Oxford Policy Management

Strategic Research into National and Local Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management

Literature Review: Version 1

Zoë Scott, Roger Few, Jennifer Leavy, Marcela Tarazona and Kelly Wooster

January 2014

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

CB	Capacity Building
CD	Capacity Development
DM	Disaster Management
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FS	Fragile States
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IGAD	Also known as Regional Capacity Enhancement Initiative (RCEI) in Sudan.
INGOs	International Non-Governmental Organisations
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NS	National Societies
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WADMCB	West Africa Disaster Management Capacity Building project

1 Introduction and Methodology

1.1 Background to the review

This literature review has been conducted by Oxford Policy Management and the University of East Anglia as part of a multi-donor research project led by IFRC focusing on Strategic Research into National and Local Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management. The preliminary objective of the review is to identify the boundaries of what is known about capacity building for DRM, in order to use this knowledge as a foundation for designing the broader research project. Although the review has been undertaken during the Inception Period for the research, **the OPM team will continue to collect other relevant knowledge products during the course of the project[1] and will release a Version 2 of this document prior to completion of the research in October 2015.**

An annotated bibliography 'Local Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Reduction' was produced for IFRC in preparation for this research project, representing an initial attempt to synthesise relevant information on capacity-building (Walker et al 2013).

Overall, the team used 5 different search engines and conducted specific searches on the websites of 33 different organisations and resource centres. 29 different academic journals were specifically searched alongside meta-searches using academic databases including Scirus and Web of Knowledge, which together cover many thousands of journals. These searches identified over 100 resources that met the inclusion criteria. The findings of these resources have been synthesised into the literature review below.

A full list of websites and search engines used is included in Annex A.

The review is structured as follows:

Introduction and Methodology – providing background to the research and details on the methodology used to conduct the review.

Definitions and Context – this section outlines the definitional debates and provides some brief contextual analysis.

Overview – this section gives a broad overview of the quality and breadth of the literature relating to CB for DRM.

Mapping CB for DRM – this section provides analysis of the actors, scope and scale of CB for DRM interventions.

Key Barriers and Enablers of CB for DRM – this section synthesises lessons from the literature on effective CB into a number of key issues. It also contains boxes providing more operational detail where possible.

M&E for CB – this section outlines the experience and best practice for monitoring and evaluating CB activities, particularly in relation to DRM.

Knowledge gaps – this section provides detail on particular areas where evidence is missing in relation to CB for DRM.

---

[1] If you wish to submit a resource for inclusion, please email Mireille.avila@opml.co.uk

1.2 Methodology

This review aims to identify and analyse evidence of capacity building for disaster risk management (DRM) and disaster risk reduction (DRR) in developing countries.

In designing the methodology for the literature review we noted that capacity building is not a discipline in itself, but is a theme that straddles many different literatures which all have relevance to this research, for example, management and organisational theory, public administration in development and the international governance literature. The IFRC research is also partially focusing on fragile states and on monitoring and evaluation, and so those material from those literatures would also potentially be relevant. It was therefore clear that, in order to ensure that we captured all possible relevant material, we would need to structure the review to incorporate searches across multiple literatures. For this reason we created a team of 5 researchers working on the review, each with expertise in different thematic areas or literatures.

These literatures were:

- Disaster risk (DRM, DRR)
- Climate change adaptation
- Public administration/governance
- Fragile states
- Monitoring and evaluation

For each of the above areas both academic and non-academic literature was reviewed and researchers prioritised documents that provided examples and lessons on capacity-building activity specifically relating to DRM. As the literature focusing specifically on DRM CB was not expected to be extensive for some of the areas, a second stage of searching involved identifying and reviewing key documents on more generic aspects of capacity-building within the literature field in question, in order to draw insights. For example then, as a first step the researcher working on the fragile states literature looked initially for resources focusing just on DRM CB in fragile states and then went on to search for more generic material on CB in fragile states to identify any potentially transferable lessons.

1.2.1 Breadth of coverage

The review includes literature dating back to 1990 to coincide with the start of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction. However, we have prioritised more recent documents to reflect progress in this area and recent innovations. As a result over half the references date from the last three years.

Additionally, resources were restricted to those focusing on developing countries, rather than middle or high income countries.

Searches were undertaken within sources associated with the different fields listed above, using academic databases, web resources (e.g. thematic collections), existing reviews, direct searches of journals or websites and recommendations from individuals/organisations.

The main categories of search were:

1. Online searches of databases and other engines

2. Online searches of websites of organisations and agencies engaging in programming and research related to DRM.

3. Searches of bibliographies of both included studies and others ("branching" or "snowballing"),

4. Consulting with subject-matter experts and practitioners in the DRM field

A full list of websites and search engines used is included in Annex A.

1.2.2   Search terms used

Searches of databases were conducted on primary key words with a Boolean "OR", and also combining modifier strings with "AND" operators. On the whole, the more qualifiers added the more restricted the search so in conducting the searches of the fields and sub-fields separately, search sensitivity was increased. Database search terms and strings (detailed in Table 1) were also employed for the website searches as appropriate.

Table 1: Search terms and strings

	Primary Key Words		Modifiers
Climate Change Adaptation	'capacity building'	AND	'climate change adaptation'
	'capacity development'		
			AND
	'institutional development'		'extreme events'
DRM	1. "capacity building"	AND	disaster
	2. "capacity development"		
Governance	'disaster'		
	'disasters'		
	'disaster capacity'		
	'disaster capacity building'		
Fragile States	'disaster capacity' (on specific FS websites)		
	'disaster capacity building' (on specific FS websites)		
	'disaster fragile'		
	'disaster fragile capacity'		
	'NGOs' (on Preventionweb and INTRAC)		
	'NGO Capacity Building' (on Preventionweb and INTRAC)		
	DRM Capacity Building for NGOs	IN	fragile states including Sudan, South Sudan, Myanmar, Afghanistan, Somalia, Yemen and Pakistan and other fragile states as categorised by the OECD
	NGO Capacity Building for DRM		
	DRR Capacity Building for NGOs		
	NGO Capacity Building for DRR		
DRM in the non-academic literature	*Capacity Development*	AND	*Disaster*
	Disaster		

Once a document was identified as meeting the inclusion criteria, certain details were recorded on a review record sheet (the template is included as Annex B). This ensured a comprehensive and standardised approach to recording information about the types of capacity building activities delivered, in what areas, the main actors, the scale and scope of the programme, barriers and enablers and other lessons learned. Each researcher then produced a summary analysis outlining key findings from their literature area. In particular they were asked to comment on a) types of activity (actors, scales and scope); b) barriers and limitations; c) enabling factors; d) M&E for capacity-building; e) knowledge gaps.

The summary notes were then used as the basis for developing this literature review which synthesises the findings of the five different literature areas. Conclusions were subsequently checked back with the team of researchers for accuracy, ensuring that this review provides a robust overview of CB for DRM in developing countries.

2 Definitions and context

2.1 What is 'capacity'?

Capacity building has consistently been identified as a critical component in development policy and practices over the last two decades (Matheson 2009 and Lucas 2013). It is mentioned in the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005), the Paris Declaration (2005), the Accra Agenda for Action (2008) and the Busan 4th High Level Forum (2011). However, there is still not one universal definition for either 'capacity', 'capacity building' or 'capacity development' – different donors and practitioners tend to use slightly differing definitions.

Our literature review encountered many different definitions of 'capacity'. Some of the most commonly cited are:

- The ability of individuals, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner (UNDP 2007)

- The ability of people, organisations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully (OECD DAC 2006)

- That emergent combination of individual competencies, collective capabilities, assets and relationships that enables a human system to create value (Baser and Morgan –European Centre for Development Policy Management, ECDPM, 2008).

We can draw three commonalities across these definitions:

- ➢ Capacity centres on abilities and competencies to achieve a given objective or objectives.

- ➢ Capacity operates at different levels – individual, organisational, institutional and societal.

- ➢ Capacity is a broad concept which touches not just on technical abilities but resources, context and relationships.

2.2 What is 'capacity building'?

Given that there is no single definition of capacity, it is not surprising that there is not a single internationally recognised definition of 'capacity building'. 'Capacity building' as a term is generally used loosely across the literature, and tends to be used inter-changeably with 'capacity development'. Some authors maintain that there is a difference between the terms. For example, CADRI argue that Capacity Development has a broader scope, focuses on enhancing resident capacity, is nationally owned and is longer-term than Capacity Building (CADRI n.d:14). Our review of the literature did not find that this was systematically the case.

Below are some of the multiple definitions of CB or CD:

UNDP: The process through which individuals, organisations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time.

OECD-DAC: Process whereby people, organisations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time.

GTZ: Process of strengthening the abilities of individuals, organisations and societies to make effective use of the resources, in order to achieve their own goals on a sustainable basis.

CIDA: Activities, approaches, strategies and methodologies which help organisations, groups and individuals to improve their performance, generate development benefits and achieve their objectives.

UNISDR: The process by which people, organisations and society systematically stimulate their capacities over time to achieve social and economic goals, including through improvement of knowledge, skills, systems and institutions.[2]

As with the definition of 'capacity', there are a number of commonalities across these definitions of 'capacity building' or 'capacity development':

➢ CB is a process that occurs over a period of time – it is not a single intervention

➢ CB should be sustainable so that gains are maintained

➢ CB is a broad under-taking which affects knowledge, skills, systems and institutions

➢ CB occurs at several different levels – individual, organisational, institutional and societal.

There is evidence that the term 'capacity building' is broadening out – in the nineties it tended to refer more narrowly to technical assistance activities and training programmes, whereas now some sources reviewed also included 'softer aspects', for example changing attitudes and values. An example would be Paul Kagame, president of Rwanda who is quoted as saying "capacity development goes beyond formal qualifications and technical skills development to include the cultivation of invisible or 'soft' attributes such as the ability to drive change and to build processes, organisations, and institutions which can deliver public services over the long term" (Lucas 2013:1).

For the purposes of this literature review, and the related research project, we have taken the definition used by Walker in the precursor study to this literature review. Capacity building can be defined as 'efforts to strengthen the competencies and skills of a target organisation, group or community so that the target could drive DRR efforts, or in a broader sense development, in a sustainable way in the future" (Walker et al 2011). This statement reflects the definitional commonalities and it also focuses our research specifically on disaster risk.

2.3   What is DRM?

According to UNISDR definitions[3]:

• Disaster risk management is the 'systematic process of using administrative directives, organizations, and operational skills and capacities to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster.'

• Disaster risk reduction is the 'concept and practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyse and manage the causal factors of disasters, including through reduced exposure to hazards, lessened vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improved preparedness for adverse events.'

---

[2] These definitions are taken from CADRI n.d. p9.
[3] http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology

In this research we refer to DRM for two main reasons: (i) we find it to be a better match to the aims of the project, and (ii), it corresponds to the way in which the client has initially addressed the programme. However, both terms are often used almost indistinctively by donors, international organizations and countries, and for this reason, we have and will continue to take into account relevant information referring to both concepts.

Disaster risk management presents a fundamental challenge to sustainable development. Until the early 90s, emphasis given to the management of disasters was focused on the response (humanitarian aid, reconstruction). However, the rapid augment in the incidence of disasters and the increase in their effects have forced national governments and the international community to shift their focus from ex-post activities to recognize the importance of treating the problem from its causes (mitigation and prevention activities). Disaster risk management aims at identifying, assessing and reducing the risks of a disaster. By doing so, it aims at reducing the socio-economic vulnerabilities to disaster as well as dealing with other hazards that trigger them.

As such, comprehensive DRM policy or strategy should take into account both ex-ante (identification, prevention and mitigation) and ex-post actions (response, reconstruction, financial preparedness) represented in several aspects of public policy: (i) risk identification (including the individual perception, social representation and objective estimation), (ii) risk reduction (prevention and mitigation), (iii) disaster management (response and reconstruction), and (iv) risk transfer (financial protection).

DRM is strongly linked to climate change, first, through the effects of climate change on disasters and second, through commonly shared solutions.
- According to scientific predictions, climate change will increase weather and climate hazards, which is likely to increase the number and scale of disasters.
- Climate change will increase the vulnerability of communities to natural hazards.
- Climate change and disaster risk reduction public policy solutions are intimately related. Climate change policies seek to address its root causes (mitigation) and to manage its impacts (adaptation). Similarly, disaster risk reduction aims at reducing the risk of disasters and the adverse impacts of natural hazards.

2.4   Why is CB for DRM important now?

The need for capacity development is identified within the priority areas of the Hyogo Framework for Action, and the urgency to close capacity gaps was reaffirmed in the Chair's summary at the 2013 ISDR Global Platform (UNISDR 2013). Our review of the literature identified some attempts to track DRM funding (for example GFDRR's Disaster Aid Tracking Initiative, and Kellet and Caravani 2013) but these studies did not provide a breakdown of global DRM spending for capacity building specifically. Despite this, the prevalence of project abstracts available on the internet suggests that a large amount of donor funds are currently channelled annually towards capacity building activities.

When looking more generally at CB (i.e. non-DRM specific) there have been a number of high profile evaluations questioning the effectiveness of CB interventions. There is a general consensus that progress on CB has been slow and disappointing due to reform resistance (World Bank 2005, Keijzer 2013, Matheson 2009). As a result some authors suggest that CB is an increasingly unpopular term and area of work for donors (Lucas 2013). Experts have recognised that CB dilemmas tend to be 'wicked problems'[4] and are therefore very complex and difficult to

---

[4] A 'wicked problem' is one which evades clear definition, is complex / unstable, involves behaviour change and has many interdependencies, lots of potential solutions and unintended consequences (Armstrong 2013).

solve. Similarly, in fragile states, CB appears generally to have not been effective, and in some cases has even been detrimental (Baser 2011).

Effective capacity building for DRM therefore requires effective guidance. According to one of the most relevant papers in the existing literature: "The tools and methodologies for capacity development, such as capacity assessment, are generally not adapted to the context of disaster risk reduction and are often not recognised by people within the disaster risk reduction community" *(*Hagelsteen and Becker, 2013). New initiatives are under way to address these gaps, for example under the CADRI and CATALYST programmes (CADRI n.d., Daniel et al 2013), and the research that this review supports will contribute to that process. This research therefore comes at a key juncture for DRM donors aiming to support capacity building for DRM – as more finance is being channelled to this area more research is needed to identify how it can be best utilised.

3   Overview of the literature

As noted in the methodology section above, we have prioritised reviewing literature that relates specifically to capacity building for disaster risk management. We have then supplemented those resources with documents that relate to either DRM or CB (not both) but contain relevant information, for example a study on capacity building in fragile states or a report on DRR M&E. This has made the review scope large, and whilst this review cannot be comprehensive given the resources and timescale available, we are confident that we have searched widely, across multiple disciplines to find relevant materials to inform the research.

In the specific literature on CB and DRM we have found:

- There is very little academic research that focuses on CB for DRM. In fact, during our searches, we only found one published journal article in a peer-reviewed journal that detailed multi-country research analysing CB for DRM (this article is Hagelsteen and Becker 2013[5]).

- In terms of non-academic research, there are two large donor funded projects working on DRM CB. These are the UNDP CADRI initiative, an inter-agency initiative of the UN tasked to increase capacity development for DRR at global, regional and local levels, and the EU funded CATALYST programme which aims to create opportunities for capacity development amongst stakeholders involved in DRR and adaptation in the context of natural hazards. A number of outputs from both initiatives are available online.

- There are many resources that identify a need for capacity building for DRM but do not give any further details on what to do or how to do it.[6]

- There are several policy documents published by donor agencies or NGOs that provide headlines of 'best practice' for CB in DRM. The methodologies used to collect the evidence for these reports is not always clear. Some contain short write ups of anecdotal evidence (typically in boxes) in support of their recommendations.

- There are many independent evaluations of DRM programmes available online, but none were found that specifically focused on CB. CADRI have developed a capacity assessment methodology specifically tailored for DRR which is based on the HFA principles and, to date, has been applied in 17 countries and 3 regional economic communities. Several of the assessment country reports are available online.

- There are numerous project abstracts available online detailing CB for DRM projects or programmes, for example the LEN- CD database (http://www.lencd.org) or the GFDRR website . The project information available online is sometimes quite limited (a web-page for example), and related evaluation reports, logframes etc are not always provided. We did not find any mapping studies or analysis synthesising information on geographical spread, spend, focus, type etc. CADRI (n.d) calls for this type of work to be done in the future.

In terms of the wider literature (i.e. not DRM specific) there is a wealth of resources on CB in general, across multiple disciplines, which contains lessons that may be transferable to the DRM field. These tend to focus on government capacity building rather than at the community level.

---

[5] A review of DRM CB by Hagelsteen and Becker (2013) draws on the experiences of a range of key actors (from advisers to field staff, across a number of agencies including INGOs and UN bodies) in providing CB for DRM across 35 countries.
[6] The Hyogo Framework for Action is an example of this – it mentions CB, CD or capacity strengthening 25 times.

Overall, we can state that from our review of the literature there is a gap in empirical, independent research focused on analysing DRM CB activities in developing countries to determine what works and why. Please see section 7 for more detail of specific gaps in the literature.

4 Mapping CB for DRM

This section briefly sets out from the literature review the actors, scale and scope of CB for DRM programmes in developing countries. This 'mapping' analysis will directly link with the research team's development of a typology of CB for DRM interventions which will be used for the sampling methodology for the case study research.

4.1 Who is involved in CB for DRM activities?

CB is a multi-stakeholder and multi-scale operation. Many different **actors** (individuals and organizations) engage in CB at a range and mix of **scales**. Though it is important to challenge the norm of provider-recipient relationships in capacity development (see section 5.1), it remains analytically useful to draw out from the literature base who tends to be involved as an implementer and who as a participant.

The range of actors involved in driving capacity building and/or capacity development for disaster risk management encompasses:

- donors (multilateral, including UN Bodies, GEF; bilateral and INGOs eg IFRC);

- external proponents or implementers of the activities - again these may be bilateral donors or INGOs often working in networks, as well as academics and other experts;

- state actors (national, regional and local government) administering and coordinating activities through a range of administrative levels;

- national governmental bodies such as disaster preparedness agencies, or public health bodies/ministries;

- NGOs working at a range of scales in-country.

Participants of CB activities typically fall into three main categories:

- in-country national and local-level government staff, usually working in the field of DRM and associated sectors;

- national/local non-state DRM practitioners and other experts;

- members of local communities or community-based organizations.

CB for DRM therefore takes place at a range of scales, varying from regional and national level programmes to sub-national/local and community-level initiatives and interventions. An example of a multi-sectoral national initiative is the UNDP/GEF/Government of Bangladesh work focusing on capacity development in 6 primary sectors particularly vulnerable to climate change (Rawlani and Sovacool 2011). Other initiatives at this scale operate via agencies or bodies dedicated to disaster risk reduction activities – for example the Government of Ethiopia's Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC) and Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC) (Tadele & Manyena 2009), or the regional body operating in the Caribbean: Caribbean Disaster Emergency Response Agency (Collymore 2011). At the grassroots scale, many INGOs target working with local at-risk communities to develop and support tools and strategies for DRR rooted in local knowledge (Allen 2006, Oxfam 2012). Increasingly, there are calls for CB initiatives to work across scales, as well as across multiple actors (see 5.4).

4.2   What is the scope of CB for DRM activities?

Given the variety in terms of scale and actors involved in CB for DRM, it is not surprising that there is also a great deal of variety in the scope of activities. From the literature on CB it is clear that it can refer to activities as disparate as training, knowledge development, access to technology, support for networking between organizations, strengthening management capabilities, reforming institutions, and building political capital for DRR.

In terms of broad approach, Coupet et al (2013) refers to four forms of capacity-building (initially defined by Crisp et al (2000) in relation to building healthcare capacity):

> "Top–down organizational approach that might begin with changing agency policies or practices.
>
> Bottom–up organizational approach involving a provision of skills to staff.
>
> Partnerships approach that involves strengthening the relationships between organizations.
>
> Community organizing approach, in which individual community members are drawn into forming new organizations or joining existing ones to improve the health of community members."

A more activity-based way to classify forms of CB is to focus on what is actually 'delivered'. In his analysis of CB in fragile states, Brinkerhoff (2010) organises CB interventions as being targeted at the following gaps and weaknesses:

- Resources (who has what)

- Skills and knowledge (who knows what)

- Organisation (who can manage what

- Politics and power (who can get what)

- Incentives (who wants to do what)

Brinkerhoff notes that capacity development interventions need to recognise which mix of the above gaps need to be addressed. He notes that in fragile states the answer will tend to be 'all of them' but requirements in terms of time, energy, difficulty and commitment must be confronted. Often, all of these requirements are underestimated.

4.2.1   Widening the scope

From our review of the literature it seems that provision of resources, especially training, often dominates what is classed as 'capacity-building'. Training and skills development encompasses many aspects but it often focuses on technical fields such as support in understanding hazards, using climate information systems, raising public awareness of risk and response measures, conducting vulnerability assessments, and in using these to formulate action plans (see for example Penalba et al 2012; Pazirandeh nd).

However, many CB documents emphasise that developing capacity requires far more than training individuals, which tends to be short-term in approach, and not sustained beyond the immediate trainees. In relation to DRM CB, Hagelsteen and Becker (2013) observe: "Capacity development projects for disaster risk reduction focus frequently on training individuals without paying enough attention to organisational issues, structures, and how such organisations interact with each other". The wider literature on CB underlines the importance of including these higher elements of capacity building, and working across the elements to ensure changes can be integrated and sustained.

The Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative argues that the enabling environment is essential for translating capacity into performance, and that emphasis must be placed on functional as well as technical aspects of capacity. It states that:

> *"Within the disaster risk reduction context, it is the technical capacities that for now appear to be the best understood and for which there is greater consensus on their composition. There is less evidence of practice across the disaster risk reduction community on how to maintain capacities or how to incorporate leadership and less tangible functional capacities into thematic and technically oriented capacities development strategies. Constraints at the level of the enabling environment tend to be overlooked or if recognised, are considered beyond the scope of intervention. Nevertheless, because of these shortcomings, a greater focus on functional capacities needs to be promoted in any programme of capacity development support to disaster risk reduction."* (CADRI, n.d)

Scientific/technical aspects also need to be balanced with non-scientific and non-technical aspects, including working with indigenous knowledge (see for example Schlurmann and Siebert 2011; Jha et al 2013; Oxfam International 2009). Much emphasis in DRM CB programmes is on integrating all the various different stakeholders to ensure an accurate flow of information (especially between different levels of government and between local communities and government systems), making sure communication channels are clear, and that roles and responsibilities have been clearly defined. There have also been CB activities in DRM to strengthen the social capital of collective community institutions and actors within civil society and at the interface of civil society and hierarchically powerful institutions including the state (Allen 2006).

The international movement toward DRR and climate change adaptation, reflected in the HFA and the UNFCCC, is also helping to reshape the wider risk and resilience agenda in which CB operates, including addressing long-term dynamics of risk and emphasizing vulnerability reduction as fundamental to DRM. Reporting on the CATALYST programme, Daniel et al (2012) emphasize that CB for DRM and climate change adaptation must take into account ability to address long-term threats and risk dynamics, as well as recognize the heightened vulnerability of certain social groups, including economically and politically marginalised people, and people with disabilities and chronic diseases. CB can also include working to foster development of financial mechanisms for DRM such innovative insurance initiatives designed to be accessible to the poor (Daniel et al 2012).

5   Key Barriers and Enablers of CB for DRM

Across the five literatures the research team were able to identify many barriers to effective CB for DRM (and effective CB generally). The resources also offered a number of suggestions for enablers of successful capacity building. Often the enablers were the converse of the barriers, but not in every case. The analysis below presents these 'barriers and enablers', approximately in order of the frequency with which they are discussed in the literature.

5.1   CB programmes must be locally 'owned'

The literature is unanimous in emphasising that CB is most effective when it is country-led, with ownership and commitment from country actors and a limited role for external actors (CADRI n.d., Lucas 2013, OECD 2006). However, despite this strong emphasis in the literature, there is also clear recognition that the reality is very different (Keijzer 2013, Matheson 2011). Specifically relating to DRM CB, Hagelsteen and Becker (2013) note that there is a tendency for DRM CB to be externally-driven and actioned without local ownership, and this can lead to a scenario where projects decline if external expertise is removed.

Political commitment from government and other actors, and insulation from changing political environments is important (Penalba et al 2012; Lafontaine et al 2012; European Commission 2012). The recipient country should lead in identifying and articulating demand for CB, and be jointly involved in the design and implementation of the programme (Teskey 2005). It is advisable for CB to align behind government priorities, specifically a national disaster risk reduction strategy or national sector plan (Hagelsteen and Becker 2013; Sisgaard 2011). Partnering between institutions is also seen to be helpful in ensuring successful capacity development (Guha-Sapir 2005). Hagelsteen and Becker (2013) emphasise that all partners should have clear and mutually agreed roles and responsibilities.

It is notable that much of the emphasis in the wider CB literature is on government ownership of the CB interventions rather than community ownership. The Local First initiative (Peace Direct 2012) is a peacebuilding movement that argues for a strong focus on local-led capacity development. It makes a key distinction between activities that are locally led (where the local partner formulates the approach and the external agency provides support) or locally owned (where the approach comes from outside but ownership is then vested in the local partner to the extent that it can eventually become locally-led), and activities that are locally delivered (where the external agency controls the activity but applies it at community level). Since community-scale activities have become increasingly common in both DRM and climate change adaptation, it is important to bear these distinctions in mind when examining CB approaches.

Several sources argue that CB activities prosper where there is a local or national champion for the programme (Baser 2008, Pearson 2011a, Evans et al 2009). Leadership is required to boost ownership and push through change, although this is not necessarily an individual – it can be a group. Daniel et al (2013) underline that a key initial step for fostering local-scale leadership is to build knowledge and understanding of risk. Ideally there needs to be both technical and political leadership associated with the CB activities. The need for internal leadership is also recognised in the literature exploring CB in fragile states (Brinkerhoff 2007, UNDP 2011, REGLAP 2012) and in the specific DRM CB literature (Hagelsteen and Becker 2013).

5.2   CB should relate to the local context

Both the DRM specific and the wider CB literature argue that a major problem for CB programmes and activities is lack of understanding of the local context (Hagelsteen and Becker 2013, CADRI n.d., Baser & Morgan 2008; Lucas 2013; Pritchett et al 2010; Matheson 2011; Teskey 2005). These authors argue that there is a significant gap between the theoretical best practice (which strongly argues against 'one-size-fits-all' approach) and the reality, where models and approaches are typically imported wholesale from more 'functional' developed country environments and contexts. Most CB programming is still not well rooted in a strong understanding of the country context. Careful analysis is required to shape the design of CB interventions because CB projects affect power and the distribution of resources. This means factors that can disrupt programmes are often hidden, informal or take time and careful analysis to fully understand (Evans 2009). In some developing countries informal institutions and political systems can be stronger than the formal, therefore it is particularly important to understand the informal context.

Hagelsteen and Becker (2013) also argue that there is a propensity to ignore established systems, strategies and capacities, instead building parallel structures. Brinkerhoff (2007) and REGLAP (2012) argue that in fragile states the starting point for CB must be the local context and interventions should focus on unleashing resident capacities and skills. Communities should provide a significant contribution alongside any outside support and even if there is a weak civil society, it is advisable to try to build on pre-existing capacity and networks as much as possible (Evans et al 2009).

Ensuring capacity needs assessments are participatory: The Armenia capacity needs assessment can be seen as an example of good practice capacity assessment (UNDP 2010). Following key stakeholder identification and consultation with key stakeholders in phase 1, a self-assessment tool designed for the local context was applied. The capacity assessment process comprised three main phases: 1) the design of a capacity assessment tool adapted for the DRR system and the Armenian context, owned and understood by the Ministry of Emergency Services (MoES) and the five key DRR agencies; 2) conducting the assessment; and 3) interpreting the results by comparing the existing capacities to the "realistic level of desired capacities". From here gaps and priorities were identified and used to inform the design of the capacity development interventions.

5.3   Contextual political factors strongly affect CB success

The non-DRM specific literature emphasises that CB used to be regarded as a technical exercise in the transference of skills and expertise from a Northern context to a Southern / developing country context. This perspective is now out-dated and CB practitioners recognise the importance of the political context and the wider governance environment as critical enablers for CB programmes (Lucas 2013, Matheson 2011, OECD 2006). CB is not just about improving the knowledge and skills of individuals, it should be about improving the quality of organisations and the enabling environment which necessarily involves affecting structures of power and institutions (**see also section 4.2**). Changing institutions is much harder than changing individuals or organisations. Problems with CB are rarely just technical – they typically have an underlying political cause.

Contextual factors are a particular concern in the literature focusing on CB in fragile states. These countries tend to have very low starting capacity, depleted by many years of conflict (Brinkerhoff 2007). As mentioned above, it is established in the CB literature generally that having local partners who fully 'own' the CB interventions is critical for sustainability. However, in fragile states there may be a lack of history or culture of citizen engagement with the state as there may have been state repression and thus a weakened civil society due to a legacy of violence towards the

politically active (Brinkerhoff 2007). In highly politicised environments the real location of power and control may be hidden (Evans et al 2009), so political economy analysis is needed to understand the context and to analyse for unintended consequences from interventions (UNDP 2011, Brinkerhoff 2007; OECD 2006).

Also in fragile states, weak state accountability and government responsiveness means CB programmes aiming to work at a regional or local level may encounter a missing connection between central government and local authorities (Sisgaard 2011). Missing infrastructure (social and physical, rule of law and basic governance structures) also affect CB programmes involving government officials (Evans et al 2009, Sisgaard 2011).

5.4   CB requires a multi-stakeholder, multi-dimensional approach

Across the literatures reviewed, multiple resources acknowledged that all CB is inherently complex, multi-dimensional and involves multiple actors (for example CADRI n.d). This is particularly true for DRM CB which straddles many scales, sectors and disciplines.

Different levels of government have to be engaged simultaneously (national, regional and local bodies) as well as including communities and community institutions in CB interventions. Daniel et al (2013) emphasize the importance of building mechanisms for coordination across scales, especially between government and communities. The DRM literature on CB also emphasises that relationships between the different actors matter for the quality of the CB intervention, in particular coordination and information sharing across the range of actors involved in the CB activity, and across all levels (Collymore 2011; Tadele & Manyena 2009; Babu & Mthindi 1995). Various resources advise creating multi-stakeholder coalitions between government and NGOs, along with community based, demand led CB approaches wherever possible (Evans et al 2009, UNDP 2011). This may prevent the well documented lack of communication and considerable gap in capacity and information flows between upper levels of government, implementers and local actors on the ground (Walker et al 2011).

In fragile states taking a multi-stakeholder approach to CB may be more difficult if society is polarised and fragmented with community divisions and a lack of trust between stakeholders (Brinkerhoff 2007 and Evans 2009).

The current tendency in CB programming is to focus on individuals rather than incorporating all administrative levels in CB activities. This may be due to budgetary constraints, because of a lack of understanding of the importance of involving multiple administrative levels, or because of a scant awareness of capacity needs at different administrative levels. The result is that CB tends to lack a true organisational or institutional focus (Becker 2012; Lafontaine 2012; European Commission 2012).

Identifying and engaging key stakeholders early on: This can be achieved via a scoping exercise at the start of the capacity building process or programme to identify and engage key stakeholders from across different levels of engagement. The Armenia capacity needs assessment began with such a scoping exercise, with representatives of the five DRR agencies actively participating (UNDP 2010) in identifying local, national, international and regional stakeholders as well as also presenting issues and solutions for streamlining DRR operations which helped to avoid duplicating existing functions leading to a more efficient system overall (UNDP 2010). The GTZ-funded capacity building in tsunami early warning systems in Indonesia (Schlurmann & Siebert 2011) focused on strengthening (i) the institutional and HR capacity in organisations and national-level government; and (ii) capacities of national and local decision making structures. Again, the first step was to identify and assess different stakeholders, their mandates and institutional capabilities (Schlurmann & Siebert 2011), followed by an institutional mapping approach. This was used to facilitate a new network of stakeholders.

5.5   High staff turnover impedes sustainability of CB

In the DRM and Climate Change Adaptation literatures, a major barrier to the sustainability of CB is identified as high staff turnover (Hagelsteen and Becker 2013, Tadele and Manyena 2009; van Riet & van Niekerk, 2012). High staff turnover, especially in government departments and other public sector bodies, causes a loss of institutional memory (European Commission 2012). This is a particularly prevalent problem in fragile states as recruitment tends to be harder and project turnover is higher, particularly with the arrival of larger INGOs and donor agencies paying higher salaries (Brinkerhoff 2007).

5.6   Donor practices can create perverse incentives for CB

Several authors argue that the practices of donor agencies in the field create perverse incentives for CB interventions. Keijzer (2013) and Teskey (2005) argue that there is a mismatch between the short timeframes of donor funding and project management cycles (including those of INGOs), and the reality that CB is a slow process with institutional change taking many years. Projects are under pressure to operationalise and spend money quickly, and evaluations are conducted before outcomes and impact can be fully assessed. Country systems tend to be bypassed and parallel structures created because that is often quicker and easier for the donor. Further, because CB funds and activities come in many different forms, they are hard to track and manage which uses up valuable core government staff time in donor negotiation and liaison.   These problems tend to be more pronounced in fragile states where work is higher profile with an associated increased pressure to deliver results in a short amount of time. This time pressure can lead to a lack of sensitivity to the context, a tendency towards imposing standardised approaches, and a 'squeezing out' of local partners (Brinkerhoff 2007; Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies 2012). Several authors note the importance of donor agencies providing continuity in funding and strategic direction (Sisgaard 2011, Brinkerhoff 2007, REGLAP 2012).

Sisgaard (2011) also notes that poor coordination and a lack of harmonisation between multiple donor agencies can cause confusion, making it difficult to track and coordinate CB programmes.

5.7   Pay attention to the timing of CB interventions

The section above emphasises the importance of having long time horizons in mind when designing CB interventions. New mechanisms and knowledge needs to be institutionalised, developed, facilitated and mainstreamed which is a long-term undertaking. However, several sources argue that there is a key window of opportunity and momentum immediately post-disaster that can and should be used to learn about people's behaviour, assess response capacity, support public discussion and provide recommendations for improvement for CB to those in charge. This is more likely to be successful if CB activities were in operation before the disaster occurred (see for example, Spahn et al 2010).

Taking time to tailor interventions to the local context: Part of the success of the IGAD approach to capacity building was the time taken by mentors to develop relationships with their counterparts, amounting to 3-6 months of the 2 year programme: "One of the CSSOs described this as akin to an anthropological research project" insofar as 'participant-observation' appears to have an important component (Rosen and Haldrup 2013: 5). A long lead-up time was also key in the West African Disaster Management Capacity Building programme where project priorities were conceptualised and determined with the partners over a period of almost two years. This was important to ensure consensus, promote ownership and commitment, and to manage expectations (Lowery and Iao Jorgensen 2011). In fragile states where the context is highly dynamic, CB strategies also need time to evolve and adapt to changing needs (Sterland 2006). In Bosnia Herzegovina and Kosovo after the conflict initial capacity building for DRM activities were for INGOs to support and train NGOs to deliver humanitarian aid. This was the priority given the context. After the initial emergency phase was over, a broader range of educational activities supported by international expertise was offered followed by longer-term approaches with emphasis on facilitation processes and organisational development. The success of the programme was reliant on the ability of humanitarian agencies to recognise opportunities for effective CB strategies in the context at different stages.

5.8 Careful design is required

In the wider CB literature inadequate design of CB interventions is commonly cited as a barrier to effective CB (Pritchett et al 2010). According to Teskey (2005) they should be based on needs assessments, with a precisely defined challenge or objective, a well thought out and realistic Theory of Change, a comprehensive CD plan and an exit strategy. Practitioners need to develop a credible change process that matches expectations with immediate capacity and ensures that all actors share a common vision of the desired end state. This prevents premature over-loading and unrealistic expectations about the level and rate of possible improvement.

In relation to DRM CB specifically, Hagelsteen and Becker (2013) argue that CB should be based on capacity assessments and combine long and short-term activities with exit strategies. However, they suggest that tools and methodologies for capacity development, such as capacity assessment, are generally not adapted to the context of disaster risk reduction and are often not recognised by people in the DRR community, who tend to be absent from wider discussion of CB across the development community (Hagelsteen & Becker 2013). Work in Climate Change Adaptation suggests that at the grassroots level, capacity building work using needs-based face-to-face training on adaptation activities relevant to the local context, and using a range of toolkits (often carried out by NGOs and INGOs) is more successful than top-down one-size-fits-all approaches that may be implemented in response to time constraints (Penalba et al 2012; Becker 2012; Sterrett 2011).

Some authors argue (and this is a theme in the wider public administration literature on any type of reform) for small-scale, incremental CB interventions rather than 'big bang' programmes (Teskey 2005). Starting small and widening out creates an opportunity to adjust the design more easily as the programme progresses, and it is easier to garner political support with any quick wins gained early on. Similarly Brinkerhoff (2007) argues that CB programmes in fragile states should focus first on where immediate gains or 'quick wins' can be made.

Several authors also note that in designing CB, greater flexibility needs to be built into interventions (Baser 2011, Sisgaard 2011). When actors are given scope and freedom to design CB programmes they are more likely to be in a position to take context as their starting point and adapt to the local context (Rosen et al 2013).

> ***Linking DRM CB with DRM policy***: By linking training courses with DRM policy development, the WADMCB project used the capacity-building process to establish an operational framework for disaster management in each of the Red Cross National Societies. The project also integrated activities (cross-country training, peer learning and exchanges) across administrative levels. Counterpart relationships were strengthened via involving national and local government staff in training activities, and this also helped to clarify roles and responsibilities between government and the National Societies. The WADMCB project also suggests that a common understanding of DRM/DRR enables the development of a common agenda, making joint actions more likely: "The review/development of DM policy served as a relevant and effective entry point to a comprehensive and holistic capacity building process of a National Society. The two-folded consultation process to review/develop DM policy of the National Societies, through participation of National Society and government counterparts in the same DM trainings and in the review/development processes of each other's policies, promoted inclusiveness, coherence and harmonisation, and ultimately enhanced disaster response effectiveness in the country" (Lowery and Iao-Jörgensen 2011: xi).

5.9   Be aware of barriers to participation in CB activities

The DRM literature also emphasises the importance of overcoming barriers to participation in DRM CB. Hagelsteen and Becker (2013) emphasise the importance of using participatory approaches for DRM CB that are grown from within.

 One key concern is that the success of the CB initiative is compromised if it further marginalises or does not meet the needs of the most vulnerable or marginalised people in affected communities, for example indigenous groups and ethnic minorities (Allen 2006). This can be reflected in lack of attendance of participants at the community level, where people prioritise other more directly productive activities such as income generation. Reasons for low attendance in DRM CB activities include the perception by participants that their capacity is already high and therefore the training is not needed, people not agreeing with aspects of the training and therefore not wanting to be involved and 'training-fatigue' (UNISDR 2010; Gamboa-Maldonado et al 2012; IFRC 2011). Low uptake then restricts the reach of the DRM CB activities (Allen 2006).

. Low uptake then restricts the reach of the DRM CB activities (Allen 2006).

5.10   Consider South-South approaches and triangular cooperation

South-South approaches have become popular for CB programmes in recent years and developing country governments tend to prefer South-South arrangements for CB stating that providers have greater understanding of contextual issues. CB interventions should be designed with equality in mind where actors are partners on a shared learning journey rather than one party is the expert provider of knowledge to the other (Lucas 2013).

Several authors argue that in fragile states, international Technical Assistance (i.e. short term international consultants) should only be used sparingly for CB and that it is preferable to use the country's diaspora or regional South-South cooperation (UNDP 2011, Baser 2011, Evans et al 2009). Regional cooperation can be a significant enabler for CB, supporting peer learning, knowledge management and the exchange of good practice (Bethke 2009).

Using South-South mentoring and shadowing: knowledge and skill transfer via mentoring and shadowing partnerships can be highly effective in enabling capacity development, for example in the transfer of civil servants from nearby countries to key ministries and departments to work alongside local counterparts at all administrative levels. Experience from the IGAD initiative in South Sudan where mentors were provided from neighbouring African countries suggests that the way (or 'spirit') in which mentoring and shadowing are delivered appears to be important: voluntarism and freedom were critical factors in this process in the programme, and it was seen as a voluntary offer from one state to another to provide demand-driven assistance, and facilitating self-help (Rosen and Haldrup 2013).

6   Monitoring and Evaluating DRM Capacity Building

6.1   M&E for DRM capacity building

There are few resources available that specifically focus on M&E for DRM CB and several authors emphasise that across the whole DRR field there are a lack of tailored M&E methods and tools (Benson and Twigg 2007, Eldis, GFDRR). Despite the growth in disaster risk, there is currently a lack of training courses, toolkits and guidelines specifically related to M&E for DRR[7].

There is no common methodology that is widely used for M&E of DRM programmes although there are three main strands in the literature that relate to M&E for CB which we outline in greater detail below:

1)   Collections of DRM indicators

2)   Evaluation of DRM programmes

3)   Resources on M&E for Climate Change Adaptation

These resources (particularly those on climate change adaptation) highlight a number of key practical challenges for M&E in the context of climate change and DRR. These include the long-time frames that characterise climate change and the measurement of non-events (how to address risk reduction when a disaster happens vs when it does not?). Also, the lack of appropriate universal indicators presents a challenge - adaptation must be grounded in the context, scale, sector, and nature of the endeavour, all of which vary widely. As with other sectors, assessing contribution vs. attribution is a challenge, as is the tracking of moving targets (Villanueva, 2010; Bours et al, 2013).

6.1.1   DRM indicators

In terms of collections of DRM indicators, most of these are highly technical and do not include a focus on institutional factors or the broader organisational context. An exception is the work of the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI). They have developed the CADRI Capacity Assessment methodology for DRR[8] which has been applied in 17 countries. An Institutional Capacity Assessment has also been applied to SADC, ECOWAS and ECCAS assessments in 2012. CADRI is currently developing public guidelines for the methodology.

In terms of other sources of DRR indicators, UNISDR (2008) has developed indicators to measure progress in DRR and the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. The main audience for the guide are national authorities and officials responsible for implementing DRR activities and for monitoring and reporting on progress. Countries' progress reports are available on UNISDR's website (http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/). A second source defining DRR indicators is Cardona (2008), who designed a system of indicators to communicate risk in the 'decision makers' own language and to allow cluster and comparison between countries'. The system is constituted by four composite indicators: a Disaster Deficit Index, a Local Disaster Index, a Prevalent Vulnerability Index, and a Risk Management Index. The indicators are aimed at reflecting the organisational, development capacity and institutional actions taken to reduce vulnerability and losses to prepare for crisis and to recover efficiently from disasters.

---

[7] For example, please refer to http://www.eldis.org/go/topics/resource-guides/climate-change/key-issues/disaster-risk-reduction/monitoring-and-evaluating-disaster-risk-reduction#.Uvzn-Pl_uSo consulted on 10/02)

6.1.2   Evaluation of DRM programmes

Generally, for most of the resources included in this review that focus on DRM CB activities there is little or no mention of M&E. It may be that independent evaluation reports do exist but they are not publicly available on the internet.[9] However, we did identify a few relevant resources, for example an evaluation of Cordaid's €20 million + DRR programme covering ten countries during the period 2004-08.   The evaluation aimed to improve the understanding of the efficiency, relevance, and effectiveness of the Cordaid DRR programme and identified strategies for any future DRR programme (Cosgrave, 2010).

Oxfam (n.d.) has developed a guide to support their staff in developing indicators of disaster resilience for any programmes that aim to reduce the risk of disaster. The ProVention Consortium also commissioned work on DRR indicators which fed into the Tsunami Recovery Impact Assessment and Monitoring System (TRIAMS) programme (UNDP, WHO, IFRC 2009) and CADRI, UNDP Armenia and the UNDP Capacity Development Group worked with the Government of Armenia to develop of a self-assessment tool on capacity building. The methodology is based on the five HFA principles and was applied in 2010 (UNDP 2010). An early attempt to reflect on the evaluation of DRR initiatives is Benson and Twigg (2007), whose guidance note sets out the main steps for planning evaluations, collecting and analysing data, using the results, and associated issues.

6.1.3   Resources on M&E for Climate Change Adaptation

Most recent work situates the M&E for DRR discussion at the interface of climate change adaptation and development (Villanueva 2011, Mitchell, 2010). There are two recent studies which are particularly relevant in responding to increasing interest in this topic. The first is Villanueva (2011), funded by DFID and coordinated by the Institute of Development Studies, Plan International and Christian Aid, and the second is Bours, McGinn and Pringle (2013) from UKCIP. Villanueva's study presents a summary of the most current methodologies and approaches used to evaluate adaptation interventions. According to the findings, current methods can be split into those focusing on effectiveness (input-output-outcome evaluations, process-based evaluations and evaluations of behavioural change) and those focusing on efficiency (economic evaluations). Bours et al's study presents and analyses a comprehensive selection of M&E tools, frameworks, and approaches for climate change adaptation. Their selection includes an array that ranges from broadly theoretical and technical, to practical guidance documents on M&E for adaptation (and not on DRR).

6.2   M&E for general capacity building

The general literature on M&E and on capacity building (i.e. not DRM specific) emphasises that there is no commonly accepted, universally used set of capacity indicators. In fact, several authors identify M&E for CB as a problem area (Lucas 2013, Keijzer 2013) for a variety of reasons, for example indicators are hard to identify, baselines are often missing and there has generally been a low level of investment in CB evaluation, which has hampered learning.

In particular, Simister and Smith (2010) argue that most evaluations and most approaches to evaluating CB/CD are written from the vantage point of a donor concerned with demonstrating their accountability rather than a society, a ministry, a city, a province, a private company or an ethnic or religious group seeking to become less vulnerable, or more capable and informed on what works and what does not. They suggest that M&E designed for accountability to donors and supporters

---

[9] We will be able to specifically look for evaluation reports during the fieldwork in country.

is not the same as M&E designed to learn and improve. In particular, M&E systems have been criticised for being too cumbersome and a burden rather than a help (Simister and Smith 2010). For example, in Myanmar, local organisations interviewed felt that external organisations brought new and complicated frameworks for monitoring which were inappropriate in the context. The external organisation rejected the local organisations' M&E systems. It was also suggested that Myanmar should not be subject to international standards or the INGOs' policies if local people do not have the capacity to fulfil those requirements (Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies 2012).

Many authors argue that M&E should be participatory, with full country involvement so that Southern perspectives and needs are reflected as well as those of donors (Lucas 2013). In the Horn of Africa, it was suggested that community members themselves should articulate their own vision for capacity development. In this approach, the community would identify changes that need to take place and then self-monitor and evaluate (REGLAP 2012).

M&E of CB has become more of a problematic issue in recent years as donors have increasingly focused on results based management. Writing specifically about CB in fragile states, Brinkerhoff (2010) makes the wider point: "The pressures to demonstrate results and improved performance push in the direction of quantifiable capacity outcomes, which favour a focus on resource inputs, skills transfer and technical assistance for organisational strengthening. However, absent attention to the socio-cultural and psychological elements of capacity, the 'countable' interventions are likely to fall short of their expected contributions to reductions in fragility". The tendency has been to focus on operational accountability without paying attention to wider institutional issues and the local context.

The current methods of results measurement struggle to adequately incorporate complexity, include 'softer' project outcomes and incorporate the long timeframes and flexibility that are required for CB. CB objectives are typically hard to measure and require an understanding and appreciation of the changing political and institutional context. Many resources emphasise that outcomes and impact should be monitored in addition to the assessment of operational inputs or outputs as has traditionally been the case with CB, for example the number of persons attending training (OECD 2006). For example, the NGO literature highlights that training evaluation forms completed by participants do not lead to an understanding of impact unless there is follow-up with participants and their organisations after they have returned to their working environment. In Pakistan 'lessons learned' events following CB activities helped to record inter-agency experience and best practice in DRM (Wooster 2008). In addition, some argue that M&E should include tangible and intangible elements (e.g. resilience, sustainability and legitimacy) and should focus on processes of learning (Baser 2011). Ideally, monitoring systems should aim to capture change across the whole complex system, including the individual, organisational and institutional levels (OECD 2006; Lucas 2013).

7   Knowledge gaps

Section 3 above gives an overview of the quality and breadth of the literature on CB for DRM. From our searches we can identify a number of knowledge and research gaps in relation to DRM capacity building:

- As identified above, overall there is a lack of independent, critical analysis of CB for DRM, in particular multi-country studies that provide comparative, empirical evidence of what works in CB for DRM and why.

- The literature emphasises the need for further research in order to improve understanding of effective M&E for CB (Lucas 2013, Keijzer 2013, Simister and Smith 2010, Baser and Morgan 2008, Sterland 2006). In particular, there are gaps relating to M&E for DRM CB, operationalising systems thinking in relation to M&E, how to incorporate all legitimate points of view in an evaluation and developing appropriate indicators of both progress and achievement in CB. Please see section 7 for more detail.

- There was little detailed discussion of the gender dimensions of CB in the resources reviewed, including in the most high profile, well-known publications on CB. Gender is also not prominently discussed in the literature focussing on capacity-building specifically in relation to disaster risk. However, many authors contend that disaster risk is fundamentally gendered (Morrow and Phillips 1999, Enarson et al 2007) and that gender dimensions also need to be taken into account in disaster response and recovery (Dung et al 2012, Harvey et al 2012, Jeffrey 2012). There is little emphasis in the literature on the gendered nature of DRM capacity at grassroots level, both in terms of differential access to resources, skills and decision-making power but also in terms of the different strengths, skills and leadership qualities that women and men can bring to collective action (Corner 1999).

- Related to the above point on gender, there was also a shortage of information in the literature about how DRM CB interventions have been and can be designed and implemented to address the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalised groups. Work under the CATALYST programme is helping to bring such information into the wider domain (Daniel et al 2013).

- There is little information on recipient views of CB interventions. The resources reviewed did not generally reflect on or report CB interventions from the recipients/ participants perspective (Lipson and Warren 2006). In Ethiopia, for example, Tadele and Manyena (2009) argue that donors perceive the development of new capacities in DRM resulting from their activities but the recipient institutions have a very different perspective. This links to the problem of creating M&E systems that incorporate different viewpoints.

In addition, there are also a number of knowledge and advice gaps specifically mentioned in some of the documents reviewed. These include calls for further work to develop and / or understand:

- The precise relationship between the levels of CB (individual, organisational and enabling environment), and how they inter-relate (Teskey 2005).

- Limits to the role that external actors can play in CB (Teskey 2005).

- How to operationalise political economy analysis in fragile states (UNDP 2011).

- Specific CB assessment tools for use in fragile states (UNDP 2011).

- Tools and methodologies for CD that are specifically tailored to DRR, including capacity assessment (Hagelsteen and Becker 2013).

- Tools for DRM CB including guidance on gender sensitive approaches (CADRI n.d.).

- Where DRM CB activity is taking place, including at international, national and local levels (CADRI n.d.).

- Coordinating CB for DRR with other programmes and sectors (IFRC 2011).

- How INGOs can support long term change processes in relation to CB (Lipson and Warren 2006).

- How best to support local capacities to access, interpret and use risk data (Daniel et al 2013).

- How access to risk-sharing instruments can be fostered at grassroots level (Daniel et al 2013).

References / Bibliography

Allen K M (2006) "Community-based disaster preparedness and climate adaptation: local capacity-building in the Philippines." *Disasters* 30.1 (2006): 81–101. Online. Internet. 16 Dec. 2012. Available: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2006.00308.x/pdf

Babu, S. C., Mthindi, G. B., (1995) Developing decentralized capacity for disaster prevention: lessons from food security and nutrition monitoring in Malawi. *Disasters.* 19(2). p.127-139.

Baser, H. (2011) *Perspectives on Capacity Development in Fragile Situations.* Learning Network on Capacity Development. http://www.lencd.org/topic/capacity-development-fragile-situations

Baser, H. and P. Morgan (2008) *Capacity, Change and Performance Study Report.* Maastricht: ECDPM (ECDPM Discussion Paper 59B) www.ecdpm.org/dp59b

Becker, P. (2012) The importance of integrating multiple administrative levels in capacity assessment for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. *Disaster Prevention and Management.* 21(2). p. 226-233.

Benson, C. and Twigg, J. (2007) 'Guidance Note 13 – Evaluating disaster risk reduction initiatives', Tools for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction: Guidance Notes for Development Organisations, ProVention Consortium.

Bethke, L. (2009) *Capacity Development In Education Planning and Management in Fragile States*, IIEP and UNESCO: http://www.etf.europa.eu/pubmgmt.nsf/(getAttachment)/278378C19FEA93D6C1257611002F8192/$File/NOTE7UVHDR.pdf

Bornemisza, O., Griekspoor, A., Ezard, N., & Sondorp, E. (2010). The Interagency Health and Nutrition Evaluation initiative in humanitarian crises: Moving from single-agency to joint, sectorwide evaluations. In L. A. Ritchie & W. MacDonald (Eds.), Enhancing disaster and emergency preparedness, response, and recovery through evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 126, 21–35 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ev.327/abstract

Bours, D., McGinn, C. and Pringle, P. (2013), Monitoring & evaluation for climate change adaptation: A synthesis of tools, frameworks and approaches. SEA Change CoP, Phnom Penh and UKCIP, Oxford. Available from http://www.ukcip.org.uk/wordpress/wp-content/PDFs/SEA-change-UKCIP-MandE-review.pdf

Brinkerhoff, D., 2010, Developing Capacity in Fragile States, *Public Administration and Development*, 30 (1) pp66-78.

Brinkerhoff, D.W. (2007). *Capacity Development in Fragile States.* Maastricht: ECDPM (Discussion Paper 58D): http://www.ecdpm.org/Web_ECDPM/Web/Content/Content.nsf/0/c56df8709c249bbcc12573060028676c?OpenDocument#sthash.OQVWFrYj.dpuf

Brown, K., Westaway, E, (2011) 'Agency, Capacity, and Resilience to Environmental Change: Lessons from Human Development, Well-Being, and Disasters' Annual Review of Environment and Resources, vol 36 321-342 Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 2011. 36:321–42 http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-environ-052610-092905?journalCode=energy

CADRI (no date available) *Basics of Capacity Development for Disaster Risk Reduction.* UNISDR.

Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation: Key Evaluation Checklist .Michael Scriven May 2006. http://evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/20060523_scriven_michael.pdf

Cardona, O.D. (2008), Updating the Indicators of Disaster Risk and Risk Management for the Americas, Inter-America Development Bank.

Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (2012) *Listening to Voices Inside Myanmar: Civil Society's Response to Cyclone Nargis*, Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies.

Chan, C., Sun, A. et al. (2009) *Community Capacity Building and Post-disaster Psychosocial Reconstruction.* Proceeding of International Disaster and Risk Conference Chengdu 2009 69-73.

Collymore, J. (2011) Disaster management in the Caribbean: Perspectives on institutional capacity reform and development. *Environmental Hazards-Human and Policy Dimensions.* 10 (1). p. 6-22.

Coupet, S., Nassiri, R., Aliu, O., Coppola, C. (2013) A long term building capacity model that prepares for effective disaster relief. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction.* 4. p.10-14.

Corner, L. (1999) Capacity Building for Gender Mainstreaming in Development. Background paper to the High Level Intergovernmental Meeting to review the regional implementation of the Beijing Declaration and the Platform for Action, Bangkok, 26-29 October 1999. *http://www.unifem-eseasia.org/resources/techpapers/mainsteam.htm#overview*

Cosgrave, J (2010). Programme Evaluation of Disaster Risk Reduction, commissioned by CORDAID. Available from http://www.cordaid.org/media/medialibrary/2013/10/Programma_Evaluation_of_DRR-_Expanded_Summary_Report_Feb_2010_1.pdf

Crisp B.R., Swerissen H., Duckett S.J. (2000) 'Four approaches to capacity building in health: consequences for measurement and accountability'. *Health Promotion International.* S 15(2):99–107.

Daniel, H. Schrass, K., Warner, K. (Eds) (2013) *CATALYST Synthesis Report of Best Practices, Networks, Research Gaps, and Recommendations for Fostering Capacity Development for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation.* A combined deliverable incorporating D5.1, D5.2, and D5.3. Version 1.0, September 2013, Bonn. Downloadable at http://www.catalyst-project.eu.

Dawson, E. (2011) Praxis Note 58: Reflections on Building CSO Capacity to Integrate Gender and Diversity Equality. International Training and Research Centre (INTRAC)

De Montclos (2012) Humanitarian action in developing countries: Who evaluates who? Marc-Antoine Pe´rouse de Montclos CEPED (Centre Population & Developpement), Paris, France: Evaluation and Program Planning:Evaluation and Program Planning [0149-7189] de Montclos, Marc-Antoine yr:2012 vol:35 iss:1 pg:154 -160. http://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu:2060/science/article/pii/S0149718910000923

Dejene A., Midgley, S., Marake, M.V., Ramasamy, S. (2011) Strengthening Capacity for Climate Change Adaptation in Agriculture: Experience and Lessons from *Lesotho.* FAO: Environment and Natural Resource Management Series.

Dumaru Patrina (2010) "Community-based adaptation: enhancing community adaptive capacity in Druadrua Island, Fiji." *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 1.5 (2010): 751–763. Online. Internet. 16 Dec. 2012.

Dung, L.T.M, et al. (2012) *Flood Preparedness in Vietnam: A Systematic Gender-Aware Approach.* Oxfam GB.

Eade, D. (2007) 'Capacity building: who builds whose capacity?' *Development in Practice* 17, 4-5, 630-639

Enarson, E., Fothergill, A. and Peek, L (2007) 'Gender and Disaster: Foundations and Directions' In: *Handbook of Disaster Research.* Springer, New York, pp130-146

European Commission. (2012) *Deliverable 2.2 Report on issues, gaps and opportunities, network coverage.* CATALYST: Capacity Development for Hazard Risk Reduction and Adaptation. European Commission.

Evaluation of FAO's role and work in Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and in Latin America and the FAO (2013) Caribbean FAO Office of Evaluation :July 2013 http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/029/mi101e.pdf

Evans, A. et al (2009) *An Approach Paper on WBI's Capacity Development Activities in Fragile States,* London: Overseas Development Institute: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/WBI/Resources/213798-1248297595434/ODI_Paper.pdf

Fitzgerald, M., Posner, J. and Workman, A., *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of NGO Capacity Building Interventions in Conflict Affected Settings* (n.d) JSI Research and Training Institute.

Gamboa-Maldonado, T., Marshak, H. H., Sinclair, R., Montgomery, S., Dyjack, D. T. (2012) Building capacity for community disaster preparedness: a call for collaboration between public environmental health and emergency preparedness and response programs. *Journal of Environmental Health.* 75 (2). p.24-29

Guha-Sapir, D., (2005) What have we learned? Capacity building for health responses in Disasters *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine.* 20(6). p. 480-482

Hagelsteen, M. and Becker, P. (2013) Challenging disparities in capacity development for disaster risk reduction, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction.* 3 (2013) 4-13.

Haigh, R., Amaratunga, D. (2009) Capacity Building for Post-Disaster Infrastructure Development and Management. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management.* 13(2). p. 83-86.

Harvey, C. et al (2012) *Post-Earthquake Response and Reconstruction. Gender-Sensitive Advocacy in Indonesia.* Oxfam GB.

Houghton R (2006) Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC) Joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean tsunami: Synthesis Report By John Telford and John Cosgrave Contributing author: Rachel Houghton. July 2006 http://www.alnap.org/resource/5536.aspx

IFRC (2010) International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Geneva, Building Capacity in Disaster Risk: Lessons learned in the DPRK. 2010. http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/disasters/reducing_risks/201300-North-Korea-Case-Study.pdf

IFRC (2011) International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. *Characteristics of a Safe and Resilient Community, Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Study.* vols. Geneva: IFRC, September 2011.

Jaspers A., et al (2012), *CATALYST Deliverable 3.1 - Report on Capacity Development on Disaster Risk Reduction.*

Jeffrey, D. (2012) *Restoring Livelihoods after Floods. Gender-Sensitive Response and Community-Owned Recovery in Pakistan.* Oxfam GB.

Jha, A.K., Miner,T.W., and Stanton-Geddes. S. (eds.) (2013) *Building Urban Resilience: Principles, Tools and Practices.* World Bank.

Jones et at (2010) *Responding to a Changing Climate: Exploring How Disaster Risk Reduction, Social Protection and Livelihoods Approaches Promote Features of Adaptive Capacity.* ODI.

Jones et at (2011) *Preparing for the Future in Uganda: Understanding the Influence of Development Interventions on Adaptive Capacity at the Local Level.* Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance /ACCRA.

Journal of Integrated Disaster Risk Management Updating the Indicators of Disaster Risk and Risk Management for the Americas O.D. Cardona and M.L. Carreño. 2011 IDRiM (2011) 1(1) ISSN: 2185-8322 DOI 10.5595/idrim.2011.0014 1 Journal of Integrated Disaster Risk Management. http://idrim.net/index.php/idrim/article/viewFile/14/PDF

Keijzer, N. (2013a) *Unfinished agenda or overtaken by events? Applying aid- and development – effectiveness principles to capacity development support.* Germany: German Development Institute (Discussion paper 17) http://www.die-gdi.de/CMS-Homepage/openwebcms3.nsf/(ynDK_contentByKey)/ANES-9CLCBX?Open&nav=expand:Publikationen;active:Publikationen\ANES-9CLCBX

Keijzer, N. (2013b) *Who's the Boss? Strengthening the Effectiveness of Capacity Development Support.* Germany: German Development Institute: http://www.die-gdi.de/CMS-Homepage/openwebcms3.nsf/(ynDK_contentByKey)/ANES-99AEUM?Open&nav=expand:Publikationen;active:Publikationen\ANES-99AEUM

Kellet, J. and Caravani, A., 2013, 'Financing Disaster Risk Reduction: A 20 Year Story of International Aid' London: Overseas Development Institute http://www.odi.org.uk/publications/7452-climate-finance-disaster-risk-reduction

Lafontaine, A., Adejuwon, J. O., Dearden, P.N., Quesne, G. (2012) *Final Evaluation of the IDRC/DFID Climate Change Adaptation in Africa Programme* Le Groupe-conseil baastel ltée (DFID/IDRC May 17, 2012).

Lowery C and J Iao-Jörgensen (2011) West Africa Disaster Management Capacity Building Project 2008-2011. Final Evaluation IFRC December 2011.

Lucas, B. (2013) *Current Thinking on Capacity Development.* Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham (Helpdesk Research Report no. 960). http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/HDQ960.pdf

Matheson, A. (2009) *Formulation of a Capacity Development Framework: A Literature Review*, Report to UNICEF India, Oxford: Oxford Policy Management.

Matheson, A. (2011) *Escaping the Capacity Treadmill: Time for a more Sustainable Approach to Capacity Development.* Oxford: Oxford Policy Management (Development Futures Paper). http://www.opml.co.uk/paper/escaping-capacity-treadmill-time-more-sustainable-approach-capacity-development

McBean, G., Rodgers, C. (2010) Climate hazards and disasters: the need for capacity building *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews-Climate Change.* 1(6). p. 871-884.

Miles, S B, Green, R A, Svekla, W (2012) 'Disaster risk reduction capacity assessment for precarious settlements in Guatemala City' Disasters, 36 (3), p.365-381. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22098171

Mitchell, T., Ibrahim, M., Harries, K., Hedger, M., Polack, E., Ahmed, A., Hall, N., Hawrylyshyn, K., Nightingale, K., Onyango, M., Adow, M. and Mohammed, S. (2010), Climate Smart Disaster Risk Management, Strengthening Climate Resilience. Brighton: Studies, I. o. D. Available from: http://community.eldis.org/.59e0ccc0

Morrow, B.H. and Phillips, B. (1999) 'What's gender "got to do with it"?' *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*, 17(1):5-13.

Norwegian Red Cross, 2010, Capacity Building, Organizational Development and Disaster Preparedness Project in Vietnam, Impact Evaluation: http://www.norad.no/en/tools-and-publications/publications/publication?key=380855
OECD (2006) *The Challenge of Capacity Development – Working Towards Good Practice.* Paris: OECD http://www.oecd.org/development/governance-development/36326495.pdf

OECD (2006) *The Challenge of Capacity Development – Working Towards Good Practice.* Paris: OECD http://www.oecd.org/development/governance-development/36326495.pdf

Oxfam (n.d.), Measuring the Impact of DRR: the Learning Companion Guide. Available from http://community.eldis.org/?233@@.59cdc973/8!enclosure=.59cf3b92&ad=1

Oxfam (2012), *Collaboration in Crises: Lessons in Community Participation from the Oxfam International Tsunami Research Program.* Oxfam GB.

Pazirandeh (n.d.) Pazirandeh, Ala. *Local Capacity Building: A Logistics Perspective in Disaster Relief.* vols., n.d. Available: http://www.pomsmeetings.org/ConfProceedings/015/FullPapers/015-0018.pdf

Peace Direct (2012) *Local First: Development for the Twenty-First Century.* Peace Direct

Pearson, J. (2011) *Training and Beyond: Seeking Better Practices for Capacity Development*, OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers, No. 1, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kgf1nsnj8tf-en

Penalba, L. M., Elazegui , D. D., Pulhin, J. M., Cruz, R.V.O. (2012) Social and institutional dimensions of climate change adaptation. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management.* 4 (3). p. 308-322.

Prasad, N. et al (2009). *Climate Resilient Cities: A Primer on Reducing Vulnerabilities to Disasters.* World Bank.

Pritchett, L., Woolcock, M., and Andrews, M. (2010) *Capability Traps? The Mechanisms of Persistent Implementation Failure.* Center for Global Development, Working paper no. 234. http://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/1424651_file_Pritchett_Capability_FINAL.pdf

Rawlani, A. & Sovacool, B. (2011) Building responsiveness to climate change through community based adaptation in Bangladesh. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change.* 16(8). p.845-863.

REGLAP (2012) *Good Practice Principles on Community Development for Use in DRR in the Drylands of the Horn of Africa*, REGLAP.

Rosén, F.F. and Haldrup, S (2013). By Design or by Default: Capacity Development in Fragile States and the Limits of Program Planning. *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development* 2(2):46, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/sta.cg

Schlurmann T and M Siebert (2011) "The Capacity Building programmes of GITEWS - visions, goals, lessons learned, and re-iterated needs and demands." *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 11.2 (2011): 293–300

Scott, Z. and Tarazona, M. (2011). Decentralization and Disaster Risk Reduction. Background chapter for the UNISDR Global Assessment Report: Oxford Policy Management, Oxford.

Shaw, R., Takeuchi, Y., Rouhban, B. (2009) Education, Capacity Building and Public Awareness for Disaster Reduction. *Landslides - Disaster Risk Reduction.* p. 499-515.

Sigsgaard, M. (2011) *On the Road to Resilience –Capacity Development with the Ministry of Education in Afghanistan* IIEP (IIEP Research Brief): http://www.iiep.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Research_Highlights_Emergencies/pdf/RB_On_the_road_to_resilience.pdf

Simister N with R Smith (2010) INTRAC Praxis Paper 23: Monitoring and Evaluating Capacity Building: Is it really that difficult? Nigel Simister with Rachel Smith http://www.intrac.org/data/files/resources/677/Praxis-Paper-23-Monitoring-and-Evaluating-Capacity-Building-is-it-really-that-difficult.pdf

Sovacool, B. (2012) Expert views of climate change adaptation in the Maldives. *Climatic Change.* 114. p.295–300.

Spahn H et al (2010) "Experience from three years of local capacity development for tsunami early warning in Indonesia: challenges, lessons and the way ahead." *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 10.7 (2010): 1411–1429

Steinke-Chase, M., & Tranzillo, D. (2010). Save the Children's approach to emergency evaluation and learning: Evolution in policy and practice. In L. A. Ritchie & W. MacDonald (Eds.), Enhancing disaster and emergency preparedness, response, and recovery through evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 126, 37–49. http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0470769122.html

Sterland B (2006) Civil Society Capacity Building in Post-Conflict Societies: The Experience of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo. INTRAC Praxis paper no 9 June 2006.

Sterrett, C. (2011) *Review of Climate Change Adaptation Practices in South Asia* Oxfam Research Report (November 2011).

Tadele, F., Manyena, S. B. (2009). Building disaster resilience through capacity building in Ethiopia. *Disaster Prevention and Management*. 18(3). P.317-326.

Teskey, G. (2005) C*apacity Development and Statebuilding: Issues, Evidence and Implications for DFID.* London: DFID. http://www.jica.go.jp/cdstudy/library/pdf/20071101_30.pdf

Todd and Todd (2011) Natural Disaster Response: Lessons from Evaluations of the World Bank and Others. David Todd and Hazel Todd, Evaluation Brief 16, 2011 http://ieg.worldbank.org/Data/reports/eval_brief_nat_disaster_response.pdf

Turnbull et al (2013), *Toward Resilience: A Guide to Disaster Risk Reducation and Climate Change Adaptation*, Catholic Relief Services.

UNDP, WHO, IFRC (2009), Tsunami Recovery Impact Assessment and Monitoring System – TRIAMS. Available from https://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/disasters/tsunami/triams-bangkok-2009-en.pdf

UNDP (2010) *Armenia Disaster Risk Reduction System Capacity Development Report.* UNDP. http://www.am.undp.org/content/dam/armenia/docs/Armenia_DRR_Capcity%20Development%20Report%20Final%20_English%20-%20Copy.pdf

UNDP (2011) *Supporting Capacity Development in Conflict and Fragile Contexts.* New York: UNDP (Report from the UNDP Workshop on Capacity Development in Conflict and Fragile Contexts): http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/crisis%20prevention/2012SupportingCapacityDevelopmentinConflictFragileSettings.pdf

UN/ISDR, (2008), Indicators of Progress: Guidance on Measuring the Reduction of Disaster Risks and the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. United Nations secretariat of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UN/ISDR), Geneva, Switzerland. Available from http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/2259

UNISDR (2013) *Chair's Summary*. Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. Geneva, 21-23 May 2013

United Nations (n.d.). *Beyond 2015 – UN Thematic Consultation on Conflict, Fragility and Disaster*. New York: United Nations (Position Paper): *www.worldwewant2015.org/file/341038/download/370713*

van Riet, G., van Niekerk, D. (2012) Capacity development for participatory disaster risk assessment. *Environmental Hazards-Human and Policy Dimensions*. 11(3). p. 213-225.

Vanaspong, C. et al (2007), *Lessons Learned from Child Led Disaster Risk Reduction Project THAILAND*. Save the Children.

Villanueva, P.S., (2011), Learning to ADAPT: monitoring and evaluation approaches in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction – challenges, gaps and ways forward, SCR Discussion Paper 9. Strengthening Climate Resilience (SCR). Available from http://community.eldis.org/.5a093c0d

Walker P, C Rasmussen and S Molano (2011). *International Dialogue on Strengthening Partnership in Disaster Response: Bridging national and international support. Background paper*

3: Best Practice Experience at the National Level. Background paper. vols. IFRC, September 2011. Available: http://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/93533/Background%20paper%203.pdf

Wooster, K. (2008) *CWS P/A Sphere Focal Point Project Internal Evaluation Report.* CWS P/A.

World Bank (2005) Capacity Building in Africa: An OEC Evaluation of World Bank Support. Washington D.C: World Bank Operations Evaluations Department:

World Bank (2005) Capacity Building in Africa: An OED Evaluation of World Bank Support. Washington D.C: World Bank Operations Evaluations Department: http://www.oecd.org/countries/mozambique/35280349.pdf

World Vision (2008) World Vision. "Building Preparedness Capacity for Community Emergency Response and Disaster Mitigation", International Disaster and Risk Conference, 2008. Available: http://idrc.info/userfiles/image/presentations2008/Interiano_Maria_Luisa_Disaster_Preparedness_ Building_Preparedness_Capacity_for_Community_Emergency_Response_and_Disaster_Mitigatio n_CERDM.pdf

Yi, P., George, S. K., Paul, J. A., Lin, L. (2010) Hospital capacity planning for disaster emergency management. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences.* 44 (3), p.151-160.

Annex A   Online databases, websites and search engines consulted

A.1   Search engines and databases

Web of Knowledge
Scirus
Google Scholar
Google
Science Direct

A.2   Resource Centres and websites

Capacity.org
GSDRC
IDRC – International Development Research Centre
Learning Network on Capacity Development – LEN CD (http://www.lencd.org/case-stories)
Fragilestates.org – Fragile States Resource Center
Preventionweb

A.3   Organisations

ADB publications
Center for Global Development
CMI – Christian Michelsen Institute
DIE – German Development Institute
ECB
ECDPM
EGPA – European Group for Public Administration
FAO
FAO Office of Evaluation
GFDRR
IADB publications
IDS publications
IFRC
IIAS – International Institute for Administrative Sciences
INTRAC
Kennedy School of Government (Harvard University)
Norwegian Red Cross
ODI
OECD
Oxfam
Save the children
Tsunami Evaluation Coalition
UN
UNDP
UNISDR/Prevention
WHO
WORLD BANK

A.4   Academic Journals:

Public Administration and Development
Development Policy Review

International Review of Administrative Sciences
International Journal of Public Administration
Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding
Public Management Review
International Public Management Journal
Stability – International Journal of Security and Development
Annual Review of Environment and Resources
Disasters
Evaluation and Program Planning
Journal of Integrated Disaster Risk Management
Evaluation
Evaluation news
Policy evaluation
The evaluation exchange
Evaluation quarterly
Performance evaluation
Evaluation practice
Research evaluation
Evaluation review
Journal of multidisciplinary evaluation
New directions for evaluation
Performance evaluation review
Studies in learning, evaluation, innovation and development
Canadian journal of program evaluation
Evaluation and Program Planning
New directions for program evaluation
The American journal of evaluation

Annex B   Review Record Sheet Template

Document type	Title	Author(s)	Date	Source journal, publisher or organisation	How document was identified *(e.g. database & search terms; web resource; journal searched; direct contact with which individual/organization; an existing review; etc)*	DRM focus? *Indicate if 'major' (main focus of document); 'medium' (included as one theme); 'minor' (brief reference only)*

Capacity-building focus? *Indicate if 'major' (main focus of document); 'medium' (included as one theme); 'minor' (brief reference only)*	Countries featured in the document (if any)	Summary details of capacity-building activity - actors, scale, and scope (*what types of activities in what aspect of DRM, and how these are delivered*) *Where possible, focus particularly on c-b for DRM*	Any identified barriers/limitations to the c-b activity

Any identified enabling factors for the c-b activity	Summary details of any discussion of M&E for capacity-building	Any identified knowledge gaps re capacity-building for DRM	General lessons