



United Nations Development Programme
And
Government of Indonesia

MAKING ACEH SAFER THROUGH DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

IN DEVELOPMENT (DRR-A) PROJECT 2009-2012

Project Evaluation
(8 May – 7 July 2012)

Final Report

Prepared by
Akbar Meirio (Independent Evaluator)

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	3
Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction	10
2. Brief description of the intervention	10
3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives	12
4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology	14
5. Data analysis	16
6. Findings	16
Effectiveness	16
Efficiency	37
Relevance	41
Appropriateness.....	43
Sustainability.....	45
Impact	51
7. Lessons learned.....	53
8. Recommendations	55
Annex 1. The list of the documents consulted	58
Annex 2. List of informants and participants.....	60
Annex 3. Evaluation Matrix.....	64

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

APBA	<i>Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Aceh</i> (Aceh Provincial Government Budget)
APBD	<i>Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah</i> (District Government Budget)
BPPD	<i>Badan Pembinaan Pendidikan Dayah/Badan Dayah</i> (Agency for the Development of Dayah Education/Dayah Agency)
BAPPEDA	<i>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah</i> (Regional Development Planning Agency)
BAPPENAS	<i>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional</i> (National Development Planning Agency)
BNPB	<i>Badan Nasional Penganggulangan Bencana</i> (National Disaster Management Agency)
BPBD	<i>Badan Penganggulangan Bencana Daerah</i> (District/Municipality Disaster Management Agency)
BPBA	<i>Badan Penganggulangan Bencana Aceh</i> (Aceh Provincial Disaster Management Agency)
CAP	Community Action Plan
CBDRR	Community-based Disaster Risk Reduction
CPRU	Crisis Prevention and Recovery Unit
DIBA	<i>Data dan Informasi Bencana Aceh</i> (Aceh Disaster Data and Information)
DIBI	<i>Data dan Informasi Bencana Indonesia</i> (Indonesia Disaster Data and Information)
DIKTI	<i>Direktorat Pendidikan Tinggi</i> (Directorate of Higher Education of the Ministry of Education)
Dinas PU	<i>Dinas Pekerjaan Umum</i> (Public Works Department)
DISDIK	<i>Dinas Pendidikan</i> (Regional Education Department)
DISHUBKOMINTEL	<i>Dinas Perhubungan, Komunikasi, Informasi dan Telekomunikasi</i> (Transportation, Communication, Information and Telecommunications Department)

DIPA	<i>Daftar Isian Pelaksanaan Anggaran</i> (Budget Programme Implementation Form)
DPRA	<i>Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Aceh</i> (Aceh Parliament)
DRMIS	Disaster Risk Management Information System
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DRR-A	Acronym employed to refer to the Making Aceh Safer through Disaster Risk Reduction in Development project
ESRI	Name of a geographic information system software company
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
FJAB	<i>Forum Jurnalis Aceh Peduli Bencana</i> (Aceh Journalist Forum for Disaster Awareness)
Fokusbari	<i>Forum Komunitas Siaga Bencana Arul Item</i> (Arul Item Village Forum for Disaster Preparedness)
FORMASIBAB	<i>Forum Masyarakat Siaga Bencana Aceh Barat</i> (Aceh Barat Forum of Communities for Disaster Preparedness)
FSBG	<i>Forum Siaga Bencana Gampong</i> (Village Forum for Disaster Preparedness)
GoI	Government of Indonesia
ICBRR	Integrated Community-based Risk Reduction
IPAR	Internal Project Assurance Report
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
KMPB	<i>Kelompok Masyarakat Penanggulangan Bencana</i> (Community-based Disaster Management Forum)
LoA	Letter of Agreement
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDF	Multi-Donor Fund
MoHA	Ministry of Home Affairs

Musrenbang	<i>Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan</i> (Development Planning Discussion)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPC	National Project Coordinator
PACC	Public Awareness Coordination Committee
PMEU	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
PNPM	<i>Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat</i> (National Program on Community Empowerment)
PPD	Provincial Project Director
Qanun	Regional Regulation in Aceh
RAD-PRB	<i>Rencana Aksi Daerah – Pengurangan Risiko Bencana</i> (Local Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction)
RAPI	<i>Radio Antar Penduduk Indonesia</i> (Indonesia Inter-Population Radio)
Renstra	<i>Rencana Strategis</i> (Strategic Plan)
Renja	<i>Rencana Kerja</i> (Work Plan)
RKPD	<i>Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Daerah</i> (Local Government Work Plan)
RKPG	<i>Rencana Kerja Pembangunan Gampong</i> (Village Development Work Plan)
RPJM	<i>Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah</i> (Medium-Term Development Plan)
RPJMG	<i>Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Gampong</i> (Village Medium-Term Development Plan)
SAR	Search and Rescue
SC-DRR	Safer Communities through Disaster Risk Reduction in Development
SD	Elementary School
Sekda	Regional Secretary
SKPA	<i>Satuan Kerja Perangkat Aceh</i> (Aceh government's local department or agencies)

SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TDMRC	Tsunami Disaster Mitigation Research Centre
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
Unsyiah	<i>Universitas Syiah Kuala (Syiah Kuala University)</i>
Walhi	<i>Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia (an Indonesian NGO whose concern is that of environmental protection)</i>

Executive Summary

1. This report presents the findings of the final evaluation of the Making Aceh Safer through Disaster Risk Reduction in Development (DRR-A) Project. The findings are drawn from analyses of documents relevant to the project, direct observations of project activities and results, and reviews of the proceedings of interviews as well as focus group discussions (FGDs) with project stakeholders and beneficiaries. They are, for the purpose of methodical presentation, organized into the six categories of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, appropriateness, impact and sustainability.

2. Effectiveness

DRR-A has made significant contributions towards the formulation and establishment of regulatory instruments and institutional arrangements for implementing disaster risk reduction in Aceh. A remaining problem is the still low capacity of BPBA to lead disaster management in Aceh. The project has also implemented Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRR) program in 10 villages located in 10 districts. The DRR activity plan proposed through CBDRR, however, appears to be weakly incorporated into government planning and budgets.

3. DRR-A has also improved to a significant degree the capacity of the Tsunami Disaster Mitigation Research Centre (TDMRC) to provide science-based products and services. The project has also contributed towards the establishment of a master's degree program in Disaster Management at the *Universitas Syiah Kuala* or Syiah Kuala University (Unsyiah.) Yet, DRR-A appears to have been less effective in improving the **financial capacity** of the TDMRC to generate revenue. Public awareness of disaster risk reduction was raised by DRR-A with campaigns using a wide range media, and the integration of disaster risk reduction knowledge into elementary, junior and high schools as well as the Modern Dayah curriculum. The achievement of the integration of DRR into the elementary school curriculum appears to be more advanced than in junior and high schools. The program in

the Modern Dayah is very good; but there was insufficient time to ensure that the integration of DRR into the curriculum is fully achieved.

4. Efficiency

The organizational structure of DRR-A was efficient enough to support the project's implementation, but it failed to actively involve the other two important national government agencies: BAPPENAS and BNPB. Delays in the implementation of many DRR-A activities compromised the project's ability to produce better quality outputs. These delays were principally caused by UNDP delays in transferring the funds to the project and by the Government in channeling of DIPA funds. The evaluator also found that the highest spending by DRR-A on strengthening TDMRC was the least efficient spending to achieve the intended outputs of DRR-A.

5. Relevance

The design of the DRR-A project is consistent with efforts to support the implementation of national policies and priorities and respond to the urgent need for the Aceh Provincial Government to establish better arrangements and environments to put disaster management into operation in Aceh. The project's relevance was also enhanced by the flexibility of its design, allowing it to respond to changing priorities and needs. However, it should be noted that DRR-A was not effective in maximising synergy of outputs to improve results.

6. Appropriateness

The design of DRR-A was suitable for the implementation of the project's activities within Aceh's structural and cultural contexts. The acceptance of DRR-A by a wide range of stakeholders and actors, including community leaders and members, is strong evidence of the appropriateness of its design and the nature of its interventions. However, DRR-A did not contain an appropriate exit strategy to end the project smoothly and help achieve more sustainable output.

7. Sustainability

It is highly likely that the regulatory framework and institutions for disaster management established by DRR-A will be sustained by the Government of Aceh. There are also indications that the community-based disaster risk reduction (CBDRR) programme established with the support of the project will continue to be implemented by the Village Disaster Risk Reduction Forum which was also established with the support of the project. However, at the local government level, the real commitment of the government to continue or replicate CBDRR Program appears to be minimal.

8. Although it is most likely that the Tsunami Disaster Mitigation Research Centre (TDMRC) will continue to operate, it is not as likely that the Centre will be able to provide science-based information, services and knowledge to the extent and quality that it did when its operations were supported by DRR-A. Limited funding and the Center's lack of ability to raise revenue may stand in the way of its capacity to sustain the quantity and quality of its outputs. With regard to the sustainability of public awareness efforts initiated by DRR-A, it is hoped that Dishubkomintel's plans to include disaster risk reduction messages in some of its regular programs will ensure the continuity of campaign-type activities. There is a strong possibility that the plan to integrate disaster risk reduction into school curricula will be put into effect. To this end, Disdik has proposed to the Government that programs be designed and budgets allocated to continue this endeavor through APBA. The Government of Aceh's formal commitment to finance this program through APBA has, however, not yet been obtained. Efforts to integrate disaster risk reduction into Modern Dayah's curriculum are facing an obstacle of a different nature, Badan Dayah is finding it difficult to continue this program due to the absence of a legal basis to support its proposal to implement the program through APBA.

9. Impact

The baseline and end-line surveys of the implementation of DRR-A indicate that the project has brought about positive impacts on the state of disaster preparedness of the people in Banda Aceh and the ten districts where the project was implemented. Another positive impact of the DRR-A project is the increased awareness of people and communities of the need to initiate efforts to mitigate some potential hazards in Aceh.

10. In addition to presenting the findings of the evaluation exercise, this report also offers lessons learned and recommendations to various stakeholders. It is hoped that the recommendations may be useful to those contemplating follow-on activities to sustain the many benefits that the project successfully produced.

1. Introduction

11. The “Making Aceh Safer through Disaster Risk Reduction” (DRR-A) Project was implemented by UNDP Indonesia and the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Government of Indonesia from January 2009 to May 2012. Towards its completion, an independent evaluation was commissioned to systematically evaluate the project, learn from the experience of the project’s implementation, and to provide inputs for future DRR-type projects in both transitional and development settings.

12. The evaluation was conducted from 8th of May 2012 until 7th of July 2012. It was carried out through document reviews and field assessments. The results of the evaluation are presented in this report which consists of sections which recount the project’s intervention; outline the scope and objectives of the evaluation; describe the approach and methodology employed by the evaluation; explain the data analysis process, and offer the evaluation’s findings, lessons learned, and recommendations.

2. Brief description of the intervention

13. The “Making Aceh Safer through Disaster Risk Reduction in Development” (DRR-A) Project was designed to make disaster risk reduction a normal part of the development process established in core functions of Aceh’s local government and their public and private partners, especially in Aceh’s local communities where the most effective and direct actions can be taken to reduce physical, economic and social vulnerability to disasters. The project supported the provincial government to reduce the risk of disasters through four substantive key outputs:

Output 1 – Institutional arrangement and enabling environment established to facilitate a participatory and concerted implementation of DRR measures;

Output 2 – Demonstration of gender sensitive projects in selected locations to test and improve measures for reducing risk from natural disasters;

Output 3 – TDMRC-UNSYIAH strengthened to provide science-based information, services and knowledge assistance to the local government and other DRR proponents in implementing their DRR activities;

Output 4 – DRR public awareness programmes implemented to promote a gender-sensitive “Culture of Safety” among the people and institutions of Aceh.

14. This project was financed by the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDF). Its implementation was based on five strategic pillars:

- 1) Gender mainstreaming: ensuring the different needs and interests of men and women are accommodated equally, with an emphasis on women’s empowerment, since women tend to be more vulnerable to disasters.
- 2) Accommodative framework: the project serves as an accommodative framework with windows for distinct yet interconnected initiatives. It is also accommodative with regard to the types of measures to be taken, adopting the priorities set by the internationally accepted Hyogo Framework of Actions.
- 3) Mutual reinforcement among project components: the project is implemented by pursuing the outputs and project component targets in a simultaneous manner.
- 4) Building on existing initiatives launched under other programmes, the components of the Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR-A) project are designed to capitalize on the relevant initiatives undertaken by the different stakeholders.
- 5) Learning lessons from experience: since many activities in this project entail breaking new ground, learning from experiences through workshops, seminars, etc. is applied for improving performance as the project advances.

15. The project was implemented by Ministry of Home Affairs as national implementing partner (IP) who delegated the authority to the Aceh Government to implement the project. At the provincial level the responsible parties for project operations included the Aceh Disaster Management Agency (*Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Aceh/BPBA*), the Tsunami Disaster Mitigation Research Centre (TDMRC) at the University of Syiah Kuala, the Aceh Provincial Development Planning Agency (*Badan Perencana Pembangunan Daerah*

Aceh/BAPPEDA), the Organization Bureau (*Biro Organisasi*), the Education Department (*Dinas Pendidikan/DISDIK*), the Islamic Boarding School Education Agency (*Badan Pembinaan Pendidikan Dayah/BPPD*) and Transportation, Communication, Information and the Telecommunication Department (*Dinas Perhubungan, Komunikasi, Informasi dan Telekomunikasi/DISHUBKOMINTEL*) and 3 selected local NGOs.

16. DRR-A has produced key outputs in disaster risk reduction by supporting strategic disaster management regulatory frameworks and planning, undertaking gender-sensitive Community-based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRR) in ten villages (East Coast, West Coast, and Central Highlands) of ten districts in Aceh, enhancing the capacity of TDMRC, and fostering a culture of safety in Aceh through public awareness and the education system.

3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives

17. The evaluation assessed the implementation of the DRR-A project from its start in 2009 to its end in 2012. The exercise took into account matters related to the implementation of the project at provincial, district, and community levels, in relation to all four programmatic outputs. The considered target groups included the beneficiaries of the project, namely: 1) Provincial Agencies and organizations (BPBA, Biro Organisasi, DISHUBKOMINTEL, DISDIK, BPPD, DRR Forum, PACC, etc); 2) District Agencies (BPBD, DISDIK, BAPPEDA, etc); 3) TDMRC; 4) Selected local NGOs (Bytra, IBU Foundation, and Karst Aceh); and 5) community beneficiaries (Village DRR Fora), and schools.

18. In accordance with the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, and taking into account UNDP's evaluation guidelines, the evaluation assessed the project implementation in Aceh in terms of its effectiveness, efficiency, appropriateness, relevance, impact and sustainability. The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

1. To assess the achievement of stated project outcomes and outputs, taking into account the strengths and weakness of the project, and unexpected results.
2. To determine the overall efficiency in the utilization of resources in achieving results.

3. To assess the appropriateness of the design of the project and the implementation arrangements, including but not limited to the project modality, organizational structure, and coordination mechanisms set up to support the project;
4. To assess the extent to which the project has contributed to the creation of an enabling environment, and the extent to which this has helped shape effective government policies and programming on disaster management and risk reduction;
5. To assess the sustainability of results and provide recommendations for sustaining the benefits of the project and how to improve sustainability in future initiatives;
6. To assess the approach to capacity development and whether initiatives have contributed to sustainability;
7. To review the effectiveness of the gender mainstreaming strategy and partnership strategy;
8. To gain insights into the level of client satisfaction with the project. The clients include community and local government beneficiaries; national government partners and donor;
9. To identify best practices and lessons learned which can be replicated.

19. The core criteria used in this evaluation are as follows:

1. Relevance: the extent to which intended outputs and outcomes of the project are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries.
2. Appropriateness: the cultural acceptance as well as feasibility of the delivery method. While relevance examines the importance of the initiatives relative to the needs and priorities, appropriateness examines whether the initiative as it is operationalized is acceptable and feasible within the local context.
3. Effectiveness: the extent to which the intended results have been achieved. This includes an assessment of cause and effect, attributed to observed changes to project activities and outputs.
4. Efficiency: how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) were converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs.

5. Sustainability: the extent to which benefits of the project continue after external development assistance has withdrawn. This includes evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional, and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in future.
6. Impact: changes in human development and people's well-being that are brought about by development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

20. The approach employed by the evaluation was that of qualitative research. The methodology it employed for data collection comprised document review, key informants interviews (KIIs), FGDs with stakeholders, and direct observations. Document review was conducted on secondary data, i.e. documents related to project implementation and government documents. The list of the documents reviewed can be seen in annex 1 of this report. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) were conducted with key persons involved in the project as implementers, partners, or beneficiaries (stakeholders). These KIIs were conducted in the form of individual interviews or group interviews. Meanwhile, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted with community representatives, postgraduate students, and personnel of the institutions involved in the project as beneficiaries primarily in capacity building or public awareness-related project activities. The FGDs were aimed at gathering and collating the collective views on the benefits of the project in improving capacity as well as awareness of the beneficiaries on DRR.

21. The KIIs and/or FGDs were conducted with stakeholders at the national level in Jakarta and at the provincial level in Banda Aceh. KIIs and FGDs were also undertaken in four sample villages out of the ten Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRR) pilot villages of DRR-A. The KIIs and FGDs in these four villages were conducted with village authorities and community representatives involved in the CBDRR activities. The sample villages were selected through a purposive non-random sampling methodology. They represented different geographical locations, types of hazards, local implementing partners and also general achievement notes based on the final review of DRR-A CBDRR Pilot Project

which had just been carried out by the project and programme team from 29 April to 4 May 2012. The different locations were Arul Item Village in Central Aceh district; Ketambang Village in West Aceh district; Pante Beureune Village in Pidie Jaya district; and Pasié Le Beu Village in Pidie district. The characteristics of the four sample villages can be described in the following table:

Table 1. Characteristics of the Four Sample Villages

Village	Geographical location	Hazard	Local implementing partner	Achievement
Arul Item, Central Aceh	Highland	Landslide	Karst	Good community understanding of DRR; Good incorporation into government policies/mechanism.
Ketambang, West Aceh	West Coast	Flood	IBU Foundation	Good community understanding of DRR; Not good incorporation into government policies/mechanism.
Pante Beureune, Pidie Jaya.	East Coast	Flood	Bytra	Not good community understanding of DRR; Good incorporation into government policies/mechanism
Pasié Le Beu, Pidie	East Coast	Earthquake and Tsunami	Bytra	Not good community understanding of DRR; Good incorporation into government policies/mechanism

(Source: Extracted from Back To Office Reports (BTORs) of Project and Programme team for CBDRR Final Review from 29 April to 4 May 2012)

22. KIIs were conducted at the district level within which the four sample villages are located, namely Central Aceh, West Aceh, Pidie Jaya and Pidie. The interviews were held with BPBD officials in particular in order to gauge their awareness and knowledge of the village level CBDRR pilot activities, as well as to obtain insights on the achievements of other DRR-A activities under output 1 and output 4 at the district level.

23. The key informants interviewed and participants involved in the FGDs were selected on the basis of the intensity of their involvement in the project; the depth of their knowledge of the project's implementation; and/or the nature of the benefits they were supposed to have gained from the project. The list of key informants interviewed and participants of FGDs can be observed in annex 2 of this Report.

24. The list of questions drawn up for this evaluation was developed using two points of references. They were the criteria established for the evaluation and the purposes determined for its conduct. The evaluation matrix presenting the questions raised, the sources of data, and the data collection methods employed is available in annex 3 of this report.

5. Data analysis

25. The method of data analysis used in the evaluation was of a qualitative order. Key information was drawn, collated and summarized from interview notes, and shaped into answers to the evaluation questions. To ensure the accuracy of data collected and correctness of outcomes of data analyses, information gathered from different key informants was put through a process of comparative analysis. Triangulation between results of interviews, FGDs, field observation and document/literature reviews was also carried out to ensure validity of data. Follow-on interviews with selected key informants were, as a final step, conducted whenever needed to reconcile contradictory information.

6. Findings

Effectiveness

To what extent the project achieved its intended outputs? What factors in the project activities (implementation) have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended results?

Output 1: Institutional arrangement and enabling environment established to facilitate participatory and concerted implementation of DRR measures.

26. By supporting the development of a series of regulations on disaster management, DRR-A has made significant contributions to the development of regulatory instruments for the implementation of disaster risk reduction measures in Aceh. The project facilitated the finalization of Qanun on Disaster Management which was initially prepared by Walhi. Qanun No. 5/2010 on Disaster Management constitutes an umbrella regulation for the implementation of disaster management in Aceh. It establishes and regulates the responsibilities of local governments, non-government organizations, international organizations, as well as local communities in implementing disaster management in Aceh. DRR-A also provided significant support to the formulation of Qanun No. 6/2010 on The Establishment of the Organizational Structure and Management of the Aceh Disaster Management Agency (BPBA). This Qanun provides a legal basis for the establishment of the Aceh Disaster Management Agency (BPBA) in Aceh. The two Qanuns are fundamental in nature because they demonstrate the robust commitment of the government of Aceh, both executive and legislative branches, to provide solid legal bases for the enhancement of disaster management as well as disaster risk reduction in Aceh.

27. The DRR-A project provided significant support to the development of Governor Regulations and a Governor Decree on enhancing disaster preparedness in Aceh. The specific regulations and decrees are the Governor's Regulation No. 43/2010 on Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Tsunami Early Warning Systems (TEWS), the Governor's Regulation No. 48/2012 on Local Action Plans for disaster risk reduction for 2010-2012, the Governor's Regulation No. 51/2011 on the Provincial Disaster Management Plan for 2012-2017 and the Governor's Decree No. 360/6a/2011 on the Establishment of DRR Forum. Governor Regulation No. 43/2010 is very important because it equips the government with an urgent standard mechanism for increasing preparedness in facing tsunamis. It is highly instrumental in shifting the paradigm from trauma caused by the tsunami to disaster preparedness to mitigate as much as possible the number of casualties caused by the occurrence of tsunamis. Governor Regulation No. 48/2012 provides a comprehensive approach to disaster risk reduction measures in dealing with various potential hazards in

Aceh. Governor Regulation No. 51/2011 provides for more strategic planning for Disaster Management in Aceh in all phases of disaster management. The latter two regulations clearly assign responsibilities for implementing disaster risk reduction not only to the BPBA but also to other provincial and district departments. Governor Decree No. 360/6a/2011 provides a legal basis for the establishment of a disaster risk reduction Forum in the form of a multi-stakeholder forum mandated to assist the government of Aceh in advancing disaster risk reduction measure in Aceh.

Table 2. Regulations at the Provincial Level that have been passed with the support of the project

No	Regulations
1	Qanun No. 5/2010 on Disaster Management
2	Qanun No. 6/2010 on The Establishment of Organizational Structure and Management of Aceh Disaster Management Agency (BPBA)
3	Governor Regulation No. 43/2010 on Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the Tsunami Early Warning System (TEWS)
4	Governor Regulation No. 51/2011 on the Provincial Disaster Management Plan for 2012-2017
5	Governor Regulation No. 48/2012 on Local Action Plan for DRR for 2010-2012
6	Governor Decree No. 360/6a/2011 on the establishment of the DRR Forum

(Source: Extracted from DRR-A Annual Reports from year 2009 until year 2012)

28. A notable achievement of the DRR-A project in improving institutional arrangements for disaster risk reduction in Aceh is the establishment of the Aceh Disaster Management Agency (BPBA). This Agency is expected to ensure that disaster management becomes a core function of the government of Aceh. It is responsible for handling all cyclical phases of disaster management, including disaster mitigation and preparedness, disaster emergency response, and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction. DRR-A also carried out activities aimed at improving the function and performance of BPBA. The activities included facilitating induction training for BPBA personnel, supporting the development of Standard

Operating Procedures (SOPs) for BPBA and conducting an assessment of the functional capacity of BPBA.

29. Another important achievement of DRR-A in improving institutional arrangements for disaster risk reduction in Aceh is the establishment of the Aceh DRR Forum. Members of the Forum include persons representing various institutions, including non-government organizations, civil society organizations, local government departments/agencies (SKPAs), and the private sector. The DRR Forum was established to be a partner to BPBA in conducting the latter's functions, especially the coordinating multi-stakeholders in Aceh to implement DRR, discussing issues of and inputs to disaster risk reduction measures from different points of view and interest, and monitoring and assessing the achievement of planned disaster risk reduction efforts in Aceh. DRR-A has also helped strengthen the Forum by facilitating the formulation of its SOP, supporting its regular meetings in the first year of its establishment, and facilitating its participation in the National Conference on Community based Disaster Risk Management in Yogyakarta.

30. DRR-A's support towards the development of regulatory instruments as well as institutional arrangements for disaster risk reduction in Aceh, has resulted, albeit in an indirect manner, in a notable increase in the BPBA's budget. The agency's budget increased from 9.7 billion in year 2011 to 37.6 billion in year 2012, representing a percentage rise of almost 388 percent.¹ Of the Agency's total 2012 budget, 87 percent was allocated for the direct costs of BPBA in implementing Disaster Management activities.

31. The establishment of an environment conducive towards participatory and concerted implementation of disaster risk reduction, however, remains problematic. One obstacle to be overcome is the low capacity of BPBA to lead disaster management in Aceh. The findings of the Capacity Assessment conducted by the DRR-A project from January until May 2012, revealed that BPBA's capacity to perform its function of coordination and command is low. BPBA is not yet able to perform its role of lead agency in coordinating local potential to collaboratively carry out disaster management. This weak leadership role is caused, by,

¹ See Document of Budget Implementation of Working Unit of Aceh Government for BPBA in year 2011; and in year 2012.

among other factors, insufficient knowledge of BPBA personnel of disaster management, and the weak leading capacity of the officials in BPBA.²

32. DRR-A did assist the BPBA to strengthen its institutional and personnel capacities. However, this assistance was not sufficient enough to improve significantly the capacity of BPBA because it was limited to the development of institutional regulations such as SOPs for BPBDs, and the conduct of one induction training. This assistance was not undertaken with a systematic and comprehensive strategy based on a capacity assessment which should have been conducted at the beginning. Capacity Assessment for Capacity Development (CACD) of BPBA was conducted late in the project due to the delay of fund channeling through DIPA mechanism. The Assessment was carried out from January to May 2012, the time when the project was nearly ended. The results of the Assessment highlighted the low capacity of BPBA as explained in the previous paragraph; and provided a comprehensive recommendation on how to develop the capacity of BPBA. Unfortunately, DRR-A has no more time to utilize the results of the assessment to systematically and comprehensively improve the capacity of BPBA.

33. Another problem is the still minimal functioning of the DRR Forum mainly due to its low financial resources. Based on the Governor Decree on the establishment of DRR Forum, the Forum is entitled to obtain funds from Government of Aceh and also other allowed sources. The Forum has developed a work plan for year 2011-2014 and an annual budget plan. There are huge expectations of the Forum to receive funding from the Government of Aceh through BPBA and also from UNDP through DRR-A. Unfortunately, in year 2011 the Government of Aceh did not provide funds for the Forum to run its work plan. DRR-A also did not provide financial support to the Forum because it expected that the Forum could gather financial resources from other sources such as the Corporate Social Responsibility programs of some companies operating in Aceh. By the time of the evaluation, the Forum was facing limitations in financial resources that made it unable to carry out many important activities as planned in the work plan. The recent activities carried out by the Forum depended on the voluntary contribution of its committee and incidental funding from BPBA.

² The Final Report of the Capacity Assessment and Formulation of Proposal for Capacity Development of BPBA, p. 23 – 31.

For example, in 2011, when BPBA received funds from BNPB to develop a contingency plan for the eruption of Mount Seulawah, BPBA involved DRR Forum in preparing the contingency plan. Through the funding from BPBA, the DRR Forum organized meetings and conducted simulation to prepare the planning. The Forum is currently struggling to secure funds from the Government of Aceh and also from other allowed sources to strengthen its institutional capacity and maximize its functions. DRR-A did carry out some initiatives to help strengthen the Forum. Unfortunately, these initiatives were insufficient to provide strategies for the forum to secure funds for implementing its activities.

34. The Project Document stipulates that “the DRR-A will provide guidance to the government on methods for community empowerment for DRR incorporated into the Musrenbang process.”³ It is also stated in the Project Document that “output 1 has a strong link to output 2 in that it aims to set up local government mechanisms to support community based inputs to the local government process for development planning, partnerships with key local CBOs, and budgets needed to fund activities identified by communities”.⁴ DRR-A, however, did not contribute to the setting up of regulations or institutional arrangement for the government to support community empowerment in disaster risk reduction. The project did not help develop guidance for the Government of Aceh to conduct CBDRR and/or specifically to incorporate disaster risk reduction inputs from the community in the government planning through the Musrenbang process. According to the DRR Cluster Manager of CPRU-UNDP who is in charge of the DRR-A project, DRR-A had planned to set up the guidelines. The project, however, placed a higher priority on supporting the establishment of an enabling environment for disaster risk reduction measures through the formulation of disaster management related regulations which were more general in nature. According to her, the length of time for the project implementation was not sufficient to support the formulation of such guidance. The evaluator views that the argument of the Cluster Manager might be valid. However, DRR-A was supposed to be able to at least insert a clause in the Qanun or Governor Regulations that it helped to set up that suggests the Government of Aceh should conduct planning for DRR through community based mechanisms.

³ The Project Document of DRRA, p. 15.

⁴ The project Document of DRRA, p. 14.

35. With regard to gender mainstreaming in output 1, DRR-A did not employ a sound strategy to encourage women to actively participate in the formulation of the regulations to ensure that their specific needs and aspirations were considered. Among all of the regulations whose formulation was facilitated by the project, Aceh DRR Local Action Plan was the only one formulated through a process of consultations specifically with women's groups. As a result, of all the regulations, Aceh DRR Local Action Plan is the only regulation that refers to the condition of women and clearly states the need to promote the role and participation of women in disaster risk reduction in both the domestic and public domain.

Output 2: Demonstration of gender-sensitive projects implemented in selected locations to test and improve measures for reducing risk from natural disasters

36. The DRR-A project, in partnership with three local NGOs, implemented the Community based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRR) program in 10 selected villages located in 10 districts. The three NGOs were Ibu Foundation, Karst, and Bytra. The target locations were selected to represent all regions across Aceh, i.e. West Coast, Central Highland, and East Coast. The villages were selected not only because of their high susceptibility to specific natural disasters, but also to multiple hazards, including floods, landslides, earthquakes, tsunamis, and volcanic eruptions. The selection was conducted through a rapid assessment and intensive consultation with local government officials from Provincial level down to District level. Admirably, the selection of the villages covering all regional divisions in Aceh (West Coast, Central Highland and East Coast) and also multiple hazards risk is very good to spread awareness among the district governments or BPBDs across all regions in Aceh on the importance of CBDRR and also on the important concern on various natural hazards, not only tsunami, that may occur.

37. As stated in the Call for Proposal, the CBDRR program is intended to achieve the following outputs⁵:

⁵ Call for Proposals: Grant Programme for Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Aceh; Section of Terms of Reference.

1. Capacity of the communities in: 1) facilitating disaster risk reduction processes with equal representations of women ; 2) identifying and understanding the potential of their area; 3) analyzing disaster risks that includes hazards as well as vulnerability and capacity of different gender groups related to certain hazards; and 4) formulating action plan of the communities in disaster risk reduction with due consideration to the different roles and needs of different gender groups;
2. Disaster Management Plan and Contingency Plan at project locations (each village or “gampong”) formulated with due consideration of the different roles and needs of different gender groups.
3. Minimum of one multi-stakeholder forum on disaster risk reduction with adequate representation of different gender groups at project locations established;
4. Community action plan for disaster risk reduction with activities to address gender specific risks established and supported;
5. Local wisdom that was proved to reduce the disaster risk documented;
6. Disaster risk reduction measures to reduce vulnerability related to certain hazards tested;
7. Initiatives for disaster risk reduction integrated into community’s gathering forum, village or “gampong” planning and regulations;
8. Assessment tools and learning modules for community-based disaster risk reduction documented;
9. Implementation report and lessons learnt of Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction Grant Programme formulated.

38. However, at the time of the data collection process for this evaluation the completion of CBDRR program was different between the partner NGOs. Ibu Foundation and Karst had completed the implementation of CBDRR in all five facilitated villages; whereas Bytra hadnot yet completed its CBDRR program in the five villages it facilitated. The inability of Bytra to prepare good Community Action Plans (CAP) in compliance with the Project Management’s requirement and the long time needed for revising the CAP until it complied with the requirement became a main factor causing the delay of the approval of UNDP to deliver

funds for the last term of the NGO's contract.⁶ Bytra just received funds from UNDP at the end of May 2012. As a result, there was a significant delay in implementation of the workshop in "Gampong Mandiri" (Village Self Reliance), simulation of contingency plan, and implementation of community action plan. It is expected by the Project Management that Bytra will complete the implementation of those activities by the end of June 2012. Since the completion of the CBDRR program was different between the Ibu Foundation and Karst, and Bytra, at the time of evaluation the achievement of some outputs expected from CBDRR implementation was also different between the villages facilitated by Ibu Foundation and Karst and those facilitated by Bytra.⁷

39. In general the evaluator found that the implementation of CBDRR program in all of the selected villages has achieved outputs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 as demanded by the Call for Proposal. The CBDRR program has helped improve the capacity of the selected communities to reduce risks from natural disasters. Village DRR Forums have been established, their members trained in disaster risk reduction and facilitated to carry out some disaster risk reduction initiatives at the village level.⁸ Through the training and facilitation from the partners NGOs, the Forum has played roles in identifying disaster risks; developing disaster risk maps; identifying local wisdom; preparing disaster management plans; preparing and applying contingency plans and community action plans; and disseminating the information on DRR to the community.

⁶ There is an issue of the low capacity of Bytra and also of the insufficient management arrangement of Bytra that contributed to the inability of Bytra in preparing good CAP in timely manner. It is acknowledged by the DRR Cluster Manager of CPRU-UNDP that the UNDP might have made a mistake in assessing the capacity of the NGO and management arrangement proposed by the NGO during the selection process of the NGOs to implement CBDRR program.

⁷ At the time of the presentation of this Evaluation Report during the Project Board Meeting, which was held in Aceh on 13 August 2012, the National Project Manager reported that Bytra has finally completed the implementation of its delayed activities at the end of June 2012. However, because the time for the evaluation had ended, the evaluator has had no opportunity to assess the achievement of the implementation of the delayed activities.

⁸ The Village DRR Forum has different names based on the preference of the community and NGO partners. In Ketambang, West Aceh, the Village DRR Forum facilitated by Ibu Foundation was named KMPB, standing for Kelompok Masyarakat Peduli Bencana (Community Group for Disaster Awareness). In Arul Item, Central Aceh, the Village DRR Forum facilitated by Karst was named Fokusbari, standing for Forum Komunitas Siaga Bencana Arul Item (Community Forum for Disaster Preparedness in Arul Item). In Pante Beurene, Pidie Jaya; and Pasie Le Beu, Pidie, the Village DRR Forum was named FSBG, standing for Forum Siaga Bencana Gampong (Village Forum for Disaster Preparedness)

40. A gender sensitive approach was practiced in the activities carried out to achieve these outputs. A method to encourage women's participation in the CBDRR guidelines was established; an adequate number of women were involved in DRR activities, the DRR Forum included women members; specific women's needs and roles were included in the disaster management plan, contingency plan as well as community action plan. As a result of the application of a gender sensitive approach, for example, it is worth noting that two of ten villages DRR Forums are led by women. Another example is the implementation of a contingency plan in Arul Item. In Arul Item which is prone to landslides, the Forum, in collaboration with the village apparatus, collected data on vulnerable groups comprising of pregnant women, as well as children and elderly, and put special signs on the walls of their houses to provide a clear evacuation process when the symptoms of landslide are first detected.

41. The implementation of the CBDRR program also achieved output 8 and output 9 demanded by the Call for Proposal. The partner NGOs have documented their assessment of the tools and learning modules for CBDRR. In general, they noticed that some elements of the tools and learning modules for CBDRR prepared by the Project Management need to be adjusted for local conditions. The recommendations for adjustment have been used to revise the modules at the end of the implementation of CBDRR. The NGO partners have also formulated implementation reports and lessons learned from the CBDRR program.

42. With regard to output 6 demanded by the Call for Proposal, at the time of the data collection process for this evaluation, DRR measures to reduce vulnerabilities related to certain hazards have been tested in the five villages facilitated by Ibu Foundation and Karst by the conduct of simulation of contingency plans. In Ketambang village which is facilitated by Ibu Foundation in West Aceh, for example, the simulation to face flood disaster contingency was conducted with the participation of the village, sub-district apparatus, BPBD, RAPI and SAR. In this simulation the community was informed and practiced how to evacuate, where to evacuate, and the responsibilities of each party during the contingency. However, DRR measures have not yet been tested in the five villages facilitated by Bytra since the simulation has not yet been conducted.

43. As far as output 7 demanded by the Call for Proposal is concerned, at the time of the data collection process for this evaluation, the achievement of the CBDRR program in the selected villages was varied. All of the partner NGOs have facilitated the integration of DRR initiatives in the village planning forum, such as during the discussion for PNPM program, pre-Musrenbang at the village level, the discussion on RKPG (village government work plan) and RPJMG (village medium-term development planning). They also facilitated the integration of DRR initiatives into village regulations (Village Qanun). However, the results of this facilitation are different amongst the villages. With regard to the incorporation of DRR into the village planning, only Ibu Foundation reported success in incorporating the initiatives of DRR into the RPJMG and RKPG in all three villages it facilitated. In respect to the incorporation of the DRR measures into the village regulations, Karst and Bytra reported its success in integrating DRR into village regulations (Qanun) in all seven villages where they implemented CBDRR. For example, in Arul Item which is facilitated by Karst, in Central Aceh, to mitigate landslide hazards, through the support of the Village DRR Forum, a Village Regulation has been enacted to forbid people to farm land with a slope of more than 35 degrees. Ibu Foundation reported that it did not succeed in integrating DRR into village regulations in all three villages of its CBDRR implementation.

44. The Project Document expects that “the outputs from CBDRR planning and implementation at the community level are reflected in the development plans and programmes to be implemented by local government departments.”⁹ This means that DRR measures proposed by the community have to go through the Musrenbang mechanism up to district level and be selected for district government plans or programmes to be funded through APBD. In general, the CBDRR program has not been successful in incorporating DRR measures proposed by community based planning into district government plan or programmes to be funded through APBD since the proposals have not successfully passed through Musrenbang mechanism up to district level.

45. Ibu Foundation and Karst have facilitated the Village DRR Forum to incorporate the CBDRR measures into the Musrenbang process. In the village level Musrenbang (usually

⁹ The Project Document of DRRA, p. 18.

called pre-Musrenbang), the Village DRR Forum in the five villages facilitated by Ibu Foundation and Karst succeeded in incorporating some of the CBDRR measures into the proposals to be brought up to the sub-district level of Musrenbang. However, in the sub-district level Musrenbang process, the proposal of CBDRR measures from the villages facilitated by Ibu Foundation failed to be selected as part of the proposal to be brought up to the district level Musrenbang because the assessors of the proposal at the district level Musrenbang perceived that the proposal on CBDRR measures only reflected the needs of one village, not the need of many villages at the sub-district. Karst claims that it was successful in facilitating the Village DRR Forum to bring the proposals of CBDRR measures to the District Musrenbang because the Forum and Karst convinced the assessors of the need for CBDRR measures for the sub-district. However, at the district level Musrenbang, the proposals were not selected to be part of the annual district government plan that would be funded through government budget (APBD). According to the Coordinator of Karst, when he asked a BPBD official about the reason for this, the official said that there were insufficient efforts made to lobby decision makers in district government to convince them about the importance of the proposal on DRR measures. Based on the interviews with the Coordinators of Karst and of Ibu Foundation, there were high expectations from the NGO partners that the Project Management of DRR-A would play such advocacy roles at the district government level to convince the government of the importance of incorporating the proposal for DRR measures developed through the community mechanism into the district planning. Unfortunately, the Project Management did not play such role.

46. It is intended by the Project Document that “both Community Actions Plans and Contingency Plans are incorporated into district five year development plans (RPJM)”¹⁰. The evaluator found that, at the time of evaluation, none of the Community Action Plans and Contingency Plans produced by the implementation of CBDRR had been incorporated into the RPJM. The intention of the Project Document seems unrealistic since the timing of the implementation of CBDRR did not coincide with the formulation of RPJMD. At the time of the evaluation, the local elections for Head of Districts in the 10 districts of CBDRR

¹⁰ The Project Document of DRRRA, p. 18.

implementation had either just occurred or were still underway. The Formulation of RPJMD has to wait until the newly elected Head of Districts are inaugurated and starting to work.

47. However, it is worth noting that in two pilot villages for CBDRR implementation the strategy of advocacy of the partner NGOs has resulted in immediate support from the relevant local government department to DRR measures proposed by the community. In Arul Item village, Central Aceh, facilitated by Karst, the Forum convinced the Forestry and Plantation Department (Dishutbun) of Central Aceh to provide direct support for replanting by distributing vegetation to the community to be planted in the village area. In Ladang village, Abdya, facilitated by Ibu Foundation, the Forum convinced Local Disaster Management Agencies (BPBD) and Local Public Works Department (Dinas PU) to provide support for the construction of a village bridge for evacuation.

48. Through the initiatives of Ibu Foundation, an unintended good result was achieved when Ibu Foundation facilitated the establishment of Formasibab (Forum of Communities for Disaster Preparedness in Aceh Barat) comprising representatives from 41 villages in West Aceh. The 41 villages are the locations where Ibu Foundation facilitated CBDRR program with the support of UNDP (1 village) and Caritas and Trocaire (40 villages). Legalized through notaries, this organization aims to promote DRR at the district level in collaboration with other actors, primarily with BPBD. The organization has been included by the District Government into the Quick Response Team of West Aceh.

49. The Project Document expects that one result of the CBDRR will be “a report containing comments and inputs for laws, regulations and other measures proposed by districts and the province to support DRR.”¹¹ The CBDRR implementation has not produced this kind of report. This kind of report is not also mentioned as an output of CBDRR in the Call for Proposal. The Project Management has decided not to include the report in the outputs of CBDRR program, and the evaluator agrees with this decision. This output was considered unrealistic to be achieved since at the provincial level the laws, regulations and other measures to support DRR were only just initiated and not yet well known by the community.

¹¹ The Project Document of DRRRA, p. 18

At the district level, the laws, regulations and other measures to support DRR either did not yet exist or were not yet established.

50. As anticipated in the Project Document, the CBDRR program would also need to improve the capacity of the relevant government agencies, but the program has not been able to achieve this. The CBDRR program involved BPBDs (or Satkorlak PB, before BPBDs were established). However, based on the reports of partner NGOs, interviews with the Coordinators of the partner NGOs, interviews with BPBD officials; it appears that the involvement of BPBD staff was minimal and limited only to informing them about the activities and using them as resource persons at some of the village meetings related to implementation. Knowledge transfer activities were not outlined in the CBDRR program, and the partner NGOs did not request capacity building of BPBD personnel in CBDRR in the Call for Proposals. Based on interviews with BPBD officials in West Aceh, Central Aceh, Pidie, and Pidie Jaya districts, the project or the partner NGOs did not share the Modules in the CBDRR program or the reports on implementation. As a result, although BPBD officials were informed about CBDRR activities in the villages, they still lack knowledge and skills in undertaking CBDRR. This is a disadvantage for the BPBDs if they intend to scale up or replicate the CBDRR program with their own resources. According to the Head of the BPBD of Aceh Barat (which just received an award from BNPB as the champion in Disaster Preparedness), the BPBD Aceh Barat had a plan to establish Village DRR Forums in all villages in Aceh Barat. However, due to limited funds and a lack of knowledge in how to implement the CBDRR program, the establishment of the Village DRR Forum was not followed up by extensive CBDRR activities like the ones supported by DRR-A. The Head of the BPBD of Aceh Barat suggested that in future the implementation of CBDRR should occur in partnership with BPBDs. These partnerships would allow BPBDs to build their knowledge and skills in CBDRR, which in turn would help them to scale up or replicate the CBDRR program in other villages.

51. The Project Document expects that the Project will “refine and improve the section of the CBDRR guidelines designed with government staff, and develop a strategy for extending the CBDRR approach to other locations in Aceh and contribute to the knowledge

management of this subject, to be shared with other CBDRR proponents”¹². The modules on CBDRR were refined and improved with the partner NGOs, based on their experience in the field. Unfortunately, the refinement of these modules did not involve government staff from BPBA or BPBDs, and they were not shared extensively with the BPBA, BPBDs, NGOs and other DRR Proponents in Aceh. The Project has not yet developed a strategy for extending the CBDRR approach to other locations in Aceh.

52. Under output 2 of the Project, DRR-A supported the formulation of Strategic Plans and Work Plans for BPBDs in Bener Meriah, Pidie Jaya, and Aceh Tamiang districts, and the Disaster Management Plan of the BPBD in West Aceh District. These planning documents are very important for the BPBDs to improve their capacity to coordinate and promote disaster management in the districts where CBDRR is implemented. However, looking at the documents, the incorporation of CBDRR into the BPBDs’ planning documents appears to be minimal, although the work plan of Aceh Tamiang’s BPBD specifically contains the plan to build resilient villages in 2013.¹³ The minimal incorporation of CBDRR into the BPBDs’ planning documents indicates that there might be insufficient government ownership of the program to make it sustainable.

Output 3: TDMRC-UNSYIAH strengthened to provide science-based information, services and knowledge assistance to the local government and other DRR proponents in implementing their DRR activities

53. DRR-A has significantly improved the technical capacity of TDMRC to provide science-based disaster management products and services such as a risk map for Aceh province, risk maps for Aceh Tamiang and Aceh Barat, 19 training modules for different groups, 21 DRR research papers by scientists from various disciplines. The Centre has also set up the Aceh Disaster Historical Data Base (DIBA) and a prototype Disaster Risk Management Information System (DRMIS).

¹² The Project Document of DRR-A, p. 18.

¹³ Draft of the Work Plan of BPBD of Aceh Tamiang for year 2013, p. 28.

54. Support from DRR-A was instrumental to equip the Centre with the software to strengthen its organizational or managerial capacity. The DRR-A supported the formulation of the Policies and Procedures governing the operation and management of the Centre, the Capacity Development Plan, Strategic Development Plan for 2012-2017 and Marketing Plan. During the implementation of the Project, the Centre was able to operate successfully, incorporating new business processes for administration, finances, asset management, procurement, and Human Resources systems along with monitoring and evaluation.

55. The achievements of the Centre in providing products and services with support from DRR-A was recognised by the Government of Indonesia with the appointment of the Centre as a focal point for South-South Cooperation in disaster management. Under the GoI's framework of South-South Cooperation, for example, the Centre will conduct a series of training programs in Disaster Management for developing and under-developed countries.

56. DRR-A support significantly contributed to the establishment of the Master in Disaster Management degree at Unsyiah, and provided technical assistance in curriculum development for the masters program. Currently, 71 students are enrolled in the program and 60 percent are government officials. Based on student interviews, the program has a very good curriculum, containing the required knowledge and skill in disaster management. They are happy with the teaching staff who are perceived as very knowledgeable in disaster management.

57. It should be noted that the delay in the provision of DRMIS (Disaster Risk Management Information System) equipment, caused mainly by the long procurement process of the UNDP and the delay in funds transferred to TDMRC, made it difficult for to the Centre to establish a well-functioning DRMIS.¹⁴ TDMRC only received a server in February 2012 and an internal hard disk in May 2012. The server was installed at the end of May 2012. TDMRC still needed technical assistance from ESRI (a geographic information system software company) to create an interface between the prototype and the server. TDMRC only received the funds from the UNDP to pay ESRI at the end of May 2012, at the same time as

¹⁴ An explanation of the factors leading to the delay of fund transfers is provided in paragraph 57.

the closure of the project. The project management demanded that TDMRC completely spend the fund by the end of June 2012. TDMRC has contacted ESRI to ask for its technical assistance, but unfortunately, ESRI had no available personnel in June 2012. Because of this, the data has not yet been published as there is still no interface between the prototype and the server. So, DRMIS is currently still a prototype.

58. The delay in the recruitment of the tsunami expert and the failure to procure research equipment for the Tsunami laboratory at the Centre, limited the development of research capacity in Tsunamis. According to the Project Management, the delay was because the expert was based in New Zealand completing his doctoral degree in 2011 and the Project Management considered it too costly to hire him while he was based abroad. The expert completed his study and returned to Indonesia by the end of 2011. Due to the lengthy recruitment process, the expert wasn't on board until the project was nearly completed. Meanwhile, the failure to procure research equipment for the Tsunami laboratory was caused by the late awareness of the Project Management and the Centre itself of the importance of this equipment. They realised at beginning of year 2012 and the approval to use DIPA to fund the procurement took time and was only given when the project was almost at an end. KEMDAGRI had insufficient time to process the procurement in accordance with the standard national government practice.

59. The delay in the transfer of the last tranche of funds from UNDP was caused by the delay in the delivery of expected results and compliance with UNDP reporting standards by the TDMRC. This delay meant the Centre had 15 outstanding activities at the end of DRR-A implementation (the end of May 2012). Those activities are as follows:

1. Workshop to establish TDMRC Board (1.2.1.1)
2. Finalisation of the Legal Status of TDMRC (1.2.1.2.1)
3. Visit for consultation and coordination with national partner (1.3.1.9)
4. TDMRC Annual Report (1.3.1.10)
5. Technical Assistant (ESRI), for developing web DRMIS (2.1.2)
6. Annual Aceh Disaster Report (2.2.4)
7. Training Capacity Strengthening related to DIBA for districts (2.2.11).
8. Production of DRR-A Educational Animation (2.2.12)

9. DRR Comic Production (2.2.14).
10. Geological and landslide survey (2.5.1)
11. Endline Survey (2.5.6)
12. Peer Group Seminar (2.8.5.1).
13. Publication of TDMRC Reseach Compendum (2.8.9).
14. Training for empowering schools, (School Disaster Preparedness and Traumatic Healing (2.12.3.2).
15. Training in Disaster Research Methodology for volunteers and staff (2.12.5).

60. The Centre only received the final funds at the end of May 2012, just as the project was about to close. Although the UNDP provided an extension until June 2012 for TDMRC to implement 12 of 15 outstanding activities, the delay in implementing those activities meant a delay in TDMRC addressing certain organizational issues and the provision of certain science-based services above as listed in the work plan. The reduced timing led to ineffective implementation of those activities.¹⁵

61. DRR-A appears to be less effective in improving the capacity of TDMRC to raise revenue. DRR-A facilitated a marketing strategy for TDMRC, but it wasn't completed until April 2012 and has not yet been implemented. Difficulty in finding a qualified consultant to develop the strategy meant it wasn't begun until third quarter of 2011. The consultant caused further delays in providing the marketing strategy for TDMRC.

62. The problem of the legal status of the TDMRC was not resolved until June 2012. It was only recently decided that the TDMRC would fall under direct supervision of the rector of UNSYIAH. Given this legal status, it is very likely that the marketing strategy needs to be reviewed again to ensure its compliance with the regulations of the university.

¹⁵ At the time of the presentation of this Evaluation Report during the Project Board Meeting, which was held in Aceh on 13 August 2012, the Head of TDMRC reported that the 11 out of the 12 activities has been done by the Centre. However, because the time for the evaluation had ended, the evaluator had no opportunity to assess whether the activities had been optimally implemented and achieved the intended results. Based on the report of the Head of TDMRC, one activity that could not be implemented was the training of DIBA to district BPBDs' officials. The evaluator believes that the failure to implement this activity could reduce the ability of the district BPBD officials to do on-line updating on the DIBA in the future. This condition will lead to the les than optimal functioning of DIBA in the future.

63. Due to ineffective initiatives to improve the capacity of the Centre to raise revenue, although the technical capacities of the Centre were developed with DRR-A support, the Centre is facing severe financial difficulties preventing them from providing products and services at the same level, and the activities of the Centre have decreased significantly. It has reduced its personnel from 59 to 12. The current structure of the Centre consists of Head, Vice Head, Secretary, Treasurer, and four divisions, i.e. Applied Research; Education and Training; Knowledge Management; and Professional Services. The Centre is also having trouble paying for maintenance of its office (electricity, cleaning, etc).

64. As mentioned earlier, the Centre was appointed a focal point of the Government Indonesia's Programme for South-South Cooperation in Disaster Management. The Centre has also developed partnerships with government, NGOs and academic institutions at national and international level including: BPBDs of Banda Aceh, Simeulue, and Sabang; Yokohama University; Politeknik Aceh; Asian Community Trust, Japan; and Centre for Integrated Area Studies (CIAS), Japan. Unfortunately, these partnerships have not helped the Centre to become a focal point for South-South Cooperation, or to generate financial resources for the Centre. The partnerships do, however, create possible opportunities for the Centre to provide services and perhaps attract future revenue.

Output 4: DRR public awareness programmes implemented to promote internalization of a gender sensitive "culture of safety" among the people and institutions in Aceh.

65. Working with DISHUBKOMINTEL, the Project has significantly contributed to the implementation of public awareness campaigns using a wide range media (TV, and Radio Talk-shows, public service announcements, newspaper advertorial, and traditional performance in remote locations) to influence public perspectives on DRR and promote a culture of safety. The awareness campaign (developed after consideration of the baseline survey) was based on a sound DRR public awareness strategy with culture and gender sensitive elements.

66. Looking at the frequency of the activities as well as the channels, media, and partners involved in the public awareness campaign, it appears the campaign was designed to reach

a wide audience throughout Aceh. These activities have contributed to increased public awareness of DRR. The end-line survey undertaken in 10 districts where the project was implemented, indicates there is an increased awareness of DRR. For example, people now know what action should be taken when an earthquake occurs and what action should be taken to mitigate potential disasters.¹⁶

67. DRR-A support of the establishment of the Public Awareness Coordination Committee (PACC) through Governor Decree No. 360/322/2010 was crucial to help Dishubkomintel prepare and co-ordinate the dissemination of DRR messages. DRR-A also provided training to improve the knowledge of the PACC members, comprising representatives from various local government institutions/departments, local and international NGOs, and the media. Although some NGO members weren't able to remain active on the committee until the end of DRR-A implementation, they continued to assist Dishubkomintel to prepare the public awareness strategy and appropriate campaign modules.

68. The PACC was an effective multi-stakeholder forum to support the Aceh public awareness campaigns on DRR. It built a sense of mutual responsibility among the various engaged institutions to contribute to DRR public awareness campaign. It also enriched the DRR messages with the multi-disciplinary perspectives of the committee members. One member from the Islamic Law Department (*Dinas Syariat Islam*) said that his involvement in the committee made him realize that his department could also promote DRR through religious teachings. Religious teachings have also been incorporated into some DRR messages disseminated during the public awareness campaign.

69. However effective, the PACC was only an "ad hoc" committee, formed during the implementation of the LoA between DRR-A and DISHBUKOMINTEL to support the conduct of the massive DRR public awareness programmes supported by DRR-A. It is felt that a longer term PACC is needed in Aceh to coordinate ongoing public awareness campaigns. It would be good, if, for example, the project could advocate the incorporation of PACC functions into the Provincial DRR Forum.

¹⁶ Further description of the result of this baseline survey can be seen in the section of "Impact".

70. The partnership with journalists to implement public awareness programmes has delivered an unintended positive result: the establishment of a Journalist's Forum for DRR called *Forum Jurnalis Aceh Peduli Bencana* (FJAB). In October 2011, in the workshop facilitated by DRR-A, as well as finalising a module for journalists, the participants developed a disaster reporting code of ethics and initiated the establishment of *Forum Jurnalis Aceh Peduli Bencana* (FJAPB). The members of this Forum have actively published articles on DRR-related issues and provided assistance to PACC and DISHUBKOMINTEL in conducting the public awareness programmes.

71. In addition to public awareness campaigns, the DRR-A also supported the communication strategy to embed DRR knowledge in the younger population using the school curricula and training of teachers. This strategy is very important and should be a priority. It will take a longer time to have a broad impact, but it's an effective way to prepare future "agents" to promote DRR.

72. Through its support to the Education Department (DISDIK), the Project conducted several activities intended to integrate DRR knowledge into the school curriculum for elementary, junior and high school students with varying levels of success. The integration of DRR into the elementary curriculum appears to be more advanced than in junior and high school. Initiated in 2010, the integration of DRR into elementary school curriculum has resulted in developed modules, ToT for teachers of the core/model in schools from 12 districts/municipalities, and implementation of DRR teaching under the monitoring of the Education Department (DISDIK). Disdik tested the results of the implementation using "cerdas cermat", a knowledge competition involving elementary students from the core/model schools. Integration of DRR into the school curricula for junior and high schools, was not initiated until 2011, and has developed modules for integration into the curriculum and ToT for selected teachers, but it is too early to assess the implementation¹⁷.

¹⁷ According to the staff of the Project, the project prioritized the integration process for the elementary school (which included activities such as module development, ToT). Therefore, the integration process for the elementary school was conducted first before the integration process for junior and senior high school. That becomes the main reason of the different achievement of the integration amongst the different school levels.

¹⁸ Dayah is Aceh's name for Islamic Boarding School or Pesantren.

73. The support and advocacy of the project contributed to the issuance of Governor Instruction No. 2/INSTR/2012 on the Application of DRR in Schools in Aceh, on 28 May 2012. Although it was issued at the end of the DRR-A implementation, the regulation provides the legal basis required by DISDIK to endorse the introduction of the DRR curricula into the education system in Aceh. This regulation also provides opportunities for DISDIK to continue the program of integration.

74. DRR-A, in a partnership with BPPD (*Badan Pembinaan Pendidikan Dayah*), supported the DRR integration into the curriculum for Modern Islamic Boarding Schools/Modern Dayah¹⁸. The first initiatives in DRR teaching were implemented in Dayahs, a popular form of Islamic school in Aceh. Once again, the implementation had insufficient time to ensure the integration of DRR curriculum was fully achieved. Since the beginning of 2011, the module was developed, the workshops held to socialize the DRR module for Dayah, ToT held for selected teachers, the field test of the module in one Dayah and the simulation of disaster preparedness in one Dayah have taken place. But by the project closure there were no activities conducted to ensure the DRR was integrated into the Dayah Curriculum.

75. Under output 4, the Project aims to establish a library in the BPBA building. At the end of May 2012, the Project had not established the library. The project had hired a consultant to prepare for the establishment of the library and conducted a series of preparation activities. However, the project management reported that the supporting books and other materials are scarce and difficult to source, so it was unable to complete the establishment the library by the end of May 2012.¹⁹

Efficiency

¹⁸ Dayah is Aceh's name for Islamic Boarding School or Pesantren.

¹⁹ In the presentation of the result of the DRR-A's Final Evaluation in the Project Board Meeting held in Aceh on 13 August 2012, a personnel of BPBA confirmed about the inability of the project to provide the books and materials for the library. However, according to the Project Manager of DRR-A, the books and the materials has now been procured and would be given soon to BPBA's library.

To what extent was the project effectively and efficiently managed, monitored, evaluated and audited?

Organizational structure and management arrangement

76. The structure of the Project Board of DRR-A was generally efficient in project implementation. With the Directorate of Disaster Prevention and Management under the Ministry of Home Affairs, as the implementing partner, the Project Management Unit of DRR-A in Aceh was strategically located under the Aceh Regional Secretary (Sekda) as the Provincial Project Director. The Sekda played a strategic role in supporting DRR-A programs given his roles as Head of BPBA *ex officio* and as a high level official with authority to lead and supervise the different local government departments involved as beneficiaries of DRR-A.

77. The management structure was also kept simple and efficient with only functional positions. An NPM leads the management of the whole project, supported by a national advisor and a gender specialist providing technical advice; a finance associate, administrative assistants and a monitoring and reporting officer to provide administrative support. Three NPCs, assisted by Project Associates, were appointed to coordinate the implementation of the 4 outputs of the Project. One NPC handled output 3. Another NPC handled output 4. The other one handled both outputs 1 and 2.

78. However, the structure of DRR-A was not optimal for ensuring the active involvement of the other two important national government agencies - Bappenas and BNPB - during the implementation of the project. Bappenas and BNPB could provide advice and play an important role in the strategic direction of the implementation of DRAA. Bappenas was the earliest proponent of DRR in Indonesia and has a lot of experience in promoting better DRR with the UNDP-supported program, Safer Community through Disaster Risk Reduction (SC-DRRR). Although it is newly established, BNPB could provide significant input for DRR-A based on the policies and initiatives it has established on disaster management and DRR. DRR-A involved Bappenas and BNPB in its steering committee but this committee only met once. According to Bappenas and BNPB, their lack of engagement in the Project has limited

their knowledge of activities and prevented them from providing important advice to the DRR-A.

79. The DRR-A used rigorous methods for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Unfortunately, these were not able to prevent delays in many project activities caused by the long process for recruitment, procurement and fund transfers. There is dissatisfaction among the partners of the DRR-A (under LoA with UNDP) caused by the delays in fund transfers from UNDP, especially from TDMRCs and Bytra who experienced serious delays. When the evaluator attempted to clarify this issue by asking each party for the cause of delay, the evaluator found that each party admitted that they might have made mistakes that contributed to the delay, but they also blamed the other party. The evaluator found that during the implementation of DRR-A, no management attempts were made to creatively solve the delays in the fund transfer.

80. The planning, monitoring and evaluation tools, and implementation arrangements were unable to prevent problems in the fund channeling mechanism from national to local government through DIPA. DRR-A experienced serious delays in implementing activities in Aceh using DIPA disbursements due to the delay in approval of DIPA in 2011. It was finally approved in November 2011, but the development of preparedness and emergency response plans were delayed due to the late approval.

Time of implementation

81. DRR-A was not able to effectively use the first year of implementation to achieve the planned annual target for 2009. As reported, the slow start up in the first year of implementation was mainly caused by challenges in recruiting qualified and competent personnel, assigning the Provincial Project Director (PPD), and the local elections in Aceh.²⁰ These conditions, besides limiting achievement of the annual targets in 2009, also caused an accumulation of pending activities into the period of 2010-2011.

²⁰ Annual Report of DRR-A for the period of January –December 2009, p. 5.

82. It was planned that DRR-A would be completed by the end of year 2011. However, because of the slow start, and the delays in funds channelled through DIPA and transferred from UNDP, the implementation of DRR-A was extended until the end of May 2012 by the donors and the Government of Indonesia.

83. In general, the evaluator found that the use of time to implement some DRR-A activities appears to be less than efficient. The delays already mentioned above contributed to this. To strengthen the BPBA, due to the late approval of 2011 DIPA, the Capacity Assessment for designing the Capacity Development Strategy could not begin until January 2012. The assessment was completed in May 2012 when the project was nearly closed. DRR-A did not have enough time to assist the BPBA to implement the strategy to strengthen its capacity. Similarly, the significant delay in producing the marketing strategy meant there was insufficient time to implement the strategy. There are another 15 activities which were still not implemented by TDMRC at the end of May 2012. With regard to CBDRR, the delayed implementation of CBDRR activities in the five villages facilitated by Bytra meant that some outputs required in the Call of Proposal could not be achieved by the time of DRR project closure. In addition, the shorter period for implementation of some activities may have affected outcomes. For example, the integration of DRR curricula into Modern Dayah was given insufficient time to ensure the implementation of the module.

Project funding

84. DRR-A spent almost 45 percent of its total budget on achieving output 3, the highest budget and spending compared to the other outputs. However, compared to the other outputs, this spending was the least efficient in achieving the intended output. The huge financial resources were not well utilized by the Project Management to improve the capacity of TDMRC to provide science-based services. The technical capacity of TDMRC and its personnel was improved, but the institutional capacity to raise revenue in order to sustain its operability was not improved. At the end of the DRR-A implementation, TDMRC faces severe financial difficulties in sustaining its ability to produce important scientific products and services without DRR-A support.

85. Output 1, with only 9 percent allocated of the total budget of DRR-A, was used efficiently to develop several regulatory instruments and establish the BPBA and DRR Forums at provincial level. Output 2, although it received only 4 percent of the total budget, has effectively implemented CBDRR activities in 10 selected villages (although there was a delay in the 5 villages facilitated by Bytra). Arguably, DRR-A would have been more effective in advancing the achievement of outputs 1 and 2, if more financial resources (and also time) had been invested in strengthening the capacity of BPBA and DRR Forums; and in strengthening government capacity and support for CBDRR implementation in communities. For example, to better achieve output 1, the project could have provided more funds to facilitate training to develop the capacity of BPBA. To better achieve output 2, the project could have provided more funds to facilitate training in CBDRR methodology for the personnel of BPBA and BPBDs.

86. Output 4, with 25 percent of the total budget, implemented large scale and intensive DRR public awareness programs. DRR-A would have been more efficient at integrating DRR into curriculum if the funds (and also time) had been utilized better. For example, by investing more funds and time, the Project could have integrated DRR into curricula of Elementary School, Junior High School and Senior High School simultaneously, making achievement across all three as good as in Elementary Schools. By investing more funds and time, the Project could also have initiated earlier integration of DRR into the Dayahs and conducted more activities to ensure the integration is on track.

Relevance

To what extent are the project design and implementation consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries? To what extent was the project able to respond to changing and emerging priorities?

87. DRR-A project's design and implementation are very consistent with national policies and priorities in promoting DRR in Indonesia. Since 2004, the Government of Indonesia has recognized the need for better DRR implementation in development. The Government of

Indonesia has formally adopted UN Hyogo Framework for Action on DRR. The Gol has enacted several national laws on Disaster Management with DRR elements and emphasis, and established Disaster Management Agencies (National and Provincial). The Gol has made DRR a national development priority as stated in the Mid- Term National Development Plan 2010-2014.

88. The implementation of DRR-A in Aceh is very relevant, considering the vulnerability to disasters in almost all regions across Aceh and the urgent need for the Aceh Provincial Government to establish better arrangements to implement Disaster Management in the context of post-disaster recovery and transition to longer-term development. According to DIBI, Aceh is prone not only to earthquakes and tsunamis, but also to floods and landslides. Floods are the most frequent disasters. Prior to DRR-A implementation and post 2004 Tsunami, Aceh Province still had an insufficient regulatory framework and institutional arrangement to implement Disaster Management, including DRR. At the community level, a baseline survey conducted by DRR-A indicated a low level of public awareness of DRR and a low level of preparedness too. The design and implementation of DRR-A's public awareness campaigns and also CBDRR programs at the community level were very relevant to the needs of the community to increase their awareness of DRR and their resilience.

89. With the strong patriarchal culture in Aceh, the inclusion of women in public affairs is often considered inappropriate. This disadvantaged women since many of their priorities and needs are not addressed by the current development planning, regulations and implementation. The emphasis of DRR-A on gender sensitive aspects in its design and implementation is very consistent with the need to promote active participation of women in public affairs in Aceh as well as the need to ensure the recognition and incorporation of women's needs and priorities in the DRR regulatory framework and implementation.

90. DRR-A, in general, has been flexible enough to adjust the program in response to changing priorities and needs. For example, DRR-A provided some assistance to improve the capacity of local government at district level in DRR through its support in formulating Disaster Management Plans (RPB), Strategic Plans (Renstra) and Work Plans (Renja) of some BPBDs regardless of the absence of this in the original design. Another example is that the

support to strengthen the capacity of TDMRC was previously planned to focus on technical support but later included the provision of tsunami research equipment.

91. DRR-A targeted various beneficiaries, i.e, government, academic institutions, NGOs, and wider communities. This is relevant to the need to build not only capacities but also to develop partnerships with various actors in Aceh to work collaboratively on DRR. The Project Document clearly encourages synergy of outputs to achieve a collective effort in the promotion of DRR among relevant actors. The Project Management attempted to apply synergy in the outputs, but this was not optimally achieved. For example, the implementation of output 1 was not strongly related to output 2, therefore output 1 missed an opportunity to provide guidance or set up an institutional mechanism to help the incorporate the input from CBDRR application into district or provincial government plans. The implementation of output 3 had also minimal synergy with output 1, so that TDMRC activities did not optimally contribute to strengthening the capacity of the BPBA or DRR Forums. Based on FGDs with personnel in the Project Management Unit, it is acknowledged that the synergy among outputs is lower than expected.

Appropriateness

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

92. In general, DRR-A's design has been feasible for implementation in the context of Aceh. Its acceptance by wide-ranging actors, including communities, was very encouraging and supportive. There were neither structural nor cultural objections to the implementation of the Project.

93. The assignment of the Project leadership under Ministry of Home Affairs as national implementing partner was very appropriate since it eased the delegation of authority to Regional Provincial Secretary as Provincial Project Director at the Provincial level. The

arrangement of DRR under Sekda at the provincial level enabled the project to have a very strategic position and involve various provincial departments.

94. The use of the slogan “Trust in Allah, but don’t forget to tie up your camels” in the Project Document indicated notable sensitivity and adaptation of the project’s design to the religious culture of the people in Aceh. The slogan is a quote from a hadith teaching people to make maximum efforts to avoid adversity. Natural disasters are widely perceived by the public in Aceh as fated by God and associated with a test of faith or punishment for people’s sins. DRR-A did not challenge this belief but implicitly complements it with the importance of taking measures to reduce fatalities or the adverse impacts of disasters. The involvement of Dinas Syariat Islam in PACC, DRR-A enriched the DRR campaign messages with religious points of view and carried out training for religious preachers (da’i) to disseminate information on DRR based on religious beliefs.

95. The method used by DRR-A to implement gender sensitive approaches in its programs is also sensible. As stated in the Project Document, the strategy to make it gender inclusive was to value women’s knowledge and experience, empowering women and women’s organizations by providing opportunities for leadership, and increasing female representation in the decision-making process. This strategy used a persuasive approach rather than dramatically challenging the patriarchal culture. During the CBDRR program, for example, the partner NGOs successfully persuaded the village authorities to hold village meetings at noon instead of evening, to enable more women to attend the meeting. The partner NGOs also held some special meetings with women to identify their aspirations and to appoint some active women to raise these aspirations at the general village meeting.

96. DRR-A did not have an appropriate exit strategy to end the project smoothly and help achieve more sustainable results. The project did not really help the partners involved to identify the remaining homework needed to achieve better outputs, prepare a followup strategy, and complete the outstanding activities with the partners’ own resources. For example, DRR-A did not assist TDMRC to identify what should be done to implement the marketing strategy. DRR-A did not assist the BPBA to identify what should be done to implement a Capacity Development Strategy beyond the life of the project. Some partners

feel that the end of their partnerships with DRR-A came too soon and left them unable to sustain what has been achieved. DRR-A also did not provide an exit strategy and sufficiently inform other DRR actors in Aceh of the achievements and/or products of the DRR-A. Therefore, further development or utilization of the achievements and/or products by these actors could not be promoted and replicated. For example, by the end of DRR-A, American Red Cross, was not informed about the modules of CBDRR produced by the DRR-A. American Red Cross are actually interested in the modules and expect to utilize the modules for better implementation of its Integrated Community Based Risk Reduction (ICBRR) program in partnership with Indonesian Red Cross.

Sustainability

Will the project 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 DRR-A?

Institutional arrangement and enabling environment

97. With the facilitation of DRR-A, the local regulations on Disaster Management in Aceh have been established and endorsed by Governor Decree and Governor Regulation. These will continue to provide legal instruments for the Aceh Provincial Government to regulate and implement disaster management, providing sufficient institutional arrangements, managing all phases of disaster management, and developing better mitigation and preparedness efforts to face possible natural hazards. Amongst these regulations, the Qanun on Disaster Management and the Establishment of BPBA, are the most fundamental, and the strongest since they were enacted by the Aceh Parliament (DPRA). The removal of these regulations would be relatively difficult. The sustainability of the other regulations in the form of Governor Decrees and Regulations will be determined by the executive side of the Aceh Government, particularly the Governor. However, the evaluator is quite convinced that the Decrees and Regulations will be sustained for four reasons: (1) the regulations are not political in nature, (2) there is a strong need in Aceh to develop better disaster

management as articulated by key informants in the Aceh Provincial government during the interviews for this evaluation, (3) the Decrees and Regulations are highly relevant to efforts to develop better risk reduction measures in Aceh, and (4) the Decrees and Regulations are highly relevant to national regulations on Disaster Management. It should also be noted that the Aceh Government (in collaboration with other DRR proponents in Aceh) could always review and improve these regulations to adjust them to new challenges or circumstances. In fact, some of the instruments, i.e. Governor Decree No. 48/2012 on DRR Local Action Plan 2010-2012, and Governor Regulation No. 51/2011 on Provincial Disaster Management Plan 2012-2017, have time limitations for enforcement. Therefore, based on the national regulations on Disaster Management, the Aceh Provincial Government needs to renew these regulations at the end of their enforcement period.

98. Beyond the life of DRR-A, the existence of BPBA should continue to provide benefits to the Aceh government in promoting and implementing better Disaster Management in Aceh. Although there are still some questions concerning the limited capacities of the BPBA to play their ideal role in disaster management, the establishment of BPBA as an SKPD has equipped the Government of Aceh with a clear institutional arrangement with a specific function and responsibility for Disaster Management. To ensure its sustainability as well as to maximize their performance, the Government of Aceh needs to develop the capacity of this agency to function as mandated by the regulations, particularly to coordinate other local government institutions and non-government stakeholders for disaster mitigation, preparedness and disaster recovery, and to take a leading role in disaster emergency response.

99. The existence of the DRR Forum potentially extends the benefit of supporting the implementation of Disaster Management in Aceh, with multi-stakeholder engagement to provide input to the Government of Aceh to implement DRR. However, the sustainability of this Forum is currently under question. The Forum still has insufficient financial resources to implement its activities as outlined in the work plan. In this challenging scenario, the leadership capacity and motivation of the leaders of the Forum will be the determining factor in running the Forum. Unfortunately, based on information from some informants, some NGO activists in Aceh frequently question the leadership capacity of the Forum. For

example, during the preparation of Contingency Plan for the Mount Seulawah eruption, some NGO activists complained about deficiencies in organizing activities and preparing the required data prior to the workshop with stakeholders to formulate the Contingency Plan. They also complained about the inappropriate actions of the leaders in conducting simulations by providing cash to the villagers who were involved in the simulation.²¹

Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRR)

100. The implementation of the CBDRR program has given communities in the 10 selected villages better knowledge of disaster risk reduction. Based on FGDs with members of the Forum, village authorities and community representatives at four sample villages, the villagers generally have a better understanding of disaster risks in their village and the measures required to reduce those risks, including disaster preparedness. The indirect benefit of CBDRR in improving the understanding of DRR will potentially continue providing benefits at the ten selected villages beyond the life of the project.

101. Although there is no guarantee regarding the sustained application of the knowledge of DRR by the people, the existence of the Village DRR Forum should help people to continue to apply their knowledge. Based on consultations with the members of the Forum, village authorities and community representatives, it is acknowledged that beyond the life of the project, the activities of the Forum to promote DRR will sharply decrease. The Forum lacks sufficient financial resources to function actively as well as it did with DRR-A support. According to village authorities, the Forum could not get regular financial support from the village government unless it is included under the village governance structure. However, due to the existing government regulations it is impossible to do so.

102. Nonetheless, based on consultations with members of the Forum, village authorities, and community representatives in four sample villages, there are strong indications that the existence of the Forum will continue without the support of the Project for a number of reasons. *First*, the Forum was established and endorsed by the Village Head

²¹ Interview with an informant from Karst Aceh; and confirmed with the information collected from the mailing list of bencana@yahogroups.com.

Decree confirming that the structure of the organizing committee will last for three years. This means that there is a legal basis at the village level for continuing the existence of this Forum. *Second*, the Forum has built strong and good relations with the village authorities; and they have acknowledged the important role of the Forum and the need to continue its existence. *Third*, the Forum members and the village authorities have identified some financial sources that could be used to sustain the Forum, for example by renting the kitchen utensils owned by the Forum to the villagers for emergency preparedness, collecting donations from the community and, if possible, submitting funding proposals to government institutions or NGOs.²² *Fourth*, the Forum members and the village authorities have identified important roles for the Forum during village planning meetings, particularly to propose the incorporation of DRR activities into the village plans.

103. Several activities were implemented based on Contingency Plans and Community Action Plans (CAP) as result of the CBDRR program, and will continue providing benefits beyond the life of DRR-A. The construction of evacuation routes, evacuation signs, preparation of the evacuation sites, as well as contingency simulations in the ten villages, have informed and trained the villagers on how to be ready during crises, where to evacuate to, and how to prevent casualties. Retaining the river side/wall in Desa Ketambang, will continue benefitting the villagers in mitigating floods. The re-plantation activities in Arul Item village will also provide long-term benefit in mitigating landslides. Based on consultations with the village authorities and community members, they were eager to maintain the benefits of the disaster mitigation activities promoted through the CBDRR program by using their own resources and capacities, for example using community mutual initiatives (*gotong royong*) for maintaining the evacuation signs and the evacuation route. Most of them expected the existing Village DRR Forum would play a leading role in encouraging the villagers to maintain the hazard mitigation activities.

104. The successful incorporation of some DRR initiatives into village regulations (Qanun) as well as village RPJMG and RKPG in several CBDRR targeted villages has provided legal instruments and better opportunities to promote DRR in the villages beyond the life of DRR-

²² The Forum has bought kitchen utensils by using the funds of CBDRR program of DRR-A. The kitchen utensils are to be used for preparing food for the villagers during the disaster emergency in the evacuation sites.

A. This should be followed up by the reinforcement and implementation of the legal documents, to bring concrete results to the villages. For example, the reinforcement of the Village Regulation in Arul Item prohibiting people from cultivating land with a slope of 35 degree or above would mitigate future landslide hazards.

105. The local government's real commitment to continue or replicate the CBDRR Program appears to be low. Based on interviews in the four sample BPBDs where the four CBDRR pilot villages are located, all of the BPBD officials were interested in the CBDRR program and acknowledged the importance of this program to create resilient villages. However, most of them claimed that the BPBDs lacked sufficient financial resources to continue the support or to replicate CBDRR in other villages. All of them admitted that the BPBDs have insufficient knowledge to implement CBDRR programs. The BPBD of West Aceh was the only BPBD that planned to establish a Village DRR Forum in all villages across Aceh Barat. But, according to the Head of the BPBD, financial constraints and limited knowledge of CBDRR methodology meant the establishment of the Village DRR Forum would not be followed up with programmatic CBDRR activities. Based on the review of the work plans of supported BPBDs, the BPBD of Aceh Tamiang is the only one with a plan to build resilient villages in line with CBDRR pilot villages in its work plan for 2013. However, the document does not explain how these activities will be conducted by the BPBD, given the limited knowledge of the CBDRR methodology.²³

TMDRC – Unsyiah

106. In general, the DRR-A program did not sustainably improve the capacity of TDMRC to provide science-based information services and knowledge assistance to the local government and other DRR proponents for implementing DRR in Aceh. Although their technical capacity to provide important services and knowledge products has improved, their capacity to generate revenue has not yet been sufficiently developed. As a result, although TDMRC continues to operate, it is facing severe financial difficulties, making it

²³ As explained before, the limited knowledge is caused mainly by the fact that there are specific activities dedicated by the project to transfer knowledge and methodology on CBDRR to BPBDs' officials.

almost impossible for TDMRC to continue providing as many services as it did during DRR-A implementation.

107. The establishment of the Masters Degree in Disaster Management facilitated by DRR-A will continue to deliver benefits to the people of Aceh beyond the life the project. With a good curriculum, qualified teachers and job opportunities after graduation, this program has attracted strong enrolments. In the first year of its operation (academic year 2011/2012), 71 students enrolled in the program from various backgrounds including both government and the private sector. Under the management of the University of Syiah Kuala, the program has sufficient human resources and teaching materials. The Head and the Secretary of the Program were confident that sufficient financial revenue will be generated by enrolments since market demand for the Master Program is very high. At the time of the evaluation, although student registration for the academic year 2012/2013 has just begun, numerous applications from potential candidates have been received.²⁴ There is also an expectation from some district governments that the Masters Program will deliver distance classes for people outside Banda Aceh. According to the Head of the Program, the management will explore distance learning options in the future.

Public Awareness Programmes and DRR Curriculum

108. Based on interviews with the personnel of DISHUBKOMINTEL involved in the DRR-A project, they are unable to continue the public awareness programmes at the same level as they did with support from DRR-A. This due to a lack of financial resources within the department, the low priority, and the lack of policies for the department to support this initiative. DISHUBKOMINTEL itself is unable to propose specific DRR public awareness programs in the APBA since it is not considered the department's specific function. So, DISHUBKOMINTEL is only able to propose general public awareness programs in APBA. According to informants in this department, they plan to include DRR messages in regular public awareness raising programs beyond the DRR-A time frame.

²⁴ At the time of the presentation of this Evaluation Report during the Project Board Meeting, which was held in Aceh on 13 August 2012, the Head of the Master Degree Program reported that the program had recently received 10 students under the program of scholarship from Directorate of the Higher Education at the Ministry of Education (Dikti). The contribution of this scholarship program has provided additional funds for the Program - as much as 1 billion IDR.

109. The very useful PACC will not continue beyond the life of the project due to its “ad hoc” nature. As mentioned previously, a committee or forum with similar function to PACC is still needed in Aceh to promote coordinated public awareness campaigns on DRR. Unfortunately, no action has been taken to explore possibilities for replicating the PACC into a multi-stakeholder forum like the DRR Forum at the Provincial level.

110. There is strong interest from DISDIK Aceh to continue incorporating the DRR curriculum into elementary, junior, and senior high schools in Aceh using the modules and strategy developed with DRR-A support. The endorsement of Aceh Governor Instruction No.2/INSTRK/2012 on 28 May 2012, provides a legal basis to incorporate the DRR curriculum in schools. DISDIK has proposed programs and budgets for implementing DRR education in schools to be funded by APBA beyond the life of the DRR-A. DISDIK also has been approached by an international organization interested in adopting the DRR curriculum. However, at the time of the evaluation, no concrete commitments or funding had been secured, either from the Government (using APBA) or any international organizations for supporting the continued integration of DRR into school curricula.²⁵

111. The incorporation of the DRR curriculum into Modern Dayah, however, is less certain. According to personnel at the BPPD, the agency is not able to include activities and budgets for implementing this program in APBA because it has no legal basis to do so. Unless there is a specific Governor policy related to this matter, the BPPD will not be able to propose implementation of the DRR integration into Modern Dayahs using APBA. However, the BPPD will attempt to monitor the implementation of DRR modules in those Dayah whose teachers have been trained in using it as part of regular program and resources.

Impact

What changes in human development are brought about by project implementation?

²⁵ At the time of the presentation of the result of this Evaluation to the Project Board Meeting held in Aceh on 13 August 2012, Disdik has not yet received a budget allocation from the government and international organizations to continue implementing the integration of DRR into school curricula.

112. In the UNDP's Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (2009), the assessment of the impacts measures changes in human development and people's well-being that are brought about by development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.²⁶ Based on this definition, the evaluator will only assess the impact of the project on the life of the people in Aceh.

113. The impact was measured by comparing the results of the baseline survey and the end-line survey conducted by the project in Banda Aceh and the ten districts where the project was implemented. The survey used a multi-stage sampling method and included more than a thousand respondents. Because the survey used a purposive sampling method which only covered Banda Aceh and the ten districts, it should be noted that the description of the impact below is only valid for those areas.

114. The DRR-A has had a significant impact on increasing the preparedness of the people in Aceh to face natural disasters. The results of the base-line and end-line surveys indicated changes in disaster preparedness at household and village level. The surveys show an increase in the people who believe that their family is prepared to face disasters from around 56 percent at the beginning of the project implementation to around 66 percent respondents at the end of the project implementation. The surveys also show an increase in the percentage of people who believe their village is prepared to face natural disasters from 29 percent at the beginning of the project to 47 percent at the end of the project.

115. This increased preparedness is seen in the respondents' attitude to facing crises: In the baseline survey, when people were asked about what to do during an earthquake, at the beginning of the project only around 48 percent of the respondents thought running toward an open space was the right thing to do. At the end of the project, according to the end-line survey, 69 percent thought running to an open space was the correct response.

116. The increased preparedness is also seen in awareness levels of the availability of evacuation facilities in their villages. According to the baseline and end-line surveys, the percentage confirming the availability of an escape building in their region (including

²⁶ UNDP's Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009), p. 170.

mosques and school buildings), increased dramatically from around 2 percent to around 51 percent.

117. In the villages where the CBDRR program was implemented, increased preparedness was indicated not only by the existence of evacuation routes and evacuation sites, and simulation exercises following the contingency plan, but also by the demonstrated ability of some communities to enact a more organized community based-early warning system. For example, in Ketambang village in West Aceh District, which is prone to floods, when heavy and long rainfall occurred in early 2012, the community implemented an early warning system by assigning some people to monitor the water level of the river and call for evacuation when the water reached dangerous levels.

118. The project also had an impact on the awareness of hazard mitigation activities. The baseline and end-line survey, show increased reforestation activities for disaster prevention, from 28 percent at the beginning of the project implementation to 44 percent. In Arul Item, landslide-prone village in Central Aceh District, the CBDRR program has increased awareness of the dangers of overclearing for plantations and they now avoid the clearance of new land to reduce the risk of landslides.

7. Lessons learned

119. The implementation of the DRR-A Project has provided important lessons that could be utilized to improve future interventions:

1. DRR-A project could have better linked their outputs. The implementation of project activities under output 1, for example, was not strongly related to attempts to achieve output 2, and did not result in any guidance or mechanism for the government to ensure the incorporation of CBDRR results into local government planning.
2. DRR-A project should have designed and implemented a sound exit strategy to help the beneficiaries to continue the initiatives or to achieve sustained benefits by using their own resources. At the end of implementation, the project should have helped

the beneficiaries identify the outstanding tasks and strategies to accomplish them using their own resources.

3. DRR-A project design should include ongoing evaluation or reflections on the outcomes of the implementation of the project activities, and ensure that these were incorporated into the project. For example: under output 1, besides developing several regulations on Disaster Management in Aceh, the project should have included an evaluation of the implementation of the regulations to provide feedback for further initiatives to maintain or improve the implementation of the regulations.
4. To achieve more strategic and sustainable results from the implementation of CBDRR, the DRR-A should have linked initiatives at the Community level with the initiatives at the governmental level. For example, DRR-A should have facilitated the formulation of guidelines for the government to implement the CBDRR program. DRR-A should have facilitated a mechanism to help incorporate DRR plans proposed by communities into local government planning. Or, as expected by the NGO partners, the DRR-A should have convinced the district governments of the importance of incorporating the community-based DRR plans into the district government planning.
5. When strengthening the capacity of an academic institution to provide science-based services or products in DRR, the DRR-A should balance their approach between the development of technical skills and knowledge, and revenue raising skills. Besides the delayed marketing strategy, DRR-A support focused on developing the technical capacity of TDMRC rather than its ability to become financially self-sufficient.
6. As sufficient time is needed to ensure any UNDP project is able to achieve its intended output, UNDP and the Government of Indonesia need to review the existing mechanisms for funds transfers and funds channeling (DIPA) that frequently cause delays. UNDP and the Government of Indonesia should develop and implement a strategy, techniques, and procedures to mitigate future delays. Many delays in implementation were due to the internal funding mechanisms and they have negatively impacted the results of some outputs.

8. Recommendations

120. There are several recommendations for the relevant parties to increase the benefits of the DRR-A project and to better implement DRR not only in Aceh but also in Indonesia:

For UNDP:

1. Conduct initiatives with the government and NGO partner institutions to help them identify strategies for continuing, replicating or developing the results and benefits of DRR, either using their own resources or finding other possible resources.
2. Disseminate the knowledge products resulting from DRR-A, such as the modules, guidelines, manuals, lessons learned papers, to wider DRR proponents in Aceh and Indonesia, including international and local NGOs, CSOs, and academic institutions to provide opportunities for them to further utilize the knowledge products to develop better DRR implementation in Aceh and Indonesia. This dissemination could take place in many forms, such as seminars, direct distribution to the organizations, and distribution to public libraries.
3. Recommend the involvement of three important Ministries/Agencies: Kemdagri, BAPPENAS and BNPB, in the structure of the Project Board in future UNDP projects in DRR, with the consent of the Government of Indonesia.
4. Conduct an internal evaluation to identify factors causing delays in the process of fund transfers, procurement and recruitment; and develop a strategy with techniques and procedures to mitigate these factors in the future.

For Kemdagri :

5. Conduct more initiatives at the local level aimed to develop greater commitment, and show that the implementation of disaster management is the collective responsibility of both the executive and legislature among government departments and agencies; along with non-government organizations, CSOs, and the private sector. This can be achieved by facilitating workshops involving local members of parliament to build better understanding of the importance of DRR; and facilitating workshops involving the government, the legislature, NGOs, CSOs, and the private sector to produce a road map to collaboratively promote DRR implementation.

These activities are intended to generate a stronger commitment to increase the government's budget allocation for DRR (which needs the approval of the parliament), and to channel more financial resources from businesses CSR obligations to DRR programs.

6. Conduct internal evaluations of the obstacles to channeling funds (DIPA) and provide feedback to the Kemdagri and the other relevant Ministries.
7. In partnership with BNPB and BAPPENAS, conduct activities to develop strategies and guidelines for the local government to expand the application of CBDRR in as many communities as possible, and to incorporate CBDRR into local government planning.
8. In cooperation with the BNPB, conduct activities to build the capacity of the local government to lead implementation of CBDRR by facilitating training to increase understanding of the concept and methodology of CBDRR, and implement CBDRR in partnership with local NGOs or CSOs who have better experience and human resources to work closely with communities.
9. Promote the replication of methods used in Aceh for public awareness programmes at the national level or in other high disaster risk provinces in Indonesia.
10. Promote the use of the the technical capacity of TDMRC to provide science-based services and products related to Disaster Management to other DRR actors in regions across Indonesia.

For the Government of Aceh:

11. Conduct more initiatives to strengthen the institutional capacity of the BPBA to be a leading agency in implementing DRR at provincial level. The initiatives should focus on helping BPBA to apply the comprehensive strategy based on the Capacity Assessment facilitated by DRR-A.
12. Support DISDIK to continue the incorporation of DRR into school curricula in elementary, junior and senior high schools by securing a clear commitment to allocating a budget for DISDIK to implement this program.
13. Support BPPDs to continue the incorporation of DRR into the curriculum of Modern Dayah in Aceh by developing a legal basis for BPPD to implement the program and

then secure a clear commitment to allocate a budget for this agency to implement the program.

For Unsyiah and/or TDMRC:

14. Provide funds for TDMRC to support its operation during the transition period post implementation of DRR-A project.
15. Strengthen the financial capacity of TDMRC by helping the Centre to implement the Marketing Strategy developed by DRRRA to enable financial sustainability.
16. Promote the use of the the Centre's technical capacity to provide disaster management related products and services to all BPBDs and other DRR actors in Aceh as a resource for improving DRR.

Annex 1. The list of the documents consulted

No	Name of the documents
1	DRR-A Inception Report – March 2009
2	DRR-A Annual Report – 2009
3	DRR-A Annual Report – 2010
4	DRR-A Annual Report – 2011
5	DRR-A Reports from Q2 to Q3 – 2009
6	DRR-A Reports from Q1 to Q3 – 2010
7	DRR-A Reports from Q1 to Q3 2011
8	Back To Office Reports of Members of Mission for Aceh CBDRR Final Review from 29 April to 4 May 2012
9	IPAR 2009 for Q2 & Q3
10	IPARs 2010 for Q1 and for Q2 & Q3
11	QMRs from Q1 2009 until Q1 2012
12	DRR-A Indicator Monitoring Plan 2010, 2011, and 2012
13	DRR-A Mid Term Review
14	DRR-A Project Document
15	Handbook of Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation – UNDP, 2009
16	Qanun No 5/2010 on Disaster Management
17	Local Action Plan on DRR for year 2010-2012
18	Disaster Management Plan of Aceh for year 2012-2017
19	Report of Capacity Assessment for Capacity Development of BPBA, 2012
20	Qanun No. 6/2010 on the establishment of the structure and management of BPBA
21	Standard Operating Procedures for Tsunami Early warning System in Aceh
22	Statute of the Aceh DRR Forum
23	Final Reports of Ibu Foundation

24	Final Reports of Karst
25	Reports of Bytra
26	Strategic Plan and Work Plan of BPBD of Aceh Tamiang
27	Strategic Plan and Work Plan of BPBD of Bener Meriah
28	Strategic Plan and Work Plan of BPBD of Pidie Jaya
29	Disaster Management Plan of Aceh Barat
30	Call for Proposals: Grant Programme for Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Aceh Through Making Aceh Safer Through Disaster Risk Reduction in Development (DRR-A) Project
31	Guidelines for integrating DRR into RPJMD of the districts/municipalities in Aceh – 2012
32	Policy and Procedure of Organization of TDMRC
33	Report of the Capacity Assessment of TDMRC
34	Report of TDMRC Marketing Plan Development
35	Reports of Consultant on Institutional and Capacity Building of TDMRC
36	Reports of Risk Assessment of TDMRC
37	Modules produced by TDMRC
38	TDMRC strategic plan
39	DRR Modules for various disasters produced under output 4
40	Module for integrating DRR into elementary school curriculum
41	Module for integrating DRR into junior high school curriculum
42	Module for integrating DRR into senior high school curriculum
43	Module for integrating DRR into Modern Dayah
44	Materials for Public Awareness Campaigns
45	Report of Baseline Survey of DRR-A, 2010
46	Report of Endline Survey of DRR-A, 2012
47	Annual Work Plans of DRR-A from 2009 until 2012
48	The Governor Decree on the establishment of PACC
49	The Strategy for Public Awareness Campaigns on DRR

50	Document on budget implementation for BPBA 2011 & 2012
51	Work Plan of DRR Forum
52	Revised Module of CBDRR implementation, 2012

Annex 2. List of informants and participants

Name	Position	Organization
<u>Government of Indonesia (national)</u>		
Syafrizal	Head, Subdirector of Identification of Disaster Potentials	Ministry of Home Affairs
Lilik Kurniawan	Head, Disaster Prevention Department	BNPB
Kuswiyanto	Head of Sub-Directorate	National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas)
Rudi Pakpahan	Supporting staff	National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas)
<u>UNDP and Project Team</u>		
Kristanto Sinandang	Head, CPRU	UNDP Indonesia
Malikah Amril	Program Manager, DRR Cluster, CPRU	UNDP Indonesia
Teuku Firsia	National Project Manager, DRR-A	UNDP Indonesia
Rozana Dewi	National Project Coordinator, DRR-A	UNDP Indonesia
Fahmi Yunus	National Project Coordinator, DRR-A	UNDP Indonesia
Jafar Sidik	Project Associate, DRR-A	UNDP Indonesia
Kamarudin Rimba	Project Associate, DRR-A	UNDP Indonesia
Pudji Aswati	Monitoring and Reporting Consultant; former Gender Specialist, DRR-A	UNDP Indonesia
<u>Local Government - Aceh</u>		
Abdul Azis	Staff	Education Department (Disdik), Aceh Province
Cut Fitrika	Staff	Education Department (Disdik), Aceh Province

Fahmi	Staff	Education Department (Disdik), Aceh Province
Abdul Azis	Head, Department of Information and Communication	Department of Transportation, Communication, Information and Telecommunication, Aceh Province
Marwan	Head of Section	Department of Transportation, Communication, Information and Telecommunication, Aceh Province
Syahrul	Staff	Department of Transportation, Communication, Information and Telecommunication, Aceh Province
Syukri	Staff	Department of Islamic Syariat, Aceh Province
Mukhlis	Former staff	Department of Communication and Information, Kota Banda Aceh
Nanda	Staff	Local Development Planning Agency (Bappeda), Aceh Province
Yusrizal	Head, Religious Affair Section	BPPD/Badan Dayah
Armia	Head, Department of Prevention and Preparedness	BPBA
Zamri	Staff	BPBA
Fadmi Ridwan	Staff	BPBA
T. Ahmad Dadek	Head	BPBD, West Aceh
Masrizal Edi	Secretary	BPBD, Central Aceh
Sahrial Afri	Head	BPBD, Central Aceh
Khaidir	Head, Department of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction	BPBD, Central Aceh
Sukurdi Win	Head, Section of Preparedness	BPBD, Central Aceh
Aminuddin	Head	BPBD, Pidie Jaya
Zulfadli	Head, Section of Reconstruction	BPBD, Pidie Jaya
Effendi Junaidi	Head, Department of Prevention and Preparedness	BPBD, Pidie
Ahmad Mulyana	Head, Section of Preparedness	BPBD, Pidie

<u>TDMRC and Unsyiah</u>		
M. Dirhamsyah	Head	TDMRC
M. Ridha	Vice Head	TDMRC
A. Kahar Irsyadi	Project Manager	TDMRC
Ridwan Mahmud	Head, Secretariat	TDMRC
T. Alvishahrin	Head, Division of Professional Services	TDMRC
Syamsudin	Vice Head, Division of Applied Research	TDMRC
Rini	Accounting staff	TDMRC
Mukhlis Hamid	Head, Division of Advocacy, Education and Training	TDMRC
Nazarudin	DRMIS Adviser	TDMRC
Syamsu Rizal	Rector	Unsyiah
Darusman	Vice Rector	Unsyiah
Sri Adelila	Secretary, Master Degree in Disaster Management	Unsyiah
Asrul	Student, Master Degree in Disaster Management	Unsyiah
Teuku Riza	Student, Master Degree in Disaster Management	Unsyiah
Bustami Zakaria	Student, Master Degree in Disaster Management	Unsyiah
<u>Schools</u>		
Nani Irawati	Head	Elementary School 02, Banda Aceh
Yusmaini	Teacher	Elementary School 02, Banda Aceh
Zuliyati	Teacher	Elementary School 02, Banda Aceh
Darul Kamal	Teacher	Modern Dayah Al Manaar
<u>Aceh DRR Forum and NGOs</u>		
Teuku Feriansyah	Secretary	Aceh DRR Forum
Nurmalis	Head, Department of Inter-institutional relations	Aceh DRR Forum
Ibnu Munzir	Program Manager, ICBRR	American Red Cross
Abdillah Imron	Coordinator	Karst
Jamal	Coordinator	Ibu Foundation
Saifuddin	Coordinator	Bytra
<u>Village DRR Forum, Apparatus and Community Members</u>		

M. Damin	Head, Sub-village of Ketambang Atas	Ketambang Village, West Aceh
D. Sayang	Head, Social Welfare Affairs	Ketambang Village, West Aceh
Kemalawati	Head of KMPB	Ketambang Village, West Aceh
9 unnamed persons	Members of KMPB and representatives of community	Ketambang Village, West Aceh
Imam Li	Head of Fokusbari	Arul Item Village, Central Aceh
Majidun	Head	Arul Item Village, Central Aceh
Aryadi	Secretary	Arul Item Village, Central Aceh
12 unnamed persons	Member of Fokusbari and representatives of community	Arul Item Village, Central Aceh
Jaffar	Head, FSBG	Pasie Lee Beu Village, Pidie
No name	Secretary	Pasie Lee Beu Village, Pidie
10 unnamed persons	Member of FSBG and representatives of community	Pasie Lee Beu Village, Pidie
Syamsul	Head, FSBG	Pante Beureune Village, Pidie
Zulkifli Ismail	Head	Pante Beureune Village, Pidie
38 unnamed persons	Member of FSBG and representatives of community	Pante Beureune Village, Pidie

Annex 3. Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Indicators	Key questions	Sub-questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
Effectiveness	Extent to which outputs have been achieved; extent to which the achievements can be attributed to project activities	To what extent did the project achieve its intended output 1: Institutional arrangement and enabling environment established to facilitate participatory and concerted implementation of DRR measures ? What factors in the project activities (implementation) have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended results?	<p>What institutional arrangement for DRR in Aceh was established by the support of the project? (institutional mapping; institution establishment; institutional systems for effective planning and implementation of DRR; mechanisms for effective coordination; systems for management, delivery and application of crisis information and resources for disaster response)</p> <p>Was an enabling environment (regulatory, procedural and budgetary environment) for DRR established by the support of the project?</p> <p>Does this institutional arrangement and enabling environment assign responsibilities to provincial and district departments and regulations specifying their functions, tasks and budgetary considerations ?</p> <p>Does this institutional arrangement and enabling environment provide guidance to the government on methods for community empowerment in DRR incorporated into the musrenbang process?</p> <p>Does this institutional arrangement and enabling environment help set up local government mechanisms to support community based inputs to the local government process for development planning, partnerships with key local</p>	Project reports; internal monitoring reports; government regulations or policies, procedures, mechanisms; capacity assessment; stakeholders' views	Document review; key informant interviews (KII) & FGDs with stakeholders; direct observation

		<p>CBOs, and budgets needed to fund the activities identified by communities that include DRR components (output 1 linked to output 2)</p> <p>Does the project contribute to the capacity building of institutions (and also personnel) mostly responsible for implementing DRR?</p> <p>Does this institutional arrangement and enabling environment take into consideration equal opportunities for women to participate in DRR activities?</p> <p>Does the project contribute to encouraging woman to actively participate in the DRR related policy/regulation development process (for example public hearings and consultations) especially the BPBD establishment and development of Operational Qanun as well as Local Action Plans/LAP-DRR?</p> <p>How satisfied were the targeted beneficiaries/clients with the activities and or achievement of output 1 of the project?</p>			
		<p>To what extent the did the project achieve intended output 2: Demonstration gender-sensitive projects implemented in selected locations to test and improve measures for reducing risk from natural disasters? What factors in the project activities (implementation) have</p>	<p>Prior to the implementation of the demonstration, did the project develop guidelines for Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRR) which are: (1) based on the growing Indonesian experience and modified to reflect the Aceh development context and planned new local government procedures and budgets intended to support community development practices with disaster mitigation</p>		

		<p>contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended results?</p>	<p>components; (2) establish a process to facilitate collaboration between communities, local government agencies and other stakeholders in designing and implementing measures for DRR; (3) include methods for encouraging the active participation of women and more disadvantaged groups?</p> <p>Prior to implementation, did the project form and train a core group of trainers in CBDRR (including gender awareness and gender sensitivity facilitation) to assist the conduct of the assessment of disaster risks in each community selected for the demonstration of CBDRR?</p> <p>What was the conduct of demonstration of CBDRR approach (including disaster risk assessment)? What was the involvement of trainers, community representatives and staff of relevant government agencies in this demonstration? Is there good collaboration among the actors involved? Has the demonstration developed the capacity of communities or community representatives and government agencies?</p> <p>In what forms was particular attention paid to women and vulnerable groups during this demonstration?</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Did this demonstration result in designing DRR plans in the form of: Local Action Plans for Disaster Risk Reduction (LAP-DRR); Disaster Preparedness Plans (DPPs); a report containing comments and inputs for laws, regulations and other measures proposed by districts and the province to support DRR; steps to disseminate information; CBDRR measures implemented through the Musrenbang mechanism and outsourcing? Were the plans then implemented in several initiatives?</p> <p>What was the integration of CBDRR outputs into the regular planning and budgeting process?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the outputs from CBDRR planning and implementation at the community level reflected in the development plans and programmes to be implemented by local government departments? 2. Are both LAPs and DPPs incorporated into the district five year development plans (RPJM)? 3. Are elements of these plans also included in annual budgets (APBD) so that adequate financial resources are provided for implementing them? 4. Are the reports containing community inputs on DDR-related laws, regulations and other measures made available and explained to the department staff and DPRD members concerned with these matters. 		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>5. Are the specific needs of vulnerable groups such as women, youth, the elderly and the disabled recognized and addressed in the above mentioned products?</p> <p>Based on the experiences gained from these demonstrations, did the project refine and improve the section on the CBDRR guidelines designed with government staff, and develop a strategy for extending the CBDRR approach to other locations in Aceh and contribute to the knowledge management of this subject, to be shared with other CBDRR proponents?</p> <p>How satisfied were the targeted beneficiaries/clients with the activities and or achievement of output 2 of the project?</p>			
		<p>To what extent did the project achieve intended output 3: TDMRC-UNSYIAH strengthened to provide science-based information, service and knowledge assistance to the local government and other DRR proponents in implementing their DRR activities? What factors in the project activities (implementation) have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended results?</p>	<p>What is the current condition of the operation of TDMRC? What are the past and current activities to provide science-based information, service and knowledge assistance to the local government and other DRR proponents in implementing their DRR activities?</p>		
			<p>Has the "software component" (plan, procedures, policies, etc.) contributed by the project implementation strengthened TDMRC Unsyiah? (five year strategic development; clarified main function and organization structures; policies and procedures governing the operation of the centre)</p>		

			<p>Has the project contributed to the improved capacity of TDMRC (institution and personnel) to provide services? (establishment of multi-hazard DRMIS; forming links between TDMRC and similar centres in southeast Asian; training and longer-term certified courses to enhance skills of administrative and professional staff; developed the ability to provide Training and Capacity Building Services ?</p>		
			<p>Has the project contributed to the improved capacity of TDMRC to generate revenue? (capacity for marketing TDMRC services, writing proposals, and implementing contracts in compliance with government and donor regulations for transparency, accountability and financial administration);</p>		
			<p>Has TDMRC developed partnerships with other DRR proponents (government, non-government organizations, academics) in Aceh and outside Aceh? In what forms?</p>		
			<p>Did the project assist TDMRC in developing its capacity to support university departments at UNSYIAH and other universities in strengthening the DRR content of academic programmes and courses? Did the project assist TDMRC and universities in designing degree programmes in Disaster Management? Did the project collaborate with TDMRC and the department or faculty in the design and</p>		

		<p>implementation of research projects?</p>			
		<p>How satisfied were the targeted beneficiaries/clients with the activities and or achievement of output 3 of the project?</p>			
		<p>To what extent the did the project achieve intended output 4: DRR public awareness programmes implemented to promote internalization of a gender sensitive "culture of safety" among the people and institutions in Aceh. What factors in the project activities (implementation) have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended results?</p>	<p>What DRR public awareness campaigns were disseminated through a wide range of media (TV and Radio talk-shows, public service announcements, newspaper advertorial, traditional performance in remote locations) by the project? Were they designed and implemented to address different groups and segments of the population?</p>		
			<p>Was DRR integrated into the school curriculum for elementary, junior and high school students? Did the teachers receive training in DRR?</p>		
			<p>Was DRR integrated into the Islamic Boarding School curriculum (Modern Pesantren/Dayah)? Did the teachers receive training in DRR?</p>		
			<p>Do the programmes promote a gender sensitive culture of safety among the people and institutions in Aceh? What are the indicators for this?</p>		

			<p>Did the Public Awareness Coordinating Committee (PACC) function as planned? What roles were played by the PACC? What support did the PACC provide to the projects? Did the support improve the capacity of the Aceh government (via PACC) to conduct public awareness programmes? Is the PACC still working?</p> <p>Do PACC members include women leaders at local level? How did they make sure that "gender sensitivity" was included in the public awareness programmes?</p> <p>Was the PACC assisted in preparing a strategy for raising awareness and improving understanding of DRR, based on surveys and research? Is the implementation of the public awareness programmes based on this strategy?</p> <p>Were the partners for designing and implementing public awareness programmes selected based on criteria reflecting institutional capacity and experience, financial resources and stability, geographical spread and level of interest and commitment to the task?</p> <p>How satisfied were the targeted beneficiaries/clients with the activities and or achievement of output 4 of the project?</p>		
Efficiency	Extent to which resources have been used wisely to achieve the intended results;	To what extent was the project effectively and efficiently managed, monitored, evaluated and	<p>Was the organizational structure viable?</p> <p>Was the management arrangement viable?</p>	Project reports; internal monitoring reports; stakeholders' views	Document review; KII with stakeholders; direct observation

	extent to which partnership strategy has leveraged other resources or initiatives that have contributed to project's intended outcomes	audited?	<p>Was project funding well spent?</p> <p>Was expertise well used?</p> <p>Was time well used?</p> <p>Did the check and control mechanism run well?</p> <p>To what extent did the partnership strategy leverage other resources or initiatives that contributed to the project's intended outcomes?</p> <p>How satisfied were the targeted beneficiaries/clients with the efficiency of the project?</p>		
Relevance	Extent to which the design and implementation were consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of the intended beneficiaries; The extent to which the project was able to adapt to changing and emerging development priorities and needs in a responsive manner.	To what extent were the project design and implementation consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of the intended beneficiaries? To what extent was the project able to respond to changing and emerging priorities?	<p>To what extent was the project design and implementation consistent with national and local policies on DRR?</p> <p>To what extent was the project design and implementation consistent with the priorities and needs of the intended beneficiaries of DRR?</p> <p>How did the project adapt to changing and emerging development priorities and needs at province or national level?</p>	Project document; Project reports; internal monitoring reports; stakeholders' views	Document review; KII with stakeholders; direct observation
Appropriateness	Cultural acceptance as well as feasibility of the activities or delivery method of a development initiative; the extent to which the planning, design and implementation of	How feasible was project design and implementation? To what extent was the project planning, design and implementation, adapted to local conditions?	Were there any cultural perceptions/views/practices which provided challenges to implementing the concept of DRR in Aceh? If so, how did the project adapt its planning, design and implementation to deal with the challenges and ensure the achievement of the outputs ?	Project document; Project reports; internal monitoring reports; stakeholders' views	Document review; KII with stakeholders; direct observation

	initiatives took local context into account.		Were there any cultural perceptions/views/practices which provided challenges to implementing a gender sensitive approach in the project? If there were, how did the project adapt its planning, design and implementation to deal with the challenges and ensure the achievement of the outputs? Was the project modality appropriate for achieving good results? What adaptations were made? Was the organizational structure appropriate for achieving good results? What adaptations were made? Was the coordination mechanism appropriate for achieving good results? What adaptations were made?		
Impact	The extent to which project outputs contributed to desired outcomes?	What changes in human development were brought about by project implementation?	Based on the achievement of outputs 1, 2, 3 and 4, to what extent did the project change people's well-being, positively or negatively, intended or unintended?	Stakeholders' views; Government laws and policies; Project Reports; capacity assessments	Document review; KII and FGDs with stakeholders; direct observation
Sustainability	The extent to which the benefits of the project will continue after the end of project implementation; The extent to which relevant conditions at the national/sub-national level are present to	Will the project's benefits 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 DRR-A?	Will the institutional arrangement and enabling environment established continue to facilitate participatory and concerted implementation of DRR measures? Are sufficient local capacities and resources available for the further development of institutional arrangement and enabling environment?	Stakeholders' views; Government laws and policies; Project Reports; capacity assessments	Document review; KII and FGDs with stakeholders

	<p>maintain, manage and ensure the benefit of the project in future;</p>		<p>Will the communities where the CBDRR was implemented continue or replicate the CBDRR beyond DRR-A project? Do the communities already have the capacity to conduct CBDRR? Is there any enabling environment for continuing CBDRR in the communities? Will the government or NGOs or groups inspired by DRR-A to replicate CBDRR in other communities?</p> <p>Will TDMRC-UNSYIAH continue running its activities beyond the DRR-A project? Will TDMRC-UNSYIAH continue providing science-based information, service and knowledge assistance to the local government and other DRR proponents, as it did during DRR-A project implementation? Do they have sufficient capacity to continue providing such services? Has TDMRC created strategic or practical partnership with other DRR proponents that will help TDMRC continue/sustain its activities? Will Unsyiah continue running the post-graduate programme in DM?</p> <p>Is there any plan to continue the PACC or replicate PACC and its roles beyond DRR? Is there any plan to continue DRR public awareness programmes that promote internalization of a gender sensitive "culture of safety" among the people and institutions in Aceh? If there is, in what ways and what forms will this plan replicate or continue the initiatives of DRR-A?</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

		How can the benefits of the project be sustained?		
--	--	---	--	--