

**End of Project Evaluation of the ECHO Supported Project  
Capacity Building for Flood Preparedness Programs (Sub-Component 4) of  
Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP)**

**Grant N°: ECHO/DIP/BUD/2008/02013**

**European Commission Support to Mekong River Commission**

01 February 2010 to 08 March 2010

Evaluation Undertaken By  
Christopher M. Nixon

***Eur Ing Christopher M. Nixon***  
Post Office Box 1353  
Phnom Penh, Cambodia  
Tel: +855-12-388964  
Email: c.nixon@online.com.kh



Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Christopher M. Nixon'.

Date:

17-Mar-2010

## **0.) TABLE of CONTENTS**

- 1.) Executive Summary
- 2.) Background and Context Of The Project
- 3.) Purpose of the Evaluation
- 4.) Methodology
- 5.) Achievements and Key Observations
- 6.) Evaluation Findings
- 7.) Lessons Learned and Recommendations
- 8.) Annexes
  - A1.) Terms of Reference
  - A2.) List of Persons Interviewed and Sites Visited
  - A3.) Maps of the Areas Covered by the Operations Financed
  - A4.) Samples of Questions Applied During the Interviews
  - A5.) Abbreviations.

## 1.) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Flood preparedness and flood emergency management strengthening remain core elements of MRC's Flood Management and Mitigation Programme (FMMP). These elements directly address the needs of flood vulnerable communities. The Mekong River Commission Secretariat (MRCS) with funding support from the European Commission Humanitarian Aid Department (ECHO) has been implementing the multi-phase project on Capacity Building for Flood Preparedness Programme in the countries of Lower Mekong Basin (Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam) since 2003. This project falls under the Component IV of the Flood Management and Mitigation Programme (FMMP) being implemented by MRCS. Building on the experiences of three previous projects, the current Phase IV is intended to **"Strengthen Implementation of Flood Preparedness Programs at Provincial, District and Commune Levels in the Lower Mekong Basin"**

The evaluation of Phase IV was conducted as a programmatic assessment of historic project documents and previous project evaluations undertaken in Phase II and III. Discussions were also held with representatives of key counterparts and stakeholders, plus various partners, through a short programme of field visits. Overall the objectives of this phase of the project can be summarised as principally **"Disaster Preparedness Systems in three Mekong Riparian countries are more effectively dealing with floods"**. Specifically the objective is that "Competence of target Provincial, District and Commune Disaster management authorities is strengthened to develop and implement Flood Preparedness Programs (FPPs)"

In some locations, more notably Cambodia, the project has continued to face the challenges of resourcing encountered in previous phases. However, there have been appreciable successes in most areas of the project and valuable lessons learned in other areas. The reformatting and updating of the former FPPs, plus enhanced capacity in District and Commune DM committees has helped to clarify and balance the roles, responsibilities and expectations of officials at sub-national level committees. A simple results oriented assessment at "ground-level" strongly supports the achievement of improved awareness in schools and communities as suggested by the reported number of "beneficiary" stakeholders. The National Flood Forums have been held, and with few qualifications, are considered a positive and value adding exchange of views and information sharing. Greater challenges have been encountered, for understandable reasons (explained within this report), in the integration of various programme activities into broader sectoral initiatives and the development framework. Some significant success has been achieved in this later aspect of integration, though implementation through the development framework has not advanced to the extent hoped for. While mainstreaming through integration in development may not have reached the desired level, in respect of awareness, educational materials and integration of FPP into the development framework, it has not been a failure. There are instances where the FPP initiatives have apparently been integrated into other programs (such as the Svay Rieng PDRRAP) and independently picked up by the sub-national authorities and implemented as their own initiative (upgrading of the previous FPP by the DCDN for Prek Prasab). Such instances could form useful models for future integration and hand-over of the project.

The action has been well prepared taking account of national policy and "grass roots" needs of the various stakeholders. Extensive consultations have generally been undertaken in preparing the activities though there is potential for improvement. The project enhances and complements the projects by ECHO partners, government and donors with limited duplication and significant synergies in shared initiatives and costs. In general the assessments of risks have been realistic and mitigated by experience and recommendations from previous phases. Most of the recommendations of the previous phase have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented. In three particular aspects (described within the report) previous recommendations that had not been implemented are again specifically highlighted (project monitoring, simplifying some courses and provision of small hardware).

The project can be said to be effective, though some challenges have arisen where the objectives are dependent on the influence of external stakeholders beyond the project. Performance has, however, been enhanced by the balancing of responsibilities through changed emphasis in coordination by DMCs of sector departments.

Local counterparts continue to face constraints of human and financial resources characteristic of developing economies. The NDMOs have, however, played a stronger role in coordinating and in linking the project implementation to the national development frameworks and planning. The project displays commendable coordination with only minor lapses. "Demystifying" and applying the monitoring process across the programme will clearly add value and is supported by a number of key stakeholders.

The majority of the short term Phase IV objectives were achieved and in some instances exceeded. A significant number of FPP activities were incorporated into commune and district level department plans to date, in Lao PDR and Cambodia. Three instances are noted where the activities are currently being implemented. While the project is yet to be sustainable, there is no evidence of donor dependency. There is, however, a need for ongoing support to maintain momentum and insure the investments and achievements to date.

Notwithstanding the constraints on early NGO participation in some cases of the project planning, generally the participation of sectoral line departments and DMCs appear excellent. The NDMO and NMC spokespeople consistently confirmed the commitment of the host governments to implement flood mitigation and management measures. Sustainability of the project is going to depend on how well rooted it is within the national development frameworks of the three countries and the extent to which it is prioritised relative to other national and internationally sponsored initiatives. Even in the absence of donor funding the project can be expected to continue, though the capacity and standard may somewhat diminish to reflect available resources and funds. Overall the project is seen by all stakeholders as effective and successful, but it needs ongoing fine tuning and support for some time.

Within the report a number lessons learned and associated recommendations have been identified. These are categorised as “programmatic” and “future actions”. The programmatic items relate to observations of how the programme operates on a day-to-day basis. In general these are administrative and monitoring issues to enhance programme performance. The future action items relate more specifically to considerations and topics for future phases of the programme. It is inappropriate to summarise and include all recommendations in the executive summary - indeed doing so would eviscerate the essential details for implementation which may consequently be out of context. Below however is a brief summary of the more significant recommendations. The reader is however, referred to the body of the report for a more comprehensive list of recommendations, and their details.

- systematic monitoring and evaluation of the project should be undertaken against a simplified system based on the pre-agreed logframe objectives and the objectively verifiable S.M.A.R.T. indicators, across the breadth and depth of the project;
- additional advocacy is required (example Cambodia) to ensure ownership of the project as support for national policies, rather than a standalone donor project;
- it is desirable and conducive to improved ownership to transparently share with national counterparts, details of the budgets and disbursements and to secure agreement on prioritising budgets and disbursements;
- in order to overcome inertia, through differing priorities or capacity in sectoral line ministries and departments, capacity of key officials in key departments at provincial and district level is recommended;
- wherever possible the FMMP initiatives and FPPs should be harmonised with and integrated to larger initiatives rather than duplicating or running in parallel;
- capacity building of counterparts and project staff on the differing roles and modalities of the various stakeholders (NGOs, Red Cross, UN, Intergovernmental Organisations, Multilateral Donors, etc) is needed;
- there continues to be a need to focus stakeholders and the project on preparedness, and in particular longer range preparedness;
- to address the constraints on compiling all the comprehensive data required under the FPP template, it would be desirable to provide a guideline summary that identifies and prioritises the key features and data required for an FPP that may in the short term only comprise approx 50 to 70 percent of the ideal data;
- the number of trained practitioners within the NDMOs should be increased to provide a national full time cadre of experienced trainers whose skills can be deployed as trainers and as a technical resource;
- instead of duplicating or replicating the activities of NGOs and the Red Cross the project should seek to leverage its position and networks as an inter-government initiative, to undertake the more challenging activities that are beyond the scope or capacity of Red Cross, NGOs and other stakeholders;
- support to the programme, should continue with the minimum of discontinuity;
- small scale essential hardware should be provided to support key flood monitoring and mitigation activities;
- the future needs of the project and its likely extension should be considered along with potential avenues of support for the crucial activities. In this respect activities should be prioritised, with their likely duration and resource requirements identified, and potential sources of support. In parallel a compatible exit and handover strategy needs to be agreed with counterparts.

## 2.) BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT

Flood preparedness, mitigation and emergency management, by the agencies and stakeholders that are potentially flood affected, is central to the effectiveness of the MRC's Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP). These elements directly address the needs of flood vulnerable communities and in mitigating physical and property loss and poverty within the communities. Robust flood preparedness, mitigation and emergency management strategies guide and strengthen the operations of government agencies in the member countries at national, provincial, district and commune levels, as well as influencing national and international NGOs. These elements are crucial for enhancing communication, coordination and cooperation between stakeholders, and in enhancing the consistency of implementation in national disaster management and mitigation policy.

The European Commission Humanitarian Aid Department (ECHO) has funded the MRC Secretariat (MRCS) with over a million Euro (€ 1,036,299) since the DIPECHO 3<sup>rd</sup> Action Plan for SEA in 2003 through various funding cycles of the DIPECHO programme. The project contributes in reducing vulnerability and promoting sustainable pro-poor development in the Lower Mekong River Basin, by focusing on strengthening flood preparedness and building capacity of local (including , district and commune DM committees) and national authorities as well as selected relevant non-governmental stakeholders. This has led to a better flood preparedness in the target provinces and the development of the annual, or multi-year, flood risk reduction plans at the provincial and district levels and capacity building at commune level. It has also resulted in identifying priorities for flood management and mitigation activities and innovative Flood Preparedness Programs (FPP) developed by the provincial and district authorities. The project overall has provided support to implement a number of the FPPs, such as safe area improvement, emergency kindergarten management and the School Flood Safety Program. The current project focuses on a total of 5 provinces (10 districts) in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam.

The Mekong River Commission Secretariat (MRCS) with funding support from European Commission Humanitarian Aid Department (ECHO) is implementing the multi-phase project on Capacity Building for Flood Preparedness Program in the countries of Lower Mekong Basin (Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam) since 2003. This project falls under the Component IV of the Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP) being implemented by MRCS. While its partner agency, Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC) implemented the project activities under a grant agreement signed between them, MRCS is directly responsible for preparation and management of the operation and provides supporting services as well as implementation arrangements to coordinate operations through the National Mekong Committee (NMC) in the three riparian countries.

The Phase I project ***“Implementation of Flood Preparedness Programs at Provincial and District Levels”*** was implemented by MRC and ADPC under the 3<sup>rd</sup> DIPECHO Action Plan for South East Asia during September 2003 - June 2004 and involved capacity building for flood preparedness planning and response through the use of flood information products by MRC in the countries of Lower Mekong Basin, namely; Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam.

Similarly, the Phase II of the project titled **“Capacity Building for Planning and Implementation of Flood Preparedness Program at Provincial and Districts levels in the Lower Mekong Basin”** has been implemented under the DIPECHO 4<sup>th</sup> Action Plan for Southeast Asia during February 2005- April 2006.

Based on the lessons learned from the two earlier phases and recommendations received from the national, provincial and district level authorities the Phase III project titled **“Support to Implementation of Flood Preparedness Programs at Provincial, District and Commune Levels in the Lower Mekong Basin”** was implemented under the DIPECHO 5<sup>th</sup> Action Plan for Southeast Asia from January 2007 to April 2008.

Building on the experiences of the three previous projects, in April 2008 a joint proposal was submitted to ECHO for Phase IV project titled **“Strengthen Implementation of Flood Preparedness Programs at Provincial, District and Commune Levels in the Lower Mekong Basin”**, under the DIPECHO 6<sup>th</sup> Action Plan for Southeast Asia. Based on feedback from ECHO a revised proposal was presented in July 2008 which was accepted by ECHO. This 15 month project (ECHO ref no. ECHO/DIP/BUD/2008/02013) was started on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2008 and completed at 14<sup>th</sup> January 2010. The total budget for this project is EUR 415,688 with a maximum of EUR 353,273 as contribution by ECHO.

The current evaluation seeks to review how the key conclusions and recommendations of the previous phases' evaluation have been actioned in Phase IV. It will also broadly consider the impact of the activities within the context of the entire MRC Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP), particularly the Component 4 and the funding support from ECHO since 2003 via the various phases of DIEPCHO funded Action Plans.

### 3.) PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The MRCS and its implementing partner ADPC are keen to undertake the “End of Project Programmatic Evaluation” to assess the effectiveness of the activities carried out. The evaluation also indicates possible strategies to build on the flood preparedness planning process through the improved capacities and partnerships in the lower Mekong Basin countries. The evaluation has the dual purposes of assisting the donor (ECHO) in evaluating the project for continued funding, as well supporting the MRCS in improved programme delivery of FMMP objectives in accordance with its mandate, and the needs identifies by its member countries.

The evaluation should, therefore, contribute to the assessment of whether this project has achieved its stated principle objective and intended results. It should also highlight any areas in which attention or improvement in delivery, may produce enhanced impacts.

The evaluation is intended to concentrate, as far as possible, on the overall conduct of the project activities under this current phase of the project and how conclusions and recommendations of the previous phase’s evaluation have been addressed. It is not the intention to evaluate individual agencies or specific intervention by other DIPECHO partners. However, the current evaluation reviews the impact of the activities within the context of the MRC’s overall Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP), and makes comparisons to seek lessons learned from the various partners which may improve overall performance of activities by national partners.

The evaluation framework is based on the guidelines taken from the ECHO’s Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of the ECHO IV project, as summarised in the TOR. The evaluation is essentially a programmatic assessment from previous evaluation reports of the same project, over the previous years. The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- provide a systematic and objective assessment of the project performance, against its objectives and the expected project outputs;
- obtain an overall view of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness of the project activities since its phase I in 2003;
- propose strategies for continuation of the flood planning process by the provincial and district disaster management agencies, including replication of such training in other high risk provinces and districts;
- provide key recommendations (in line with Hyogo Framework of Action 2005-2015), in support of
  - (i) MRC/ADPC, and National Governments (NMCs and NDMOs) continuation and enhancement of the programme implementation, and
  - (ii) future funding consideration of the programme by the European Commission and other donor agencies.

### 4.) METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV was conducted in parallel with a similar and related evaluation of MDRD-EDU II Phase II<sup>1</sup>. Throughout the evaluation the Evaluator worked closely with, and secured inputs and regular consultation from, the project staff of MRCS and ADPC.

The two ECHO projects evaluated together had useful synergies and areas for comparison as well as highlighting particular aspects and common trends for consideration. However, the requirements of evaluating two separate projects in parallel covering four countries (MRC-ADPC: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam and MRD-EDU: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Philippines) plus Thailand and the associated documented did place some necessary constraints that had been identified by the evaluator prior to engagement. Necessarily therefore, it was agreed with ADPC to prioritise the focus in keeping with resources and time. Given the volume of data and reports in each project, and the constraints of travel to spread project sites within the evaluation time, it was decided that a “qualitative” rather than “quantitative” assessment and evaluation was most appropriate.

The evaluation of Phase IV was conducted as a programmatic assessment of historic project documents and previous project evaluations undertaken in Phase II and III. Discussions were also held with representatives of key counterparts and stakeholders, plus various partners, through a short programme of field visits. The support and assistance of ADPC and MRCS personnel is acknowledged, in identifying and providing key information, and in developing the structure of the evaluation to focus on both conduct of the project activities

<sup>1</sup> “Support to Implementation of Hyogo Framework for Action through Mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Planning and Implementation: Advocacy and pilot project implementation in Education Sector in 3 South East Asian RCC member countries” Implemented by UNDP and ADPC with support from ECHO.

under this current phase of the project, and to review the impact of the activities within the entirety of Component 4 of MRC's FMMP.

The evaluation framework was based on the ECHO's guidelines provided in the TOR, which broadly assess on the basis of:

- (a). Is the Project Action relevant ?
- (b). Is the Action effective ?
- (c). How efficient were the various activities ?
- (d). What was the impact of the Action ?
- (e). What is the sustainability of the Action ?

In addition to preparation in Bangkok and Phnom Penh prior to the evaluation, plus debriefing and reporting in Bangkok at the close of the evaluation, field visits were carried out in some of the target provinces and districts of Cambodia, Vietnam and Lao PDR. The target provinces are Kratie and Svay Rieng in Cambodia, Khammouane in Lao PDR and Tien Giang and Ben Tre in Vietnam. Consultations also took place with institutional partners (NMCs and NDMOs) in Phnom Penh, Vientiane, Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh City. There are a number of stakeholders whose actions influence the project and where consequently engaged in the evaluation process. The Evaluator travelled to these target areas for data collection and discussions with them. Key stakeholders are:

- The National Mekong Committees (NMCs) and The National Disaster Management Offices (NDMOs) of the target countries
- The officials of Provincial, District and Commune DM Committees as well as key line agencies such as the Water Resources Department, Education Department, Rural Development Department and Local Administrative Department involved in the target countries.
- The School Teachers, Students and Community members where flood preparedness priority activities were initiated.
- The Red Cross Society in each of the target countries as well as NGO partners

Details of the individual stakeholders met are included in Annex A2.

The evaluation was undertaken on behalf of the Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC), whom the Mekong River Commission Secretariat has contracted to implement the project activities in accordance with a grant agreement between them. Inputs and suggestions from MRCS, were sought and incorporated in each step of the evaluation. Overall the evaluation comprised three stages, during which the evaluator worked closely with, and obtained inputs in regular consultation sessions with the FMMP Team of MRCS and DMS Team of ADPC. The evaluation was implemented in parallel with the related evaluation of MRD-EDU Phase II<sup>2</sup>, as:

- **Planning of Evaluation Activities:** A briefing of the evaluator was undertaken both at the ADPC office (Bangkok) and at the MRCS (FMMP at Phnom Penh), providing him with all the documents available and necessary clarifications. During this time a detailed work was developed for activities and visits to be undertaken in the field, plus the travel plans and schedule of interviews, debrief and reporting. During the planning period questionnaires were developed to guide the progress and consistency of interviews.
- **Field Study:** Field studies for both projects were undertaken in parallel and due to the similarity of the two projects some synergies were possible. During field work the FMMP team facilitated the evaluation study through its NMCs in the target countries. ADPC and the evaluator worked closely with MRCS and the NMCs in each country. While the geographic spread of target areas placed some constraint on schedule, through the offices of the various stakeholders it was possible to meet with a selection of key stakeholders in the target areas. Stakeholder meetings included MRC-ADPC project staff plus counterparts and partners at the provincial, district and commune levels (key partners were identified as the provincial and district disaster management authorities) as well as the national line agencies (National Mekong Committees, National Disaster Management Offices, etc.).
- **Debriefing and Submission of Reports:** Following field work a debriefing was held at Bangkok with representatives of ADPC on the initial findings of the evaluation. Additionally a meeting was held with to brief the ECHO Regional Support Office on the initial findings by the evaluator and to provide inputs to the final report. On the basis of the field work and the Bangkok debriefing the evaluation report was finalised and submitted to MRCS and ADPC four days following the debrief. It was agreed that any request for further amendments would be made by the MRCS and ADPC within one week of the presentation.

<sup>2</sup> "Support to Implementation of Hyogo Framework for Action through Mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Planning and Implementation: Advocacy and pilot project implementation in Education Sector in 3 South East Asian RCC member countries" Implemented by UNDP and ADPC with support from ECHO.

## 5.) ACHIEVEMENTS and KEY OBSERVATIONS

Overall the objective of this phase of the project is summarised as “Disaster Preparedness Systems in three Mekong Riparian countries are more effectively dealing with floods”. Specifically the objective is to enhance the competence and capacity of particularly district and commune level communities to prepare for, mitigate and respond to floods. This is translated into strengthened ability to develop and implement Flood Preparedness Programs (FPPs)”

The principal objective of this action supported by ECHO under the 6<sup>th</sup> action plan, placed a larger emphasis than previously on developing capacity at district and commune level of existing locations in which the programme was operating. Provincial capacity building was also undertaken where the programme was reaching to new locations. An emphasis was further applied to integrating the programme and its activities into the mainstream development framework. By taking the initial steps in piloting the mainstreaming of flood preparedness into development, the lessons learned and increased capacity should improve sustainability of the programme and its results.

In some locations, more notably Cambodia, the project has continued to face the challenges of resourcing encountered in previous phases. However, there have been appreciable successes in most areas of the project and valuable lessons learned in other areas. The reformatting and updating of the former FPPs, plus enhanced capacity in District and Commune DM committees has helped to clarify and balance the roles, responsibilities and expectations of officials at sub-national level committees. A very simple “results oriented assessment” at “ground-level” strongly supports the achievement of improved awareness in schools and communities as suggested by the reported number of “beneficiary” stakeholders. The National Flood Forums have been held, and with few qualifications, are considered a positive and value adding exchange of views and information sharing. Greater challenges have been encountered, for understandable reasons, in the integration of various programme activities into broader sectoral initiatives and the development framework. Some success has been achieved in this later aspect of integration, though implementation through the development framework has not advanced to the extent hoped for. Mainstreaming through integration in development may not have been at the desired level, but in respect of educational materials and awareness, and integration of FPP into the development framework, it cannot be construed as a failure. Overall the level of success reported is commendable. There are instances where the FPP initiatives have apparently been integrated into other programs (such as the Svay Rieng PDRRAP) and independently picked up by the sub-national authorities and implemented as their own initiative (upgrading of the previous FPP by the DCDN for Prek Prasab). Such instances could form useful models for future integration and eventual hand-over of the programme.

Full details and chronology of the projects activities and achievements are included in the MRCS-ADPC progress reports to the Donor. The table overleaf provides an overview of the project achievements against planned results and activities. The following text then summarises the activities contributing to these results. Subsequent sections of the report detail the evaluator’s observations in respect of achieving the key “results”.

(Please Refer To The Achievements Table Overleaf)

<b>Title Of The Action:</b> Strengthen Implementation of the Flood Preparedness Programs at Provincial, District and Commune Levels in the Lower Mekong Basin		
<b>Principal Objective:</b> Disaster Preparedness Systems in three Mekong Riparian countries are more effectively dealing with floods		
Country: Cambodia	Province: Kratie	Districts: Kratie, Chhloung, Sambor
	Province: Svay Rieng	Districts; Svay Chrum
Country: Laos PDR	Province: Khammouane Province	Districts: Nongbok, Xebangfai
Country: Viet Nam	Province: Ben Tre	Districts: Cho Lach
	Province: Tien Giang	Districts: Cai Be, Cai Lay, Chau Tanh
Objectives and Results	Indicators and Sources of Verification	Level Of Accomplishment
<b>Specific Objective:</b> Competence of target Provincial, District and Commune Disaster Management authorities is strengthened to develop and implement Flood Preparedness Program (FPP)	<b>Indicator 1:</b> Key officials of selected Province, District and Commune have enhanced capacity to develop and implement Flood Preparedness Program (FPP) and are enabled to update them continuously.	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacities of key officials at provincial, district and commune in Kratie and Svay Rieng have been enhanced through a multi-sectoral DRR planning process including the creation and updating of FPPs plus ongoing training of officials at District and Commune level.</li> </ul>
		<b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Led by the PDMC and DDMCs Secretariats, key officials of Khammouane province, Nongbok and Xebangfai districts are able to develop, update and implement the FPP by themselves.</li> </ul>
		<b>Viet Nam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key officials of Ben Tre province and Cho Lach district are able to update and adapt their Annual provincial and district FSC plans with the National Strategy DM and the National 1002 Project of Capacity Building and CDBRM and implement by themselves</li> </ul>
	<b>Indicator 2:</b> Linkages established for FPP with local level development planning process	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DRR priority activities have been linked with Commune Investment Programmes in Kratie and Svay Rieng</li> </ul>
		<b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FPP priority activities of Khammouane province, Nongbok and Xebangfai districts have been integrated into district and provincial socio-economic development plans.</li> <li>At least 3 FPP projects are in process of implementation through local development plans.</li> </ul>
		<b>Viet Nam</b> N.A.
	<b>Indicator 3:</b> Commune DM Committee capacity is enhanced on flood management	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of CCDM in 4 target districts is enhanced on flood management through commune trainings</li> </ul>
		<b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of 50 Village Disaster Protection Unit (VDPU) members from 11 flood vulnerable communes in Nongbok and Xebangfai districts were enhanced through the commune level trainings</li> </ul>
		<b>Viet Nam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of 280 persons from 98 flood vulnerable communes in 4 project districts (Cai Be, Cai Lay, Chau Tanh and Cho Lach) and one extra district of Mo Cai Bac were enhanced through the commune level trainings</li> </ul>
	<b>Indicator 4:</b> Awareness on flood risk is raised through innovative tools including the School Flood Safety Program (SFSP)	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness on flood risk for school teachers and student in 50 schools in 4 target districts was raised through awareness raising activities in schools</li> </ul>
		<b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partnership with Department of Education at provincial and district levels in raising awareness on flood risk for school teachers and students in 40 schools in Nongbok and Xebangfai through SFSP campaigns</li> </ul>
		<b>Viet Nam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partnership with Department of Education and Training at national, provincial and district levels to raise awareness on flood risk for school teachers and student in 60 schools in 4 target districts in Tien Giang and Ben Tre through SFSP campaigns</li> </ul>
<b>Result 1:</b> Flood Preparedness Program implemented by provincial and district authorities in selected districts of Cambodia , Lao PDR and Vietnam	7 existing FPPs and their priority implementation activities in Kratie, Cambodia and Khammouane, Lao PDR are further reviewed by the provincial and District DM	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 existing FPPs consolidated (1 Kratie Province, 3 District level)</li> <li>1 existing Provincial Disaster Risk Action Plan (PDRAP) reviewed and updated – Svay Rieng Province</li> <li>1 additional FPP updated in Prek Prasab as an unassisted DCDM initiative following training in Phase III</li> </ul>

	authorities and take full ownership of regular updating and mobilise resources for implementation.	<b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 existing FPPs ; 1 Provincial FPP of Khammouane province and 1 district FPP of Nongbok district) and their priority activities reviewed with full ownership of Khammouane PDMC and Nongbok DDMC</li> </ul>
	2 new District FPPs and their priority implementation activities are developed in Khammouane province in Lao PDR and Svay Rieng province in Cambodia.	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DRR Plan was developed by Svay Chrum District Committee with assistance from MRC-ADPC &amp; Action Aid</li> </ul> <b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 new district FPP and its priority activities of Xebangfai district developed</li> </ul>
	The National Guideline on Disaster Preparedness (Sổ tay Hướng dẫn Phòng tránh Thiên tai) issued by CCFSC is adapted for Ben Tre province's condition	<b>Viet Nam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ben Tre Provincial Action Plan for implementing the National Strategy of DM to 2020 was updated by the members of Ben Tre PCFSC, endorsed by the PCFSC for the province's condition and put in use.</li> </ul>
	Flood and Storm Control Plan in Ben Tre province and Cho Lach district in Ben Tre prepared by provincial and district are updated and implemented by them.	<b>Viet Nam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual provincial FSC plans of Ben Tre province and its project district Cho Lach were reviewed and updated for adapting with the <i>National Strategy of DM and the National 1002 Project of Capacity Building and CDRM</i>, and for identify training needs.</li> <li>A 4 day training workshop was held for 73 persons from Ben Tre and its 9 DCFSCs (in which included 8 extra districts trained with a cost sharing approach)</li> </ul>
<b>Result 2:</b> Linkages established for provincial FPP with local developmental planning process in 3 selected provinces of Cambodia and Lao PDR	National Consultative Workshop held at the beginning of project (Cambodia and Lao PDR) on linking of DRR into local developmental planning process	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 National and 1 provincial &amp; district start-up meeting were held at the start of the programme. These included topics on linking DRR into local development planning processes. (Aug 2008)</li> <li>3 multi-stakeholder consultations on linking DRR into local development planning process were held in Kratie (2) and Svay Rieng (1) (Jan/ Feb 2009)</li> <li>National Flood Forum on 12/13 Jan 2010 had the theme of inking DRR into local development planning processes (guidelines from the forum are currently pending)</li> </ul>
		<b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 national multi-stakeholder consultation on DRR integration into national and local development planning process in Lao PDR held in Vientiane (29-May-2009)</li> </ul>
	Provincial level multi-stakeholder plans developed in Kratie and Svay Rieng province in Cambodia and Khammouane province in Lao PDR on linking of DRR into the local level planning process taking into consideration the inputs of the national consultations	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Referring to Activity 1, the preparation of FPPs has included identification of sectoral line ministries and departments that will incorporate the activities within their development plans</li> <li>2 Consultation meetings with PCDM, DoP and PSDD at Kratie and Svay Rieng to explore integrating FPP priority into the Provincial 3 year Investment and Development Plan (Jan / Mar 2009)</li> <li>FPP priority activities have been included in District and Commune Investment Programs in Kratie and Svay Rieng. (Provincial and project implementations are pending)</li> <li>2 Provincial level workshops held in Kratie and Svay Rieng to identify progress and gaps in linkages of DRR in local level planning processes (Dec 2009)</li> </ul>
		<b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 provincial multi-stakeholder consultation on FPP and linkage with Khammouane development strategy by taking the inputs from the national consultation</li> <li>FPP priority activities have been included in District and Provincial Socio-economic development plans.</li> <li>At least 3 FPP projects have been identified as in the process of implementation through local development plans, others are pending.</li> </ul>
<b>Result 3:</b> Capacity of the Commune DM Committees / Team in flood management and mitigation is enhanced in Cambodia, Lao DPR and Vietnam	Existing Commune level course curriculum developed in the previous phase in Cambodia and Vietnam are reviewed and harmonised by national and provincial level experts including other key stakeholders	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DRR Forum to address existing Commune level course curriculum involving harmonising &amp; institutionalising existing training efforts.</li> </ul>
		<b>Lao PDR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District level ToT and commune level curriculums were developed and used during the trainings</li> </ul>
		<b>Viet Nam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Existing commune level course curriculum was reviewed by DDMFSC (national) and provincial authorities for use in training.</li> </ul>
	2 refresher Training of Trainers by the national level trainers; one each in Kratie and Tien Giang (who were involved in the previous phase) conducted using the ToT Curriculum developed already in local language	<b>Cambodia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Refresher ToT held in Kratie Province</li> </ul>
		<b>Viet Nam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One refresher TOT was held for Cai Be and Cai Lay districts in Tien Giang.</li> </ul>

	3 ToT conducted; one each in new provinces (Svay Rieng, Khammouane, and Ben Tre) by the set of national level trainers	<p><b>Cambodia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 new ToT held in Prey Veng (in association with GTZ flood FEMS Program) for Svay Rieng Province</li> </ul> <p><b>Lao PDR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 District level ToT conducted for selected participants from Nongbok and Xebangfai districts</li> </ul> <p><b>Viet Nam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One TOT training was held for Cho Lach district in Ben Tre and Chau Thanh district in Tien Giang.</li> </ul>
	Selected CCDMs in Kratie, CCFSC in Vietnam and Village Protection Unit (VPU) in Lao PDR are trained to implement flood preparedness measures	<p><b>Cambodia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCDM in 4 target districts of Kratie and Svay Rieng provinces were trained to implement flood preparedness measures</li> </ul> <p><b>Lao PDR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11 VDPU from flood vulnerable communes in Nongbok and Xebangfai were trained to implement flood preparedness</li> </ul> <p><b>Viet Nam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>280 CCFSC members of 98 communes in the 4 project districts (Cai Be, Cai Lay, Chau Tanh and Cho Lach) and one extra district of Mo Cai Bac were trained to implement flood preparedness measures</li> </ul>
	At least 1 commune level training in each of the target districts (as shown above) by the Trainers from each of the ToT are supported	<p><b>Cambodia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Commune level training held in Kratie, Sambor &amp; Chhloung Districts in Kratie Province, &amp; Svay Chrum District in Svay Rieng Province</li> </ul> <p><b>Lao PDR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 commune level trainings for VDPU conducted by district level trained trainers for 11 villages in Xebangfai and Nongbok</li> </ul> <p><b>Viet Nam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 commune trainings held with for 98 communes in the 4 project districts and one extra district of Mo Cai Bac</li> </ul>
<b>Result 4:</b> Awareness raised in the target communities for children and educators to deal with floods in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam	Enhanced capacities of Provincial and District level officials from Education Department in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam in organizing in flood awareness through school programme	<p><b>Cambodia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of provincial and district officials of DoEYS in target provinces of Cambodia is enhanced in organizing flood awareness through school activities (identified in Letter of Agreement)</li> </ul> <p><b>Lao PDR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial and District level officials from Education Department involved through Letter of Agreement to carry out flood awareness through school programme in 40 schools in Nongbok and Xebangfai districts</li> </ul> <p><b>Viet Nam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial and District level officials from Education and Training involved through Letter of Agreement to carry out flood awareness through school programme in 60 schools in 4 target districts in Tien Giang and Ben Tre</li> </ul>
	Flood Awareness through Schools is linked with the ongoing programs of Provincial Education Department as well as other DRR initiatives in the target countries focussing education sector and other Safer School programs.	<p><b>Cambodia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC materials reviewed in partnership with DIPECHO partners.</li> <li>IEC materials produced for the SFSP (2 posters, 1 drought and 1 flood booklet, 1 teacher information kit, 1 women headed households brochure, 1 safer communities leaflet). Total distribution was 5030 posters, 403 each booklet, 203 teacher information kits, 403 each, 200 brochures and 200 leaflets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Lao PDR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC materials (5 posters, 1 flood booklet, 1 SFSP Teacher Information Booklet, SFSP kit) developed, reviewed and published in collaboration with various stakeholders (1,000 copies each produced under MRC-ADPC projects)</li> <li>500 SFPS kits containing IEC materials were produced for distributing to schools</li> </ul> <p><b>Viet Nam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIC materials were produced by wide stakeholder consultation of community, teachers, NGOs and institutional stakeholders</li> <li>500 SFSP kits containing IEC materials, 250 Food Booklets, 250 posters (Children Drowning Prevention), 250 posters (Household Safety Measures), 250 poster (Four On-Site Mottos) were produced for distributing to schools and line agencies.</li> </ul>
	150 School Flood Safety Programme (SFSP) supported (30 school in each of the 5 target provinces) in target countries through partnership approach and replicating the successful model of the previous phase. <sup>3</sup>	<p><b>Cambodia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50 school SFSP campaign activities organized in 3 districts in Kratie province and 1 district in Svay Rieng.</li> <li>1 awareness billboard erected in Kratie</li> </ul> <p><b>Lao PDR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School flood safety campaigns conducted in 40 schools in Khammouane (Nongbok and Xebangfai, districts) facilitated by Provincial and District Education Office</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> The original indicator was "150 School Flood Safety Programme (SFSP) supported (50 school each) in target countries through partnership approach and replicating the successful model of the previous phase." However as Lao PDR had only one target province, the indicator was reportedly revised, by agreement of stakeholders, to 150 School Flood Safety Programme (SFSP) supported (30 schools in each of the target provinces of the 3 countries = 30 x 5 provinces = 150 schools) through partnership approach and replicating the successful model of the previous phase.

		<p><b>Viet Nam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 59 SFSP campaigns were held in primary and secondary schools in the 4 project districts in Tien Giang and Ben Tre.</li> <li>• 2 awareness billboards erected in the 2 most flood impacted communes in Cho Lach district in Ben Tre.</li> </ul>
	100 School Flood Safety Programmes (SFSP) supported in a further 100 new schools in each of the target provinces in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam.	Not applicable. This provision was reportedly mistakenly included in the programme agreement, but not the logframe, as an editing and typographic oversight in preparing the Program Terms of Reference.
<p><b>Result 5:</b> Three National Flood Forums organised in the three target MRC member countries to promote knowledge an information sharing on flood management and mitigation in the Lower Mekong Basin and contribution of Flood Preparedness Programs in developing the future programming of MRC FMMP</p>	Improved documentation of good practices and Increased Knowledge sharing through documentation of good practices among the MRC member countries on Flood Preparedness Programs	<p><b>Cambodia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good practice documents on 'Safe Area Improvement' is in process of being developed</li> <li>• National experience sharing on DRR Planning experience at Provincial and District Levels and its Integration into Local Development Planning Process held in Phnom Penh</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Lao PDR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 Case Study on 'Flood preparedness programme development in Lao PDR being developed.</li> <li>• The National Flood Forum on sharing experiences on flood planning and integrating DRR into development processes was held on 04-Dec-2009.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Viet Nam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 national experience sharing workshop on Promotion of Partnership between Public-Private Sector and Vulnerable Community in Flood Risk Reduction in participation of 52 participants</li> <li>• 2 case studies on 'Good Practice on Flood and Storm Control Planning' and 'Public and Private Partnership for Flood Risk Reduction' being developed</li> </ul>
	Promoted linkages of FMMP within DRR initiatives of the three MRC member countries	<p><b>Cambodia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participated in DRR forums and workshops in Cambodia, including UNDAC DRR mission, ECHO National Consultative Meeting, as well as supporting NGO partners and contributing to the Post Ketsana Needs Assessment</li> <li>• Attended the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Sub-Committee on Public Education and Awareness (PEA)</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Lao PDR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participated in DRR forums and workshops in Lao PDR, including the National Workshop on DRR Planning by NDMO, plus contributing to the field assessment on the Lower Mekong Integrated water Resource management Project (World Bank / GFDRR) and facilitating World bank DRR investigative missions to Khammouane.</li> <li>• Hosted the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Sub-Committee on Public Education and Awareness (PEA)</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Viet Nam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRR contributions to the JANI Project, World Bank NDRMP project, field testing of IEC materials under JANI, National Forum on Climate Change and support of NGO partner initiatives in mainstreaming DRR into education.</li> <li>• Attended the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Sub-Committee on Public Education and Awareness (PEA)</li> <li>• Private sector planning partnerships established and undertaking awareness activities with scope for subsequent activities</li> </ul>

## Result 1: Flood Protection Or Flood And Storm Control Plans:

### Cambodia

The FPP review processes were undertaken for Kratie Province as well as Kratie, Sambour and Chhloung Districts. These review processes are quite standardised for all the target provinces (Prey Veng, Kandal, Kratie and Svay Rieng) where MRC is implementing the FMMP project with ADPC technical support<sup>4</sup> (both ECHO and GTZ programmes). In Kratie province, the provincial and district sectoral DRR plans were prepared by the PCDM and DCDM line departments with technical assistance from the PCDM and DCDM Secretariat, Department of Planning at provincial and district levels, Provincial Executive Committee, PSDD Advisor and the project team. Based on the directions by the PCDM and DCDM to have a single DRR plan for the province and district, the FPPs of Kratie province, Sambour, Kratie and Chhloung districts were then updated and consolidated as part of the 3-Year Multi-Sectoral DRR Plans through technical consultative meetings and consolidation workshops, including:

- 4 Consultative Technical Meetings were conducted in Kratie province between Jan-Feb 2009 with participants as shown in Kratie Province (37 participants from 30 line departments plus 1 NGO and PSDD) and the districts of Kratie (30 participants from 12 line departments), Sambour (30 participants from 11 line

<sup>4</sup> ADPC is supporting MRCS –FMMP in both ECHO and GTZ programmes

departments) and Chhloung (23 participants from 8 line departments) from which all sectoral plans were developed and submitted to the PCDM Secretariat for comments prior to finalization workshops;

- 4 Consolidation Workshops were conducted between 22 Jan-April 2009 with indicated participants in Kratie (75 participants from 28 line departments plus 7 NGOs, PSDD, ECHO and CRC) province as well as in the districts of Kratie (29 participants from 13 line departments plus 2 NGOs and PSDD), Sambour (27 participants from 12 line departments plus 1 NGO and PSDD) and Chhloung (45 participants from 12 line departments plus 1 NGO and PSDD). In addition to the DMCs, line departments, CRC, PSDD and the following NGOs participated at various of the workshops - Action Aid, KAFDOC, PADEK, Oxfam-GB, Oxfam-Australia, DRC, Save the Children Australia.

In Svay Rieng, the decision of the PDMC Secretariat was to develop a long term Multi-Sectoral DRR Plan and ensure effective implementation and involvement of all line departments. Consequently the existing Provincial Disaster Risk Action Plan (PDRAP) for Svay Rieng province<sup>5</sup> was reviewed and updated under this Phase IV project through a provincial level technical consultative meeting and consolidation workshop. The provincial FPP was part of this document.

Consolidation and updating of the Svay Rieng Provincial DRRAP was undertaken from two meetings:

- a DRRAP Technical Meeting for revision of the plan was held in Svay Rieng in 10 March (42 participants from 22 line departments plus 2 NGOs, CRC, ACLEDA PLC, PRASAC and PSDD);
- the DRRAP Finalisation Workshop was held on 24 April (46 participants from 22 line departments plus 2 NGOs, PRASAC, ACLEDA PLC, PSDD, World Bank and DCDM Svay Chrum).

As a result all the FPPs in Kratie Province and the three target districts and in Svay Rieng (Province and district) were compiled and completed

The development of a FPP for Svay Chrum district in Svay Rieng was a joint effort by the MRCS-ADPC project and Action Aid to develop the 3-Year Multi-Sectoral DRR Plan through training and workshops including:

- a 3 day Orientation Training on 24 – 26 June 2009 (47 Participants from 23 line departments plus 2 NGOs, MRC, CRC and CNMC) followed by Disaster Risk Assessment conducted PCDM Working Group in the most vulnerable villages from, 27 June – 14 July 2009;
- a 3 day Planning Workshop on 15-17 July 2009 (54 Participants from 26 line departments, 16 CCDM plus 9 persons from 5 NGOs);
- a 1 day Consolidation Workshop on 27 October July 2009 (42 participants from 6 PCDM line departments, 14 line district offices, 13 CCDM and 3 persons from 2 NGOs) and
- 1 day Finalization workshop for final review of the draft Sectoral Plans submitted by all line departments, held 18 November 2009 (51 participants from 26 line departments, 16 CCDM and 9 persons from 5 NGOs)

### **Lao PDR**

The Flood Preparedness Programs (FPPs) developed by the Khammouane province and Nong Bok and Xebangfai districts have been achieved through a consultation process and assisting the Provincial and District DM Committees (PDMC and DDMC) to facilitate the process. That process included internal meetings by the DMCs (10 November 2008, 13 February 2009) plus consultation with the project (17 February 2009) and Multi-stakeholder consultation workshops on 18 December 2008 plus 3 & 4 March 2009. The FPPs for in Xebangfai and other districts (Hinboun, Yommalath, Mahaxay in Khammouane province and Xaybuly in Savannakhet province) under MRC's FMMP Component 4 projects, were developed between 3 March and 1 April 2009. The FPPs for the 5 districts of Nongbok, Xebangfai, Hinboun, Yommalath and Mahaxay were finalised at the completion workshop on 18-19 June 2009.

On 26 July 2009, the Nongbok DDMC organized an internal meeting to review and approve the final draft of FPP. The Nongbok and Xebangfai FPP were finalized, approved by District Governor and submitted to Khammouane PDMC in July and October 2009, respectively. The Khammouane Provincial FPP was updated based on the FPPs and priority activities of 5 districts with the final revision of the FPP and its priority activities approved on 16 November 2009 by the Provincial Governor.

### **Viet Nam**

The Ben Tre PCFSC and Cho Lach DCFSC were supported in adapting the recent Government Guideline on disaster preparedness and in implementing the FSC Plans in compliance with the National Strategy. To do so the Provincial and District Flood and Storm Control Plans were reviewed and updated during a Provincial FSC Plan Meeting in May 2009 with participation by PCFSC and DCFSC members of 9 districts. This was followed by developing and conducting a 4-Day workshop of Training on Development and Implementation of the Flood and Storm Control Plan on 9-12 June 2009 in Ben Tre Cit. The workshop was organised in consultation with

<sup>5</sup> Developed under ADB-TA project during 2007-2008 with technical support from ADPC and Church World Service (CWS)

the CCFSC Secretariat and NDMP Secretariat, with participation of 74 members of the PCFSC and DDFSC members of 9 districts.

The Ben Tre Provincial Action Plan for Implementation of the National Strategy on Natural Disaster Prevention, Mitigation and Response 2020, was reviewed and updated based on comment and recommendations from the 4-day workshop (of 9-12 June, above) in close cooperation with the PCFSC members and World Bank funded CBDRM Project during a meeting on 27 November 2009. Gaps and weak points of the existing action plan, particularly on linkages to the socio-economic development plan were clearly identified and discussed during the meeting. The updated Provincial Action Plan was endorsed and launched by Ben Tre PCFSC on 15 December 2009.

**The summary of beneficiary participation in Result 1 is as follows:**

Beneficiaries	Cambodia		Lao PDR		Viet Nam		TOTAL	
	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual
Prov and district officials, Red Cross, mass organisations, local NGOs (existing FPPs)	20	173	20	73	35	60	75	310
District officials, Red Cross, mass organisations (new FPPs)	35	99	25	26	35	20	95	145
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>455</b>

**Result 2: Mainstreaming FPP Into The Development Framework:**

**Cambodia**

At the initial stage of project implementation, 2 project start-up meetings were held in Phnom Penh on 27-28 August 2008, one for consultation with national partners and another one for provincial and district partners. DRR integration into local development planning was one of the discussion topics. It was agreed that the NCDM with support from PSDD would take lead in supporting provincial and district in FPP development and implementation as well as development of guidelines.

Consultation meetings were held with the PCDM Kratie, Department of Planning, project team and PSDD on 12 January 2009, and with the PCDM Svay Rieng, Department of Planning and project team on 10 March 2009.<sup>6</sup> It is indicated that the purpose of these meetings was to clarify the FPP / PDRRAP processes and explore linkages to local development plans.

Three consultative meetings were subsequently held - 2 in Kratie (22-23 January 2009) and 1 in Svay Rieng (23 February 2009). These meetings reportedly discussed linkages of the MRC-ADPC projects with DIPECHO partners, PCDM, DCDM, PSDD and other NGOs i.e. Oxfam, SCA, CAFDOC, DRC/CRC, and to improve coordination and information sharing between NGOs and local authorities.

DRR integration is addressed as part of the process of developing the FPP. In January 2009 FPP/DRR Technical Consultative Meetings and Consolidation workshops were held at provincial level in Kratie province, and at district level in Sambour, Kratie and Chhloung districts in February 2009 and April 2009. The PCDM DCDM and line departments, participated to promote integration of the FPPs into the 3 Year Investment and Development Program. Similarly in Svay Rieng province, the integration of DRR planning into local development planning was addressed in developing and updating the FPPs, with support from MRC-ADPC and Action Aid. The revision and consolidation process of the Svay Rieng province PDRRAP was undertaken in March 2009 and the Svay Chrum district Disaster Risk Reduction Plan, based on PDRRAP, was developed during April-July 2009.

At the end of the Phase IV project, 2 provincial workshops on the current status on linking of DRR measures into local development planning process were held at:

- Kratie province: 11 December 2009, attended by 52 officials from PCDM, DCDM and line departments, CCDM plus PSDD and 4 NGOs;
- Svay Rieng province: 14 December 2009, attended by 45 key officials from PCDM, DCDM, line departments, CCDM plus PSDD, PRASAC, ACLEDA PLC and 6 NGOs.

In Kratie 551 priority activities related to DRR were identified in 23 Commune Investment Programs (CIP) in Kratie, Sambor and Chhloung districts. Among the priority activities, 501 activities are related to DRR in 5 areas on economic, social, natural resources and environmental management, security and health whereas 50 activities are related to flood preparedness programme.

<sup>6</sup> Numbers and specific details of these meetings are not listed, as with other meetings.

In Svay Chrum district of Svay Rieng 314 priority activities related to DRR were identified in 16 CIPs. Among those, 283 activities are related to DRR in socio-economic, natural resources and environmental management, security and gender, while 31 activities are related to flood preparedness programme.

### Lao PDR

In Lao PDR, the process of integrating FPPs into the local development planning process started with the multi-stakeholder consultation in December 2008 which identified this activity as one of the key aspects for successful implementation of flood risk reduction activities. A country paper “*Integrating Flood Preparedness into National and Local Development Planning Process in Lao PDR*” was drafted in February 2009.

With assistance of the Ministry of Planning and Investment and the NDMO, a multi stakeholder consultation was held on 29 May 2009, attended by 48 participants (LNMC), (NDMO), DMCs, line ministries and NGOs. Thereafter, the PDMC Secretariat and Provincial Planning and Investment Department took the lead in supporting the PDMC and DDMC member departments in integrating the FPPs into the next 5 Year Development Plan (2011-2015). The provincial FPP of Khammouane and district FPPs of Nongbok, Xebangfai, Hinboun, Mahaxay and Yommalath have been integrated into the local socio-economic development plans. In parallel the PDMC Secretariat is advocating that NGOs seeking new projects should focus on priority activities listed in the FPPs.

Based on various discussion with the Provincial Planning and Investment Department, WB and KDP Component 2 Project the KDP had been targeted for priority implementation of flood risk reduction activities. However, as the KDP project has only recently started, activities related to DRR could not been implemented during the project period. Potential areas of cooperation with the KDP are still under discussion.

Currently the World Bank is undertaking appraisal for a new project, “*Adaptable Programmatic Lending (APL): Lower Mekong Integrated Water Resources Management (MIWRM)*” covering the four MRC member countries. The appraisal mission in Khammouane (including Nongbok and Xebangfai districts) was conducted from 15-19 Feb 2010 to define project activities (infrastructure), develop a set of core tasks (feasibility study, economic analysis, environmental and social safeguard). The mission was also to agree outputs, schedule as well as defining the preliminary institutional framework / modality and cost. The ADPC accompanied the mission to explain the FPP development and approval process. The WB has reportedly agreed to implement the new project based on the FPP priority activities listed in Nongbok and Xebangfai districts, starting with implementation from the target villages which participated in commune level trainings under this phase.

Additionally, the WB’s GFDRR project on Operationalising Strategic Planning for Disaster Management Project (OSPD) will be implemented by WREA in Khammouane province. The focus will be on water resource management in Lao PDR such as hydropower development, floods, lack of IWRM mechanism and practices, etc. This project could be linked with the APL-Lower MIWRM project to support the districts to implement flood risk reduction activities in the target communities.

### The summary of beneficiary participation in Result 2 is as follows:

Beneficiaries	Cambodia		Lao PDR		Viet Nam		TOTAL	
	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual
DM practitioners, provincial and district officials	16	16	15	26	20	0	51	42
National, Provincial officials, DIPECHO Partners, NGO, INGO, IOs, Donor, UN	18	18	30	55	0	0	48	73
Commune and village level officials and members	30	26	30	30	0	0	60	56
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>171</b>

### Result 3: Enhancing Capacity Of Commune DM Committees In FPP:

#### Cambodia:

Through various meetings and discussions, the Cambodian National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM) and partner NGOs involved in DRR initiatives had agreed at the start of the project to review and institutionalize existing training curricula on disaster risk reduction in Cambodia to harmonize training efforts. The organisations participating at various stages included Action Aid, Danish Red Cross/Cambodian Red Cross (DRC/CRC), Church World Service (CWS), CARE, World Vision, Oxfam (GB, USA, Australia) and others articulated a common need in the conduct of their training activities on disaster risk reduction (DRR).

At the 13th DRR forum, on 21-22 May 2009, a two-day workshop on “Standardization of Training Course Curriculum” and steps towards a National Training Course Curriculum for DRR in Cambodia was convened. A total of 39 representatives from NCDM and 20 agencies participated, including MRCS, ADPC, Action Aid, LWF,

ZOA, Oxfam (GB, USA, Australia), CRC, CWS, DRC, CARE, DRM-EPP, DCA, Plan International, Save the Earth, World Vision, DIPECHO-SEA, WHO and IOM.

- Based on the outputs from the workshop a 5 day refresher ToT was held in Kratie province from 7-11 September 2009 for 29 officials from relevant authorities at provincial and district levels (14 PCDM Secretariat officers, provincial line departments and 15 DCDM officials from Kratie, Chhloung, Sambour and Prek Prasab districts participated);
- For Svay Rieng officials, a 5 day new ToT course was organized in Prey Veng province from 21-25 September 2009 as a cost sharing between the GTZ and ECHO funded projects for 39 selected participants from Prey Veng, Kandal, Svay Rieng provinces, Universities and NGO partners. Under the ECHO funded project 11 participants from Svay Rieng province were trained (7 Svay Rieng PCDM officials and 4 Svay Chrum DCDM officials).

The two courses were organized by resource persons from different partners who have extensive experience and knowledge in organizing DRR training programs in Cambodia, including NCDM, VBNK and ADPC. Following the training sessions, the "trained trainers" formed a core group of trainers in each in each province and district to carry out wider training programs in their locations, and to support other partners in organising training activities. Subsequently the "trained trainers" organized 3 day commune level trainings on flood preparedness planning and integration of flood risk reduction measures into local development planning process during October-December 2009 at the following locations and dates:

- Chhloung district, Kratie province on 5-7 October 2009 (30 participants from 10 CCDM);
- Kratie district, Kratie province on 12-14 October 2009 (30 participants from 15 CCDM);
- Svay Chrum district of Svay Rieng province on 21-23 October 2009 (35 participants from 16 CCDM);
- Sambour district, Kratie province on 26-28 October 2009 (30 participants from 10 CCDM).

#### **Lao PDR**

The training course curriculum in the Phase II project had already been translated into Lao by the NDMO and used widely in the country for training. The existing curriculums (including CBDRM, First Aid, Search & Rescue) were reviewed by the NDMO, LNMC, Khammouane PDMC and Nong Bok DDMC for adaption as the district level ToT and commune level training curriculum. It was agreed by the NDMO and Khammouane PDMC that this would form the base, to which additional materials on search & rescue, early warning would be added. The additional materials would be added during the ToT and an update subsequently made of documents and presentations, based on comments received from the users.

The outline of the training course curriculum for district level trainers was reviewed during July 2009 by the training development team comprising resource persons from NDMO, WREA (Department of Meteorology and Hydrology), MoE, Ministry of Public Security and Ministry of National Defence, Khammouane LSW and Nongbok DDMC. The content of the curriculum was reviewed and additional material added to ensure that the document could be used by NDMO as a standard flood preparedness curriculum focusing across the country. The 5 day district ToT on Flood Management was organized in Xebangfai district and delivered by 10 resource persons from the training development team agencies from 3-7 August 2009 (30 participants, 15 from each of Nongbok and Xebangfai districts).

To accommodate local conditions of flooding and cultivation the commune level trainings on flood preparedness for Village Protection Units (VDPU) were carried out in the target districts as follows:

- day commune level training in Xebangfai district held on 11-13 November 2009 in Xabangfai district (participants were 20 VDPU members of 5 flood vulnerable villages, delivered by 4 district level trained trainers from District LSW, Public Health, Military and Education offices);
- day commune level training in Nongbok districts held on 23-25 November 2009 in Nongbok district (participants were 30 VDPU members of 6 flood vulnerable communes, delivered by 9 district level trained trainers from District Agriculture & Forestry, Public Health, Education, LSW, Lao Front and Security offices).

Following the commune trainings 11 village FPPs were developed in 5 villages of Xebangfai and 6 villages of Nongbok.

#### **Viet Nam**

In Viet Nam, the ToT training curriculums developed under the previous phases of ECHO and GTZ funded projects were reviewed and updated for Tien Giang and Ben Tre provinces based on a series of consultations, working group meetings (among the MRC-ADPC project team, DDMFSC Southern Office, Tien Giang and Ben Tre PCFSCs, JANI members, WB, etc) and lessons learned from ToT conducted in Cuu Long Delta. A total of approx 300 copies were printed and distributed to the target provinces, districts, provincial Red Cross and the NGOs working in Tien Giang and Ben Tre:

- a 3 day a refresher TOT training was held from 10 – 12 April 2009, in My Tho city, Tien Giang province for 12 officials from Cai Lai and Cai Be who were previously trained under Phase III;

- a 5-day new ToT training was held in Ben Tre province from 2-6 June 2009 for 25 officials from Chau Tanh district of Tien Giang and Chau Lach district of Ben Tre province.

Following the ToT training, the commune level curriculums developed under the previous phases of ECHO and GTZ funded projects were updated and adapted by the “trained trainers” of each district. In addition, specific modules on typhoon and whirlwind preparedness planning were added. A total of approx 470 copies were printed and distributed to the target districts, provincial and district Red Cross and the NGOs working in Tien Giang and Ben Tre. Based on the updated curriculum, 9 commune level trainings were conducted by the trained trainers for 280 key officials from 113 flood prone communes in 5 target districts of Tien Giang and Ben Tre as follows:

- Chau Tanh district of Tien Giang province, on 17-19 and 20-22 August 2009 for 60 participants from 26 communes;
- Cai Be district of Tien Giang province, on 23-25 August 2009 for 30 participants from 15 communes;
- Cai Lay district of Tien Giang during 29-31 August and 1-3 September 2009 for 60 participants from 30 communes;
- Chau Lach district of Ben Tre province, during 10-12, 13-15 September and 2-4 December 2009 for 80 participants from 16 communes.
- Additionally at the request of the Ben Tre PCFSC the project conducted training for Mo Cay Bac district of Ben Tre province using the updated curriculum on a cost sharing basis. The training was undertaken on 2-4 December 2009 for 20 participants from 14 communes.

**The summary of beneficiary participation in Result 3 is as follows:**

Beneficiaries	Cambodia		Lao PDR		Viet Nam		TOTAL	
	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual
National/Provincial/ District officials, Teachers, NGO, Mass Organisation	30	93	30	47	35	47	95	187
Commune staff, volunteers, village leaders	120	125	60	50	120	280	300	455
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>642</b>

**Result 4: School Flood Safety Programs:**

**Cambodia**

On 4-5 February 2009, a regional meeting with participants from the NDMOs of Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam participated in the “*Technical Meeting on Public Awareness in Flood Risk Reduction, Component 4 of the MRC FMMP*”. This meeting considered lessons learned in awareness. It also sought to identify needs for new IEC material on flood / emergency management and means to mainstream public awareness activities on flood/disaster management into sectoral development planning/plans.

During March 2009, a workshop was organized jointly with Action Aid to identify available IEC materials for public awareness, and formation of an IEC working group. A survey was conducted by Action Aid with support from all the DIPECHO partners. In the ensuing workshop three IEC working groups were formed and information was shared with MDRD-EDU-II. Final products were printed during July 2009 on a cost sharing basis with WV, Action Aid and Zoa and distributed to local authorities and line departments in two target provinces for organizing public awareness activities. In parallel a 2 day national workshop <sup>7</sup> was held on 21 to 22 May, 2009 to review training curricula and target audiences for National DRR training.

Thereafter key training and planning activities included

- a single 1 day reflection workshop in Kratie province on 5 October 2009 to review SFSP activities and share experience and lessons learned in the last phase (28 teachers from 20 schools, school authority officers from DoEYS at provincial and district levels participated) following which a total of 20 work plans were developed by school authorities and submitted to PoEYS and DoEYS for proposed implementation.
- three 2 day Orientation Trainings on SFSP for school teachers were organized in collaboration between NCDM and Department of Curriculum Development (DCD) of MoEYS as:
  - Chhloung district, Kratie province, during 6-7 October 2009 (28 school teachers from 10 vulnerable schools participating);
  - Sambour district, Kratie province, during 8-9 October 2009 (30 teachers from 10 vulnerable schools participating);
  - Svay Chrum district, Svay Rieng province, during 28-29 September 2009 (31 teachers from 10 flood vulnerable schools participating).

<sup>7</sup> As noted in Result 3, at the 13<sup>th</sup> DRR forum, a 2 day workshop on Standardization of Training Course Curriculum and steps towards a National Training Course Curriculum for DRR in Cambodia was held.

- Following the training 30 work plans were submitted to PoEYS and DoEYS for supporting implementation.
- Teacher to teacher replication was undertaken by those who attended the reflection workshop or orientation training, to introduce IEC materials, implementation action plans and SFSP activities to other teachers on:
  - 19 October–14 November 2009: 40 Teacher to teacher orientation sessions held in 40 schools in Kratie, Sambor and Chhloung districts of Kratie (535 teachers briefed);
  - 26 October- 10 November 2009: 10 Teacher to teacher orientation sessions held in 10 schools in Svay Chrum district of Svay Rieng, (129 teachers briefed).
- The school flood safety campaigns were carried out by school authority officers and school teachers through awareness raising activities proposed by each school as follows:
  - 40 school public awareness campaigns in 40 schools in Kratie, Sambor and Chhloung districts of Kratie (9,163 students plus 541 authorities and students' guardians participating);
  - 10 school public awareness campaigns in 10 schools in Svay Chrum of Svay Rieng (2,390 students plus 78 authorities and students' guardians participating).

### **Lao PDR**

During the multi-stakeholder consultation held on 18 December 2008 in Khammouane, the Lao Red Cross and ADPC agreed consultation among partners and stakeholders in the use of existing IEC materials as well as any development of new materials. On 6 February 2009, three meetings were held with Lao Red Cross (LRC)/French Red Cross (FRC), National Research Institute for Educational Sciences (NRIES) and the Department of Planning of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. The LRC and FRC were invited to jointly organize public awareness events, such as the proposed Mekong Flood Safety Day. Discussions were also undertaken with the National Research Institute for Education Science (NRIES) on various dates in February 2009 regarding appropriate IEC materials and topics for compatibility on-going national curriculum improvement programs of NRIES.

Following meetings with Xebangfai and Nongbok DDMC members on 13 and 17 February 2008, respectively, IEC materials were reviewed with the NDMO, LNMC, PDMC, DDMC and NGOs. On 7 May 2009, the IEC Material Review workshop was organized by NDMO and Ministry of Education in Vientiane with participants from the MoE officials, NDMO and NGOs (Save the Children, Lao Red Cross, World Vision, etc). Five flood posters and 2 booklets on Floods plus Teacher Information on the School Flood Safety Program were developed with inputs and review by various national, local authorities, teachers and NGO partners. A total of 1,000 copies of each material and 500 kits were produced for the Khammouane Provincial Education Department to distribute to flood vulnerable schools. In addition, the MDRD-EDU-II project also printed 500 of each poster to be used as supporting materials of school curriculum developed by MoE.

The Provincial Education Department led in implementing school flood safety activities including:

- 2 one day Teacher Orientations organized in Nongbok and Xebangfai districts on 1st and 2nd October 2009, respectively (30 school teachers from 20 flood vulnerable schools in each district participated);
- following the orientation, teachers shared the orientation experience with other teachers in their schools who then taught flood risk reduction measures to students in their classes;
- the School Flood Safety Campaigns were organized from 16-20 November 2009 in 20 flood vulnerable schools each in Nongbok and Xebangfai districts for 4,478 students. During the campaigns, parents, small children, community leaders and mass organizations also participated in the activities.

### **Vietnam**

The previous phase of the project was successful in developing a School Flood Safety Programme (SFSP) Kit for School, by the Education Department of Tien Giang province and establishing a Provincial Partnership between Provincial authorities and other stakeholders to facilitate child safety initiatives. A similar approach was adopted under the current phase in Ben Tre province, where consolidation and scaling up of the School Flood Safety Programme was undertaken in Tien Giang province.

As a result:

- sets of IEC materials and kits were produced and distributed widely to target schools in Ben Tre and broader participants in several events;
- 2 teacher orientation workshops were held in 4 target districts for 120 teachers from 59 primary schools during February-April 2009;
- following the 2 orientation workshops there were 59 school meetings held for introducing the workshops to other teachers of the schools who had been unable to attend the workshops. All the classes of these schools also held class meetings for students in preparation for SFSP festival days. Topics covered were disasters and flood preparedness;

- SFSP campaigns were held during March-May 2009 by 59 flood vulnerable schools in Tien Giang and Ben Tre provinces under supervision of the Education Department for 37,132 students, teachers, parents and community staff.

Subsequently a one day SFSP Partnership Workshop was jointly organized by Tien Giang DoET and PCFSC in Tien Giang province on 9 October 2009 with participants from MoET, DDMFSC, VNMC, provincial and district line agencies, education sector school teachers and students in Ben Tre, Tien Giang, An Giang and Don Thap provinces. The objective of the workshop is to consolidate experiences and lessons learned from SFSP since 2007 in the Mekong Delta and to foster provincial partnerships for further child safety awareness programs, as part of regular activities in schools.

**The summary of beneficiary participation in Result 4 is as follows:**

Beneficiaries	Cambodia		Lao PDR		Viet Nam		TOTAL	
	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual
National, Provincial and District level officials, Red Cross, DIPECHO Partners	15	19	15	45	15	91	45	750
DOET, Teachers	250	782	250	216	250	2079	750	3069
Students	4,000	11,553	3,000	4,478	5,000	30,981	12,000	47,012
Others (parents, village and mass organizations, etc)		619		857		4,079		5,555
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4265</b>	<b>12973</b>	<b>3265</b>	<b>5596</b>	<b>5265</b>	<b>37230</b>	<b>12795</b>	<b>55772</b>

**Result 5: Documentation And Sharing Of Best Practices Of FPPs**

As a result of discussions between ECHO, MRCS and ADPC in March 2009 it was decided that due to delayed project start and as most activities were at their inception, it was not feasible to hold the National Flood Forum before the MRC Annual Flood Forum on 13-14 May 2009. It was agreed to defer the National Flood Forums to the end of Phase IV, allowing “good practice” documents and other dissemination materials to be prepared.

Prior to the National Forum, a “Provincial Experience Sharing Workshop” was held in Khammouane province on 30 November 2009 (26 participants from Khammouane and Savannakhet PDMCs, and DDMCs of Nongbok, Xebangfai, Hinboun, Mahaxay, Yommalath and Xaybouly districts participated). Presentations were made of achievements during Phase IV, under each activity.

Three National Forums were organized in Viet Nam, Lao PDR and Cambodia with individual country themes:

- Cambodia: Title “**Disaster Risk Reduction Planning at Province and District Levels and Integration into Local Development Planning Process in Cambodia**”, 12-13 January 2010, Phnom Penh, jointly organized by NCDM, CNMC, MRC, ADPC and ECHO.
- Lao PDR: Title “**Integration of Disaster Risk Reduction into National and Local Development Planning Process in Lao PDR**”, 4 December 2009, Vientiane Capital, jointly organized by NDMO, LNMC, Ministry of Planning and Investment, MRC, ADPC and ECHO;
- Viet Nam: Title “**Promoting Partnership between Public-Private Sector and Vulnerable Community in Flood Risk Reduction in the Cuu Long Delta**”, 1 December 2009, Hi Chi Min City; jointly organized by CCFSC, VNMC, VCCI, MRC, ADPC, GTZ and ECHO;

National line agencies who are members of the NDMC, provincial and district officials, public-private organizations as well as NGOs, IOs and donor organizations participated in the forums.

The “good practice” documentation process has been initiated in Viet Nam, Lao PDR and Cambodia since September 2009 through field visits and interviews as well as during national forums and End of Project Evaluation trips. The case studies will be presented during 8th Annual Mekong Flood Forum (AMFF-8) on 26-27 May 2010 in Vientiane, Lao PDR, under the theme, “Flood risk management and mitigation in the Mekong River Basin”. Case studies identified for presentation include:

- Safe Area Improvement in Cambodia;
- Flood preparedness programme development in Lao PDR;
- Good Practice on Flood and Storm Control Planning in Viet Nam; and
- Public and Private Partnership for Flood Risk Reduction in Viet Nam.

**The summary of beneficiary participation in Result 5 is as follows:**

Beneficiaries	Cambodia		Lao PDR		Viet Nam		TOTAL	
	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual	Prop	Actual
National Partners, DIPECHO Partners, NGO, INGO, IOs, Donor, UN Agencies	40	88	40	55	40	44	120	187
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>187</b>

## 6.) EVALUATION FINDINGS

### PROJECT RELEVANCE

#### Identified reality of problems and needs:

The Phase IV project built on the added value and lessons learned of three earlier phases plus the networks and relationships built through these phases. To a large degree many of the activities in Phase IV were an extension and strengthening of previous accomplishments and in this respect the needs and target beneficiaries were well understood.

A new area into which the project extended was the need to mainstream integration of DRR (specifically flood mitigation and management) into local development frameworks. This is a challenging task and involves significantly increased tiers of stakeholders outside the immediate project operation.<sup>8</sup> The methods and activities were clearly defined. However, the extent to which priorities, timelines and available resources or political will of stakeholders outside the project would align with the project, may have been over optimistic. This is exacerbated by the short duration of the project in which the activities and results have to be achieved with external stakeholders.

#### Analysis of local capacities for absorbing the aid:

National partners were eminently transparent in recognising the constraints of capacity and resources that they faced. There seemed limited capacity to analyse and address this, though efforts had been made, for example:

- In Lao PDR and Viet Nam national counterparts reported that the human resources were available but limited capacity was the main challenge. (however, in Lao PDR external stakeholders observed that they felt some national counterparts were overstretched);
- In Cambodia the gap in human resource was acknowledged and reported as not excessive, but difficult to fill, especially in more remote areas. The solution proposed by Cambodian counterparts is to emphasise the need to retain focal point staff in order to maintain institutional memory and capacity. Thence the provincial, district and commune authorities inform that they work together to fill human resource gaps by support from the PCDM.

Notwithstanding, counterparts consistently responded that they either did not have overlapping responsibilities and tasks, or that they had sufficient staff and assistance to manage these requirements.

An area in which human capacity was noted to be limited and apparently exceeded was the ability of commune level trainees and teachers to assimilate the training modules in the available time. Additionally requests were made in Cambodia that methodology training be included as well as DRR content – e.g. teaching, communication skills, listening and sensitivity to local conditions. In Viet Nam, teaching technique is already included in the ToT.

All National partners interviewed highlighted lack of capacity and funding as constraints. This may not entirely reflect a lack of project capacity, because on one hand the national needs are clearly huge but:

- in many cases the national partners are not seeing the project as purely a pilot project, or
- alternatively see it as so successful they would like it replicated.

On the other hand, within the pilot project there are some needs that are unmet through lack of resource capacity within the national counterpart organisations. Examples include lack of gasoline and resources to follow up and monitor project initiatives. These are accepted limitations within national government counterparts that are overstretched to meet their operational needs and sometimes supporting a number of aid projects. The constraints were most evident in Cambodia and to a lesser degree in Lao PDR. In Viet Nam this is less evident and there are clear advantages of the implementing (as compared to purely coordination) role of the DDMFSC and the provincial, district and commune authorities. Additionally in Viet Nam the management and planning structures are somewhat more developed. In Viet Nam the evaluator was assured at national and provincial levels that necessary resources can be mobilised through existing budget planning and

<sup>8</sup> For Example: Line ministries and sectoral departments, PSDD (in Cambodia) and external agencies, although stakeholders, are referred to as "external stakeholders"

supplementary budgets and through line departments, ODA (e.g. ADB grants and loans), Red Cross, private sector partnerships and NGO support.

#### **How the actions were prepared:**

On the whole the action was well prepared based on previous phases and alignment to both regional and national policies on flood mitigation and management. The project had the advantage that it built on three prior implementation phases with the associated “lessons learned”, recommendations and established networks.

The majority of recommendations from the previous Phase III have been, or are in the process of being implemented. Implementation of some previous recommendations were not able to be verified in the current evaluation (such as use Sphere indicators for the improvement of the safe areas, protection of water points with fences, increasing number of latrines at safe areas, etc).<sup>9</sup> Others recommendations are in progress or planned (such as updates of the training with additional DRR topics, scaling up the project to new areas, etc). Still other recommendations (such as the use of simulation drills) are being utilised in a few locations to date. Some recommendations such as simplifying district level training, providing an effective programme monitoring system and provision of small scale hardware have again been found to be germane and recommended for follow-up action.

These earlier phases apart from the day-to-day sharing of information and experiences, also contained a number of local, national and regional consultation workshops which are documented. In each country the new phase was commenced with “start-up” workshops, and included consultative workshops throughout the action which in most cases appear to have been substantive.

#### **Prior consultations undertaken:**

Reports by the stakeholders and from the evaluation visits seem to confirm that the overall parameters of the project design were established as extensions of the previous phases, with the National level counterparts. It is necessary to distinguish between the project design which defines the broad activities to be undertaken, and the sub-project and target definition (for district and commune / village pilot initiatives) which falls under the jurisdiction of the local stakeholders. Some National counterparts suggested the project was an MRCS and ADPC design. In Viet Nam this was later clarified that while design was predominantly developed by MRCS / ADPC and defined by the previous phases, the NDMO and DDMSC were involved in “fine tuning” discussions. There is no reason to suggest that Lao PDR and Cambodia differed in approach. In terms of detail implementation within the project parameters, reports and sample interviews confirm that detailed project design and consultation was undertaken at the “grass-roots” from commune to provincial levels in particular.

In several sub-national meetings in Cambodia, inquiries regarding participation by NGOs in the design, failed to confirm participation. This is considered an oversight as the project had a significant field presence and established linkages through earlier phases. Also the NDMO made specific reference to the project being “developed and implemented by NGO and Red Cross consultation”. While the selection of projects and pilot areas was substantially undertaken at grassroots level, the extent seems to vary between countries. In Cambodia, for example, DCDMs, NGOs and Red Cross confirmed involvement in the initial selection of projects and target areas, though some were deleted at higher levels of approval. In provincial interviews in Lao PDR and Viet Nam, however, it was explicitly confirmed that, that NGOs did not participate in initial detail planning which is undertaken by the provincial committees<sup>10</sup>. NGOs were subsequently invited to participate in the completed plans in Viet Nam and Lao PDR.

Records throughout the project implementation further document the presence of a range of stakeholders (including ECHO representatives) at various workshops facilitated by the project. Indeed the project documents further record that while an initial proposal was made to ECHO in April 2008, “.. based on feed back from ECHO, a revised proposal was submitted in July 2008 ...”.

#### **How the project complements and enhances other projects:**

The MRC-ADPC ECHO IV project clearly complements and enhances projects by ECHO partners, government and donors. There have been limited instances of duplication though these have tended to be where ongoing projects at different stages have overlapped. All stakeholders interviewed affirmed that the MRC-ADPC ECHO IV project fits well with the national DM management strategy and policy of each country. It is linked with the overall strategy of MRC’s FMMP, in particular with the Component 4–Flood Emergency Management Strengthening supported by the GTZ.

In Cambodia representatives of Action Aid, Cambodia Red Cross and Oxfam GB referred to the complementary nature of the FMMP project to their flood and disaster management projects in Kratie and Svay Reing. This

<sup>9</sup> These recommendations could not be verified as the areas were not visited in the course of the evaluation

<sup>10</sup> Please refer to subsequent sections regarding detail planning in Lao PDR and Viet Nam, and NGO participation.

included joint organisation of a ToT (with GTZ interests in Prey Veng and Kandal provinces) and cost sharing of IEC material printing with World Vision Action Aid and Zoa. Some initial overlap occurred with the MDRD-EDU-II project though this was clarified and the DoEYS / DCDM was actively involved in the preparation of SFSP activities.

In Lao PDR specific reference was made to complementarity with FRC/LRC CBDM projects in Nongbok, Xebangfai, Hinbourne, Mahaxay, Yomnalath all in Khammouane province and Xaybouly in Savannakhet Province (the later not being a MRC-ADPC ECHO IV province), with components of the KDP (Khammouane Development Project) and NT 2 (Nam Tern 2 Downstream Project) projects, the GoL Mekong Basin Soil Protection project. Although there are less NGOs operating in the Khammouane province contact is maintained with Save the Children (currently in Sayabouly) and OXFAM GB (who are proposing further projects in Sayabouly).

In Viet Nam the DDMSC and PCFSC made specific reference to the alignment of the project to GoV national guidelines and plans from 2011 to 2020 plus the intention to incorporate the FPP ToT into wider GoV DRR training. Also in Viet Nam cost sharing was undertaken with GoV agencies in training of officials from Ben Tre provincial line agencies and its 9 districts (8 of which are outside the project target area) which included additional districts at the request of the local authorities.

***The action was well prepared taking account of national policy and “grass roots” needs of the various stakeholders. Extensive consultations have generally been undertaken in preparing the activities though there is potential for improvement. The project enhances and compliments the projects by ECHO partners, government and donors with limited duplication and significant synergies in shared initiatives and costs.***

## **PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS**

### **Whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received:**

The majority of the project objectives had been designed based on the background, lessons learned, recommendations and relationships of earlier phases. Consequently the project evolved largely as expected.

Consequently review of project documents and discussion with stakeholders leaves no doubt that the project benefits are, in the main, delivered. Although there were no unforeseen outcomes, in some locations additional benefits have accrued.<sup>11</sup> The results and activities of the action can be split into:

- components that are well understood and relatively within the grasp and control of the project team and partners (such as preparation of FPPs, preparing and conducting ToTs, consultations and SFSPs, etc). These are all quite “tangible” items, plus
- components that are less tangible and in some instances require interfaces with, or are dependent on other stakeholders with a differing frame of reference or priorities (such as integration into the development framework and the subsequent implementation through sub-national or national investment plans).

“Tangible” items have been consistently delivered, and in some cases exceeded (such as the additional FPP prepared by the DCDM for Prek Prasab, increased beneficiary numbers, etc). Only in the respect of the revised and reallocated number of SFSPs has there been a nominal shortfall from expectations (the original 50 for Cambodia, instead of 2 x 30 per target province).

Despite challenges the project has made significant progress in terms of the “less tangible” objectives. Counterparts have reportedly succeeded in securing FPP activities into sub-national investment plans, often within sector plans, in all three target countries. As yet, however, limited resources and dependence on external stakeholders with differing priorities and schedule from the project, has constrained implementation of FPP activities through the development framework (particularly in Cambodia and to a lesser degree in Lao PDR). Documentation and dissemination to provinces of the guidelines on integrating DRR into national development is well advanced in Lao PDR and pending with NCDM in Cambodia. However, the project team report that delay in Cambodia is not a handicap as it is felt provincial workshops have addressed the dissemination requirement. Viet Nam, has the advantage of both already having integrated DRR into government development plans, and has secured some private sector partnerships as well as ODA capacity and NGO support. Within Cambodia and Laos PDR initial progress reports suggested that while the majority of FPP projects are being integrated into local development plans there are challenges to secure implementation. The situation is, however, more promising than initially reported. At least one project in Cambodia (Kratie) is

<sup>11</sup> Although initially planned that the Prek Prasab FPP developed under Phase III would be updated, this was subsequently deleted from the programme in favour of updating a previous Svay Reing Provincial FPP. The DCDM has, however, updated the FPP on its own initiative, based on earlier FPP training.

indicated as likely to be implemented through the development plans<sup>12</sup>. In Lao PDR provincial and commune level interviews identified that at least three FPP projects within the local development framework had started limited implementation with funds from Nam Tern 2 project, and with village funds. These previously unrecorded successes suggest that there is grounds for optimism and there are a number of potential avenues for implementation (other than specific aid projects) that can, and are, facilitating implementation.

**Flexibly of the various levels of management:**

The majority of the project objectives had been designed based on the background, lessons learned, recommendations and relationships of earlier phases. As noted previously many of the recommendations from Phase III and earlier have been adopted across the project (5 day ToTs) or locally (employing training drills and simulations). Consequently in general the project evolved largely as expected. In limited instances such as the re-allocation of SFSP quotas for equitable distribution, and substituting FPPs where appropriate, the project proved sufficiently flexible to respond to needs as verified.

**Whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was correct:**

The previous phase had identified challenges in securing implementation of FPP activities through sector departments and ministries in Cambodia and Lao PDR. In Viet Nam, with DRR integrated into government policy and the benefits of DDMSC as national level implementing agency this appears not to be a constraint. Additionally with the relatively recent advent of district committees in Cambodia some aspects of the sub-national implementation were untested. The revised FPP format and process emphasises coordination rather than direct implementation by the sub-national DMCs and places the emphasis for identifying and implementing with the sectors. Discussions with stakeholders have indicated that this has been beneficial in redressing the balance of responsibilities.

Stakeholders have also referred to their “learning by doing” experience, (especially in the Ketsana response) that has highlighted advantages in redistributing and reallocating tasks more appropriately (such as delegating additional responsibility from the district to commune committees). It is important these experiences are shared widely. Apparently not all of these “lessons from doing” have been reflected in the National experience sharing workshops, and stakeholders in Cambodia have suggested that a longer workshop (possibly two days of operational experience sharing)<sup>13</sup> may be preferable, with routine sharing of experiences more frequently (three or four times annually) at sub-national level. In Lao PDR it was proposed that sub-national level sharing should be undertaken approximately twice annually at provincial level in addition to the national experience sharing workshops twice per year. During interviews in Viet Nam, it is understood that information is already, readily shared between sectors and committees due to a well defined planning structure.

**Cross-cutting or over-arching issues such during implementation:**

The project at this point is relatively unsophisticated in that it deals with flood risk and mitigation in general terms. It is yet to mature to the sophistication of formalising attention to gender, disability, environment and other cross cutting issues, in detail. The Cambodia project did, however, produce and distribute 200 “Women Headed Household” brochures. In all interviews the stakeholders from officials to teachers, children and parents recognise that floods discriminate against people and communities with differing vulnerabilities (age, gender, disability, etc) as well as affecting the environment. It is also recognised that individuals will respond to and plan, in different ways (boys will take on different roles from girls, etc). Particularly in the rural communities people are aware of the impact of floods on their environment, and therefore their livelihoods and safety.

The project does not at this time explicitly address cross cutting issues<sup>14</sup> - it focuses on general awareness and behaviour change. It is, however, confirmed by a number of teachers and officials that although the project is still general in its awareness, and technical in its planning, that they had incorporated specific aspects (such as gender, disability, etc) into the training that they have designed or conducted.

***In general the assessments of risks have been realistic and mitigated by experience and recommendations from previous phases. The project can be said to be effective though some challenges have arisen where the objectives are dependent on the influence of external stakeholders. Performance has, however, been enhanced by the balancing of responsibilities through changed emphasis in coordination by DMCs of sector departments.***

<sup>12</sup> Single project mentions by the MoP, but as yet not confirmed, is a planned Commune Level workshop that MoP, indicated OXFAM had expressed an interest to facilitate

<sup>13</sup> The National Workshop in Cambodia was two days duration, but as noted elsewhere was the merging of two previously planned workshops, which some stakeholders had felt undesirable and diminishing opportunities for sharing operational experiences.

<sup>14</sup> The programme does not at this time explicitly address cross cutting issues except a “Woman Headed Household” booklet produced in Cambodia,

## **EFFICIENCY OF THE VARIOUS ACTIVITIES**

### **Operational capacities of the partners:**

Being a regional project with a multitude of lateral and vertical stakeholders and a relatively short duration the project stretches even the best resourced of partners. Local counterparts continue to face constraints of human and financial resources characteristic of developing economies. Were the national partners not resource and financially challenged, it could be argued that there may be limited requirement of an assistance project, or of capacity building and technical support.

In the context of the operational capacity of the partners, the MRCS, ADPC and local counterparts have performed well. The resources and capacity of both MRCS and ADPC have been a significant asset. It appears that counterparts have contributed according to their capacity. In Viet Nam the authorities have a more developed managerial structure aided by the implementing role of the DDMSC, the more robust contributions of sectoral line departments, and partnerships which now include the private sector. In Lao PDR the linkages into development plans have already started to mobilise additional capacity such as from associated development projects and local provincial and village funds.

National and sub-national counterparts, with limited exception, recognise the need for the ownership, technical support and coordination of the project. Most however, express to a greater or lesser degree, their preference for a longer project that allows ideas and practices to take root more fully as well as being tested, evaluated and where necessary modified. It is also expressed that a move from being "recipients" and "beneficiaries" of the project to a more active responsibility in the full planning, implementing, monitoring, and increasing financial responsibility and accountability would enhance "ownership" and sustainability.

MRCS continues to play a major role in the overall project management and coordination with the NMCs, who in turn provide administrative coordination and technical support for the MRCS, ADPC and NDMOs. MRCS also provides supporting services to ADPC and project implementation in the three target countries.

ADPC continues to take the lead in project implementation support, with their presence in the field and parallel support of the FEMS and EDU projects.

Progressively, however, the DMCs (sub-national) are assuming greater responsibilities than previously in coordination of sectors and grass-roots implementing partners (including NGOs and the Red Cross). The NGO consultative process appears more developed in Cambodia than in Lao PDR or Viet Nam. This is likely due to operation of the Cooperation Committee for Cambodia (CCC), the Cambodia DRR Forum (CDRRF) and a larger NGO presence compared to Lao PDR. In Laos PDR and to a greater extent Viet Nam, it is noted that partnerships with NGOs could be enhanced, and thereby incremental capacity mobilised - particularly by coordinating increased participation of NGOs in early planning and definition of DRR activities.

Overall the NDMOs have played a stronger role in coordinating, and particularly in linking the project implementation to the national development frameworks and planning. Notwithstanding these improvements there is still an ongoing need to root and nurture the investment to date with ongoing capacity building and support. In Cambodia there is still a perceived need to support the NDMO in the transition and prioritisation of DM from primarily "responses" to "longer horizon preparedness" as well as "responses" and "resilience" capacity and focus.

### **Systems of control and auto evaluation set up by the donors and partners:**

It is acknowledged that the project partners have undertaken monitoring visits to the various project sites and venues. These visits are documented in the reports to the donor. The reports include various comments regarding aspects such as limitation on number of trainers and "The purpose of visit was to verify the benefit of the project and check the current status of the project", etc. However within the evaluation period there did not appear to be detailed systematic reporting of the project against objectives, indicators, activities, etc. It seems that monitoring is ongoing, but appears more subjective and less formal. Similarly DMCs indicated that they verify progress of individual activities, though details were not clear. There appeared to be limited reporting of a systematic review of the project (as contrasted to individual activity) performance.

In general it appeared that the monitoring systems and indicators agreed with the project partners and donor, had not been robustly followed up with counterparts at national and sub-national levels. It appears (with exceptions in Viet Nam) that lead partners monitor the programme in respect of chosen indicators, while counterparts are informed of the required activity and schedule (rather than objectives and indicators). It was stated by two of the NMCs and confirmed from an MRCS stakeholder that counterparts are not bound to the monitoring and evaluation system at this time. In an exception, discussions in Laos PDR (NDMO) and Viet Nam (DDMFCS and PDMC), revealed that the indicators were known and understood - and their use by all stakeholders was advocated by those counterparts. The parties concerned appeared to have a significantly

improved understanding of the project. It is felt that there is a strong argument to “demystify” the monitoring process and apply it across the programme as simple and effective planning functions.

In general the project indicators were adequate (though frequently not “S.M.A.R.T.”).<sup>15</sup> Objectives and indicators for achieving implementation of FPP activities through the local development process (e.g: Activities 2.3 and 2.4) might not have been entirely appropriate taking account of their dependence on third parties’ priorities outside the project. These indicators should have been subject to review and amendment. The programme view was that there was insufficient time to review and amend indicators, as is normally accepted.

In Cambodia the project indicators appeared less well understood by national project staff and counterparts. In Lao PDR and Viet Nam, at all levels there was strong support for adopting a simple, consistent and understandable monitoring system and indicators for all stakeholders to use. Within the MRCS and ADPC project partners the response was somewhat mixed. From MRCS a positive view was expressed that this would enhance the project focus and delivery. ADPC are the most likely to be required to implement the system on a day-to-day basis and capacity build partners where necessary. ADPC expressed mixed support and concern that even a simple system may be beyond the scope and constraints of a short duration project.

The evaluator believes that combined with normal financial accounting transparency, the basic systems of project control built around the concept of the logical framework,<sup>16</sup> is fundamentally sound. By having agreed, simple and usable objectives and objectively verifiable indicators, all partners have an improved understanding of activities and priorities. Necessary “course corrections” in the project will be achieved in a more timely and efficient fashion and there will be a greater shared common understanding both of the project and its external linkages. Reporting will likely be more effective and succinct, while requiring less resources (especially in multiple language inputs). Furthermore, those less tangible results and objectives will have an improved focus where there are clear and simple but S.M.A.R.T. pre-agreed indicators. In summary it is recommended that further attention be applied to the appropriate, efficient, timely and relevant use of project controls such as reports, logframe indicators, etc.

Resistance to these processes is often due to lack of understanding, over complexity, or allowing them to become a straightjacket rather than a tool for maintaining the project on course while identifying and effecting adjustments. It was observed by the evaluator and a number of stakeholders many of the sub-national counterparts were unaware of the project indicators and specific objectives<sup>17</sup> that had been agreed with the donor, and / or had their own subjective indicators. These often had less direct relevance on the defined project objectives.

It is also to be appreciated that it may be unrealistic to expect a national counterpart to be fully responsible for monitoring and evaluation - where this may exceed their capacity, or place them in perceived conflict with the need for their organisation to see the project in an entirely positive light. It is not suggested that a large scale external monitoring and evaluation process be adopted. To the contrary it is advocated that:

- reports should be simplified and succinct, based on the objectives and indicators;
- the logframe should be shared by all stakeholders;
- the objectives and objectively verifiable indicators should be simple to understand and S.M.A.R.T.;
- objectives and indicators should have clear and unmistakable linkages to the project goal.

A simplified but consistent and systematic control system that checks progress against the objectively verifiable and pre-agreed indicators is crucial. This may be as simple as a Gantt with deliverable and activity times identified as a check against progress to milestone objectives and their associated descriptive indicators.

#### **Quality of day-to-day management:**

Regarding budget control and suitability, there was insufficient time in the evaluation to make any meaningful examination of the budget management. National counterparts at all locations noted that they had limited if any access to the budget, and in some instances (Cambodia and Loa PDR) this was an item of contention. It was noted, however, in the execution of the evaluation that ADPC exercises quite stringent budget control, and if this has been extended within the project it is expected that the available budget would be adequately managed.

Similarly the duration and practical constraints of the evaluation prevented a meaningful, reliable or objective assessment of the value for money of the various activities. A number of activities have had limited previous application (or have been applied only in differing contexts) thus preventing reliable comparison. National counterparts and stakeholders themselves may have limited experience for comparison on aspects in which

<sup>15</sup> S.M.A.R.T. is the accepted acronym for effective use of logical frameworks, requiring that objectives and indicators comprise all attributes with respect to the programme, of being “Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time Bound”

<sup>16</sup> The logical framework is a widely accepted programme planning and monitoring tool that when employed correctly comprises, S.M.A.R.T. objectives, objectively verifiable indications, agreed means of verification and a simple analysis of critical assumptions and risks.

<sup>17</sup> Excluding Viet Nam, noted in the text

their capacity is being built and developed. In discussions with stakeholders it was felt that a diligent approach had been taken and practically “value for money” had likely been achieved. It highlighted that delays in the project approval and start, and the relatively short timeframe of implementation, results in disproportionate management and overhead costs to the size of the project. The short duration also militates against sustainability. This potentially increases relative costs, if non sustainable components arise. In this respect reference is made to Item 13 of the “*Principles And Good Practice Of Humanitarian Donorship*” in respect of advocating for longer-term funding arrangements.<sup>18</sup>

In all locations it was commented by counterparts that the budget was insufficient to meet their perception of needs. In some respects it can be seen that counterpart expectations were somewhat unrealistic, and outside the project scope, especially in respect of meeting “hardware wish lists” at every pilot location.

On the other hand there were comments that training sessions and workshops were rushed or seen as too short, due to budget constraint and it is felt that this should have been addressed through both budget and expectation management by the project partners.

There is a compelling argument for providing some minor hardware in the implementation areas within the project budget. This could ensure that the investment in capacity is not constrained or lost through the national counterpart's or local partner's inability to function for lack of minor hardware. It is also recognised there are challenges of in respect of maintenance and defining ownership of such hardware items. These challenges are not, in the experience of the evaluator, insurmountable. Solutions can be found, in order to assure that capacity building benefits are mobilised, and used practically rather than constrained by absence of small but crucial hardware (loud hailer, stationary, basic essential tools / equipment, etc).

#### **Management of personnel, information, supplies, etc:**

Assessment of the management of personnel and supplies was also beyond the scope of the evaluation time and resources. Information management seemed on the whole to be good with adequate records generally available, mostly complete and where “spot checked” quite accurate. Only limited instances were noted in Cambodia where records of IEC material produced and distributed were incomplete and along with beneficiary numbers containing apparent discrepancies - though these were not considered major and were reviewed and updated during the evaluation.

Both the project team and counterparts were open and willing to provide access to, and assistance in obtaining, project information. As noted elsewhere, it is felt that the project is overburdened with excessive documentation requirements. This was particularly noted in Cambodia where it was felt the project team were making diligent efforts, but more focussing on doing a lot of activities and documenting these, rather than maintaining full focus on objectives. It is felt these information requirements could be simplified and made more succinct, without loss of information. This would likely enhance the use of the project reporting. It would enable the project partners, and third parties (such as the evaluator), to focus on key aspects and effectively follow them through. It is noted elsewhere that a systematic but simplified objective and indicator driven monitoring system would enhance project focus and performance.

#### **Whether management of risk was adequate, i.e. whether flexibility was demonstrated:**

Development projects by their nature have a number of uncertainties in risk management that cannot be fully anticipated in even the best project designs. Lack of capacity of national counterparts and differing perceptions by local and international partners will result in unanticipated challenges, and opportunities, in any project.

Particularly in a project of this type and schedule it is prudent and diligent for the emphasis to be on “processes” (and their refinement and institutionalisation) which may be applied recurrently - rather than “deliverables” which may be superseded with further development.

Given that all that the indications (with some limited exceptions noted elsewhere) are that the project was built from the “grass roots” and with a fairly broad and deep spectrum of stakeholders the risks appear to have been quite well identified. The fact that the project was building on earlier phases with the benefit of lessons learned and networks formed in those phases also seems to have assisted in mitigating the risks. In general the project

<sup>18</sup> The “Principles And Good Practice Of Humanitarian Donorship” were endorsed in Stockholm, 17 June 2003 by Germany, Australia, Belgium, Canada, the European Commission, Denmark, the United States, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Luxemburg, Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Switzerland. Article 13 states “While stressing the importance of transparent and strategic priority-setting and financial planning by implementing organisations, explore the possibility of reducing, or enhancing the flexibility of, earmarking, and of introducing longer-term funding arrangements.”

seems to have been flexible both in managing the activities to reflect conditions, and in permitting modification of the deliverables (FPPs and training modules) for local conditions.

One area in which flexibility could be improved is again linked to the development and understanding of systematic monitoring. Some indicators could not be readily achieved in total (such as Activity 2.3 in Cambodia and 2.4 in Lao PDR<sup>19</sup>) for reasons and stakeholder involvement outside the control of the project.<sup>20</sup> In an effective monitoring system, this would normally have been highlighted, and the indicators adjusted to achievable expectations. In this project such adjustments of indicators and objectives were not made. Queried on this, the evaluator was told that the limited period of the project and the complexity of securing approval of changed indicators precluded such adjustments. This seems an unfortunate constraint on monitoring and effective alignment of the project's implementation that may benefit from further project to donor dialogue.

Based on the project records and evaluator's discussions with various stakeholders the relations and coordination of the project to third parties (local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors, etc) was, with limited exceptions, excellent. Local counterparts expressed some reservations over the coordination in various activities (e.g. inputs to project design and FPP activity definition). In a number of interviews with national counterparts, and with PDMCs in Lao PDR and Viet Nam the process of selecting and designing the FPP projects seemed less inclusive of NGOs (as noted elsewhere).

#### **Relations/co-ordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors:**

Generally the project displays commendable coordination with external stakeholders. All the available information on the incorporation of FPP components into an existing ADB funded PDRRAP in Svay Reing seems a model of cooperation and integration, that should be replicated. However, there seemed some isolated lapses which suggested a hierarchical and project focussed, rather than integrated national development approach. These instances (in Cambodia) included but were not limited to, excessively short notice to NGO and CRC stakeholders precluding their participation in a workshop;<sup>21</sup> initial production of IEC materials for SFSP without first consulting thoroughly with the MDRD-EDU II project and MoEYS;<sup>22</sup> unavailability of some partner members at evaluation meetings with external stakeholders (NGOs, Red Cross). These appeared to be minor aberrations on an otherwise strong participatory process, but suggest an area in which participation could be enhanced.

#### **Respect of deadlines:**

The records examined, plus the project staff and stakeholders interviewed indicate that with the exception of delayed project start by approx three months in donor approval<sup>23</sup> most activities finished approximately on time. One exception noted elsewhere in this report was the apparent substitution for other forums at the start of the project, for the National Consultative Workshop on integrating DRR into the national development framework, in Cambodia.<sup>24</sup> Subsequently at the end of Phase IV implementation, the annual experience sharing National Flood Forum of two days was devoted to the theme of "Development Linkages to the FPPs". The guidelines are currently pending preparation following the National Flood Forum. A certain level of confusion within the stakeholders, and by the evaluator, resulted and differing reports suggested that even within the project team and partners there was some lack of clarity. Several stakeholders have suggested that devoting the National Flood Forum substantially to the DRR integration may have potentially diminished the opportunities of sharing operational experiences and caused some confusion. Indicators and project design must not constrain the project, but changes need to be well understood by stakeholders.

The challenges of, and caused by, a delayed project approval and start are recognised. The donor hopefully appreciates that in a short project of 15 months, the impact of delayed approval and start can be significant and impossible to recover in the remaining balance of the project. Even with a partial recovery of schedule through extension, it has to be pointed out by project stakeholders that the hiatus created at the start, and progressing the project to scheduled completion pending an extension, creates project distortions and logistical challenges. These distortions and challenges may not be fully recovered by a later extension.

<sup>19</sup> Although Activity 2.4 was not fully realised under the Khammouane Development Strategy being formulated under the World Bank – UNDP programme as envisaged, nonetheless three FPP activities included in local development plans were in the process of implementation – one at provincial level under the Nam Tern 2 Downstream Project and two commenced in Noglom Village, under village funding

<sup>20</sup> e.g. issues associated with implementing FPP tasks within development programmes, and local commune / district or environmental priorities conflicting with programme schedule

<sup>21</sup> As reported by the MRC-ADPC ECHO IV programme

<sup>22</sup> As reported by the MDRD-EDU II programme

<sup>23</sup> Project start was delayed by 3 months. Originally planned to be implemented from start 15 August 2008 to 14 November 2009, approval was indicated at 9 December 2008, with the start sometime before 31 December 2009). A two month no cost extension was provided by ECHO from 15 December 2009 to 14 January 2010.

<sup>24</sup> The programme team report that a decision was made that as the programme was gaining traction in Cambodia, and as linkages were being established through the PSDD and DoP, the guidelines and dissemination in the provinces could be deferred in favour of discussions at the national startup meeting and provincial workshops. The project team refers to the integration of the majority of FPP activities into local development plans in Cambodia as the key indicator rather than implementation as envisaged in Activity 2. It is also suggested by members of the project team that budget for the National Consultation Workshop was a further consideration as was aligning the preparation of guidelines to inputs from the DoP.

***Local counterparts continue to face constraints of human and financial resources characteristic of developing economies. The NDMOs have, however, played a stronger role in coordinating and in linking the project implementation to the national development frameworks and planning. The project displays commendable coordination with only minor lapses. "Demystifying" and applying the monitoring process across the programme will clearly add value and is supported by a number of key stakeholders.***

## **IMPACT OF THE ACTION**

### **Extent that planned overall objectives were achieved:**

The majority of the short term (within the Phase IV duration) objectives were achieved. This included implementation of FPPs plus district and commune capacity building in the target areas and convening of the National Flood Forum (Results 1, 3 and 5). In some instances the objectives were exceeded with the production of an additional FPP update, additional SFSPs in some locations and greater than expected beneficiaries of training - especially in cost shared training in Cambodia and Viet Nam. An exception was in respect of 10 school SFSP projects not implemented (Result 4) due apparently to a change in project scope that was seemingly overlooked by the country team in Cambodia.

The Phase IV project focussed on raising capacity and securing future implementation at district and commune level in established project areas and at provincial level in new provinces. A significant number of FPP activities were incorporated into development plans at commune<sup>25</sup> and district level (Result 2), in many cases in line ministry / department plans to date, in Lao PDR and Cambodia. The incorporation of these FPP activities is an important achievement under Activity 2, even though incorporation into provincial plans (as envisaged in the project plan) proved more challenging, and less successful. Viet Nam, on the other hand, directly integrates DRR into their sectoral planning at all administrative levels.

In Cambodia, as yet, there are no reports of FPP activities being directly funded through the local development plans due to the differing priorities and schedules of line ministries and PSDD which are beyond the control and schedule of the project. Notwithstanding that a significant number of FPP activities have been incorporated in commune and district development plans, the PSDD pointed out that they are still at an early stage before they can ensure FPP activities will be incorporated into provincial level planning.<sup>26</sup>

In Lao PDR again the majority of FPP activities are integrated into the local development planning and even limited sample interviews identified at least three FPP projects incorporated in the local planning are in the process of implementation – albeit it with limited funding in two cases from village finances and one from an external project (Nam Term 2 Downstream).

### **Whether there were any unplanned impacts:**

While there are no unplanned impacts from the action, and while dependency on the ECHO aid has not been "created", there seems to be a consensus that the project has yet to be fully self sustainable. To a greater or lesser degree (depending on the country), the programme will need additional support. In the least case, Viet Nam reportedly has the resources to continue the project, through its development plans and even private sector and NGO partnerships - though it will still benefit from additional support in capacity building. Lao PDR and Cambodia can likely resource the project though, it would be constrained without further donor support and additionally support in capacity building remains a requirement for both. In order to preserve the gains made to date, additional support will be required. While the actions would proceed, in the absence of external support, the momentum and impact of the project and even its robustness would be expected to reduce markedly with limited available resources, particularly in Lao PDR and Cambodia.

### **Whether the desired wider impact could have been better achieved otherwise:**

No instances of negative impacts in gender or other cross cutting issues have been identified and achievements have been much as expected and in line with the indicators, with some limitation in respect of Result 2 (in Cambodia and Lao PDR) - as discussed elsewhere in this report.

All of the other Results (excluding Result 2) have quite tangible indicators and deal with activities (workshops, training, capacity building, information sharing) that are well understood and therefore well implemented in many aid projects, and under the direct control of the project partners. The outputs and indicators associated with Result 2 are somewhat less tangible, are outside the routine activities of many aid projects in Cambodia

<sup>25</sup> In Viet Nam and Cambodia, FPP activities and development plans focus on Provincial, District and at the lowest level, "Communes". However in Lao PDR, "Commune" is not applicable. In Lao PDR FPP activities and development plans focus on Provincial, District and at the lowest level, "Villages".

<sup>26</sup> In discussions with the PSDD, they confirmed that in terms of integrating DRR into Provincial Development plans they are only at an early stage to date and this will be an extended process. PSDD indicated that to date they have developed a "tool" that will later be used in the integration of projects into the local development framework. It appears the "tool" is the initial "stakeholder analysis"

and Lao PDR and are therefore can be more challenging for the counterparts. In Viet Nam Result 2 does not apply as DRR is already integrated to national and sub-national development planning as a matter of policy and practice, through sector line ministries and departments. Additionally in Lao PDR and Cambodia the activities and indicators of Result 2, are to some degree outside the control of the project partners - they are frequently determined by stakeholders,<sup>27</sup> factors and priorities outside the project influence. Notwithstanding the challenges of securing implementation of FPP activities through local development projects, three instances in Lao PDR were identified at Provincial and Village level, of FPP implementation through local development, where these had not been previously reported. This highlighted the possibility of unforeseen funding sources being available and applied, plus the prospect of higher success rates in implementation than displayed through official reporting. In summary, there is a commendable success rate in integrating FPP activities into development plans and although limited, the required impacts are being achieved through implementation. It is however felt warranted to encourage better understanding of targets and closer monitoring to highlight these successes.

***The majority of the short term Phase IV objectives were achieved and in some instances exceeded. A significant number of FPP activities were incorporated into commune and district level department plans to date, in Lao PDR and Cambodia. At least three instances are noted where the activities are being implemented While the project is yet to be sustainable, there is no evidence of donor dependency. There is however a need for ongoing support to maintain momentum and insure the investments and achievements to date.***

## **SUSTAINABILITY OF THE ACTION**

### **Ownership of objectives and achievements:**

There is no doubt that the project consulted widely and shared information through workshops and training, with a wide range of stakeholders.

In Cambodia sample interviews across the spectrum from national to sub-national government agencies and across the breadth of government departments to Red Cross and NGOs appear to confirm project consultations in developing the implementation details of the project.

In Viet Nam in particular, and to a lesser degree Lao PDR, there has been less consultation with NGOs in the detail planning and selection of projects and activities. This aspect was explicitly queried and confirmed in interviews with PDMCs in both Lao PDR and Viet Nam. Cambodia appears to have a more developed NGO consultative process through the Cooperation Committee for Cambodia (CCC), the Cambodia DRR Forum (CDRRF) and a larger NGO presence compared to Lao PDR. It has been pointed out that an improved understanding of NGO modalities and greater early participation by NGOs in the selection and planning of projects, may secure greater technical and resource support.

Notwithstanding the constraints on NGO participation in some cases, generally the participation of sectoral line departments, PDMCs, DDMCs, CCMCs and VDPUs appear excellent. However, even in Cambodia where participation with a broad constituency appears strong there are (as noted elsewhere) some indications that the wide and timely consultation was not consistently robust in all instances. It was also made clear that some counterparts (CNDMO) feel the project more of a MRCS standalone project predominantly designed and implemented at grassroots by MRC / ADPC / NGOs and therefore ineligible for national budget support, requiring full donor support - though this view was not shared universally. Overall, though, ownership and consultation appeared favourable in most areas. However, these isolated aberrations noted suggested that in some respects the project is still considered by some individuals as "a flood management project" rather than a central component of the national development and poverty reduction strategies.

### **Policy support and the responsibility of the beneficiary institutions:**

The MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV project aligns well with national policies and local strategies within the three target countries. In all instances the spokespeople for NDMOs and NMCs referred to national policies and the commitment of the host governments to implement flood mitigation and management measures. The documents and interviews indicate a high level of support for the project objectives and outputs, by local counterparts at provincial, district and commune / village level. In some instances the support is subject to constrained resources (particularly in respect of local technical capacity and implementation resources).

Constraints of budget and capacity seems to result in there still being a larger emphasis on short term preparedness and response, at district and commune level, rather than longer range planning and preparedness. However, the emphasis does seem to be moving more toward preparedness and mitigation.

<sup>27</sup> For the purposes of the evaluation, sectoral ministries and departments, PSDD, etc are considered as stakeholders, but external to the programme

Within Cambodia the initiative of FMMP at national level still seems to be more focussed on responses and short term planning. Coordination is recognised as a role of the CNDMO, though seemingly a somewhat “arms length” coordination of a project that is seen to be an MRCS and NGO project. The project is seen as funded by the ECHO / MRCS. By comparison the LNDMO, although similarly constrained with resources as Cambodia, state that the MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV project is an integrated part of the national policy implementation, and is supported (albeit with limitations and typically “in kind”) from the national budget allocation. In Viet Nam DRR is substantially integrated into national planning. As a result the sector Line Ministries and Departments undertake appropriate planning and budget allocations. Where there may be a shortfall, the Viet Nam authorities have contingencies through their development funding, ODA, Red Cross, NGOs and already some public - private sector partnerships that have been fostered.<sup>28</sup>

Many of the FPP activities now fall under the mandates of the line ministries and line departments (at sub-national level), whose ministries in turn comprise membership of the NDMOs. It is reported that one of the constraints in securing funding and implementation of FPP activities is the inertia, capacity, priorities and sometimes lack of awareness within the line ministries, departments and other third party stakeholders. This has been confirmed in several discussions with ministries of planning and with PSDD (in Cambodia). Notwithstanding, in some sample interviews the level of commitment and success in progressing implementation that is being achieved at “grassroots”, with local provincial and village funding, was quite surprising. In three instances (e.g. Khammouane, Lao PDR) local implementation of several FPP projects had gone largely unnoticed and unrecorded by higher levels of the project. Documents and sample interviews also indicate a high level of acceptance by NGOs and Red Cross, though there are still some areas in which coordination needs to be more concrete.

#### **Institutional capacity:**

There is no doubt that additional institutional capacity and budget support is required for the successes to date (in the preceding and current phase) to take root and to insure against loss or erosion of the significant achievements to date. While capacity building and even a degree of institutionalisation can be initiated within a series of short projects, it is unrealistic to expect or require these to be fully sustainable without ongoing nurturing and monitoring.

Furthermore there is a need to meet attrition within the cadre of trained stakeholders. Retirements, reassignments, relocation and other causes will reduce the core of trained and experienced personnel. While it is essential that the FMMP messages and training are disseminated, it was disappointing to note that an apparently large proportion of attendees at ToT's (in Lao PDR and Cambodia in particular) were attending for information purposes, and that they are unlikely to utilise their training as resource persons. In one instance quoted in Lao PDR (Xenbangfai District) of 15 persons attending ToT only 4 are available as resource persons due to other duties and seniority. There is therefore a need to develop other media for general dissemination, or scale up the project. In Viet Nam it appears that this has been achieved by undertaking the provincial planning training workshops in sections – as general dissemination (1 day), and then user training (3 days). Additionally in Viet Nam provincial training, as in the Cambodian TOT training, by cost sharing with government authorities or NGOs has produced synergies between projects and locations.

In general there is a high level of policy and practical support for the concepts and practices of the project, particularly at the lower sub-national levels where the impacts of flooding and benefits of flood management are most acutely felt in a concrete manner. There are exceptions, where it seems the position of FMMP within an overall national and regional strategy may be voiced, but seemingly not “fully owned” by some individuals as noted earlier in respect of NCDM position on funding, in Cambodia.

Even where there is the policy and political will to support the project and its integration into national and regional initiatives, the target countries (especially Lao PDR and Cambodia) routinely struggle with budget and human resource constraints, across the board in their governance and implementation initiatives. While it is ideal to mainstream integration of FMMP and DRR into the local and even national development framework this will take time, capacity building and resources. In the first instance, FMMP initiatives must be adopted in sectoral policies, requiring the capacity of line ministries and departments to recognise, prioritise and implement FMMP initiatives. Secondly, the line ministries and departments themselves must compete for limited national budget or international development assistance funding. In this respect, sustainability of the project is going to depend on how well rooted it is within the national development frameworks of the three countries and the extent to which it is prioritised relative to other national and internationally sponsored initiatives. While much of the budgets of these countries are substantially subsidised by international assistance, it is also essential the

<sup>28</sup> In Viet Nam, instances were quoted of partnership with a biological protection company and aquaculture consultants that have sponsored DRR initiatives and TV programme material on “Flood and Disaster Planning”, were noted.

international community have a consensus on priorities, which is not always the case.<sup>29</sup> In this respect there is a key advocacy role for the NDMOs to ensure that DRR and FPP are seen as priorities, and that a consensus on these priorities is maintained.

It is suggested as prudent and diligent to consider whether the activities undertaken in the project are the optimum use of the project's resources, networks and facilitation capacity. The Red Cross and NGOs to a greater or lesser degree are ready, willing and capable to undertake capacity building and awareness activities. Appropriately coordinated by the NDMOs and PDMCs, etc they could provide much of the needed capacity building, based on the foundations and guidelines laid by the current and earlier phases of the FMMP. The Red Cross and NGOs are also well positioned and capacitated to support the essential follow-ups on earlier phases. The FMMP project, MRCS and ADPC as regional and intergovernmental initiatives have strengths and capacity beyond the NGOs.<sup>30</sup> MRCS and ADPC have the ability to access and leverage government agencies, ministries and donors. Rather than replicating the work of NGOs, there is niche for the project and its intergovernmental partners to leverage and facilitate the more difficult, aspects of FMMP. Typically this would include the intergovernmental partners advocating for and supporting mainstreaming the integration of DRR into local and national development frameworks, and advocacy to donors for sustainable projects and commitments (potentially multi-year). These activities would facilitate the FMMP initiatives to take root and grow while insuring against the loss or erosion of the already significant commitments and successes of earlier phases.

#### **Adequacy of the project budget for its purpose:**

It is recognised as unrealistic for the project to fund all aspects of the FPP initiatives in the target areas. It is therefore, important to be more explicit with stakeholders as to the scope of the project, what can be funded and why there are limitations. Similarly national counterparts have sought to have project funding channelled through the national institutions in accordance with their national policies and practices. While there may be compelling reasons to not channel funds through the national policies, this should be explained. There seems no apparent reason, however, why there cannot be an entirely transparent and detailed accounting of funds (by the international partners). These are, after all, funds designated for the support of the national governments and policies. The evaluator was told that this practice is not currently employed.

Recurrently throughout the evaluation the issue of inadequacy of budget arose. In part this is due to the large resource gaps that exist and need to be bridged, for the project to secure full implementation. Also it is in part a failure by national counterparts and partners to recognise the nature and constraints of particular donor funding and the scope of the project.

In a less positive context there were recurrent concerns expressed at district and commune / village level in to varying degrees in each country, in three areas of budget shortfall. These should be addressed in future initiatives, and would benefit from retroactive support to shore up the investment and successes to date in the following three areas:

- Particularly in Cambodia and Lao PDR, some training sessions were felt to be too intensive for local partners and counterparts. At village / commune level, and in some instances district level, the trainings were felt to contain too much information in a short period, for village / commune officials and teachers to understand fully. Figures of estimated understanding of around 70 percent were quoted. At the next level down, those trained by colleagues in most instances were quoting 50 percent comprehension of what they were taught. This equates to around 35 to 40 percent absorption by village members and teachers who will later instruct children or communicate within their community. The stakeholders attributed the short and packed training to limited budget. In a separate evaluation of the MDRD-EDU II project UNICEF commented on the weaknesses and constraints of traditional teaching methods in Lao PDR, which are now to be addressed through the "Schools of Quality" policy. Within this MRC-ADPC ECHO IV project similar challenges were noted and discussed in Cambodia. In one interview with DDMC stakeholders they specifically requested breaking training into blocks, and adding modules on "listening" "communicating" and "sensitivity to local issues". In Lao PDR it was further commented at NDMO level that the project team need to be "*...more led by local conditions...*"<sup>31</sup>. A number of stakeholders attributed the "full nature" of a single course to funding and schedule constraints, and this seems plausible given the likely incremental costs to set up and run additional stages of courses, and potentially commit additional resources and schedule in what is already quite extensive planning.
- In awareness initiatives within schools (the SFSP) IEC materials were considered suitable by the majority of stakeholders, but insufficient to meet their needs (posters and books) and in some instances unable to be used (local absence of equipment to use the DVD materials provided). In Viet Nam and Laos PDR it was

<sup>29</sup> As an example: the evaluator made reference to a previous NZAID bilateral project in Cambodia with the Ministry of Public Works and Transport, whose sustainability was assured by the national petroleum tax – until the International consultative committee for Cambodia (1999) assigned other national priorities as a condition of assistance. Consequently the petrol tax support had to be diverted to other initiatives by the Ministry of Economy and Finance.

<sup>30</sup> It is acknowledged that NGOs and the Red Cross have opportunities for national advocacy, through cooperation forums, etc. However under normal circumstances these opportunities will likely be less than the opportunities, access and networks afforded to Intergovernmental Organisations (such as MRCS and ADPC).

<sup>31</sup> "*...more led by local conditions...*", was explained to mean that local conditions such as seasonal work may limit participation in capacity building at particular times.

noted that a number of students did not have access to teaching materials, and typically materials are being shared by anything from 1 book for 3 students in cases to 1 book for 10 students.

- Recurrently local stakeholders and officials praised the efforts (particularly awareness and capacity building). They however pointed out that while the theory is very useful, practical practice and implementation is constrained by the absence of essential small scale hardware such as loud-hailer equipment, first aid kits and other small hardware. Additionally lack of budget (for project support such as gasoline, staff support, etc) limits the ability of officials to follow up and monitor FPP initiatives in the field. Officials have in other contexts pointed to the “lessons learned by doing” such as in the case of the Ketsana response. Where there is insufficient materials to implement, there is a risk that these lessons will not be learned, and indeed that skills and knowledge may be eroded by limited use, or less suitable practices institutionalised in order to be consistent with available resources and budget.

In summary, it appears that despite admirable and acknowledged successes, the project needs to endeavour to be somewhat more sensitive to local conditions and capacity. This in turn will likely involve budgetary and schedule impacts. This may predispose, with other factors mentioned, towards a longer term project that addresses challenging issues of sustainability at all levels, and insuring the benefits of the donor and project’s investment to date.

#### **Financial sustainability:**

In consideration that the majority of the MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV project has been capacity building and institutionalising flood mitigation and management measures, and that the project provided the IEC and awareness materials, it can be argued that the products and services were affordable for the beneficiaries. This however does not, and cannot, quantify (within the scope and time of the evaluation) the opportunity costs and even direct costs born by local officials and community members participating in the project.

As noted by Action Aid and school teachers in Cambodia, village committee members and school teachers in Lao PDR, plus teachers and provincial committee members in Viet Nam, there is no doubt the projects will continue. Even in the absence of specific donor funding the projects and FPPs can be expected to continue, though the capacity and standard may somewhat diminish to reflect available resources and funds. These thoughts have been echoed by provincial DM and planning officials in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam who indicate that there are various sources of funding. In addition to NGO and Red Cross support, additional funding may include some provincial funding allocations, limited community funding sources and in the case of Lao PDR, projects such as the NT 2 Downstream project (that is funding some FPP initiatives in water gates and irrigation channels), and in Viet Nam some early private sector partnerships.

That the project initiatives will continue is confirmed in specific instances noted in the evaluation, including but not limited to:

- In Cambodia the district FPP at Prek Prasab was updated by the DDMC without current project assistance;
- In Lao PDR the NT2 project is funding the rehabilitation of water gates and irrigation channels as identified in the FPP;
- In Lao PDR villagers in Nonglom Village, the villages have commenced purchase of loud hailers and establishing a early warning system, and have started to upgrade a school to be used as a village office and training centre, both from limited village funds – both are FPP identified projects;
- In Viet Nam, although not specific to the FMMP project, the private sector has funded awareness initiatives which include sponsored television shows on flood awareness, and disaster planning public awareness.

It is recognised by all stakeholders that these sources would not maintain the current momentum of the project. Even within the target areas additional IEC and awareness materials are requested, plus additional training with its associated costs is required for teachers, officials and community members. Follow-ups and refreshers are also required, especially for earlier phases of the project, though these are potentially the first casualties of a budget deficiency. While the safe areas and emergency kindergartens of earlier phases were not visited in the evaluation, it is reported also that insufficient funds has left these without adequate maintenance. Some of these measures could be addressed by NGOs or the Red Cross though their funds are frequently tied to particular broader policies and agendas of the agency. Consequently there is likely to be gaps.

There is a further concern in respect of “expectation management” of the communities and even institutional stakeholders. The FMMP project has successfully raised awareness of flood risks and the necessary mitigations and preparation. Most of all the project demonstrates that flooding and the associated cycle of destruction, losses and poverty is not inevitable - and can be mitigated, if not avoided. Interviews with community members, parents, plus lower secondary school and primary school teachers and children, leaves absolutely no doubt of the increased level of awareness in communities. The commitment of the children, parents, teachers and community to flood awareness tangible in all locations. Strong concern is expressed that the project must seek to reach the more remote flood affected communities. There are robust indications in all three target countries that the project has gained traction and behavioural change is occurring in villages and

districts - such as stockpiling dried food, raising house foundations, cleaning irrigation channels, infilling low lying land areas, repairing boats, etc.

The project has clearly and demonstrably raised the awareness of communities and officials. It has also raised their understanding of what must be done, and that flood impacts need not be inevitable. In summary the project has removed prior ignorance and unawareness and raised the expectation of the communities and officials. There is a risk that these expectations may not be met, and the consequences of that are extremely hard to predict. It can be speculated that floods such as those seen in 200/01 or a cyclone such as Ketsana, which is not mitigated could assume the political dimension of a "complex emergency", as has been seen in other countries and contexts. Similarly the host governments, may for a range of reasons, pose the question to the international community as to why expectations have been raised (in countries whose national budgets are highly dependent on international community intervention) if the international community is unable to assist in meeting those raised expectations.

**Technical issues:**

The project is based around raising awareness and capacity building individuals, government ministries and departments, NGOs and other stakeholders. In specific interview questions officials, teachers and parents were asked if the capacity building is consistent with practical knowledge in the community. All agreed the training was practical and reinforced and systematised what is informally known in communities. In this sense the technology is appropriate and sustainable. As noted, small items of hardware have been requested for future projects (loud speakers, latrines for safe areas, etc) and these are generally within the capacity of the community to maintain. The challenge, however, will be establishing ownership in such a manner that the resources remain available to the community, and that somebody undertakes to ensure that they are maintained.

The FPPs have very detailed requirements. Sample FPPs that were examined (and partially translated) are well prepared and provide a good basis for preparedness, response and rehabilitation. In Cambodia and Lao PDR where FPPs are prepared following the standard MRCS / ADPC templates at present the estimates by DM officials are that that between 50 percent and 70 percent of the ideal content of risk maps, assessments, data etc are achieved.<sup>32</sup> In one instance the Provincial Committee indicated they had selected what they felt was obtainable and priority and secured that data. In other areas committees had obtained such data as resources and time permitted. This does not mean that the FPPs are not useful, and application has already been conclusively demonstrated both in operation and (as noted by Red Cross, Action Aid and Oxfam GB spokespeople) in the awareness and markedly improved effectiveness of trained officials and communities. What is required is that progressively more detailed information and assessments need to be undertaken to make the FPPs more effective - and from time to time they will need update. These activities would require actions and budget at provincial, district and commune / village level. NGOs and Red Cross however are less likely to be able to provide support above the "grassroots" level. It was suggested that it may be some time before the DM committees can collect all data. As a result it would be desirable, meantime, to produce an FPP summary that emphasises the priority data for collection rather than leaving it to individual committees to determine. Although the Viet Nam planning does not follow the same template, similar considerations in respect of the achievable level of planning were mentioned.

***Notwithstanding the constraints on early NGO participation in some cases of the project planning, generally the participation of sectoral line departments and DMCs appear excellent. The NDMO and NMC spokespeople consistently confirmed the commitment of the host governments to implement flood mitigation and management measures. Sustainability of the project is going to depend on how well rooted it is within the national development frameworks of the three countries and the extent to which it is prioritised relative to other national and internationally sponsored initiatives. Even in the absence of donor funding the project can be expected to continue, though the capacity and standard may somewhat diminish to reflect available resources and funds.***

<sup>32</sup> Differing Provincial and National committees gave estimates varying from 50 to 70 percent of the ideal documentation of an FPP having been compiled

## IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS

The process adopted by MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV was to raise awareness of flood mitigation and management, and to capacity build officials and communities from provincial to commune/ village level within the target areas. It is a pilot project which also seeks to institutionalise the processes and lessons learned into a sustainable framework within each of the target countries for future expansion of the applicable areas.

During Phases I to III the focus has been on developing flood preparedness tools and training modules to support Provincial and District level DM committees. In Phase IV previous planning initiatives were updated reflecting lessons learned and the areas of the pilot were expanded. In addition to continuing to raise awareness and contribute to a national DRR awareness curriculum, Phase IV sought to raise the capacity and secure future implementation at district and commune level in established project areas, and at provincial level in new provinces. Another key Phase IV activity was enhancing the sustainability of the project by integrating it into the local development process and funding sources. There is no doubt that the process has been effective at all levels.

There are still areas which need attention and support, in particular the area of securing sustainability through the planning process in Cambodia and Lao PDR, which is likely to take some time to develop. In Viet Nam and a lesser degree in Lao PDR, there is a need to appreciate the NGO modality and to involve the NGOs at an earlier stage of the planning and selection of activities.

There is also a compelling argument to undertake monitoring of the earlier activities to verify their sustainability and to secure reflections and lessons from the longer operation of these early activities.

***Overall the project is seen by all stakeholders as effective and successful, but needing ongoing fine tuning and support for some time.***

## 7.) LESSONS LEARNED and RECOMMENDATIONS

Lessons learned are general for all the three countries, except where specifically stated otherwise. Following each “experience” is the proposed recommendation. Experiences (and associated recommendations) have been subdivided into general **“programmatic”** aspects, and considerations for **“future actions”**.

### Programmatic Experience and Recommendations:

#### 1.) Experience:

There is a need that a greater depth and breadth of the stakeholders have a holistic understanding of the project structure. This should emphasise the relationship of project activities to effective outputs and outcomes, plus the synergies and interactions with other projects and initiatives. Activities and results should not be seen in isolation, hence the impacts on other activities / results by changing the nature or schedule of an activity should be understood.

As an example, while the adoption of the “DRR Integration into Development” theme in the National Flood Forum has been assured as appropriate, it nonetheless caused some confusion to stakeholders who were not clear on the specific agenda, and others felt deprived of sufficient opportunity to share operational experiences in the field.

#### **Recommendation:**

Project objectives and indicators should be simple and clear. Project staff and national stakeholders at all levels should have a holistic understanding of the objectives and indicators. Where necessary capacity building of staff and stakeholders in project monitoring should be undertaken.

#### 2.) Experience:

The evaluator and a number of stakeholders have identified there is an apparent need for systematic monitoring and evaluation throughout the project at all operational levels in order to keep it “on course” and focused on the principal and specific objectives. This need not be complex so long as it is systematic, and should be simple.

This monitoring should be against the pre-agreed objectives, and objectively verifiable indicators. Objectives, results and indicators should be SMART and understandable at all levels of the project participants. This will assist in maintaining the focus of the project, its schedule for activities and deliverables, It will also highlight areas where “course correction” is needed in a timely manner, and ensure focus on key or relevant objectives and activities, rather than on potentially more subjective or less relevant activities.

Systematic routine monitoring and evaluation will also assist in keeping a focus on the activities, deliverables and timelines of the more complex and more challenging objectives, such as mainstreaming the integration of the FMMP into the development framework. This in turn will enhance the likelihood of these objectives and results being materialised.

Where circumstances result in objectives being unrealistic, the objectives and indicators should be amended, by agreement, to reflect achievable and meaningful outcomes.

What is important is to “demystify” project monitoring and evaluation so that project staff and national counterparts and stakeholders have a mutual and common understanding of the process and indicators. It is also important for the partners and stakeholders to understand that by whatever name “*monitoring and evaluation*” is referred to it is no more than a systematic and consistent approach to the normal and uncomplicated everyday process of assessing suitability of actions and deliverables - in much the same way as even laymen assess goods and services for suitability of purpose.

**Recommendation:**

Systematic monitoring and evaluation of the project should be undertaken against the pre-agreed logframe objectives and the objectively verifiable S.M.A.R.T. indicators, throughout the project. Project objectives and indicators should be simple and clear. Project staff and national stakeholders at all levels should have a holistic understanding of the objectives and indicators. Where necessary capacity building of staff and stakeholders in project monitoring should be undertaken. Where circumstances change, the objectives and indicators should be modified accordingly.

**3.) Experience:**

The overlap of production of new IEC materials for the SFSP (in Cambodia) with the MoEYS DRR curriculum development appears to have arisen as earlier phases of the project had undertaken awareness activities in the earlier absence of MoEYS curriculum. It seems consultation with the MoEYS before preparing the SFSP IEC materials was initially therefore, not emphasised sufficiently (reports and interviews suggest consultation initially focussed at DoEYS level).

Stakeholder analysis and other parameters at the design phase (such as stakeholder activities or interests) may change. Consequently these design parameters and analyses should be reviewed throughout the implementation to determine if changes in stakeholders or changes in their projects and initiatives require re-evaluation of initially planned deliverables and activities. This may avoid overlaps and gaps occurring between the project and its key partners and stakeholders.

**Recommendation:**

Stakeholder analysis and other parameters at the design phase (such as stakeholder activities or interests) need to be reviewed and updated regularly for changes during the project implementation.

**4.) Experience:**

It is important to recognise that other key stakeholders (such as PSDD, DoP in Cambodia), necessarily operate in different structures and with differing priorities and flexibilities from an individual project.

In a short duration project such as the ECHO project, it may therefore be difficult or unrealistic to align key activities and priorities with those of such external stakeholders. Project timelines and the associated objectives and results need to be realistic in recognising such constraints or find viable alternative solutions.

**Recommendation:**

Project timelines and the associated objectives and results need to be realistic in recognising that external stakeholders (such as PSDD or Ministries) may have different priorities and timelines that are not consistent or compatible with a short project.

**5.) Experience:**

In some instances “Partners” have been considered to be any organisation operating within the general target area, or an organisation undertaking similar though unrelated activities to the project activities. In other contexts “Partners” have a defined role and share in the implementation of project.

Roles and definitions of “partners” need to be clearer to the project participants so that opportunities for synergies or outreach are not lost and overlaps with other initiatives are minimised.

There also needs to be improved clarity over what activities constitute “participation” or “support”, compared to “consultation”, or “informing” stakeholders. This should improve the project’s inclusiveness,

encourage appropriate outreach and a proactive approach to involving potential or actual partners rather than informing them.

Similarly the project needs to have improved clarity in respect of other development concepts such as “integration” or “institutionalisation” of activities and concepts. In project reports it appears that activities “implemented” or “integrated” into school curricula support etc, have been reported as “institutionalised” where this may not be readily appropriate in the short term or in the context of this project.

**Recommendation:**

The role and definition of “Partners” needs clarification. In this respect it is also important to distinguish between “participation”, “consultation” and “informing”, regarding project activities. Similarly the project needs to clarify in the development aspects of “integration” or “institutionalisation”.

**6.) Experience:**

There have been instances where NGOs and other partners were not invited to participate in detailed planning and sections of FPP projects, or where insufficient notice was provided to NGOs and Red Cross to participate in workshops or planning sections with the DMCs. In order for participation of the relevant stakeholders to be effective, their priorities and operational constraints must be considered, especially in providing adequate advance notice and consultation of events and workshops.

**Recommendation:**

Participation by partners must be concrete, recognising their priorities, schedules and constraints to secure their active participation in workshops and other activities.

**7.) Experience:**

There is a very strong practical and operational focus at sub-national level. Particularly with the absence of funding of national level stakeholders in MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV, it is necessary to reaffirm and advocate to the national level stakeholders for their practical and resource support.

The MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV project should be considered as part of the national development projects, receiving appropriate consideration for allocation from national budgets rather than solely be funded as a stand alone externally funded project.

**Recommendation:**

Additional advocacy is required (example Cambodia) to ensure ownership of the project as support for national policies, rather than a standalone donor project.

**8.) Experience:**

In some instances noted in the report, participants appear to view the project narrowly. The project participants must in practice, at every level, see the project as part of an overall development mosaic. This requires constant and meaningful consultation and participation with a wide range of stakeholders.

It is necessary to recognise that some stakeholders (such as Education and other line Ministries and Departments) have specific mandates and authorities on which the project cannot encroach without participation and approval.

Linkages to, and synergies with, other projects and initiatives also need to be recognised and pursued in a meaningful manner. It was perceived that the project is, occasionally, in some contexts seen in isolation, rather than as a component of interlinking national and regional development assistance projects. This appeared evident even within the project team.

**Recommendation:**

The project staff and stakeholders need to recognise the project as part of an overall development matrix supporting national and regional policies rather than an independent initiative. The mandates of line ministries must be recognised and the project must in addition to consultation, ensure meaningful participation by, and approval of, specific sector activities where needed.

**9.) Experience:**

There is a risk that the effectiveness of an otherwise sound activity may be constrained by the effectiveness of its delivery. The total requirements for an activity to be effective and sustainable should be considered along with the resources this may require.

For example: effective teaching requires not only the technical messages and lesson plans, but also adequate timing for teaching and the communication and pedagogic skills to ensure effective

transmission of the messages. This was not only apparent in the teaching components, but also in requests of PCDM / DCDM trainers that communication, listening and local sensitivity skills be included in the ToTs.

In general it seems that ToTs that are now 5 day duration with practical information sharing are considered effective. In some areas, particularly in Viet Nam it was highlighted that specific training skills are incorporated in the ToT and in the teacher orientations, though this does not seem universal across the project. However, in both the Flood Preparedness activities at commune training level and at some of the schools participating in SFSP, training was found to be excessively challenging and less effective. There were concerns in all three countries that the volume of information was difficult for commune / village people to assimilate.

It would be ideal to address these local capacities and to include such material in all teaching / training activities. Suggestions have been made to make smaller teaching blocks for training at commune level, as well as incorporating communication, listening and sensitivity skills in the training of officials

**Recommendation:**

The total requirements for an activity to be effective and sustainable needs to be considered along with the resources this may require plus the local context and capacity.

For example: training and teaching will require not only the technical messages but also the skills and techniques to facilitate effective communication and learning on the part of the trainer, ability to learn effectively on the part of the student.

Capacity building should not be limited to technical messages only and should consider the effectiveness and appropriateness of the methods and detail employed. It should also consider the local absorptive capacity of individuals and communities. It is also desirable to incorporate communication, listening and sensitivity skills in the training of district and commune officials, as a minimum

**10.) Experience:**

Initially it had been indicated in Lao-PDR that while there had been success in incorporating FPP initiatives into the local planning process, to date success in implementation had not been realised. In practice quite detailed discussions at district and one village level indicated that at least three initiatives from the FPP were in the process of implementation, funded from NT2 downstream project and village funds.

In another instance it was identified that in 2009, the provincial authorities had received USD 10,000 specifically for DRR activities, some of which had been committed to flood preparedness.

In Cambodia the DCDM similarly shared details of the Prek Prasab FPP which had been updated as a DCDM initiative.

It is therefore important to be cautious in drawing conclusions on sustainability as projects may be funded from a variety of sources. This highlights the need for both excellent communication and an understanding by all stakeholders of key indicators of progress and success.

**Recommendation:**

There is a need for enhanced communication and understanding of key success indicators, across the depth and breadth of stakeholders and that these are disseminated. This can also be combined with increased "operational experience sharing" at provincial and national levels, as suggested by counterparts

**11.) Experience:**

It is recurrently expressed as a matter of sensitivity that assistance funds designated for the target countries are not channelled through the national budgetary and budget management processes. National counterpart agencies would prefer to be partners in the management of the project and take ownership through increased responsibilities and participation, rather than solely recipients.

While it may not be entirely feasible to channel funds wholly through the national budget channels, it would certainly be desirable to facilitate national counterparts having access to information and the opportunity to comment on the disbursement of the project budget, which is ostensibly for their national benefit. Based on several interviews it seems that details of budgets and disbursements under the budget are not routinely shared with national counterparts.

**Recommendation:**

Despite the project being grant funded it would be desirable and conducive to improved ownership to transparently share with National counterparts, details of the budgets and budget disbursements.

It would also be desirable to secure their agreement on prioritising budgets and disbursement when these are targeted to support the national policies and initiatives for which the counterparts are responsible.

This does not require that funds are actually transferred to counterparts, but rather they become active partners in the programme implementation and responsibilities. This should also build capacity for sustainable counterpart management and “taking over” of projects.

**Experiences and Recommendations for Future Actions:****12.) Experience:**

The majority of recommendations from the previous Phase III have been, or are in the process of being implemented. Some it was not possible to verify in the current evaluation (such as use Sphere indicators for the improvement of the safe areas, protection of water points with fences, increasing number of latrines at safe areas, etc). Others are in process or planned (such as updates of the training with additional DRR topics, upscaling the project to new areas, etc). Still other recommendations (such as the use of simulation drills) are being utilised in only a few locations. Some recommendations such as simplifying district level training, providing an effective programme monitoring system and provision of small scale hardware have again been found to be germane and recommended for follow-up action.

**Recommendation:**

Review the previous, Phase III, evaluation recommendations where these have not been implemented, and particularly give consideration to resourcing and implementing key areas that have again been identified in the Phase IV evaluation and recommendations (such as but not limited to, simplifying district and commune training, programme monitoring, provision of hardware).

**13.) Experience:**

While it has been possible to increase the frequency of FPP activities integrated into local development plans, this is often by coordinating the planning of sector line ministries and departments. The priorities and capacity of these sectoral departments may not align with the DMCs priorities. It may be desirable to support the DMC at provincial and district level in building capacity within, and advocating to, sectoral departments.

**Recommendation:**

In order to overcome inertia, through differing priorities or capacity in sectoral line ministries and departments, capacity of key officials in key departments at provincial and district level is recommended.

**14.) Experience:**

There is a need to more carefully harmonise and integrate FPP initiatives, rather than duplicate (as in the SFSP content and IEC). The instance of incorporating FPP into an existing PDRRAP (in Cambodia) is a more positive model to follow.

**Recommendation:**

Wherever possible the FMMP initiatives and FPPs should be harmonised with and integrated to larger DRR initiatives rather than duplicating or running in parallel. The instance of incorporating FPP into an existing PDRRAP is a positive model. There is also merit in transferring local lessons into the greater GMS area and vice versa.

**15.) Experience:**

There is an apparent need, particularly in Viet Nam (and a lesser degree in Laos PDR) to understand the relative roles and operating modalities, strengths and weaknesses of NGOs / INGOs, Intergovernmental, UN and other agencies and their funding criteria and project criteria.

With this understanding the detail design of FPP projects and selection of activities should seek to secure earlier participation of all the relevant stakeholders and potential resources.

**Recommendation:**

Capacity building of counterparts and project staff on the differing roles and modalities of the various stakeholders (NGOs, Red Cross, UN, Intergovernmental Organisations, Multilateral Donors, etc) is recommended. It would be desirable to solicit the participation of these organisations for this purpose. As noted elsewhere, the emphasis of the intergovernmental stakeholders should be towards leveraging the sustainability of the programme and facilitating the more challenging components, rather than duplicating NGO and Red Cross capabilities.

**16.) Experience:**

It is noted that at present "preparedness" frequently refers to short term preparedness such as on receipt of early warning (e.g. moving animals to safe ground securing food, etc) and is in this respect more an early "response". It continues to be important to add additional focus to longer range preparedness.

**Recommendation:**

There continues to be a need to focus the stakeholders and project on preparedness, and in particular long range preparedness, as well as short term preparedness..

**17.) Experience:**

In Cambodia and Lao PDR where FPPs are prepared following the standard MRCS / ADPC templates it was discussed that the majority of FPPs while still very useful, contain approx 50 to 70 per cent of the ideal content of risk maps, assessments, data etc.

It was suggested that it may be some time before the DM committees can collect all data and as a result it might be desirable to produce an FPP summary that emphasises the priority data for collection - rather than leaving determination to individual committees. Although the Viet Nam planning does not follow the same template, similar considerations in respect of the achievable level of planning were mentioned.

**Recommendation:**

To address the constraints on compiling all the recommended comprehensive data required under the FPP template, it would be desirable to provide a guideline summary that identifies and prioritises the crucial features and data required for an FPP that may in the short term only comprise approx 50 to 70 percent of the ideal data.

**18.) Experience:**

It is recognised that all three target countries encounter, to a greater or lesser degree, human resource and / or capacity constraints, and that all share a desire to expand the pilot project.

Given limited funding, and the potential attrition of trained personnel it is necessary to assure institutional knowledge. In Viet Nam there is apparently a proactive approach already of engaging retired or promoted personnel to teach additional staff. This should be encouraged in all the target countries as an institutional practice rather than a project response.

Additionally stakeholders were canvassed regarding expanding the number of trained resource persons within the NDMO's to form an enhanced national cadre of operationally based ToT personnel who are not specifically tied to a particular district or province. This would enable them to provide a consistent set of training messages at any location, irrespective of being within or outside designated project areas. As a national cadre they would be full time trainers and evaluators, who could undertake ToT in new areas, follow-up and conduct ToT refreshers, as well as being a technical resource to evaluate and support any province, district or commune as needed. In this role they also serve as a means of disseminating and quality assuring best practices. With one exception, this scheme was considered favourably by all stakeholders with whom it was discussed in the three countries.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended to increase the number of trained practitioners within the NDMOs to provide a full time cadre of experienced trainers whose skills can be deployed operationally to any location. As a national cadre they would be full time trainers and evaluators, who also act as a technical resource and as a means of disseminating and quality assuring best practices. Additional support should be obtained from the engagement or seconding as consultants of retired and promoted staff for preserving institutional knowledge. It will also be prudent to liaise with NGOs and other projects who have undertaken ToT initiatives, and to harmonise all such initiatives for consistency in the "National cadre"

**19.) Experience:**

There have been limited instances where the project has, seemingly replicated the type of activities of others or not obtained the benefits of other initiatives by NGOs etc. The project can readily duplicate the activities of others (e.g. NGOs) quite simply though this may not be most value adding.

However, donors, intergovernmental organisations and their projects have enhanced access to, and leverage with, both National Government Agencies / Ministries, and other donors. Quite often this access is not readily available to NGOs.

It would be prudent to capitalise on this resource by leveraging the more challenging aspects that NGOs would be challenged by (such as mainstreaming and institutionalising DRR into National Development plans and priorities) or leveraging for adoption of the less attractive but essential FPP components in CIPs, DIPs and PIPs. NGOs would continue to undertake the activities that best suit their resources, capacity and priorities (such as grass roots level awareness, capacity building, etc).

**Recommendation:**

Instead of replicating the activities of NGOs and the Red Cross the project should seek to leverage its position and networks as an inter-government initiative, to undertake the more challenging activities that are beyond the scope or capacity of Red Cross, NGOs and other stakeholders. This could typically include:

- National level advocacy and support for integration of DRR into sector line ministries development plans,
- Facilitating or implementing essential “grass roots” activities that are unattractive to, or cannot be implemented by, NGOs or others.

**20.) Experience:**

At the present time, and until DRR activities can be mainstreamed into the development projects (in Cambodia and Lao PDR) with suitable priority, and the development projects can be funded there is doubt as the ability to maintain current momentum. There is also the need to insure against loss or erosion of the successes and significant prior investments of the project. In Viet Nam it is acknowledged there is a greater capacity and likelihood of maintaining momentum, though ongoing assistance is still requested.

While capacity building and even a degree of institutionalisation can be initiated within a series of short projects, it is unrealistic to expect or require these to be fully sustainable without ongoing nurturing and evaluation. The evaluator therefore advocates for ongoing support of the project through incremental phases. This would be consistent with The “Principles And Good Practice Of Humanitarian Donorship”, which suggest that *“While stressing the importance of transparent and strategic priority-setting and financial planning by implementing organisations, explore the possibility of reducing, or enhancing the flexibility of, earmarking, and of introducing longer-term funding arrangements.”*

Future support should recognise the need to review and evaluate the earliest interventions and current interventions. These can be reinforced or “course corrected” as appropriate as well as taking stock of lessons learned and sustainability issues identified through several years of operations. Ideally a longer term commitment to funding would allow some of the more challenging activities to be robustly institutionalised.

Longer term funding will in addition to enabling continuity and planning across broader horizons, produce some economy of scale and overhead over short interventions and avoid the potential hiatus of programme restarts and completions.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that support to the programme, continue with the minimum of discontinuity. Longer term funding is consistent with the “Principles And Good Practice Of Humanitarian Donorship”, and the need to provide suitable time for activities to gestate, mature and be shaped through operational use. This will also allow a “look back” on earlier activities for operational lessons learned, benefits or weaknesses that may have been identified through longer ongoing operations. It is proposed that longer funding horizons should therefore be considered.

**21.) Experience:**

In order to preserve the investment and successes to date and to enhance the sustainability of the project there is a need to enable the provincial district and commune / village to undertake the full range of flood preparedness and mitigation measures. In this respect there are compelling arguments to find appropriate means to overcome the practical challenges and constraints on providing small but essential hardware and ensuring its maintenance. (This recommendation is consistent with recommendations from Phase III)

**Recommendation:**

Small scale essential hardware (early warning loud hailer, latrines to safe areas, essential tools, project monitoring support, etc) should be provided to support key flood monitoring and mitigation activities.

**22.) Experience:**

Due to the success to date of the FMMP, communities and counterparts now appreciate that flood damage is not inevitable, and can be mitigated. It is also recognised to be a high priority activity. It is important therefore not only to advocate for sustainable funding, but to manage the expectations of the government and community stakeholders with their increased awareness.

**Recommendation:**

The future needs of the project and its likely extension should be considered along with potential avenues of support for the crucial activities. In this respect activities should be prioritised, with their likely duration and resource requirements identified, and potential sources of support. In parallel a compatible exit and handover strategy needs to be agreed with counterparts.

**8.) ANNEXES**

- A1. Terms Of Reference
- A2. List Of Persons Interviewed And Sites Visited
- A3. Maps of the Areas Covered by the Operations Financed
- A4. Samples Of Questions Applied During The Interviews
- A5. Abbreviations.

## **A1.) TERMS OF REFERENCE**

A detailed "Draft Terms of Reference" (TOR) of some 11 pages (including Report Structure and Summary Analysis Table annexes) was provided at the outset of the project. This was discussed and refined at the commencement of the MRC-ECHO and MDRD-EDU evaluations, which were conducted in parallel. The Draft TOR is appended overleaf.

# Terms of Reference

## End of Project Evaluation of the ECHO supported Project

Capacity Building for Flood Preparedness Programs (Sub-Component 4) of  
Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP)

European Commission Support to Mekong River Commission

### 1. BACKGROUND

Flood preparedness and flood emergency management strengthening remain core elements of MRC's Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP), as these address directly the needs of the flood vulnerable communities, and also indicate / guide the strengthening and operations of government agencies in the member countries (at different levels: nation, provincial, district and communes) and of national and international NGOs. This is vital for enhancing communication, coordination and cooperation between these stakeholders, as well as the consistency of national disaster management and mitigation policy implementation.

The European Commission Humanitarian Aid department (ECHO) has been funding the MRC Secretariat (MRCS) over a million Euro (€ 1,036,299) since 2003 in different funding cycles under its DIPECHO program. By focusing on strengthening of local and national authorities as well as selected relevant non-governmental actors in flood preparedness, the project contributes to reduce vulnerability and sustainable pro-poor development in the Lower Mekong River Basin.

Since the DIPECHO 3<sup>rd</sup> Action Plan for SEA in 2003, the project focussed on building the capacity of the key officials of the provincial, district and commune DM committee that has led to a better flood preparedness in the target provinces. These led to development of the annual or multi-year disaster risk reduction plan at the provincial level and identifying priorities for flood management and mitigation activities. Innovative prioritize Flood Preparedness Programs (FPP) were developed by the provincial and district authorities. The project provided support to implement some them such as safe area improvement, emergency kindergarten management and the School Flood Safety Program. The current project focuses a total 5 provinces (10 Districts) in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam. A brief analysis of the projects objectives , activities and its outcomes is enclosed as Anenx-1.

### 2. PURPOSES OF THE EVALUATION

Against this backdrop, MRCS and its implementing partner ADPC are keen to undertake the *End of Project Programmatic Evaluation* to assess the effectiveness of the activities carried out and possible strategies to ensure the continuation of the flood preparedness planning process with the built capacities and partnerships in the lower Mekong Basin countries. The process has dual purposes of assisting the donor (ECHO) in determining the worthiness of its funding for such endeavour as well as of the MRCS to determine effective implementation of FMMP objectives as per its mandate and needs identified by its member countries.

The evaluation should, therefore, help assess whether this project has adequately achieved its stated principle objective and intended results what it has set out to do and identify in what areas it could be improved to have greater impact.

The evaluation in essence a programmatic evaluation looking into the previous evaluation reports of the same project done in previous years. The overall objective of this Evaluation is ;

- To provide a systematic and objective assessment of the project performance against its objectives and the expected project outputs.
- To obtain an overall view of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness of the project activities since its phase I in 2003.
- To propose strategies for continuation of the flood planning process by the provincial and district disaster management agencies and replication of such training in other high risk provinces and districts.
- Provide key recommendations, in line with Hyogo Framework of Action 2005-2015, not only for MRC/ADPC, and National Governments (NMCs and NDMOs), but also for European Commission and other donor agencies for future funding support to FMMP activities

### **3. TARGET COUNTRIES AND KEY STAKEHOLDERS**

The evaluation would be carried out in the target provinces and district of Cambodia, Vietnam and Lao PDR. These provinces are Kratie and Svay Rieng in Cambodia, Khammouane in Lao PDR and Tien Giang and Ben Tre in Vietnam. There are number of stakeholders whose actions influence the project and will be engaged in the evaluation process. The consultant will have travel to these target areas for data collection and discussions with them. Some of the stakeholders are

- The National Mekong Committees (NMCs) and The National Disaster Management Offices (NDMOs) of the target countries
- The officials of Provincial, District and Commune DM Committees as well as the key line agencies such as the Water Resources Department, Education Department, Rural Development Department and Local Administrative Department involved in the target countries.
- The School Teachers, Students and Community members where flood preparedness priority activities were initiated.
- The Red Cross Society in each of the target country as well as NGO partners

### **4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation should concentrate as far as possible on the overall conduct of the project activities under this current phase of the project the present exercise and how the key conclusions and recommendations of the previous phase's evaluation phase has been looked into. It should also look at the overall impact of the activities within its entirety of the MRC's Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP), particularly the Component 4 and the funding support from ECHO since 2003 in different phased through DIEPCHO Action Plans. It is not the intention to evaluate individual agencies at the target areas or specific national level interventions by other DIPECHO partners, although comparisons of these is expected in order to draw out lessons learned and help improve overall performance for these activities by the national partners. More generally, the evaluation framework will be based on the guidelines taken from the ECHO's Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of the ECHO Action. These are broadly classified for reference purpose as follows ;

## 5. GENERAL GUIDELINES (TAKEN FROM THE ECHO'S TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE ECHO ACTION)

### A. *Is the Project Action relevant?*

Evaluation Analysis should include the topics given below:

- how well the reality of problems and needs, as well as target beneficiaries were identified and incorporated into the action plan,
- how local capacities for absorbing the aid were analysed;
- how the actions were prepared, noting particularly any obvious omissions. This should include policy assessments, sector analysis, planning workshops and how far they were incorporated into the action.
- whether prior consultations were undertaken with appropriate people on the spot, i.e the Delegation, national and local authorities, intended beneficiaries and other donors and aid organisations (the latter being particularly important to ensure complementarily and avoid overlap).
- how the programme complements and enhances, rather than duplicates and hinders, related activities carried out by other DIPECHO's partners, governments and donors.

### B. *Is the Action effective?*

*Effectiveness* measures the extent to which the activities funded under the action achieve their purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the results. The effectiveness should indicate the real difference made in practice by the activities funded, how timely the intervention was; equally how far means were used to their maximum effect, how far the intended beneficiaries really benefited from the products or services it made available.

The points to be taken into consideration are:

- whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived mainly by the key beneficiaries, but also taking account of the views of donor management, the responsible national Government authorities, and other interested parties (NGOs, local organisations, etc);
- if the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or external factors intervened, how flexibly the various levels of management adapted to ensure that the results would still achieve their purpose. To summarise, "were the right things done" to ensure that the potential beneficiaries actually benefited?;
- whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was correct. What accompanying measures were or should have been taken by the partner authorities, and with what consequences?;
- what unplanned effects of the action, if any, have there been in the region?;
- whether any shortcomings were due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, environment and security during implementation.

### C. *How efficient were the various activities?*

*Efficiency* measures how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (outputs) maximising quality, quantity and timeliness. An analysis of Efficiency will focus on:

- the operational capacities of the partners;
- the systems of control and auto evaluation set up by the donors and partners, whether it was appropriate, accurate and followed up;
- the quality of day-to-day management of the aid, for example in:
  - management of the budget (including whether an inadequate budget was a factor);
  - management of personnel, information, supplies, etc.
- whether management of risk was adequate, i.e. whether flexibility was demonstrated in response to changing circumstances;
- relations/co-ordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors;
- respect of deadlines.
- costs and value-for-money: how far the costs of the activities were justified by the benefits - whether or not expressed in monetary terms - compared, *mutatis mutandis*, with similar projects, activities or approaches elsewhere;
- whether the chosen indicators of efficiency were suitable and, if not, whether management amended them;
- did any unplanned results arise from the activities?

#### ***D. What was the impact of the Action?***

*Impact* looks at the wider effects of the Action. Impact can be short or long-term, intended or unintended, positive or negative, macro (sector) or micro (household).

This section should therefore show:

- to what extent the planned overall objectives were achieved, and how far that was directly due to the actions financed. This should take into account aspects such as contribution to the reduction of human suffering, effects on health and nutrition, effects of the humanitarian aid on the local economy, on local capacity-building, etc;
- whether there were any unplanned impacts (e.g., creation of dependency on humanitarian aid), and how they affected the overall impact;
- where appropriate, all gender-related, environmental, security and human rights -related impacts and any lack of overall impact resulting from neglecting these issues;
- whether the desired wider impact could have been better achieved otherwise.

#### ***E. What is the sustainability of the Action?***

*Sustainability* is concerned with measuring whether an activity is likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn and also whether its longer-term impact on the wider development process can also be sustained at the level of the sector, region or country.

An analysis of sustainability will focus on the aspects below. Their relative importance will depend on the nature of the project. It is useful to examine how concern for, or neglect of, one or other of these factors may have affected the sustainability of the outcome:

- ownership (agreed communality) of objectives and achievements, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and remained in agreement throughout the duration of the project;
- policy support and the responsibility of the beneficiary institutions, e.g. how far donor policy and national policy corresponded, and the effects of any policy changes; how far the relevant national, sector and budgetary policies and priorities affected the project; what was the level of support from governmental, public, business and civil society organisations; whether national bodies provided resources;
- institutional capacity, e.g. the degree of commitment of all parties involved, such as Government (e.g. through policy and budgetary support) and partner institutions; the extent to which the project is integrated in local institutional structures; whether counterparts were properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;
- the adequacy of the project budget for its purpose;
- socio-cultural factors, e.g. whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power-structures, and beliefs; if it seeks to change any of them, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it was based on an analysis of such factors, including target group/beneficiary participation in design and implementation; the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities, notably their leaders;
- financial sustainability, e.g. whether the products or services provided were affordable for the intended beneficiaries and remained so after funding ended; whether funds were available to cover all costs (including recurrent, operating and maintenance costs), and continue to be so after funding ended;
- technical (technology) issues, e.g. whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service provided fitted in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii) alternative technologies were considered, where there was a choice; (iii) the intended beneficiaries were able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance; having minimal maintenance, operating and replacement costs; and using national resources (notably, in creating jobs) together with minimum waste;
- wherever relevant, cross-cutting issues such as the already mentioned Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) question, gender, environmental impact, respect of human rights, etc.

## 6. METHODOLOGY

The detail methodology of the evaluation will be proposed by the Consultant as part of the inception report and agreed by MRCS and ADPC, but is initially expected to include:

- Review of documents (FMMP Documents, ECHO Funding Single Form proposals and Grant Agreement, Progress reports, Project agreements, internal M&E Notes, relevant correspondence between MRCS, ADPC and partner organizations etc.)
- Semi-structured interviews with key informants including: NMCs and NDMOs Provincial and District DM committees, NGOs, local authorities, beneficiaries, etc.

- Meetings with relevant stakeholders in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam.
- Field visit to at least one programme sites in each of the target countries to directly observe programme activities and meet with relevant staff and stakeholders.
- Focus groups with programme beneficiaries.
- Meeting with the key officials of MRCS particularly the FMMP team base in Phnom Penh

## 7. OUTPUTS

The expected outputs of the evaluation are:

- **Inception report** (4-6 pages) detailing the scope and methodology of the Evaluation within the context of this project.
- **Evaluation Report** (in English), including background, context, methodology, findings, analysis, conclusions and recommendations (30-40 pages).<sup>33</sup>
- **Presentation of findings** to the MRC and ADPC team

## 8. TIME FRAME

This evaluation will be done on behalf Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC), whom the Mekong River Commission Secretariat has contracted to implement the project activities as per a grant agreement between them. Inputs and suggestion from MRCS, particularly the FMMP team should be incorporated in each step of the evaluation. It is expected to start from First week of February 2010 and expected to complete by 10 March 2010. A schedule would be worked out with the Consultant and in consultation with the national partners.

### Stage 1: Planning of Evaluation Activities

A briefing for the Consultant both at MRCS (FMMP at Phnom Penh) and ADPC office (Bangkok), providing him/her with all the documents available and necessary clarifications.

Detailed workplan is to be laid out for activities and visits to be undertaken in the field. That will include the development of questionnaires to be applied in the field, the detailed travel plans, list of people to be met and interviewed, when to give a presentation on the findings and to submit the report.

### Stage 2: Field Study:

The FMMP team will facilitate the Evaluation field study through its NMCs in the target countries and ADPC would work closely with MRCS and the NMCs

The consultant must work in co-operation with the MRC-ADPC project staff, partners at the provincial, district and commune levels (key partners identified as the provincial and district disaster management authorities) as well as the national line agencies (National Mekong Committees, National Disaster Management Offices, etc.) to carry out the field study within an pre agreed methodology and target audience.

### Stage 3: Debriefing and submission of reports:

<sup>33</sup> The outline of the final evaluation report presented by the Consultant should be agreed by MRCS and ADPC beforehand and should reflect ECHO Evaluation Report Standards. A sample is enclosed as annexe - 2

There will be a debriefing at either MRC office in Phnom Penh or at ADPC office in Bangkok by the consultant to the project staff and to the relevant MRC and ADPC personnel on the findings of the evaluation.

A meeting with the ECHO Regional Support Office in Bangkok would be organised for the Consultant to seek inputs from the ECHO RSO.

On the basis of the results of the debriefing the **final report** will be submitted to MRCS and ADPC within an agreed timeframe after the debriefing. Any request for further amendments from MRCS and ADPC shall be made within one week.

Throughout these processes, the consultant will work closely with, seek inputs and conduct in regular consultation session with the FMMP Team of MRCS and DMS Team of ADPC.

**Annex-1 : Summary Analysis Table**  
**Capacity Building for Flood Preparedness Programs (Sub-Component 4)**  
**European Commission Support to Mekong River Commission**  
**Flood Management and Mitigation Program**

Project Duration	Focus	Overall Budget	Geographical Coverage	Beneficiaries	Programmatic Focus	Achievement	Gaps	Elements for continuation
Phase 1 2003-2004 ECHO/TPS/219/2002/02017	National (Cambodia, Vietnam)	€180,000	National level activities inviting beneficiaries from selected provinces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Mekong Committee</li> <li>• National Disaster Management Offices</li> <li>• National Red Cross Society</li> <li>• Selected provincial officials from member target countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of Flood Preparedness Planning Capacities in target member countries</li> <li>• Use of MRC's Flood Information Products at Provincial and District levels.</li> <li>• Capacity building for the provincial authorities on Development and Implementation of Flood Preparedness Programs at Province level</li> <li>• Dissemination of Flood Management and Mitigation activities in the member countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Launch of FMMP component 4</li> <li>• Flood Preparedness prioritized as focus areas by member country</li> <li>• MRC's Flood Information Products ( EWS etc) received by community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short time frame (8 months) to implement and achieve outputs</li> <li>• Flood Information Products (website updates, EWS message) could not reach to community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on capacity building at province and district level</li> <li>• FMMP will be fully operational with specific component on flood early warning</li> </ul>
Phase 2 2005-2006 ECHO/DIP/BUID/2004/03012	National, Provincial and District (Cambodia, Vietnam, Lao PDR)	€ 220,000	<p>CAM: 1 P + 1 D</p> <p>VN: 2 P</p> <p>Lao: 4P<sup>34</sup></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provincial and District Level DM officials 7 provinces of the lower Mekong Delta</li> <li>• National Red Cross Society</li> <li>• NMCs and NDMOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standardized Training Course Curriculum on "Planning and Implementation of Flood Preparedness Programs" in the three riparian country languages</li> <li>• Capacity building of key officials from provincial and district disaster management committees on developing and implementation of flood preparedness programs.</li> <li>• Identification of Priority Action Areas flood preparedness program in target provinces.</li> <li>• District level detail Flood Preparedness Program and capacity building and priority action areas identified for implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country specific training and capacity building materials</li> <li>• Participation of Provincial and District level authorities on flood preparedness activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building activities had little time to practice after gaining knowledge.</li> <li>• Support to implement priority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full 15 month for activity implementation</li> <li>• Deeper linkages with FMMP activities</li> <li>• Wider Geographical coverage</li> <li>• Innovative priority activities for Flood risk reduction</li> </ul>

<sup>34</sup> During Phase 2, the Lao PDR had only one activity by bringing 4 provincial level officials

<p>Phase 4 2008-2010 ECHO/DIP/BUD/2008/02013</p>	<p>National, Provincial, District and Commune (Cambodia, Vietnam, lao PDR)</p>	<p>€ 353,272</p>	<p>CAM: 2 P+4D+49C VN: 2 P+4D+91C Lao: 1P+2D+15C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial, District and Commune level DM authorities</li> <li>Provincial Education Department</li> <li>Schools Teachers and Students</li> <li>National and Provincial Planning Officials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity 1: Support to implementation of the Flood Preparedness Program in target provinces of Cambodia, Vietnam and Lao PDR</li> <li>Activity 2: Support target provincial authorities in linking the Flood Preparedness Program into the Local Developmental Planning Process</li> <li>Activity 3: Support target districts in capacity building Commune DM committee on Flood Preparedness</li> <li>Activity 4: Support authorities implementing prioritised awareness activities in target schools to enhance vulnerable community's capacity to deal with floods</li> <li>Activity 5: Promote national level consultations and knowledge sharing on the Flood Preparedness Program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desired leadership by NMCs and NDMO in implementation and monitoring</li> <li>Flood Risk Reduction interventions linked to the provincial and local</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delay in start</li> <li>Too little time for too many activities</li> </ul>	
<p>Phase 3 2007-2008 ECHO/DIP/BUD/2006/01012</p>	<p>National, Provincial, District and Commune (Cambodia, Vietnam, lao PDR)</p>	<p>€ 283,027</p>	<p>CAM: 1 P+3D+84C VN: 1 P+ 3 D+80C Lao: 1P+1 D+1C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial, District and Commune level DM authorities</li> <li>Provincial Education Department</li> <li>Schools Teachers and Students</li> <li>NMCs and NDMOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Training Manual on Flood Preparedness in Lao PDR focusing on Provincial and District level authorities</li> <li>Preparation of Flood Preparedness Program and Implementation of Priority Action Areas in the selected Districts of the target province of Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam;</li> <li>Conduct training of trainers on "Flood Preparedness for the Commune Disaster Management Committee/Teams".</li> <li>Conduct National Seminars on "Lesson Learnt in Flood Preparedness Planning at Province, District and Commune levels" in Cambodia, Vietnam and Lao PDR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood Management and Mitigation focused capacity building activity</li> <li>Deeper involvement of NMCs and NDMO as Lead in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up scaling in other flood province could not achieved.</li> <li>Not much linkages within the 5 component of FMMP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geographical up scaling to cover more provinces</li> <li>Deepen activities until commune levels</li> <li>Promote cost sharing an ownership based activity implementation</li> <li>Document lesson learnt for next phase of FMMP</li> </ul>

## **Annex-2 Structure of the Report**

The final report is to be written in English, of a maximum length of 30-40 pages including the Executive Summary to be appeared at the beginning of the report.

The report format appearing below closely follows the structure issued by ECHO and, therefore, must be strictly adhered to:

### 1. Cover page

- Title of the evaluation report
- Date of the evaluation;
- Name of the consultant.

### Table of contents

### Executive Summary (not more than 2 pages)

It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main points of the analysis, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations.

### Main body of the report:

The main body of the report shall elaborate the points listed in the Executive Summary. It will include references to the methodology used for the evaluation and the context of the action. In particular, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation. Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the action, and of the resources available to implement it.

### Annexes:

Terms of Reference;  
List of persons interviewed and sites visited;  
Map of the areas covered by the operations financed under the action;  
Samples of questions or questionnaires applied during the interviews;  
Abbreviations.

- All confidential information shall be presented in a separate annex.
- An electronic copy of each report including all annexes must be submitted together with the final reports' hard copies

## A2.) LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND SITES VISITED

The following organisations and individuals were met in the course of the evaluation. Their cooperation in being available and participating in the evaluation is gratefully acknowledged.

<b>COUNTRY:</b>	<b>Thailand</b>	
<b>NAME</b>	<b>POSITION</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>
Aloysius Rego	Deputy Executive Director	ADPC
Aslam Perwaiz	Programme Manager (MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV)	ADPC
Ms Lizz Harrison	Project Coordinator (MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV)	ADPC
Ms Thitiphon Sinsupan	Senior Coordinator (MRCS-ADPC ECHO IV)	ADPC
Arghya Sinha Roy	Program Manager (MDRD-EDU-II)	ADPC
Ms Ronilda Co	Project Officer (MDRD-EDU-II)	ADPC
<b>COUNTRY:</b>	<b>Cambodia</b>	
Mean Meanith	Programme Officer	Action Aid, Kratie
Chum Vuthy	Project Manager	ADPC
Ms Thitiphon Sinsupan	Senior Coordinator	ADPC
Ms Lizz Harrison	Programme Coordinator	ADPC
Ol Seine	Programme Coordinator	ADPC
Heng Kim Eng	Commune Clerk, Chhloung	CCDM
Kong Sokhom	Commune Clerk, Hanchey	CCDM
Lao Bun Nin	Chief Of Commune	CCDM
Nguon Seng	Chief Of Commune, Prek Samann	CCDM
Sim Slai Mann	Deputy Chief Of Commune, Prek Samann	CCDM
Smas Amath	Commune Clerk, Prek Samann	CCDM
Tith Diamon	Chief of Commune, Hanchey	CCDM
Hak Socheat	National Flood Coordinator	CNMC
Pich Dun	Secretary General	CNMC
Sok Bun Heng	National Flood Expert	CNMC
Ms Prak Sopheap	Administrative Official	CRC, Kratie
Thong Virada	Provincial Director	CRC, Kratie
Hang Chandy	Deputy District Governor Chhloung	DCCDM
Saum Sariith	District Governor Chhloung	DCCDM
Ouk Serey Vathanak	Deputy Chief of District Education, Chhloung	DoEYS
Bun Phenth	Chief of Planning	DoEYS
Iv Sophany	Director, Department Of Fine Arts	DoEYS
Kim Dina	Staff of Planning Office	DoEYS
Thoun Thom	Chief of District Education	DoEYS
You Kimlay	Chief of District Education (Cheat Borey District)	DoEYS
Pech Samy	Deputy Director of Provincial Planning	DoP
Bun Vuthy	Parent and School Committee Member	Krokro Secondary School
Keo Kimchoeurn	Deputy Principal	Krokro Secondary School
Ms Phy Phearum	Teacher	Krokro Secondary School
Pot Channy	Principal	Krokro Secondary School
Sun Bunlorn	Teacher	Krokro Secondary School
Komar Kaun	Programme Officer	MRCS
Nicholaas Bakker	Chief Technical Adviser	MRCS
Ponn Narith	Deputy Secretary General	NCDM
Soth Kimkolmony	Assistant to President of NCDM	NCDM
Som Vanthat	Programme Assistant	OXFAM GB
Chen Hong Srey	Deputy Chairman	PCDM
Ms Sa Chean Heang	Deputy Provincial Governor, Kratie	PCDM
Kong Socheat	Permanent Member of EXCOM	PRDC
Eng Vicher	Senior Provincial Programme Adviser	PSDD
Try Vuny	Local Administration Adviser	PSDD
154 students (girls and boys)		Krokro Secondary School
<b>COUNTRY:</b>	<b>Laos PDR</b>	
Ms Thitiphon Sinsupan	Senior Coordinator	ADPC
Ms Lizz Harrison	Project Coordinator	ADPC
Ms Kong Pheng Syhabut	Assistant Program Coordinator	ADPC
Ms Somvath Keokhamphoui	Program Coordinator	ADPC
Chanthanome Niemmanyvong	Vice Chairman	DDMC
Lodvilay Chanthanuvong	Deputy Director	DED
Khambang Lathanama	Vice Director - Nongbok DED	DED
Bounbang Manivong	Head of Health Office	DHD
Khambay Paxaxay	Head of LSW Office	DLSWD
Khambay Paxayya	Head of District LSW	DLSWD / DDMC
Keointha Pakkatong	Director DLSWO Nongbok / Vice Chairman Nongbok DDMC	DLSWO / DDMC
Benoit Gerfault	Disaster Preparedness Technical Adviser	FRC
Phonepaseuth Pouliphanh	National FMMP Coordinator	LNMC
Komar Kaun	Programme Officer	MRCS



**A3.) MAP OF THE AREAS COVERED BY THE OPERATIONS FINANCED**



**LOWER MEKONG BASIN**  
**Showing Project Areas of FMMP Phase IV in Cambodia, Viet nam and Lao PDR**

#### A4.) SAMPLES OF QUESTIONS APPLIED DURING THE INTERVIEWS

The following represents a “tool-kit” of available questions that were developed by the Evaluator and with amendments agreed with the ADPC team prior to commencing the evaluation. Questions were forwarded in advance to the field teams to disseminate to national counterparts and partners as appropriate, to assist preparation and effectiveness of the limited field evaluations. The sample questions were not intended to be either a comprehensive or exclusive list of questions for all participants. Available time<sup>35</sup> and translation constraints prevented extensive questioning of any individual or group. Rather, the sample questions served several functions:

- their compilation by the evaluator and ADPC briefing team served as part of the evaluator’s rapid initial familiarisation of the project and highlighted areas in the initial briefing that needed clarification;
- they established initial areas of focus based on the first briefings in Bangkok;
- they created a base framework to identify areas that would warrant additional queries during the field evaluation;
- to the extent possible, they provided counterparts and partners with an advance indication of areas that would potentially be discussed in the evaluation, to enable counterparts / partners to have information available;
- the structure and content of questions, was to the extent practical, considered in advance to capture key elements, while also minimising incorrect evaluator perceptions and also being respectful of potential local sensitivity.

#### Questions Guide for the Evaluation of MRCS-FMMP Phase IV

**For national, provincial, district and commune level (NDMO, NMRC- FMMP staff, National Authorities, NGO and Donors)**

- 1.) How well were the needs, challenges, and lessons learned identified in Phase I, II and III (Lao PDR excludes Phase II) incorporated into the phase IV of this project?
- 2.) One of the recommendations of Phase III was to establish a monitoring system to see the impact of the project results and how individual project achievements contributes to the overall objective of the FMMP programme.
  - (a). do you feel this appropriate?
  - (b). was it undertaken ?
  - (c). can you provide any details ?
- 3.) One of the recommendations of Phase III was to test the FPP to establish its validity and to practice with mock drills and simulations.
  - (a). Can you comment on if this is feasible and / or was it tried ?
- 4.) It was recommended that the duration of the district ToT and commune training shall be at least five days for each course to allow participants working in group discussion and practice, or to be conducted in phases.
  - (a). have the recent district ToTs and commune trainings incorporated changes to reflect these recommendations ?
- 5.) It was recommended from Phase III that there is a need to focus during the training on “prevention”, “mitigation”, “preparedness”, not just “response” as well as on how to incorporate DRR into development.
  - (a). have the recent district ToTs and commune trainings incorporated changes to reflect these recommendations ?
- 6.) It was commented in Phase III that the number of women in trainings should be increased.
  - (a). is the ratio of males to females in Phase IV considered appropriate ?
  - (b). approx what was the male : female ratio during Phase IV ?
- 7.) One of the key challenges (in Cambodia) of Phase III was to sustain and update the FPP through regular coordination meetings between the members of PCDM and DDMC.
  - (a). In what way did your institution (in all areas, not just Cambodia) assist in supporting and facilitating the coordination and also the updating of the FPP ?

<sup>35</sup> Time for dialogue with partners was constrained by a number of factors including, availability of officials and partners, travel between locations and interviews, needs of translation and translation effectiveness, size of group considerations of individual participation and courtesy, accommodating local courtesies and practices (including introductions and organisation statements)

- 8.) One of the challenges of Phases II and III was the lack of appropriate staffing and resources at different levels in particular at provincial, district, and commune level. In some cases due to lack of available staff, in other cases the unwillingness of highly qualified and married staff to accept remote postings.
  - (a). How did your institution analyse the mechanisms to absorb the Phase IV project within the existing local capacity ?
- 9.) During the assessment and preparation of the Phase IV projects:
  - (a). which stakeholders were involved in identifying the project objectives and activities ?
  - (b). in which forum where they involved ?
  - (c). to what extent were decisions incorporated into the action ?
- 10.) Can you explain how the MRCS-ECHO IV project complements and enhances related activities, carried out in your country by other DIPECHO partners, governments, and donors in particular the Component 4 of the MRC-GTZ (ADPC-FEMS, Flood Emergency Management Strengthening) Cambodia & Viet Nam & Lao-PDR, and the MRC-Flood Management and Mitigation Programme (FMMP) ?
- 11.) The Phase IV of the project has the aim that “Competence of target Provincial, District and Commune Disaster Management authorities is strengthened to develop and implement Flood Preparedness Programme (FPP)”.
  - (a). how far have the planned activities been adequately delivered and implemented to/by the target groups ?
  - (b). what is your perception in terms of increase in capacities to understand, identify, plan, and implement flood safety measures ?
- 12.) To what extent have the roles and responsibilities of the Provincial, District and Commune Disaster Management authorities and individual personnel (in each Phase IV activity) been clarified and balanced among the various stakeholders ?
- 13.) In respect of capacity building of Provincial and District and Commune Authorities, and implementation of the various Phase IV activities:
  - (a). what methods or procedures did your organisation use to ensure effective capacity building and implementation of the projects ?
  - (b). what accompanying measures were, or should have been, taken by the partner authorities (MRCS, ADPC) to ensure it and was it successful ?
  - (c). If not successful, what was the reason ?
- 14.) Please describe the overall coordination role and activities of MRC-FMMP with the National Mekong Committee (NMC) for the implementation, monitoring and integration of the project activities ?
- 15.) Do you think that all the actions of the projects adequately took into consideration issues such as gender, culture sensitivity, environment, and security during the implementation ?
- 16.) In terms of daily management, monitoring and project evaluation:
  - (a). how accurate and adequate were the mechanisms and systems put in place to ensure a timely, beneficiary-oriented and cost effective management of the project among the different stakeholders ?
  - (b). what went well ?
  - (c). what has to be still improved ?
  - (d). what were the lessons learned ?
- 17.) Do you have any comments or suggestions on the effective and appropriate managing of relationships and interfaces between individuals and organisations within the programme ?
- 18.) In respect of project deadlines and milestones:
  - (a). do you have any comments on whether the programme achieved and respected deadlines as planned?
  - (b). where deadlines and programme milestones could not be achieved please identify causes,
  - (c). any recommendations for the future ?
- 19.) In your opinion and experience of project cost and cost effectiveness:
  - (a). have the costs of the programme implementation and deliverables been suitable value for money?
  - (b). how would the cost of components of this programme compare with costs of other similar programs or activities ?

- (c). do you feel that these costs are sustainable and affordable for the beneficiaries when the funding has ended ?
- 20.) Considering planned results, activities and the chosen indicators:
- (a). were you and your organisation aware of the specific “results” and “indicators” associated with the key “activities” ? (go to “b” or “e”)
- If “Yes” to (a):**
- (b). do you think that the planned “results”, “activities” and the chosen “indicators” were most suitable to ensure and measure a real and relevant benefit for the beneficiaries?
- (c). if not, were they amended by the project management team ?
- (d). did any unplanned positive or negative results arise from the activities (if so please describe)?
- If “No” to (a):**
- (e). would it have assisted you in your programme implementation targeting and monitoring to have know “objective indicators” for the objectives and activities ?
- 21.) Considering project design for this phase:
- (a). did the project design realistically identify project challenges, risks and beneficiary needs, and address them adequately ?
- (b). can you indicate any areas of shortcomings or not addressed ?
- (c). where the needs of beneficiaries, or challenges, were not as assumed in the design, was the project management and donor flexible enough to permit modification to suit the actual needs rather than designed needs ?
- (d). can you recommend improvement ?
- 22.) One of the outputs of the project is the development, update or adaption of a FPP and manual:
- (a). do you think that the approach used for the development / update / adaption of the FPP and manual are adequate enough to enhance the capacities of the provincial, district and commune, as well as to ensure the implementation of the identified priority area?
- (b). If yes, why and if not please suggest what changes are necessary and how could it be done differently?
- 23.) Was the amount of the budget and the manner in which it was managed and administered, suitable to meet the needs of the programme and beneficiaries for the targeted areas and activities and their management ?
- 24.) Considering TOT at District level and Commune trainings:
- (a). how effective in terms of methodology, content, and time were the trainings at ToT district, and commune DM Committees levels ?
- (b). Can you please suggest what should be improved for any ToT or future trainings ?
- 25.) In respect of priority activities identified:
- (a). do you think that Districts and Communes are well prepared to carry out the priority activities identified ?
- (b). can you make any recommendations ?
- 26.) In consideration of monitoring and coaching the provincial, district and commune DM committees:
- (a). how are the MRC, NMCs and NDMOs ensuring monitoring and coaching ?
- (b). is this effective ?
- (c). can you suggest alternative preferred and suitable methods ?
- 27.) One of the planned priority activities (Cambodia, Vietnam, Lao PDR) was to conduct a flood safety awareness school programme:
- (a). were existing IEC materials reviewed found to be adequate and suitable for replication and use ?
- (b). what steps were taken, and how effective were these, to ensure the participation of line ministries, families, children, and schools ?
- (c). how effective in terms of methodology, content, and time were the trainings for the teachers ?
- (d). can you please suggest what should be improved for the next trainings ?
- (e). how well were the school flood safety activities identified to increase disaster risk awareness among students and how was it implemented?
- (f). did the teachers have the adequate resources (budget, IEC material, etc) and skills, for implementing these activities?
- (g). do you feel that the teachers have adequate teaching skills, in addition to the teaching plans, to transmit the DRR messages clearly and with interest
- (h). what would you do differently and what are your recommendations for the future ?

- 28.) To what extent do you think the SFSPs were effective and successful in:
- raising awareness in children ?
  - raising awareness in parents and community ?
  - developing a safety culture and changing behaviour patterns in the children, parents and community ?
- 29.) How adequate and useful was the National Workshop in terms of:
- an awareness tool, sharing experience on FPP and identifying linkage within the countries/other projects, drawing lessons learned and best practices to seek input on scaling up the action?
  - providing the right forum for these issues,
  - appropriate time allocation and participants present
  - being followed up in individual strategies and activities envisaged by your country, and institution to implement the outcome of the workshops?
- 30.) To what extent have the planned overall objectives / results (as documented in the programme designs) in phase I, II III and IV been achieved (*Phase II not applicable in Lao PDR*) ?
- 31.) Were the achievements in Phase I, II, III and IV a direct result of the MRCS-ADPC current project or, were they more a result independent of the MRCS-ADPC (and therefore, as a result of other programs or initiatives by Government, NGOs or others) ?
- 32.) Is the continuation of the programme and its future sustainability dependent on another phase funded by ECHO or external donors, or can it be sustained by resources within the country (government budget, related development programs, private sector participation) ?
- 33.) What is the added value from each phase of the project in increasing capacities, coordination and management for the Flood preparedness, mitigation and response at different level, as well as in terms of revision or designing DRR in your country policy and strategy?
- 34.) What is the immediate impact after Phase IV for the government structure and for the beneficiaries?
- 35.) What are the remaining challenges for an effective disaster flood management:
- in your location ?
  - In your organisation ?
- 36.) What are your recommendations to your government/organization, partner organisations and donors for future action's improvement ?
- 37.) What would you do differently to ensure a wider impact of the actions with the same time and resources available ?
- 38.) How do you plan to institutionalize and scale up the preparation of the FPP in your DM structure at provincial, district and commune level ?
- 39.) To what extent has it been possible to promote effective local partnerships for:
- FPP implementation (including training)?
  - SFSP implementation (including training)?
- 40.) In respect of DRR policy and the required budget for policy implementation, can you please outline:
- what has already been done in terms of policy strategy, and budget allocation for key activities, and
  - what will be the next steps and the time required to advance those activities, and
  - what has been, and what shall be, the contributions of other Ministries/ Departments, and other external organizations under the government's national and local development programmes ?
- 41.) How much have each of all the project's phases contributed to ensure the link between Preparedness (Development), Relief and Rehabilitation.
- 42.) Considering other DRR projects being implemented in your area by your government, or partners, or other organisations:
- which projects are currently in progress, or planned for the near future, by which organisations ?
  - how does the MRCS-ADPC current project fit with, complement, or overlap with these projects ?
  - how are the projects coordinated to minimise gaps and overlaps ?

- 43.) Considering information sharing and coordination of DRR and FPP with your organisation:
- to what extent are other government agencies, ministries or NGOs involved in meetings, for these purposes, with your organisation ?
  - how effective is this ?
  - can you suggest improvements ?
- 44.) Can you summarise briefly what are your, or your organisation's, main DRR and FPP achievements in the current phase of the programme ?
- 45.) Ownership of the programme and its results and activities is very important for the sustainability of the programme.
- do you believe that you, your colleagues, staff and superiors adequately "understand" and "take ownership of the programme and its outputs and activities ?
  - can you suggest ways to improve ownership and participation by that yourself or your colleagues, staff or superiors ?
- 46.) In some areas and organisations officials and staff are required to undertake general staff and organisational duties for their organisation / commune /department / ministry as well as the duties of the MRCS-ADPC programme:
- do you have additional duties to those of the MRCS-ADPC programme.
  - if you have additional duties or responsibilities, how do you manage the different roles?
  - do the differing roles and duties overlap
  - do you have enough time and resources to undertake both roles
- 47.) It was suggested in Phase III that the lack of operational structure, human and financial resources at different levels is one of the main challenges for assuring the sustainability in particular in Lao PDR and Cambodia.
- how is your organisation addressing and attempting to resolve this challenge in order to enhance post funding sustainability of the benefits gained in the programme ?
- 48.) Minutes and decisions of programme meetings between MRCS, ADPC and NMC and NDMO meetings are recorded to improve the performance and sustainability of the programme:
- do you routinely receive copies of these reports, minutes and decisions ?
  - if so, how often do you receive these ?
  - are they translated into a language that is easy for you to read ?
- 49.) In considering funding and coordination options, which is considered preferable:
- short duration actions with a number of donor supported participants (e.g. NDMOs, and ministries, and NGO and other partners), or
  - longer duration actions, with centralised funding through a single coordinating donor partner (e.g. the counterpart ministry or NDMO), or
  - other options ?

**For the teachers, principals, and district and provincial education officers**

- 50.) How much were you involved in the assessment, identification, implementation and evaluation of the School Flood Safety Programme ?
- 51.) The training that you received:
- do you think that it was appropriate in terms of content, clarity, simplicity, and teaching methods?
  - If appropriate, why?
  - if not appropriate, please suggest what could be done differently.
- 52.) Would you add more, or remove, topics in the training? If yes, which topics and why ?
- 53.) Were you provided any additional training or instruction in differing, or improvement in teaching methods, such as different ways of presenting DRR (Disaster Risk Reduction) ideas and holding the students attention and interest (Note this refers to teaching instruction, not the teaching plan modules) ?
- 54.) Have you undergone training on Disaster Management before this training ?
- 55.) How did the training help you to enhance or to improve your understanding on DRR and flood management and prepare yourself and the students for eventual disasters ?

- 56.) Do you know what kind of coaching or supervision the school, PED, DED or the Ministry of Education is organizing to support you in conducting these school safety activities?
- 57.) Did you have enough material (posters, leaflets, teaching-books, budget, etc), to organize school safety activities in the school?
- 58.) How interesting were these extra activities for the students and for your self?
- 59.) Is the school planning these activities for the next school year?
- 60.) Do you feel that the implemented activities were adequate to create awareness and school safety measures for flood disasters? What would you add to, or subtract from, these activities and why?
- 61.) Can you please summarise 3 lessons learned from the school safety activities?
- 62.) Based on the “3 lessons learned” (above) what are your recommendations for the school safety programme for your school and for other schools?
- 63.) Have you shared your teaching related experiences and lessons learned with:
  - (a). other teachers at your school
  - (b). other schools in your district
  - (c). schools in other extended areas (provincial , national workshops, etc)

#### **For Students**

- 64.) How did the school safety activity improve your understanding of how to be prepared for a flood?
- 65.) Did you share your new knowledge about floods, with other people (e.g. your family and friends) ?
- 66.) Did you make any changes in your normal life or activities because of what you learned about floods ?
- 67.) Do you think that it is important that your school teaches you about disasters and how to prepare for them, as an important subject for all children ?
- 68.) Can you give examples of what to do before, during and after a flood disaster?
- 69.) Did you have enough material (poster, leaflets, etc) to participate in the school safety activities at school? What did you learn?
- 70.) Can you think of other activities that you would like your teachers to use to help you learn about, understand and enjoy learning about preparing for disaster ( e.g. songs, plays, other ideas, etc) ?
- 71.) Do you have any ideas of the best way to share the information you learned about disasters, with other classes in your school, and with other schools ?
- 72.) Can you please mention at least 3 things you learned and that most stayed in your memory during the activities ?

#### **For Parents**

- 73.) Did the children involve you in what they had learned and were learning about floods (for example sharing teaching from school, asking for homework assistance or explanations, etc) ?
- 74.) What did the children learn or tell you about disaster preparedness and responses ?
- 75.) Did the information from your children, or school or community events encourage you to change behaviour or your way of thinking to prepare for, minimise risks or consequences of disasters ?
- 76.) Which disasters are you most likely to experience in your area ?
- 77.) What are the “most likely”, and “most concerning”, effects and consequences of disasters in your area ?
- 78.) Projects to prepare for, or respond to, floods are targeted to highly vulnerable communities – and with the vulnerable groups within these communities.
  - (a). do you think that preparing for and knowing about floods is important,

- (b). do you have the available time, effort and resources to commit to disaster preparedness
- (c). if you do not have the time or resources is this because your time and resources are focused on day-to-day survival needs and livelihood activities ?

## A5.) ABBREVIATIONS

The following acronyms have been used throughout the text of the evaluation report. Wherever possible these acronyms are consistent with normal abbreviations for the agencies within the project documents and common usage.

### ACRONYM REFERRING TO:

#### GENERAL ACRONYMS

ADPC	Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre
ADB	Asian Development Bank
DFT	District Facilitator/Trainer
CBDM	Community based Disaster Management
DIPECHO	Disaster Preparedness ECHO
DM	Disaster Management
DMC	Disaster Management Committee (including DM committees at Provincial PDMC; District DDMC, Commune CCMC and Village VDPU levels)
DMS	Disaster Management System
DRC:	Danish Red Cross
EC	European Commission
ECHO	European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office
EU	European Union
EWS	Early Warning System
FEMS	Flood Emergency Management Strengthening
FMM	Flood Management and Mitigation
FMMP	Flood Management and Mitigation Programme
FPP	Flood Preparedness Programme(/Plan)
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
LMB	Lower Mekong Basin
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRC	Mekong River Commission
MRCS	Mekong River Commission Secretariat
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NMC	National Mekong Committee
ODA	Official Development Assistance (Aid)
PFT	Provincial Facilitator/Trainer
RC	Red Cross
RGC	Royal Government of Cambodia
SFSP	School Flood Safety Program
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund (formerly United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund)
WHH	Women Headed Households
WB	World Bank

#### GENERIC ACRONYMS (Report Specific)

CDMC	Commune Disaster Management Committee Cambodia = CDMT; Lao DDR = Not Applicable; Viet Nam = CCFSC)
DDMC	District Disaster Management Committee (Cambodia = DCDM; Lao DDR = PDMC; Viet Nam = DCFSC)
DMC	Sub- National Disaster Management Committee (General Description) (Includes PDMC, DDMC, CDMC, VDPU)
MOE	Ministry of Education (Cambodia = MoEYS; Lao PDR = MoE; Viet Nam = MoET;)

NDMO	National Disaster Management Office (Cambodia = NCDM; Lao PDR = NDMC; Viet Nam = CCFSC, implemented by DDMFSC)
NMC	National Mekong Committee (Cambodia = CNMC; Lao DDR = LNMC; Viet Nam = VNMC)
PDMC	Provincial Disaster Management Committee (Cambodia = PCDM; Lao PDR = PDMC; Viet Nam = PCFSC)
VDPU	Village Disaster Protection Unit (Cambodia = Not Applicable; Lao DDR = VDPU; Viet Nam = Not Applicable)

#### **CAMBODIA ACRONYMS**

CCC	Cooperation Committee For Cambodia
CCDM	Commune Committee for Disaster Management
CRRF	Cambodia Disaster Risk Reduction Forum
CNMC	Cambodia National Mekong Committee
CRC	Cambodian Red Cross
DCDM	District Committee for Disaster Management
DCDM	District Disaster Management Committee
DoEYS	Department Of Education Youth and Sport
DoP	Department of Planning
DRRAP	Disaster Risk Reduction Action Plan
NCDM	National Committee for Disaster Management
PCDM	Provincial Committee for Disaster Management
PDRRAP	Provincial Disaster Risk Reduction Action Plan
PRDC	Provincial Rural Development Committee
PSDD	Project to Support Democratic Development through Decentralization and Deconcentration
RGC	Royal Government of Cambodia

#### **LAO PDR ACRONYMS**

DDMC	District Disaster Management Committee
DED	District Education Department
DHD	District Health Department
DLSWD	District Labour & Social Welfare Dept
DoE	Department of Education
DoLSW	Department of Labour and Social Welfare
DWR	Department of Water Resource
GoL	Government of Lao PDR
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
LMNC	Lao National Mekong Committee
LRC	Lao Red Cross
LSW	Labour and Social Welfare
LWU	Lao Womens' Unit
MLSW	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoLSW	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare
NDMC	National Disaster Management Committee
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
PDMC	Provincial Disaster Management Committee
PDoAF	Provincial Department of Agriculture and Forestry
PDoLSW	Provincial Department of Labour Social and Welfare
PED	Provincial Education Department
WREA	Water Resources and Environmental Administration

#### **VIET NAM ACRONYMS**

CCFSC	Central Committee of Flood and Storm Control
CCoFSC	Commune Committee of Flood and Storm Control
CPFC	Committee for Population, Family and Children
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
DCFSC	District Committee of Flood and Storm Control
DDMFSC	Department of Dyke Management, Flood and Storm Control
DoET	Department of Education and Training
DoWR	Department Of Water Resources
FDCC	Flood and Drought Control Committee

GoV	Government of Viet Nam
MoET	Ministry of Education and Training
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
PCFSC	Provincial Committee of Flood and Storm Control
PDFSC	Provincial Division of Flood and Storm Control
VNMC	Vietnam National Mekong Committee