and the perception of what is needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries. |
| **Appropriateness** | How feasible was project design and implementation? To what extent was the project adapted to local conditions? | Project document; Project reports; internal monitoring reports; stakeholders’ views | Document analysis; interviews with stakeholders; | Cultural acceptance as well as feasibility of the activities or method of delivery of a development initiative; extent to which the planning, design and implementation of initiatives has taken local context into account |
| **Sustainability** | Will the project’s investments continue to deliver benefits beyond the life of the project? Are sufficient local capacities and resources available for the further development of DRR activities initiated by SC-DRR Phase II? | Stakeholders’ views; Government laws and policies; capacity assessments | Document analysis; interviews with stakeholders, especially partner government agencies; review of capacity assessments | A sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, has been developed or implemented; Financial and economic mechanisms in place to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the assistance ends; Suitable organizational (public or private sector) arrangements have been made; Policy and regulatory frameworks are in place that will support continuation of benefits;  Requisite institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) exists. |
| **Impact** | To what extent have project outputs contributed to desired outcomes? | Project reports; internal monitoring reports; stakeholders’ views | Document analysis; interviews with stakeholders; direct observation | Extent to which project has delivered benefits to people’s wellbeing, directly or indirectly, or as an intended or unintended consequence of project activities |

## Evaluation approach and methods

1. The evaluation focuses on the project’s overall contribution to mainstreaming DRR into the development process in Indonesia, paying particular attention to the linkages between outputs and outcomes. The evaluation focus on strategic issues and challenges. Because SC-DRR Phase II overall goal is to make DRR a normal part of the development process, the evaluator have employed a qualitative approach to assess the project’s results.
2. The evaluator has drawn on a variety of primary and secondary data to assess the project’s achievements and its strengths and weaknesses. Primary data includes interviews with project beneficiaries and stakeholders, DRR experts as well as former consultants of SC-DRR II. Stakeholders include representatives of government agencies at local and national levels, and representatives of UN agencies, Donors, international and national NGOs, CSOs and local communities in target areas. A list of respondents is attached as Annex II. Data collection methods include desk-study (document analysis) to review these documents below:
3. SC-DRR Phase II Project Document (including Result Resources Framework);
4. Training materials produced by the project;
5. Quarterly Monitoring Reports;
6. Internal Project Assurance Report (IPAR);
7. Mid Term review of SC-DRR Phase II;
8. Board Meeting Minutes;
9. Donor Reports;
10. SC-DRR M&E plan; and
11. DRR Investment Tracking Final Report.
12. Secondary data was collected from other sources that have direct relevance for the review purposes. This includes, but is not limited to, government policies and regulations.
    1. National and region development plans;
    2. National and regional laws and regulations on disaster risk reduction; and
    3. Other DRR project reports and evaluations.
13. The evaluation was conducted between 13 February and 30 March 2018. Findings are based on the evaluator’s direct observation and interviews with the project beneficiaries and stakeholders. While it is difficult to measure the impacts of a policy and governance-oriented program with a high degree of precision, the evaluator is confident that they have been able to capture and distill the views of a broad range of project stakeholders and beneficiaries and to make a fair assessment of the extent to which the project has achieved its intended results.

## The Evaluator

1. The evaluation is conducted by one independent evaluator. Biodata of the consultant is attached as Annex IV. The consultant reports to the SCDRR project manager and consults with the evaluation reference group, which consists of representatives from GoI and donors.

# Evaluation Findings

## Effectiveness

*To what extent has the project achieved its intended results? What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended results?*

1. The SC-DRR Phase II overarching goal is to minimize the risks of adverse impacts of disasters through the application of DRR policies, regulations, and practices.. This section examines the extent to which the project has achieved its intended results.
2. Initially, the early design of the project was to expand and replicate the national policy regulatory framework produced by the SC-DRR Phase I at the sub-national level. Nevertheless, the SC-DRR Phase II project has been scaled down from its original proposal due to limited funding. SC-DRR Phase II has been unable to secure a large scale donor to support the project. Consequently, some of proposed activities were either minimized in term of objectives and activities or completely changed (Table 3).

**Table 3 A comparison of the original proposal and the revised one**

| **Original locations, activities and outputs** | **Revised location, activities and outputs** |
| --- | --- |
| **Selected Location**: Originally, the project targeted districts located in five provinces, including Aceh, Central Java, East Nusa Tenggara, Central Sulawesi, and West Papua) for the implementation. | **Selected Location**: The SC-DRR Phase II focused in Makassar and Kupang for empowering sub-national stakeholders’ capacity. |
| **Output 1:** National and local governments policy and regulatory enabling framework for DRR in target areas designed and implemented. | **Output 1:** Policy guidance developed to support the integration of DRR in in development planning. |
| **Activity 1.1** Regulation formulated for specific sectors and areas related to DRR. | **Activity 1.1** Regulations and procedures formulated for specific sectors and areas related to DRR. |
| **Activity 1.2** Planning documents and procedures formulated to improve preparedness. | **Activity 1.2** Methodologies and knowledge enhanced to improve the implementation of DRR. |
| **Activity 1.3** Local government plans and budgets specify. | **Activity 1.3** Enhanced decentralized DRR planning and budgeting tools for local government. |
| **-** | **Activity 1.4** DRR planning tools and frameworks for government developed. |
| **Output 2:** DM agencies in target areas effectively functioning and utilize risk assessment for DRR initiatives partnership with multi-stakeholder DRR fora. | **Output 2:** Technical capacities of DM actors strengthened to plan, implement, and monitor DRR. |
| **Activity 2.1** Improved disaster information management system to enhance coordination and partnership. | **Activity 2.1** Improved data and information coordination for integrated disaster risk management planning. |
| **Activity 2.2** Mechanisms for monitoring DRR implementation are established. | **Activity 2.2** Mechanisms for monitoring DRR implementation are established and yield relevant and timely information to enhance planning procedures. |
| **Activity 2.3** System established to monitor the use of fiscal resources allocated for DRR. | **Activity 2.3** Mechanism established to monitor the use of fiscal resources allocated for DRR |
| **Activity 2.4** Functional and technical capacities of BNPB and BPBDs supported to fulfill their mandates more effectively | **-** |
| **Activity 2.5** DRR Fora strengthened and operating more effectively to support and monitor government policy and plans for DRR | **-** |
| **Output 3:** DRR principle and techniques to minimize disaster risk are adopted and applied by communities. | **-** |

1. SC-DRR Phase II consists of three sub-projects: EP-DRR, IC-DRM, and UCLIM. The division is part of UNDP strategy to attract donors to fund the project. Activities of those three sub-projects covered policy guidance and technical capacities development, but they have different scope and themes.
   1. EP-DRR was funded by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia. It is designed to influence strategic policy guidance on disaster management, and support the improvement of planning and budgeting for disaster risk reduction. In addition, the project resulted recommendation for improving disaster risk assessment methodology which integrates climate-related factors. EP-DRR provided technical assistance for formulating Disaster Management (DM) Plan and developing fiscal tracking criteria.
   2. IC-DRM was financed by BPPS Thematic Trust Fund for Government of Sweden. The project focused on establishing CCA and DRR convergence by providing its framework with specific gender concern. The project produced a manual to integrate both themes and a module for verifying and interpreting risk assessment. In addition, the project also strengthened technical capacities the governmental agencies that administer data and information regarding CCA and DRR to produce a sharing mechanism.
   3. UCLIM was funded by BPPS and Regional Bureau for Asia Pacific (RBAP). UCLIM was designed to enhance urban stakeholders’ capacity in Makassar and Kupang to assess their city vulnerability to climate change and to formulate urban risk management plan. Prior to the activities in both cities, the city developed policy guidance consisting of climate risk indicators.
2. One of the main concern in SC-DRR Phase II is the urgency to consider climate change in DRR. Previously, there had not been so much attention to promote awareness and capacity of stakeholders upon the issue. Thus, some activities of three sub-projects were devoted to enhance the capacity of stakeholders at national and local level to combine CCA and DRR approaches.

### Policy Guidance

EP-DRR

1. Conclusively, EP-DRR played big parts of SC-DRR achievements in providing DRR-based policy guidance. EP-DRR involved key stakeholders at the national level, particularly BNPN, the MoHA, and BAPPENAS, who have important authorities to issue policies related to planning and budgeting in DRR. Furthermore, they are positioned as the leading implementers within this partnership that is effective to increase sense of ownership for the project among them. Although EP-DRR focused on strengthening policy with stakeholders at the national level, the project produced useful sources for sub-national governments to formulate and implement DRR policies at lower level governance, for example DRR-based spatial planning guidelines.
2. First, EP-DRR has been instrumental to strengthen current DRR policies, legal, and regulatory frameworks at the national level, especially related to planning. EP-DRR was commenced in the transition of new government administration which enabled the project management to incorporate DRR into the development agenda. The project management took the opportunity to integrate DRR into RPJMN 2015 – 2019. UNDP worked closely with BAPPENAS to prepare a background study for the inclusion of DRR in RPJMN. The facilitation resulted to include DRR in the seventh national priority agenda in RPJMN 2015-2019 that focuses on self-reliant economies. The incorporation DRR into RPJMN is a strategic option to ensure that DRR becomes part of national and local programs. RPJMN is the main reference for ministries and local governments to budget and to implement their development programs.
3. Second, EP-DRR assisted the formulation of National Guideline on DRR-based Spatial Planning. BNPB, BAPPENAS, and the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning (MoASP), with the facilitation of UNDP, have drafted the guideline. Spatial planning can be a potential instrument for DRR since it contains spatial strategies that can reduce hazard occurrence as well as decrease vulnerabilities in a region. The project has resulted background studies that supported the preparation of DRR-based spatial planning guideline, including:

* A background study of the current Spatial Plan of National Strategic Area *Jabodetabekpunjur* (Jakarta- Bogor-Tangerang-Bekasi-Puncak-Cianjur) as a DRR instrument;
* A technical material for revising guideline for provincial spatial planning and strategic zone spatial planning.

1. EP-DRR provided guidance to improve existing policy on disaster risk assessment with the inclusion of climate change*.* By the time the project was commenced, the policy had not considered climate change factors (e.g. baseline and future rainfall condition) as part of the procedure yet*.* In EP-DRR, a consultation team was appointed to facilitate the improvement of the existing risk assessment instrument outlined in the Head of Regulation or *Peraturan Kepala* (Perka) of BNPB 2/2012. The consultation was held with BNPB, academia, and practitioners in DRR and CCA to result some recommendations, including the incorporation of climate change factors in hazard assessment.
2. EP-DRR was extended to 2016 to assist the MoHA to formulate technical standards for public service on DM. The extension was to take the opportunity when the MoHA was preparing the Government Regulation on Minimum Service Standard or *Standar Pelayanan Minimal* (SPM). The facilitation of EP-DRR helped the Government to frame the standards for DM public service provision that is now annexed on the Government Regulation 2/2018 on SPM. In the era of decentralization, this regulation is very important to ensure the implementation of DRR at local level because it provides guidance as well as legal basis for local governments to deliver their mandatory public service. Hence, it is expected to encourage local government involvement in DRR implementation.
3. Nevertheless, the role of UNDP could have been more significant to leverage the urgency of DRR-based spatial planning if UNDP promoted more intensive dialogue among stakeholders at the national level. UNDP focused on assisting the MoASP to draft the regulation and the policy guidance. When the project was carried out, there were on-going related policy-making, such as the mainstreaming of CCA into spatial planning conducted by the MPW.
4. Although SC-DRR Phase II produces several important policy guidance in DRR, UNDP and their partners faced significant challenges to achieve the outputs. In EP-DRR, there was significant delay in the project achievements due to difficulties in recruiting experts. The project was set to yield various policy guidance that required extensive consultations with ministry partners. Nevertheless, the project management encountered difficulties in recruiting suitable consultants for the project because the consultants must have a mixed of specialties and experience, such as DRR, CCA and spatial planning. There is a limited pool of consultants in Indonesia who have such background. Thus, this situation delayed the recruitment process as well as affected the pace of EP-DRR deliverables. Three out of eight of EP-DRR activities had been just started by early December 2013 while there was an on-going mid-term review conducted in November – December 2013.
5. EP-DRR worked with various entities and produced different outputs. Such situation was challenging for the project management to assembling perception, commitment, time, and human resources among the involved stakeholders. The production of policy guidance in EP-DRR comprised of consultation works with several ministries/agencies to yield different thematic outputs within limited timeframe. For example, BAPPENAS had responsibility to produce recommendation for spatial planning guidelines while they were also responsible to conduct a background study for DRR fiscal tracking. The project deliverables required active involvement of various stakeholders and extensive coordination between UNDP and their ministry partners. According to the hired consultants, they had difficulties to synchronize different perception when the activity involved multiple stakeholders. In addition, competing priorities and delay in internal budget disbursement within ministries, especially the MoHA and BNPB, hampered their participation in the project activities, such as slow response in giving feedback to the consultants.

IC-DRM

1. IC-DRM brought a big step to the current DRR policy in Indonesia by promoting the convergence of CCA and DRR. The project management facilitated the key stakeholders in both issues, the MoEF (for CCA) and BNPB (for DRR) to create the convergence framework. In addition, other ministries and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) were also invited in a focus group discussion and workshops to support the convergence. For instance, the Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection (MoWECP) were invited in the framework building process to give inputs for gender mainstreaming. IC-DRM was conducted after there had been growing concern at the national level to combine CCA and DRR as outlined in the National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation (*Rencana Aksi Nasional Adaptasi Perubahan Iklim –* RAN API) and the Disaster Management (DM) Plan 2015 – 2019. This project has established synergy and communication among the key stakeholders to actualize the concept of CCA-DRR convergence into practice.
2. IC-DRM experienced difficulties in synchronizing commitment and perception among the participating stakeholders, especially between BNPB and the MoEF. Integrating CCA and DRR was an advanced step in policy-making for both sides, but it requires huge coordination and supervision task. It required intensive communication between the stakeholders to consolidate their views regarding the methodology of CCA-DRR convergence. Such situation led to significant delay to the project achievement because the project management must spare more time than what had been allocated to facilitate the consolidation. In addition, different meetings were attended by different representatives from the invited institutions. It is difficult to maintain the same level of understanding regarding the process that has been done before. Moreover, the representatives often do not hold strategic position in their institutions which hinder the follow-up.

UCLIM

1. Through UCLIM, SC-DRR Phase II developed a guideline for conducting Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment (CCVA) at urban level and a guideline for Urban Risk Management Plan. A group of climate risk experts developed indicators to assess climate vulnerability, including sensitivity, exposure and adaptive capacity. The developed indicators put special attention on how women groups are affected by climate change. After assisting urban stakeholders to conduct CCVA and Urban Risk Management Plan in the selected cities, the project released gender-sensitive manuals for both activities. Those were developed based on the experience of CCVA and Urban Risk Management Plan formulation in Kupang. The CCVA in Makassar was not conducted from zero since the project management decided to update the previous CCVA done by UNEP, UNDP and UN

Habitat in 2012.

1. The project management could not be able to form a working group consisting of national stakeholders in CCA and DRR, such as the MoEF and BAPPENAS, to support the UCLIM activities due to their conflicting internal priorities. As a result, the project management was not well informed that there have been similar CCVA studies in Makassar that were done by the World Bank and the MPW. In addition, the activities of UCLIM was not linked to other related initiatives in CCA in the city. Before UCLIM was commenced in Makassar, the MPW had studied the integration of CCA into spatial planning in the city which one of the products is a climate risk assessment.
2. The project management could have learned from other similar initiatives in Indonesia and positioned the results of UCLIM among them. ACCCRN (Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network) has done similar thing to what UCLIM did. The project commenced in 2008 has produced policy guidance as well as toolkits for local stakeholders to increase urban resilience to climate change. They involve different actors within their pilot project city in the form of a core team (working group or city team) which became a forum for knowledge sharing, decision making and action. UNDP has vast network with local governments and other NGOs which could have facilitated communication with them to identify the lesson learned from any preceding similar projects. UCLIM might have filled the gap rather than created new one.

### Strengthening Technical Capacities

1. In addition to policy guidance, SC-DRR Phase II delivered technical capacities empowerment for the national partners as well as the selected municipality stakeholders. Although the initial project plan was to deliver technical capacities for wider beneficiaries (i.e. communities), but later on the scope was scaled down due to funding limitation. The project management was still able to involve stakeholders from national to local one. Most of the technical capacity assistances were delivered at the national level meanwhile only stakeholders in City of Makassar and Kupang received the assistance. The activities were covered in the three sub-projects. Those comprised of:
   1. Supporting analysis and preparatory framework of the DM Plan 2015 – 2019.
   2. Supporting the formulation for fiscal tracking criterion/indicators.
   3. Improving data and information coordination for DRR and CCA convergence; and
   4. Supporting the Municipality Government of Makassar and Kupang to conduct CCVA and their Urban Risk Management Plan.
2. EP-DRR assisted BNPB in the formulation of the DM Plan 2015 – 2019 to develop a framework and instruments for monitoring and evaluation. The instruments consist of self-assessment, report assessment and field assessment. The project also resulted the framework that has a clear workflow for ministries/agencies to monitor, evaluate and report the implementation. The framework and the instruments are new features in DM Plan since those were not exist in the previous one. BNPB acts as the coordinator for monitoring, evaluation, and reporting activities. In addition, EP-DRR also incorporated climate change issues into the formulation of the DM Plan program. In the chapter of general disaster situation, there is strong emphasis on the urgency of addressing climate-induced disasters (e.g. flood and coastal inundation). In the DM Plan 2015 – 2019, there are two main programs related to climate change, including building community resilience to climate change and mainstreaming DRR and CCA into development planning.
3. The facilitation of the DM Plan improvement was accomplished through a number of meetings with 37 ministries and non-government partners. The technical support was done through a series of consultations to identify their program focus and priorities which were later adjusted with the DM Plan targets. This gave substantial challenges for the project management to consolidate those stakeholders’ point of views and their participation to provided data. The participating stakeholders delegated different representative in different meetings so it was difficult to maintain the same level of understanding. Some of meeting required important decision, but those representatives did not hold strategic positions. In addition, BNPB had limited human resources to supervise and to coordinate the progress with other line ministries.
4. EP-DRR promoted the integration of DRR-based budgeting in the formulation of development program that the main partner for this activity was BAPPENAS. The appointed consultants conducted a background study for DRR fiscal tracking in ministerial and local government budgets. The study aims to examine to what extent DRR had been allocated by 37 line ministries and 17 selected local governments. Thus, this study required budgeting data from those stakeholders. With the strong leadership of BAPPENAS, the data was successfully collected. The study resulted an important finding that DRR-related activities were still allocated below 1% of the overall national budget. Accordingly, the consultation team assisted BAPPENAS to develop fiscal tracking criteria that are expected to encourage the national government to invest more in DRR activities.
5. The decision to select BAPPENAS as the responsible party for DRR fiscal tracking is quite debatable as the effective way to promote the issue. Although BAPPENAS has the authority to coordinate planning and budgeting across ministries/agencies in development planning, the Ministry of Finance (MoF) should have also contributed directly in this activity. The MoF holds the authority to issue norms, standards, procedures, and criteria related to development budgeting. Thus, the MoF could have directly obtained the benefits of the study to influence their budgeting policy.

IC-DRM

1. IC-DRM provided capacity building for supporting the convergence of CCA and DRR, including climate-induced risk assessment training. The risk assessment modules have been disseminated and tested through trainings in three districts in East Nusa Tenggara for local government officers, local NGOs officers, and academia. The content of the modules was developed from the proposed framework of CCA and DRR convergence. The trainings focused on conducting risk assessment in coastal areas. The selected district represent the characteristics of coastal areas with climate sensitive condition. The three districts are Manggarai (wet climate), East Sumba Timur (dry climate), and Sabu Raijua (small islands). The selection was based on the MoEF and BNPB suggestion. The technical capacities assistance in IC-DRM could have been more strategic if the project involved academia in developing the training design and its modules. Academia have not only related experience in conducting climate risk assessment, but also knowledge on existing similar activities that may contribute to the improvement of the training and the module.
2. IC-DRM also set a mechanism for data sharing between agencies that has authority to administer climate and disaster related data, such as BMKG (*Badan Meteorologi, Klimatologi, dan Geofisika* – The Meteorology, Climatology, and Geophysics Agency), BIG (*Badan Informasi Geospatial –* the Geospatial Information Agency), and the MoEF. IC-DRM was intended to fill the gaps that the GoI had not had standard format for data collection and even lack of understanding about who has authority to regulate specific data related to CCA and DRR. IC-DRM has resulted the mechanism, but the quality of the mechanism needs to be improved further. The process to formulate the mechanism has limited interaction with the aforementioned agencies. The appointed consultant did not have adequate input from them to develop the mechanism because of limited number of workshops. The discussion to solve the problems was not sufficient to be done in this limited meeting. Moreover, the invited participants who came to the workshop were not the same persons attending the previous one.

UCLIM

1. UCLIM selected two cities, Makassar and Kupang, as the locations of pilot project for formulating CCVA as well as Urban Risk Management Plan in CCA and DRR. The selection was based on that the cities are considered high risk to natural disaster and located in different climate zone. The trainings attempted to test the developed indicators for CCVA. It was delivered through participatory approach which allowed the invited stakeholders to contribute directly in the making of CCVA and Urban Risk Management Plan.
2. UCLIM contributed to new CCA and DRR policies in the two cities. Neither Makassar nor Kupang had had any specific plan in both themes before. According to the appointed consultants appointed for UCLIM, local stakeholders, including local NGOs officers, academia, private sector representatives, and women organizations, showed strong enthusiasm to participate in the UCLIM activities. They were involved in a participatory process to formulate their CCVA and Urban Risk Management Plan through a series of meetings and workshops with the consultation team. They, especially BAPPEDA (Local Development Planning Agency) and BPBD (Local Disaster Management Agency) in Kupang and Makassar, have shown consistency in contributing to every UCLIM activities. According to the appointed consultants, both municipality governments showed support during the training program which was very effective to encourage active participation from their local staff.
3. Although the invited local stakeholders showed strong enthusiasm as well as active participation, the local government agencies did not always delegate their staff who have related experience with the issues brought by the project. Even they did not hold strategic position in their institution. Hence, it influenced the quality of the discussion and the follow-up.

## Efficiency

*How efficiently were resources converted into results? Was project funding well spent?*

1. Generally, the project management was able to cope with the limited budget to achieve its overall SC-DRR Phase II targets. The early design of the project was quite ambitious since it used to have larger scale (Table 3) than did the actual realization. The initial objective to empower a wide range of sub-national stakeholders could not be fully done because the project could not meet its funding targets. Consequently, the budget cut gave significant impact to some of the activities. SC-DRR Phase II had planned to deliver technical capacities for sub-national stakeholders in five province before the project management decided to scale down the locations to Makassar, Kupang, and Kendari (Southeast Sulawesi). Yet, eventually, the activity was conducted only in Makassar and Kupang with limited activities.
2. Most of the activities in SC-DRR Phase II were done at the national level in which those are efficient ways in converting the modest financial resources into strategic and important results. In EP-DRR, the partnership with the selected ministries helped the project management to achieve the intended outputs more efficiently. For example, BAPPENAS coordinated data collection for the DRR fiscal tracking study from 37 line ministries and selected local governments. Had not taken over by BAPPENAS, the data collection for this study could have had large expenditure. In addition, the MoHA did not hire an external consultant to assist them to formulate the guideline of DRR planning and budgeting. They decided to undertake the activity with their own experts and staff.
3. However, working with the national stakeholders is not easy task, especially in synchronizing their time for coordination meetings, focus group discussions, and workshops. In ICDRM, the progress of CCA and DRR convergence was slow because of debates and opinions in the meetings among the key stakeholders. The consultants and the project management needed to continuously revise and update the contents. In some occasions, not all of the partners have sufficient resources and commitment to support the activities. For instance, BNPB was under-staff to coordinate and synchronize during the formulation of the DM Plan 2015 – 2019. In addition, some of them had competing priorities to accomplish their own programs and budget. This caused some delay in carrying out coordination meetings and workshop.
4. The budget cut affected not only the location selection for UCLIM, but also its methodological approach. The decision to keep Makassar instead of Kendari was based on UNDP previous experience in conducting similar study in the city. The project management had established communication with local stakeholders in Makassar as well as the study was intended to be an improvement of the previous one.
5. Some of the activities in EP-DRR had slow start because the project management could not be able to recruit appropriate consultants and the complexity of UNDP business process. The project did not anticipate limited pool of experts that have cross-sectoral expertise. Meanwhile, EP-DRR required 18 consultants to support the project to handle nine activities. Thus, such situation had led to unsatisfactory budget delivery rates by the end of 2013 because the resource could not be converted into certain activities, such as workshops and focus group discussions, in timely manner. UNDP procurement team was under-staff that made UNDP to recruit extra personnel to support the activities in EP-DRR. In both EP-DRR and UCLIM case, the financial resources was not disbursed in timely manner due to the complexity of UNDP business process so that it slowed down the activities achievement.
6. In addition, there are some potential repetitive outputs in SC-DRR Phase II. EP-DRR resulted a policy guidance for the inclusion of climate change in disaster risk assessment. Meanwhile, similar document was produced later on in IC-DRM. The document gives guidance to conduct climate-induced disaster risk assessment, including its indicators and a mechanism for data sharing. Both have focus to give input for improving Perka BNPB 2/2012 on disaster risk assessment. In UCLIM, one of the product is a manual for conducting urban climate change vulnerability. The manual was developed based on the experience of conducting participatory CCVA in Kupang. Nevertheless, there is unclear explanation on how those separated products in risk assessment are complementing or linked to each other. In fact, those risk assessment share similar aspects, such as proposed indicators in calculating vulnerability.

## Relevance

*Was the project consistent with national and local development priorities? How has the project adapted to the changing development context?*

1. Since Law 24/2007 and BNPB were established, DRR has been promoted as integral part of Indonesia development. The Government have issued various disaster management policies, such as DM Plan, safe school guidance and risk assessment guidance. DRR has becomes one of Indonesia development priorities as outlined in RPJMN 2010 – 2014. As SC-DRR Phase II was launched in the early years of Indonesia disaster management institutionalization, the project is still fit to the emerging needs of the Government to improve their policies and practices in DRR. The project followed up SC-DRR Phase I recommendation to continue strengthening DM policy and institutional capacity. SC-DRR Phase II ensured that the importance of DRR in Indonesia development agenda is outline in RPJMN 2015 – 2019.
2. Since mandated by the constitution, the Government have allocated some portions in the National Budget (*Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara* – APBN) for DRR-related programs. According to the EP-DRR fiscal tracking study, the portion for DRR is still quite low under 1% of the total budget, but ministries/agencies have increased their budget for supporting DRR implementation. The budget for DRR-related activities in 2012 was Rp 11.2 trillion which increased about 10% from 2011. There are several institutions who have large portions for DRR, including BNPB, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, the MoEF, and the National Search and Rescue Agency. Although there has not been any study to measure the precise impact that SC-DRR Phase II has had on the Government’s DRR programming to date, the project contributes to securing the incorporation of DRR in RPJMN 2015 – 2019. This is very important to ensure that DRR is financed by the government in that period.
3. The selected partners are very relevant for supporting the achievement of the project objective as well as giving wider impact at national and sub-national level. They have potential roles to promote the developed guidance as inputs for making regulations in DRR. BAPPENAS are the driving agency for development planning. BNPB produce and coordinate the implementation of DRR policies. The MoHA empowers sub-national stakeholders and ensure that the direction of local development is in-line with national development agenda. EP-DRR also support DRR-based planning and budgeting at sub-national level that is in-line with the MoHA Strategic Plan (2010-2014) to improve local capacity in managing disaster. In addition, the project involved other sectoral ministries that could give contribution to improve their policies, such as the MoSAP and the MoWECP.
4. The outputs of SC-DRR Phase II are highly relevant with the need of the partners. These can fill the gaps in DRR legislation as well as in their capacity to administer DRR problems. EP-DRR resulted policy guidance for DRR-based budgeting and the inclusion of climate change in risk assessment methodology. Before the project, both issues had not been fully covered in the DRR legislation yet. There are similarities and differences in governing DRR and CCA among relevant stakeholders so this situation requires the convergence of DRR and CCA. For example, BNPB could not implement policies to prevent hazards occurrences without the role of the MoEF in regulating environmental protection. The inclusion of climate change into DRR has been considered by the Government as outlined in RAN-API and it is later on re-emphasized in RPJMN 2015 – 2019. In view of that need, the facilitation of the CCA and DRR convergence was conducted in the right momentum. UCLIM also assisted the Municipality of Makassar and Kupang to have their first Urban Risk Management Plan containing CCA and DRR strategies. The UCLIM activities are in-line to the strategy outlined in RPJMN 2015 – 2019 to increase local stakeholders’ capacity for DRR.
5. SC-DRR Phase II has proven to take the advantages of government transition. First, the project management can see it as the opportunity to incorporate DRR into the new RPJMN. Second, the project management could be adaptable to the governmental structural changes. Before the new government administration took place, the project management had worked with the National Spatial Planning Coordinating Board (Badan Koordinasi Penataan Ruang Nasional – BKPRN) and coordinated with the MPW to produce DRR-based spatial planning guideline. Since BKPRN was dismissed by the new government, the project management could approach and establish cooperation with the MoASP, a newly ministry formed to administer spatial planning affairs. EP-DRR assisted the MoASP to provide experts to improve the quality of the draft of the guideline.
6. In 2013, UNDP was quite new to enter to the landscape of climate change governance in Indonesia. Thus, UNDP was not been well informed about other related project in CCA and other players in this kind of field. For example, the project could have been more adaptive with on-going initiatives to integrate CCA and DRR into spatial plan. The project was being conducted when the MPW promoted the integration of CCA into spatial planning. At the same time, the MoEF was drafting the guideline for climate change actions. There could have been communication developed among these projects since they actually did similar activities, especially in developing risk assessment methodology. The convergence of DRR and CCA in IC-DRM could have been the umbrella to inform the other on-going initiatives related to this matter so that the impact of the project could have been wider. UNDP might have taken a leadership role in making connections between these initiatives.

## Appropriateness

*How feasible was project design and implementation? To what extent was the project adapted to local conditions?*

1. The overall objective of SC-DRR Phase II is to make DRR a normal part of development process, one that is embedded in core functions of central and local government and its public and private partners. Although the scope of the project has been scaled down due to financial constraint, the overall objective is not changed. At the national level, the project delivered assistance to produce policy guidance and to strengthen national and local government capacity for DRR. The produced policy guidance could support DRR policy-making and its implementation at both levels because it attempted to influence their planning and budgeting. As outlined in the first version of the project document, the initial intention for this project was “to continue, to expand, and to replicate regulatory framework and DM institutional framework at the local level”. However, the project has limited range of local stakeholders to engage with due to the limited financial constraint. The interaction with local stakeholders only occurred during UCLIM which the project design did not really try to replicate current DM regulatory framework. Instead, it produced a new approach for CCVA. Furthermore, UCLIM did not clearly relate it products to the other SC-DRR Phase II products, such as *Improved Risk Assessment Methodology: the Inclusion of Climate Factor* and even current BNPB or other ministerial regulations.
2. The approach applied in EP-DRR was to provide technical support to the partners to develop policy guidance and deliver capacity development. It ranges of different themes, including development planning, fiscal tracking, budgeting, spatial planning, and minimum standard service. Therefore, consultants’ roles are the keys to support the activities. Unfortunately, the limited pool of consultants in Indonesia who have cross-sectoral experience and expertise delayed the project management to recruit suitable consultants. Furthermore, the project involved intensive interaction with multiple ministerial level institutions through focus group discussions, workshops, and meetings. This is not easy task to do because it encountered complex bureaucratic problems which each governmental institution has its own priorities and view upon DRR problems. Certainly, the project management required more times than what it had been scheduled to consolidate and influence the involved institutions.
3. In IC-DRM, the project faced difficulties to consolidate the stakeholders involved in the convergence of CCA and DRR. IC-DRM held a series of meeting that help to facilitate intensive discussion and coordination between multiple stakeholders in CCA and DRR at the national level, especially between the MoEF and BNPB. The process also involved universities, NGOs, and experts. Nevertheless, the process required extra time and supervision since it was difficult to combine different opinions on the approaches that can be used to combine both themes. They have existing regulations to follow, for example, the Minister of Environment and Forestry issued regulation 33/2016 on the Guideline for Formulating Climate Change Action Guideline while BNPB has regulation 2/2012 on risk assessment. Both regulations regulate risk assessment in different ways. However, they are quite inflexible to accommodate any innovation that involve cross-sectoral policies, such as the convergence. This situation led to low participation in IC-DRM activities among the involved stakeholders.
4. UCLIM project design is very suitable to strengthen technical capacities of local disaster management actors to plan urban risk management. It applied participatory approach in conducting CCVA and planning their Urban Risk Management. The approach allowed active participation from local stakeholders in Makassar and Kupang, including municipality governments, local NGOs, private entities, and women groups. They were invited to three different workshops to learn how the consultants determined climate change vulnerability in their area. The workshops facilitated them to give feedback upon the findings and the applied methodologies. In addition, they contributed to give any information/data that had not been covered by the consultants as well as formulate further actions to address the identified problems. This direct participation helped to raise the local stakeholders’ awareness on climate change.
5. In IC-DRM, an advisory working group comprising of BNPB, the MoEF, the MoHA, and the MPW could not be established. They were expected to give input for CCVA indicators development. This could have been a knowledge exchange platform for them, the consultation team as well as the local stakeholders in Kupang and Makassar. The national stakeholders could give input for the indicators development and the applied methodology since they were doing the CCA-DRR convergence. In addition, they could have harnessed lesson-learned from Kupang and Makassar cases and improved the on-going policy-making, especially in climate-induced risk assessment.

## Sustainability

*Will the project’s investments continue to deliver benefits beyond the life of the project? Are sufficient local capacities and resources available for the further development of DRR activities initiated by SC-DRR?*

1. SC-DRR Phase II continued the ways of SC-DRR Phase I to focus on strengthening DRR-related policy, legal and regulatory framework. SC-DRR Phase II has ensured that DRR will remain an important priority for national and local governments beyond the life of the project. DRR contents outlined in RPJMN 2015-2019 will guide the national government as well as local governments to implement DRR at least until the new government administration. The Government Regulation on SPM accommodate disaster management as one of the minimum services that must be provided by local governments. The policy guidance produced in EP-DRR are useful source for the government agencies to formulate regulation. The current draft of DRR-based spatial plan is derived from the study background that have been conducted in EP-DRR.
2. IC-DRM has provided an initial step to integrate CCA and DRR. The product, such as the framework to integrate the methodologies, would be very useful as sources to guide the stakeholders to formulate the convergence as a regulation. However, the convergence is still difficult to be achieved if both CCA and DRR are seen as sectoral units in development and managed exclusively by certain institutions. The convergence needs to be followed up with further advocacy and synchronization among relevant stakeholders. To date, there is still unclear whether the convergence will be followed up as part of DRR and CCA legislation. There is no staff assigned to ensure the convergence advocacy and continuation.
3. The CCVA studies conducted in Makassar and Kupang were used as basis for formulating their Urban Disaster Risk Management Plans. During the interaction with the local stakeholders, they show commitment to follow-up what have been resulted in CCVA studies. In Kupang, Pikul and PIAR (*Perkumpulan Pengembangan Inisiatif dan Advokasi Rakyat*), two local Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are working on advocacy to promote climate actions in the islands area of Kupang which have been identified as vulnerable areas. However, their Urban Disaster Risk Management Plans have not legalized as a local regulation or *Perda* (Peraturan Daerah) in Kupang and Makassar. In addition, the planning process was not in the same cycle of the formulation of Local Development Plans (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah* – RPJMD). Thus, the local governments’ commitment to follow up UCLIM results becomes challenges because the plans are not legally binding for them. The advisory working group could have used the developed manuals for conducting a CCVA and planning an Urban Risk Management Plan for improving current DRR and CCA policies at the national level.

## Impact

*To what extent have project outputs contributed to desired outcomes?*

1. SC-DRR Phase II has contributed to the advancement DRR policy in Indonesia. It supports the incorporation of DRR in several important regulations and plans at the national level. It provides technical assistance for the key partners in DRR to formulate necessary frameworks or mechanism for the integration. The developed policy guidance has been used as the references for the formulation of regulation, including RPJMN 2015 – 2019 and DRR-based spatial planning guideline. Furthermore, the project has increased awareness to include climate change in DRR policy and vice versa among the involved national and local stakeholders.
2. SC-DRR Phase II has provided technical assistance for the national partners to incorporate DRR as part of their governmental functions, including budgeting and planning. The local stakeholders participated in UCLIM learned the process of conducting a CCVA and planning an Urban Risk Management Plan. The project has also raised the awareness of CCA-DRR convergence at the national level. Moreover, the project has helped to increase BNPB standing point as the coordinator for disaster management. The relatively new institution get more acknowledgment for its role in DRR among ministerial-level institution since the project management involved them in most of the project activities and facilitated communication with other ministries, such as BAPPENAS, the MoASP, the MoHA, and the MPW. SC-DRR Phase II supports BNPB credential as the coordinator in disaster management like as mandated by Law 24/2007.
3. SC-DRR Phase II produced various policy guidance and manuals related to DRR and CCA policy-making, but those still have limited outreach. Certainly some of them were used as basis for the policy-making by the partners. The products could have had widespread impact for those are not directly involved in the project. There is not any knowledge management strategy established in this project to deliver the results of the project for wider audiences. There is a regular staff turnover in governmental institutions meanwhile only the participants often hold the knowledge and experience gained from the project. Therefore, the project management should have considered how the knowledge are maintained.

# Recommendations

1. The following recommendations are strategic recommendations for the design the next phase of the project. The project stakeholders at national and local levels all have gained the benefits of continued UNDP support for DRR in Indonesia.
2. **Investing in promoting paradigm shift in the governance of DRR and CCA.**

Currently, both DRR and CCA are seen as development sectors so both are governed by specific institutions. Currently, BNPB are responsible for coordinating DRR meanwhile the MoEF has authority to administer CCA issues. Such paradigm hinder other agencies to take part of DRR and CCA activities although they might not realize that they already have programs to support both issues. Both should have been considered as part of sectoral programs so ministries and agencies have similar spirit for supporting DRR and CCA. Therefore, the role of BNPB and MoEF must be invested in shifting the paradigm of CCA and DRR-policy making among national stakeholders.

1. **Designing knowledge management strategies for DRR policy guidance**

The purpose of the project is to improve the quality of DRR policy making through policy guidance and technical capacities assistance. The developed policy guidance in SC-DRR Phase II could have had wider impact in strengthening institutional capacity if it had dissemination strategies. Knowledge management could be the solution to form a kind of platform for stakeholders to access the knowledge produced by SC-DRR. This can be a solution for dealing with staff turnover issue in the government.

1. **Extending the area of DRR works to other emerging development issues**

Donors’ focus has shifted gradually from disaster management to other emerging issues in development, such as child protection or gender empowerment. Therefore, the future work should be adapted with the changing trend of donors’ interest to allocate their fund, especially from international donors. One that could be done is to ensure other development programs investing DRR elements into their activities. For example, currently, the GoI and multiple donors have put their attention to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Any future DRR-related works could take a part into such development agenda. This could be one of approaches to extend UNDP network with other players in sustainable development issues.

1. **Focusing on providing DRR technical assistance for sub-national stakeholders**

The two previous SC-DRR have laid important foundation at the national level. Both have provided inputs for the DRR regulations making. Some of them have been enacted as regulations that enable local stakeholders, such as BPBD and BAPPEDA, to carry out DRR-related activities. There is still a need to increase awareness and capacities to deal with DRR issues at local level as DRR investment is still low.

1. **Maintain the flagship of SCDRR to support disaster risk reduction to be normal part of development process of Indonesia**

SCDRR-II is a follow up of SCDRR-I that focuses in making policy & guidelines to support DRR in national level. The experience of UNDP working with GoI would be an asset and important contribution that needs to be followed up with more advocacy and campaign to support the policy and guideline produced.
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