



European
Commission

Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection



Photo credit: Maciej Moskwa / TESTIGO DOCUMENTARY *_Improving water, hygiene and sanitation in South Sudan*

Resilience in Practice

Saving lives and improving livelihoods

October 2015

Table of Contents

List of frequently used abbreviations.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Contributors	6
Methodology	8
Executive Summary	9
General Approach.....	9
Policy Commitments.....	10
Joint working.....	11
Organisational structure	12
Staff awareness/capacity.....	13
Programming	14
Funding/Finance	15
Monitoring and Evaluation	17
Tools.....	18
Advocacy	19
CARE Netherlands.....	20
DFID	23
FAO	31
Germany – BMZ/GIZ.....	35
Ireland	38
JICA	41
OECD.....	44
Oxfam	47
Save the Children UK.....	52
Sweden	56
UNDP	59
USAID.....	62
World Bank.....	66
World Vision	71

List of frequently used abbreviations

BMZ = Germany Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development

BRACED = Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters programme

CNL = Care Netherlands

DEVCO = International Co-operation and Development department of the European Commission

DFID = Department for International Development

DRC = Democratic Republic of Congo

DRM = Disaster Risk Management

DRR = Disaster Risk Reduction

EC = European Commission

ECHO = Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection department of the European Commission

EU = European Union

FAO = Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations

GFDRR = Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery

GIZ = German Federal Enterprise for International Co-operation

JICA = Japan International Co-operation Agency

MS = Member State(s)

NGO = Non-Governmental Organisation

ODI = Overseas Development Institute

OECD = Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

SAVE = Save the Children International

SCUK = Save the Children United Kingdom office

Sida = Swedish International Co-operation Development Agency

UN = United Nations

UNDP = United Nations Development Programme

USAID = United States Agency for International Development

WFP = World Food Programme

Introduction

Resilience is about saving lives and improving livelihoods at a time of increasing disasters and humanitarian crises. Humanitarian needs are growing rapidly and outstripping resources. The traditional division between humanitarian and development assistance is increasingly seen as ineffective as the number of protracted and recurring crises grows and the ability to reduce poverty and save lives is threatened.

Resilience concepts are progressively accepted and adopted by actors across the international aid system as part of the solution to these problems. There has been a great deal of debate over the meaning of 'resilience' and whether it is a truly innovative concept or a re-hashing of existing ideas. This debate is not the subject of this report; it has been well covered elsewhere. To briefly summarise, while definitions vary in emphasis they largely converge on the need for multi-level, multi-sectorial and long-term approaches that are sensitive to risk. The aim is to build the capacity to absorb and adapt in the face of shocks and stresses and ultimately achieve transformational change that may end the cycle of increasing humanitarian needs.

However, instead of the concept of resilience, this report focuses on the practice. What are donors, UN agencies and civil society organisations doing differently in order to better address risk and vulnerability to shocks and stresses? What is the focus of their individual approaches and what changes are underway to implement these approaches, such as joint working, programming, organisational structure, funding and monitoring and evaluation? How are the different organisations working together to achieve change? How are they trying to maximise the expertise of humanitarian and development actors by modifying outdated working arrangements?

In order to answer these questions, this report provides an overview of the changes made by 15 organisations: Care Netherlands, DFID, the European Commission, FAO, Germany (BMZ/GIZ), Irish Aid, JICA, the OECD, Oxfam, Save the Children UK, Sweden, UNDP, USAID, the World Bank and World Vision. Change is being seen in all of these organisations. It may be happening at different speeds or with different focuses, but the international aid community is beginning to do things differently.

In a short summary such as these it is impossible to provide a completely comprehensive picture of the work being undertaken, but the most significant and substantial changes are outlined. In addition to reviewing relevant reports and policy documents, at least one staff member was interviewed at each organisation in order to capture those changes which are not necessarily formally recorded such as staff training sessions or the existence of internal working groups. Furthermore, these interviews allowed the organisations to identify for themselves what they see as the central elements of their implementation. Overall, there was a sense of optimism among interviewees that change is happening and that it will make a difference to the results delivered, although it is too early to demonstrate this definitively.

Although the Summary necessarily compares the different approaches being used, this is done factually and without a qualitative judgement. There is no attempt to definitively point to how resilience can be applied by all different organisations. The aim of the report is not to assess 'how much' or 'how well' different organisations have done but to showcase a variety of examples and approaches.

'Innovation, learning and advocacy' is one of the EU's three priorities in its *Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries*¹; the report forms part of this ongoing effort to build an evidence base around resilience and achieve "a better understanding of what works and what does not and why". Along with the *Resilience Compendium*, it is part of a process to collate and share good practice and identify what works best for vulnerable people in different contexts. The report is a tool for practitioners to look at what others are doing and perhaps apply these ideas in their own context. It is therefore a formative rather than summative assessment; the report's central aim is to help turn resilience concepts into good practice.

¹ http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2013_227_ap_crisis_prone_countries_en.pdf

Contributors

Care France:

Hervé Bonino (*African Programmes Lead*)

Care Netherlands:

Joke Langbroek (*Programme Director*)

DFID:

Ursula Antwi-Boasiako (*Political Champions for Disaster Resilience Policy Adviser*)

Anita Shah (*Disaster Resilience Adviser*)

Tim Waites (*Senior Livelihoods and Disaster Resilience Adviser*)

European Commission:

Dominique Albert (*Deputy Head of Unit, Specific Thematic Policies*)

Roger Bellers (*Resilience Policy Officer*)

FAO:

Dominique Burgeon (*Strategic Objective Co-ordinator*)

Luca Russo (*Deputy Strategic Objective Co-ordinator*)

Germany:

Barbara Abbenheren (*Transitional Development Assistance Adviser, GIZ*)

Katja Hummel (*Transitional Development Assistance Adviser, BMZ*)

Irish Aid:

Mags Gaynor (*Resilience Policy Team Leader*)

JICA:

Junichi Hanai (*Senior Representative, JICA Kenya Office*)

Miharu Furukawa (*Project Formulation Adviser, JICA Kenya Office*)

Norihito Yonebayashi (*Director, Global Environment Department, JICA Headquarters*)

OECD:

Rachel Scott (*Senior Policy Adviser*)

Oxfam:

Madeleine Evrard Diakité (*Food Security and Safety Nets Adviser seconded to the Niger Government; formerly Regional Food Security and Livelihoods Adviser for West Africa*)

Larissa Pelham (*Social Protection and Resilience Global Lead*)

Save the Children:

Nick Hall (*Head of Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation*)

David Matyas (*Sahel Resilience Adviser*)

Sweden:

Jessica Eliasson (*Specialist Humanitarian Affairs, Sida*)

Amanda Högberg (*Desk Officer, Department for Multilateral Development Co-operation*)

UNDP:

Jo Scheuer (*Director/Chief of Profession, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction*)

US AID:

Tom Beck (*Director, Resilience Secretariat*)

World Bank:

Francis Ghesquiere (*Manager of the Disaster Risk Management Practice of the World Bank and Head of the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery (GFDRR) Secretariat*)

Rossella della Monica (*International Affairs Officer*)

World Vision:

Maggie Ibrahim (*Resilience Manager*)

Georgina Jordan (*Quality Assurance and Knowledge Manager, Somalia Resilience Programme*)

Worknesh Mekonnen (*Deputy National Director, Ethiopia*)

Methodology

The findings in this report are primarily based on phone interviews conducted between October 2014 and January 2015. At least one staff member from each organisation was interviewed and where possible, or necessary, further staff members were interviewed to get a different perspective, for example country office staff.

The information provided in the interviews was supplemented by the publically available documents listed in each summary and where relevant by internal documents provided by the interviewees (for example documents that are yet to be finalised).

Contributors from each organisation have reviewed, amended and approved their individual summaries. It is important to acknowledge that the summaries are an overview of each organisation's work and may not necessarily list every change and every piece of work they are undertaking to embed resilience. The report does, however, contain the most significant changes as identified by the interviewees themselves.

Executive Summary

General Approach

Most of the organisations involved have a clear position on what they mean by resilience and have made commitments or set objectives towards achieving this. Both the definition and the approach are specific to each organisation. While some interviewees see the different definitions as possibly confusing and an impediment to working together to achieve change, most recognise that these variations are necessary according to mandate and context and do not see value in spending what could be years in trying to reach a common definition.

There are, however, some commonalities across the various definitions of resilience. In particular it is emphasised as a multi-level approach. Many organisations refer to the resilience of individuals up to countries or regions. It is also common to refer to different types of capacities to deal with change, whether this is anticipation, mitigation, withstanding, resistance, absorption, adaptation, recovery, transformation or a range of other terms. They can be roughly grouped into three types of capacities: absorption, adaptation and transformation.² There is wide consensus that these capacities must be built across multiple sectors, including food security; health; nutrition; shelter; livelihoods; water, sanitation and hygiene. All of these sectors must be developed and risk-informed for a person, community or state to be truly resilient to shocks and stresses.

Most official definitions of resilience have the common features listed above; Oxfam's focus on the individual and its attention to inequality and power dynamics differentiates it from others. However, whilst definitions are largely similar, there are nuanced differences in focus. Oxfam is by no means the only organisation with a people-centred approach: the EC, Irish Aid, Sweden and SCUK, for example, also focus on people. DFID, JICA and the World Bank place a greater emphasis on hazards, while the OECD takes a whole-system approach. Slight differences in definition do not necessarily convey the extent of the differences in practice.

As well as different definitions, no two organisations have made the same commitments or are attempting to build resilience in the same way. The broadest division is between those organisations who are trying to mainstream resilience principles across their entire portfolio (DFID, EC, FAO, Germany, Irish Aid, JICA, Oxfam, Sida, UNDP, World Bank and World Vision) and those who so far have set more specific, focused objectives for particular projects or locations (CNL, SCUK, USAID). However, this division must be nuanced because some of the organisations which are embedding resilience are also doing specific projects (e.g. DFID, World Bank, World Vision) while the organisations with a geographical focus also recognise the applicability of resilience principles as good practice across their work.

2

- **"Absorptive capacity:** The capacity of a system to absorb the impacts of negative events in order to preserve and restore its structure and basic functions.
- **Adaptive capacity :** The capacity of a system to adjust, modify or change its features or actions to reduce its exposure to shocks and make the most out of opportunities, without major qualitative change of its function or structure.
- **Transformative capacity:** The capacity of a system to create a new structure or identity. This is necessary when the context makes the current system unsustainable."

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/OECD%20UNDP%20stabilization%20systems%20analysis%20Lebanon.pdf>

Approaches and commitments vary significantly but one overarching priority is the need for greater co-ordination between humanitarian and development teams and organisations. Traditionally treated as separate programmes of work by many organisations, there is now a growing recognition that the existing aid architecture has created an artificial divide which does not correspond to the reality faced by many vulnerable people. Development is unsustainable if not risk-informed and humanitarian responses must consider their long-term impact. Complex situations need complex answers and the application of a wide range of expertise and experience. Humanitarian assistance should trigger action to address causal and chronic reasons for vulnerability, especially in protracted or recurrent crises. By combining the skills and knowledge of humanitarian and development experts, aid organisations can better address underlying risks and vulnerabilities and find longer-lasting solutions.

Many of the practical changes seen in implementing the resilience agenda are in essence attempts to overcome this fragmentation. It is not as simple as 'linking relief, rehabilitation and development' chronologically but about creating whole new ways of working to substantially reduce the divide between humanitarian and development. The aid community collectively, and as individual organisations, is a long way from achieving this reform, but efforts are being made across a variety of spheres. Organisations are beginning to move away from the traditional structure of separate humanitarian and development teams; there is a strong interest in multi-year humanitarian programming and funding; organisations are looking for ways to make their funding more flexible so that it can be released quicker, for example through crisis modifiers; and they are looking for ways to measure, and demonstrate, the impact of these efforts. All of these changes can contribute towards 'building resilience'.

Policy Commitments

The approaches outlined above have been summarised in different ways. Around half of the organisations involved have produced policy papers specifically on resilience that contain particular commitments on how to work differently.³ Some others address resilience as a key issue in a broader policy document, in which they may set specific objectives or commit to mainstreaming resilience across other objectives.⁴ As explained above, the focus of these commitments varies between organisations.

What is common to all organisations, whether they have a resilience policy or not, is a growing awareness and application of resilience principles – the need for risk-informed, flexible and multi-level approaches that use the expertise of a range of staff and organisations. Perhaps above all else, considerations of risk and vulnerability are becoming progressively mainstreamed across organisations' work. They are being seen less as purely humanitarian concerns; these key elements of the resilience concept are being addressed more and more by development staff as well as explained below. Significant changes are being made which in time should lead to higher quality programming and better results.

To focus on one major area of change, organisations are increasingly aware of the importance of systematically analysing risk. For example, USAID has committed that all of its five-year Country Development Co-Operation Strategies will analyse humanitarian considerations, for example by completing a comprehensive risk analysis. This is a substantially different way of working, placing risk at the heart of development work. The World Bank is also making risk integral to its work; since July 2014 all borrowing through the International Development Association (which finances countries with the lowest

³ Such as DFID's *Minimum Standards for Embedding Disaster Resilience in DFID Country Offices* or CNL's *'Enhancing Resilience' Programme Strategy 2015-2020*.

⁴ Such as FAO's *Strategic Objectives* or Sweden's *Aid Policy Framework*.

incomes) must be screened for climate and disaster risks. All DFID country offices must now complete multi-hazard risk assessments. These are some of the most significant commitments to mainstreaming risk considerations, but other organisations are also considering similar changes.

A more systematic awareness of risk is only one area where organisations are beginning to do things differently. Policy commitments vary in focus, length of time, and number of countries, for example, but they are consistently leading to change across a number of areas, as explained below.

Joint working

One interviewee praised the resilience agenda for its unifying nature while another stated that partnership was a prerequisite of resilience. As mentioned above, resilience is built through multi-sectorial and multi-level approaches. It therefore requires combining a wide range of expertise both across organisations (such as food security and livelihoods teams) and between organisations (such as the OECD Experts' Group, explained below). This is a crucial area of change, which all organisations could cite examples of but which is also seen as an ongoing major challenge. Better co-ordination between humanitarian and development teams is emphasised as key to creating more flexible approaches to protracted crises and ensuring that all relevant expertise and experience is taken into account. Some organisations, such as USAID, have institutionalised this link in their Joint Planning Cells, while the EC, for example, has made substantial changes to systematise ways of working between ECHO and DEVCO.

Improved joint working covers a range of relationships, not only internal change. Connecting up the efforts of different organisations in order to maximise their impact is seen as a high priority but also a significant challenge. One interviewee argued that one organisation should step forward and provide the leadership to drive towards a shared vision and understanding across the aid system. Although no single organisation has taken an overall lead, a number of cross-organisational partnerships serving different purposes have already been established at both head office and country office level. An important example is the OECD Experts' Group on Risk and Resilience which is a key way for donors to exchange learning and ideas on resilience work. Germany's Resilience Learning Initiative has the same purpose.

In addition to sharing experiences, some organisations are moving towards closer day-to-day working with partners. For example, FAO, WFP and the International Fund for Agricultural Development have written a joint conceptual framework that looks at how to maximise the strength of the three agencies on building resilience and will be implementing the framework in selected pilot countries. World Vision, the Danish Refugee Council, Adra, Care, Oxfam, ACF and Coopi have created the Somalia Resilience Programme, which participants feel is an unusual consortium as it was created around the idea of building resilience in Somalia rather than chasing a particular grant. It also brings together humanitarian and development partners. These partnerships are not merely about idea exchange but about combining planning and activities to multiply the impact of individual organisations and to work towards common objectives.

While many improvements can be seen in joint working both within and between organisations, areas have also been identified where further co-operation is needed. Key among these is the private sector, on which the World Bank, DFID and USAID in particular, are working.⁵ The resilience agenda is seen as an opportunity to scale up public-private partnerships, particularly on insurance and risk transfer. For example, the recently launched Global Resilience Challenge encourages private sector partners to form part of multidisciplinary teams, in order to make use of their expertise and resources.

⁵ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/305413/Public-support-private-sector-resilience-summary.pdf

Another area where better co-ordination is needed, as identified by UNDP, is between those with expertise on conflict and those who work on natural disasters. This is particularly true given the ever-increasing security risks of working in conflict-affected and fragile states. As one interviewee noted, the resilience approach becomes more relevant as the country context becomes more difficult and it becomes harder to implement anything at all; an idea also supported by Levine and Mosel in *Supporting Resilience in Difficult Places*.⁶ This paradigm is one of the biggest challenges facing the international aid system.

Organisational structure

One relatively common way to improve joint working has been to make changes to the structure of the organisation. In order to facilitate co-ordination between humanitarian and development specialists, some organisations have chosen to merge relevant teams. Others have kept the two functions technically separate but are encouraging more co-operation between the teams. Institutional change is happening gradually; it takes time to make such substantial changes. It also requires a strong justification. Some organisations, such as Irish Aid, JICA, BMZ and GIZ, are in the process of gathering evidence on the utility and impact of the resilience concept before making any potential further changes to their organisations.

Nearly half of the organisations have changed their organisational structure, whether this is merging existing teams or creating new teams or departments. For example, Care Netherlands has merged its Peacebuilding and DRR teams; it was found that they had a lot of overlap such as using the same mechanisms and focusing on risk. Given that the two sectors are mutually reinforcing and that Care Netherlands has expertise in both areas, it hopes that integration of the teams will lead to higher quality programming. In general these new teams have been created in head offices, except for the USAID Joint Planning Cells. Ensuring any necessary structural change also takes place at country level was identified as an upcoming challenge for some organisations.

The other half of organisations have appointed staff within existing structures to work on resilience. This may be a specific 'resilience advisor' or staff without 'resilience' in their title but who nevertheless contribute to the organisational resilience strategy. An example of this is Oxfam's appointment of more long-term food security staff in their country offices who are being integrated into livelihoods teams. In the past, long-term work was managed by the livelihood teams and food security staff were brought in when crises occurred. By appointing permanent staff, they can be involved in longer-term analysis and systematically ensure that livelihoods programmes support the most vulnerable.

Appointment of these staff members is more widely seen in country offices than the creation of whole new teams. Three NGOs (SCUK, Oxfam and World Vision) have engaged regional resilience advisors in those of their country offices most at need of the support. In contrast, USAID is the only donor which has created resilience-specific roles in country offices. Others such as DFID and the EC have not established new positions but instead are embedding resilience within existing structures and expanding the responsibilities of existing staff.

Another change is the increasing number of staff implementing commitments on resilience being housed in development departments or teams. This demonstrates how resilience is increasingly seen as the concern of development as well as humanitarian aid, although several interviewees felt that there is still some way to go to make it a truly joint concern. Both World Vision and SCUK have moved the DRR

⁶ <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8881.pdf>

function from humanitarian to development departments, which World Vision found allowed a "more integrated approach to programming to address the root causes of rural vulnerability".⁷ Others, such as Sida and Irish Aid, still house the resilience team in the humanitarian department but are bringing staff with development experience into that team or creating resilience focal points on the development side. In the European Commission, responsibility is joint between ECHO and DEVCO.

Around half of the organisations have created an informal resilience working group with staff from across the organisation. Their purposes vary – some are mostly for exchange of practice and experiences while others have more specific work plans and outputs. For example, the World Vision DRR/Community Resilience Community of Practice helped to develop their Resilient Development Practice strategy (2010-13). The OECD has an informal group across the organisation, with staff responsible for both the OECD member countries and the countries they provide humanitarian and development aid to, participating. Risk and resilience is a concern far more broadly to the OECD than only the Development and Co-operation Directorate, but also to staff who work on trade, agriculture, investment law, financial risk and societal risk etc. This holistic approach ensures that resilience is a cross-cutting theme, relevant to the whole organisation.

Staff awareness/capacity

It is widely recognised that there has been "much talk and perhaps also much confusion" about resilience in recent years.⁸ It is lacking an easily comprehensible 'soundbite'. This is seen as a potential barrier to translating the concept into practice. High-level political buy-in is insufficient if the staff required to implement it do not understand the value of the resilience concept. In a sector already crowded with buzzwords, organisations must actively raise both the awareness and capacity of staff, especially in country offices.

That being said, seven different organisations mentioned the importance of senior buy-in or championing of resilience for raising overall staff awareness. This is particularly true in DFID, UNDP, USAID and the EC, where the highest level staff have been prominent and dedicated members of the Political Champions for Disaster Resilience and have driven forward the resilience agenda internally.

For some organisations, the process of developing a new corporate strategy or resilience policy has been particularly important. FAO and UNDP in particular emphasise the value of this procedure in creating their Strategic Objectives and Strategic Plan, respectively.⁹ Staff consultations and inputs to the production of these documents has improved understanding of resilience and ensured broad buy-in to the new strategies. Some organisations such as DFID, the European Commission and USAID have also produced additional guidance on how to embed resilience in country offices and projects.

Six organisations have chosen to raise awareness more formally by holding training sessions for staff. Some were resilience specific seminars or workshops and others focused on issues such as DRR or conflict where resilience is relevant. For example, DEVCO and ECHO have developed joint training on resilience and on DRR for resilience for the EC's country delegations; DFID hold sessions on resilience as part of their Continuous Professional Development for humanitarian staff; and BMZ plans to begin training its field staff on the Transitional Development Assistance strategy.

⁷ <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9372.pdf>

⁸ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/Experts%20Group%20working%20paper%20-%20Communication.pdf>

⁹ <http://www.fao.org/about/what-we-do/en/>

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/UNDP_strategic-plan_14-17_v9_web.pdf

In most organisations, the resilience agenda was initially driven at head office level and is now being decentralised. As it is country offices who ultimately deliver on projects, this is a vital stage of awareness raising. DFID in particular have systematically increased country offices' capacity to integrate resilience considerations into country programmes by ensuring that all offices meet the seven minimum standards to embed disaster resilience. Organisations did raise a number of challenges they are facing in country, including developing a common understanding of the concept, ensuring that staff have the necessary expertise and technical support (for example being able to do a multi-hazard risk assessment) and the need for prioritisation. Country offices are set many tasks and requirements by head office and it takes time to meet all of these expectations, particularly when different capacities need to be developed or new staff hired.

Most interviewees for this report were head office staff who felt that their organisation needed to do more to decentralise their resilience agenda in order to make it more specific to local realities. Only two interviewees stated that field practitioners had initially felt like they were leading the donors and that only recently had this balance switched.¹⁰

While a number of organisations felt there may have been some initial resistance at both head and country office level to the resilience agenda as 'just another buzzword', most felt that this barrier had now been overcome as people realised the value of the concept. Staff awareness of resilience has certainly been improved, facilitating a more extensive use of the concept, but most organisations still feel that there is more to do. This will necessarily be an ongoing process due to high staff turnover; it is not a case of making the case for resilience on one occasion to convince staff but continuously raising the capacity and skills of the workforce.

Programming

The purpose of increasing organisational capacity (both through changing structures and raising awareness) is so that organisations are able to embed resilience in their projects and programmes and improve the way they address risk and support vulnerable people. Political will must be translated into a technical approach in order to have any impact.

There seem to be two main approaches to programming: mainstreaming the principles of resilience and separate resilience programmes. Within the group of organisations who mainstream resilience, different levels of importance are placed on how well the principles are embedded. FAO, UNDP and the World Bank have placed resilience at the heart of their work by either making it a corporate objective or an indicator for a corporate objective. Resilience is therefore a measure of the overall success of these organisations towards their high-level goals.

Resilience and risk feature highly in the strategic plans of FAO and UNDP and are therefore top level corporate priorities until at least 2017. This means that all country offices will be required to work towards these objectives. FAO's Strategic Objective 5 is *"To increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises"*, while resilience is applicable across UNDP's objectives but is most relevant to numbers 5 and 6: *"Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict, and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change"*; and *"Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post-disaster settings"*. The World Bank has embedded resilience by making it one of the three categories of indicators to measure progress towards

¹⁰ Of course, a study that interviewed a higher number of country-office staff may yield different results.

its objectives of *"To end extreme poverty by 2030 and to promote shared prosperity in a sustainable manner"*.

Other organisations are also mainstreaming resilience but have not given it such a prominent position in their corporate objectives. The European Commission, Irish Aid, JICA, DFID, World Vision and Sida are all trying to integrate resilience principles across their portfolios and some of these organisations also have additional resilience programmes or projects, such as DFID's BRACED and the Somalia Resilience Programme consortium (led by World Vision).

A concern about mainstreaming mentioned by some interviewees was, what happens next? Once organisations have demonstrated they have made a certain number of changes, what will they do after that? How will the aid community ensure that progress continues to be made and that resilience is not just a short-lived buzzword or a tick-box exercise? As one interviewee stated, the international community cannot "deal with resilience" in just two years – it requires a long-term approach and change in mindset. Another interviewee questioned whether donors in particular would have the patience to stick with the resilience agenda over many years, rather than move on to a different buzzword. Demonstrating the added value of resilience will be crucial to ensure this long-term commitment.

In contrast, USAID is mindfully not applying resilience across its whole portfolio – it is focusing on mainstreaming resilience in three priority geographical areas (the Horn of Africa, the Sahel, and South and South-East Asia) and learning from this process. Any further expansion is not currently planned. SCUK is taking a similar approach by concentrating at this stage on four resilience programmes in Bangladesh, Somalia, Northern Kenya and the Sahel. Care Netherlands is focusing on a higher number of countries (19) but this is still a reduction of 30% from its current number of focus countries in order to ensure it can provide a quality service. These 19 countries span Latin America, Africa and Asia – a conscious choice due to CNL's belief in the added value of sharing experiences between regions.

Funding/Finance

Approaches to funding and financing these programmes also vary but one common concern is the need for, firstly, more flexible and, secondly, longer-term funding. To address the first issue, finance modalities are needed that can respond flexibly to the shifting risk environment, for example a development programme should be able to reallocate funds quickly if an emergency arises. If a country or region experiences a lean season funds should be made available to plan for the likely upcoming food shortage rather than waiting for it to hit (as Oxfam are increasingly doing in the Sahel). On the second point, 78% of humanitarian funding from OECD Development Assistance Committee Donors is spent on protracted emergencies.¹¹ Humanitarian funding needs to be committed for more than one or two years so that programming can be done more effectively. Long-term funding would allow investments to build coping capacities so that future humanitarian needs are reduced. This is not how the aid architecture has traditionally worked – humanitarian and development funding has been separate and followed set cycles.

A number of organisations raised the reform of these mechanisms as a top priority, in particular NGOs such as SCUK and Oxfam, who are advocating for donors to bring in flexible funding more systematically. They also identified a lack of co-ordination (both geographical and timing) between donors' funding instruments as a significant challenge.

¹¹ <http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/GHA-2014-Ch-7-How-quickly-and-for-how-long.pdf>

Donors are beginning to trial different ways of making their funding more flexible and more effective. For example DFID is trialling multi-year humanitarian programmes in a number of countries experiencing protracted crises, including Pakistan, DRC, Somalia and Ethiopia. This decision followed studies which found that multi-year programmes are more cost effective.¹² An external evaluation of these programmes is expected by 2017.

USAID and Sida are considering how to use development funding more effectively in places that have traditionally received mostly humanitarian funding. It is well known that there is little overlap between where development funding is spent and the locations where humanitarian assistance is given repeatedly; the underlying risks and vulnerabilities causing protracted or recurring crises are not being addressed. It is only through a strategic approach and long-term funding that the international community will be able to break this cycle.

Another element necessary to flexible funding is the ability to respond to unforeseen crises, such as through the World Bank's Immediate Response Mechanism and Crisis Response Window (explained in more detail below). The World Bank is not the only organisation to recognise the value of contingency funding but this is a complex issue for both donors and NGOs. Oxfam and Save the Children International, along with Concern Worldwide and using an ECHO Enhanced Response Capacity grant, have recently published a Situation and Response Analysis Framework to support decisions for appropriate and timely responses.¹³ Central to the principles of this framework is the need for better contingency planning and rapid funding mechanisms. However, while the importance of such funding is widely recognised, it is not so easy to put this into practice. Country contexts vary so significantly that it is difficult even within one organisation to set up a standard system. One particular example of good practice found was that heads of DFID country offices are able to approve the release of new contingency budgets without sign-off from head office, allowing a much quicker response. In general, contingency funding is seen as an issue which needs further consideration and change.

The resilience agenda has certainly highlighted the need for a reform of aid financing mechanisms. In addition, most organisations have allocated funding specifically towards 'building resilience'. This has been done in different ways and to different extents. Germany is the only country so far to have established a general 'resilience' budget line, through its Transitional Development Assistance. This fund aims to support countries which predominantly receive emergency funding to transition to move towards longer-term development funding. In contrast, USAID has intentionally not created a stand-alone financial instrument in an attempt to avoid resilience being seen as a separate sector. This is not to say that USAID have not committed funding to resilience work; the Global Resilience Partnership is one of the biggest financial commitments in this area.¹⁴ However, a regular 'resilience' funding cycle has not been established and is not currently planned.

This is also the case for most other organisations, although they, like USAID, have set up funding for particular resilience projects. Some of these are specifically labelled as 'resilience' for a particular sector

¹²

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/226154/TEERR_Summary_of_Findings_Final_July_22.pdf

¹³ <http://www.sraf-guidelines.org/project>

¹⁴ The Rockefeller Foundation and USAID have so far committed \$100 million and SIDA \$50 million.

e.g. DFID's BRACED, the World Bank's Health System Resiliency project in the West Bank and Gaza, Oxfam's Scaling Up Resilience in Governance project in the Philippines or JICA's Enhancing Community Resilience against Drought in northern Kenya.

Other organisations have new financial mechanisms that incorporate resilience principles without a specific label such as the EC's new "Bêkou" Trust Fund in the Central African Republic, a multi-donor instrument that will contribute to the reconstruction of the country, or the World Bank's Immediate Response Mechanism and Crisis Response Window. Both of these World Bank funds were established in 2011; the former is aimed at rapid release of emergency funds (and is yet to be used) and the latter is aimed more at recovery and reconstruction, and has been used in West Africa for the Ebola response, for example.

Monitoring and Evaluation

As detailed by Levine¹⁵, there has been both confusion and hesitation in trying to measure resilience. As a broad term with varying definitions, it is unsurprising that organisations are taking different approaches to monitoring the impact of their work on resilience. The concept can apply to an immeasurable set of circumstances: even to put it simply, the resilience of what (individuals, buildings, health services, banking systems etc.) to what (conflict, earthquakes, famine, epidemics etc.) is extremely hard to quantify. Organisations are choosing to address this problem in a number of ways.

Their responses are relatively evenly split over three different stages: those who have developed a specific set of indicators or type of assessment; those who are in the process of doing so; and those who are still considering what to do. This is not to say that those who have already developed something new for monitoring and evaluation see the question as resolved; it is seen as a work in progress and a learning process. Many emphasise that it may take years to demonstrate any substantial impact. As stated by the OECD, "the true impact of overall resilience will likely only be measurable in times of crisis or shock".¹⁶ So for example, in the Sahel or Horn of Africa, the success of the substantial efforts of the last few years can best be judged when another drought hits.

The new approaches to monitoring and evaluation are all different depending on their purpose. The five organisations which have already produced something substantial have chosen to focus at three different levels: across the portfolio, country progress and project-specific. UNDP and the World Bank each have a set of indicators to measure progress towards their high-level goals (explained below) across the organisation's portfolio. However, because the objectives are different the measures are also different.

As mentioned above, UNDP's Outcomes 5 and 6¹⁷ seem the most directly relevant to the resilience agenda; each one has four outcome indicators and a number of outputs and output indicators. The range of measurements include mortality risk, economic loss from natural hazards and/or conflicts, the funding of disaster and climate risk management plans, sustainable livelihoods, the development of strategies to address the causes of crises and many others. UNDP will therefore be building up a picture of how it is building resilience using a large number of wide-ranging indicators.

¹⁵ <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9049.pdf>

¹⁶ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/Experts%20Group%20working%20paper%20-%20Options.pdf>

¹⁷ "Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict, and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change"; and "Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post-disaster settings".

The World Bank Group's Corporate Scorecard measures its progress towards its own high level objectives (*"To end extreme poverty by 2030 and to promote shared prosperity in a sustainable manner"*) and has a more limited number of indicators under the 'sustainability and resilience' section. However, like UNDP the indicators cover a range of areas including mainstreaming DRM, the percentage of the population living in areas at risk from water or air pollution and climate change adaptation. This means that of the two organisations who have chosen to assess progress at an organisational level, both are doing so by choosing relevant development indicators rather than a stand-alone 'resilience' indicator.

This is also the case for FAO and USAID. Both have chosen to measure progress at country level using a defined set of humanitarian and development indicators. FAO's choice of indicators is relatively similar to UNDP. Within Strategic Objective 5 (*"To increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises"*) FAO uses 13 output indicators to measure four outcomes in each of its countries: institutional systems and frameworks; information and early warning; prevention and mitigation measures; and preparedness and response (all of course related to food, agriculture and nutrition). USAID has chosen a different set of indicators to measure its progress in building resilience in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel: reduction in humanitarian assistance needs; depth of poverty; moderate to severe hunger; and global acute malnutrition.

The EC is so far the only organisation to monitor application of resilience principles for each individual project. The four questions of its Resilience Marker aim to ensure that every ECHO-funded project systematically considers risks and vulnerabilities, builds local capacity and takes opportunities to reduce humanitarian need in the long term. The Marker received positive feedback from a number of interviewees, although one did also question whether it should be accompanied by a new funding mechanism to address the underlying causes of vulnerability. As mentioned above, new approaches are a work in progress and evidence needs to be built before making substantial changes.

Four other organisations (Care Netherlands, DFID, the OECD and Oxfam) are developing or have plans to start developing their monitoring and evaluation systems to assess the progress made towards resilience objectives. The other organisations involved in this report do not yet have firm plans but are closely following the changes made by others and considering how they plan to measure resilience.

Tools

To support organisations in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating their resilience programmes, some new 'tools' have been developed. The term is used in a broad sense, to indicate a particular methodology, model, software or data-sharing platform, which can be used in any stage of the programming cycle. These tools might serve various purposes such as risk and vulnerability analysis or early warning.

All organisations have approached this question differently and a number of tools have been produced, although the OECD Experts' Group has argued that a lack of tools to translate policy into practice is the most significant barrier to implementing resilience in the field. For the OECD and the World Bank the development of tools to support programme design and implementation is a central part of their service to governments. While the OECD has created one principle tool, the World Bank is producing a range of relevant tools. The OECD's Resilience Systems Analysis tool has so far been applied in the DRC and Lebanon. The tool allows a joint analysis and prioritisation of resilience options, by providing a step by step approach to holding a multi-stakeholder workshop, designing a roadmap to boost resilience and integrating the results of the analysis into humanitarian and development planning.

The World Bank has designed and is using a range of tools. Similarly to the OECD, it has produced screening tools to guide teams to systematically consider climate and disaster risks. Furthermore, in an attempt to make risk data and analysis more widely available (known as the Open Data for Resilience initiative), the World Bank promotes the use of Geonode (an open source data sharing platform), Open Street Map (for community mapping and crowdsourcing), and InSafe (which calculates the impact of disaster scenarios).

A number of other organisations have also developed new approaches to encourage risk analysis, such as ECHO's Resilience Marker, FAO's Risk Index and Measurement Analysis model and Care Nederland's Handbook Resilience 2.0. These methodologies are being applied in different ways. As of January 2015, all of ECHO's projects must use the Marker, while FAO, on the other hand, have gradually increased the number of country offices applying the model, beginning with the most vulnerable. Better risk analysis is also central to DFID's approach to resilience, but their multi-hazard risk assessments are not produced using any one specific tool. Guidance does exist but the assessments are produced according to their own specific contexts.

Two donors, Irish Aid and Sida, are mindfully not producing their own tools at this stage. Sida in particular emphasises the importance of a consistency in approach between donors in order to maximise their efforts and also to make it easier for NGOs applying for funding. Both organisations see the outputs of the OECD Experts' Group as a potential route to combining the efforts of donors.

Advocacy

Although resilience is not a new concept and is linked to the previous push towards LRRD (linking relief, rehabilitation and development), the shifting emphasis towards this approach since 2011 has led to resilience receiving a great deal of attention across the international aid system. A great deal of work has been put into raising awareness of the resilience agenda, in particular through high level meetings such as the twice-yearly Resilience Dialogues, the EU Resilience Forum and the Political Champions for Disaster Resilience. Interviewees felt that this process has been successful, that the understanding of resilience has been improved and that it is increasingly taken into account across the aid architecture.

A number of interviewees felt that the focus of such advocacy now needs to shift. 2015-16 are important years because of the number of high-level meetings and decisions that will be taken during this time. Among these are the World Conference on DRR in Sendai in March 2015, where the Hyogo Framework for Action will be updated; the negotiation and finalising of the Sustainable Development Goals, which should be complete by September 2015; and the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in May 2016. Fully integrating risk and resilience into these processes and ensuring consistency between the various post-2015 frameworks is a highly important goal for many of the organisations involved in this study.

CARE Netherlands

General approach

CARE International has integrated building resilience into its CARE 2020 Programme Strategy as one of its three main approaches (the others being strengthening gender equality and inclusive governance). When considering how to increase resilience, CARE differentiates three levels of capacity: absorptive, adaptive and transformative.

As a consortium, the individual CARE offices implement the CARE 2020 Programme Strategy independently. This document focuses on the CARE Netherlands (CNL) office as an example where some practical changes can be seen. An interview was also conducted with CARE France, whose resilience work focuses mainly on natural disasters in West Africa and Madagascar.

Strengthening resilience has been one of CNL's four main objectives since 2011. The practical changes necessary to achieve this are gradually taking place, including organisational change and the development of a strategy and measurement tools. Traditionally focused on DRR, CNL's approach now also encompasses peacebuilding and an emphasis on inclusive governance.

Definition of Resilience

"The ability of a system to accommodate positively adverse changes and shocks, simultaneously at different scales and with consideration of all its different components and agents of the system, through the complementarities of its absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities"

http://www.reachingresilience.org/IMG/pdf/resilience_new_uto pia_or_new_tyrranny.pdf

Key policy commitments and documents

CNL has finalised its new resilience strategy. From 2015-2020 CNL aims to support six million people by enhancing resilience of vulnerable communities in fragile situations by promoting social justice, sustainable livelihoods and good governance, and contributing to human dignity, equality and inclusiveness.

Annual Report 2012-13 (The 2013-14 report is available in Dutch and will be published in English shortly)

http://issuu.com/carenederland/docs/annual_report_care_enkel_lr

Putting Community Resilience into Practice, May 2013

http://www.wetlands.org/Portals/0/NLRC_PfR_vision%20p%20web.pdf

Example initiatives

Partners for Resilience

<http://www.partnersforresilience.nl/>

CNL is one of the five members of Partners of Resilience, led by the Netherlands Red Cross. The other agencies are Cordaid, Wetlands International and the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre. The alliance's mission is to integrate climate change adaptation and ecosystem management and restoration into DRR.

Typhoon Haiyan

<http://www.carenederland.org/content/uploads/2014/11/ONE-YEAR-HAIYAN-REPORT-Final-Copy.pdf>

Following the typhoon in the Philippines, CNL's approach has been to build capacity of local people and markets by providing shelter repair kits to rebuild houses. Over 500 local carpenters have been trained to help rebuild the houses using safer techniques. Each household was provided with cash to buy lumber locally and pay the carpenter's fees. Over 15,000 households have been assisted and over half of these have completed repairs.

Organisational structure

- CNL was reorganised internally about a year ago. The two existing programme departments (Peacebuilding and DRR, including emergency response) were combined to create one department that works on resilience. Given the mutually reinforcing nature of the two sectors and CNL's expertise in both, CNL hopes that the integration will lead to a higher quality of programming.
- The teams working on humanitarian and development aid have been combined in CNL's head office. This means that one set of people deal with the country offices and project implementation for both emergency response and longer-term development. In addition, there is a Humanitarian Response Co-ordinator who deals with the humanitarian response co-ordination within CARE International and within the Netherlands.

Staff awareness/capacity

- The combination of the Peacebuilding and DRR teams, and the greater link between humanitarian and development, has in general been positively received in CNL. CNL is actively seeking to link humanitarian aid with longer-term development, and integrate DRR measures in planning.
- Two training sessions on the new resilience strategy have taken place so far and have gained a lot of interest among staff. Many approaches in community development that were used by the former Peacebuilding Team and by the former DRR team are shared and lessons are learnt between teams.

Funding/finance

- The main funding CNL receives is twofold. It has longer-term partnerships with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) for three to five years of funding. DEVCO funding is also longer-term. There is also short-term, emergency funding (around 30% of the total funding CNL receives).
- CNL links its work with local CARE Offices in the region who have longer-term programmes. These offices can implement short-term humanitarian projects within the scope of their long-term programming. Examples of successful longer-term planning with short-term funding are DRR interventions in the Philippines and capacity building at local level in Afghanistan e.g. the Widows' Association for Advocacy in Afghanistan.
- CNL has multi-year programmes such as Partners for Resilience, as described above. It also has other MFA-financed projects like Peace under Construction, Foundations for Peace and the Dutch Consortium for Rehabilitation. All of these programmes contribute to resilience, as resilience is strengthened in response to natural disasters as well as conflict.

Programming

- CNL has chosen to focus its resilience work in 19 countries (a reduction by 30% of its previous focus countries) in order to provide a high quality service. The criteria used to select these countries were: fragile and risk prone context; high gender inequality; funding opportunities; CARE International trends; the track record and relationship of CNL with the country office; the compatibility of country office and CNL strategies; and the chance to add extra value through a regional focus.
- CNL has been selected for a new three year partnership (2014-2017) with the MFA on Chronic Crises in Somalia and Sudan. This programme contains elements of peacebuilding and livelihoods strengthening and DRR.
- CNL has also recently been chosen for two new Strategic Partnerships with the MFA for a proposal on inclusive governance in fragile states and for the continuation of Partners for Resilience (both 2016-2020).

Monitoring and evaluation

- CNL is at the stage of considering how to measure resilience. It is working on indicators and building a project management system, which should both be ready at the end of 2015.

Joint working

- Partnerships are central to the work of Partners for Resilience, both among the alliance members but more importantly in the countries where they work. Partnerships are formed at local level with communities, government agencies, private sector enterprises, and civil society organisations that are active at local levels, in different disciplines and with different approaches.
- In addition, CNL has developed its new Resilience Strategy to be consistent with the international political agenda and the priorities of its two main donors, the Dutch Government and the European Commission.

Tools

In partnership with the European Commission, Wageningen University and Groupe URD, from 2009-2012 CNL participated in the RESILIENCE Project. One outcome was a toolkit and a handbook to provide practitioners, policy makers and students with "an understanding of the issues, key points, assessment and planning tools, and proposed action to engage with multiple stakeholders, integrate different processes and to deal with constraints and power differentials when translating 'resilience' into practice".

DFID

General approach

The 2011 Humanitarian Emergency Response Review (HERR) said resilience should be a fundamental objective of all DFID's work. Given that DFID had already been investigating the usefulness of the resilience concept through two consortia (Strengthening Climate Resilience with the Institute of Development Studies and Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance with ODI) it was able to respond quickly to the HERR report. Since then, the DFID Business Plan of 2012-2015 committed DFID to embed disaster resilience in at least eight DFID country offices by March 2013 and all DFID country offices by 2015. It is on track to achieve this target, with one or two exceptions where the decision has been made not to. For example in Sierra Leone DFID is currently focusing all its efforts on the Ebola outbreak.

Definition of Resilience

"The ability of countries, communities and households to manage change by maintaining or transforming living standards in the face of shocks or stresses without compromising their long term prospects"

(Defining Disaster Resilience: A DFID Approach Paper, 2011)

Key policy commitments and documents

In order to embed disaster resilience in all country offices, DFID has set seven minimum standards. To complete this process, the 24 country offices were divided into Tier One, Two and Three countries (Tier One being those with the highest levels of risk) to allow an ordering and prioritisation of work.

1. Designate an Office Champion for disaster resilience.
2. Carry out a multi-hazard risk assessment.
3. Develop a country/regional disaster resilience strategy.
4. Disaster-proof new business cases.
5. Develop new programmes and adapt existing programmes to support disaster resilience.
6. Develop an emergency humanitarian response plan.
7. Contribute to bi-annual reporting to ministers on disaster resilience.

Promoting innovation and evidence-based approaches to building resilience and responding to humanitarian crises: A DFID Strategy Paper, February 2012

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/193166/prom-innov-evidence-based-approaches-build-resilience-hum-crisis.pdf

Minimum Standards for Embedding Disaster Resilience in DFID Country Offices, July 2012

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/191840/Minimum_standards_for_embedding_Disaster_Resilience.pdf

Defining Disaster Resilience: A DFID Approach Paper, November 2011

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/186874/defining-disaster-resilience-approach-paper.pdf

Example initiatives

BRACED – Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters

<https://www.gov.uk/international-development-funding/building-resilience-and-adaptation-to-climate-extremes-and-disasters-programme>

In BRACED's first four year phase from August 2013 DFID will provide up to £140 million from the International Climate Fund. The fund will allow the delivery of interventions in up to ten countries. The aim is to build evidence on how to scale up work on climate resilience, in order to influence policy and institutional changes. This is expected to benefit up to five million people, especially women and children.

Somalia Multi-Year Humanitarian Programme

<http://devtracker.dfid.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-203462/>

DFID has allocated a budget of £145 million from 2013-17 to address ten objectives that will build resilience in Somalia. The Resilience Strategy reflects both the long-term nature of conflict and instability in Somalia and the mutually reinforcing relationship between conflict and natural hazards, particularly drought. As such the DFID Somalia Office has adapted the generic, DFID-wide definition of resilience to this specific context.

Organisational structure

- As disaster resilience is being embedded in all country offices, no significant changes have been made to the structure either at head office or country office level.
- However, in head office three Disaster Resilience Advisers (DRA) were appointed to support country offices to embed the seven standards. Each country office appoints an Office Champion as part of the embedding process.

Staff awareness/capacity

- All country offices are aware of the resilience agenda due to the commitment to embed resilience by 2015. There is, however, also recognition that the process cannot be too prescriptive from the centre due to the greatly differing contexts in country offices. The embedding process therefore begins with a kick off workshop for all the country offices in the tier at regional level. The resilience approach and embedding process is presented at the workshop and an Office Champion is appointed.
- When the DRA arrives in country, a cross-office meeting is usually organised to explain the process further. A range of relevant staff are further involved in the embedding process: governance, poverty, climate change and humanitarian, for example. Country office staff and the DRA decide on the scoping question for their country: building the resilience of which people to what risk, where and within what time frame? The DRA remains in country for about two weeks and by the end of that time a cross office team is set up and has produced the key outputs for the embedding process (the risk profile and resilience strategy).
- There has been a demand from several country offices to follow up on these visits with further work, for example designing specific resilience programmes.
- Within DFID head office, staff capacity has been built through Continuing Professional Development events for the Humanitarian cadre.

Funding/finance

- Country offices have taken different approaches to planning for contingencies according to their own context but all multi-year humanitarian programmes do include contingency budgets. They differ in size and scope but average about 15% of the total budget.
- As well as BRACED, DFID has a number of other budget lines that contribute to building resilience. For example, DFID will fund a three-year £40 million Disasters and Emergencies Preparedness Programme to improve significantly the quality and speed of humanitarian response in countries at risk of natural disaster or conflict related humanitarian emergencies. It will do this by strengthening humanitarian capacity at all levels, but focusing in particular on improving national preparedness systems and training local humanitarian workers.

Programming

- The case of Somalia is only one example of the embedding process. Through this initiative, other offices such as Ethiopia, Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan are also significantly increasing investments in resilience programmes.
- DFID are introducing multi-year humanitarian programmes in a number of countries that have protracted crises, after studies found that multi-year funding can be both more efficient and have better outcomes for beneficiaries.¹⁸ DFID has invested almost £1400 million in multi-year programmes in Bangladesh, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya, the Sahel, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen and Syria and the surrounding region. They are also being considered in Pakistan and South Sudan.

Monitoring and evaluation

- After completing the embedding process in the Tier One countries, DFID completed a lessons learnt exercise to inform the work in the Tier Two and Three countries. A stocktake was also completed recently for the Tier Two and Three countries and a final lessons learnt exercise will be done once the embedding process is finished.
- The new multi-year humanitarian programmes will have a new model of monitoring and evaluation. This is being trialled in Pakistan, DRC, Somalia and Ethiopia. The process will include formative evaluations and collection of baseline data, real-time evaluations after a disaster, summative evaluations every year and a final evaluation. The evaluation will be completed by late 2017.

18

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/226154/TEERR_Summary_of_Findings_Final_July_22.pdf

Joint working

- DFID is considering how better to link its programmes within countries, with the hope that synergies will lead to added value. For example, in Pakistan there were three programmes being designed in isolation in 2014 and central office staff worked with the country office to attempt to co-ordinate the programmes. Furthermore, where possible country offices work with partners such as other donors, NGOs and the UN to increase their impact.
- A key area of work is with the private sector, exploring in particular its role in cash transfers and insurance. DFID has a cross-departmental group on insurance to bring together the various bits of work happening across the department. It has also been closely involved in the insurance initiative of the Political Champions for Disaster Resilience¹⁹.
- In addition, DFID is seeing examples of improved relationships at national and local level. In particular, the Pakistan National Disaster Management Authority and its provincial counterparts have welcomed the resilience programme and are keen to jointly steer it in the right direction. A further example is the Productive Safety Net Programme led by the Government of Ethiopia.

Advocacy

- DFID's Secretary of State, Justine Greening, co-chairs the Political Champions for Disaster Resilience, which has significantly raised the profile of the resilience agenda through its advocacy work. The second substantial success of the group is that the members have been prompted to get their own houses in order and make the changes necessary to integrate resilience into their work. The group facilitates sharing these individual experiences and considering what the members can do collectively.
- DFID also participates in a number of other international initiatives on resilience such as the Global Alliance for Action for Drought Resilience and Growth in the Horn of Africa and the Resilience Dialogue.

Tools

Around 20 country offices have now carried out a multi-hazard risk assessment (MHRA). DFID found that there was no commonly agreed 'how to guide' for conducting a MHRA and therefore wrote their own guidance. The MHRA is about 15-25 pages long and is tailored to each context

An important lesson from this has been the consideration of how multiple risks can react against each other and lead to a major humanitarian situation.

¹⁹ <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTDISASTER/Resources/8308420-1352168039865/Political-Champions-25-Sept-insurance-summary-note-final.pdf>

European Commission

General approach

The European Commission (EC) has a people-centred approach to resilience that focuses on vulnerability to hazards, risks and shocks. One of the most significant areas of change is greater joint working and collaboration between DEVCO and ECHO, both in Brussels and in the countries which the EU supports.

Key policy commitments and documents

The EC has committed, through the 2013 Action Plan, to work on three main areas: 1) supporting the development and implementation of national resilience approaches; 2) innovation, learning and advocacy; and 3) creating methodologies and tools to support resilience.

The EU Approach to Resilience – Learning from Food Security Crises, October 2012

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2012_586_resilience_en.pdf

Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020, June 2013

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2013_227_ap_crisis_prone_countries_en.pdf

Council Conclusions on the EU Approach to Resilience, May 2013

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137319.pdf

Example initiatives

Two well-known examples of resilience-building are the AGIR and SHARE initiatives. However, similar approaches and lessons learnt from these examples are now being applied in a range of other fragile countries and contexts. Some of these are mentioned in this document.

AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel and West Africa

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/aid/countries/factsheets/sahel_agir_en.pdf

The aim of AGIR (the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative) is to build resilience to the recurrent food and nutrition crises that affect the Sahel and West Africa. AGIR focuses on a 'Zero Hunger' goal in the next 20 years through four strategic pillars focusing on livelihoods and social protection, nutrition, agricultural and food productivity, and governance for food and nutritional security.

SHARE – Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/node/974>

The SHARE initiative is a joint humanitarian-development approach with a package of more than €270 million. SHARE initially aims to boost resilience in Ethiopia, Kenya, Djibouti and Somalia, by addressing recovery from drought. The second phase lays the foundation for long-term development in the entire Horn of Africa by addressing, for example, land resource management, income opportunities for nomadic populations, chronic malnutrition and protracted refugee situations.

Definition of Resilience

"The ability of an individual, a household, a community, a country or a region to withstand, to adapt, and to quickly recover from stresses and shocks."

(The EU Approach to Resilience, 2012)

Organisational structure

- The Inter-Service Group on Transition is attended by a range of colleagues across ECHO, DEVCO and the European External Action Service. The group is used as a platform to report on and monitor the progress made under the Action Plan for Resilience and other key developments.
- Primary responsibility for resilience sits with ECHO unit A4 (Thematic Policies) and DEVCO unit O7 (Fragility and Resilience). These units co-ordinate on the implementation of the Action Plan and support country teams in Brussels, EU Delegations and ECHO field offices in developing and applying national resilience plans and strategies.

Staff awareness/capacity

- On 11th October 2013 a Joint Instruction Letter was sent from the Directors General for Humanitarian and Development Aid of the EU Member States and of the EC, and the Chief Operating Officer of the European External Action Service, to Ambassadors of EU Member states, Heads of EU Delegations and Heads of ECHO Field Offices in crisis prone countries. The letter encouraged them "to reflect together on the application of the resilience approach in their programmes, in a co-ordinated and coherent way to the maximum extent possible".
- An EU Staff Handbook was published in December 2014 on *Operating in Situations of Conflict and Fragility*. The Handbook collects EU knowledge and practice when engaging in fragile states and building their resilience. The handbook features the main policies, concepts, methodologies and tools for the process and practical case studies from the field.

Funding/finance

The EC is not introducing a specific budget line for resilience programming. Instead, best practice principles are integrated into ongoing work. Below are some examples of funding that will support resilience-building.

- The 2014 EU "Bêkou" Trust Fund for the Central African Republic (CAR) is a multi-donor funding instrument, which will allow the EU and other donors to respond collectively to the crisis in CAR, contributing to the reconstruction of the country.
- PRO-ACT is a new programme with an indicative allocation of €525 million (2014-2020). It aims to address food insecurity through a co-ordinated approach to crisis prevention and post-crisis response. One key change is an improved needs assessment methodology, involving joint working between ECHO and DEVCO.
- From 2005-2014 the EC contributed €241 million to Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme, which provides cash transfers to the chronically food insecure. A second phase has been agreed for 2015-2020, which the EC will continue to fund.
- ECHO's disaster preparedness programme (DIPECHO), initiated in 1996, is being re-oriented to link, where appropriate, humanitarian assistance and DRR into longer-term national development and resilience strategies.

Programming

- There is now much greater, informal collaboration between ECHO and DEVCO on programming. The two departments increasingly provide inputs to each other's work. In addition, resilience has been integrated into 2014-2020 programming by both ECHO and DEVCO.
- A significant number of DEVCO's National Indicative Programmes include resilience across various sectors and many of ECHO's Humanitarian Implementation Plans identify resilience as an objective.

Monitoring and evaluation

- The *Resilience Compendium* is nearing completion with 29 examples of practical application of resilience approaches in different contexts and with different partners. The printed version of the compendium will be finalised in time for the Sendai conference in March 2015. The electronic version will be added to as further good practice is developed. Those submitting examples – MS and partners of ECHO and DEVCO – determine what they consider to be good practice for resilience in order to capture a wide range of approaches.
- More frequent joint sessions between the Council Working Party on Humanitarian Aid and Food Aid (COHAFA) and the Council Working Party on Development Co-operation (CODEV) now take place, at which progress on the Resilience Action Plan is reported.
- Recent evaluations of programmes, for example in Haiti, have also identified where more synergies are occurring (or still need to be built) between humanitarian and development.

Joint working

The resilience agenda contributes to greater coherence, co-ordination and information sharing between EU institutions. Consultation is becoming more systematised throughout development and humanitarian programme cycles, and there is more inclusion and awareness of opportunities for complementarity. Resilience is factored into joint guidance and training resources, for example, in DEVCO/ECHO DRR training for delegations and EU guidance and training on conflict sensitivity. Below are further examples of such collaboration, both within the EC and with its partners.

- The EU resilience-building programme in Ethiopia (RESET) brings together ECHO and the EU Delegation at operational level. For each geographic area ECHO and DEVCO complete a joint analysis and needs assessment, a joint strategy and a joint action framework. The different interventions are funded on the basis of a division of labour between ECHO and DEVCO.
- Following resilience training in June 2014 ECHO and the EU Delegation now have a plan for a longer-term investment in Bangladesh to address short-, medium- and longer-term vulnerability. The EU

Tools

ECHO introduced a Resilience Marker for its proposal on 1 January 2015. There will be a six all month trial period to refine it before use becomes mandatory. The aim is to enhance the quality of humanitarian actions by ensuring a systematic inclusion of resilience into proposals and implementation. The Marker will allow ECHO to monitor its own performance in supporting resilience.

Delegation, with ECHO support, is working with development partners to place resilience considerations into the Government's next strategic development plan.

- The EC has assumed a convening role, advancing the resilience agenda on behalf of MS and facilitating MS engagement with resilience initiatives such as AGIR and those in Bangladesh and Zimbabwe. The EU approach is to mobilise MS, other donors and agencies behind national and regional resilience strategies.

Advocacy

- The first EU Resilience Forum was held on 28th April 2014. This high level event, co-hosted by the ECHO and DEVCO Commissioners, brought together MS, partner organisations such as the UN and the Red Cross, the World Bank, NGOs, civil society and donors. Participants assessed the progress made, analysed best practices and lessons learnt, and outlined a way to further reduce vulnerabilities in risk-prone environments.
- The previous European Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Management, Kristalina Georgieva, played a central role in the Political Champions for Disaster Resilience, which successfully raised awareness of the resilience agenda. The current Commissioner, Christos Stylianides, will continue this work.
- The EC advocates for the inclusion of resilience in many international fora and initiatives, including the World Humanitarian Summit, the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Sustainable Development Goals.

FAO

General approach

Following a major Strategic Thinking Process, in 2013 FAO restructured its work and organisation around five Strategic Objectives, of which resilience is one (the SO5). This has ensured that resilience is now a corporate priority for FAO.

The SO5 is best explained around three main questions: 1) the resilience of whom? Vulnerable communities and families depending on renewable natural resources in disaster and crisis prone countries; 2) the resilience of what? The FAO Resilience Agenda is based on livelihoods systems related to agriculture, livestock, fisheries, aquaculture, forestry and other renewable natural resources sectors; and 3) the resilience against what? FAO resilience work is defined around five main categories of shocks: natural disasters, including climate change extreme events; food chain crises of transboundary or technological threats; socio-economic crises; violent conflicts; and protracted crises.

Key policy commitments and documents

FAO's Strategic Objective 5 is *"To increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises"*. The FAO resilience work is structured around four complementary pillars covering both humanitarian and development interventions, and linked to the Organisational Outcomes explained below.

1. Enable the environment (institutional strengthening and governance of risk and crisis)
2. Watch to safeguard (risk information and early warning systems)
3. Apply risk and vulnerability reduction measures (protection, prevention, mitigation)
4. Prepare and respond (to crises in agriculture, livestock, fisheries and forestry)

The Director-General's Medium Term Plan 2014-17 and Programme of Work and Budget 2014-15, June 2013

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/027/mf490e.pdf>

Resilient Livelihoods: DRR for Food and Nutrition Security, April 2013

<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3270e.pdf>

Example initiatives

Typhoon Haiyan Disaster

<http://www.fao.org/emergencies/crisis/philippines-typhoon-haiyan/en/>

The restructured organisation allowed FAO to respond more efficiently to Typhoon Haiyan in November 2013 than it would have previously been able to. The crisis was declared a Level Three Emergency and treated as a corporate priority. Due to the existence of a cross-cutting resilience team, within two weeks

Definition of Resilience

"The ability to prevent disasters and crises, as well as to anticipate, absorb, accommodate or recover and adapt from them in a timely, efficient and sustainable manner. This includes protecting, restoring and improving livelihoods systems in the face of threats that impact agriculture, nutrition, food security and food safety (and related public health)."

(Council document 145/4 on the Reviewed Strategic Framework and outline of the Medium Term Plan 2014-17, 2012)

FAO was able to deploy experts from many different technical areas. They delivered emergency assistance while also working on longer term recovery and building back better to reduce future disaster risks.

Level Three Central African Republic emergency and Level Three South Sudan emergency

Equally, the new focus on resilience which includes emergency response benefited from the corporate Level Three approach for mainstreamed and scaled up support to conflict affected countries, ensuring rapid deployment of technical and operational staff and meeting priority agriculture humanitarian needs.

Enhancing Resilience in Somalia

[http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs_high_level_forum/documents/Brief-Resilience-JointStrat - Final Draft.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/cfs_high_level_forum/documents/Brief-Resilience-JointStrat_-_Final_Draft.pdf)

Since 2012, FAO, WFP and UNICEF have been implementing a Joint Strategy in Somalia. They aim to build resilience by strengthening the productive sectors, improving basic social services and establishing predictable safety nets.

Organisational structure

- As one of the new Strategic Objectives, resilience has its own dedicated leader and multidisciplinary team. This team brings together expertise from across the FAO, allowing a more holistic approach. FAO's technical divisions at sub-regional, regional and headquarters levels are responsible for providing high quality guidance and expertise for the delivery of the Strategic Objectives. For the resilience of livelihoods, it ensures a more adapted and comprehensive twin track approach for both emergency responses and longer-term risk prevention and reduction.
- Previously, the line of command in country was different for emergency and for development interventions. With the increased decentralisation process, and in an effort to improve the links between humanitarian and development, the decision was made to consolidate both emergency and development teams under the leadership of the FAO Representative. The staff member in this position can be changed or a deputy appointed in order to deal with a new specific emergency or threat and to ensure that the right skills and experience are in place.

Staff awareness/capacity

- All technical divisions and member countries were involved in the strategic thinking process that resulted in the Strategic Objectives. However, there is a need to ensure that the capacities of the FAO offices in disaster or crisis prone countries are reinforced and supported to increase the resilience of livelihoods at community and institutional levels.
- Resilience-related indicators are designed at country-level, ensuring that FAO's work on resilience is not merely about producing documents or guidelines but implementing these in country to serve the needs of the most vulnerable. This is a very strong incentive for staff to ensure their work is relevant at country level.
- Dedicated attention aims to ensure co-ordinated (including global, regional, and national levels) and scaled up support for resilience in 30 disaster and crisis prone countries, including in protracted crises. This resilience country support process is addressing the technical, operational and programme capacity development of FAO teams and its government partners.

Funding/finance

- The assessed contributions from member countries to FAO are allocated directly to the Strategic Objective teams. The resilience team distributes this budget among the technical divisions, according to the needs of the resilience agenda. This is described as a profound change focusing on corporate results and more convergence of interventions.
- For 2014-15, the Resilience Strategic Objective has been estimated to require a budget of 831,904 (000 US dollars). 36,617 (000 US dollars) of this comes from net appropriation (assessed contribution from members) and 795,287 (000 US dollars) from extra-budgetary (voluntary) contributions. The very high proportion of extra-budgetary contributions for resilience work means that FAO must continue to articulate and advocate its change of approach with the donor community in order to mobilise these additional resources.

Programming

- In developing their Country Programming Framework, country offices are identifying the scope for building resilience. There are a number of indicators associated with this. Many FAO member countries have indicated some degree of priority on resilience. On the basis of these priorities and also in relation to the country's exposure to various types of hazards affecting agriculture, food security and nutrition, the SO5 identified 30 focus countries in which to concentrate efforts to achieve impact.
- Resilience-related programming aims to support countries towards the delivery of Organisational Outcomes and Outputs (explained below), in order to ensure it works to achieve the Strategic Objective of increasing the resilience of livelihoods to shocks.

Monitoring and evaluation

- A set of indicators for each Strategic Objective is being developed. Furthermore, each Strategic Objective is linked to a set of Organisational Outcomes and Outputs (result based management). The Organisational Outcomes reflect the changes needed in the country-level enabling environment to help achieve the five Strategic Objectives. The Outputs are FAO's direct contribution to the Outcomes. For the Resilience Strategic Objective, there are four Organisational Outcomes and nine Outputs.

Joint working

- In April 2014 the heads of Rome-based agencies, FAO, WFP and the International Fund for Agricultural Development chose resilience as an area to work on more closely together. They launched a process of co-operation that will lead to a big event in autumn 2015. A conceptual framework has been written that looks at how to maximise the strength of the three agencies on building resilience. They are now identifying pilot countries where they can focus these efforts. Political support is strong at leadership level of all three organisations.

Tools

FAO has developed the Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis model which identifies and weighs factors that make a household resilient to shocks affecting its food security and traces the stability of those factors over time. It will allow more effective decision-making in terms of design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of

- The Africa Solidarity Trust Fund for Food Security was established in June 2013. Administered by FAO, the Fund will support Africa-led, Africa-owned initiatives in the framework of the African Union's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme to boost agricultural productivity and food security. The Trust Fund's activities are aligned to FAO's five Strategic Objectives.

Germany – BMZ/GIZ

General approach

BMZ's work on resilience is channelled through its strategy and budget for Transitional Development Assistance (TDA), which is implemented by GIZ and other partners. Germany has been working on TDA for many years but has updated the strategy in 2013 to include resilience. The strategy is aimed at fragile countries, protracted crises and periods of recovery. It can be used at the same time or after humanitarian aid or during the transition to longer-term development. The strategy promotes the idea of linking relief, rehabilitation and development, or 'connectedness', and laying the foundations for sustainable development.

Key policy commitments and documents

Through the TDA budget line, BMZ aims to strengthen resilience by supporting programmes and projects focusing on basic social and productive infrastructure; disaster risk management; (re-)integration of refugees; and food and nutrition security.

Strategy on Transitional Development Assistance: Strengthening Resilience – Shaping Transition, 2013
http://www.bmz.de/en/publications/type_of_publication/strategies/Strategiepapier335_06_2013.pdf

Definition of Resilience

"The capacity of individuals, households, local communities or states to cope with acute shocks or chronic stress caused by fragile situations, crises, violent conflict or extreme natural events, and to adapt and recover quickly without compromising their medium- and longer-term prospects for sustainable development."

(Strategy on Transitional Development Assistance, 2013)

Example initiatives

Conflict Sensitive Resource and Asset Management (COSERAM)

<http://coseram.caraga.dilg.gov.ph/>

COSERAM is a joint programme of the Philippine and German Governments that aims to integrate poverty reduction and peacebuilding by ensuring sustainable governance of natural resources. Working at multiple layers of government, the programme reaches more than 100 indigenous clans comprising over 12,000 indigenous beneficiaries.

African Risk Capacity Insurance Company

<http://www.africanriskcapacity.com/>

BMZ has pledged €50 million towards the establishment of the ARC Insurance Company Ltd. This organisation insures African countries against drought and provides incentives to improve drought resilience. So far Kenya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger and Senegal have purchased insurance.

Organisational structure

- In Germany, the Foreign Office is responsible for humanitarian assistance and BMZ leads on international development. There is a clear division of labour which has not changed as a result of the resilience agenda.
- Within BMZ the division responsible for TDA also leads on the Resilience Learning Initiative (explained in more detail below). Neither BMZ nor GIZ has changed its organisational structure yet as they are still gathering evidence-based results on whether/how the resilience approach necessitates this change.

Staff awareness/capacity

- The Resilience Learning Initiative has so far been the main forum for raising awareness of the concept among BMZ's own staff and staff of the implementing partners (GIZ, NGOs, WFP), through its workshops, field visits and virtual exchange. A final event is planned for autumn 2015.
- In addition, there is a plan to begin training BMZ field staff on TDA and resilience. Strategies to raise awareness of resilience may change as further evidence is gathered through the Resilience Learning Initiative.

Funding/finance

- The TDA budget line includes specific funding for strengthening resilience. The aim is that Civil Society Organisations and other implementing partners will place greater focus on resilience in order to acquire this funding.

Programming

- Since introducing the new TDA strategy at the start of 2013, all of the programmes sitting within it have to make a thorough description on how resilience is built through their project cycle. TDA projects run from one to four years.
- More broadly, resilience also plays a major role in BMZ's work on food security. Through its new "One World, No Hunger" initiative launched in October 2014, BMZ will make €1 billion a year available for food security and rural development. By setting up public-private partnerships in rural Africa, the initiative aims to contribute to modernising the agri-food sector, to enhancing socially acceptable and environmentally friendly agricultural production and processing, and to providing the population with sufficient food.

Monitoring and evaluation

- The Resilience Learning Initiative (RLI) was launched in April 2014 with the aim of finding out how to operationalise and how to measure successes in strengthening resilience on the ground. This initiative includes five programmes in three countries: Haiti, Madagascar and Bangladesh. Evidence is being gathered through regular dialogue workshops with all participating stakeholders and through field visits (which are almost complete). The initiative is expected to culminate in a conference in autumn 2015. The intended outcome is an evidence-based synthesis of the five case studies and lessons on what works in context that can be fed into future programming and implementation.

- In addition BMZ commissioned ODI to conduct a critical review of the resilience concept, *Supporting Resilience in Difficult Places*,²⁰ which provides a helpful overview of the progress made by aid organisations and some key challenges which they face.

Joint working

- A central aim of the RLI is to provide a dialogue platform for mutual learning and exchange of experience. Actors with different perspectives are involved: donors, NGOs, government agencies, a multilateral agency, staff from the field and from headquarters, academics and subject-matter experts.
- Close co-ordination between BMZ and the Foreign Office is also seen on resilience issues. For example, in November 2014 they jointly hosted a Syria Resilience Conference in Berlin to discuss and decide on how to tackle the crisis. At project level, there is also co-operation to avoid duplication in areas where both humanitarian and development interventions are being implemented, especially in countries with protracted crises.

Advocacy

- Germany participates in the OECD Experts' Group on Risk and Resilience in order to share experiences with other donors working in volatile contexts.
- Within the food security context, Germany also advocates for strengthening resilience in the Committee on World Food Security 'Agenda for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises' initiative and in the programming of the World Food Programme. More broadly, Germany participates in the negotiations for the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Tools

GIZ plans to develop new risk assessment tools following its internal restructuring.

Following the completion of the RLI in 2015, BMZ will review its overall strategy and decide accordingly whether any new tools are needed or if existing instruments need to be adjusted.

²⁰ <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8881.pdf>

Ireland

General approach

'Reduced Hunger, Stronger Resilience' is one of the three goals of the new Policy for International Development. Irish Aid has focused for a number of years on vulnerability and its root causes and on linking relief and development, and has been influential in pushing this agenda. Under the new policy, work is underway to communicate an institutional approach to building resilience across the portfolio. To date, resilience has been viewed in the organisation as strongly linked to hunger, climate adaptation and humanitarian assistance. The emphasis is now shifting more to applying resilience analysis and principles across the programme.

Key policy commitments and documents

Irish Aid is in the process of developing a staff paper on resilience. The concepts and approach will be tested at country level before finalisation. A final paper is expected by the end of 2015. However, 'Reduced Hunger, Stronger Resilience' is already one of the three goals of the new Policy for International Development. The Framework for Action to implement Ireland's development policy has seven priority areas of action across which resilience is broadly applicable: global hunger, fragile countries, humanitarian assistance, climate change and development, trade and economic growth, essential services, and human rights and accountability.

Definition of Resilience

"The ability of people and communities, as well as countries, to withstand setbacks such as extreme weather events like flooding, an outbreak of violence, or an unexpected dip in income. Being resilient means you are better prepared, better able to cope, and better placed to recover."

(One World, One Future, Ireland's Policy for International Development, 2013)

One World, One Future: Ireland's Policy for International Development, May 2013
<https://www.irishaid.ie/media/irishaid/allwebsitemedia/20newsandpublications/publicationpdfsenglish/one-world-one-future-irelands-new-policy.pdf>

Reducing Hunger, Strengthening Resilience: Irish Aid Annual Report 2012, September 2013
<https://www.irishaid.ie/media/irishaid/allwebsitemedia/20newsandpublications/publicationpdfsenglish/irish-aid-annual-report-2012-high-res.pdf>

Example initiatives

Expanding Social Protection

<http://www.socialprotection.go.ug/index.php>

Irish Aid provides funding to Uganda's Social Protection Programme, which provides cash transfers to vulnerable elderly people. A review found that these funds are invested in livelihood initiatives, school fees, medical expenses and household improvements.

Sweet potato

<https://www.irishaid.ie/media/irishaid/allwebsitemedia/20newsandpublications/publicationpdfsenglish/irish-aid-annual-report-2012-high-res.pdf>

Irish Aid invests a substantial amount of money into research on hunger and nutrition. For example it works closely with the International Potato Centre to encourage communities in countries including Malawi, Mozambique and Ethiopia to grow the nutrient rich and highly resilient sweet potato.

Organisational structure

- In September 2014 Irish Aid was restructured. Instead of having a separate policy section and thematic section, there are now four policy teams. The Resilience team is one of these. It is housed within the humanitarian unit but has a role in formulating policy and overseeing implementation of policy across the Department of Foreign Affairs.

Staff awareness/capacity

- The OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Peer Review of Ireland (2014) noted Irish Aid's progress on resilience. The organisation has a strong poverty focus and many staff are familiar with resilience concepts.
- In December 2014 a team for Irish Aid head office visited the Uganda country office. The team visited programmes, considering what might be different if best practice principles of resilience had been applied. They also did a workshop with the Embassy team to road-test current thinking around Irish Aid's understanding of resilience and its principles. Feedback suggested familiarity with the principles of resilience as best practice, but a recognition that it does not always happen.
- The wider Irish Aid organisation (both at head office and country level) will be consulted in the process of developing a resilience paper in 2015. The resilience team is currently clarifying its own understanding.

Funding/finance

- Irish Aid provides €80 million of humanitarian funding annually with a focus on protracted and forgotten crises. It uses a mix of modalities including NGO contingency budgets to pooled funds. The new humanitarian assistance policy puts more emphasis on recovery and recognises a need to move towards longer-term more flexible funding that can address both rapid response and recovery in ways that build resilience.
- In 2014 Irish Aid disbursed approximately €20 million to DRR programming and €29 million to climate change adaptation programming, both of which contribute to building resilience.
- In eight key partner countries, Irish Aid develops multi-annual strategies, generally five years. Although these are development-focused, they mostly contain a contingency budget for small national emergencies. A resilience approach might encourage longer-term perspectives on target communities and regions even where programmes are more time bound.
- Almost a third of Irish Aid bilateral finance is disbursed through civil society partners, a number of whom are committed to building resilience to shocks and long term stresses.

Programming

- Irish Aid is not promoting separate resilience programming. Instead it promotes the application of best practice principles to all of Irish Aid's work, in order to strengthen the extent to which all interventions build resilience.

Monitoring and evaluation/Tools

- Irish Aid is planning to explore further how to measure the application of resilience principles and increased resilience at different levels (individual, community, national etc.) However, it is not intended to develop a specific tool for monitoring and evaluation of resilience, but instead resilience considerations will be fed into existing tools.

Joint working

- Ireland is following closely and participating in the OECD DAC Experts' Group on Risk and Resilience. A presentation was given to the group on Irish Aid's approach on 14th January 2015. Sharing experience with and learning from other donors is supporting Irish Aid's thinking process on resilience.

Advocacy

- Ireland held the EU Presidency during the first half of 2013 and played a central role in the Council Conclusions on the EU Approach to Resilience, as well as an awareness raising visit to Ethiopia and a joint meeting of the EU Commissioners for Development, Humanitarian Aid, and the Environment. Ireland helped to promote closer links between humanitarian relief and development aid.
- Ireland advocates for the inclusion of resilience in many international fora and initiatives, including the World Humanitarian Summit, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Negotiations, the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Sustainable Development Goals.

JICA

General approach

As a disaster-prone country, disaster risk reduction and management has long been a high priority to Japan and JICA. By mainstreaming DRR, JICA aims to contribute to the attainment of poverty reduction, while sustainable development and resilient society building will lead in turn to human security. DRR is addressed using a mixture of 'hardware (structural measures)' and 'software (non-structural measures)', in addition to governance (institutional strengthening on disaster risk management) and set up of disaster-related data. By so doing, JICA's general concept of DRR, i.e. mainstreaming of DRR, speedy and effective preparation and 'Build Back Better' could be achieved with great effectiveness.

Key policy commitments and documents

JICA's position paper *Towards Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction* guides JICA's activities in DRR through the utilisation of various Official Development Assistance schemes and by reflecting experiences, lessons, knowledge and knowhow, including ones from the Great East Japan Earthquake and the Thailand Flood in 2011. JICA's support in DRR area will contribute to the attainment of the current Hyogo Framework of Action.

The main concepts of 'strengthening institutional governance', 'mainstreaming of DRR' and 'speedy and effective preparation' require time to reach the community then bear fruits. Community-Managed DRR (CMDRR), however, is effective since it reaches and considers vulnerable people, and is implemented based on self-help, co-operation and assistance by public means, which are all key elements in DRM.

Towards Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction, June 2014

[http://gwweb.jica.go.jp/km/FSubject0301.nsf/ff4eb182720efa0f49256bc20018fd25/3958a0a725aba98549257a7900124f29/\\$FILE/Toward%20Mainstreaming%20Disaster%20Risk%20Reduction%20.pdf](http://gwweb.jica.go.jp/km/FSubject0301.nsf/ff4eb182720efa0f49256bc20018fd25/3958a0a725aba98549257a7900124f29/$FILE/Toward%20Mainstreaming%20Disaster%20Risk%20Reduction%20.pdf)

Linking DRR to Sustainable Development, May 2013

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/30085_posthfaconsultationjicabrochure.pdf

Example initiatives

Enhancing Community Resilience against Drought in northern Kenya (ECORAD)

<http://www.jica.go.jp/kenya/english/office/others/c8h0vm000001pzn8-att/news201304.pdf>

This project has run since 2012. It uses a CMDRR approach to achieve three main outputs: sustainable natural resource management, improvement of the livestock value chain, and livelihood diversification. This has included setting up local Development Committees and Drought Management Committees. One particular success has been the construction of solar panels to power a well. Due to lower operational costs for the well, the community has been able to use the savings to build a primary school.

Definition of Resilience

JICA approaches resilience through DRR and a focus on 'disaster-resilient societies'.

While there is no strict definition of what a disaster-resilient society is JICA links it to a capacity to cope with disasters. This capacity can be increased by taking "adequate actions in the phases of disaster prevention (mitigation and preparedness), response, and recovery and reconstruction", i.e. disaster management cycle.

Project for Building Disaster Resilient Societies in Vietnam

<http://www.jica.go.jp/project/english/vietnam/007/outline/index.html>

http://www.jica.go.jp/project/vietnam/031/newsletter/ku57pq00001wzwvg-att/newsletter_no.4_en.pdf

Since 2009, JICA has been using CMDRR approaches to build the resilience of Vietnamese communities to storms and flooding. Although the initial project finished in 2012, co-operation is ongoing. Recent activities have included conducting river cross-section surveys, training local government staff in flood monitoring and response, and developing and implementing Integrated Flood Management Plans.

Organisational structure

- DRR, as a global issue, is handled by the Global Environment Department, which deals with climate change, environment and water resource management among others. Not limited to project-based support, the department also leads on the set up of the DRR concept within JICA as an organisation. In addition, the department is currently working on the system to incorporate DRR in the projects led by other development sectors.

Staff awareness/capacity

- As mentioned above, JICA is tackling integration of DRR in other sectors (health, education, economic/infrastructure, rural and agriculture development) through reviewing the institutional set up and system.

Funding/finance

- JICA's support is not limited to technical assistance. Monetary inputs/investments through the yen loan scheme have been introduced in the field such as earthquake-resistant bridges and river dike/bank protection. JICA also started up the scheme "Stand-by Emergency Credit for Urgent Recovery (SECURE) Loan", which will contribute to the recovery process after a disaster and meet the needs in the affected areas.

Programming

- JICA is considering how best to integrate DRR into all of its programming and projects. Currently, JICA is reflecting on how to do so by conducting a research project, which includes the screening of various development projects from all sectors, followed by identifying the scoping of the eligible projects.

Monitoring and evaluation

- As with other organisations, JICA is at an early stage of implementing resilience-building programmes. It is therefore too early to demonstrate a substantial or long-term impact, but early indications are successful.

Joint working

- One example of a close partnership built by JICA is with the Philippines's Office of Civil Defence (OCD). Since 2012, JICA and OCD have partnered to raise the capacity of OCD staff to manage and plan DRR as well as to respond. The project has focused also on community enhancement and is seen by the Philippines as a significant step towards making its communities more disaster-resilient.
- Bridging the gap between humanitarian and development actors through joint work between JICA and humanitarian aid organisations such as ECHO is seen as a very important factor to building resilience. This is true both within JICA and for the communities it works with. For example, vulnerable pastoralist societies in northern Kenya have traditionally received humanitarian aid so it is a change of mind-set for them to shift to a development approach.

Advocacy

- The Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction will be held in March 2015 in Sendai in Japan. JICA wants to ensure consistency between the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Sustainable Development Goals in order to ensure highly sustainable development projects.

Tools

Working with consultants and academics, JICA developed a model called 'DR2AD' which demonstrates the critical role of DRR investments on sustainable development by simulating the impact on economic growth under long-term disaster risk with or without DRR investment. The tool is still subject to improvements and modifications, but when applied in Pakistan, it demonstrated that with DRR investment, there would be approximately 25% higher economic growth (real GDP) by the year 2042 than without this investment.

OECD

General approach

The OECD's approach to resilience stems from the 2008 financial crisis and the need to offer member states advice on how to recover from the crisis and to avoid – as much as possible – future similar shocks. Discussions around financial resilience morphed into work on different aspects of societal resilience in the OECD countries, which then led to an exploration of what resilience means for developing countries. This coincided with the advocacy work of UNDP and the EU, and growing international interest in the concept. The OECD set out to consider what resilience means in both theory and practice, and to develop a technical approach to support implementation.

Definition of Resilience

"The ability of individuals, communities and states and their institutions to absorb and recover from shocks, whilst positively adapting and transforming their structures and means for living in the face of long-term changes and uncertainty"

(What does "resilience" mean for donors? 2013)

Key policy documents

The OECD has produced a series of documents on risk and resilience, looking at what resilience means for donors and how they can implement it.

- *What does "resilience" mean for donors?*
- *What are the right incentives to help donors support resilience?*
- *How should donors communicate about risk and resilience?*
- *Joint risk analysis – the first step in resilience programming*
- *From good idea to good practice – options to make resilience work*

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-development/risk-resilience.htm>

Example initiatives

Thus far, the Resilience Systems Analysis tool (RSA) has been used in DRC and Lebanon. Although of very different natures, both countries are facing complex crises and a range of stresses. Workshops were held in both countries and roadmaps produced, which demonstrate how resilience can be strengthened in different contexts.

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/aresilienceroadmapforeasterndemocraticrepublicofthecongo.htm>

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/resilienceinlebanon.htm>

Organisational structure

- Within the Development Co-operation Directorate, the OECD has two members of staff who work full time on resilience. They share learning with an informal group composed of staff across the OECD who work on different types of risk such as trade, financial or agricultural.

Staff awareness/capacity

- Senior management at the OECD have been supportive, championing the idea of resilience and including it in speeches, for example. There is also substantial interest in risk among staff who focus on OECD countries. It has been harder to raise awareness and capacity among those who work on development countries. Work is still needed to overcome traditional 'siloes'.

- Beginning in 2015, the OECD will begin training donors' field experts to use the Resilient Systems Analysis tool independently. This is likely to start in the Asia Pacific region.

Programming and Financing

- The OECD promotes policies that improve social and economic wellbeing and provides a forum for governments to share experiences and work together to find solutions to common problems. It does not design or finance its own humanitarian or development programmes. However, the OECD does support both donors and developing countries in embedding resilience within their organisations. This includes designing their programmes to include resilience-building principles and promoting financing mechanisms that support this work.

Monitoring and evaluation

- The OECD's role in monitoring and evaluation focuses on following and interpreting the changes (or lack of changes) made by different donors and using this to develop guidance. For example, the OECD has evaluated what challenges are facing donors when building resilience, dividing these into three areas: contextual, programmatic and institutional. The OECD has also identified what incentives can help overcome each type of challenge. Another example is the paper on communication of resilience, outlining current practice and suggesting ways of working.
- In 2015-16 the OECD Experts' Group on Risk and Resilience (explained below) is also planning to develop a model to monitor system resilience on a real time basis, which will aim to assess the impact of changes in policies and programmes. This may be a stand-alone model or linked to an existing model such as INFORM (Index for Risk Management).

Tools

The Experts' Group found that the most significant barrier to implementing resilience in the field was a lack of tools to translate policy into practice. The OECD has developed a Resilient Systems Analysis tool, which helps field practitioners to host a multi-stakeholder workshop on resilience analysis, design a roadmap to boost resilience and integrate the results of the analysis into their programming. The tool is being continuously updated as it is used and lessons are learnt. As well as DRC and Lebanon (mentioned above), the tool will soon be used in Egypt and Somalia.

Joint working

- The OECD hosts the Experts' Group on Risk and Resilience. There are about 200 people in this group, with a core, more active sub-set of 20-30 people. The group creates a community for those people trying to turn resilience discourse into practice. The use of online tool Basecamp allows for easy document sharing and discussion.
- The RSA brings together people from many areas: experts on risk, experts on systems, key decision makers, donors, NGOs and UN agencies. By facilitating honest conversations about risk and vulnerability and acting as a neutral broker, the OECD supports this range of stakeholders to develop a common understanding of risk and what needs to be done to address it.

Advocacy

- The OECD has contributed substantially to the advocacy of resilience, particularly through its ability to convene stakeholders at the Experts' Group. The Group works to raise awareness amongst member states, and advocates integrating resilience and risk into the post-2015 processes, including the Sustainable Development Goals, Financing for Development, the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action, and the World Humanitarian Summit.

Oxfam

General approach

Inequality and power dynamics are central to Oxfam's understanding of resilience and its focus on advocacy. It advocates for risk to be shared more equally globally, while programming targets the most vulnerable, particularly women. Oxfam is seeking to break down siloes between humanitarian and development aid and build multidisciplinary and multi-level partnerships, focusing on vulnerability at micro, meso and macro levels, ultimately to achieve systemic change.

Definition of Resilience

"The ability of women, men, and children to realise their rights and improve their well-being despite shocks, stresses, and uncertainty"

(No accident: Resilience and the inequality of risk, May 2013)

Key policy commitments and documents

Oxfam's resilience work focuses on five recommendations: national governments must provide leadership; resilience-building must address inequality, power and rights; development work must internalise risk; institutional reform is required; and international frameworks must support risk reduction.

No accident: Resilience and the inequality of risk, May 2013

<http://www.oxfam.org/en/research/no-accident-resilience-and-inequality-risk>

Oxfam GB West Africa Annual Report 2012-13

http://www.oxfamblogs.org/westafrica/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/OXFAM-English_Rapport-annuel-2012.pdf

Example initiatives

Kenya

<http://www.alnap.org/resource/7072.aspx>

www.cashlearning.org/downloads/resources/casestudies/kenya.pdf

Oxfam has had a long-standing engagement with the Government of Kenya supporting a range of safety nets under its National Social Protection Programme. In 2009, Oxfam initiated and piloted the Urban Safety Net Programme, to provide monthly cash transfers alongside business development activities in Nairobi. The Government subsequently adopted the pilot within its broader social protection programme and scaled it up to other urban areas, while Oxfam has remained in an advisory position to the Government, providing technical support and helping in the development of policies. Simultaneously, Oxfam has engaged in targeting and registration activities for the northern arid lands Hunger Safety Net Programme, advocating for it as a scalable safety net when rains failed in 2013. For Oxfam it was important to act as a catalyst and to support government delivery systems to meet basic needs.

Yemen Social Welfare Fund

<http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/the-yemen-cash-transfer-programme-how-oxfam-used-social-welfare-fund-lists-and-302274>

In its biggest cash programme to date, Oxfam was able to demonstrate the feasibility of cash interventions and the ability of Yemeni state structures to deliver in a fragile context. Parallel structures were avoided and the success of the programme led to a scale-up. Formerly using ECHO funding, it now delivers cash to over 500,000 people, updating government welfare lists and persisting with using national structures. It has led to further multi-sectorial funding and a more resilience-focused approach.

Niger

Oxfam's Niger Resilience Programme is a multi-donor, multi-project and multi-year (five to ten years) strategic initiative that focuses interventions across the same nine villages and across all the sectors of Oxfam's programming including water, sanitation and hygiene; food security; education; livelihoods; and gender. The time frame allows for consistent impact measurement, which the communities have been involved in planning. As well as fitting within the Government's 3N strategy (Nigerians Feed Nigerians), the comprehensive multi-sectorial approach aims to build resilience by tackling all aspects of basic needs and vulnerability.

Organisational structure

- Resilience is being mainstreamed across Oxfam, rather than having a separate resilience team. On both the humanitarian and development sides of the organisation there are focal points who have resilience in their job title. These focal points attend the regular team meetings of the other teams, to channel information and respond to opportunities.
- The humanitarian department has fundamentally reorganised its structure to better support country teams towards resilience thinking. Emergency response has now been divided between rapid onset response and a separate focus on countries with long-term fragility that require more ongoing humanitarian support beyond a rapid intervention. The development team is also part of this group. Oxfam's roving humanitarian support personnel now incorporate resilience within their job descriptions and job titles, reflecting a need to ensure better linkage with the development teams in country.
- A Resilience Working Group has been established to share lessons and develop programming and guidelines. There are also both global and regional Resilience Hubs. The aim of the regional Hubs is to have all the relevant advisers in one place in order to maximise their expertise. This will ensure Oxfam can respond earlier and better and be more consistent in tackling root causes and structural aspects of vulnerability.
- In the Sahel, Oxfam is working to secure long-term food security staff and integrate them with the livelihoods team, to ensure that food security is not seen as only a humanitarian issue. This is a change because in the past, long-term work was managed by livelihood programme managers and food security staff were brought in for crises. Now these staff members can be involved in longer-term analysis and systematically ensure that livelihoods programmes support the most vulnerable.
- There is a joint research work stream between the humanitarian and development teams to ensure that Oxfam's forward thinking is properly integrated and to address how its different areas of focus can be better understood by each other and lead to more integrated programming.

Staff awareness/capacity

- There is recognition that an understanding of resilience is needed across the organisation. The resilience agenda has not faced resistance but understanding does still need to be improved, particularly as to what resilience means practically, in a programming context.
- Training is undertaken in country offices and humanitarian and development staff receive the same messages on resilience. This is ensured through presence of expertise within country offices, regional centres and head office. Oxfam aims to provide advice and coaching suitable to each context and in line with innovations and tools that can help resilience programming, rather than to just train people on theoretical concepts.
- Oxfam training on resilience is being developed jointly between the humanitarian and development teams, and will be rolled out to regions and country teams, to help improve resilience thinking and understanding in programming.

Funding/finance

- Funding mechanisms are an area where Oxfam would like to see reform. It is considering how to build a contingency fund into all programmes and how to make humanitarian funding more flexible for country teams. Oxfam recognises that multi-year funding is crucial and is advocating for it with donors. In particular, Oxfam emphasises that multi-year funding must embed funding mechanisms to temporarily/seasonally scale up in case of more acute needs for a short period. Responses to crises need to be time bound and complementarities and split in mandates need to be clearly stated.
- Within the humanitarian team, there is a rapid response fund for emergencies. At the request of country offices, Oxfam is exploring how and whether this can be better suited to the more protracted emergencies that many of its country teams are engaged in.

Programming

- In the Sahel, Oxfam is ensuring that long-term livelihoods programming takes chronic vulnerability into account so that actions are accurately targeted at the most vulnerable people. This is done by, for example, livelihood zone mapping, the Household Economy Analysis baseline profile and socio-economic categorisation. But rather than a blanket approach, Oxfam specifically ensures flexibility to ensure that the approach is relevant to the region and/or country context.
- Programming in the Sahel increasingly focuses on the 'lean seasons' (cyclical periods of vulnerability to food and nutrition insecurity) that are more regular than acute food crises but receive less media attention. Oxfam stays in chronically vulnerable areas long-term and prepares for a lean season every year through mid- to long-term programming. The peak of a lean season is predictable six to eight months beforehand (for example due to a poor production season) and an appropriate, needs-based, cost-effective response can therefore be planned. This is described as a whole new way of looking at things.

Monitoring and evaluation

- Work has been undertaken and a working paper produced on a possible way to measure resilience (the Alkire-Foster method). This is still a work in progress and Oxfam is refining its measurements for planning and programming purposes, as well as assessing impact.
- Oxfam acknowledges that information systems in the Sahel need strengthening in order to quantitatively assess the impact their work is having on malnutrition during the lean season or incidences of food insecurity during the lean season. Once people are more resilient, Oxfam would expect food security and nutrition indicators to vary less throughout the year and over time.

Joint working

- The resilience agenda has led to joint planning between humanitarian and development staff. Oxfam is increasingly sending in development personnel at the start of an emergency to look at the longer-term development opportunities. Within two weeks of Typhoon Haiyan, following the immediate Oxfam response, a joint development and humanitarian team went to the Philippines, to look at how to build back better. In this instance it meant Oxfam could look at income and agricultural diversity to ensure less dependence on monocropping for recovering households. Oxfam feels that this really changed the approach to recovery.
- Using ECHO funding, Oxfam is working with other NGOs in countries such as Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso and Mauritania to standardise targeting and responses to seasonal food insecurity and to build the capacity of local actors in developing safety net systems.

Advocacy

- Oxfam is known for its advocacy on inequality, governance and basic needs. In some countries such as Niger, there is strong government awareness of the need to build resilience. However, in other countries it is necessary to build and strengthen this awareness in order to secure the government's engagement on resilience issues.
- One particular example is the GROW campaign, launched in 2011. This campaign deals with four issues: the volatility of food prices, land-grabbing, climate change and support for small-scale sustainable agriculture. By influencing local policies

Tools

- The development team and markets team are developing a new Theory of Change. Humanitarian staff are involved in the process to ensure it looks at vulnerability and risk analysis. Joint tools for market analysis are also being developed, in particular to ensure that Oxfam's long standing Gender Enterprise and Markets methodology is revised to incorporate risk and vulnerability analysis and humanitarian market analysis tools.

- Oxfam is considering how to use existing tools more effectively. For example, development staff already have tools around climate vulnerability analysis. Humanitarian staff are trying to incorporate the use of this tool in their work at community level. They are also advocating for development staff to consider both short- and long-term risk (including food insecurity deriving from these risks) in their analyses.

- In partnership with other NGOs, Oxfam has been developing tools to ensure that response analysis can be carried out sufficiently early to implement activities that will mitigate the impacts of a pending shock. This is a shift in the mindset of the humanitarian department to take on work to prevent rather than simply respond to disasters. Oxfam is looking at how this thinking can be embedded both in country office processes and funding as well as at the programme and project level.

- Guidelines on resilience for programming and policy are being developed to give country teams a broad framework for a resilience approach to their programming.

and practices and addressing the structural causes of food crises, GROW aims to build the resilience of populations to these crises.

- West African countries adopted the revised Charter for Food Crisis Prevention and Management in February 2012, with the aim of dealing with recurrent droughts more effectively. Oxfam and its partners have assessed implementation progress, producing national and regional reports which have since been used to advocate for stronger implementation and follow-up mechanisms at national and regional level.

Save the Children UK

General approach

Save the Children UK²¹ (SCUK) have approached the resilience agenda by focusing first on what it means by a resilient child, and then on the systems and sectors that affect children's resilience. It considers that: "A child, whose rights are respected and progressively being realised, can grow more resilient". However, resilience is not absolute nor is it fixed – it is a dynamic state and a child's level of resilience may be degraded by a shock just as it may be enhanced by avoiding a shock. Save the Children focuses on the enabling environment and the building of local and national systems that are themselves resilient (able to cope with shocks and stresses) and also are specifically designed to strengthen the resilience of children."

Key policy commitments

Save the Children has developed the Braided Approach to Resilience, which weaves together humanitarian and development thinking. In order to embed resilience the Save the Children federation of organisations has adopted resilience as one of the three cross cutting themes that will shape all of the organisation's work in future. The Save the Children International strategy from 2015 to 2030 is currently being drafted, where resilience is treated as the product of effective development and humanitarian work that is sensitive to shocks (emergencies) and stresses (challenges such as climate change and urbanisation). Within the broader development context, resilience programming includes work on disaster risk reduction and management and climate change adaptation, as well as other systems such as the 'crisis modifier' and 'household economy analysis' approaches that have been developed to improve poor people's and countries' abilities to plan for and recover effectively from shocks or stresses.

Definition of Resilience

Save the Children has established the "premise that we need to be identifying what resilience programming looks like, rather than becoming overly fixated on definition and characteristics of resilience, or simply repackaging existing activities as 'resilience'". However, for working purposes it has adapted DFID's definition:

"The ability of individuals (including children), communities and countries to resist, adapt and manage change by maintaining or transforming living standards in the face of shocks or stresses, without compromising their long term prospects."

Save the Children has identified five priority areas for resilience work. These are: 1) building the evidence based on the results of resilience-building programmes; 2) ensuring resilience is effectively embedded in analysis, policies, programming and the approach to standards by fitting resilience into the Programme Quality Framework, and developing tools; 3) adopting an all-risks approach, responding to children at risk, wherever they are and whatever the crisis; 4) enhancing the capacity of local humanitarian systems as well as adapting the global system; and 5) promoting changes in the existing aid architecture through targeted advocacy.

²¹ This summary document refers primarily to the work of Save the Children UK office. SCUK is one of the larger members of the Save the Children federation of organisations. Each subscribes to the same commitment to supporting the rights and well-being of children.

Example initiatives

Children's Charter for DRR

http://www.unisdr.org/files/33253_33253towardstheresilientfuture2013l.pdf

Save the Children International worked with a number of partners and over 600 children worldwide from 2010-11 to produce the Children's Charter for Disaster Risk Reduction. By improving their knowledge and skills, children can contribute to DRR and to building the resilience of their communities. The Charter has led to a range of follow up work and it serves as a foundational framework for the advocacy work of all the international child-centred agencies (UNICEF, Save the Children, Plan International, World Vision and ChildFund) for the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Sentinel Sites

This programme is a partnership with the Government of Niger, the WFP and other NGOs. It aims to harmonise approaches to early warning systems. The programme is at an early stage but SAVE THE CHILDREN hopes that if successful it could lead to further work on crisis modifiers and flexible programming.

Organisational structure

- In a significant restructure of Save the Children in 2011, DRR was moved from the humanitarian department to the development department. This represented a major change in thinking, acknowledging that DRR and resilience are development activities.
- In 2011 it was agreed that all Save the Children country offices (previously run by different members e.g. UK, Canada, US, Australia etc.) would be merged under one body called Save the Children International, which has become the implementation arm of the organisation. This ensures greater consistency in approach and strategy among the Save the Children members, and allows experiences to be shared and lessons learnt jointly.
- Regional Resilience Advisers have been appointed in some regions, including West Africa and the Middle East. The rationale for this was to translate discourse into something practical and actionable and to develop concrete programmes.

Staff awareness/capacity

- All major Save the Children programmes are presented for approval to the Programme Impact Board. In February 2013 the Board approved a paper requesting to do work to develop a much clearer understanding and approach to resilience.
- The resilience agenda initially faced some opposition among staff because it was seen as just another bit of jargon. Save the Children now emphasises with its own staff, governments, UN agencies and donors that the resilience agenda does offer guidance on new ways of breaking the cycle of poverty and minimising the impact of emergencies, and with each new iteration of the conversation tries to add new depths, insights and analytic approaches.

Funding/finance

- In the last five to six years, Save the Children has begun to use crisis modifiers as an instrument for flexible programming that is able to respond to early warnings and thus minimise the effect of a potential or likely emergency. For example, Save the Children runs a livelihoods programme in Yemen with a £5 million budget. Built into this is a £1 million crisis modifier that can be triggered by a specific set of early warning indicators.
- Save the Children emphasises that to bridge the humanitarian and development divide, it is vital to have flexible funding mechanisms that can encompass both areas of work. NGOs are reliant on donors to make this change in order to design programmes that really build resilience.
- Save the Children also maintains a reserve of 'unrestricted' funds that can rapidly be released when an emergency is forecast or strikes unexpectedly, and the release triggers are being redesigned with the explicit aim of paying for resilience-building programmes.

Programming

- Save the Children sees resilience as a multi-sectorial, cross-cutting issue and is designing programmes that reflect this. For example, Save the Children is working with the Government of Bangladesh to develop a child nutrition programme that is not just dealt with by the Health Ministry or food security experts, but also education, livelihoods and DRR institutions and experts.
- Donors are in general not requesting specific resilience-building programmes. Instead, many funding calls request an explanation of how a health or education project, for example, builds resilience. This can lead to retro-fitting. Save the Children recognises that to truly embed resilience into programming requires substantial change. For example, country offices' Emergency Preparedness Plans currently presume that the impact of a disaster can be minimised by early action, but cannot be prevented. In contrast the resilience approach begins with the assumption that the impact of a disaster can be prevented. Fully integrating resilience principles into an organisation's plans calls for a fundamental change in mind-set and approach.
- In the Niger country office, Save the Children is working on how to build flexible delivery platforms that can shift from development to emergency response and back again, if the situation arises. In a context like the Sahel, it is likely that there will be some sort of shock over the course of a five year programme. The resilience agenda has led to greater thinking about how to design programmes that can flex and adjust in line with the changing context and the dynamic risk patterns facing children.

Monitoring and evaluation

- Like many others, Save the Children recognises that measuring resilience is difficult. Work in this area is currently focused on considering whether achievements in the key sectorial areas of Save the Children's work – education, health and child protection – can be used as indicators or as proxies for how resilient children are. For example, an educated child is probably more resilient than an uneducated child. This approach to measuring calls for an integrated approach across all sectors in order to give due weight to each and all of the different aspects of children's rights, wellbeing and thus resilience.

- The resilience agenda requires innovative ways of measuring risk. For example, in Niger Save the Children ran a pilot programme on risk management at school level. One of the early warning indicators for declining resilience referred to falling attendance level of students.

Joint working

- There is recognition that the global humanitarian system is dominated by western NGOs and donors and the UN system. In response, there has been a push to localise humanitarian capacity and responsibility and rebalance the humanitarian system. As part of this Save the Children is pioneering the establishment of a Humanitarian and Leadership Academy that aims to strengthen the capacities of national and local agencies aiming to build resilience and be better able to respond to emergencies. The Academy will have hubs and virtual learning spaces across the world with centres in Africa, Asia and the Americas.
- Government buy-in from the outset is essential for resilience work. In Niger, Save the Children has been able to work closely with the Government due to the 3N Initiative. The initiative, a multi-sectorial approach to food insecurity and malnutrition, has strong national leadership and political will. In other countries, Save the Children has to play a greater advocacy role to engage governments.

Advocacy

- As mentioned above, Save the Children works closely with other child-centred agencies to argue for the promotion of child rights within risk reduction and resilience targets in the post-2015 framework. The Children in a Changing Climate coalition advocates for the inclusion of specific child-related targets and indicators in the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Tools

- Save the Children recognises that the foundation for any resilience programme is a thorough understanding of risk and that therefore a robust risk analysis is vital. Work is in progress on tools and methodologies to support this.
- A Child Rights Situational Analysis is the basis for Save the Children's planning for programmes, strategic plans and annual plans. While the tool is not new, country offices are increasingly embedding risk thinking into the analysis.

Sweden

General Approach

At the start of 2014 Sweden produced a new overarching *Aid Policy Framework*, emphasising the importance of resilience to all six of its objectives. Since then, awareness-raising and capacity-building has accelerated. One crucial change has been closer working between humanitarian and development staff, both at head office and in country offices. Sweden particularly emphasises engaging development actors to take a bigger financial responsibility as well as increasing their competence and capacity to build resilience. Sweden's approach is people-centred and values the participation of women at all levels, especially in leadership roles.

Key policy commitments and documents

Sweden's *Aid Policy Framework* states that: "Within all the objectives, aid must strengthen the resilience and adaptability of people and societies when faced with sudden and protracted changes of a varying nature, such as disasters, conflicts and climate change, and in recovering and continuing to develop."

This means that resilience is mainstreamed across all six main areas of work: democracy, equality and human rights; better opportunities for those living in poverty; a better environment (including work on climate change and natural disasters); health; security and freedom from violence; and saving lives, alleviating suffering and maintaining human dignity.

Aid Policy Framework: the direction of Swedish aid, March 2014

<http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/24/28/99/5718b7f6.pdf>

Resilience, Risk and Vulnerability at SIDA, October 2012

http://www.sida.se/contentassets/64f0d44f23b04e39b017238656d71448/resilience-risk-and-vulnerability-at-sida---final-report_3406.pdf

Example initiatives

Somalia

http://www.swedenabroad.com/ImageVaultFiles/id_17735/cf_347/Strategy_Somalia_ENG.PDF

One of the earlier country offices to adopt resilience programming was Somalia. Its progressive team developed a three year resilience programme joint between humanitarian and development that linked to the strategic response plan.

United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR)

Definition of Resilience

There is no government-wide agreed definition of resilience. Sida's definition is:

"The ability of an individual, a community, a country or a region to anticipate risks, respond and cope with shocks and stresses, while addressing the underlying root causes of risks, to then recover and continue to develop."

(Sida's Helpdesk for Environment and Climate Change – Mali Environmental and Climate Change Policy Brief, 2013)

<http://www.unisdr.org/>

Sweden funds and works with UNISDR. This body aims at supporting the implementation of the international blueprint for disaster risk reduction – the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. Sweden is taking an active part in negotiating the new framework for DRR for the post-2015 period.

International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)

<http://www.ifrc.org/>

Sweden funds and works with the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies through the Swedish Red Cross. Through an integrated approach the key purpose is to develop resilience to disasters and crises at the community level.

Organisational structure

- A Sida Working Group on Resilience and DRR was established in 2012. Various staff members from across Sida were included with their different perspectives on resilience. The group published an early analysis of Sida's experiences of resilience-building with recommendations for action.
- In September 2014 a resilience focal point was appointed in Sida's development department. This is one step to ensure that resilience is not merely seen as a humanitarian issue. A resilience working group with a wide variety of members was also set up.
- Humanitarian staff have been integrated with development staff in country offices. The number of humanitarian field staff has increased and they are working within the development structure.

Staff awareness/capacity

- Awareness of resilience and DRR has been higher on the humanitarian side; more work was needed to build capacity for resilience on the development side of Sida. A change has been seen in the last year and awareness of resilience is now common across Sida. This is partly due to the increased integration of resilience into geographical development strategies (such as in Somalia, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Mali and Kenya) and the production of a policy document, shared with all staff. The focus now is on operationalising resilience principles.
- Sida's staff capacity is being built through field training and the Helpdesk for Environment and Climate Change. This training has largely focused on preparation for country strategies that include resilience. The helpdesks have prepared small files and presentations for staff to improve their understanding of resilience.

Funding/finance

- From its development budget, Sweden has committed \$50 million over five years to the recently launched Global Resilience Partnership (GRP), managed by USAID and the Rockefeller Foundation. The GRP aims to build the resilience of communities and systems in Africa and Asia to increasing shocks such as droughts and floods and chronic stresses such as extreme poverty and malnutrition.
- Until now, Sweden's humanitarian budget has funded some more development-oriented programmes that dealt with DRR and reducing risks. Sida is pushing to change this as humanitarian needs are increasing and as awareness of resilience-building grows among development staff and there is more willingness to invest in it.

- Sweden supports multi-year humanitarian funding, particularly for the Common Humanitarian Funds. There are also a number of examples of flexible humanitarian funding such as support to GFDRR and UNISDR; supporting innovative and durable solutions for IDPs in Colombia; support for building community resilience through, among others, the Swedish Red Cross; supporting capacity-building of national authorities' emergency services (MSB – Swedish Civil Contingency Service); and resilience programmes jointly funded through development and humanitarian budgets (Somalia and Palestine).

Programming

- In the last 18 months resilience has been increasingly included in Sweden's development strategies. In many countries with recurring crises such as Mali, Kenya, Ethiopia, Afghanistan and the DRC, the development strategies in fact focus on resilience. In addition humanitarian staff now participate in preparing geographic development strategies, which is a significant change.
- Sweden is supporting the joint planning of programmes that build resilience at different levels (national, community etc.) For example, Sweden supports the Somalia Resilience Programme, a multi-year effort of seven NGOs to tackle the challenge of recurrent droughts and the chronic vulnerability that results among pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, and peri-urban households across Somalia. Designed to address communities' unique needs toward building resilient livelihoods, the programme builds on collective lessons learnt by consortium members World Vision, Oxfam, DRC, COOPI, CARE, ADRA, and ACF.

Monitoring and Evaluation/Tools

- Sweden does not currently plan to produce its own tools for implementing resilience. Instead it is following closely the work of the OECD Experts' Group and emphasises the importance of consistency between donors in their implementation of resilience.
- The 2013 Concept Note on Resilience suggested a set of indicators applicable to a resilience focus in Sweden's country programming. The proposed framework to organise these indicators is similar to DFID's.

Joint working

- Sweden has supported the development of the African Risk Capacity (ARC), a weather indexed risk pooling mechanism. The ARC's objective is "to reduce the risk of loss and damage caused by extreme weather events and natural disasters affecting Africa's populations by providing targeted responses to disasters in a more timely, cost-effective, objective and transparent manner". It is an African-owned and led initiative that aims to build sustainable solutions to climate risk.
- In May 2014 Sweden and the US, through SIDA and USAID, announced a large investment in innovations for development. The aim of the \$400 million investment from 2014-18 is to find scientifically based, smart solutions to existing problems. Their joint programmes include Making Voices Count, Powering Agriculture and Securing Water for Food.

UNDP

General approach

From 2012-13 UNDP simultaneously created its new Strategic Plan and engaged in the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) process. UNDP sees the two processes as closely linked and wants to ensure that the organisation will be 'fit for purpose' for the new SDGs. A key objective of this process was to ensure that the new SDGs fully integrate risk. As a development agency, an increased awareness of and planning for risk is central to UNDP's approach to resilience.

Key policy commitments and documents

UNDP's new Strategic Plan cut down the number of corporate outcomes from over 30 to 7. Awareness of risk is central to all seven outcomes and resilience is most relevant to numbers 5 and 6: *"Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict, and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change"; and "Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post-disaster settings"*. In order to achieve the seven outcomes, building resilience forms one of the three substantive areas of UNDP's work (the others being governance and sustainable development). All 144 country offices are in the process of aligning to these outcomes and areas of work.

Definition of Resilience

"An inherent as well as acquired condition achieved by managing risks over time at individual, household, community and societal levels in ways that minimize costs, build capacity to manage and sustain development momentum, and maximize transformative potential."

(UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17, 2013)

Changing with the world: UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17, September 2013

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/UNDP_strategic-plan_14-17_v9_web.pdf

Example initiatives

3RP: Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan

<http://www.undp.org/content/dam/rbas/doc/SyriaResponse/3RPbrochure-draft-AB-FINAL-lowres.pdf>

The protracted and devastating nature of the Syrian conflict has damaged development efforts across the region. In both Syria itself and the neighbouring affected countries, UNDP aims to ensure that communities recover from the crisis and improve the longer-term development prospects needed to move towards lasting peace. The 3RP supports the development and implementation of nationally-led plans within a regionally coherent response to humanitarian and development needs.

Pacific Risk Resilience Programme (PRRP)

http://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/cpr/UNDP_PC_PRRP_brochure.pdf

The PRRP works with the governments and communities of Fiji, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu – countries that are highly vulnerable to natural hazards. It aims to enhance government mechanisms and empower communities to identify risks and needs, and design and implement sustainable responses.

Organisational structure

- UNDP has merged its two main central policy bureaus. The Bureau for Development Policy and the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, which used to operate more in parallel than together, have been merged into the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support. Within this there are four main teams: governance, sustainable development, climate change and DRR, and gender. The climate change and DRR team is considered the lead for resilience, however all of the four teams embed risk and resilience principles.
- UNDP has also created a Development Solution Team (DST) that focuses on resilience. DSTs are flexible, time-limited teams that combine a range of technical expertise.
- Regional centres mirror the changed structure. The number of technical and policy advisers in these offices has been increased in order to support programming. In addition, the number of staff dealing with resilience issues has increased; for example the climate and disaster team has probably doubled during the change process.

Staff awareness/capacity

- There has not been a deliberate capacity development process for staff. Partly due to the strong leadership shown by Helen Clark, the UNDP Administrator, on the resilience agenda, this has not been necessary. In addition, developing the new Strategic Plan raised awareness of risk and resilience issues. However, this process was quite centralised and effort is now going into driving change across the regional and country offices.

Funding/finance

- UNDP's financing mechanisms have not changed. It already works in five year programming cycles and has quick release facilities in case of a crisis, which will not change. However, the overall Trust Fund Architecture is in the process of being aligned to the Strategic Plan, which means that risk and resilience is now being integrated into Trust Funds as well.

Programming

- During 2014 country offices began to align themselves to the Strategic Plan with its seven risk-informed outcomes. As work that doesn't meet these outcomes is gradually phased out, everything within UNDP's global operation will come to support these outcomes and concentrate on resilience as one of the three main areas of work. By the end of the Strategic Plan in 2017, UNDP's aim is that 70 country offices will have risk-informed country programmes.

Monitoring and evaluation

- With the new Strategic Plan and the Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF), for the first time UNDP has a single corporate framework that drives all reporting, monitoring and evaluation and ensures alignment across all programmes. Assessment of risk will be pervasive throughout the indicators in this framework.

Joint working

- UNDP leads the Early Recovery Cluster but also recognises that there is still too much of a divide between early recovery and long-term recovery. This is not merely a problem to solve within UNDP but globally and therefore it is a key issue for UNDP's co-operation with partners. For example, UNDP worked closely with GFDRR and the EU on the production of the Disaster Recovery Framework, launched in September 2014. The guide aims to assist in planning for efficient, effective and resilient post-disaster recovery.
- One area for improvement, both internally and externally, identified by UNDP is the co-operation between those working on conflict and those working on disasters from natural hazards. Many fragile countries are vulnerable to both risks and they can be interdependent. Closer working between experts on the two areas (both within UNDP and the wider aid system) would lead to more risk-aware strategies and responses.

Advocacy

- UNDP's Administrator Helen Clark is co-chair of the Political Champions for Disaster Resilience. Not only has her leadership raised awareness of resilience within UNDP, but the group has also increased the profile of the resilience agenda across the aid architecture. Due to the greater success the Political Champions have achieved in advocacy than in operational change at country level, this will be their main focus over the next 18 months in the run-up to the World Humanitarian Summit.

Tools

While some of the indicators in the IRRF specifically mention resilience, UNDP has not yet developed any specific or separate tools to measure resilience. However, the 2015 work plan does include the development of internal tools to ensure that programming does build resilience. This step naturally followed on from the organisational restructuring and may take a couple of years to complete.

USAID

General approach

USAID emphasises the need for closer working between humanitarian and development teams as the key element of resilience, and seeks to do this through layering, integrating and sequencing the two types of assistance. It aims to achieve improved adaptive capacity, ability to address and reduce risk, and social and economic conditions of vulnerable populations. At this stage USAID is mindfully focusing on specific geographic areas (the Horn of Africa, the Sahel and South and South-East Asia), rather than mainstreaming resilience across all of its programming.

Definition of Resilience

"The ability of people, households, communities, countries and systems to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth."

(Building Resilience to Recurrent Crisis, 2012)

Key policy commitments and documents

USAID has committed that its integrated teams of humanitarian and development experts will undertake joint problem analysis and objective setting; intensified and co-ordinated strategic planning; mutually informed project designs and procurements; and robust learning.

Building Resilience to Recurrent Crisis: US AID Policy and Program Guidance, December 2012
<http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/USAIDResiliencePolicyGuidanceDocument.pdf>

Example initiatives

Horn of Africa Joint Planning Cell

<http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1860/Horn%20of%20Africa%20JPC%20Annual%20Report%202013.pdf>

Following the Horn of Africa drought in 2011, USAID institutionalised change in the region by setting up three Joint Planning Cells in the Kenya, Ethiopia and East Africa Missions. Together with the USAID Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance and USAID Food for Peace, these offices make up the Horn of Africa Joint Planning Cell. Through working in one team rather than separately, humanitarian and development experts can better understand and utilise each other's strengths and challenges. A key achievement so far has been the development of a shared framework for building resilience in the dry lands of the Horn of Africa.

Global Resilience Partnership

<http://www.globalresiliencepartnership.org/>

The Partnership was launched in 2014. It is a \$150 million initiative sponsored by USAID, the Rockefeller Foundation and Sida. It will enable a range of partners to co-ordinate their capabilities, knowledge and resilience investments to develop and implement innovative solutions to pressing

resilience needs in the Sahel, the Horn of Africa and South and South-East Asia. In particular, it will provide a more permanent architecture to bring together learning across sectors and locations. A strategic planning exercise is underway to further refine its programmatic features, which will include innovative financing, data and technology, policy and influence, learning and networking and measurement and diagnostics. A strong engagement with the private sector and regional and local stakeholders are central features. As a first step, the Partnership has launched the Global Resilience Challenge, a three-stage grant process that will bring together multi-sectorial and multidisciplinary teams to create innovative solutions that will build resilience in the focus regions. Nearly 500 applications were submitted to the first round of the Challenge.

Organisational structure

- A Resilience Leadership Team, with members across the different USAID bureaus, meets weekly to discuss resilience activities. An informal Resilience Secretariat has also been set up with three staff members.
- The decision has been made that a more permanent architecture needs to be created within USAID. It is likely that a Centre for Resilience will be established, as an expanded version of the Secretariat. This would include a Resilience Co-ordinator and probably five other core staff in head office, as well as staff in the regional bureaus and the missions. This Centre would support and bring a greater coherence to activities in the field.
- Joint Planning Cells (JPC – explained above) have been set up in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel. As yet, there is no intention to establish JPCs elsewhere. The JPCs are specific to that context and that need.

Staff awareness/capacity

- USAID is developing a training curriculum on resilience, which is likely to be led by a knowledge management and training specialist. The training curriculum will help to address the issue of staff turnover and institutionalise resilience thinking. The first pilot activity was held in Bangkok at the end of 2014 and another session will be held in the spring. The session was attended by staff from a number of missions and head office.
- Part of the current work plan focuses on internal and external communication. A more robust internal communications pathway will be created in order to improve understanding of the resilience work both in Washington and in the field. While any initial resistance to resilience as just another buzzword has been overcome by a realisation of the value of the concept, regular updates on policy and activities are still important.

Funding/finance

- The funding level for resilience-related activities has increased by \$451 million from 2010-13 compared to 2006-09.
- Resilience is viewed as a concept not as a sector. There are therefore no plans for a specific resilience funding mechanism. Instead the focus is more on how to bring existing mechanisms together, for example bringing development funding into what have traditionally been humanitarian areas.

Programming

- Four key principles are applied to all of USAID's resilience work: resilience as a common objective; create and foster linkages; enable host country/regional ownership; and focus on the long term.
- USAID has committed that all of its five-year Country Development Co-operation Strategies (CDCS) will now include an analysis of humanitarian considerations, such as a comprehensive risk analysis. Of the finalised CDCS, the references to risk and resilience vary, as is appropriate to their differing contexts. USAID is intentionally not pushing resilience in all geographic and situational contexts but focusing on learning from certain key countries. Country strategies that include substantial references to resilience include Nepal, Bangladesh, DRC and the Philippines – as well as countries in the Sahel and the Horn of Africa.

Monitoring and evaluation

- The Horn of Africa and Sahel Joint Planning Cells have established a set of topline indicators for measuring the livelihood outcomes and impact of resilience investments. These include a measure for Reduction in Humanitarian Assistance needs; Depth of Poverty; Moderate to Severe Hunger; and Global Acute Malnutrition. The indicators provide a concise overview of the impact of investments, but other measurements are also needed to gain a holistic view.
- USAID is also involved in some of the global efforts on monitoring and evaluation, including the Food and Nutrition Security Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group. This group aims to produce a common analytical framework for measuring food and nutrition security resilience and to promote the adoption of agreed principles.

Joint working

- Partnerships are a major focus for USAID. The Global Resilience Partnership (explained above) is a central component of this. One of the key aims of the Partnership is to create a global learning platform and to convene around some of the top level policy issues.
- In addition to this Partnership, USAID serves as the Secretariat of the Global Alliance for Action for Drought Resilience and Growth in the Horn of Africa. This was established with 51 other partners in 2012 at the request of African leaders. The Global Alliance is the informal network of key actors supporting the resilience agenda in the Horn of Africa, including the drought resilience initiative led by East Africa's Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). The Global Alliance has been instrumental in supporting the development of country and regional programming frameworks which provide a basis for alignment of development partner investments. The Global Alliance and IGAD are planning a Technical

Tools

- USAID is at an early stage of developing tools for resilience work. Some of these will focus on climate risk, for example.
- USAID emphasises the threat that armed conflict, political instability, and violent extremism pose to development gains. Its Conflict Assessment Framework (2012) is therefore a key tool in developing programmes that link conflict management and governance in order to foster

Meeting in March 2015 to identify key actions needed to address drought cycle management and preparedness, convergence of investments at the country level and monitoring and evaluation/learning.

Advocacy

- International efforts such as the Global Resilience Partnership and the Global Alliance raise awareness of the resilience agenda in participating organisations and the countries they are active in. As well as these initiatives, USAID is a member of the Political Champions for Disaster Resilience, is a sponsor of the twice-yearly Resilience Dialogues and is active in a variety of resilience events, including the first EU Resilience Forum in April 2014.

World Bank

General approach

In 2013 the World Bank Group adopted a new strategy with two goals: *"To end extreme poverty by 2030 and to promote shared prosperity in a sustainable manner"*. In order to achieve this, the World Bank emphasises that development must address the risks from climate and disasters as a core component of sustainability. The World Bank advocates for and provides assistance so that climate and disaster resilience are integrated into national strategies and development assistance, especially in the most vulnerable and least developed countries.

Key policy commitments and documents

The World Bank has committed to accelerating the mainstreaming of DRM into its operations, based on the recommendations of the Sendai Report of 2012. The Sendai report emphasised the five-pillared DRM framework comprising risk information, risk reduction, preparedness, financial protection and resilient recovery.

In addition, the World Bank is placing increasing emphasis on bringing together DRM and climate resilience. This effort is the core of the Special Theme on Climate Change in the recent International Development Association replenishment (see more details below). *Building Resilience* concluded that the poor and most vulnerable are the most directly affected by climate and disasters, and the integration of DRM and climate resilience is essential for reducing poverty. Climate and disaster risks affect multiple sectors and timeframes and thus need a collective approach to build resilience through:

- Sustained and flexible programmes with clear institutional frameworks;
- Predictable, long-term financing;
- Enabling policies for climate and disaster resilient planning;
- Improved risk assessment information and early warning systems; and
- A robust, iterative decision-making framework that can respond to changing climate.

The Sendai Report: Managing Disaster Risks for a Resilient Future, 2012

http://www.gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr/files/publication/Sendai_Report_051012_0.pdf

Progress Report on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management in World Bank Group Operations, March 2014

<https://www.gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr/files/publication/DC2014-0003%28E%29DRM.pdf>

Building Resilience: Integrating Climate and Disaster Risk into Development, 2013

http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/SDN/Full_Report_Building_Resilience_Integrating_Climate_Disaster_Risk_Development.pdf

Definition of Resilience

"The ability of a system and its component parts to anticipate, absorb, accommodate or recover from the effects of a hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner, including through ensuring the preservation, restoration or improvement of its essential basic structures and functions."

(Building Resilience, 2013)

Example initiatives

The Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)

<https://www.gfdr.org/>

This multi-donor partnership and grant-making facility, launched in 2006, aims to help high-risk, low-capacity developing countries better understand and reduce their vulnerabilities to natural hazards and adapt to climate change. Working with over 300 local, national, regional and international partners, GFDRR provides grant financing and technical assistance to help mainstream disaster and climate risk management policies in country-level development strategies. The GFDRR has five pillars of action: risk identification, risk reduction, preparedness, financial protection and resilient recovery. It also serves as a global platform for knowledge sharing and capacity building for disaster and climate resilience and has significantly raised the profile of these issues.

Organisational structure

- The World Bank created a new Vice Presidency on 1 January 2014 to address climate and disaster risk and mainstream it in World Bank operations. As part of the reorganisation, the GFDRR is now hosted in this new Climate Change Group Vice-Presidency, reflecting the cross-cutting nature of DRM.
- DRM operational staff sit within the Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice (one of 14 global practices or thematic units within the World Bank). In total, the number of DRM staff grew by 20% from 2011 to 2013, from 93 people to 112.
- In 2014 a new DRM Hub in Tokyo was established. The Hub, and its related Japan-World Bank Programme for mainstreaming DRM in developing countries, managed by GFDRR, will act as a global centre of DRM and provide project design and implementation support to World Bank teams and national development planning.

Staff awareness/capacity

- The fact that resilient development is now a fully integrated, cross-cutting work area demonstrates that it is at the forefront of the World Bank's agenda. As the new practice groups emerge, and with the convergence of climate adaptation and DRM units, funding sources, staff deployment, and efficient client support should be better streamlined. This has the potential to promote cross-fertilisation of disaster and climate resilience expertise throughout World Bank operations and across sectors, thus enabling rapid deployment of global experts in response to client demands.
- There is no specific training for staff and differences in understanding of the concept do still exist, but over the last five to six years resilience has become part of everything the World Bank does and is currently very high profile. Publication of DRM and climate specific reports, the development of 'screening tools' to support the IDA commitments, and recent initiatives such as the Small Islands Resilience programme are enhancing staff capacity and are used to inform operations design.

Funding/finance

The World Bank offers a wide range of financial instruments to support countries with DRM. Some of the key ones are highlighted below. In total, the World Bank's DRM portfolio has grown from \$2 billion in 2010 to \$3.8 billion in 2013 and \$5.3 billion in 2014.

- The International Development Association (which finances countries with the lowest incomes) was replenished for the 17th time in December 2013 (IDA17). Starting in July 2014, three major commitments focus on climate and disaster risk management: (1) all IDA operations must be screened for short- and long-term climate change and disaster risks, and where risk exists, appropriate resilience measures should be included; (2) all IDA Country Partnership Frameworks incorporate climate and disaster risk considerations into the analysis of the country's development challenges and priorities; and (3) support at least 25 IDA countries to develop and implement country-led, multi-sectorial plans and investments for managing climate and disaster risk in development.
- In 2011, two new mechanisms were created within the IDA to support the poorest countries in dealing with crises. The Immediate Response Mechanism (IRM) and the Crisis Response Window (CRW) are complementary instruments, with the former aimed at rapid release of emergency funds and the latter aimed more at recovery and reconstruction. The IRM is yet to be used but under the CRW \$390 million has been granted to the Ebola response, for example.
- The World Bank also provides support to middle income countries, through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD). Within this the Catastrophic Draw Down Option (CAT-DDO) was launched in 2008. This is a contingent development policy loan which IBRD countries can subscribe to if they have a DRM plan in place. The funds become available for disbursement after the declaration of a state of emergency due to a natural disaster.

Programming

- Across its five pillars, GFDRR supports three broad activities: capacity building, analytical products and technical assistance. In addition, GFDRR has identified seven thematic areas requiring focused technical support: Civil Society Engagement, Community Resilience, and Gender; Disaster Risk Financing and Insurance; GFDRR Labs; Hydromet; Resilience to Climate Change; Resilient Cities; and Safer Schools. The thematic initiatives are broad programmes working with a number of partners in a range of countries. Finally, GFDRR is managing specific initiatives such as the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Risk Reduction Programme²² and the Japan-World Bank Programme for mainstreaming DRM in developing countries²³.
- A number of programmes for which the World Bank is a trustee are designed to support climate and disaster resilient development. One of these is the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR – part of the Climate Investment Funds). The PPCR provides technical assistance and investments to support countries in mainstreaming climate risk and resilience. About \$1.3 billion has been pledged to the PPCR since it was launched in 2008 and it supports programmes in 18 countries.

Monitoring and evaluation

²² <http://www.drrinacp.org/acp-eu> - ACP is the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States

²³ <http://www.gfdr.org/japan-world-bank-program-mainstreaming-disaster-risk-management-developing-countries>

- As of 2014, the World Bank Group produces a Corporate Scorecard monitoring progress towards its two main goals, *"To end extreme poverty by 2030 and to promote shared prosperity in a sustainable manner"*. This is in addition to the World Bank Corporate Scorecard and also takes into account the work of the International Finance Corporation, and the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency. The indicators are grouped into three categories: growth, inclusion, and sustainability and resilience. This reflects the importance the World Bank Group attaches to resilient development.
- At an operational level, all World Bank programmes have monitoring indicators but as yet there is no separate monitoring and evaluation system for resilience. Development of a resilience indicator is planned for by December 2015.

Joint working

- The World Bank works in partnership with implementing governments and other partners. An example of joint working is the GFDRR Hydromet initiative. Since launching in 2011, GFDRR has worked closely with the World Meteorological Organisation, the Climate Services Partnership and hydro-meteorological services in 31 countries.
- However, the World Bank does not only work at national level. Recent studies have found that it is very difficult to make risk management truly sustainable without engaging with local communities and ensuring that these communities are connected to the local authorities. Without this local capacity and communication, a programme can fall apart as soon as a NGO leaves. The World Bank is therefore increasingly focusing on what it calls 'community driven development', which supports local authorities in awarding grants to local communities, for example on water or housing.
- The World Bank operates in close co-ordination with the UN and the EU under their Joint Declaration on Post-Crises Assessments and Recovery Planning by co-operating with affected governments on conducting post-disaster needs assessments, which help in planning resilient recovery. GFDRR, the EU and UNDP worked on finalising the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment Guide and the Recovery Framework Guide, both of which were launched at the 2nd World Reconstruction Conference in September 2014.
- A further example is the Understanding Risk community of experts. This open-knowledge platform for sharing experiences and learning currently has more than 2800 members from 125 countries. The Understanding Risk Forum

Tools

The World Bank has a range of tools to help countries manage climate and disaster risks. Some examples are given below.

- Through the Open Data for Resilience Initiative, the World Bank/GFDRR aims to make risk data and analysis available to governments, international organisations and civil society groups. A number of tools are utilised as part of this initiative, including Geonode (an open source data sharing platform), Open Street Map (for community mapping and crowdsourcing), and InSafe (which calculates the impact of disaster scenarios).

- Under the new World Bank Group strategy, all new Country Partnership Frameworks will be supported by a Systematic Country Diagnostic. This process will provide an evidence-based assessment of the key challenges and opportunities for a country to meet the two strategic goals. For IDA countries, disaster and climate risk analysis will systematically form a part of this diagnostic.

- As part of the IDA17 commitments, all operations need to be screened for climate and disaster risk and resilience measures included as needed. Screening tools have been developed to guide task teams to systematically consider climate and disaster risks, based on various types of information available at global to sub-national levels.

brings together the global DRM community every two years. Regional Forums are also organised on a regular basis.

Advocacy

- Since 2011 the GFDRR has been organising the Resilience Dialogue series with Japan, the EU and USAID. These events, on the margins of the World Bank Group-International Monetary Fund Annual and Spring Meetings, are an opportunity for high level discussion on the progress of the resilience agenda. By bringing together senior figures such as the World Bank Vice President, European Commissioners, and government ministers and administrators, these meetings have raised the profile of resilience and addressed key issues such as the place of resilience in the post-2015 framework.

World Vision

General Approach

World Vision has sought to institutionalise resilience across three spheres: programming, organisational change, and the external policy and market context. In its own words, the extent to which World Vision has improved the quality of its programmes and promoted resilient practice is varied. However, some key lessons have been learnt that can be applied to future practice.

Key policy commitments and documents

In 2013, five key programming approaches were identified by World Vision as necessary to operationalise resilience. These are: recognition of complex interactions between actors, resources and activities; appreciative inquiry; dynamism and flexibility – adapting outputs and activities in programming where necessary; multi-sectorial approaches; and open systems approaches that engage actors at multiple levels.

Institutionalising Resilience: the World Vision Story, December 2014

<http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9372.pdf>

World Vision's resilience programming: adding value to development, August 2013

<http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8525.pdf>

Example initiatives

Children as risk communicators, North Gaza Area Development Programme

http://www.google.be/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.wvi.org%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2FNorth%2520Gaza%2520-%2520Building%2520resilience-%2520Case%2520Study.pdf&ei=-lyuVLyRIsftO_PlgagK&usg=AFQjCNE2AT48p7dEoNzpbUK-mroTu4IL7Q&bvm=bv.83134100,d.ZWU

The community resilience project began in the Gaza Strip in October 2011. It aims to increase the capacities of children and their communities to reduce disaster risk and the impacts of climate change, and build resilient communities. Although the programme was making progress, it has been severely disrupted by the conflict of August 2014.

Somalia Resilience Programme

<https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Somalia/130319%20-%20SomRep.pdf>

World Vision houses the technical unit of the Somalia Resilience Programme, or SomRep. Its aim is to build resilience to drought among pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, and peri-urban households. Further detail is below. The consortium, with guidance from current SomReP donors DANIDA and Sida, has formed a donor advisory group which meets regularly to guide, consult with, and receive reports and key updates from the SomReP consortium.

Definition of Resilience

"The capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by changing or resisting in order to reach and maintain acceptable levels of functioning and structure."

<http://www.wvi.org/disaster-risk-reduction>

Organisational structure

- In 2009, a position of Director of DRR/Community Resilience was created to design and implement a strategy to institutionalise resilience in World Vision.
- In 2011 World Vision International (WVI) moved the DRR function from the humanitarian department to a team working on livelihoods, environment and economic development.
- More recently the Resilience and Livelihoods team has been formed in WVI. Regional offices in Africa are mirroring this approach and creating resilience and livelihoods Learning Centre Directors.
- Regional Community Resilience Co-ordinators have been appointed in Regional Offices.
- A Resilience Working Group was created in February 2013 composed of staff from multiple sectors and countries. It has been tasked to produce the Theory of Change (now completed), a clear policy position, field level guidance, indicators and funding mechanisms.

Staff awareness/capacity

- Having a global director brings risk reduction more in focus for leadership and management decisions in terms of resourcing. Further championing is still necessary to secure buy-in, but World Vision sees this as a challenge because it is difficult to build a quantitative evidence base when you have stopped a risk from having an impact on your work.
- The Community of Practice is the main capacity building and learning mechanism on DRR and climate change adaptation. Within each region, trainings have been held in National Offices and within communities. Training resources and toolkits are available.
- There is no official competence development system or formal incentive structure. The Resilience Community of Practice is a form of voluntary, peer-to-peer learning.

Funding/finance

- World Vision acknowledges that it is difficult to track how much spending goes into DRR and resilience-building. However, from 2011-13, 1.3% of programme funding was spent on DRR and the accumulated total of DRR, economic development, agriculture/food security, environment and climate spending amounted to 8.4% of total programme expenditure. The second figure encompasses a multi-sectorial approach to resilience-building, which is gaining prominence within World Vision.

Programming

- As of December 2014, approximately 70% of National Offices and all Regional Offices now report "resilience related" strategies, programmes and activities. Resilient Development Strategies are also now part of all Regional Office strategies.

- In 2014, based on case studies and experiences in the field, World Vision identified a number of key lessons on how to operationalise resilience. These include doing a multi-hazard risk assessment so that projects are risk-sensitive and address the root causes of vulnerability; developing a pathway of change to be clear on how resilience will be built and for whom; ensuring regular context monitoring for sector programmes to allow a more responsive and flexible approach; and maximising the participation of children and young people.

Monitoring and evaluation

- Annual child wellbeing reports from each National Office will include progress based on identified indicators for each of the five drivers in the 2014 Drivers of Sustainability Strategy. Previously, although resilience had been included in the child wellbeing reports, resilience had been self-defined by National Offices. This led to contextualised understandings which were difficult to compare for progress. The new approach is more systematic.
- World Vision is also considering how to develop specific targets and outcomes for community and household resilience.
- It is too early to demonstrate real impact but there are ways to informally assess change. For example, the SomRep partnership has recently been trained in the 'Most Significant Change' methodology, a qualitative tool that allows communities to decide what stories they want told about change in their area.

Joint working

- World Vision works closely with its partners in SomRep. The other six partners are the Danish Refugee Council, Adra, Care, Oxfam, ACF and Coopi. The consortium is unusual as it was formed around an idea, to build resilience in Somalia, rather than to chase a particular grant.
- SomRep works with the Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group and there are also three or four ongoing research contracts.
- When creating the new Theory of Change, a wide stakeholder group across World Vision was consulted. This ensured that different sectors were involved and looked at what resilience means for World Vision's work across the board, rather than just within the humanitarian sector of World Vision UK.

Advocacy

- World Vision, along with other child-centred agencies in the Children in a Changing Climate consortium, advocates for the inclusion of child rights in risk reduction and resilience in the post-2015 processes. They are advocating for specific outcome-oriented targets to be included in the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Sustainable Development Goals.²⁴

Tools

- A Strategy for Resilience Development Practice was developed in 2010 as a result of learning from phase one of the flagship Community Resilience Programme.
- In 2013 a Resilience Theory of Change was developed that clarified World Vision's understanding and definition of resilience and the outcomes it is seeking to achieve.
- The SomRep technical unit has produced different technical packages for pastoral, agro-pastoral and peri-urban.

²⁴ http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/519dd284ee697Post_HFA_policy_brief.pdf