

Management summary PfR 2018 Annual Report: Local Realities, Global Ambitions

In 2018, Partners for Resilience (PfR) has stepped up its efforts to empower civil society organisations (CSOs), and local and national authorities, by continuing to demonstrate what it takes to build resilience amidst complex realities and increasing risks due to extreme weather events, climate change, and deterioration of ecosystems.

We observe the following achievements:

- Full embracement of dialogue trajectories and capacity strengthening of civil society to advocate for Integrated Risk Management (IRM):** the shift from service delivery activities in PfR1 (2011-2015) to capacity strengthening of CSOs in PfR2 (2016-2020) did not happen overnight. It meant a change in the way of working for some of our partners and CSOs. Communication, training, and joint learning proved to be important to align interests and expectations. 2018 marks the year that country and regional teams (including CSO partners) have fully embraced the transition from directly supporting local communities towards a different role as facilitator and/ or broker, bringing stakeholders from different (often competing) sectors together in multi-stakeholder platforms, and strengthening CSO capacity to advocate for the identified needs and priorities. It is even observed that country and regional teams are becoming strong advocates of this approach whereby CSOs capacities are strengthened to influence national and local policies, practises, and investments, to reach scale and impact.
- Bringing stakeholders together at multi-stakeholder platforms:** creating opportunities for individuals, communities and other actors to come together to discuss relevant issues, is a proven way to create mutual understanding for each other's perspectives, and formulate common positions on shared interest and seek solutions for potentially conflicting interests. Even more so in challenging settings, when scarcity of natural resources or climate change can aggravate an already sensitive relationship between stakeholders. For example in Mopti (Mali) coalitions of fishermen and farmers have made arrangements over the usage of water resources, including the right of women to own (and develop) land. In Kenya, voices of marginalised agro-pastoralist people are included in multi-stakeholder dialogues on the use of land and water in Ewaso Ngiro and Tana River basins, to ensure inclusive and sustainable investment and development planning. Through participation in the Water as Leverage programme for resilient cities Asia, PfR contributes to an all-inclusive approach and innovative integrated proposals are being developed by multi-disciplinary design teams for Chennai (India) and Semarang (Indonesia). The ambition is to have bankable project proposals funded, locally owned and implementable whereby stakeholders are co-creating a shared and resilient future.
- Stronger collaboration in-between multiple levels:** ensuring that national and international policy makers understand the realities faced by communities, and ensuring that the voices of the most vulnerable and marginalised are included in the international development debate, is essential to bridge gaps, and to make the challenges known to a larger audience. As such, PfR actively engaged local voices in global and regional policy events that took place in 2018. At the Adaptation Futures Conference in Cape Town, Yohan Santosa from Karina Indonesia (local CSO) gave a presentation on the Integrated Risk Management approach in Indonesia at the opening plenary. Furthermore, regional engagement is increasing through participation of CSOs at the Africa-Arab Regional Platform for DRR in Tunis (in preparation of the Global Conference for DRR in Geneva in 2019) and the Asian Ministerial Conference on DRR in Mongolia. In addition, at the High-Level Political Forum on SDGs in New York, PfR presented the Voluntary National Report on the implementation of SDGs in Mali, upon which the IFRC asked PfR to share these experiences with other countries for inspiration and possible scale up of this influencing trajectory.

Elements of learning:

- Working in conflict setting requires long-term commitment and multi-faceted approach:** while positive examples can be observed in fragile and conflict-affected areas (e.g. in coalition building in central-Mali, the completion of the National Disaster Management Policy in South-Sudan, and the Y-Adapt programme in Haiti) the chronic insecurity in especially South-Sudan and Haiti, and the increasing violence in central Mali, is hampering implementation of the programme. In these countries there is a clear demand to leverage the Dialogue & Dissent programme with complementary support. Some PfR alliance members implement resilience projects in these countries with other funds to enhance community resilience and to create evidence for the IRM dialogues. Those countries who were already part of PfR1, have the advantage of using the evidence from PfR1, and as they are already familiar with Integrated Risk Management, they can use this as leverage for the capacity strengthening of CSOs and relevant government departments. It is also

observed that enhancing resilience in fragile and conflict-affected areas, an IRM approach might not be sufficient to address conflict risk reduction. A conflict (risk) analysis at local level, carefully mapping the sensitivities in communities, as well as limited complementary service delivery to people with changing needs, is essential to gain trust and to work step-by-step towards multi-stakeholder process engagement and minimum coping levels of exposed communities.

- **Inclusion of most vulnerable and marginalised groups, and empowerment of women:** not all (PfR) CSOs have the same understanding of inclusion. This was one of the findings of PfR's internal mid-term stock-taking in 2018. Where these groups are most vulnerable and/ or marginalised, it is essential to ensure that the voices of individuals and groups are well enough heard, as so many people (still) fall through the cracks, and millions of people living in crisis are not receiving the (humanitarian) assistance they desperately need, as indicated by the [IFRC 2018 World Disasters Report](#). The outcome of the mid-term stock-taking was two-fold: on one hand it was observed that better attention is required to ensure inclusion of the most vulnerable and marginalised in society. On the other hand PfR needs to improve on adequately addressing the topic of inclusion in our documentation and communication, and be more specific about it. Based on the outcomes of the mid-term stock-taking, both issues were addressed during the country leads week in January 2019 and follow-up, support and monitoring is done on a regular basis.

Partners were also requested in 2018 and following years to give special attention to the inclusion of the most vulnerable and marginalised during the bi-annual PME workshops, and through the availability of tools, trainings and support (e.g. see Indonesia example p.19). Furthermore, a '*Step-by-Step Guide to Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction*' will be developed in 2019 to support and engage in dialogue with country and regional teams to ensure inclusion of the most vulnerable and marginalised. This guideline will be supportive to CSO partners to develop a better understanding on inclusion, and facilitate clear guidance on improvements in the current programme.

- **Evidence base and communication:** providing evidence of resilient communities and attribution to large-scale policy dialogues remains a challenge. PfR is continuing to improve capturing its '*inspiring stories*' (theme country leads week 2018) and '*inspiring learnings*' (theme country leads week 2019), through analysis and evaluation (e.g. the Ethiopia Impact Evaluation which was conducted in 2018), and through multiple social media channels. External communication is also expected to improve with an agreed communication strategy in place since November 2018.
- **Reporting on learnings, or even failures, does not come natural:** in 2018 special attention has been given in the PME reporting, the PfR country leads week and through monthly catch-ups, on capturing the learnings from the programme. It is observed that across the board teams are struggling to report on failures. While rich discussions take place at workshops, and teams are open and honest with each other, the richness of such discussion is not reflected in the reporting. Cultural values, pride and capacity to report (on failures) are main reasons why this remains challenging. Through (more) diverse monitoring instruments (e.g. interviews, peer-to-peer country exchanges) we expect learnings will be better captured, including on failures, and continue to improve.

Reflection on civic space:

We see an increase of civic space on the subject of Integrated Risk Management in Ethiopia, while especially in the Philippines, Uganda, Haiti, South-Sudan and Guatemala civic space is increasingly under pressure. In other countries we observe little change. Disaster risk reduction, climate change and the importance of ecosystems are generally not very politically sensitive topics. Countries have signed international framework agreements, such as the Paris Climate Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals, and governments are committed to their implementation. Through building the capacity of CSOs to both critique and support the implementation of the international framework agreements, PfR has good entry points for engagement with the government. In many countries we observe that there is good coordination and collaboration between the CSO's we work with, as well as with the authorities at multiple levels and across multiple sectors. However when it concerns land-rights, certain drivers of risk and inclusion of the most vulnerable and marginalised groups in planning and development, discussions can become more sensitive, especially in urban contexts where the pressure on land and resources is increasing. Partners find creative ways to be able to continue the discussion: e.g. less controversial topics are good entry points to start dialogues, and once relations with (interlocutors of) authorities are well established, gradually more controversial topics can be discussed. Experiences have shown that partners prefer to operate carefully, in order to ensure that the doors remain open.

Key (cumulative) achievements of our work since 2016

						
67	337	62	60	316	68	52
Partners	CSOs	Dialogues	Policies, practices + investments	Government / institutional stakeholders	Resolutions adopted	Knowledge institutes
with increased capacity for IRM dialogues	Trained on dialogue capacity for IRM	with specific focus on inclusive development	that reflect IRM principles	engaged in IRM	that reflect IRM principles	engaged in IRM dialogues

Highlights per country/ region/ globally in 2018

<p>Ethiopia study tour for Ethiopian Ministers to Uganda organised by PfR results in government commissioning wetlands study to assess the implications of adopting the Ramsar convention. (p.18)</p>	<p>Guatemala Interuniversity Platform on IRM hosted by the University of San Carlos established to coordinate IRM knowledge management and provide an e-learning IRM curriculum. (p.25)</p>	<p>Haiti first Y-Adapt pilot implemented with Haiti Red Cross to help youth understand the impacts of climate change and engage them in IRM learning and action. (p.11)</p>	<p>India with PfR's support communities have successfully leveraged additional funds to build community and household resilience. In flood-prone Bihar, 90 villages raised €500,000 in 2018. (p.20)</p>
<p>Indonesia ensuring women's participation in development budgeting and planning through implementing 'Council Action Plans for Women'. (p.19)</p>	<p>Kenya voices of marginalised agro-pastoralist people included in multi-stakeholder dialogues to ensure inclusive and sustainable investments and development planning. (p.17)</p>	<p>Mali building coalitions of fishermen, farmers and herders in the Inner Niger Delta to work together for more effective integrated risk management and conflict resolution. (p.23)</p>	<p>Philippines advising municipal level multi-stakeholder cooperation platforms on the development of Climate Change Adaptation Plan submitted to the People's Survival Fund and Green Climate Fund. (p.21)</p>
<p>South Sudan IRM integrated into Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management 5-year National DRM strategy which has been endorsed and adopted. (p.62)</p>	<p>Uganda 40% of PfR's policy recommendations were adopted in the Climate Change Bill and the Bill was put on the agenda of the cabinet for final review and approval. (p.65)</p>	<p>Global programme active participation in Regional Platform meetings for DRR (Columbia, Tunis, Mongolia) connecting local to global voices in prep of the Global Platform for DRR in 2019. Some country teams were part of their official government delegations. (p.70)</p>	<p>Capacity Strengthening in 2018 more attention was given to focusing capacity strengthening on those civil society organisations that can be supported to become independent IRM advocates by 2020. (p.6)</p>
<p>Asia IRM principles and components reflected in the outcome documents and Ministerial Statements of Indonesia and Philippines Governments at Asian Ministerial Conference on DRR, as well as the final Ulaanbaatar declaration (p.67).</p>	<p>Central America scaling of the Guatemala national programme to all Central American Integration (SICA) countries started in 2018, through the regional disaster management organisation CEPREDENAC.(p. 70)</p>	<p>Horn of Africa joint initiative to develop an IRM advocacy training manual enhancing partners' and CSOs' capacity on policy advocacy processes and IRM programming and implementation. (p.36)</p>	<p>West Africa IRM recognised by key regional stakeholders such as ECOWAS and Coordination of Niger River Users and reflected in inputs in ECOWAS position paper for Arab-Africa DRR platform. (p.75)</p>