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CHAPTER 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluation of the Project “Preparedness, response and early recovery for multi-risk scenarios and mainstreaming of risk management in development planning” (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”) was carried out from November – December 2014 by an independent consultant Nana Gibradze. It was commissioned by UNDP Peru on behalf of the Disaster Preparedness Programme of ECHO (DIPECHO), and the consortium of UN agencies involved in the implementation of the Project: United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Pan-American Health Organization of the World Health Organization (WHO/PAHO) and World Food Programme (WFP).

The timing of the Evaluation was determined by the following factors:

1. The Project has implemented all activities as spelled out in the Project Document/Single Form and was scheduled to close upon completion of the 18-month timeframe of the DIPECHO-funded projects;

2. The forthcoming launch of the IX DIPECHO Action Plan in 2014 presented the opportunity for the consortium members to apply for DIPECHO funding for the possible replication and expansion of the Project.

Linked to these factors are the primary purposes of the Evaluation:

1. To assess the implementation of the Project and the achievement of expected results according to the Project Document/Single Form and the workplan;

2. To compile and analyze the lessons learned in the course of the Project implementation for their subsequent consideration in future joint endeavors with DIPECHO, UN Agencies and Peruvian Government including INDECI, CENEPRED, Risk Management Secretariat of the PCM, Provincial and District Municipalities, Sectorial Ministries, etc.

3. To extract replicable models and mechanisms for multi-risk scenario mainstreaming in risk management and development planning for their application in various locations of the country with the diverse types of natural phenomena.

The overall objective of the Project was to strengthen disaster preparedness, response and recovery capacities of public and private actors and local populations in the Provinces of Trujillo, Cañete, Paita, Tumbes and Huaura as well as Metropolitan Lima through the implementation of management and planning tools for disaster preparedness, response and early recovery and awareness raising on and empowerment of local populations for disaster risk management.

The expected result of the Project was:

1. Strengthened capacities of public and private actors and the population in general for preparedness, response and early recovery.

The Project interventions were focused on the Departments of Tumbes, Lima and La Libertad, namely the Provinces of Paita (Piura), Trujillo, Cañete y Huaura.
The immediate direct beneficiaries of the Project included 601,880 representatives of local and government authorities and officers, Technical staff from public and private institutions, leaders of grassroots organizations and members of volunteers’ brigades from communities in risk-prone areas, general population. The indirect or “catchment” beneficiaries comprise approximately 1,800,000 inhabitants of the provinces of Piaya, Tumbes, Trujillo, Huaura, Cañete and Metropolitan Lima that are expected to benefit from the Project products and results. The catchment population is estimated to represent 20% of the population of these provinces.

The Project implementation timeframe is from 1 April 2013 till 31 January 2014. The Project has been approved by the Consortium of UN Agencies including the UNDP, UNFPA, WHO/PAHO and UNFPA, as well as the representatives of the INDECI.

The Project represents a continuation of the two earlier joint INDECI/UNDP/ECHO projects: “Seismic and Tsunami Disaster Preparedness and Early Recovery in Lima and Callao” which was implemented from 2009 - 2011 and “Preparedness, Response and Early Recovery for Earthquakes and Tsunamis in Selected Areas of the Peruvian Coast” implemented from 2011 – 2012. The Project builds on the results, experiences and lessons of the previous projects as well as the tools and mechanisms piloted therein.

The Evaluation considers that the Project has fully achieved the intended Output/Specific Objective based on the targets and indicators spelled out in the Prodoc. The change in the output has been positive and was supported by the evidence gathered through the evaluation process.

The achievement of the output has been steady despite delays related to internal administrative obstacles and external institutional challenges (see below). Most of the implementation proceeded according to the workplan and by the time of the Evaluation 90% of the Project activities have been implemented and Project products produced as planned. The remaining activities were expected to be implemented on time.

The Evaluation concludes that the Project was relevant and effective and has achieved reasonable efficiency in the use of human and financial resources. The Project has stimulated political incidence and has generated innovative mechanisms and products, which include highly successful communication strategy, strategic partnerships with academia, private companies and other UN Agencies and Projects (UNV and TACC).

The Evaluation concludes that the Project has contributed significantly to the potential impact of the intended outcome through the improvement of lives of Project beneficiaries, contributing to the quantitative change in the understanding of disaster risks and in response capacities. The Project has achieved positive change in the awareness and knowledge about disaster risks that can affect positively their wellbeing and have life-saving effects in future. The Project has contributed to the increase in the resilience of local populations through the provision of early warning training and equipment.

The Project has encountered challenges of which the majority were exogenous challenges linked with the institutional weaknesses, insufficient coordination
between key stakeholders, legal loopholes and lack of awareness and application of the SINAGERD Law, lack of commitment and political will and high turnover of public personnel; lack of awareness and interest among the communities.

The endogenous challenges and limitations included administrative obstacles and delays in procurement of goods and services; absence of small cash amounts for unexpected expenses in the field; limited human resource capacity in Tumbes and Paita provinces.

The Evaluation elaborated a series of recommendations for a possible continuation of the Project, which include strengthening institution linkages between the key stakeholders; fostering awareness on GRD through enhances communication strategies and products; strengthening of national capacities through targeted trainings and diploma courses, provision of equipment and tools, strengthening and harmonizing information management systems, offering publicly available spaces for information sharing and experience exchanges; stronger engagement of civil society and private sector; engagement and awareness raising of newly elected/reelected officials through awareness raising and recognition activities, induction and executive courses; strengthening of student-teacher-parent nexus by replicating successful interventions in other educational facilities and involving trained beneficiaries as promoters/trainers for multiplying effect.

CHAPTER 2: INTRODUCTION

Purpose and timing of the Evaluation

Evaluation of the Project “Preparedness, response and early recovery for multi-risk scenarios and mainstreaming of risk management in development planning” (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”) was carried out from November – December 2014 by an independent consultant Nana Gibradze. It was commissioned by UNDP Peru on behalf of the Disaster Preparedness Programme of ECHO (DIPECHO), and the consortium of UN agencies involved in the implementation of the Project: United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Pan-American Health Organization of the World Health Organization (WHO/PAHO) and World Food Programme (WFP).

The timing of the Evaluation was determined by the following factors:

1. The Project has implemented all activities as spelled out in the Project Document/Single Form and was scheduled to close upon completion of the 18-month timeframe of the DIPECHO-funded projects;
2. The forthcoming launch of the IX DIPECHO Action Plan in 2014 presented the opportunity for the consortium members to apply for DIPECHO funding for the possible replication and expansion of the Project.

Linked to these factors are the primary purposes of the Evaluation:

1. To assess the implementation of the Project and the achievement of expected results according to the Project Document/Single Form and the workplan;
2. To compile and analyze the lessons learned in the course of the Project implementation for their subsequent consideration in future joint endeavors
with DIPECHO, UN Agencies and Peruvian Government including INDECI, CENEPRED, Risk Management Secretariat of the PCM, Provincial and District Municipalities, Sectorial Ministries, etc.

4. To extract replicable models and mechanisms for multi-risk scenario mainstreaming in risk management and development planning for their application in various locations of the country with the diverse types of natural phenomena.

Primary Audience of Evaluation

In line with the UNEG norms for Evaluation in the UN System the present evaluation will contribute to knowledge building and organizational improvement through sharing the findings and lessons learned with all concerned stakeholders.

The primary users of this Evaluation are the DIPECHO and the Consortium of UNCT agencies involved in the implementation of the Project: UNDP, UNFPA, WHO/PAHO and WFP, who will use the evaluation findings and recommendations for future interventions aimed at preparedness, response and early recovery from multi-risk scenarios and mainstreaming risk management in development planning in diverse geographical settings and types of disaster risk. The conclusions and recommendations will contribute to further strengthening of the mechanisms of interagency cooperation piloted by the previous DIPECHO projects and the modalities of cooperation with the key Government stakeholders.

Key conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the evaluation will be used to contribute the preparation of a new DIPECHO proposal to be submitted for the IX DIPECHO Action Plan in early 2015.

The main findings of the final report will be shared with the key stakeholders of the Government of Peru to contribute to the improvement of public policies and institutional structures aimed at reducing the vulnerability of the Peruvian population to disasters caused by natural phenomena, increasing resilience and coping capacities and mechanisms and achieving long-term sustainable development.

Structure and contents of report

The report largely follows the structure recommended in the Evaluation Report Template of the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. However, in some cases the sequence has been modified to better reflect the logic of the information analyzed by the Evaluation. The Report contains 12 chapters.

Chapter 1 offers the audience a 2,5-page Executive Summary of the Evaluation with key findings, conclusions and recommendations and lessons learned.

Chapter 2 introduces the purpose and the timing of Evaluation, describes the primary audience of the Evaluation and outlines the structure and contents of the Report.

Chapter 3 presents the basic background information about the Project, explains key Project objectives and expected results as stipulated in the Results Framework Matrix, linking them with corporate priorities and strategic plans; and outlines the
Project strategy. It also identifies the beneficiaries and strategic partners, describes
the implementation arrangements and funding situation.

Chapter 4 explains what the Evaluation intends to achieve and how, and points to
the issues not covered by the Evaluation, defines the Evaluation scope, objectives,
criteria and type of information generated by the Evaluation.

Chapter 5 describes selected methods of analysis and rationale for their selection,
defines data sources, data collection procedures and methods, describes the
sampling methods applied and identifies limitations of the selected methodology.
The Chapter also describes what type of data was collected, how this data was
processed and identifies challenges of data analysis.

Chapter 6 offers the Findings of the Evaluation. It includes the findings related to the
achievement of the Project Output in accordance with the Results and Resources
Framework (RRF), as well as the general achievements, challenges and limitations,
political incidence, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, visibility and sustainability.

Chapter 7 provides the list of lessons learned during the Evaluation.

Chapter 8 consolidates the Evaluation conclusions drawn as the result of the analysis
of the findings and lessons learned, following the Evaluation criteria described in
Chapter 4.

Chapter 9 offers a list of recommendations to DIPECHO, UNDP Peru and UN
Consortium Agencies and by proxy, to the Government and people of Peru.

Chapter 10 lists the consulted data sources and the bibliography.

Chapter 11 contains the list of abbreviations and acronyms

Chapter 12 contains the list of annexes.

CHAPTER 3: INTERVENTION DESCRIPTION

Subject of Evaluation

The primary subject of the Evaluation is the UN Interagency Project “Preparedness,
response and early recovery for multi-risk scenarios and mainstreaming of risk
management in development planning”, which is currently in the last stage of
implementation.

The overall objective of the Project was to strengthen disaster preparedness,
response and recovery capacities of public and private actors and local populations
in the Provinces of Trujillo, Cañete, Paita, Tumbes and Huaura as well as
Metropolitan Lima through the implementation of management and planning tools
for disaster preparedness, response and early recovery and awareness raising on and
empowerment of local populations for disaster risk management.

More specifically the Project aimed at:

1. Strengthening the disaster risk management capacities of public officials and
technical personnel at local and regional levels;

3. Raising awareness of authorities and populations for generating behavioral change regarding the exposure to disaster risks in their communities and taking action for reducing vulnerability.

Within these objectives the expected result of the Project was:

1. Strengthened capacities of public and private actors and the population in general for preparedness, response and early recovery.

Geographic Scope and Beneficiaries

The Project interventions were focused on the Departments of Tumbes, Lima and La Libertad, namely the Provinces of Paita (Piura), Trujillo, Cañete y Huaura.

The immediate direct beneficiaries of the Project included 601,880 representatives of local and government authorities and officers, Technical staff from public and private institutions, leaders of grassroots organizations and members of volunteers’ brigades from communities in risk-prone areas, general population.

The indirect or “catchment” beneficiaries comprise approximately 1,800,000 inhabitants of the provinces of Paita, Tumbes, Trujillo, Huaura, Cañete and Metropolitan Lima that are expected to benefit from the Project products and results. The catchment population is estimated to represent 20% of the population of these provinces.

Implementation Phases, Strategic lines and Programmatic linkages

The Project has been approved by the Consortium of UN Agencies including the UNDP, UNFPA, WHO/PAHO and UNFPA, as well as the representatives of the INDECI. The Project implementation timeframe is from 1 April 2013 till 31 January 2014, while the deadline for official closure is March 2015.

The Project represents a continuation of the two earlier joint INDECI/UNDP/ECHO projects: “Seismic and Tsunami Disaster Preparedness and Early Recovery in Lima and Callao” which was implemented from 2009 - 2011 and “Preparedness, Response and Early Recovery for Earthquakes and Tsunamis in Selected Areas of the Peruvian Coast” implemented from 2011 – 2012. The Project builds on the results, experiences and lessons of the previous projects as well as the tools and mechanisms piloted therein.

The most important element replicated from the previous projects was the integrated approach to building national capacities for disaster risk management through information management, decision-making, institutional coordination at local, regional and national levels and public-private partnerships. This integrated approach allows to address a number of issues of strategic importance articulated in the national policies and plans as well as the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, such as reducing vulnerability and poverty and achievement of MDGs, advancing gender equality, strengthening local governance and decentralization, environmental sustainability etc.
At a country level, the Project is harmonized with the UNDAF Expected Outcome 12: “Capacities strengthened at three levels of the Government, civil society, private sector and scientific and academic institutions for integration and mainstreaming of disaster risk management and climate change adaptation processes in development policies, plans and programmes, which contribute to the reduction of vulnerabilities and increase in the resilience of the population”.

Institutional Settings

As in the previous projects, the primary governmental counterpart of the Project is the Institute for Civil Defense (INDECI) with other responsible institutions including the National Center for Disaster Risk Assessment, Prevention and Reduction (CENEPRED), Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF) functioning under the auspices of the National System for Disaster Risk Management (SINAGERD).

The SINAGERD, created under the Law # 29664 and its regulation # 048-2011-PCM, is an inter-institutional, synergetic, decentralized, transversal and participatory system, with the objective to identify and reduce the risks associated with the hazards or minimize their effects, and to avoid the generation of new risks and prepare and response to disaster situations by means of establishment of Disaster Risk Management principles, policy guidelines, components, processes and instruments. Since its creation in 2011, the System has evolved from a mainly civil defense focus towards one focused on disaster risk management, leading to new institutional arrangements, such as the creation of Disaster Risk Management working groups, Civil Defense Platforms and Emergency operations Centers at territorial and sectoral levels.

The SINAGERD is governed by the Presidential Council of Ministers (PCM) under the strategic direction of the Presidency of the Republic and the National Council for Disaster Risk Management. Key line ministries such as the Ministry of Health, Education, Interior Affairs, Defense, Environment, Agriculture etc. are integrated in the National Council for DRM.

Within the SINAGERD, the INDECI is a public executive body in charge of formulation, coordination and articulation of the policies and processes related to Preparedness, Response and Rehabilitation at the three government levels. The INDECI functions in coordination with the Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF), National Centre for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN), National Information System on Disaster Risk Management, and National Centre for Assessment, Prevention and Reduction of Disaster Risks (CENEPRED), which incorporates the Programme for Reducing the Vulnerability to El Niño Phenomenon (PREVEN).

INDECI is responsible for managing the National Information System for Response and Rehabilitation (SINPAD), which is based on an internet-based information system, comprised of a set of information services aimed at proper registering, maintenance, reference and utilization of Response and Recovery information by private and public entities as well as citizens at large in close interaction with the SINAGERD.

The CENEPRED is a public executive body with technical responsibility for coordination, facilitation and supervision of formulation and implementation of the
National Plan for Disaster Risk Management, with comprises risk assessment, prevention and reduction as well as reconstruction processes; advising, elaboration and establishment of technical guidelines and mechanisms for the development of the above processes for different public and private entities that form part of the System. The CENEPRED manages the Disaster Risk Management Information System (SIGRID), which is a web-based geo-spatial platform designed to consult, share, analyze and monitor territorial information at national and local levels.

The CENEPRED also offers advisory services to the SINAGERD governing bodies regarding the National Disaster Risk Management Policy. The Policy, approved by the Supreme Decree # 111-2012-PCM is a set of directions aimed at prevent or reduce disaster risks, avoid generation of new risks and carry out adequate disaster preparedness, attention, rehabilitation and reconstruction measures as well as to minimize their adverse effects on the population, economy and environment. Public entities at all levels of the Government are responsible for implementing the guidelines of the National Policy within their respective planning processes.

Within the framework of SINAGERD, CENEPRED operates at the risk level and is in charge of the “prospective” management in the risk-prone areas and “corrective” management in the areas of consolidated risk. The engagement of INDECI is expected in the context of disasters, with the responsibility for “reactive” management in the areas of disaster impact.

The international institutional framework is composed of the ECHO Representation in Quito and the consortium of United Nations agencies with the field presence in Peru: UNDP, UNFPA, WHO/PAHO and WFP. In addition to the consortium the Project launched strategic collaboration with the UNV, deploying national UNV to project sites. Within the Project framework each agency collaborated with the INDECI and the line ministries: Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Women and Social Development as well as their regional directorates and regional and local governments.

Project Design

As in the previous two projects, due the nature of the intervention, the Project implementation was guided by two programmatic frameworks that outlined the intervention objectives, activities and results: The DIPECHO Single Form for Humanitarian Aid Actions and UNDP Project document format. Both documents are fully compatible and complementary and have been referred to extensively during the Project Evaluation. For the purposes of this report the UNDP Project Document format is used as a primary reference document.

The Project Document is well developed and provides adequate background information and contents. The Project rationale and objectives are coherent and well aligned with the UNDAF, namely the Expected Outcome 12. The Project cover page and the Results and Resources Framework make reference to the Country Programme Outcome 60, which repeats the text of the UNDAF Expected Outcome 2. The Evaluation could not find the named Outcome 60 in the Provided Country Programme document. Likewise, the Project Results and Resources Framework (RRF) erroneously refers to the Key Result Area of UNDP Strategic Plan for 2012-2016: Reduction of Natural Disaster Risks and Climate Change Adaptation. The timeframe
for the previous Strategic Plan was 2008-2011 (extended to 2013, whereas the timeframe of the current Plan is 2014-2017.

The Evaluation noted the improvement in the use of terminology in the Results and Resource Framework Matrix since the last Project Document. The terminology use is adequate as prescribed by the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. The Output baselines are of a general, descriptive nature and lack quantitative parameters to provide measurable base for setting the targets. Targets and indicators are clear, realistic and measurable, however, rather than the baseline, these are harmonized with the project Output.

The Management Arrangements are clearly defined. The structure and the functions of the Project Board, Project Assurance and Project Manager are well defined and clear. The Prodoc also clearly defines roles and responsibilities of participating UN Agencies, administrative and coordination mechanisms as well as financial management arrangements.

The signed Project Document contains a detailed component “Quality Management for Project Activity Results”, a Risk Log and a Monitoring Plan. The two latter documents are well developed and detailed.

The Legal Framework component of the Prodoc lists legal documents and agreements that frame the activities of UNDP, WHO/PAHO, WFP and UNFPA in Peru.

The Budget and the Workplan provides detailed breakdown of activities/costs per donor/implementing agency.

The Project document does not contain the sustainability strategy. The latter is provided in the Single Form.

*Execution and Implementation Modalities*

The Project was Directly Implemented (DIM) by UNDP in coordination with the implementing partners: WHO/PAHO, WFP and UNFPA as well as the UNV. At the national level, the Project was implemented in close coordination with the INDECI, CENEPRED, Ministry of Economy and Finance, Ministry of Health, ministry of Woman and Vulnerable Populations, Ministry of Housing, Construction and Sanitation and Ministry of Environment.

The official counterpart and the co-signatory of the Project is the INDECI, which has the overall responsibility for the coordination of preparedness, response and rehabilitation activities at the national level. Together with the CENEPRED, the INDECI participated in the strategic decision-making processes of the Project, within their respective mandates.

As in the previous project, UNDP has been designated the Administrative Agent of the Project in charge of administering donor funds, financial and Project management overall coordination and convening functions. The WHO/PAHO implemented corresponding components directly, including contracting and disbursement of funds, through fund advances; WFP had delegated contracting and payment responsibilities to UNDP, whereas UNFPA components have been fully managed by UNDP.
The Central Technical Team in charge of the Project implementation consists of one Project Coordinator, 3 Field Coordinators, 4 UNV and a Project Assistant. The Project Coordinator works under the direct supervision of the UNDP Programme Officer in charge of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Environment area.

The Project Coordinator is responsible for the achievement of outputs and daily handling of the Project. The Project Coordinator is supported by three Field Coordinators located in the three Project intervention sites, (Tumbes/Paita, Lima and La Libertad Provinces), who are responsible for carrying out Project activities in the field under the guidance of the Project Coordinator. A Project Assistant and the UNDP Operations (Procurement) Unit provide administrative and financial support to project implementation in collaboration with the WHO/PAHO, WFP and UNFPA teams.

The Project has a formally established Joint Project Board comprised of the representatives of the following:

- Key Beneficiary – Regional Governments of Tumbes, Piura, La Libertad, Lima, Metropolitan Municipality of Lima, INDECI, CENEPRED;
- Executive – UNDP;
- Senior Supplier – UNDP/DIPECHO including WHO/PAHO, WFP and UNFPA;

The Project Assurance functions are assigned to the UNDP Programme Officer. Implementation support is provided by the Technical Team composed of UNDP/UNV, WHO, WFP and UNFPA.

The Board has met twice in the Project lifetime to discuss main strategic lines, project priorities and implementation arrangements and to discuss the Project progress. The Project has also received two monitoring visits from DIPECHO representatives.

Strategic Partnerships

The Project has established successful partnership arrangements at different government levels. Apart from the key counterpart and implementing partner INDECI, the Project has strengthened its partnership and collaboration with the CENEPRED and the Risk Management Secretariat of the Presidential Council of Ministers (PCM), Geophysical Institute of Peru (IGP), National Meteorology and Hydrology Service (SENAMHI)¹ regional governments of La Libertad and Lima, Metropolitan Municipality of Lima, Provincial Municipalities of Trujillo, Huaura, Cañete, Paita and Tumbes, District Municipalities of Huanchaco, Salaverry, Moche and El Porvenir.

The Project has continued to successfully foster partnerships at the community level, with the community groups and grass roots organizations that have participated in trainings and drills. The Project has also continued the establishment of groundbreaking public-private partnerships between the municipal authorities and major private transportation, food and warehouse and logistical companies in the target provinces and districts.

¹ Through the TACC Project.
The Project has constructed successful partnerships with the academia through the Diploma Course and the mini-series and has established synergies with the Project: Territorial Approach to Climate Change (TACC).

CHAPTER 4: EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

Evaluation Objectives

The objective of the Evaluation was to provide external analysis of the following:

- Implementation of activities
- Achievement of results
- Impact of the results on the achievement of the objectives
- Sustainability of the launched processes (national ownership)
- Replicability of the instruments in other parts of the city and the country.

The Evaluation was to extract lessons learned from the launched processes, intervention strategy and the methodology and provide recommendations for the strengthening and replicability of these actions in similar initiatives. The Evaluation was to analyze in a cross-cutting manner the relevance, efficacy, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the actions.

Evaluation Scope

The Evaluation, which was conducted in Peru and Panama, assessed the implementation of the output of the Project Document:

Output: Public and private actors in 4 departments (Lima, La Libertad, Piura and Tumbes) apply management and planning tools for disaster preparedness, response and early recovery with populations sensitized and empowered on disaster risk management.

This output corresponds to the Specific Objective of the DIPECHO Single Form for Humanitarian Aid Actions:

Specific Objective. Strengthened capacities of public and private actors and the population in general for preparedness, response and early recovery.

The Evaluation assessed the relevance of the said output with regards to the achievement of the intended UNDAF Outcome # 12: “Capacities strengthened at three levels of the Government, civil society, private sector and scientific and academic institutions for integration and mainstreaming of disaster risk management and climate change adaptation processes in development policies, plans and programmes, which contribute to the reduction of vulnerabilities and increase in the resilience of the population”.

The Evaluation assessed the adequacy of the Project baseline data, indicators and targets following the SMART criteria; effectiveness of Project interventions and efficiency in the use of funds and human resources.
The Evaluation reviewed the overall progress of the Project since its inception, assessed the validity of existing strategic directions of the Project in the current socio-political context.

The Evaluation reviewed the implementation modalities of the Project, financial and administrative arrangements to determine if the Project had adequate financial and human resource capacity to achieve the intended outputs, if the resource mobilization was adequate and successful and if the use of funds was appropriate and served the Project objectives.

The Evaluation investigated whether the services provided by the Project were adequate, timely, efficient and effective, in line with the corporate values and strategic priorities as defined in the UNDAF. It also assessed the quality of cooperation and partnership of the Project with the key stakeholders and reviewed the relevance of the Project in the current political and socio-economic context of Peru.

The Evaluation assessed the model of interagency cooperation among the consortium of UN agencies implementing the Project, including the administrative arrangements, operational and technical coordination, advantages and limitations as well as replicable experiences and processes.

The Evaluation did not specifically assess the financial efficiency and financial management arrangements of the Project. However, general conclusions were made on the overall financial performance and management arrangements on the basis of audit reports and financial reports reviewed during the evaluation.

The Evaluation did not evaluate the technical validity of the Project-produced plans, manuals and tools. Instead it assessed their quality, utility and relevance for strengthening disaster preparedness and response capacities of the stakeholders.

The Project did not assess the impact of the project on the achievement of the UNDAF/Country Programme outcomes or of broader development goals given the relatively short life of the Project. However, the Evaluation verified to what extent the processes, mechanisms and tools introduced by the Project contributed to the achievement of the outcome, helped bring about changes in human development conditions, including in the behavior of people and/or institutions targeted through UNDP initiatives” (UNDP) and have triggered political incidence leading to potential long-term impact.

Based on the findings of the Evaluation and the consultations with the implementing partners, the Evaluation identified replicable activities and products as well as several key lessons learned and provided the Project management and implementing partners with a number of recommendations for the possible second phase of the Project.

*Evaluation Criteria and Questions*

The Evaluation criteria were based on the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the Project and its interventions, as well as the relevance of institutional arrangements and strategic partnerships that contribute to the
achievement of the ultimate outcomes of the Project and the sustainability of its results.

Interview and focus group questions were based on the evaluation criteria mentioned above as well as the specific questions related to the respondents’ particular role and engagement in the Project. The questions focused primarily on the overall relevance of the Project activities in the regional, provincial and district context, relevance and sustainability of the mechanisms and tools, quality of learning and capacity building activities and materials, quality of services provided by the Project, major achievements and problems, lessons learned and replicability of results, agency-specific contributions, institutional coordination, etc.

Specific questions related to the Project design, relevance of outputs, activities indicators, baseline data and targets, administrative and financial management arrangements and the like were directed to the Project staff directly involved in the Project implementation. Likewise, questions related to the inter-agency cooperation were addressed to the representatives of the UN agencies involved in the Project.

The Evaluation tried to minimize the response bias by wording the questions without suggesting the leading opinion.

A consolidated list of indicative questions is given in Annex 1. Evaluation Matrix

CHAPTER 5: EVALUATION APPROACH, METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

Data sources
The Evaluation used the following data sources: UNDP and ECHO strategic and programmatic frameworks; national legal and conceptual documents; basic Project information; project reports; stakeholder information; and financial information.

The full list of the data sources is given in Chapter 11: Data Sources and Bibliography.

Sample and Sampling Frame
The type and methodology of the Evaluation was determined by various factors: the nature of the project; scope of the Evaluation; and quality of the available data and sampling method.

The current Evaluation was a non-experimental summative output evaluation. The purposive sample was constructed from the respondents intentionally selected by the Project Management from the population of Project stakeholders and direct beneficiaries. The sample consisted of 2 categories: Direct Beneficiaries and Implementing Partners. The Direct Beneficiary category was divided into 3 geographical sub-groups: Trujillo, Tumbes/Piura and Lima and included regional, provincial and district authorities, civil society and community groups.

The Implementing partners’ category contained two sub-groups: National (INDECI, CENEPRED, Risk Management Secretariat, SENAMHI, Risk Management Working Groups and Platforms, communities and civil society) and International Partners (UNDP (including the TACC project), WFP, WHO/PAHO, UNFPA and UNV). In addition
to the indicative questions described earlier, the respondents in the latter sub-group answered questions regarding the institutional coordination and interagency cooperation and overall lessons learned on implementation and technical contents.

The size and the structure of the sample was directly related to the specific task at hand: to test the validity, sustainability and replicability of the mechanisms and tools piloted by the Project as well as the increase in the capacities of primary Project stakeholders. All respondents were directly involved in the elaboration and testing of these tools and had specific relevant knowledge and experience.

Given the nature of the sample and the evaluation method (qualitative) the internal and external validity posed a challenge. In order to increase the credibility and validity of the findings the Evaluation first cross-examined the data from each sub group within the Category 1. Direct Beneficiaries. The Evaluation then compared the findings with the data obtained from the Category 2. Implementing partners as well as secondary data sources. Finally, the Evaluation triangulated the findings with the findings from the previous Project interventions, given the similarity of the interventions. Despite the obvious deficiency of this method, in the absence of “treatment” and “control” groups typical to randomized controlled trials, it allowed to measure the effects of the Project in the course of the time.

**Basic Statistics**

The evaluation reviewed more than 50 documents and reference materials, conducted field visits to the Project sites and interviewed and had conversations with more than 100 respondents. In addition to the respondents included in the sample, the Evaluation interviewed a representative of DIPECHO as well as the Project staff. While not included in the sample, information provided by these respondents was valuable for the assessment of the project implementation, achievement of the output, analysis of challenges and triangulation of the main findings, especially given some of the respondents’ knowledge of previous interventions.

The Evaluation conducted individual and group (2-3 person) interviews and focus groups. 1 interview with the ECHO representative was conducted by phone/Skype. The rest of the interviews were conducted in person during the mission to Peru.

**Data collection Procedures and Instruments**

Given the characteristics of the sample the Evaluation applied exclusively qualitative data collection methodology. Qualitative analysis, albeit non-generalizable, allows for better understanding the mechanisms through which the program helps beneficiaries (WB Handbook on Impact Evaluation), and permits to work with issues related to “soft” and intangible products associated with processes, as well as perceptions related to knowledge and capacities.

The primary qualitative data used for the Evaluation was comprised of the knowledge, opinions and commentary of the stakeholders and beneficiaries. This information was gathered through a combination of semi-structured interviews (1 and 2 persons) and focus groups conducted during the 11-day visit to Peru. It also included Evaluator’s observations from visits to Project sites, and information provided by DIPECHO management and Project staff.
The secondary qualitative data was comprised of the information generated by the Project such as methodological instruments, plans, manuals, reports, as well as the data generated by UNDP and stakeholders. Substantial data was obtained from the presentations and training materials during the closure workshop organized by the Project in Lima to present the Project products and results.

The proportion of weight of the primary and secondary qualitative data in the final analysis is approximately 85:15.

As for the quantitative data, the non-experimental nature of this Evaluation and the small size of the sample, it was obtained primarily from the indicators of Project Outputs as presented in the Annual Workplan. The share of quantitative data in the final analysis is less than 1%.

Stakeholder Participation

The evaluation was guided by the fundamental premise of transparency and consultation with the major stakeholders, which are essential features in all stages of the evaluation process. As defined by UNEG, consultation during the evaluation process “improves the credibility and quality of the evaluation, [it] can facilitate consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations”².

UNDP handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results states that “… key partners and stakeholders must play an integral part in the evaluation from the outset to ensure national ownership of the results.”

In line with these provisions, the Project management was engaged directly with key national stakeholders at the central, regional, provincial and district level. Key stakeholders participated in the interviews and were duly informed about the Project Evaluation and provided with the relevant information.

Ethical Considerations

In line with the UNDP Evaluation Policy and the UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, the evaluation was based on the principles of independence, intentionality, transparency, and ethical integrity. Some respondents were informed of the objectives, scope and criteria of the Evaluation beforehand by the Project and by the Evaluator during the interviews. All interviews were preceded by the explanation of the Evaluation objectives. On those occasions when the interviews were recorded, the responses were requested the permission to record.

Background Information

The Evaluation was conducted by independent consultant Nana Gibradze. Although the competitive selection process had been initiated on the basis of the existing RBLAC consultant roster, it was waived given that other consultants were not available during the proposed timeframe.

² Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, p. 10. UNEG, 2005
CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS

Achievement of Output

The Evaluation considers that the Project has fully achieved the intended Output/Specific Objective based on the targets and indicators spelled out in the Prodoc. The change in the output has been positive and was supported by the evidence gathered through the evaluation process.

The achievement of the output has been steady despite delays related to internal administrative obstacles and external institutional challenges (see below). Most of the implementation proceeded according to the workplan and by the time of the Evaluation 90% of the Project activities have been implemented and Project products produced as planned. The remaining activities were expected to be implemented on time.

Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Visibility

The Evaluation concludes that the Project has been highly relevant at all levels of intervention, given that it addresses the existing priorities and needs in the beneficiary provinces/districts/communities. These needs and priorities include strengthening of national capacities for DRM, information management and awareness raising among affected authorities and communities given the persistent institutional weaknesses and lack of awareness and knowledge on DRM issues. The Project addressed the vulnerabilities identified in the needs assessment conducted by the participating UN agencies and selected target populations in accordance to their vulnerability profiles and needs.

As mentioned earlier, the objectives of the Project have been relevant for the strategic development priorities spelled out in the UNDAF by contributing to the strengthening the capacities of national stakeholders at different levels (provincial/district/metropolitan authorities, communities, private sector), raising awareness and fostering the integration of DRM concepts in the local planning and budgeting and focusing interventions on the reduction of vulnerability among the target populations.

The Project team has built its intervention on the basis of the results and lessons learned in the previous two interventions. The Project has built on the innovative implementation modality of the UN Consortium tested in the previous project and incorporated new innovative elements into the implementation strategy by strengthening the communication and awareness component, offering diploma courses for public servants and engaging national volunteers in the communication and community engagement components.

The implemented activities as well as the established strategic partnerships and agreements have mostly been adequate for the achievement of the results. The Project has secured strong support and participation from the Project stakeholders and has introduced new actors in the implementation strategy.

Overall, the institutional arrangements were mostly adequate and favorable to the implementation. The Consortium of the UN Agencies has further strengthened its coordination and decision making mechanisms and has not experienced major
challenges, except for those caused by differences in financial management instruments between the PAHO and UNDP.

Overall, the Project has demonstrated adequate and efficient use of human and financial resources. The total budget of the Project was USD 1,489,790.58, which is equivalent of 1,138,200 Euros. Of these, USD 1,439,790.58 (1,100,000 Euro) was provided by ECHO, whereas USD 50,000 (38,200 Euro) was the contribution of the UNDP. The UN Agencies contributed USD 218,134 in kind whereas the Government contributed USD 172,922. Activities and inputs of the TACC Project, executed in parallel with the Project, amounted to USD 134,566 and were not included in the total requested budget.

The funds have been utilized to finance consultant and personnel costs, trainings and workshops, provision of equipment, data collection and analysis for mapping, elaboration of protocols, manuals and plans, information and awareness campaigns, production of communication, knowledge and visibility materials as required for the achievement of the output.

By the time of the Evaluation, the budget delivery was 90% and the Project was on track to achieve 100% execution by the end of March.

The Project has started with a strong recognition among the key stakeholders and some beneficiaries given its long-standing successful engagement in the target areas. The current intervention has also garnered significant visibility and recognition given the close engagement approach of the Project Technical Team, strong emphasis on participation of beneficiaries and the reinforced communication component engaging professional communicators. All Stakeholders were duly acknowledged in the audio and visual material, which included posters, publications, billboards, video and photo products and Project related documentation.

Achievements and Strengths

The Evaluation considers that the Project has implemented successfully all activities and has generated certain political incidence through its interventions.\(^4\)

The Project has received overwhelmingly positive ratings and has been considered by all respondents as successfully implemented.

The Project was valued for its contributions to the strengthening of national capacities (both governmental and civil society/community) through targeted trainings, diploma courses, DRM information and tools and vulnerability assessment.

The Project has been valued positively for the technical assistance provided to the authorities at different levels in designing DRM-oriented budgeting and planning proposals. The respondents particularly valued knowledge and tools for public finance planning and implementation, especially related to the Budgetary

---

\(^3\) The Government contribution was executed directly by the Government and was not included in the total requested budget.

\(^4\) Political incidence is a set of “activities aimed to increase access to/generate influence on the actors who have decision-making power in matters of importance for a group or for the society at large”. (WOLA).
Programme 068 of the Ministry of Economy and Finance - PPR 068\(^5\), which has been unanimously considered as a useful and relevant tool. Both the DRM and Food Security Diploma Courses have been highly praised by both the course alumni and the authorities that benefitted from the trained personnel.

All activities conducted by the Consortium have been valued positively, noting the importance of coordinated interventions in the area of food security and health. The respondents evaluated as outstanding trainings and capacity building activities for food security assessments, early recovery and gender mainstreaming in DRM interventions, application of hospital security index, disaster preparedness and response capacity assessments in healthcare facilities and networks. Respondents both in Government and communities stressed the importance of capacities strengthening and information related to post disaster needs assessment (PDNA) and continuous engagement of private sector through Private Public Partnership agreements initiated in the previous projects.

All activities related to strengthening community capacities have been positively valued, noting that interventions aimed at strengthening community brigades and awareness raising among the communities remains one of the key priorities in vulnerable provinces and districts of Peru. The respondents valued highly the investments made by the Project for establishing Early Warning Systems (equipment, backpacks, evacuation signs and/or plans, contingency plans), which when combined with trainings and awareness raising activities, are most effective for reducing vulnerability to disasters.

The Project has been valued positively for strengthening technical capacities and infrastructure of the provincial and district emergency operation centers (EOC) and providing technical assistance for the elaboration of the emergency operation plans. Quality and pertinence of activities related to the use of SIRAD were also positively valued although the Evaluation noted prevalent skepticism about the long-term sustainability of SIRAD (see below).

The Project was positively evaluated for the strengthening of coordination between the different levels of the government and contributions to the improvement of communication and engagement between INDECI and CENEPRED. The Project was also instrumental for fostering stronger engagement of civil society and non-governmental actors, through diverse coordination mechanisms, including civil defense platforms and working groups.

The Project received highest praise for its enhanced communication strategy and its effects on raising the awareness about the challenges and priorities of DRM. For the first time in the last three interventions, the Project has engaged professional communicators who designed the communication strategy targeted to different groups of society and authorities. The most lauded product of this enhanced strategy have been the photo exhibition and the mini-series/soap opera “Voices in Risk” designed for raising awareness on the disaster risks and promoting tools and mechanisms for preparedness and response.

---

\(^5\) Disaster Risk Management and Budgetary Programme 068 – Reduction of Vulnerability and Disaster Emergency Response
The Evaluation concludes that the Project interventions have triggered a series of decisions at governmental and community levels that contribute to the achievement of the long-term impact. The most vivid example of such incidence is the agreement reached by the Municipalities of El Porvenir, Huanchaco and Salaverry for the joint interventions in the San Ildefonso Ravine, which is affected by floods and landslides and is characterized by high vulnerability given the proliferation of irregular settlements and land invasion. The Project has contributed technical assistance and expertise and fostered coordination and consultations that led to the establishment of the alliance between the three municipalities.

Capacities and knowledge fostered by the Project have triggered interest and commitments from district authorities to tap on the resources available through PPR 068 for DRM-related activities in their respective jurisdictions. A notable example of such interest is the newly elected mayor of Tumbes who has expressed his interest in applying tools and products generated by the Project after assuming the position. This is particularly important given the lack of political engagement in Tumbes throughout the Project implementation.

Other examples of incidence include the commitment expressed by different representatives of authorities to replicate emergency operation plan models and workshops in other provinces (Paita); decisions to engage the alumni of the DRM Diploma Course in the planning and budgeting processes and structures (Trujillo); decision to replicate the experience of the San Jose brigade in other neighborhoods and engage the selected brigade leaders in the replication exercise as communicators of experience (Tumbes); request for the training materials and methodologies from the Red Cross for replication (Tumbes); commitment of the College of architects to support the improvements in the Pedregal Ravine (Tumbes); training assistance for a PDNA workshop organized by INDECI in Piura, which was attended by 75 persons instead of the originally invited 40.

A particularly promising example of the commitment and awareness generated by the Project was the decision of the members of community brigades of San Jose and Pueblo Joven San Martin Central en Paita to purchase the supplies for the emergency backpacks provided by the Project. Decision to purchase the supplies was made internally and was funded by the brigadiers themselves. The same brigade has demonstrated strong awareness of the PPR 068 and commitment to self-organize in order to request funding for local DRR projects, as a result of the Project interventions.

**Limitations and Criticism**

Despite overall highly positive appraisal of the Project, the Evaluation identified several limitations and challenges, some of which may affect the long-term sustainability of the Project results. As in the previous interventions, a large number of these challenges was exogenous, i.e. related to the political and institutional context of the country, its political and administrative system and weak institutional and resource capacities of some stakeholders.

**Exogenous Limitations and Challenges**
The Project continued to operate in the conditions of overall institutional weaknesses and low political engagement. The same weaknesses identified in the previous evaluations (weak technical and functional capacities, inefficient legal frameworks and implementation mechanisms, insufficient communication and coordination between the Governmental institutions at all levels on the one hand, and with the civil society and communities on the other) have presented challenges throughout the Project implementation and posing threats to the sustainability of the Project results.

Despite the increased capacities and stronger presence of the CENEPRED in the institutional settings of SINAGERD, its engagement in the field has been relatively low. Except for one case in Piura, where INDECI has hosted the CENEPRED representative on its premises, CENEPRED has not established its presence in the regions. This affects the implementation of all components of the National Risk Management Policy and in particular, the efforts of the Project aimed at installing and strengthening national capacities for processes of DRM. At the central level this is further exacerbated by the ambiguity about the roles and functional responsibilities of the CENEPRED, INDECI and the Risk Management Secretariat of the PCM and insufficient articulation and synergies at the level of processes.

This lack of synergy is most clearly reflected through the management of information systems and databases aimed at improving disaster decision-making and action for disaster preparedness, response and recovery. Both CENEPRED and INDECI manage their own information platforms (SIGRID and SINPAD, respectively) that are to consolidate information from the district, provincial and regional levels. To the best of the Evaluator’s knowledge, to date these platforms lack harmonization and connection through common interface that would improve information management and reduce duplication of data.

There is still a persistent lack of understanding of the holistic concept of Disaster Risk Management, with the authorities at different levels still giving prevalence to reactive interventions and giving priority to public works against policy and capacity development interventions. This is reflected in the placement of DRM units and entities in the municipal structures, deviation of funds destined for disaster risk reduction and management (e.g. Allocations through the PPR 068 to other priorities), lack of engagement of stakeholders in the working groups and articulation between the working groups and platforms, low investments in equipment and infrastructure for Emergency Operation Centers at all levels, etc.

Personnel turnover was identified as a major limitation affecting the Project implementation. A large number of authorities trained through the Project have left the Project partly due to the municipal elections and related restructuring decisions. In Tumbes another important challenge was related to signing of PPP agreements between the municipalities and private companies due to administrative hurdles and obstacles.

At the community level the key challenges are related to low interest and awareness of population, institutional and legal weaknesses and gaps and lack of adequate

---

6 At the time of the Evaluation CENEPRED was planning to establish its presence in two provinces of Peru.
infrastructure to reduce the community vulnerability to disasters. Despite the evidence of strong community participation in Project-led activities, all respondents pointed to the overall apathy and lack of interest to participate in trainings, drills and simulations. The communities lack Early Warning Systems and adequate evacuation infrastructure (e.g. evacuation stairs in the ravines affected by floods and landslides). The existing legal frameworks lack clarity and implementation mechanisms to address the issue of illegal settlements in disaster prone zones such as the Pedregal and San Ildefonso Ravines.

*Endogenous Limitations and Challenges*

The Evaluation encountered a number of internal limitations related mostly to the administrative arrangements and Project design.

There was evidence of delays in procurement of goods and services required for the achievement of the results. Due to delays in approval of payments Project personnel and agencies more than once had to cover the pending expenses, which were duly reimbursed by the Project. The Project does not use the petty cash mechanism, which allows for more flexibility in disbursement of small amounts of funds. This delays the implementation of the Project and may generate undesired obstacles, given that the personnel may not have sufficient liquidity to cover unexpected expenses.

The Project has not envisaged the purchase and installation of SAT equipment in the target communities. Whereas these were eventually purchased as a result of budget revision and savings, Evaluation considers that provisions should have been made at the inception phase to cover SAT procurement and installation costs.

Despite the overall positive appraisal of both Diploma courses, there was criticism related to the absence of feedback on assignments from Professors. The alumni indicated the need to receive comments to submitted work in order to improve the learning process. On various occasions the comments and information provided by the professors were inconsistent, and some did not have adequate knowledge of the SINAGERD Law. Comments were also made regarding the profiles of the professors of the WFP Food Security course, where the professors focused mostly on nutrition due to their background in nutrition. The Evaluation could not verify the validity of the criticism.

*Sustainability*

As in the case of the previous two projects, the Evaluation considers that most of the Project results are sustainable in the medium term but face long-term sustainability challenges related to a number of factors. These include continuing institutional weaknesses, lack of coordination between national, regional and local authorities, lack of articulation between the INDECI, CENEPRED and the DR Secretariat vis-à-vis the SINAGERD law, lack of awareness and application of the SINAGERD law, lack of human and financial resources and most importantly political will and institutional mechanisms required to sustain the mechanisms and systems installed by the Project. Most of these sustainability challenges have been identified in the previous Evaluation and remain relevant to date.
Namely, the Evaluation considers that there is a major challenge of sustaining the acquired capacities and knowledge at all levels of the government and communities. At the government level this challenge is due to the lack of commitment and political will; insufficient institutionalization of the achieved results due to the legal loopholes and gaps, lack of awareness and commitment; high rate of turnover among the government officials trained by the Project; insufficient coordination between different governmental levels on one hand and government and civil society on the other.

At the community level the risks to sustainability are related to low level of participation due to lack of awareness on the one hand and lack of confidence in authorities on the other; insufficient resources allocated to the communities for disaster risk reduction; discontinuation of Project interventions, which often lead to disappearance of acquired skills and knowledge due to lack of reinforcement; absence of equipment to complement knowledge and capacities acquired as a result of Project interventions.

As noted in the previous Evaluation, there is enough evidence that sustainability of SIRAD is a risk. Despite awareness and training activities on the use of SIRAD, in the absence proper institutional mechanisms to integrate SIRAD in municipality personnel structures and budgets and constant updates, its utility in case of disasters will be minimal. On the other hand, without proper harmonization with other similar platforms, such as SIGRID, there is a risk of duplication of information, which may affect decision-making process in case of disasters.

An important limitation affecting the sustainability of the Project results is the limited knowledge and application of the SINAGERD Law among the authorities and communities, which affects its application. Likewise, despite the recent increased awareness about the PPR 068 and its application, there is still a lack of knowledge of the use of this financial tool, which is available for disaster risk management planning and implementation. This includes knowledge on the scope of PPR 068 eligibility as well as the capacities to formulate proposals for PPR 068 funding.

CHAPTER 7. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

The Evaluation identified a number of lessons and best practices to be considered for the possible continuation of the Project and/or subsequent interventions of this kind:

As in the previous interventions, the value added of the UN auspices is very high. On numerous occasions the respondents have indicated the importance of the UN convening power, which on many occasions has enabled action from the authorities and contributed to the achievement of commitments. The role of the Consortium has been particularly valuable for articulating often disjointed programmes of the main stakeholders and providing coherence and consistency to Project interventions. In fact, the Consortium has been lauded as the only similar interagency cooperation modality in South America and has been qualified as a best practice to be replicated.

There is a major value added in engaging experienced staff from previous interventions that have established knowledge bases in the target areas and
constructed solid networks with local stakeholders. In case where new staff was recruited, hiring of local persons with strong knowledge of local contexts and links with local authorities and communities has proven to be a major asset.

The engagement of UNVs has been a highly positive experience. Despite logistical difficulties related to administrative rules governing the contracting of national UNV, the engagement of UNV has been key for the increased the efficiency and effectiveness of the Project interventions with the communities, especially in Tumbes and Piura/Paita, which were covered by one Project Coordinator. DIPECHO considers work with communities as key for its interventions and UNVs were considered an important strategic investment for the success of the Project.

The Evaluation considers the work with schools as key to the achievement of results and sustainability of the Project. The example of Miguel Grau School in Salaverry of Trujillo Province has demonstrated the importance of engaging children and teachers in trainings and simulations and building their capacities as future resource persons for replicating experiences in similar environments. Moreover, the Evaluation considers the approach, which incorporated elements of civic education in the training methodology can lead to the formation of future community leaders and trainers and can contribute to long-term impact on the local development.

The Evaluation considers that the Project Communication strategy/products and strategic partnerships with higher education institutions represent a best practice that can be adjusted to and replicated in different contexts. The accessibility of material, popular and playful format, scope of its potential diffusion and outreach are essential elements of the success of the mini soap opera “Voices in Risk, especially given that large part of the potential audience responds better to ludic format of awareness/communication material than the written text. As a confirmation of the success, the soap opera has been in high demand from different stakeholders and was presented as a best practice at the COP 20 held in Lima in December 2014.

The Evaluation has confirmed that the communities have innate capacities, which, when accompanied and stimulated, can turn project results into opportunities for sustainability and replication. Unlike the previous two interventions, the Project has abandoned the practice of offering lunches during some trainings, replacing them with light snacks. Instead of abandoning the trainings, as could have been expected, the participants have demonstrated their motivation and interest, continuing and eventually finishing the courses.

The Project has based its interventions on previous lessons, targeting the areas with the highest potential effectiveness and impact. Thus, in the area of health, the Project opted not to work in Lima Province given the difficulties with the regional authorities during the last interventions. Instead, the Project identified targets in areas with higher chance of obtaining better results and visibility, adjusting the lessons learned in Trujillo to Tumbes and Piura contexts.
CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing the primary and secondary data the Evaluation has drawn a series of conclusions that feed into the recommendations for the next phase. It is important to reiterate that these conclusions are based on the limited data obtained through a small sample of respondents and cannot be generalized, however, the comparative similarity of respondents in sub-groups allows to assume with certain degree of confidence that the conclusions are applicable at a larger scale.

The Project has been successfully implemented, achieving the intended objectives, implementing all planned activities and producing expected results building successfully on the results of the previous two interventions and incorporating lessons learned from previous initiatives as appropriate. As mentioned in the previous Evaluation, the overall effect of the Project is larger than the intended output and will be manifested in the long run, provided that there are adequate sustainability mechanisms and follow-up.

The Evaluation concludes that the Project has contributed significantly to the potential impact of the intended outcome through the improvement of lives of Project beneficiaries, contributing to the quantitative change in the understanding of disaster risks and in response capacities. The Project has achieved positive change in the awareness and knowledge about disaster risks that can affect positively their wellbeing and have life-saving effects in future. The Project has contributed to the increase in the resilience of local populations through the provision of early warning training and equipment.

The Evaluation concludes that the Project has been of great relevance both at the moment of its design as well at its conclusion. Within the limitations of the budget and the timeframe the Project has responded adequately to the identified needs of the target populations and has mostly carried out well-targeted activities. The Project has contributed to the strengthening of national capacities through enhancement of knowledge, skills and mechanisms for decision making both at institutional and community levels and has achieved certain degree of political incidence.

As the third installment of the series of projects aimed at strengthening national capacities for disaster preparedness, response and early recovery, the Project has generated knowledge and capacities that are replicable and transferable. The Project has tested innovative methodologies and tools and communication and awareness mechanisms in diverse territorial settings. The Project has created replicable capacity nuclei in the communities, schools and authorities (mainly through trained mid-level managers and technical personnel), which can have multiplying effects and contribute to expanding the scope of Project results.

At this point, the Evaluation considers that there are a number of important lessons, practices, tools and knowledge that need to be systematized and disseminated as a contribution to UNDP’s knowledge management efforts. An important element of such systematization should be Trujillo experience, where the Project, in close cooperation with local stakeholders, has succeeded in installing a replicable model, which can serve as a material for knowledge exchange and replication. Despite the
existing institutional and political challenges, the Trujillo experience has demonstrated the effectiveness of the combination of political commitment and participatory leadership with effective communication and manageable and measurable goals and objectives.

Another best practice to be considered in the systematization is the Consortium of the UN Agencies, which has demonstrated the potential and the added value of joint intervention modality, by maximizing the benefits and reducing the transaction costs. Despite the existing administrative discrepancies, the Evaluation considers the model a valuable experience to be replicated and disseminated. Likewise, the Evaluation considers the model of strategic partnerships achieved by the Project in two consecutive interventions as worthy of systematization and dissemination as a best practice. These include Public-Private Partnership agreements, alliances with the academia, including the Diploma courses and communication/awareness products, newly established engagement of the Ministry of Health and Social Security.

The Evaluation considers that the sustainability of the Project results is subject to the level of their institutionalization and appropriation by the authorities and communities. So far there is a substantial dissonance between the key institutions that comprise SINAGER due to overlap of functions, lack of awareness of the SINAGERD law and respective insufficient level of its application and implementation. The continuous staff turnover in governmental points to the need to better target the interventions, focusing on staff with fixed positions rather than political appointees subject to political shuffles. At the same time, the Project should increase the outreach to involve more communities in capacity building activities, e.g. UNFPA-led trainings and awareness work on gender and vulnerability. Despite the advances, lack of awareness and political will remains a major weakness and sustainability challenge.

After comparing the findings of the previous evaluations, the Evaluation considers that the focus on SIRAD needs to be reconsidered. The sustainability of SIRAD continues to be a major challenge and the Evaluation has not seen the evidence of any improvements of institutionalizing SIRAD in local municipal structures. The efforts and resources invested in trainings for SIRAD are not reinforced and sustained by institutional mechanisms such as budgets, human resources and executive orders that mandate regular maintenance and update of SIRAD. Absence of interface with SIGRID related to the coordination gaps between INDECI and CENEPRED points to the need to refocus the work with information systems and to address more structural, institutional aspects.

The Evaluation considers that despite the highly satisfactory performance of Project staff, there available human resources were insufficient, especially in Tumbes and Piura, where one coordinator and one UNV covered a relatively large territory. While understandable, the decision to cover two large regions with limited resources was ambitious and generated obstacles in the implementation, especially given the difficult political situation in Tumbes, where a more permanent presence of the Project would have been more effective.
The Evaluation considers that the latent vulnerability in the ravines is an important priority to be addressed should there be future phases of the Project. The Evaluation observed an urgent need for both short-term and long-term interventions. The former are related to strengthening early warning mechanisms, through skills and equipment, trainings of community brigades and awareness rising, evacuation plans and safe exits, such as stairs, mechanisms for securing livelihoods and means of income. The latter include legal frameworks related to spontaneous/illegal settlements, assistance with title and property rights and the like, integrated territorial focus (involving the littoral, city center and the ravine, health and sanitation).

In general, the Evaluation considers that any activity related to strengthening disaster preparedness capacities in vulnerable communities must be accompanied with basic EWS, such as radios, antennae, sirens etc. Unless the communities are alerted of the disaster risks, even the strongest response capacities may prove to be useless or insufficient. Likewise, the Evaluation considers that the training in communities be complemented with basic demonstrations/guidelines for securing livelihoods, livelihood and key businesses maps (which can me combined with/pasted on the vulnerability maps that identify pregnant women, children, elderly, persons with disabilities in the community). These relatively low-cost interventions can prove useful for increasing the resilience and reducing post disaster vulnerability.

CHAPTER 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings, the Evaluation formulated a following set of recommendations to be considered for similar interventions (listed without order of importance):

1. Continue the Project in the targeted areas enhancing the results and expanding the scope of beneficiaries from the communities; place greater emphasis on the institutionalization and national ownership of Project results fostering institutional agreements, mechanisms, allocation of financial and human resources, legal acts;
2. Continue the successful model of the UN Consortium while looking for more flexible administrative and financial mechanisms to reduce transaction costs and inefficiency; consider including the UNV in the consortium and/or look for modalities continue and expand the engagement of national UNV in future interventions;
3. Assess realistically the proposed scope of the Project to allocate human resources efficiently; consider operating a petty cash fund to give financial flexibility to field staff and avoid implementation delays and potentially embarrassing situations;
4. Consider focusing efforts on strengthening institutional coordination mechanisms between the INDECI, CENEPRED and the Secretariat; foster prevention element of the DRM policy by increased engagement of CENEPRED in planning and implementation of Project interventions; use CENEPRED methodologies to strengthen national capacities for project
formulation, budgeting and planning; consider engaging CENEPRED staff in Diploma courses;  
5. Complement the capacity strengthening activities in the communities with basic elements of EWS, provision of equipment, drills and simulations, evacuation plans etc. Consider introducing training modules/demonstrations for safeguarding livelihoods, mapping key livelihood and healthcare sites, mapping vulnerable groups (pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, families with small children, elderly and persons with disabilities etc.), providing basic supplies for backpacks;  
6. Strengthen civil society participation fostering their more active involvement in planning and implementation of DRM budgets and policies, engaging them in civil defense and DRM platforms; promote more active engagement of private sector;  
7. Develop a strategy for an increased engagement of newly elected public officials such as mayors and other municipal workers. Consider offering brief induction in DRM and transfer of Project-generated material (guidelines, manuals, maps, plans and the like); involve newly elected/reelected officials in ceremonies honoring the brigadiers, delivery of EWS equipment and evacuation signs, backpacks, delivery of certificates, drills and simulations, etc.;  
8. Discontinue the SIRAD component in its current format and channel the efforts and resources on institutional work aimed at harmonizing the coordination mechanisms and information management systems between the INDECI, CENEPRED and other stet institution; consider SIRAD as an additional module of diploma courses and offer SIRAD use trainings only in the case of confirmed commitment to institutionalize it (normative act, resolution, executive order, budgetary allocations etc.);  
9. Focus capacity development activities on mid-level managers and technical personnel with higher probability to remain on posts after political changes, in order to avoid turnover and loss of trained personnel. Formulate special short training and awareness raising activities for senior managers and officials, such as mayors;  
10. Consider prevision of technical assistance to strengthen the awareness and application of the SINAGERD Lay as well as other important normative acts and laws, such as PPR 068, the law on municipalities etc. as part of capacity development activities;  
11. Use persons trained by the Project (both at community level as well as the governmental actors) as capacity nuclei for replication of successful practices in other areas (neighborhoods, sectors, municipalities); consider engaging trained schoolchildren and teachers to replicate acquired knowledge and practices in neighboring schools thus strengthening the teacher-student-parent nexus for increased awareness and engagement;  
12. Consider systematization of the lessons learned and best practices acquired throughout the three recent interventions for the improvement of knowledge management and dissemination;

7 To the best of the Evaluator’s knowledge, all educators engaged in the Diploma courses were from INDECI.
13. Consider replication of the mini soap opera in different formats (radio/audio, comic strips, etc.) in order to adapt the message to available means of communication and different audiences taking into account different absorption capacities and literacy levels; engage local and national media in the dissemination of the series; distribute the series in schools complementing the video material with didactic methodology to be used with teachers, students and parents;

14. Consider construction of an open platform for disseminating tools and knowledge produced through the Project, sharing experiences and practices; Foster knowledge exchanges between the provincial/district municipalities to replicate experiences; Identify new and expand existing agreements with the universities to offer executive training courses to the authorities and/or scholarships for civil society as a condition for transfer of copyright for Project sponsored intellectual property.
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CHAPTER 11. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMMS

AWP - Annual Work Plan
CENEPRED - National Centre for Disaster Risk Assessment, Prevention and Reduction
CEPLAN - National Centre for Strategic Planning
COE - Center of Emergency Operations
DIM - Direct Implementation Modality
DIPECHO - Disaster Preparedness Programme of ECHO
DRM - Disaster Risk Management
DRR - Disaster Risk Reduction
CHAPTER 12. LIST OF ANNEXES

1. Evaluation Matrix
2. Lists of Respondents
### Anexo 1. Matriz de evaluación con escalas de calificación de las preguntas indicativas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterio de Evaluación</th>
<th>Preguntas Clave</th>
<th>Fuentes de Data</th>
<th>Herramientas y Metodología de recopilación de data</th>
<th>Indicadores</th>
<th>Escala de Calificación Cuantitativa</th>
<th>Métodos de análisis de data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pertinencia</strong></td>
<td>El Proyecto ha sido pertinente a nivel nacional y local al momento de su comienzo?</td>
<td>Personal del Proyecto, Socios, Contrapartes, beneficiarios</td>
<td>Documento de proyecto, Formato Único, informes de proyecto Entrevistas, grupos focales, observaciones, Lecciones aprendidas</td>
<td>Porcentaje de las respuestas positivas del total de las respuestas Testimonios de los entrevistados</td>
<td>1 - No adecuado/pertinente/catalítico/claro</td>
<td>Cualitativo/cuantitativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Proyecto sigue pertinente?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – poco adecuado/pertinente/catalítico/claro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El diseño del Proyecto ha sido adecuado?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Moderadamente adecuado/pertinente/catalítico/claro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La lógica de intervención ha sido adecuada?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Bien adecuado/pertinente/catalítico/claro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los resultados del proyecto claros, lógicos, y respondían a las necesidades claramente identificadas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Muy adecuado/pertinente/catalítico/claro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Proyecto ha sido innovador y catalítico? De qué manera?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – no responde/no alineado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Proyecto responde a las prioridades de desarrollo del país?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – poco alineado/responde poco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Proyecto responde a las necesidades de los beneficiarios?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 – moderadamente bien alineado/responde moderadamente bien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Proyecto esta alineado con las prioridades del PNUD y ECHO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Bien alineado/responde bien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las actividades e insumos son relevantes para el logro de los resultados?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eficacia</td>
<td>Proyecto</td>
<td>Documento de Proyecto/Forma Única, POA, informes de proyecto, Entrevistas, grupos focales, Lecciones aprendidas</td>
<td>Indicadores y metas de producto, Porcentaje de las respuestas positivas del total de las respuestas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los convenios y alianzas estratégicas son relevantes y adecuadas para el logro de los resultados?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – no constante/positivo/adequado/efectivo</td>
<td>Cualitativo/quantitativo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cual es la principal lecciones aprendidas del Proyecto?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – poco constante/positivo/adequado/efectivo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En que medida han sido logrado los resultados? Cual ha sido el cambio?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Moderadamente constante/positivo/adequado/efectivo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El avance hacia los resultados ha sido constante y según el plan de trabajo?</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Bien constante/positivo/adequado/efectivo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El cambio en el logro de resultado es medible?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Muy bien constante/positivo/adequado/efectivo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El cambio ha sido positivo? En caso negativo, por que?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los resultados del Proyecto contribuyen al Programa de País y los efectos de MANUD? Cual ha sido el avance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los arreglos institucional han sido adecuados y efectivos para el logro de resultados?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El proyecto ha logrado resultados no-planeados?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qué factores han contribuido a lograr o no lograr los resultados?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Eficiencia**

Los recursos financieros y humanos han sido suficientes y adecuados para el logro de los resultados?

Dada la naturaleza de la organización, el PNUD ha contribuido algún valor agregado específico?

Los recursos han sido utilizado de manera eficaz?

Que factores contribuyeron a la eficacia?

**Sostenibilidad**

El Proyecto es sostenible?

El proyecto tiene la estrategia de sostenibilidad y de salida?

En qué medida ha sido implementada la estrategia de sostenibilidad (desarrollo de capacidades institucionales, fortalecimiento de coordinación)?

Existen mecanismos

---

**Proyecto**

**Plan/Goal**

**Documento de proyecto, presupuesto, Informes financieros (CDR), POA, informes de auditoría**

Porcentaje de las respuestas positivas del total de las respuestas, datos de ejecución (delivery)

1 – nada suficiente/eficaz
2 – poco suficiente/eficaz
3 – moderadamente suficiente/eficaz
4 – bien suficiente/eficaz
5 – muy suficiente/eficaz

**Cualitativo/cuantitativo**

---

**Proyecto**

**Documento de Proyecto, Informes de proyecto**

Porcentaje de las respuestas positivas del total de las respuestas

**Observaciones**

1 – no sostenible – 5 muy sostenible

**Cuantitativo/cualitativo**

---

**Proyecto, socios, contrapartes**

**Entrevistas/Grupos focales**

1- no implementada
2- poco implementada
3- moderadamente bien implementada
4- bien implementada
5- Muy bien implementada

**Sí/no**

---

**Existen mecanismos**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Visibilidad, comunicación y coordinación</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proyecto, socios, contrapartes, beneficiarios</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proyecto/Forma Única, POA, informes de proyecto Entrevistas, grupos focales Lecciones aprendidas</strong></th>
<th><strong>Porcentaje de las respuestas positivas del total de las respuestas Observaciones</strong></th>
<th><strong>1 – nada adecuados/efectivos 2 – poco adecuados/efectivos 3 – moderadamente adecuados/efectivos 4 – bien adecuados/efectivos 5 – muy adecuados/efectivos</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>financieros, organizacionales y económicos para asegurar la sostenibilidad de los resultados?</td>
<td>Existe la capacidad y voluntad institucional suficiente para asegurar la continuidad y sostenibilidad de los resultados?</td>
<td>En que medida la participación y apropiación de los beneficiarios contribuyó a la sostenibilidad del proyecto?</td>
<td>1 – no suficiente – 5 altamente suficiente</td>
<td>1 – nada bien 2 – poco bien 3 – moderadamente bien 4 – bien 5 – muy bien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El proyecto tiene la estrategia de comunicación?</td>
<td>Los mecanismos de comunicación han sido adecuados y efectivos?</td>
<td>Los mecanismos de coordinación interagencial/interinstitucional han sido adecuados?</td>
<td>La visibilidad del Proyecto ha logrado reconocimiento adecuado?</td>
<td>Si/no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cuantitativo/cualitativo**