



Funded by
European Union
Civil Protection

Final Report of Uscore2 - Appendix 1: Evaluation of project management/implementation process City-to-city local level Peer Review on Disaster Risk Reduction

ECHO/SUB/2016/743543/PREV04

A: Positive aspects / opportunities

A1. Strong networks for knowledge exchange and dissemination

A1.1. All Uscore2 partners have a history of innovative and effective development on disaster response with respected reputations and credibility in practitioner, government and academic networks. This ensured the project had access to (and was accepted by) a wide range of European cities, international organisations and networks. This aided the dissemination of findings as promotion through such networks was usual practice for the partners. The International Advisory Board enhanced the profile of Uscore2, increased the breadth of information that fed into the project, and offered an even wider network through which to disseminate project findings.

A1.2. Partners were already leading figures in international networks engaged in DRR, including as role model cities within the Making Cities Resilient Campaign (MCR), in the 100 Resilient Cities Network and the International Standards Organization. This enabled the lessons emerging from the project to be shared and scrutinised at an early stage with interested partners at European, United Nations and International levels.

A2. Developing innovative evidenced based tools

A2.1. The Peer Review tool and impact evaluation methodology were developed based on the latest evidence of good practice which brought significant credibility to the findings. This began with significant investment in the initial phases of the project with the production of a comprehensive literature review and survey of the available performance indicators which established a solid foundation for the project. This foundation proved invaluable for partners to easily reach agreement on the format of, and confidence in, the tools that were to be developed.

A2.2. As the Peer Review tool has been developed, our International Advisory Board (IAB) has been regularly consulted and fed their knowledge into developing the content. IAB teleconferences have been timed to invite comment at an appropriate point in the development of the peer review modules to ensure these partners can offer expert input to add as much value as possible e.g. The IAB provided guidance/suggestions of how to test

individual modules that had not been tested during one of the pilot peer reviews in Viggiano/Amadora/Salford. Recruitment of independent specialists to support the peer review was also aided by the confidence the specialists had in the project team.

A2.3. The strength of the relationship between the partners and IAB has been crucial in scrutinising and refining the Uscore2 tools. The project undertook a rigorous process of constant reflection on the evidence from the trials before publication. This process of develop, reflect, adapt, trial, reflect and evaluate/scrutinise, repeated in each of the three pilot cities, ensured that the final versions of the Step-by-Step Guide, associated modules and Impact Evaluation Methodology were approved unanimously before publication.

A2.4. All planned peer reviews have been undertaken with full cooperation and participation from the partner cities and the wider partnerships within each city. Reviews incorporated live or table top exercises evidencing commitment to DRR beyond those with direct responsibility. E.g. In Viggiano, a full scale emergency drill simulating the response to an earthquake engaged around a third of the city's population.

A3. Strengthening resilience in cities

A3.1. Prior to Uscore2, UNISDR's ten essential activities for Making Cities Resilient excluded consideration of the impact of public health factors on disaster risk. The Uscore2 project created the opportunity to trial the inclusion of public health factors. The mix of skills, knowledge and experience within the partnership facilitated the inclusion of Module 8, assessing public health as a key factor in disaster risk reduction. This innovation has produced significant evidence to support this innovation, attracting interest and approval within resilience networks.

A3.2. Each partner in the project has fully engaged in the project, which has resulted in excellent working relationships, exchanges of knowledge, and participation commensurate with the expectations and needs of the project. This has had the positive effect of constantly refining and improving the methodology that has been developed during the project. It has also been beneficial for all the cities to learn from one another.

A4. Effective dissemination of the findings from Uscore2

A4.1. As the Peer Review tool has been developed, our International Advisory Board (IAB) has been regularly consulted and fed their knowledge into developing the content. IAB teleconferences have been timed to invite comment at an appropriate point in the development of the peer review modules to ensure these partners can offer expert input to add as much value as possible and ensure wide applicability of the tool across cities with very different characteristics. Recruitment of independent specialists to support the peer review was also aided by the confidence the specialists had in the project team.

Dissemination of the findings from Uscore2 is ongoing but has included use of social media (twitter), the Uscore2 and UNISDR websites, academic and practitioner conferences, published articles and two Master Classes.

A4.2. Knowledge exchange within pilot cities

- Greater Manchester (GM) is looking at implementing elements from Amadora's DRR activities.
- Viggiano are working in collaboration in Amadora to share experiences, processes, initiatives and connections across the volunteer sector.
- Broadening the range of involvement between local stakeholders and an increased awareness of DRR within communities, through a public event in Viggiano.
- The City to City Peer Review is informing 100RC work in GM and will be built in to the GM resilience strategy.
- A specific Seveso Directive workshop to exchange knowledge between Viggiano and Greater Manchester on major accidents involving chemicals.

A4.3. Knowledge exchange undertaken beyond the pilot cities

- Elements of the Uscore2 tools have been considered in a peer review of a city in Saudi Arabia

A4.4. Opportunities for future knowledge exchanges are have also been identified

- Initial discussions held in South Korea and Chile with international DRR experts to utilise the Uscore2 tools and IEM in future peer reviews
- Through the UNISDR network, plans are underway to apply the Uscore2 Peer Review tool and IEM in one or two cities within the African region.

A5. Development of an ISO on the use of peer review in DRR

A5.1. The manner in which the project has been managed together with the membership of the partnership and IAB has enabled the project to work collaboratively with the team developing the ISO for peer review for disaster risk reduction. This has ensured the Uscore2 tools and draft ISO are complementary. The ISO has successfully passed the first ballot with 98% of the vote. It has received some comments to strengthen the next draft and these will be worked on. The next draft is aimed for submission in March 2019.

B: Internal and external difficulties encountered.

Language issues

B1. Insufficient time was allowed for translation of pre-review information from English into the Host City's language, and vice versa, reducing the time available to obtain information from stakeholders and to complete the pre-review work before the Peer Reviews in both Viggiano and Amadora. The need to start earlier to translate essential documentation was

remedied prior to the Salford peer review and the extended timing factored into the published Uscore2 tools.

B2. Simultaneous translation during the peer review was a significant factor. The peer review in Viggiano was enabled by translators translating information during pauses after brief verbal inputs which added considerable time to discussions. During the Amadora Peer Review simultaneous translators were required to overcome difficulties in some participants and reviewers understanding the proceedings and provide a more fluent process in relaying DRR information between the stakeholders and the Peer Review team. The requirement to determine the need for simultaneous translation in advance of the peer review visit is now incorporated into the Uscore2 tools.

International variation in legal and regulatory requirement for information sharing

B3. Effective peer reviews depend on sharing information to enable a joint understanding of circumstances and approaches. There are a number of sensitivities in sharing information e.g. commercial, security and political which vary between countries. The need for context and city-specific sensitivity and awareness is incorporated into the peer review tool.

Time and capacity of the project team

B4. At the outset of the review, anticipated time lines were in place for the three phases of the review. In reality, the pilots evidenced these timelines were unrealistically ambitious and the lack of time created unnecessary pressure on the teams. Increasing the time allowed for each phase in the final pilot relieved this pressure and enabled the setting of realistic time frames within the published tools.

B5. During the project, major incidents occurred in two of the partner's cities, namely the Manchester Arena terrorist attack (Salford, UK) and the large scale forest fires (Amadora, Portugal). Some personnel that were working on these incidents were also working on the Uscore2 project which resulted in extremely high workloads beyond the norm which brought competing demands. Despite this, the project remained on time and delivered or exceeded the project objectives.

B6. Understanding and negotiating the financial and audit arrangements for the project has been more resource intensive for the project coordinator and more complex than anticipated. Future projects should factor in sufficient resource to facilitate the demands of a complex system.

C: Partnership/core group cooperation (as appropriate)

C1. Throughout the project all partners have been fully engaged. Attendance and participation in planning and review meetings has been exemplary as evidenced by sign in sheets.

C2. The working relationships are such that challenge as well as agreement is welcomed. Partners have developed trusted relationships and readily shared information with each other during the workshops and between these meetings.

C3. All partners report that involvement in the project has added value to their 'day job' and the relationships developed have been a source of rich and varied support for them and their organisations. These relationships are ongoing and are driving other projects and exchanges of knowledge and ideas.

C4. Each partner has fulfilled their own detailed project tasks and regular liaison was undertaken to assist each other. The national level offered support when requested by the cities.

D: Cooperation with the Commission

D1. From the outset of the project the partnership has maintained a positive relationship with EU Project Officers ensuring that, when there were EU staff changes, new advisors were appropriately briefed.

D2. The EU-led project 'kick-off' workshop in Brussels for project leaders was very useful in providing and inducting the coordinator and project manager into the structure for managing the project. EU Advisors have been invited to all Uscore2 workshops and have been open to clarifying issues emerging from the pilot peer reviews where required.

D3. All interim progress reports have been well received and the Project Officers' feedbacks have been appreciated.

D4. The partners have maintained a timely flow of information regarding any changes in project timings, staffing, budgeting etc. There have been no issues raised by the EU advisors which might suggest there had been any difficulties in this project or communication.

D5. Project financial advisors from the Commission have been helpful in answering questions relating to the project Grant Agreement.

E: Comments on European value added

E1. The profile and reputation of the partners leading this project has attracted attention within existing European Resilience networks, principally the Making Cities Resilient Campaign, which has ensured that the learning from Uscore2 has already added value to the original outcomes envisaged for the project. This is evidenced by the frequent requests for partners to present at a variety of high profile conferences and seminars and also the popularity of the Uscore2 workshops. Over 100 representatives from across the world attended the Master Classes at the EFDRR in Rome on 21 November 2018 and the Barcelona Master Class of 13 November 2018.

E2. Links with United Nations' networks has ensured effective cross boundary development work enabling alignment of the peer review tool with the suite of tools and activities promoted by the UNISDR to support implementation of the Sendai Framework. For example, the UNISDR's Disaster Resilience Scorecard is a recommended precursor to the Uscore2 peer review methodology. Prior to the Uscore2 project the Making Cities Resilient ten essentials did not include a specific section on health. The lack of health as a specific subject was highlighted in the early stages of the Uscore2 project and was developed as a standalone module.

E3. The comprehensive literature review has added to the body of research available in Europe on the application of the MCR campaign. A number of research papers to disseminate other findings during from the project are in preparation.

E4. The Peer Review process encourages each city to engage with an extended group of stakeholders who previously may not have been involved in DRR. Encouraging greater stakeholder engagement in city level DRR was a benefit from implementing the peer review tool in the three pilot cities. With many stakeholders operating across administrative boundaries, greater awareness of and engagement in DRR is of benefit beyond the peer review cities.

E5. The pilot city peer reviews 'road tested' the majority of modules enabling the tools to reflect the most effective mix of partners for each 'Essential' and this has encouraged more detailed thinking about how DRR is embedded and assessed in a significantly more diverse range of professional communities in European Cities (as well as globally). This has been particularly evidenced in the development of a module focusing on public health, which has facilitated a very active and transformational European conversation on the crucial role public health factors play in DRR.

E6. In the final workshop a presentation from the Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (DG ECHO) recognized the contribution that Uscore2 added to the European work on national peer reviews through fostering dialogue and trans-boundary communication, helping address the challenges governments face in political decisions and in financing. There was also recognition that local peer reviews, as opposed to national, recognise a larger need at the local level for actions, are a bit more action orientated and help local government's access leverages they have been struggling with.

E7. The project is building on firm European and global DRR foundations. It:

- promotes the objectives of the EU Action Plan on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (Priority 2) by using Peer Reviews to 'Strengthen disaster risk governance to manage disaster risks' whilst also exchanging good practices through Peer Reviews. The pilot cities are embedding the recommendations from the peer reviews into future resilience strategies and work programmes, supporting the delivery of the Sendai Framework target to increase the number of countries with local disaster risk reduction strategies.

- builds on recommendations from the EFDRR 'How does Europe link DRR and CRR' working paper including supporting Member countries to continue to strengthen the link between CCA and DRR, integrating CCA into DRR policies, plans and actions, and vice versa. Internal coordination, transfer of knowledge and transfer of technical experiences in DRR/CCA processes are being encouraged to essentially strengthen resilience at all levels by enhancing resilience and reducing vulnerability to present and future climate impacts at regional, national and local levels.
- collaborates with other initiatives and projects including the RESIN and the SMR project and been presented to the European Union Centre for Disease Prevention and Control.
- UScore2 links closely with Goal 11, Sustainable cities and communities, of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The findings of the peer review programme have enabled the EU to make a significant contribution to the SDG11 target of reducing impact of disasters.

F: Lessons learnt and possible improvements

F1. Recruiting a diverse project leadership team, reflecting a representative mix of relevant constituents

F1.1. Recruiting and retaining an appropriate mix of senior leaders from a diverse range of organizations engaged in DRR, who were prepared to incorporate leadership of this project alongside their demanding day jobs is crucial to the success of partnership projects such as UScore2. The experience of the project leaders was that participation in the project added value to their roles as well taking forward evidence based improvements in their chosen field.

F1.2. The recruitment of the University of Manchester as a lead partner has had significant benefits in strengthening the relationship between the academic and practitioner professional bodies working in DRR. The University brought academic challenge and rigor to the project and its evaluation.

F1.3. The recruitment of a highly qualified and experienced International Advisory Board, who were active throughout the project and whose scrutiny of the process and outcomes was invaluable in guiding the development of the UScore2 Peer Review tools and Impact Evaluation Methodology. Recruiting a body of well-respected professional advisors to act as 'critical friends' proved very effective in achieving high quality outcomes.

F1.4. National government in the UK and Portugal were enrolled as partners in the UScore2 project from the outset and participated in all workshops and Master Classes, bringing valuable links to and the ability to influence policy making. Following the Viggiano peer review, the Italian national government entered into discussion with the project.

F1.5. The involvement throughout of DG ECHO has enabled the dissemination of information into wider international networks and the development of an ISO complementary to the

Uscore2 tools has added value to the project and enabled the findings to be disseminated internationally.

F2. Effective project management is a critical success factor

F2.1 Maintaining face to face contact with key partners through workshops and Master Classes has proved invaluable in working collaboratively to make the best use of the partner capacity available. Partners experienced significant unexpected challenges during the lifetime of the project which meant that their ability to complete tasks assigned was compromised at very short notice. The strength of the partnership is such that other partners stepped up willingly to complete these tasks to keep the project on track. Investing time in building and maintaining key individual leadership relationships was vital to the effectiveness of the project.

F2.2. Good project management and maintenance of project documentation ensured a robust audit trail for key financial and project management decisions.

F2.3. The recruitment of experienced staff from partners, some of whom have previous experience of working on European projects, to support the operational and administrative aspects of the project has been essential. This top quality team enabled the project to provide significant support to the pilot peer reviews when requested, maintain effective and timely communication with EU advisors and facilitate information sharing, project workshops and the production of well-designed project workbooks, all crucial to the success of Uscore2.