Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency

DISASTER PREPAREDNESS AND PREVENTION INITIATIVE FOR SOUTH EASTERN EUROPE

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

MAY 2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere thanks are due to all the individuals who gave over their time to be interviewed for this evaluation.

I would also like to specifically acknowledge the efforts by Joakim Eriksson, Project Manager in MSB, for his overall co-ordination and support, Ivana Ljubojevic (DPPI SEE Secretariat), Igor Milic NPRD (National Protection and Rescue Directorate of Croatia) and Mo Hamza (Disaster Risk Managment and Recovery Consultant) respectively for providing their valuable perspectives.

It is sincerely hoped that the lessons learnt and recommendations set out in this report will build stronger and more effective programming in MSB and support Disaster Risk Reduction across South East Europe to move forward.

Evaluator
Catherine Lowery
May 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms

CADRI	Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative
DM	Disaster Management
DPPI SEE	Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for Southern Eastern Europe
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DMTP	Disaster Management Training Programme
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
MSB	Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
SEE	South East Europe
TOT	Training of Trainer
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), The Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) and the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE) carried out a DRR capacity development project in South Eastern Europe. The project started in 2008 and ran until the end of May 2012. The project took place over two phases and was funded by Sida.

Phase One covered 2009-2010, which focused on designing a solid curriculum and training materials for a disaster risk reduction (DRR) course that would serve as an entry point into introducing DRR concepts, knowledge and practice to civil protection organisations in the region. Phase Two covered 2010-2012, and focused on making the developed DRR training capacity within DPPI SEE more sustainable.

As part of the project close-out MSB contracted this final evaluation. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to: **improve the work of MSB with its partners, relative to capacity development in DRR, by collecting, analysing and learning from the experiences generated by the DPPI SEE project**.

To meet the purpose of the evaluation as stated above, two key objectives for the evaluation are: firstly, the examination of the mode of cooperation[1] to determine whether, where and how to replicate this kind of co-operation between CADRI, DPPI SEE and MSB[2]; and secondly, project results to assess the extent to which the project has achieved expected results[3], and support donor reporting as well as capturing overall lessons learnt.

This evaluation adopted a light review proportionate to the scale and scope of the project, building on the evaluative review of Phase One in the 2010 Annual Report. The data gathering took place over April and May 2012. The methodology adopted a three-phase approach: firstly, a desk study which primarily focused on reviewing project documentation;[4] secondly, telephone interviews and questionnaires covering MSB, CADRI, DPPI SEE Secretariat and a sample of the DPPI SEE member states' focal points; and thirdly a field visit to interview key informants in, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, from the 7th to the 10th April. In total, 24 interviews were conducted either face-to-face or by telephone.

---

[1] [5] The DPPI SEE DRR capacity-building project is one of the first in which MSB has cooperated in the field of capacity development and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR).

[2] This aspect of the evaluation will:

- Identify factors that have contributed positively/negatively to the implementation of the project.
- Analyse project design flaws and implications on project implementation. This includes (but is not limited to) staffing issues, and scope of results and activities as well as division of responsibilities.
- Feed back a set of recommendations on similar future cooperation to MSB, CADRI and the DPPI SEE.

[3] The objectives will:

- Assess how well the project has fulfilled the expected results as per the current project document/plan.
- Identify obstacles to fulfilling the expected results of the DPPI SEE.
- Make recommendations on how to overcome similar obstacles in similar projects in the future.

Key Findings

The project achieved each of its deliverables as set out in the proposal and Phase Two delivery plan. It created a pool of **22 DPPI SEE DRR facilitators,** which is a resource that now exists within the region, and so increasing DPPI SEE (individual and organisation's) capacity to provide DRR-related training and capacity development activities for the member states.

In addition to this, a total **117 participants**[5] have been trained in 5[6] DRR training courses and two pilot courses from 2009-2012. 'Increased awareness' was most often cited as the most significant result coming out of the project, noting that DRR was a new way of thinking and working. This increased awareness aligned with the outcomes on the project which aimed to ' Increased appreciation within the trained target group of how different professional disciplines relate to, and can engage in, disaster risk reduction' and 'to use tools and mechanisms to analyse hazards, vulnerability and capacities and to acquire basic skills in risk identification and assessment, taking gendered aspects into account'.

The creation of a network with other professionals within the region was also cited as an important result coming out of the project, with the training creating a platform on which the member states can communicate and exchange information.

In terms of partnership, it was clearly recognised from all stakeholders in the initial phase of the project what added value each of the agencies brought to the SEE DRR capacity development project. Also, the participatory approach adopted by MSB was a key factor in supporting the capacity development of DRR in SEE and in incorporating aspects of sustainability into the project; encouraging active engagement of participants and ownership of the material. The involvement from a range of member states in the development of the material was noted as one of the building block in supporting ownership of the project within the member states. This exercise of self-development also built up the knowledge and skills of the individuals involved

However, the lack of formalised structures and process in a number of project areas presented a number of challenges and so, lessons learnt. Consequently the level of individual/country commitment became significant in making the project successful but in turn also hindered the project's effectiveness.

The gaps in formalised structures and processes noted included:

- no formal partnership arrangement, in the form of a charter or MOU, set up between MSB, CADRI and DPPI SEE so that as the project moved forward, the original added-value and roles of each of the partners were not as clear.
- the project did not monitor or report against project outcomes set out in the proposal. The proposal set out the performance expectation, but did not provide any benchmarks against which to measure success. Therefore, this mismatch between the programme outcomes and the project's key activities sets up the project to present an unrepresentatively negative picture of MSB interventions.

[5] including among others staff at disaster management and civil protection agencies and representatives of the red cross movement and a limited number of academics.

[6] This does not included an additional 10 estimated participants from the final DRR course to be run after the writing this evaluative review

- the fact at times it was difficult to get commitment from some of the trained facilitators to 'come back' and deliver a subsequent DRR training. Consequently, of the 22 trained facilitators, the quality of the training skills will vary, as will their ability to run a DRR course independently of MSB technical experts.

Lessons Learnt

The lessons learnt, as set out below, are summarised from issues highlighted throughout the report and built upon the conclusions from the Croatia meeting in April 2012 (see meeting notes for more detailed information):

- Ensure institutional commitment from the DPPI SEE member states to send trainees to the courses and to provide trainers to run subsequent courses.
- Provide resources to investigate suitable options for following up participants and to support them with the incorporation of identified actions from the training course into their work environment; for this to work it needs to be linked with a more formalised relationship between the DPPI SEE and MSB and balanced with the potential scope of this happening when operating at a regional level.
- In future courses there is a need for tighter and better selection and nomination of the course participants.

Best Practices

Key best practices which should be incorporated into future similar projects included:

Participatory approach

The adoption of the participatory approach in the development of the training material supported the ownership and potential longer term sustainability of the project. Also, the requirement of active engagement of the trainees during the DRR training made the participants mutually dependent upon each other around certain learning outcomes. This, in turn, fed into the building of solid relationships and the creation of the informal network.

Creation of a Pool of DRR TOT trainers

The pool of trainers, coupled with the training material and TOT guidebooks, left a DRR resource within the region to be built upon after the project's completion.

Focus on Gender

The inclusion of a gender adviser within the project ensured that the mainstreaming of gender did not result in these issues being sidelined.

Recommendations

Key recommendations are set below

R1: Formalisation of partnership relationship for future projects, setting out roles and responsibilities of key partners.

R2: Setting out performance benchmarks against key project results in project proposals.

R3: Linking project reporting against performance outcomes in the proposal

R4: MSB to investigate different performance models for setting and reporting against projects working in the area of capacity development, such as the ripple model[7] and/or Outcome Mapping[8]

R5: MSB and DPPI SEE to investigate the scope for formalising an agreement between the member states around 'roles and responsibilities' in relation to the training, to ensure that adequate and suitable staff were put forward; and in terms of the TOT, attendees would then be committed to delivering a certain number of DRR trainings afterwards.

R6: Development of a commitment action plan to be completed by each participant, and resources made available to follow up and support participants in incorporating learning into their working environment.

What next...

Overall, creation of a pool of DRR trainers is the most valuable deliverable from the project. Although initiatives are being put in place by DPPI SEE to create a platform on which the trainers and participants from the training can exchange information, the sustainability of the pool of facilitators in the SEE region cannot yet be determined. The sustainability will be based on the trainers continuing to develop their knowledge and facilitation skills through delivering training in the region. Investment of future resources should therefore focus on the existing TOT, in part to build up the level of quality of all the trainers to an international standard. This investment must also be linked with some form of commitment from member states to utilise the 'resources[9]' provided through the project. DPPI SEE role in moving forward would then be creating this community of practice and linking the pool of trainers into wider DRR initiatives taking place within the region, most notably the work taking place within the UN and the development of National Platforms.

This, in turn, would enable the skills and knowledge to spread out, encompassing a wider range of stakeholders who need to be part of the DRR debate as it moves forward.

[7] The ripple metaphor is intended to communicate the difficulty in specifying exact causal pathways for capacity-building interventions: one ripple moves outwards to cause another in an unpredictable fashion and the causal relationships between specific changes at each level are not articulated. Just as a drop of rain that lands in water is harder and harder to see as it moves outward, it is most difficult to draw the direct causal link to the outer rings of the ripple model. Page 17; A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of NGO Capacity Building Interventions in Conflict Affected Settings, Molly Fitzgerald, Jessica Posner and Anna Workman by JSI Research & Training Institute, Inc.

[8] http://www.outcomemapping.ca/

[9] Recourses in this context refers the new skills and knowledge gained from the DRR trainings and TOTs.

Introduction

The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency[10] (MSB), The Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative[11] (CADRI) and the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for South Eastern Europe [12] (DPPI SEE) carried out a DRR capacity development project in South Eastern Europe. The project started in 2008 and runs until the end of May 2012.The project took place over two phases and was funded by Sida.

Phase One covered 2009-2010, which focused on designing a solid curriculum and training materials for a disaster risk reduction (DRR) course that would serve as an entry point into introducing DRR concepts, knowledge and practice to civil protection organisations in the region a

More specifically, the goal of Phase One of the project was to reduce the vulnerability of DPPI SEE member states to natural hazards by developing the capacity of local authorities and actors to reduce the risk, while carrying out preventive response and recovery activities and promoting a coordinated approach in disaster risk reduction, in line with the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Phase Two covered 2010-2012, and focused on making the developed DRR training capacity within DPPI SEE more sustainable. More specifically the project goal was to contribute to reducing disaster losses in South Eastern Europe through developing the capacity of DPPI SEE members in disaster risk reduction and enhancing regional cooperation. This would be achieved through a number of outcomes:

- Increased DPPI SEE (individual and organisation's) capacity to provide DRR-related training and capacity development activities for the member states.

[10] The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) (the successor of the former Swedish Rescue Services Agency - SRSA) is a national authority that is active in many areas of expertise, for example, through preventive methods working towards reducing the number of emergencies and their consequences and thereby making society safer. The MSB takes an active role in international cooperation on issues related to emergency prevention, preparedness, response and recovery.

[11] In January 2005, the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR), Kobe, Hyogo, Japan adopted the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015. The HFA serves as the foundation for a worldwide commitment and understanding for a disaster risk reduction agenda for the coming decade. Capacity development is seen as a cross-cutting activity in the HFA, which includes five priorities. The Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) was created in 2007 to succeed the UN Disaster Management Training Programme (DMTP), which trained United Nations, Government and Civil Society professionals for their disaster roles, between 1990-2006. CADRI is a joint UNDP, UN/ISDR, UN OCHA effort, launched by the directors of the three organisations in June 2007. It has been designed to support the three organisations to deliver as "one" for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), focused on capacity development. CADRI works in close collaboration with staff from the member organisations at headquarters, regional and national levels.

[12] The Disaster Preparedness & Prevention Initiative for South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE) was created in order to improve disaster preparedness, prevention and coordination in the region. The institutional framework was signed by eleven countries in the region represented by their Disaster Management Agencies, thus the leading role has passed from donor to signatory countries. A new function - the "Chair-in-Office" (CiO) - has also been established. The CiO is responsible for the overall implementation of the initiative, including coordination, and for promotion at both regional and international levels. This position is rotated on an annual basis between signatory countries. The DPPI currently has eleven member countries consisting of: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Hungary, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Montenegro, Slovenia and Turkey. Greece participates as an observer. The Secretariat of the DPPI SEE is based in Sarajevo, BiH.

The MoU defines the goals and objectives of the Initiative, the governance and coordination structure, the role and responsibilities of the Advisory Board, the Working Groups, Partners; it defines the role of the Secretariat as well as the budget and financing. In its Annexes it gives the Terms of Reference for the Chair in Office, the Advisory Board, the Head of the Secretariat and the Finance/Administrative Assistant

- Increased ability within the trained target group to use tools and mechanisms to analyse hazards, vulnerability and capacities and to acquire basic skills in risk identification and assessment, taking gendered aspects into account.
- Regional familiarity to be enhanced within the trained target group with the global framework for disaster risk reduction: the Hyogo Framework for Action and the ISDR (International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) system.
- Increased appreciation within the trained target group of how different professional disciplines relate to, and can engage in, disaster risk reduction in a complementing and integrated way to facilitate cooperation in DRR activities.

The project's goal and outcomes were in turn contributing to DPPI SEE strategic objectives[13]. The primary beneficiaries of the project are: Disaster Management Agencies and Directorates within the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE), members of the DPPI SEE (National Platforms, National Disaster Management Committees or Focal Points), line ministries within DRR Functions, civil society organisations, academic institutions and NGOs in the region.

Scope and purpose of the Evaluation

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to:
improve the work of MSB with its partners, relative to capacity development in DRR, by collecting, analysing and learning from the experiences generated by the DPPI SEE project.

Therefore, the report is geared towards MSB's project management arrangements with partners, process and programme design methods. From that perspective, it will also reflect on the achievement and non-achievement of project results.

To meet the purpose of the evaluation as stated above, two key objectives for the evaluation are:

Firstly, the examination of the mode of cooperation[14] to determine whether, where and how to replicate this kind of co-operation. This aspect of the evaluation will:

- Identify factors that have contributed positively/negatively to the implementation of the project.
- Analyse project design flaws and implications on project implementation. This includes (but is not limited to) staffing issues, and scope of results and activities as well as division of responsibilities.
- Feed back a set of recommendations on similar future cooperation to MSB, CADRI and the DPPI SEE.

[13] a) To strengthen good neighbourly relations through the exchange of information, lessons learnt and best practices.
b) To enhance cooperation between DPPI SEE partners within the perspective of EU enlargement and the process of Euro-Atlantic integration.
c) To support and encourage countries in the region to develop, adopt and/or enforce state-of-the-art disaster emergency legislation, environmental regulations and codes designed to prevent and mitigate disasters.

[14] The DPPI SEE DRR capacity development project is one of the first in which MSB has cooperated in the field of capacity development and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR).

Secondly, project results to assess the extent to which the project has achieved expected results, and support donor reporting as well as capturing overall lessons learnt. The objectives will:

- Assess how well the project has fulfilled the expected results as per the current project document/plan.
- Identify obstacles to fulfilling the expected results of the DPPI SEE.
- Make recommendations on how to overcome similar obstacles in similar projects in the future.

Methodology

This evaluation adopted a light review proportionate to the scale and scope of the project, building on the evaluative review of Phase One in the 2010 Annual Report. The methodology adopted a three-phase approach as set out below:

Desk study

The desk study primarily focused on reviewing project documentation.[15] The desk review (see Annex Two for bibliography) coupled with telephone interviewing of key stakeholders in MSB, DPPI SEE and CADRI enabled the development of generic questions for the main interviewees. Secondly, it enabled a review of the timeline, main activities, mode of implementation and project management structures.

Telephone interview and questionnaires

Telephone interviews included MSB, CADRI, DPPI SEE Secretariat and a sample of the DPPI SEE member states' focal points (a selection of individuals who had undergone the TOT, a range of stakeholders from different agencies in the DPPI SEE member states and those who had just attended a DRR training course were interviewed). Attempts were made to interview respective focal points in all the DPPI SEE member states, but this was not possible in all cases.To ensure a deeper and wider coverage of response from attendees of the DRR trainings, a short questionnaire was emailed to around 45 individuals who had attended the course, and were not being interviewed directly. The questions focused on the extent to which the training has impacted on their own, and their organisation's, effectiveness. Unfortunately there was very limited response to this.

Field visit and key informant interviews

A field visit to Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia took place from the 7th to the 10th April carrying out face-to-face interviews with the Head of DPPI SEE Secretariat and the Bosnia and Herzegovina DRR focal point and a number of individuals who had been recipients of the DRR training in Croatia. In total 24 interviews were conducted either face-to-face or by telephone. A list of those interviewed can be found in Annex Three. The data gathering took place over April and May 2012.

Structure of the Report

The report has two main sections. The first section is based around the two main objectives of the evaluation - the mode of cooperation and project results, each answering the specific evaluation questions in turn. The second section then brings together lessons learnt and best practices identified throughout the report and sets out an overall conclusion.

Mode of Co-operation

Mode of co-operation examines the project management structure and methods of project implementation with specific reference to:

- Identifying factors that have contributed positively/negatively to the implementation of the project.
- Analysing project design flaws and implications on project implementation[16].
- Setting out best practices and lessons learnt in particular referring to potential future cooperation between MSB, CADRI and DPPI SEE.

Overview of Project Management structure and project implementation

Project Management structure

Prior to the project, MSB and CADRI had worked together on different initiatives. At the same time CADRI was also working directly with DPPI SEE on another project[17] running from 2008. As a result of the capacity assessment which took place as part of the project, the lack of capacity of DPPI SEE to meet its regional function in DRR was identified. Due to the previous relationships established between CADRI and MSB, and CADRI's knowledge of DPPI SEE, during discussion around capacity development, MSB was a natural partner to bring on board. From this point in the context of the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative's (DPPI SEE) Disaster Management Training Programme (DMTP), the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) and the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) were engaged in discussions to collaborate in order to make disaster risk reduction more crosscutting in the DMTP training curricula.

In support of this, CADRI and MSB personnel attended the meeting of the DMTP Steering Group on 7 April 2008 in Sofia, Bulgaria as part of the XVI DPPI SEE Regional Meeting. CADRI and MSB presented to the DMTP Steering Group their proposal for collaboration that was further discussed in the DPPI SEE Extraordinary Meeting in Zagreb, Croatia on 25 August 2008 and endorsed at the XVII DPPI SEE Regional Meeting in Skopje, Macedonia 16-17 October 2008.

Building on this to promote disaster risk reduction DPPI SEE identified a small group to attend the MSB's overview course on Disaster Risk Reduction, Response and Recovery, November 2008, to determine how the course could be adapted to their regional context. A training design working Group (including DPPI SEE, CADRI and MSB participants) was then set up to adapt the course and support DPPI SEE to conduct the course regionally in 2009 and 2010, including a Training of Trainers workshop.

[16] This includes (but is not limited to) staffing issues and scope of results and activities as well as division of responsibilities.

This design working group formed the basis of the organisational structure of the DPPI SEE Capacity Development Project; it comprised of experienced and professional staff members from CADRI, MSB and DPPI SEE representatives, supported by external consultants.

The project steering group's role was to provide support and input to the planning, implementation and evaluation of the training courses as well as managing some of the activities directly. The DPPI SEE representatives included the Head of DPPI SEE Secretariat and the DMTP chairman; in addition planning focal points from course hosting organisations. The design working group planned to meet regularly in DPPI countries, Geneva or Sweden and to conduct meetings and consultations via teleconferences and e-mail.

Project implementation

To support the achievement of the technical project results set out in MSB proposal, the mechanisms through which the project was managed and implemented were aimed to be highly participatory and inclusive. MSB viewed these mechanisms as an intrinsic part of the capacity development process.

Opportunities for the project partners to be involved in the main activities of the project are identified below for Phase One and Phase Two of the project:

- Active participation in the design working group consisting of DRR experts from DPPI SEE member states, and the partner organisations: UN Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) and The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB). (November-December 2008)
- Designing and planning course on Disaster Risk Reduction for South Eastern Europe. (2009-2010)
- Conducting and evaluating two courses on DRR for SEE. (2009-2010)
- Selecting DPPI SEE facilitators from the participants of the first two courses. (2010)
- Conducting a Training of Trainers workshop for the selected DPPI SEE participants. (2010 and 2012)
- Producing a future delivery plan of the course to be run under the leadership of the Disaster Management Training Programme of the DPPI SEE. (End 2009 moving into the second phase of the project)

Coupled with the opportunities listed above, MSB highlighted the participatory method by which the trainings were delivered as a key principle in the project implementation. The project also targeted middle-management staff within the member states. This approach was seeking to plant the seed of DRR within organisations in staff that would be moving up the management's organisational structure and hopefully stay within the organisation for number of years.

In terms of project monitoring and revisions to project results, due to the nature of the grant[18], a simplified reporting procedure was used in accordance with MSB's funding agreement with Sida.

[18] The project followed the standard reporting requirements for Sida humanitarian funding.

The project produced a report at the end of Phase One for Sida. Project monitoring throughout the project consisted of course evaluation reports.

Findings on Project Management structure and project implementation

Findings on Project Management structure

As there was no formal partnership arrangement in the form of a charter or MOU, set up between MSB, CADRI and DPPI SEE, no benchmark existed against which to determine whether the relationships meet pre-determined responsibilities and expectations.

That said, it was clearly recognised from all stakeholders in the initial phase of the project the added value each of the agencies brought to the SEE DRR Capacity Development project. MSB brought the funds and technical expertise in the field of DRR. CADRI had existing training material, was already working and aware of other initiatives in the region and brought an international perspective. To ensure a regional reach, the DPPI SEE was recognised as being the most suitable platform existing in the SEE in which MSB and CADRI could work to access a number of targeted states. The clear division of roles was supported further by good communication and working relationships due to the commitment of those involved.

However the evaluation gave rise to a number of questions for further consideration by MSB as it moves forward working in partnership and on a regional basis.

Firstly, as the project moved from the 'set up stage' where the added value and roles of each of the partners was clear, this situation did not continue as the project moved into its implementation. This lack of clarity around specific roles was particularly noted between CADRI and MSB.

Due to the fact that no arrangements were formalised it is not appropriate or justified in this evaluation to highlight gaps in organisations' responsibilities as expectations were never set out. However, it does give rise to reflection for MSB on the potential added value of formalising partnership arrangements, which would enable clearer lines of responsibility to be established and ensure that opportunities were not missed.

Secondly, if MSB wants to maximise the impact of its training (as noted in the project's outcomes), the training needs to sit as one part of a wider organisational development strategy. To enable this to happen, MSB needs to work closely with the respective national contingency agency in question. However, operating at a regional level does not allow this depth of interaction required to take place. At the same time there was no commitment in place from the member countries to utilise the 'resource' brought back into their organisations, through sending their staff on a DRR and/or a TOT course. No resources were put in place in the project budget to follow up and monitor this. Consequently this role would be left for DPPI SEE; however, within the existing structure DPPI SEE is not mandated to address these issues. Therefore the structure of the project determined the scope of its potential achievements; in that beyond the quality of the training delivered MSB had limited interaction with the attendees.

Thirdly, in the second phase of the project the difficulty to get previously trained TOT to return and deliver future courses to new participants; and at certain points get 'enough' attendees to commit to attend the courses. This can be linked back to the lack of formalised arrangements between MSB and DPPI SEE.

Fourthly, the project did not monitor or report against project outcomes set out in the proposal. The latter set out the performance expectations, but did not provide any benchmarks against which to measure success. In reality, the project was focused on addressing immediate DRR training needs and project monitoring focused around the production of the course evaluation reports. Therefore, this mismatch between the projects outcomes and the project's key activities sets up the project to be measured against a level of results[19] that are not realistic and present an unrepresentatively negative picture of MSB successes.

Findings on Project implementation

The findings examine whether, and to what degree, the approach adopted for project implementation has been effective in building capacity in DPPI SEE.

The participatory approach adopted by MSB through:

- the development of the original training material through the creation of a design working group,
- creation of a TOT training,
- the delivery methods of the DRR training course, and the
- creation of a facilitators guide

were key factors in supporting the capacity development of DRR in SEE. Feedback from a range of stakeholders reported that the method by which the training was delivered supported and encouraged active engagement of participants. Also, combining training courses with the simultaneous development of TOT material (facilitation guide) and the creation of a pool of regional trainers supported the longer term sustainability of the project's inputs by increasing regional resources to develop DRR capacity further.

Typical quotes received feedback on the training style and the benefits of the overall implementation approach are reflected below:

> ' It involved a lot of group work, where participants had to lean on each other to get results.'
>
> 'The course material can be used at a national level.'
>
> 'The DRR courses are particular - the participants have to lean on each other to achieve results. In other projects participants were not mutually dependent.'
>
> 'The training courses are really good to bring people together - they (the participants) get to talk about what they have been doing. The MSB training has been very effective as it is practical and comes from a practitioner's point of view.'

Coupled with the participatory approach the project targeted middle management for the TOT and participants of the standard DRR training. The middle management were seen as having the greatest potential to be 'change agents' within their respective organisations so increasing the likelihood of the training being delivered in country by the newly-trained trainers, and participants of the DRR course continuing within their own organisations and mainstreaming the DRR approach in

[19] Normally key results that projects should use to measure success against are the expected results (outputs) and annually against the projects outcomes.

the longer term. All of the participants who attended the course then became focal points for DRR and recruiters for future courses.

That said, the project activities did not match the performance expectations set out in the proposals[20]. The implementation focused on addressing the immediate training needs and, as noted above, put in place a number of mechanisms and approaches that supported the effective delivery of a training programme and the creation of tailored DRR resources for the region. The question this then gives rise to is: 'What scope was there for MSB and DPPI SEE to follow up on, incorporate, or be part of a wider organisational development intervention to ensure a greater match between project activities and the key programme outcomes?'.

In terms of possible gaps in the project's activities highlighted above, some stakeholders reflected on the possible lost opportunity for the wider integration of the project into the UN DRR approach in the region, beyond the initial technical collaboration during the design phase, as DRR forms part of the UN's overall remit.

Summary of Key Findings for Management Structure and Implementation

As there was no formal partnership arrangement, between MSB, CADRI and DPPI SEE, no benchmark existed against which to determine whether the relationships meet pre-determined responsibilities and expectations. That said, it was clearly recognised from all stakeholders in the initial phase of the project what each of the agencies brought to the SEE DRR. However as the project moved forward, the original added value and roles of each of the partners did not continue. This lack of clarity around different roles what was particularly noted between CADRI and MSB.

The technical expertise from MSB created a solid foundation of strengthened DRR capacity for those who attended the course (See project results section for more detailed information). However, capacity development does not operate in a vacuum. In any project where the focus of the input is on the capacity development of individuals, a pre-requisite for the intervention is for it to sit within a wider organisational development strategy. To enable this to happen, MSB needs to work closely with the respective national contingency agency in question. Operating at a regional level does not allow the depth of interaction required to take place. At the same time there was no commitment in place from the member states to utilise the 'resource' brought back into their organisations, through sending their staff on a DRR and/or a TOT course. No resources were put in place within the project budget to follow up and monitor this. Even if resources were available for OD, it is not within the mandate of MSB. Consequently this role would be left for DPPI SEE; however within the existing structure DPPI SEE is not mandated to address these issues. Therefore the structure of the project determined the scope of its potential achievements; in that beyond the quality of the training delivered MSB had limited interaction with the attendees and or their organisations

Also, the project did not monitor or report against project outcomes set out in the proposal. The proposal set out the performance expectation, but did not provide any benchmarks against which to measure success. In reality, the DRR CB project was focused rightly on addressing the clear immediate DRR training needs and consequently projecting monitoring focused around the production of the course evaluation reports which reviewed the quality of the training. Therefore, this mismatch between the projects outcomes and the project's key activities sets up the programme to

[20] For Phases One and Two

be measured against outcomes that are not realistic and present an unrepresentatively negative picture of MSB successes.

The participatory approach adopted by MSB was a key factor in supporting the capacity development of DRR in SEE. Feedback from a range of stakeholders reported the method by which the training was delivered, supported and encouraged the active engagement of participants. Also, combining training courses with the simultaneous development of TOT material (facilitation guide) and the creation of a pool of regional trainers supported the longer term sustainability of the project's inputs by increasing regional resources to develop DRR capacity further.

Recommendations

R1: Formalisation of partnership relationship for future programme, setting out roles and responsibilities of key partnerships

R2: Setting out performance benchmarks against key project results set out in proposals

R3: Linking programme reporting against performance outcomes in proposals

R4: MSB to investigate different performance model for setting and reporting against projects working in the area of capacity development , such as the ripple model and/or Outcome Mapping

Project Results

The project took place over two phases. The focus of Phase One (from 2009-2010) focused on the design of a solid curriculum and training material for a disaster risk reduction (DRR) course that would serve as an entry point into introducing DRR concepts, knowledge and practice to civil protection organisations in the region.

The key project results for Phase One were listed as:

- A training course on Disaster Risk Reduction that is tailor-made for the needs of the SEE region developed.
- A cadre of trainers created that form a sustainable pool of facilitators in the SEE region that has the capacity and the tools to strengthen the commitment given to disaster risk reduction and the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) at regional and at national levels.
- Staff trained at Disaster Management Agencies and Directorates within the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE), members of the DPPI SEE Emergency Coordination National Mechanisms (National Platforms, National Disaster Management Committees or Focal Points), line ministries within Disaster Risk Reduction Functions, civil society organizations, academic institutions and NGO's in the region.
- A common knowledge base established within mentioned target group regarding Disaster Risk Reduction and its links to sustainable development that applies to the multi-sector and multidimensional nature of disaster risk.
- Regional familiarity enhanced within the trained target group with the global framework for

disaster risk reduction: the Hyogo Framework for Action and the ISDR (International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) system.

- Increased appreciation within the trained target group of how different professional disciplines relate to and can engage in disaster risk reduction in a complementing and integrated way to facilitate cooperation in Disaster Risk Reduction activities.

- Increased ability within the trained target group to use tools and mechanisms to analyse hazards, vulnerability and capacities and acquired basic skills in risk identification and assessment.

Phase Two of the project (2010-2012) focused on further strengthening capacity, harnessing and supporting the emerging role of trainees as new trainers in the region, while developing tools and mechanisms for long-term sustainability. The second phase was developed through a working group consisting of DPPI SEE member states, the Head of DPPI SEE Secretariat, CADRI and MSB. The delivery plan was perceived to make the development of DRR training capacity within DPPI SEE more sustainable[21].

The key project results for Phase Two were listed as:[22]

[21] Specifically, the second phase sought to contribute to reducing disaster losses in South Eastern Europe through developing the capacity of DPPI member organisations in DRR and enhancing regional cooperation. This was to be achieved through the project working on a number of outcomes:

- Increased DPPI (individual and organisations') capacity to provide DRR-related training and capacity development activities for the member states.
- Increased ability within the trained target group to use tools and mechanisms to analyse hazards, vulnerability and capacities and acquire basic skills in risk identification and assessment taking gendered aspects into account.
- Regional familiarity enhanced within the trained target group with the global framework for DRR: the Hyogo Framework for Action and the ISDR (International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) system.
- Increased appreciation within the trained target group of how different professional disciplines relate to, and can engage in, DRR in a complementing and integrated way to facilitate cooperation in DRR activities.

[22] The project results listed above were supported by a number of activities including:

- Mentoring support for the three DPPI DRR training courses in 2011. This involved coaching the facilitators before, during and after the training and to a larger extent focusing on DPPI lead facilitators.
- Conducting a Training of Trainers (ToT) for a second batch of DPPI DRR trainers identified during the subsequent DRR courses in 2011.
- Advisory support to DPPI in nationalising the regional DRR trainings for member states (using the cadre of trainers).
- Participation in a showcase meeting to disseminate project results and secure further engagement to DRR in the region, (possibly held back-to-back with a lessons learnt meeting for project partners).
- Mentoring support for the DPPI secretariat, DMTP chair and the (to be decided upon in the DPPI regional meeting in April 2011) appointed Capacity Development and Training Officer at the DPPI secretariat based on the ToR of the position (see appendix 1).
- Revision and printing of information material about the project for showcase meeting and other activities.
- Mentoring and facilitation support to integrate gender aspects when applicable into the project's events and products.
- Participation in regional DPPI and project group meetings.
- Workshop to outline partners' cooperation after 2011.
- Compilation of a best practice document based on the experience of the whole project that can be shared within the partner organisations and provide insights for similar types of projects. Dissemination of information about the project through published article(s) in, for example, MSB magazine.

- Experts[23] trained in DRR and training facilitation.
- A DRR Expert roster system was developed for experts from DPPI SEE member states and organisations who can support DRR activities in the region.
- An information management system is set up at the DPPI SEE Secretariat for hosting and disseminating the various training products that DPPI SEE supports.
- A DPPI SEE ToT training module is established and disseminated.
- A plan for nationalisation of the DRR training is developed.
- A long-term strategy for MSB cooperation in the region is developed.
- Organisational impact of DRR trainings is evaluated and lessons learnt are drawn.
- Quantitative gender balance and qualitative participation is achieved in project activities (at least 40% of the participants and facilitators in the different project activities belong to an under-represented sex and the activities are done in an inclusive way).

Findings on Project Results

This section examines the project results; specifically it looks to:

- assess how well the project has fulfilled the expected results as per the current project document/plan.
- identify obstacles to fulfilling the expected results of the DPPI SEE.

The findings below build on an evaluative review of Phase One of the project, captured in the project's 2010 annual report.

Achievement of Project Results

Achievement of project results will focus on the ability of the project to meet its overall expected results as set out in the project proposal and in turn their contribution to the project outcomes (Phase One and Phase Two). However due to the misalignment of the project documentation with the reality of the partnership's remit and scale of the project, this section will give greater weight and significance to the achievement of the expected project results. Project results, cross-cutting issues, sustainability and issues and challenges that the project faced for the two phases of the project are set out in the table below:

- External evaluation and follow up of the organisational impact of the DRR training on DPPI (regional level and member organisations) including follow up on personal action plans.

[23] Experts/participants derive from Disaster Management Agencies and Directorates within the member countries of the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative of South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE) and when possible other relevant actors within DRR (for example National Platforms, National Disaster Management Committees or Focal Points, line ministries within DRR functions, civil society organisations, academic institutions and NGOs in the region).

Expected results following project proposal	Achievements	Challenges and issues
Phase One Result: A training course on DRR that is tailor-made for the needs of the SEE region developed.	The course material was developed by a group consisting of representatives for DPPI SEE member states, MSB and CADRI. The material was developed on the back of a Training Needs Analysis and revised twice (after the two pilot courses) including regional aspects of DRR. The material is a regional specific training resource on DRR for SEE. As noted in the project implementation section above, the involvement from a range of member countries in the development of the material was noted as a building block in supporting ownership of the project within the member states. The exercise of self-development also built up the knowledge and skills of the individuals involved.	No challenges and issues were noted in relation to the development of tailor-made training material. No plans presently exist within DPPI SEE to ensure the maintenance and updating of training material.
Phase One Result: A cadre of trainers created that form a sustainable pool of facilitators in the SEE region, with the capacity and tools to	**22 DPPI SEE facilitators** underwent one of the two ToT courses. A ToT course was run in each phase of the project. Of those who underwent the original ToT training a limited number went on to deliver other DRR training courses within the project. During the creation of the pool of ToT, mentoring support was provided by MSB advisors. This involved coaching the facilitators before, during and after the training. Of those who underwent ToT training none have delivered the complete DRR course back in their home country[25], although aspects of the material developed for the courses have been incorporated into existing and new training courses. For example, in Croatia, material from the DRR training has been incorporated into a Bachelor of Arts on crisis	At points during the project it was difficult to get commitment from some of the trained facilitators to 'come back' and deliver a subsequent DRR training. There was no formal obligation on the part of the facilitators to have any further commitment to the project. Some facilitators reported difficulty in getting authorisation from their senior

[25] At the time of writing this report, May 2012.

Expected results following project proposal	Achievements	Challenges and issues
strengthen the commitment given to DRR and the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) at regional and national levels. **Phase Two Result:** A DPPI SEE ToT training module is established and disseminated. Experts[24] trained in DRR and training facilitation.	management. Another example came from Romania, where the course material was also used in a university setting on a course related to civil protection, ecology and the environment. A third example came from Serbia where the national civil contingency agency was developing new trainings for the local mayor using DRR concepts taken from training. At the time of writing, 8 courses had been planned for existing mayors. In 2012, after the local election, there would be another cycle of trainings for incoming mayors. Another course for emergency management staff in the municipalities also incorporated the idea and concepts from the DRR training course. Last year, six courses were delivered and this year, two courses are planned. In addition to the ToT training a number of resources were developed during the project including: – Facilitator's Guide; – Training Guide; – Guide for gender-sensitive facilitation. These remain a resource for DPPI SEE member countries to support the effectiveness of future DRR trainings delivered. By building on this, DPPI SEE has been in the process of establishing a list of regional DRR trainers that can be used within the region by DPPI SEE member countries and partner organisations such as CADRI, OCHA and UNDP.	management. Although numerous presentations had been given to member state representatives at the DPPI SEE regional meetings on the project's outcomes and activities, these were not, in the majority of cases, the direct supervisors of the facilitators and the information had not dissipated enough to ensure buy-in at the necessary level. The active participation of some facilitators throughout the course was based on individual's personal commitment and their ability to negotiate with their direct supervisors. Consequently, of the 22 trained facilitators, the quality of the training skills will vary, as will their ability to run a DRR course independently of MSB technical experts.

[24] Experts/participants derive from Disaster Management Agencies and Directorates within the member countries of the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative of South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE) and when possible other relevant actors within DRR (for example National Platforms, National Disaster Management Committees or Focal Points, line ministries within DRR Functions, civil society organizations, academic institutions and NGOs in the region).

Expected results following project proposal	Achievements	Challenges and issues
A DRR Expert roster system is developed for experts from DPPI SEE member states and organisations who can support DRR activities in the region	Facilitators interviewed noted the ongoing support that they received from MSB technical experts, which was both timely and sufficient. They reported that they felt able to approach MSB on issues as they arose. An indirect benefit of the course was noted due to a significant reference made by the facilitators interviewed and some training participants on improved presentation/facilitation skills gained through the project. The improved skills and related increase in confidence were reflected upon in how they delivered presentation back within their working environment, represented in the quote below: ' This course changed my life as a trainer and improved my English.'	Overall the sustainability of the pool of facilitators in the SEE region cannot yet be determined. The DPPI SEE establishing a list of available trainers and discussions regarding further active engagement between them, such as creating a forum/blog, will further support this. Ultimately, sustainability will be based on the trainers continuing to develop their knowledge and facilitation skills.
Result for Phase One and Two: Staff trained in DRR[26] creating a common knowledge base regarding DRR	In total, **117 participants**[27] have been trained in 5[28] DRR training courses and two pilot courses from 2009-2012. (For a more detailed breakdown of participants from each course, and numbers, see Annex Six.) In terms of the course evaluations, the majority of participants scored the training course highly ('Yes, a lot', or 'Yes, to some extent') in relation to Having a better understanding of the purpose of the Disaster Management Training	A group of issues and challenges was noted around the organisation of the courses and co-ordination with the member states, aptly captured in the quote below: 'Country commitment made it successful but also hindered the project; it was very visible as to who

[26]Staff trained at Disaster Management Agencies and Directorates within the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative of South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE), members of the DPPI SEE Emergency Coordination National Mechanisms (National Platforms for disaster risk reduction, National Disaster Management Committees or Focal Points), line ministries within Disaster Risk Reduction Functions, civil society organisations, academic institutions and NGOs in the region.

[27] Including, among others, staff at disaster management and civil protection agencies and representatives of the Red Cross movement and a limited number of academics.

[28] This does not include an additional 10 estimated participants from the final DRR course to be run after the writing of this evaluative review.

Expected results following project proposal	Achievements	Challenges and issues
and its links to sustainable development;	Programme (DMTP) of the DPPI SEE and their potential role as a trainer and/or as a resource for further development of the training material and knowledge they acquired during the course to improve opportunities to identify areas for development /improvement in their organisation and to suggest changes[29]. (For a more detailed breakdown of the individual course evaluations, refer to specific evaluation reports.) When followed up, identifying what has been the most significant results of the project, 'increased awareness' was most often cited noting that DRR was a new way of thinking and working, referencing the global framework for DRR; the Hyogo Framework for Action	was interested'. Language was cited by a significant number as a hindering factor. A number of the member states did not have suitable and sufficient numbers of staff within the civil contingency agencies to send on the trainings with the level of English needed to attend. This resulted in a waste of resources and slowed down the learning for the attendees who could speak English. Secondly, the

[29] Feedback from some of the previous training course extracted from the 2010 Annual report is set out in summary below.

Knowledge:

1. Increased knowledge of key concepts, terminology and principles for DRR and its link to sustainable development.
2. Common knowledge base established that applies to multi-sector and multi-dimensional nature of disaster risk.
3. Increased appreciation of how different professional disciplines relate to and can engage in DRR in a complementing and integrated way.
4. Familiarity with the global framework for disaster risk reduction: the Hyogo Framework & ISDR system.
5. Exchange of diverse ideas on how to apply the course content to participants' own contexts, including how to engage with others on this topic.

Skills:

1. Acquire the conceptual basis to appreciate the complexities of vulnerability, risk and disaster risk management.
2. Develop a better ability to engage with and relate to disaster professionals from various disciplines in a field situation.
3. Increased ability to use tools and mechanisms to analyse hazards, vulnerability and capacities and acquire basic skills in risk identification and assessment.
4. Contribute to tasks related to DRM within DRR National Platforms, government frameworks and country programmes.
5. Identify strategies for building a disaster risk reduction capacity.
6. Ability to advocate and promote DRR for government buy-in

Expected results following project proposal	Achievements	Challenges and issues
	and the ISDR (International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) system and an understanding of how different professional disciplines relate to, and can engage in, DRR in an integrated way. When prompted as to how these new skills have been used in their working context, responses varied from creating a training course based on the DRR to delivering to the municipalities (Serbia), to re-examining the organisational structure due to changes in understanding how to manage risk, to increased knowledge of how to develop the DRR national platform - through a wider understanding of what risk reduction involves, i.e a different set of actors needed for response. After increased awareness, the most common response was that of networking with other professionals within the region; an example of a typical response in relation to this is captured in: ' It (the training) created a platform for the member states to communicate and exchange information.' The network was informal and developed on the back of individuals taking initiatives; the continuation of this is dependent on the individual maintaining and developing these contacts. One positive example mentioned was that of using the contacts they had gained through the training to access knowledge and skills on issues in which they knew their counterpart had more expertise. When a range of risk actors came to the DRR trainings in Bulgaria, Red Cross and National Contingency agency, this formed the basis of closer working relationships.	issues of sending the same person on the same training course was another issue that presented itself to DPPI SEE and MSB, and ensuring the commitment of sending enough staff to fill the course. In terms of the courses themselves overarchingly the feedback was positive; where issues were raised they were in the minority of cases citing the long days and quantity of new material to get through in the allocated time period. Most significantly was the lack of consistent take-up of skills within the working environment for the participants. Reasons noted as to why this happens ranged from the organisations still focusing on disaster response and DRR still remaining a new concept, to a lack of engagement and understanding on the part of their direct supervisor(s).

Expected results following project proposal	Achievements	Challenges and issues
Phase Two Result An information management system is set up at the DPPI SEE secretariat	At the time of writing this evaluation no information management system was set up in the DPPI SEE Secretariat to host and disseminate various training products that DPPI SEE supports. Plans presently being developed in DPPI SEE Secretariat around the ToT have also involved discussions around management of existing resources and the creation of platforms to exchange information.	No information management system was in place.
Phase Two Result A plan for nationalisation of the DRR training is developed	MSB participated in the showcase meetings to disseminate project results and secure further engagement with DRR in the region. MSB attended each of the DPPI SEE regional meetings throughout the project's lifespan. They also gave a number of presentations to the DPPI SEE Regional Meeting on the project's objectives and key activities. MSB also facilitated a two-day meeting in Dubrovnik, Croatia (11-12 April 2012) aimed at providing the working group with an opportunity to spend focused time to plan ahead for the scaling-up and scaling-out of project activities. Minutes and key action points were produced from the workshop. A further meeting has also been arranged to take forward the key action points of the Croatia meeting. At the time of writing this review the meeting had not yet taken place. In addition to the above, this evaluation also contributed to MSB role in disseminating project results and supporting further engagement with DRR in the region through the identification of best practice and lessons learnt.	No issues and challenges were noted in relation to nationalisation of DRR training.

Expected results following project proposal	Achievements	Challenges and issues
Gender quality **Phase Two Result** Quantitative gender balance and qualitative participation is achieved in project activities	Gender considerations and guiding principles on the project were explicit from the outset, and were supported by the inclusion of an MSB gender adviser as one of the experts involved in the training course. Gender equality was addressed in a number of ways throughout the project. Firstly, all material developed for the courses including publications were regularly checked for language, context and overall approach Secondly, gender awareness in disasters formed a part of the DRR and ToT courses, with specific training sessions allocated to these issues. The inclusion of these gender perspectives into the DRR training course was noted by those interviewed; one example of feedback from the training course was where an example was given in relation to the tsunami and why more women died then men - as women were at home when the wave struck. Another example of gender in relation to DRR was how, in Muslim countries, women have a tendency to have less of a public life and how this would relate to DRR. Thirdly, a gender balance was sought in the training courses and for the TOT courses Recruitment of trainees on the courses stressed the need for efforts among those planning and arranging courses in host countries in terms of extending invitations for recruitment of women. In the TOT guide produced gender-sensitive issues in facilitation were also addressed	At the time of writing this evaluation, no information existed on the overall ration of women who attended the courses.
Sustainability	A number of initiatives was put in place by the project to support the longer term sustainability, most significantly the creation of a pool of regional TOTs; secondary was more general, in terms of the fact that the programme contributed to building the constituency of supporters for DRR in the region.	No issues and challenges were noted in relation to sustainability.

Table 1: Review of Project Results and related issues and challenges

Two other key results[30] were set out for Phase Two of the project; these, however, were connected to the approval of the delivery plan by the DPPI SEE. The DPPI SEE regional meeting did not endorse the positions suggested and therefore these results were not reported on in this evaluation.

Summary of Key Findings for Project Results, Gender and Sustainability

The project achieved each of its deliverables as set out in the proposals. It created a pool of **22 DPPI SEE DRR facilitators,** which is a resource that now exists within the region. Coupled with this, a number of resources were created which would support the trainers, such as the facilitation guidelines. TOT interviewed reported increased skills and confidence in facilitation and presentation skills. Examples also exist from proactive countries of using the material and trainers to develop an run tailored short courses on DRR.

In addition to this, a total **117 participants**[31] have been trained on 5[32] DRR training courses and two pilot courses from 2009-2012. Of the most significant results from the project 'increased awareness' was most often cited as the most important result coming out of the project, *noting that DRR was a new way of thinking and working.* Examples of how these new skills have been used in the working context, responses varied from creating a training course based on the DRR to delivering to the municipalities (Serbia), to re-examining the organisational structure due to changes in understanding on how to manage risk, to increased knowledge of how to develop the DRR national platform - through a wider understanding of what risk reduction involves, i.e a different set of actors needed for response.

The creation of a network with other professionals within the region was also cited as an important result coming out of the project with the training creating a platform for the member states to communicate and exchange information. **The network was informal and developed on the back of individuals taking initiatives, the continuation of this is dependent upon the individuals maintaining and developing these contacts**. One positive example mentioned was using the contacts they had gained through the training to access knowledge on issues in which they knew their counterparts had more expertise.

There was no formal obligation on the part of the facilitators to have any further commitment to the project and at times it was difficult to get the commitment from some of the trained

[30] The two projects set out in the Phase Two delivery plan, which were not approved, were:

- Mentoring support for the Secretariat and the appointment of a Capacity Development and Training Officer at the DPPI SEE Secretariat. (This appointment, however, was not approved in the regional DPPI meeting and therefore not supported in Phase Two.)
- A regional, temporary secondment to the DPPI SEE Secretariat to support the Disaster Management Training Programme in order for the DPPI SEE Secretariat to solve their current legislative and staffing challenges more efficiently (complementary to the Capacity Development and Training Officer).

[31] Including, among others, staff at disaster management and civil protection agencies and representatives of the Red Cross movement and a limited number of academics.

[32] This does not include an additional 10 estimated participants from the final DRR course to be run after the writing of this evaluative review.

facilitators to 'come back' and deliver a subsequent DRR training. Consequently, **of the 22 trained facilitators the quality of the training skills varied as does their ability to run a DRR course independently of MSB technical experts**. Overall, the sustainability of the pool of facilitators in the SEE region cannot yet be determined. The DPPI SEE establishing a list of available trainers and discussion around the initiatives for ongoing active engagement between them, such as creating a forum/blog, will support this further. Ultimately, sustainability will be based on the trainers continuing to develop their knowledge and facilitation skills.

A group of issues and challenges was also noted around the organisation of the courses and co-ordination with the member states, aptly captured in the quote **'country commitment made it successful but also hindered the project**; it was very visible as to who was interested'. The issues that were related to co-ordination and organisation of the courses with member states resulted in a waste of resources.

Most significantly was the lack of consistent take-up of skills within the working environment for the participants. Reasons noted as to why this happens ranged from the organisations still focusing on disaster response and DRR still remaining a new concept, to a lack of engagement and understanding on the part of their direct supervisor(s).

Recommendations

R5: MSB and DPPI SEE to investigate the scope for formalising an agreement between the member states around 'roles and responsibilities' in relation to the training, to ensure that adequate and suitable staff were put forward; and in terms of the TOT, attendees would then be committed to delivering a certain number of DRR trainings afterwards.

R6: Development of a commitment action plan to be completed by each participant, and resources made available to follow up and support participants in incorporating learning into their working environment.

Conclusion - What next? Best Practices and Recommendations

Conclusion

The project achieved each of its deliverables as set out in the proposal and Phase Two delivery plan. It created a pool of **22 DPPI SEE DRR facilitators,** which is a resource that now exists within the region, and so increasing DPPI SEE (individual and organisation's) capacity to provide DRR-related training and capacity development activities for the member states.

In addition to this, a total **117 participants**[33] have been trained in 5[34] DRR training courses and two pilot courses from 2009-2012. 'Increased awareness' was most often cited as the most significant result coming out of the project, noting that DRR was a new way of thinking

[33] including among others staff at disaster management and civil protection agencies and representatives of the red cross movement and a limited number of academics.

[34] This does not included an additional 10 estimated participants from the final DRR course to be run after the writing this evaluative review

and working. This increased awareness aligned with the outcomes on the project which aimed to ' Increased appreciation within the trained target group of how different professional disciplines relate to, and can engage in, disaster risk reduction' and 'to use tools and mechanisms to analyse hazards, vulnerability and capacities and to acquire basic skills in risk identification and assessment, taking gendered aspects into account'.

The creation of a network with other professionals within the region was also cited as an important result coming out of the project, with the training creating a platform for the member states to communicate and exchange information.

In terms of partnership, it was clearly recognised from all stakeholders in the initial phase of the project what each of the agencies brought to the project. Also the participatory approach adopted by MSB was a key factor in supporting the capacity development of DRR in SEE and in incorporating aspects of sustainability into the project; encouraging active engagement of participants and ownership of the material.

However, the lack of formalised structures and process in a number of project areas presented a number of challenges and so, lessons learnt. Consequently the level of individual/country commitment made the project successful but also hindered the project's effectiveness.

The gaps in formalised structure and process that were noted included:

- no formal partnership arrangement, in the form of a charter or MOU, set up between MSB, CADRI and DPPI SEE so that as the project moved forward, the original added-value and roles of each of the partners were not as clear.

- the project did not monitor or report against project outcomes set out in the proposal. The proposal set out the performance expectation, but did not provide any benchmarks against which to measure success. Therefore, this mismatch between the programme outcomes and the projects key activities sets up the project to present an unrepresentatively negative picture of MSB interventions.

- at times it was difficult to get commitment from some of the trained facilitators to 'come back' and deliver a subsequent DRR training. Consequently, of the 22 trained facilitators the quality of the training skills will vary as will their ability to run a DRR course independently of MSB technical experts.

Lessons Learnt

The lessons learnt, as set out below, are summarised from issues highlighted throughout the report and built upon the conclusions from the Croatia meeting in April 2012 (see meeting notes for more detailed information):

- Ensure institutional commitment from the DPPI SEE member countries to send trainees to the courses and to provide trainers to run the courses.
- Provide resources to investigate suitable options for following up participants, to support them with the incorporation of identified actions into their work environment;

for this to work it needs to be linked with a more formalised relationship between the DPPI SEE and MSB and balanced with the potential scope of this happening when operating at a regional level.

- In future courses of the project there is a need for better selection and nomination of the course participants.

Best Practices

Key best practice which should be incorporated into future similar projects included:

Participatory approach

The adoption of the participatory approach in the development of the training material supported the ownership and potential longer term sustainability of the project. Also, the requirement of active engagement of the trainees during the DRR training got the participants mutually dependent upon each other around certain learning outcomes. This in turn fed into the building of solid relationships and the creation of the informal network.

Creation of a Pool of DRR TOT trainers

The pool of trainers coupled with the training material and TOT guidebooks left a DRR resource within the region to be built upon after the project's completion.

Focus on Gender

The inclusion of a gender adviser within the project ensured that the mainstreaming of gender did not result in these issues being sidelined.

Recommendations

The recommendations below are a summary of recommendations set out throughout the report:

R1: Formalisation of partnership relationship for future programme, setting out roles and responsibilities of key partnerships

R2: Setting out performance benchmarks against key project results set out in project proposals

R3: Linking programme reporting against performance outcomes in the proposal

R4: MSB to investigate different performance model for setting and reporting against projects working in the area of capacity development, such as the ripple model and/or outcome mapping

R5: MSB and DPPI SEE to investigate the scope for formalising an agreement between the member states around 'roles and responsibilities' in relation to the training, to ensure that adequate and suitable staff were put forward; and in terms of the TOT, attendees would then be committed to delivering a certain number of DRR trainings afterwards.

R6: Development of a commitment action plan to be completed by each participant, and resources made available to follow up and support participants in incorporating learning into their working environment.

What next...

Overall, creation of a pool of DRR trainers is the most valuable deliverable from the project. Although initiatives are being put in place by DPPI SEE to create a platform on which the trainers and participants from the training can exchange information, the sustainability of the pool of facilitators in the SEE region cannot yet be determined. The sustainability will be based on the trainers continuing to develop their knowledge and facilitation skills through delivering training in the region. Investment of future resources should therefore focus on the existing TOT, in part to build up the level of quality of all the trainers to an international standard. This investment must also be linked with some form of commitment from member states to utilise the 'resources' provided through any project. DPPI's SEE role in moving forward would then be creating this community of practice and linking this pool of trainers into the wider DRR initiatives taking place within the region, most notably the work taking place within the UN and the development of National Platforms.

This, in turn, would enable the training to spread out, encompassing a wider range of stakeholders who need to be part of the DRR debate as it moves forward.

Annexes

Annex One: Evaluations TOR

TERMS OF REFERENCE	Evaluation
Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative South Eastern Europe Capacity Development Project	

I. Background

The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), The Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) and the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative (DPPI SEE) carried out a capacity development project in South Eastern Europe. The project started in 2008 and runs until the end of may 2012.

The overall project goal is to reduce the vulnerability of DPPI SEE member states to natural hazards by developing the capacity of local authorities and actors to reduce risk, while carrying out preventive, response and recovery activities and promoting a coordinated approach in disaster risk reduction, in line with the Hyogo Framework for Action. Specifically, expected project results are:

1. A training course on Disaster Risk Reduction that is tailor-made for the needs of the SEE region developed.
2. A cadre of trainers that form a sustainable pool of facilitators in the SEE region equipped with the capacity and the tools to strengthen the commitment given to disaster risk reduction and the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) at regional and at national levels.
3. Staff trained at Disaster Management Agencies and Directorates within the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative of South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE), members of the DPPI SEE Emergency Coordination National Mechanisms (National Platforms, National Disaster Management Committees or Focal Points), line ministries within Disaster Risk Reduction Functions, civil society organisations, academic institutions and NGO's in the region.
4. A common knowledge base established within mentioned target group regarding Disaster Risk Reduction and its links to sustainable development that applies to the multi-sector and multi-dimensional nature of disaster risk.
5. Regional familiarity enhanced within the trained target group with the global framework for disaster risk reduction: the Hyogo Framework for Action and the ISDR (International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) system.
6. Increased appreciation within the trained target group of how different professional disciplines relate to and can engage in disaster risk reduction in a complementing and integrated way to facilitate cooperation in Disaster Risk Reduction activities.
7. Increased ability within the trained target group to use tools and mechanisms to analyse hazards, vulnerability and capacities and acquired basic skills in risk identification and assessment.

In addition to these results, the project design and implementation has stressed the importance of gender and environment as cross cutting issues; of a cross-border, regional approach to disaster management and of conducting the project in such a way as to produce sustainable results. All these elements need to be considered within the evaluation.

In addition to technical project results, the mechanisms through which the project has been managed and implemented have been highly participatory and inclusive. These mechanisms are themselves part of the capacity development process of the project. Whether and to what degree this approach has been effective in building capacity in DPPI SEE will be another area of assessment and learning for the evaluation.

An independent, external evaluation is being conducted towards the end of the project to collect and feedback learning on how the joint capacity development mechanisms have worked between MSB, CADRI and DPPI SEE Secretariat to assess the extent to which the project has achieved its results and outcomes. The findings and lessons learned will inform future joint capacity development projects.

II. Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Methodology

Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to improve the work of MSB with its partners relative to capacity development in DRR by collecting, analysing and learning from the experiences generated by the DPPI SEE project.

Evaluation Objectives

The two sets of objectives for the evaluation are as follows:

1. Mode of cooperation

The DPPI SEE DRR capacity-building project is one of the first in which MSB has cooperated in the field of capacity development and DRR. In the process of determining whether, where and how to replicate this kind of cooperation, it is important to learn more about the project's success factors, its flaws and how to improve. Thus the evaluation will:

- Identify factors that have contributed positively/negatively to the implementation of the project.
- Analyse project design flaws and implications on project implementation. This includes (but is not limited to) staffing issues, scope of results and activities as well as division of responsibilities.
- Feed back a set of recommendations on similar future cooperation to MSB, CADRI and DPPI SEE Secretariat.

2. Project results

As the DPPI SEE project draws to an end in May 2012, it is important to assess to what extent the project has achieved expected results. This element of the evaluation will support donor reporting as well as supporting the overall lessons learnt process that encompasses all of MSB's international operations, with the aim of amending and improving operations based on actual project experiences. The objectives relating to this purpose are to:

- Assess how well the project has fulfilled the expected results as per the current project document/plan.
- Identify obstacles to fulfilling the expected results of the DPPI SEE.
- Make recommendations on how to overcome similar obstacles in similar projects in the future.

Evaluation Methodology

The overall methodology for the evaluation is based on phased approach starting with a desk study where project documentation is reviewed and used to formulate key queries for the field visits. The field visits are where most of the data collection regarding project progress is gathered, as well as providing an opportunity to verify information in the project documentation. Interviews with key stakeholders will corroborate documentary and field evidence and a seminar/workshop for partners will provide an opportunity for their feedback on the draft findings and conclusions before the evaluation report is finalized.

1. Desk study

The purpose of the desk study is to provide the evaluation consultant with an overall view of the project, which will be used to develop a series of generic questions to be put to interviewees regarding both the effectiveness of the project's capacity development and DRR elements. Other project priorities such as gender, environment, and cross-border engagement will also be included in the generic questions.

The desk study will primarily focus on reviewing project documentation, including (but not limited to):

- Project documents, both original and revised
- Yearly activity plans and plans for specific activities
- Activity reports
- Annual reports

In addition to the generic questions, the desk study will also inform the expanded, final version of the evaluation TOR.

2. Key stakeholders' interviews

The evaluation team consultant will conduct interviews in person and by telecom using a systematic, consistent and structured questionnaire with key stakeholders within MSB, CADRI, DPPI SEE Secretariat and Focal Points in DPPI SEE member states, as well as a sample of trained personnel from each country and focal points of their organisations. These interviews will contribute important insights into how effectively the coordination/cooperation mechanisms worked to deliver the desired results (stronger DM capacity and specific project outputs) and what lessons can be learned going forward for future joint projects aimed at capacity development .

Throughout the project design and implementation modalities have been highly inclusive, involving participation of the partners in the project management, and engagement of all key stakeholders in identification of challenges and gaps, training and implementation of the project. It will be important to see how effective different partners feel this approach has been in building capacity in the national contexts of DPPI SEE member states. Interviews

will cover the design and implementation of the project, and any challenges, which arose and how these were dealt with.

3. Field visits and tele-interviews

Field visits and/or tele-interviews with MSB, CADRI, DPPI SEE Secretariat and a sample of member states focal points, will provide the most important *opportunity* to assess project progress on the ground. The evaluation consultant will interview a range of stakeholders. Given that a primary mechanism for capacity development was the conduct of a number of DRR courses and that sustainable capacity is a project goal, it will be important to meet with a number of course participants and see to what extent their training through the project has impacted on their own and their organisation's effectiveness.

It is equally important that the evaluation identifies any sustainable mechanisms for capacity maintenance and further development. In other words, how the project makes sure that created capacity has a future. Is there a commitment from beneficiaries to sustain and further develop it? If yes, how is it articulated? Budget commitments? Legislation? Behaviour change?

4. Seminars

Once a draft of the evaluation report has been produced, a seminar to feedback to the three key partners (MSB, CADRI, DPPI SEE Secretariat and focal points from national organisations) will be held, so that their views and comments can be discussed and addressed in the final evaluation report[35]. This seminar can be timed to coordinate with the closing activity of the entire project.

5. Evaluation phases

The evaluation will be conducted in two phases comprising:

1) A desk study in which project documentation is reviewed:
   i) To produce a desk study report which will be the basis for formulating generic questions to guide key interviews on both the effectiveness of the capacity strengthening and expected DRR results; and
   ii) To elaborate the TOR for the implementation of the evaluation including an activity and time plan.
2) Main study and evaluation report
   i) Field visits and conduction of interviews with key stakeholders in the project.
   ii) To produce draft and final evaluation report

III. Evaluation Management and Team

The evaluation is to be carried out by a consultant contracted by MSB who will lead the evaluation process supported by a management team from MSB, CADRI and DPPI SEE Secretariat. The evaluation will be managed by the current DPPI SEE Project Manager in MSB, however, the evaluation expert will need the support of all project partners in order to

[35] It should, however, be emphasised that, being an independent evaluation; the final report will represent views consistent with the observations and findings of the consultant.

access relevant documentation, set up meetings, arrange trips etc. Thus there needs to be a focal point at each organisation for the duration of the evaluation.

Name	Position	E-mail	Organisation
Joakim Eriksson	Project Manager	joakim.eriksson@msb.se	MSB
Ivana Ljubojevic	Head of Secretariat	ivanaljubojevic11@gmail.com	DPPI SEE
Armen Grigoryan	Programme Officer	armen.grigoryan@undp.org	CADRI

Evaluation Consultant Profile

Desired skills/experience of the evaluation consultant:

- A minimum of 5-7 years experience in DRR and/or capacity development at international level.
- Experience of conducting/leading multi-partner development evaluations.
- Familiarity with South Eastern Europe and the Balkans region.
- Multi-cultural sensitivity and ability to engage with a range of partners from senior government officials to communities.
- Experience of evaluating gender and environment as crosscutting issues.
- Strong English language communication skills, both written and spoken.
- Strong organisational skills and ability to deliver quality outputs on time.

IV. Evaluation Outputs

The evaluation consultant will deliver a number of outputs:

Phase 1:

i. Desk review report.

ii. A list of generic questions to guide interviews.

iii. An elaborated ToR including activity and time plan.

***Phase 2*:**

iv. A draft evaluation report in English of not more than 5,000 words including the findings and initial conclusions/lessons learned of which would be discussed in the final seminar with key partners. Partners will be given the opportunity to comment on the draft report following the seminar.

v. Final evaluation report in English of not more than 5,000 words. (While addressing the comments of partners, the final report will represent the independent findings and conclusions of the evaluation consultant) - Follow up recommendations for the future engagement in DRR and Capacity development for DRR in the region would constitute important part of the report.

Annex Two: Bibliography

Internal project documents

FINAL phase II project description

DPPI SEE - Croatia Meeting 11-12 Apr 2012 Meeting Report, Hotel Lero – Dubrovnik, Republic of Croatia

Budget DPPI 2011

DDPI SEE- End of Year Report (2010)

DDPI SEE - Project Brief (2011)

DPPI SEE - Croatia Meeting 11-12 Apr 2012 PowerPoint Presentation

DPPI SEE- Facilitators Guide Manual

DPPI SEE- Training Material Development Guide

DPPI SEE current results and possible future PM

DPPI SEE Project Proposal (2009-10)

Course Reports

Overview Course 2010, DRR Training Course Pilot IV, Slovenia, Bled, 7.-11.11.2010

Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for SEE, DRR in SEE Training of Trainers Course ,5-9 June 2011, Šibenik, Croatia, Course Evaluation – Final Summary

Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for SEE DRR Overview Course 2010, DRR Training Course Pilot IV, Slovenia, Bled, 7.-11.11.2010, Course Evaluation Analyses of results

Course Evaluation Form-Summary DRR Course Bulgaria 04.11

Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for SEE,DRR in SEE Training Course – Pilot 2, 07-11 February 2010, Tuhelj, Croatia, Course Evaluation – Final Summary

DPPI SEE Turkey Course - Course Reflections

DRR 2011 Romania Annex 5 Synthesis

Disaster Risk Reduction Training Course II 7-11 2010, Tuhelj, Republic Croatia, Report DMTP WG

Disaster Risk Reduction Training, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia Jan 28 - Feb 3 2012

Disaster Risk Reduction Training , Skopje, Republic of Macedonia Jan 28 - Feb 3 2012

Disaster Risk Reduction Training of Trainers Course, 5-9th June 2011, Sibenik, Republic Croatia.

Disaster Risk Reduction Training of Trainers Course – TOT-, Antalya, Turkey, 19-24 May 2010

Annex Three: List of Interviewees

Name	Country	Contact Details
Igor Milic	Croatia	igor.milic@duzs.hr
Ms Arabela Vahtarić	Croatia	NPRD
Natasa Holcinger	Croatia -	natasa.holcinger@gmail.com
Sanja Pupacic	Red Cross Croatia	sanja.pupacic@hck.hr
Ead Becirevic Red Cross	Red Cross Croatia	ead.becirevic@hck.hr
Ms Marina Črnko	Croatia	University of Applied Science Velika Gorica
Gloria Stoyanova	Bulgaria	gloria.stoyanova@gmail.com
Preslava Lilova	Bulgaria Red Cross	p.lilova@redcross.bg
Atanas Stevanon	Bulgaria Red Cross	redcross_nuc@abv.bg
Petre Vlad	Romania	petrev@mai.gov.ro
Costantin Popa	Romania	costi_popa001@yahoo.com
Katja Banovec	Slovenia	katja.banovec.juros@urszr.si
Jernej Hudohmet	Slovenia	jernej.hudohmet@gmail.com
Kristina Nemanic	Red Cross	tina.nemanic@rks.si
Vlatko Jovanovski	Macedonia	v_22002@yahoo.com
Sakmir Agic	B&H	Head of Protection and Rescue Sector
Radmila Randjelovic	Serbia	radmila.randjelovic@mup.gov.rs
Dejan Djurdjevic	Serbia -	dejan.djurdjevic@mup.gov.rs

Marielle Pettersson	MSB	marielle.pettersson@msb.se
Joakim Eriksson	MSB	Joakim.Eriksson@msb.se
Armen Grigoryan	DRR and Recovery Team/UNDP	armen.grigoryan@undp.org
Ivana LJUBOJEVIC/ Head of the Secretariat	DPPI SEE	i.ljubojevic@dppi.info
Prof. Mohamed Hamza, PhD	Disaster Risk Management & Recovery Consultant	mohamza.drm@gmail.com
Mike Thurman	UNDP	michael.thurman@undp.org

Annex Four: Description of Project Partners

DPPI SEE

The Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE) was created in order to improve the disaster preparedness, prevention and coordination in the region. The Memorandum of Understanding on the Institutional Framework of the DPPI SEE was signed by eleven countries in the region represented by their Disaster Management Agencies, thus the leading role passed from donor to signatory countries. A function “Chair-in-Office” was also introduced. The Chair in Office is responsible for the overall implementation of the initiative, including coordination and for promotion at both regional and international levels. This position is rotated on an annual basis between signatory countries. DPPI SEE currently has eleven member countries consisting of: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Hungary, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Montenegro, Slovenia and Turkey. Greece participates as an observer. The seat of the DPPI SEE Secretariat is Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

CADRI

CADRI is an inter-agency initiative whose mission is to expand existing efforts to develop robust and sustainable capacity for disaster risk reduction worldwide. We cooperate with national and local governments, UN entities, NGOs and other international organizations to advance the five priorities of the Hyogo Framework for Action. CADRI is a joint UNDP, UN/ISDR, UN OCHA effort launched by the Directors of the three organisations in June 2007. It has been designed to support the three organisations to deliver as “one” for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), focused on capacity development. CADRI works in close collaboration with staff from the member organisations at headquarters, regional and national levels. For more information see: www.cadri.net

MSB

The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) is a national authority that is active in many areas of expertise, for example, through preventive methods working towards reducing the number of emergencies and their consequences and thereby making society safer. The MSB takes an active role in international cooperation on issues related to emergency prevention, preparedness, response and early recovery; and maintains a high level of preparedness for humanitarian relief missions in the event of overseas disasters.

Annex Five: Project Budget from Phase One 2009-2010 and Phase Two

Phase One

Project Budget 2009-2010: Capacity Development for Disaster Risk Reduction in South Eastern Europe

	[amounts in US dollars]	2009		2010	
Entity		*Covered*	*Requested*	*Covered*	*Requested*
CADRI	*Expert provision (incl. Travel + per diem)*	30'000	0	30'000	0
CADRI	*Training design & development consultancy (incl. Travel + per diem)*	65'000	0	0	60'000
CADRI	*Organisation of 2 days design working group meeting I*	1'500	0	0	0
MSB	*Expert provision (incl. Travel + per diem)*	12'000	0	12'000	0
MSB	*Disaster Risk Management expert (incl. Travel + per diem) -costs tbc*	0	34'834	0	0
MSB	*Training expert (ToT) -costs tbc*	0	0	0	30'000
Romania	*Expert provision (incl. Travel + per diem)*	4'500	0	7'500	0
Romania	*Organisation of 10 days pilot I training in 2009*	8'000	0	0	0
Croatia	*Expert provision (incl. Travel + per diem)*	2'500	0	2'500	0
Croatia	*Organisation of 2 days design working group meeting III*	1'500	0		
Croatia	*Organisation of 10 days pilot II training in 2010 (tbc)*	0	0	8'000	0
Macedonia	*Expert provision (incl. Travel + per diem)*	3'000	0	3'000	0
Macedonia (tbc)	*Organisation of 2 days design + facilitation working group meeting IV*	0	2'500	0	0
DPPI Secr.	*DPPI secretary (incl. Travel + per diem)*	1'500	0	3'000	0
DPPI Secr.	*Reimbursement of travel of participants to pilot I and II*	45'000	0	45'000	0
DPPI Secr.	*Reimbursement of travel of participants to ToT*	0	0	20'000	0
DPPI Secr.	*Administrative and coordination support*	1'500	0	1'500	0
Turkey	*Organisation of training of trainers in 2010*	0	0	8'000	0
Tbc	*Organisation of 10 days training III in 2010-2011*	0	0	8'000	0
	TOTAL	176'000	**37'334**	148'500	**90'000**

2009-2010	*OVERALL PROJECT BUDGET*	451'834
	from which FUNDS COVERED BY PROJECT PARTNERS	324'500
	from which FUNDS REQUESTED from donor	**127'334**

The overall project budget is of 451'834 USD out of which 324'500 USD (72%) is already covered by the project partners. In order to fully implement the project, an additional amount of 127'000 USD is seeked by several DPPI partners in this project:

MSB
The total costs for the Disaster Risk Management expert (incl. Travel + per diem) is to be confirmed;

CADRI
65'000 USD for the continuation of the Training design & development consultancy (incl. Travel + per diem) from 2009 into 2009;

Macedonia
2'500 for the organisation of a 2 days design + facilitation working group meeting IV in Skopje.

Phase Two

Project	Country	Project no.
ity development for DRR in SEE- p	Sydöstra Europa	0
Registration no.	**Project manager**	
2009-8324	Marielle Pettersson	

BUDGET

Item	Cost SEK	Project Mangement	Total Cost Sek	Total Cost USD
1. Staff	0	63 000	63 000	7 721
2. Staff - other costs	0	0	0	0
3. Procurement services	465 636	155 000	620 636	76 058
4. Material & equipment	0	0	0	0
5. Transport	0		0	0
6. Travel	0	49 000	49 000	6 005
7. Accomodation & rent of facilities	0	9 600	9 600	1 176
9. Misceallaneous	5 000		5 000	613
Total	470 636	276 600	747 236	91 573

Valutakurs		
1 USD =	8,16	SEK

Annex Six: List of Training participants

Date	Course	Venue	Trained	Countries
Oct 2009	Pilot 1	Romania	17	B&H, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Turkey
Feb 2010	Pilot 2	Croatia	18	Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Turkey
May 2010	TOT 1	Turkey	10	B&H, Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Turkey
Sep 2010	Course 1	Turkey	17	Albania, B&H, Bulgaria, Croatia, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Turkey
Nov 2010	Course 2	Slovenia	15	Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia
Apr 2011	Course 3	Bulgaria	16	Albania, B&H, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Turkey
Jun 2011	TOT 2	Croatia	12	Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia, Slovenia, Turkey
Sep 2011	Course 4	Romania	16	Albania, B&H, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Turkey
February 2012	Course 5	Macedonia	18	Nine countries