

# Appendix 11:

## Proposed Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity Development for Disaster Risk Reduction

### Capacity Result 1: Capacities for engagement

Relevant individuals and organizations (disaster management or DRR department, sectoral ministries, local government, private sector, NGO and civil sector, gender organization, scientific organization, the citizens, and others relevant) engage proactively and constructively with one another in managing a global DRR issue.

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 1.1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead disaster risk reduction organizations:</b> This indicator measures whether or not the appropriate organizations and individuals targeted for CD have been identified, as determined by how clearly and accurately their respective responsibilities have been defined (in accordance with Sendai Framework goals and targets) and whether the authority they hold to perform these responsibilities is recognized.</p> | Organizational responsibilities for DRR are not clearly defined   | 0 |
|   | Organizational responsibilities for DRR are identified  | 1 |
|   | Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for DRR are partially recognized by stakeholders | 2 |
|   | Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for DRR recognized by stakeholders               | 3 |
| <p><b>Indicator 1.2 – Existence of operational multi stakeholder mechanisms:</b> This indicator measures whether or not there exist public and/or private mechanisms (e.g., associations, contracts, memoranda of understanding) through which the engagement and coordination of DRM stakeholders may occur, and whether or not these mechanisms are functional.</p>   | No multi stakeholder mechanisms are in place  | 0 |
|   | Some multi stakeholder mechanisms are in place and operational  | 1 |
|   | Some multi stakeholder mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.                       | 2 |
|   | Comprehensive multi stakeholder mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional              | 3 |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Indicator 1.3 – Existence of cooperation among stakeholder groups:</b> This indicator measures the quality of involvement of stakeholders, including representation of all appropriate stakeholder groups, the establishment of stakeholder consultation processes, and the active contribution of these stakeholders to decision-making. | Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in management decision-making is poor                   | 0 |
|  | Stakeholders are identified but their participation in management decision-making is limited                               | 1 |
|  | Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established   | 2 |
|  | Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative management decision-making processes | 3 |

### Capacity Result 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge

This is the capacity of relevant individuals and organizations to research, acquire, communicate, educate and make use of pertinent information to be able to identify and assess hazard risk and analyse and implement DRR solutions.

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Indicator 2.1 – Degree of stakeholders' disaster risk reduction awareness:</b> This indicator measures how much awareness stakeholders have with regards to the existence and severity of hazard risk at all levels (including the community level), and about the existence and availability of risk reduction interventions. | Stakeholders are not aware about global DRR issues and their related possible solutions                                  | 0 |
|   | Stakeholders are aware about global DRR issues but not about the possible solutions                                      | 1 |
|   | Stakeholders are aware about global DRR issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate             | 2 |
|   | Stakeholders are aware about global DRR issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions | 3 |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 2.2 – Access and sharing of disaster risk reduction information by stakeholders:</b> This indicator measures knowledge that exists about the information needs of disaster risk reduction stakeholders, the adequacy of the information management infrastructure in place, and the degree to which sharing of this knowledge and information is occurring.</p>                          | The DRR information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate   | 0 |
|  | The DRR information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate   | 1 |
|  | The DRR information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited | 2 |
|  | Comprehensive DRR information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure  | 3 |
| <p><b>Indicator 2.3 – Extent of inclusion/use of local and traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction decision-making:</b> This indicator measures whether or not local and traditional knowledge exists among stakeholder groups (including beneficiaries), and whether such knowledge has been captured and shared among stakeholders for effective participative decision-making processes.</p> | Local and traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes  | 0 |
|  | Local and traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes  | 1 |
|  | Local and traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes  | 2 |
|  | Local and traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes  | 3 |
| <p><b>Indicator 2.4 – Existence of disaster risk reduction education programmes:</b> This indicator looks at the quantity and quality of formal and informal DRR education that are provided by and available to stakeholders, as a factor of capacity gaps and stakeholder demand.</p>  | No DRR education programmes are in place   | 0 |
|  | DRR education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered   | 1 |
|  | DRR education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered   | 2 |
|  | Comprehensive DRR education programmes exist and are being delivered   | 3 |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 2.5 – Extent of the linkage between disaster risk reduction research/science and policy development:</b> This indicator measures the linkage between DRR policy and research; including the identification of research needs and research strategies and programmes; and the relevance of the research available to policy development.</p> | No linkage exists between DRR policy development and science/research strategies and programmes  | 0 |
|   | Research needs for DRR policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes                               | 1 |
|   | Relevant research strategies and programmes for DRR policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs | 2 |
|   | Relevant research results are available for DRR policy development   | 3 |

### Capacity Result 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development

This is the capacity of relevant individuals and organizations to plan and develop DRR policy and legislation, and to develop strategies and plans, all of which support or otherwise operationalize DRR efforts.

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 3.1 – Extent of the disaster risk reduction planning and strategy development process:</b> This indicator measures the quality of the planning and strategy development process, whether the planning and strategy development process produces adequate plans and strategies related to DRR, and if adequate resources and coordination mechanisms are in place to ensure proper implementation of these plans, programmes and projects.</p> | The DRR planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate DRR plans and strategies   | 0 |
|   | The DRR planning and strategy development process does produce adequate DRR plans and strategies but there are not implemented /used  | 1 |
|   | Adequate DRR plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems  | 2 |
|   | The DRR planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead DRR organizations and produces the required DRR plans and strategies; which are being implemented | 3 |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 3.2 – Existence of policies and regulatory frameworks to support capacity development:</b> This indicator measures the completeness of the policy and regulatory frameworks that exist or have been put in place to support DRR (including CD for DRR), including measurement of mechanisms for enacting, complying, and enforcing these policies and laws.</p> | The DRR policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment   | 0 |
|   | Some relevant DRR policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced   | 1 |
|   | Adequate DRR policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them   | 2 |
|   | Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions | 3 |
| <p><b>Indicator 3.3 – Adequacy of the information available for disaster risk reduction decision-making:</b> This indicator measures the adequacy of the information available for decision-making, if the information is made available to decision-makers, and if this information is updated and used by decision-makers.</p>  | The availability of information for DRR decision-making is lacking   | 0 |
|   | Some DRR information exists but it is not sufficient to support the DRR decision-making processes  | 1 |
|   | Relevant DRR information is made available to DRR decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly                                     | 2 |
|   | Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated DRR information to make decisions  | 3 |

---

#### Capacity Result 4: Capacities for management and implementation

This is the capacity of relevant individuals and organizations to perform the required implementation actions guided or mandated by DRR policies, plans, strategies and/or regulatory decisions, and the capacity plan and execute relevant sustainable risk management actions and solutions.

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 4.1 – Existence and mobilization of resources by the relevant organizations:</b> This indicator measures the availability of human, financial, and other resources within the relevant organizations, whether potential sources for resource shortfalls have been identified, and whether resources have been mobilized appropriately.</p>          | The DRR organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed                              | 0 |
|   | The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed  | 1 |
|   | The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed                             | 2 |
|   | Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead DRR organizations   | 3 |
| <p><b>Indicator 4.2 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer:</b> This indicator measures the availability of skills and knowledge, if the technical needs and sources are identified and accessed by the program or project, and if there is a basis for an ongoing locally- or nationally-based upgrading of skills and knowledge.</p> | The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified  | 0 |
|   | The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources   | 1 |
|   | The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources   | 2 |
|   | The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies | 3 |

---

### Capacity Result 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate

Individuals and organizations have the capacity to effectively monitor and evaluate project and/or programme achievements against expected results and to provide feedback for learning, adaptive management and suggesting adjustments to the course of action if necessary to reduce disaster risk and make risk-informed development decisions.

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 5.1 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process:</b> this indicator measures the existence of a monitoring framework, if the monitoring involves stakeholders and if the monitoring results inform the implementation process.</p>                     | Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme  | 0 |
|   | An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted   | 1 |
|   | Regular participative monitoring of results is being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team  | 2 |
|   | Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action   | 3 |
| <p><b>Indicator 5.2 – Adequacy of the project/programme evaluation process:</b> this indicator measures the existence of an evaluation framework, if the adequate resources and access to information is available and if the evaluation results inform the planning process.</p> | None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources   | 0 |
|   | An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted  | 1 |
|   | Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team and other staff designing the next generation of projects | 2 |
|   | Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team to correct the course of action if needed and to learn lessons for further project planning activities.                    | 3 |

These indicators have been adapted to the DRR context from: Global Environmental Facility (GEF). 2011. Monitoring Capacity Development in GEF operations: A Framework to Monitor Capacity Development Initiatives. pp. 12-16.