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Purpose of the presentation

- To wrap-up on the process and main findings of the interim evaluation

Contents of the presentation

1. Framework of the interim evaluation (*purpose/methodology*)
2. Evaluation findings
3. Key areas of attention and recommendations
1. Evaluation framework: Purpose

- **Overall objective:** Independent assessment of project performance
- **Purpose (three-fold):**
  - Review project progress
  - Identify problems/contraints *(if any)*
  - Identify areas of attention and develop recommendations to improve implementation in the second year
- **Time-frame:** One month *(incl. feedbacks from SC)*
1. Evaluation framework: Methodology

- **Desk review**
  - Relevant resource material, EC ROM 2012

- **Structured questionnaires (DMAs and NMHSs):**
  - Participatory approach/interaction with stakeholders
  - Beneficiaries’ views and perspectives per evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability)

- **Qualitative interviews (key informants):**
  - Understanding of project background and logic, and current/future implementation
2. Evaluation findings: Relevance

- "DRR is a means to adapt to climate change impacts" – NOT a separate field

- **A.** Beneficiaries’ risk profiles and previous regional initiatives
- **B.** Coherence with HFA and alignment with global efforts for prevention
- **C.** Need for informed decision-making and role of NMHSs
- **D.** UNISDR/WMO complementary portfolio in DRM
- **E.** Key stakeholders involved in project design and governance
- **F.** Support by relevant regional initiatives (DPPI SEE, DMC/SEE, ISRBC, etc.)

Ensured project relevance
Relevance 1): *Is the project purpose consistent with and supportive of national efforts and policies in broad DRR and CRM?*

![Diagram showing the distribution of responses](image)
Relevance 2): Does the project respond to clearly identified needs/priorities of national target groups? Is the project addressing issues which are specific to your national context?

- Pronounced positive feedback proves ongoing efforts in Beneficiaries DRR/CCA (incl. NPs for DRR), follow-up with WMO/UNDP RP on DRR
- Different opinions are potential theme for discussion
Relevance 3): Has your institution been actively involved in project design? Is there a clear understanding of project purpose within your institution?

- More than 80% feel active involvement, but 3 not sure/do not feel sufficiently involved (requires clarification)
Relevance 4): Are project duration, work-plan and range of activities in which your institution is involved sufficiently realistic having regard to the available capacities for follow-up?

- Diverse capacities (incl. human resources/pool of experts) may affect full access to project services
- Diverse involvement to date in concrete implementation (n. of activities attended) has impact on opinion (more expected in coming months!)
2. Evaluation findings: Efficiency

- Good operational management + availability of resources + Beneficiries’ support = **project on track** towards planned outputs (!)
- **Not crucial delays** – rather postponements (Tasks 2,3,4,7) – due to re-assessing feasibility (**KMS and CDMS**), and re-scheduling for enhanced effectiveness (**trainings**)
- **Broad** and regular **participation** in regional events/workshops with **positive feedback** from audience (despite diverse commitment observed among Beneficiaries)
- Beneficiaries are looking forward to **second year** for further involvement
- Good management and **governance** arrangements – SC, Advisory Group, Focal Points, PCIT
- Project **communication** in line with good practice
Efficiency 1): Is there a logical sequence in the delivery of planned outputs having regard to the work-plan of activities in which your institution is involved?

- Some feel the project in initial implementation phase and may not be comfortable with assessing efficiency
- Question unclear to some
Efficiency 2): How good is the coordination of the project with other relevant ongoing initiatives and existing networks in the region?

- Establishment of **ideal environment** for **regional cooperation** by also complementing other initiatives (**though it does not always apply to national level**)}
2. Evaluation findings: Effectiveness

- **Project activities/services** appreciated overall
- **Implementation arrangements** clearly understood by stakeholders
- **Inter-institutional coordination** at national level might be an issue in some Beneficiaries (*in relation to some project tasks*)
- **Limited human/financial resources** are a challenge (*constraint*)
- Beneficiaries see clearly the **added value** of **operational cooperation**, incl. at **EU level**, and the **hands-on approach** (some require more practice)
- Results likely to be achieved and support **enhanced DRR/CRM measures** in **regional cooperation framework**
Effectiveness 1): What is the quality of the project activities and services so far?

- Reflects also affirmed positive assessment of conducted trainings/events
- Despite not all stakeholders have “used” project services to date
Effectiveness 2): Are project implementation arrangements in which your institution is involved clearly defined and understood? Are all necessary measures in place to enable your institution’s optimal participation in project activities?

- Reflects good communication and coordination between project and Beneficiaries
- Closer coordination among different groups is essential (specific to some project tasks)
Effectiveness 3): *Is your institution facing any clearly identified challenges or constraints which are affecting full access to project services?*

- Clearly identified challenges: **deficiencies in qualified staff** and necessary **IT equipment**
2. Evaluation findings: Impact prospects

- Too early to assess impact, but positive signs:
  - Support to **regional cooperation**, incl. with **EU MSs**
  - **Shared vision** of importance to work on disaster **prevention**
  - Likely **institutional changes** in some Beneficiaries
  - Widened **mandate** of DM Authorities

- **Prospective impact** expected to relate with:
  - Institutional **approaches** in DRR/CCA aligned to **EU practices**
  - Improved **cross-border measures** *(harmonized hazard analysis and mapping, hazardous hydro-met events forecasting, EWSs)*
  - Strengthened **informed decision-making/operations** in DRR
  - Increased **disaster risk insurance penetration**
  - Improved **community-based DRR** measures
Impact 1): "The likely future impact of the project includes reinforced coordination among different relevant sectors and improved measures to reduce risks and build disaster resilience in the BCs”

N. responses observed

Average rating observed
1.7 = Agree
2. Evaluation findings: Sustainability

- Intervention based on **existing institutional structures/resources**
- Project results ultimately leading to **enhanced capacities** in DMAs and NMHSs (sustainable as long as project is relevant to national contexts and supportive of national efforts)
- Strong **ownership** of target groups developed (even though with diverse capacities to deploy resources)
- **Sustainability** is **key driver** in project development by PCIT (*e.g.* CDMS upgrading/procurement)
- Facilitated **networking** with **long-lasting** potential also at EU level
- Some issues exist with **visibility** of the **work** done at NMHSs in some Beneficiaries (including at the level of International Organizations in DRR)
Sustainability 1): Are relations between your institution and the project good enough to set the ground for future collaboration with International Organizations in the fields of DRR/CCA?

- Opportunity for closer relations, for appropriate visibility of DRR-related work done at NMHSs (also towards relevant International Organizations)
Sustainability 2): Is it realistic to expect that project outputs will continue to be used in your institution once the project support will be over and that adequate resources will be committed by your institution to ensure follow-up with the project stream of benefits after project completion?

N. responses observed

- Likely very much is depending on mobilization of resources to support DRR in the Beneficiaries, incl. through external funding
3. Key areas of attention/recommendations

A. Enhance emphasis on close dialogue/teamwork among traditional DM/DRR actors, NMHSs and other groups (for improved change in approach from DM to broader DRR/CCA)

B. Secure optimal participation in up-coming project activities by all Beneficiaries

C. Secure timely KMS implementation to ensure appropriate project support – in cooperation with DPPI SEE – with operating and promoting the system among stakeholders (ownership, sustainability)

D. Extend in depth hands-on approach in training events (when appropriate/needed)

E. Review project LogFrame (links between activities and results; indicators)
Thank you for your attention and for your cooperation in the conduction of this interim evaluation!

Antonio Barbera