Oxford Policy Management

Strategic Research into National and Local Capacity Building for DRM

Mozambique Fieldwork Report

Roger Few, Zoë Scott, Kelly Wooster, Mireille Flores Avila, Marcela Tarazona, Antonio Queface and Alberto Mavume.

June 2015

Acknowledgements

The OPM Research Team would like to express sincere thanks to Roberto White from GFDRR Mozambique, Joao Ribeiro from INGC and Wild do Rosário from UN-Habitat for sharing their time and resources. We would also like to thank Joczabet Guerrero and Konstanze Kamojer for their invaluable advice and guidance in relation to the GIZ PRO-GRC project.

Finally, we would like to thank all those interviewees and workshop attendees who freely gave their time, expert opinion and enthusiasm, and to Antonio Beleza who assisted the team during the fieldwork.

This assessment is being carried out by Oxford Policy Management and the University of East Anglia. The Project Manager is Zoë Scott and the Research Director is Roger Few. For further information contact zoe.scott@opml.co.uk

Oxford Policy Management Limited
Registered in England: 3122495

6 St Aldates Courtyard
38 St Aldates
Oxford OX1 1BN
United Kingdom

Tel +44 (0) 1865 207 300
Fax +44 (0) 1865 207 301
Email admin@opml.co.uk
Website www.opml.co.uk

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements i
List of Boxes and Tables 3
List of Abbreviations 4
1 Introduction and methodology 7
1.1 Introduction to the research 7
1.2 Methodology 8
1.2.1 Data collection tools 9
1.2.2 Case study procedure 10
1.2.3 Coverage 10
1.3 Challenges and limitations 11
2 Country context 12
2.1 General Background 12
2.2 Disaster risk 12
2.3 DRM governance structure and policies 13
2.4 Recent history of DRM interventions 13
2.5 Existing status of DRM capacity in Mozambique 14
3 PRO-GRC Programme 15
3.1 Programme actors 16
3.2 Funding and timescales 17
3.3 Geographical coverage 18
3.4 CB activities 18
3.4.1 National / institutional level 18
3.4.2 Provincial and district level 19
3.4.3 Community level 19
3.5 Analysis in relation to the six principles 20
3.5.1 Flexibility/Adaptability 20
3.5.2 Comprehensive Planning 23
3.5.3 Ownership / partnership 26
3.5.4 Integration of Actors and Scales 29
3.5.5 Attention to Functional Capacity 31
3.5.6 Contribution to Disaster Resilience 32
4 The Safer Schools Project 34
4.1 Programme actors 35
4.2 Funding and timescales 36
4.3 Geographical coverage 36
4.4 CB activities 36
4.4.1 National / institutional level 37
4.4.2 Provincial level 38
4.5 Analysis in relation to the six principles 38
4.5.1 Flexibility/Adaptability 38
4.5.2 Comprehensive Planning 39
4.5.3 Ownership / partnership 41
4.5.4 Integration of Actors and Scales 42
4.5.5 Attention to Functional Capacity 43

4.5.6 Contribution to Disaster Resilience 44
5 Towards capacity building – key lessons from the Mozambique case study 46
5.1 Flexibility and adaptability 46
5.2 Attention to Planning 48
5.3 Ownership / Partnership 49
5.4 Integration of scales and actors 51
5.5 Functional Capacity Building 52
5.6 Linkage to disaster resilience 53
References 54
Annex A Perspectives of Interviewees on Key Factors in CB 58
Annex B Interview Questionnaire Schedules 62
B.1 Initial Workshop/Key Stakeholders' Meeting (and/or contextual interviews as required) 62
B.2 Interview Question Schedule: CB Actors 64
B.3 Interview Question Schedule: Commentators 68
B.4 Interview Question Schedule: Group interviews 71
B.5 Final Workshop 74

List of Boxes and Tables

Box 1 South-south learning as an effective approach to capacity building 21
Box 2 DRM as a potentially neutral issue in areas of conflict 22
Box 3 Timescales for functional capacity building 23
Box 4 PRO-GRC Techniques for Improving Inter-Scalar DRM Capacity 29
Box 5 Orienting CB to institutional needs 39
Box 6 GFDRR's approach to capacity building 43

Table 1: PRO-GRC at a glance 15
Table 2: Safer Schools Project at a glance 34
Table 3: Safer Schools budget breakdown 36
Table 4: Interviewee perspectives on DRM CB success factors 58

List of Abbreviations

BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
CB	Capacity Building
CBDRM	Community Based DRM
CBDRR	Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction
CCGC	Coordinating Council for Disaster Management
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CEDH	Centre for Development Studies and Habitat
CENOE	National Emergency Operations Center
CERUMS	Resource and Multiple Use Centres
CLGRC	Local Risk Management Committee(s)
CPCCN	Coordinating Council for Preventing and Combating Natural Disasters
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CTDGC	District Technical Council for Disaster Management
CTG	Consulative Technical Group
CTGC	Technical Council for Disaster Management
CTPGC	Provincial Technical Council for Disaster Management
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DIPLAC	Directorate of Planning and Cooperation
DNG	National Directorate of Geology
DPCCN	Department for Preventing and Combating Natural Disasters
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DPEC	Provincial Directorate of Education and Culture
DPOPH	Province Direction for Public Infrastructure and Housing of the MOPH
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Aid Office
EWS	Early Warning System

GACOR	Office for Reconstruction Coordination
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
GIZ	German Development Cooperation
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action 2015
IFRC	International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INAM	National Institute of Meteorology
INGC	National Institute for Disaster Management
IRC	International Rescue Committee
MAEFP	Ministry of State Administration and Civil Service
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MICOA	Ministry of Coordination of Environmental Affairs
MINED	Ministry of Education
MOPHRH	Ministry of Public Works, Housing and Water Resources
MPD	Ministry of Planning and Development
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
PARP	Poverty Reduction Action Plan
PDGC	Master Plan for Disaster Management
PES	Socio-Economic Plan
PESOD	District-level Socio-Economic Plan
PRODER	GTZ Programme for Rural Development
PRO-GRC	Disaster Risk Management Programme
SDDS	Strategic Plans for District Development
ToT	Training of trainers

UEM	University Eduardo Mondlane
UEM-FAPF	University Eduardo Mondlane-Faculty of Architecture and Physical Planning
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNRCO	United Nations Resident Coordinator's Office
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VCA	Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment

1 Introduction and methodology

1.1 Introduction to the research

In September 2013, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) contracted Oxford Policy Management and the University of East Anglia to conduct Strategic Research into National and Local Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management.

To date there has been little formal, empirical research that has been conducted on capacity building for disaster risk management (DRM), and as a result international actors lack robust, evidence-based guidance on how capacity for DRM can be effectively generated at national and local levels. The research project has been designed as an initial step towards filling that knowledge and evidence gap.

Our central aim in the research is therefore to draw lessons and guidance on 'how to' build DRM capacity in a range of contexts. We will do this by analysing the characteristics, effectiveness and relative importance of a range of capacity building for DRM interventions across a variety of country contexts.

Our objectives are to research the following overarching issues of concern:

1. How is capacity for DRM generated most effectively at both national and local levels?
2. What factors enable or constrain the building of national and local capacity for DRM?
3. How and why does this vary across different environments?
4. How is the international community currently approaching the task of building national and local capacities for DRM?
5. How can we identify and measure improving capacity for DRM?

The core research is based on a country case study approach. A pilot study was conducted in March / April 2014 in Ethiopia. The second case study was conducted in Pakistan in June 2014 using the refined standardised methodological framework for data collection and analysis. The third case study was conducted in Myanmar in November 2014. The Philippines was the fourth case study, conducted in January / February 2015. Mozambique was the sixth and final case study conducted in May 2015. This report sets out the approach taken and the findings of the Mozambique case study and has been structured to enable comparative analysis across countries and interventions. In each of the 6 case studies the team looks in-depth at 1-3 programmes that involve capacity building for disaster risk management.

The Research Team is led by Dr. Roger Few, Senior Research Fellow at the School of International Development (DEV) in the University of East Anglia. The Project Manager is Zoë Scott who is a full-time staff member at Oxford Policy Management. Marcela Tarazona, also from OPM, is the Disaster Risk Management (DRM) specialist. The Fieldwork Leader is Kelly Wooster and the Research Assistant is Mireille Flores Avila. The team members based in Mozambique were Dr. Antonio Queface and Dr. Alberto Mavume from the Eduardo Mondlane University, and Antonio Beleza.

1.2 Methodology

In Mozambique, as in each case study country, we aim to analyse the following themes:

- Context/dynamics
- Specific examples of capacity-building activities for DRM
- Actors/programme characteristics
- Approach to CB process
- Content of CB activities
- Effectiveness
- Capacity development for DRM (in general)

In order to investigate CB activities for DRM the team selected two capacity-oriented DRM intervention programmes for in-depth study. In each case study the programmes are selected with consideration for the research as a whole - they are not intended to give a representative picture of the situation in Mozambique, but are intended to combine with the selections made in other case study countries to give a broad overview of different types of intervention to feed into the final synthesis report. Overall the selection of case studies will enable the team to look at a balance of different scales, contexts, disasters and CB for DRM activities. On occasion the team selects programmes that are similar to facilitate comparison, at other times unusual projects are selected, that could offer lessons learned to a wider audience.

When selecting interventions the following criteria are applied:

- The programme should have both capacity building and disaster risk management as a central focus.
- The programme should aim to enable government, organisations, communities or individuals to make better decisions regarding disaster risk management in a sustainable way.
- The programme should be nearly finished or recently finished (ideally evaluations will have already been done) so there has been adequate time to reflect on lessons learned and observe impact. The project should not have finished many years earlier as it will then be difficult to track down stakeholders and budget information.
- The programme should not be exclusively training, provision of equipment or building of infrastructure (training may be considered if it is followed up with action planning, development of DRM committees and follow-up support).
- The programme should not be exclusively or mainly located in areas in which the research team cannot travel due to security constraints.

In the case of Mozambique, the following steps were taken to identify and select appropriate programmes:

1. A web-based search and literature review identified a long-list of possible programmes.

2. This list was supplemented with information and suggestions from the consultant in Mozambique.

Several programmes were ruled out because they did not meet the criteria outlined above and in the research methodology. In particular, most of the capacity building activities focused on training only or provision of materials only.

Two programmes emerged as appropriate case studies:

- GIZ: PRO-GRC I and II (Disaster Risk Management Programme).
- GFDRR / INGC / Ministry of Education and UN-Habitat Partnership: Safer Schools Project.

The PRO-GRC programme was executed by INGC with advice and guidance of consultants from the German Development Cooperation (GIZ). This programme was selected because it was noted that one of the main objectives was to establish and reinforce holistic disaster risk management practice in Mozambique and that it was a large-scale programme, with a large budget and long duration. The team saw an opportunity to learn how the programme enabled government and other DRM actors in Mozambique to make better decisions on DRM and how the programme influenced the DRM context. The project included different actors and scales across national, regional, provincial, and community levels, working specifically on capacity building for DRM.

The partnership programme, Safer Schools, was funded by GFDRR and UN-Habitat and so provided an opportunity to investigate how the World Bank-GFDRR approaches capacity building, in this case specifically in relation to building codes and guidelines in relation to school safety. The team was interested to learn about the inter-ministerial partnership and the very high level working groups that the project established. This project focused mainly at the national, institutional level.

Both initiatives fit in with the selection criteria and reached from the national to the community level. The combination of the initiatives was believed to be an opportunity for rich findings for the fieldwork report.

1.2.1 Data collection tools

During the case study we used the following tools for data collection:

a) **Desk review of secondary data sources** (documents and databases) such as programme reports, financial data and review articles, which provided key information for several of the research questions.

b) **Key informant interviews and group interviews** at a range of scales (national / subnational / community). Semi-structured interviews (individual and group) were the primary research tool, and were guided by question schedules (see Annex B). These were flexibly applied according to the interviewee(s).

c) **Ratings exercise** conducted with interviewees and groups. At the close of each interview a brief exercise component was included that asks interviewees to rate the importance of the six proposed principles of effective capacity building identified in the 'conceptual framework of change'[1] on a scale of 1-4.

[1] The six principles were identified from a global literature review conducted during the inception phase of the research. The principles are flexibility and adaptability, comprehensive planning, ownership, attention to functional capacity, integration of actors and scales and contribution to disaster resilience. Please see the Inception Report for detailed explanations of each principle.

1.2.2 Case study procedure

During the case study the team undertook the following steps in data collection and analysis:

a) Preliminary desk-based study. During the month preceding the field visit the team undertook a desk-based search and analysis of secondary sources and a preliminary stakeholder mapping exercise. Documents such as programme reports, evaluation reports, review articles and general contextual and policy documents on disaster risk, DRM and governance were accessed via internet searches and through liaison with in-country partners and wider networks. Relevant text from these sources was coded and collated in relation to the research questions. The mapping of key stakeholders formed an initial list for the key informant interviews which was refined and added to as the fieldwork progressed.

b) Main data collection in country. The main data collection phase comprised the collection of additional secondary sources (including non-electronic sources not previously accessed) and financial data relating to selected programmes, key informant interviews (semi-structured) at a mix of scales, and group interviews.

c) Final workshop. At the close of the fieldwork a final workshop was organised with stakeholders at national scale. The workshop's purpose was to provide an update/debrief and feedback/validation of the preliminary findings of the case study, and provide an opportunity to undertake a large-scale M&E framework testing exercise with national experts. The workshop lasted for half a day and 16 individuals attended.

d) M&E Framework Testing. The final workshop provided a forum to discuss and reflect on the M&E framework which had been revised and refined over the course of the research. During the workshop a group activity was undertaken whereby participants were introduced to the proposed M&E framework and asked to provide feedback on tools created for one core outcome indicator. Groups reported back on the ease of use, measurability, the guidance tool and were also asked whether they could suggest other core indicators that could measure the outcome area. A separate meeting attended by 5 individuals, including 3 M&E experts and the national consultants, was organised to collect more specific feedback.

e) Initial analysis. Preliminary analysis of primary data sources commenced whilst in the field. For qualitative data sources the initial analysis entailed coding/collation of interview transcripts. The coding scheme has a shared core component to facilitate comparative analysis.

f) Integrated analysis. Data from across data sources has been compiled for each selected activity and for the Mozambican context as a whole to provide a narrative analysis. Triangulation of data sources has been employed wherever possible to maximise robustness of the analytical points drawn; and where interpretations of evidence are more speculative this is clearly indicated.

1.2.3 Coverage

In total 78 individuals were interviewed as part of the fieldwork in 28 different key informant interviews, workshops or focus groups. Of the 78 individuals, 24 participants were female. Five mixed group interviews at subnational and community level were conducted. Key informant interviews were conducted with different levels of actors and scales in the two selected capacity

building programmes. Information on context was gathered during the two workshops which included 21 key informants.

Therefore the vast majority of the individual informants were actors directly engaged in the DRM capacity building activity, including those engaged primarily as programme donors, implementers, and those engaged primarily as programme beneficiaries. The remaining key individual informants provided contextual information or commentary on the selected programmes. There were 16 attendees at the final workshop.

The research team adhered strictly to the ethical guidelines whilst in country, which included gaining verbal consent from all participants in the research prior to interviews. The research was conducted on the basis of anonymity, and therefore in this report we do not disclose the identity of those making statements that are reported. All verbal sources have been removed from this report, but the research team has retained the information so that findings in the synthesis report can be verified. Documentary sources are retained, but not presented in the analysis sections. A bibliography for this report has been provided at the end of the document.

The research team presented the M&E framework and one of the core indicators with guidance notes in the workshop in Mozambique. Details of the subsequent discussion are given in a separate report focusing specifically on M&E findings from the case study.

1.3 Challenges and limitations

There were a number of challenges that the team encountered during the fieldwork:

Access to programme documents: The team prefer to have substantial documentation on the projects available for study prior to arrival in country. Nevertheless in Mozambique this represented a challenge. The organisations involved with the projects selected for in-depth study were more willing to share documents once the team was in country. This, to some extent, hindered the team's ability to plan ahead.

Financial analysis: The team was only able to collect a small amount of budget information for the GIZ and the GFDRR programme. It was particularly challenging to get breakdowns of financial data related just to capacity building. Nevertheless, the fact that both selected programmes were almost exclusively focused on CB for DRM facilitated the team's ability to analyse the resources required for the various CB activities. It was also possible to collect detailed information on staffing numbers for different CB activities, especially on the GIZ project.

Commentators: In Mozambique, as in most countries, it was a struggle to find interviewees who could serve as commentators for the selected initiatives. The trend has been that only those who have a stake in the initiative are familiar enough to comment. Hence no commentator interviews were undertaken.

2 Country context

2.1 General Background

Mozambique is located on the south-eastern coast of Africa, and is particularly exposed to the impact and influence of extreme events in the region, for example cyclones, floods, droughts, epidemics and earthquakes (MAEFP, 2015). In the last decade, the frequency of disasters has doubled (INGC, 2013), a reminder of the need to invest in capacity building for disaster risk management (DRM) and disaster risk reduction (DRR).

Mozambique has been one of the fastest growing non-oil economies in sub-Saharan Africa, with steady growth rates of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) between 6 and 7 percent since 2007 (World Bank, 2014). Between 1996 and 2009 national poverty fell from 69.4% to 54.7% (IMF, 2011). Despite good economic growth and relative progress as measured by the Human Development Index 2010 and 2014, it remains one of the world's poorest countries, ranking 178 out of 187 countries in 2014 (UNDP, 2014). At the same time, the country is experiencing high population growth, with a particular concentration in urban areas (IMF, 2011), urban population growth is estimated to have been 3% per year since 2000 (World Bank, 2014).

2.2 Disaster risk

According to the World Risk Index 2014, Mozambique ranks first in the list of countries with the highest susceptibility to disasters (likelihood of suffering from and experiencing harm, loss and disruption in an extreme event or natural hazard) and tenth in the list of counties with the highest vulnerability (susceptibility plus lack of coping capacities and lack of adaptive capacities). This is exacerbated by a number of concurrent factors, for example that 60 percent of the country's 25.8 million population live along the coastline which is highly vulnerable to tropical storms and cyclones (MAEFP, 2015).

Between 1980 and 2012 there have been 24 flood events, 12 drought and 16 cyclones (INGC, 2013), in addition to the January 2013, February 2014, and January 2015 floods. The risk of floods and cyclones in Mozambique is higher from October through to March. From 1984 to 1997, Mozambique was hit by 5 cyclone events. However, from the year 2000 to 2012, the number of cyclones has doubled - there have been 11 cyclone events in 13 years (INGC, 2013).

The impact of disasters on development, particularly on the MDG efforts to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger and those to ensure environmental sustainability, is very evident in Mozambique. The January 2015 floods alone resulted in 163 deaths, 370,906 affected people, 52,714 people internally displaced and an estimated post flood recovery and reconstruction plan of $423 million by the Humanitarian Country Team (UNRCO, 2015).

The 2000 floods caused heavy economic losses, which led to reduced GDP for the subsequent two years (MOPHRH, 2015). The government of Mozambique estimates the damage cost for the 2013 floods at $322 million, the equivalent to 4 percent GDP. The 2015 floods, which devastated the central and northern regions of the country, are estimated at $400 million. Several studies show that flood events cause an average annual reduction in GDP of about 0.5 percentage points in Mozambique (MOPHRH, 2015).

2.3 DRM governance structure and policies

Established in 1999, the National Institute of Disaster Management (INGC) is the leading government institution mandated to coordinate disaster risk management (DRM) efforts in Mozambique. It operates under the Ministry of State Administration and Public Function and coordinates all efforts and activities to promote disaster prevention at the national, provincial, district, and community levels.

The INGC is operationally supported by the National Emergency Operating Centre-CENOE. The Coordinating Council for Disaster Management (CCGC), led by the Prime Minister, aims to ensure multi-sectoral coordination. The CCGC is a political and decision-making body, technically advised by the Technical Council for Disaster Management (CTGC), a multi-sectorial organ comprising government representatives and members of the humanitarian country team.

In June 2014, Mozambique approved the disaster management law or Law 15/2014. The law sets the legal framework for disaster management, which includes preparedness, mitigation, and recovery efforts. Simultaneously, the Law 16/2014 establishes the principles and norms for protection, conservation and sustainable restoration of biodiversity (Boletim da Republica, 2014).

Mozambique is signatory to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015 and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.

2.4 Recent history of DRM interventions

Many international donors are supporting the government in relation to DRR, including GFDRR, DFID, Government of Denmark, GIZ, UNDP, ECHO and USAID. Some information on selected programmes is given below.

GFDRR is very active in relation to DRM in Mozambique, with several recent and current programmes. The ‘Programmatic Support to DRM Management’ ended in December 2014 and aimed to support the INGC (i) to conduct a risk assessment in vulnerable areas of the Limpopo River Basin; (ii) to develop an online risk data platform; (iii) to increase integration of disaster risk considerations into national policies and investments; (iv) to advance the risk transfer dialogue and finalize the legal establishment of a contingency fund; and (v) to conduct a fiscal disaster risk assessment to support contingency funding for post-disaster resilient recovery. In addition, GFDRR is also funding the Strengthening Hydro-

meteorological Capacity for Improved Early Warning and the Safer Schools Project (analysed later in this report).

GIZ funded 'Institutionalising Disaster Prevention in Mozambique (PRO-GRC II)' which supports INGC in the establishment of DRR structures at the national, provincial, district and community levels (studied in this report). DFID, Danida, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, and the Austrian Development Cooperation recently funded the 'Adaptation Learning Programme for Africa' which seeks to increase the capacity of vulnerable households in sub-Saharan Africa to adapt to climate variability and change with particular focus on gender equality and diversity.

According to some interviewees, international organizations have played a role in facilitating technical discussions on DRM with the government. National organisations also have a role in their ability to reach specific groups, but would benefit from strengthening their technical capacities.

2.5 Existing status of DRM capacity in Mozambique

Despite its poverty levels, Mozambique is often viewed as a leader in relation to DRR and an example of best practice in the region. Interviewees argued that there has been good progress in relation to disaster risk management in the last 10 years, and there has been a shift towards prevention, mitigation and planning, at the national, regional and local levels.

In addition to the new disaster management law, other mechanisms provide further evidence of increased capacity: the development of a National Contingency Plan, and the establishment of the Technical Council for Disaster Management and of the Humanitarian Country Team.

3 PRO-GRC Programme

Table 1: PRO-GRC at a glance

Research question	Overview at a glance
Which actors are involved in the CB activity?	The programme was commissioned by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) with co-financing from Munich Re Foundation. The executing agency was the National Disaster Management Institute (INGC) with advisory services from IP Consult and Ambero (consultants working on behalf of GIZ (German Development Cooperation) Beneficiaries were the Mozambique government and communities in disaster prone areas.
What is the funding level and duration?	Total budget $7.6 million for 5 years Phase 1: 2 years: (Jan 2007-Dec 2008) Budget: $3.9 million (GFDRR, 2009) Phase 2: 3 years: (Jan 2010-Dec 2012) Budget: $3.7 million.
What is the scope of the activities?	Strengthening DRM through shifting practice from a focus on reaction to prevention. Capacity building activities included: institutionalisation of DRM at all levels through technical, procedural and organisational advice, training, provision of guidelines and manuals to support effective DRM/CCA implementation and reduction of vulnerability to risks through improved agricultural practices.
What is the geographical focus?	National level support was provided in Maputo. Other programme activities were focused in the hazard-prone provinces of Inhambane, Manica, Sofala and Zambezia.

The first programme selected for the case study was the PRO-GRC programme. “PRO-GRC” is a shortened name for Disaster Risk Management Programme.

The overall aim of the programme was to establish and re-inforce holistic disaster risk management practice in Mozambique. The programme was conducted in two phases.

- **PRO-GRC I:** Phase I of the programme was entitled: “Institutionalisation of Disaster Risk Management in Mozambique”. The overall objective was: ‘The population in the districts affected by natural hazards such as floods, cyclones and droughts, carry out, together with the INGC and local governments, disaster risk management measures.’ The programme’s activities were grouped into three components:

    1. Dissemination of proven tools for reducing vulnerability to drought;

2. Implementation of system-wide disaster risk management; and

3. Technical and organisational advice to the INGC (PRO-GRC, 2010).

- **PRO-GRC II:** Phase II of the programme was entitled 'Institutional Assistance for Expansion and Consolidation of Disaster Risk Management.' The overall objective was: 'In cooperation with local governments and the INGC, the population uses methods and disaster prevention measures to reduce the risk in areas vulnerable to disasters, taking into account climate change.' The programme had three components:

    1. The reduction of vulnerability to drought;

    2. Capacity development of DRR committees and decentralised district planning; and

    3. The development of guidelines for the integration of DRR and CCA into the activities of the Ministry of Agriculture and Planning and Development (GIZ, 2011).

The programme's activities were targeted at the institutional, organisational, community and individual levels. Capacity building activities included institutionalisation of DRM at all levels through technical, procedural and organisational advice, training, provision of guidelines and manuals to support effective DRM/CCA implementation and reduction of vulnerability to risks through improved agricultural practices.

The research team focused on district and community level support as these programme areas were more fruitful in terms of identifying effective elements of capacity building.

The activities are described in sections 3.1 to 3.4, followed by an extended analysis in relation to the 6 principles of CB[2] in section 3.5.

3.1 Programme actors

The commissioner of the programme is the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). BMZ develops the guidelines and the fundamental concepts on which German development policy is based. BMZ began partnering with Mozambique after the civil war ended in 1992 in an effort to rebuild the country. The priority areas of work are now decentralisation for rural development, education, sustainable economic development and measures to adapt to climate change (BMZ, 2015).

The implementers of the PRO-GRC were The National Institute of Disaster Management (INGC) and GIZ together as partners. INGC, operating under the Ministry of State Administration was established in 1999 and coordinates DRM activities in Mozambique (GFDRR, 2009). Part of the PRO-GRC programme was to build and strengthen organisational structures from the national to the district level. These structures then played a major role in the implementation of PRO-GRC.

- National Emergency Operation Centre (CENOE) which coordinates and executes actions relating to DRR nationally and provides technical assistance to the provincial INGC (Scott, 2010). Two regional centres were also established with one specialising in cyclones and the other with floods.
- Technical Council of Disaster Management (CTGC). The CTGC, composed of technical staff from sectoral Ministries proposes technical responses to disasters which are then submitted for analysis and approval at the ministerial level (GFDRR, 2009). At the provincial and district levels the Technical Councils for Disaster Management (called CTPGC and CTDGC

[2] The six principles were identified following a global literature review early in the research. A definition for each one is included in the text below.

respectively) were created and strengthened to improve cross-sectoral representation on DRM issues and communication flow between communities and provincial levels.

- Local DRM committees. These were established to coordinate and address community DRM issues and liaise with the CTDGC.

Several other government agencies and departments have been involved in aspects of the programme including the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Planning and Development and several other educational and health institutions and agencies (PRO-GRC, 2009).

The vulnerability reduction programme component heavily used CERUMS to coordinate activities, enhance training delivery by demonstrating drought resilient agriculture practices. CERUMs are 'Resource and Multiple Use Centres' that are based at the district level and are monitored by the Regional CENOE Units (Scott, 2010).

GIZ, the other programme implementer, is a federal enterprise which supports the German government to achieve its objectives. Advisory services during PRO-GRC were provided by IP Consult and Ambero with co-financing from Munich Re Foundation (GIZ, 2011). The advisors were responsible for guiding and empowering INGC and other relevant actors at all levels to implement the programme (PRO-GRC, 2009).

A south-south arrangement was used to transfer capacity between DRM stakeholders in Central and South America and Mozambique. Many DRM stakeholders from Brazil, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua participated in the exchange. This south-south cooperation was used to help develop CENOE, local DRM committees and Early Warning Systems (EWS).

The beneficiaries of PRO-GRC were INGC and government representatives at the national, provincial and district levels. Additionally the programme benefitted non-government agencies, communities, local crafts people, teachers, students, agricultural producers and farmers.

3.2 Funding and timescales

The initial timetable for PRO-GRC I was two years. BMZ normally takes a longer-term approach to development, however PRO-GRC was a fairly unusual programme area and therefore a 2-year programme was identified.

As a result of an evaluation conducted one year before the end of PRO-GRC I, it was determined that a second phase of three years would be required to reinforce the structures and systems built in Phase I and expand activities into new geographic areas.

Funding for PRO-GRC was provided by BMZ with co-financing from Munich Re Foundation.

The research team was unable to collect detailed budget information for the programme. However it was possible to collect some limited information on the human resources from GIZ required for the CB for DRM initiative:

PRO-GRC I:
A total of five advisors from were used to carry out the programme including:

- One international advisor
- Two regional advisors
- Two local advisors

(PRO-GRC, 2005)

PRO-GRC II:

- Four advisors (three national and one international)
- Six technical assistants

- Four-six administrators
- Two monitoring and evaluation team members

The GIZ team was increased for PRO-GRC II as the programme expanded into new geographic areas with an increased focus on inter-scalar activities. At the community level, the programme relied heavily on community volunteerism including contributions of labour and time for DRM learning and implementation.

3.3 Geographical coverage

The national level programme activities were focused in the capital of Maputo. Sub-national programme locations were selected as targets by BMZ because the frequency and magnitude of disasters in those areas has increased dramatically over the last 50 years and it is anticipated that climate change will further increase risks (PRO-GRC, 2013).

At the sub-national level the geographical area of influence of PRO-GRC I was in Caia, Chemba and Marromeu districts of Sofala province and Mopeia district of Zambezia province (PRO-GRC, 2009).

For PRO-GRC II, the sub-national level targets were Buzi, Caia, Chemba and Machanga districts and Beira municipality of Sofala province. Funhalouro, Govuro, Inhassoro, Mabote and Vilanculos districts of Inhambane province and Mopeia district in Zambezia province were also targeted (PRO-GRC, 2013).

3.4 CB activities

PRO-GRC operated at national, provincial, district and community levels. These activities are described below by scale.

3.4.1 National / institutional level

At the national level, PRO-GRC aimed to strengthen institutional and technical capacity in DRM. GIZ supported INGC by providing conceptual, strategic and organisational advice. They also contributed to staff development and improved coordination with sector ministries and donors for the consolidation and implementation of risk management taking CCA into account (IP Consult, 2015).

The programme contributed to the development of the current INGC National Master Plan for Prevention and Mitigation of Natural Disasters (hereafter referred to as the Master Plan) 2012. The revision process involved reviewing the existing plans and identifying areas to strengthen. The original plan was seen as ad hoc, response-focused and lacking alignment with international standards. The Master Plan went through two revisions (2006 and 2012) using a consultative process facilitated by GIZ and INGC and was approved by the CTGC and the ministerial level. The revised plan specifically emphasises the links between development policies and preparedness, prevention, mitigation and vulnerability reduction. It also pays attention to developing arid zones through introduction of conservation agriculture and non-agricultural income generation activities, water supply and rainwater harvesting. For flood protection in risky areas, water resources infrastructure such as dams and dikes are emphasised as mechanisms for flood prevention. (GFDRR, 2009).

At the national level, CENOE was also established through PRO-GRC. The CENOE aims to provide all those involved in the prevention, mitigation and disaster response guidance on procedures, tasks and actions. CENOE also conducts technical and scientific monitoring, issues warnings, acts as the control centre for emergency operations and provides multi-sectoral coordination and decision-making structures (INGC, 2012). CENOE benefitted from the assistance

of the south-south cooperation. International experts from Central America visited Mozambique to provide technical advice and INGC members visited their countries to learn about the experience of establishing DRM coordination centres.

The PRO-GRC team also established DRM/CCA training curriculum, guidelines and manuals that are now approved and used nationally for DRM stakeholders. The materials were meant to document best practice and promote effective implementation of DRM/CCA approaches in the context of Mozambique. GIZ created these materials with input from stakeholders from other southern countries, INGC, DRM committees and several multi-sectoral government departments. It took several years to develop and get approval for these materials. They are now all housed and managed in CENOE.

PRO-GRC contributed to the drafting of national DRM Law. GIZ contributed by identifying a legal expert, orienting him to DRM and providing technical support. The DRM law was finally passed in 2014: two years after the completion of PRO-GRC. The programme also contributed to drafting of regulations for early warning systems and other DRM aspects, but these are not yet approved.

3.4.2 Provincial and district level

At this level the CTPGC and CTDGC were created and strengthened to improve cross-sectoral representation on DRM issues and communication flow between provincial, district and community levels.

Integration of DRM/CCA into development plans at the district level began in 2010 in cooperation with Provincial Technical Planning Councils of Sofala, Inhambane and Manica. As a result, some DRM/CCA measures were included in Strategic Plans for District Development (SDDS) and the Economic and Social District budget (PESOD). GIZ used a series of participatory seminars and coordination meetings to agree processes and to develop detailed guidelines on effective DRM/CCA integration.

PRO-GRC also supported INGC at the provincial level to create contingency plans for each sector in preparation for rainy season (October to March) and cyclone season (November to April). The plans incorporated education, awareness-raising and early warning systems at each location. GIZ supported through provision of tools and methods to manage risks efficiently and effectively.

DRM/CCA trainings were conducted for INGC, provincial representatives, district administrations and representatives of civil society to improve understanding of a more holistic DRR approach. In the early stages of PRO-GRC, the trainings were delivered mostly by GIZ or by trainers who had been trained in BMZ's previous DRM programme, PRODER. Over time a systematic approach to training trainers and development of training curriculum was put in place. By the end of the programme, INGC was initiating and delivering most training independently of GIZ.

Actors at the provincial and district levels learned how to monitor and evaluate local DRM committees (described in the next section) against five indicators: training, organisational structure, risk management, instruments, flow of information and acceptance in the community. A series of tools were developed and trainings conducted to prepare INGC for the role of managing the committees nationally. The evaluation methodology used a variety of techniques including games and interactive exercises which ensured active participation of the committee members and also served as an opportunity to share information and clarify misconceptions (PRO-GRC, 2013).

3.4.3 Community level

In PRO-GRC I, 39 local DRM committees were created and existing committees were strengthened (PRO-GRC, 2009). By the end of PRO-GRC II over 200 local DRM committees had been created and strengthened (GIZ, 2011). The committees had the responsibility of assessing and managing disaster risks within the community, operating early warning systems, providing

emergency response, conducting community-level post disaster needs assessments and liaising with the district level CTDGC on DRM issues.

These committees were formed through community engagement with district authorities and INGC. GIZ and INGC provided trainings on DRM/CCA. In the higher risk areas DRM committees were equipped with DRM equipment and supplies such as first aid kits, bicycles, spare wheels etc. Those operating the EWS were provided with radios and river-level monitoring equipment.

The DRM committee members each have an assigned designation such as EWS, search and rescue or post disaster needs assessment. The same is true with the members of the CTDGC. Sub-commissions were formed in line with the designations to enable regular coordination and information-sharing between several communities and the district level together on these specific elements of DRM.

One of the primary functions of the local DRM committees has been to operate the Early Warning System for Cyclones and Floods. This informal system was designed to work in conjunction with an existing formal method of early warning operated by the government. At the community level, the volunteers regularly collect information on the local river behaviour and precipitation and pass it to the district level. Information arrives at administrative posts, is validated by the national water authority, and then goes to CENOE for decisions to be made. EWSs have been created along three river systems under PRO-GRC: the Save, Buzi and Shire.

The programme promoted vulnerability reduction through training of farmers, teachers, students and local craftsmen in the use of drought resilient agricultural practices such as conservation of rainwater and humidity, irrigation systems, improved barn design and harvesting technologies. At the end of the programme, 749 producers were employing the new technologies. Local CERUMs were used to prepare demonstrations, experiment with techniques and increase awareness of DRM/CCA measures. The programme provided seeds and tools to support implementation of the learning. In addition, an evaluation of gender sensitivity of the disseminated technologies was conducted (PRO-GRC, 2013).

3.5 Analysis in relation to the six principles

In this section, the programme described above is analysed in relation to six principles for effective capacity building in disaster risk management.

3.5.1 Flexibility/Adaptability

Definition: *The need to approach capacity building interventions flexibly, ensuring that the design of the programme can be adapted to the context in which it is applied rather than applied as an externally-imposed 'blueprint'. It includes working with and reinforcing existing skills, strategies, systems and capacities. It also includes understanding and accounting for the political and power dimensions that can contribute to or undermine capacity building.*

Research question: *How has the programme approached capacity development in a flexible manner, adapting the approach to context?*

- Evidence suggested that a longer-term approach using cumulative experience to adapt CB for DRM approaches has contributed to the effectiveness of the GIZ programmes. PRO-GRC was planned based on the experience of the previous programme entitled PRODER from 2003-2006. In PRODER, DRM approaches were modelled and tested in a small geographic area.

PRO-GRC went on to implement these DRM approaches in new areas. The GIZ team and an INGC member agreed that it was useful having PRODER followed by the two-phase PRO-GRC programme. PRO-GRC I was used to establish new systems and procedures for DRM and then PRO-GRC II was used to strengthen and expand on what was built in the first phase. In this sense GIZ has a continuous process to adapt and strengthen CB approaches before replicating them in new areas.

- The GIZ team in Mozambique did not use a logical framework for planning, which according to interviewees, allowed maximum flexibility to adapt the activities of the programme to what was needed on the ground. The programme indicators were agreed at the highest level between the governments of Germany and Mozambique, and then there was great flexibility in how the indicators were achieved. An example of this was in the development of emergency centres (CENOE and COEs). Originally two regional emergency centres were envisioned to be placed in two high-risk areas, but INGC argued that a national centre was also required and GIZ had the flexibility to adapt the plan. GIZ was able to accommodate this request without an extensive process for approval with the donor. An interviewee from GIZ explained, "We did this because we wanted the organisation to know we were listening. To be effective, you have to have the flexibility to change to meet their needs."

  Contrastive, there was evidence of less flexibility on other matters. BMZ identified the target areas for PRO-GRC despite INGC's desire to work in additional areas that they felt were more vulnerable to disasters. An interviewee from GIZ explained that their priority was to build adaptable models which the government could replicate throughout the country.

Box 1 South-south learning as an effective approach to capacity building

Evidence suggested that carefully selected partners from other southern countries to participate in the programme contributed to appropriate and effective capacity building for disaster risk management and facilitated contextualisation.

Interviewees emphasised the importance of having countries with similar DRM contexts to learn from each other. One interviewee from the PRO-GRC team said, "As westerners we normally think that our methods and standards are the best options but our technologies [i.e. German] don't work in Africa. It's better to work with countries that are in a similar stage of development…countries that experience the same challenges and problems."

In Central America, the experience of responding to Hurricane Mitch in 1998 consequently leading to the affected countries shifting to a more holistic DRM approach meant these countries had valuable lessons to share with Mozambique. Additionally Central America had similar hazards and were in a similar development stage to Mozambique which helped to ensure that examples of realistic technologies for DRM would be shared. For example, INGC was able to identify EWS equipment and systems that were not heavily reliant on uninterrupted power supplies or high tech equipment. In rural areas, the water monitoring tool was essentially a wooden stick painted with different colours to signify when to act to an approaching hazard. It did not require the reader to have any level of formal education. The EWS stick also did not present any temptation to be stolen in poverty stricken areas. Interviewees also commented that the fact that there were similar languages between the countries was helpful in facilitating exchange of ideas.

One interviewee from INGC discussed how learnings were adapted for Mozambique: "The process, of course, wasn't copy and paste. With the exchange trips we did and the technical

expertise we received, we had the opportunity to observe and to choose the more relevant aspects of the models, the aspects that were relevant to Mozambique. We didn't use everything from the models. Even at the community level we didn't take the same exact same processes. We took what was relevant to us." INGC used the frameworks from other countries, but then applied it to their own structural reality.

- Interviewees from the PRO-GRC team underlined the importance of contextualising the EWS to the characteristics of each river system. For each river system, a baseline study was done to determine the requirements for operationalising the system. For example, the Save River originates in Zimbabwe and had six privately owned dams with no system of communication between them. The EWS design was then adapted to use the existing capacity of dam owners to provide monitoring information and a more coordinated water management system. The river systems were mainly in rural areas so farmers who had land near the river were recruited to the local DRM committees to monitor water levels. The system was designed around their way of living which was seen to be an important success factor for establishing the EWS.

- When the PRO-GRC team identified that an EWS was needed in Beira (the second largest city in Mozambique) the EWS was successfully adapted to the urban environment for an improved outcome. After conducting the baseline study, the PRO-GRC team determined that the target area was more vulnerable to flooding in built up areas where there was less natural means of drainage so the team added drainage works to manage urban-specific risks. In addition, the livelihoods and therefore lifestyles of people from rural and urban areas differed quite dramatically. In rural areas, it was perfectly normal to have the farmers check river levels periodically from dawn to dusk as it aligned to their farming duties. The rural approach did not suit urban dwellers who were likely to have business-related livelihoods which would not permit them to check the water levels regularly. Nor did the local DRM committees feel comfortable being outside in the evening to check water levels when security concerns are higher. Therefore, in Beira, the EWS consisted of electronic water level monitors which sound when the water levels rise to a certain point. The sound alerts people to prepare with one alert sound and to evacuate on a different sound. Awareness raising sessions helped the urban communities to understand what each sound signified. The urban EWS system worked well and received an international risk award from UNISDR in 2012.

- During PRO-GRC II there had been growing political tensions between the government party in power and two opposition parties in Sofala province. Beira, the capital of Sofala province, was governed by members of the opposition party. At the same time coastal erosion and concerns about climate change compelled the municipal government to improve disaster risk management through the establishment of six local DRM committees and an EWS on the Shire river system. The box below describes how PRO-GRC operated under these challenging political circumstances.

Box 2 DRM as a potentially neutral issue in areas of conflict

Evidence from PRO-GRC suggested that CB for DRM can be implemented in the context of conflict if presented as a neutral issue.

During times of tension, GIZ was well positioned to act as an impartial facilitator offering assistance and advice in the implementation of the EWS and establishment of local DRM committees. Due to long-standing work in Sofala, GIZ was trusted and perceived to be

neutral. For this reason, GIZ staff members were used to approach the target communities in Beira to create the local DRM committees, rather than INGC who would normally do it.

One interviewee from GIZ reflected, "DRM is an issue that affects all people, no matter what their political beliefs are." This was the basis on which the programme was able to continue to achieve in challenging circumstances.

Through careful communication and negotiation, the relevant actors were able to engage in CB for DRM despite the political challenges. INGC and GIZ demonstrated flexibility by adapting their approach to the extenuating circumstances.

3.5.2 Comprehensive Planning

Definition: *The need to carefully design interventions so that they are appropriate, responsive and sustainable. It includes planning on the basis of existing capacity and capacity gaps, and appropriate scheduling of interventions so that pressure to show visible results does not undermine capacity development. Also critical is planning for the long-term sustainability of capacity gains after the withdrawal of interventions.*

Research question: *What has been the approach to full programme planning?*

- PRO-GRC I and II were each conceived based on an evaluation of BMZ's preceding DRM programme one year prior to its completion. (The programme origins are described further in the next section on Ownership and Partnership.) As a starting point for the programmes, a series of consultative meetings were conducted with relevant stakeholders to analyse the baseline (existing capacity) and contextual elements for each programme indicator and then formulate a strategy for achieving the indicators. This consultative approach was used at all levels from the national, provincial, district and community levels. Interviewees from national and district level INGC, district level government and communities indicated that the programme design for PRO-GRC was appropriate to meet CB for DRM needs

- Timetabling for the 2-year PRO-GRC I programme was designed to introduce DRM structures and systems in two provinces. PRO-GRC II was a 3-year programme envisioned to reinforce the structures and systems developed in PRO-GRC I and expand into new districts and a new province. The strategy for PRO-GRC II was to build INGC's capacity to monitor and maintain what had been established during the programme and then replicate it on a national scale. Interviewees from GIZ and INGC reflected that the timetabling of both programmes was adequate to meet the programme indicators. According to one interviewee, designing a new system is fairly easy, but the implementation and functional capacity building to operationalise those systems is much more challenging and timetabling should take this into account. The box below describes in more detail the importance of sufficient timetabling for functional capacity building.

Box 3 Timescales for functional capacity building

Achieving goals in functional capacity for DRM within the timeframe of a programme has been a fairly constant challenge to the majority of CB for DRM programmes studied under this research. The fragile contexts in which these programmes have operated have had a plethora of impacts, all of which put increased pressure on implementing agencies to achieve objectives within a certain timeframe. The exception has been PRO-GRC where evidence suggested that sufficient timetabling was recognised as a programme strength (PRO-GRC, 2013).

GIZ prioritises functional capacity building as part of its sustainability strategy. The first consideration for time planning was that stakeholders must first develop their technical capacity through raising awareness and developing knowledge and skills related to DRM/CCA. Technical capacity formed the basis for, or the enabling environment for, functional capacity to take place which was accounted for in the programme.

One interviewee recalled that at the beginning of PRO-GRC, many of the stakeholders automatically assumed that a programme on DRM would have a significant focus on provision of infrastructure and equipment. It took more time to gain ownership for functional capacity building because it is much more difficult to "see" the results. Having said this, it should be noted that the successes of the preceding PRODER programme also provided an enabling environment for PRO-GRC and contributed to their ability to meet their indicators within the planned timeframe. Having the evidence that there was already a tested and functioning DRM system and structure in one area, was helpful to gain ownership for PRO-GRC more quickly.

Another consideration for functional capacity building time-tabling was that programme beneficiaries need time to realise and adjust to new responsibilities in DRM. Many of the cross-sectoral actors and the communities had assumed that INGC was responsible for everything to do with disasters rather than it being a shared responsibility across multiple actors.

Actors then needed the time and space to come to the realisation themselves that change was needed. GIZ and INGC conducted a phased process which included consultative meetings, trainings and facilitated interactive exercises which led stakeholders to identify and accept responsibility for both the problems and the solutions.

Effective timetabling was also seen as a coping mechanism for turnover within government. One GIZ team member said, "If our indicator said we needed to work with five people, then we would end up working with 20 because so many staff members came and went over the lifetime of the project".

- The future sustainability for PRO-GRC was described both as a success and a challenge by programme stakeholders. Sustainability mechanisms included: 1) Development of national DRM knowledge base and supporting materials; 2) Gradual shift in support levels to implement DRM and CCA measures; 3) Building INGC capacity to monitor, maintain and replicate PRO-GRC activities.

- The establishment of a nationally approved DRM knowledge base has been an important contributing factor to the sustainability of PRO-GRC according to interviewees. The inclusive process to develop them has helped them to gain acceptance amongst stakeholders. They have been officially approved and there is a systematic way of tracking them is in place. Evidence suggested that the GIZ approach of gradually shifting support levels to INGC over a number of years, enhanced programme sustainability. One interviewee shared the example of contingency planning. In the first year an expert was used to help draw up with the initial plan outlining resources and preparations required. GIZ then facilitated a group of stakeholders to prepare the plan. In the second year, GIZ coached INGC to lead the process and provided technical advice only during contingency planning. By the third year INGC was leading the contingency planning process and several other departments joined to enable a national system of pre-positioned resources in strategic locations around the country and emergency

funds set aside in the budgets. This is now routine at INGC and they no longer need external support in contingency planning. A similar approach was also used in building INGC's capacity to maintain and monitor DRM systems and structures. INGC has now fully integrated the monitoring system. The systems and structures developed in the four provinces targeted have been replicated and benefits of the PRO-GRC programme can now be felt nationally.

- INGC has gradually built a pool of trainers nationally and delivers quality trainings without external support. PRO-GRC saw the development and delivery of a number of DRM and CCA trainings at all levels throughout the country. GIZ facilitated INGC to standardise training materials, manuals and approaches nationally. At the same time, PRO-GRC trainings were adapted to the needs of each audience by selecting modules that were most relevant to them. Trainings were delivered in Portuguese and local languages although training materials were only available in Portuguese and sometimes English or German. Participants of trainings described trainings as well-structured and successful in terms of meeting their objectives. In the earlier stages of the programme new trainers from INGC learned by observing others, but as materials were developed and institutionalised, training of trainers (ToT) workshops were offered. After providing ToT workshops, more experienced trainers would accompany new trainers in their first delivery. New trainers were provided with feedback and had opportunities to ask questions. One interviewee remarked that this process contributed to increased quality of training over the lifetime of the programme. There was evidence that INGC now has the capacity to deliver practical and relevant training workshops through stimulating methodologies such as simulation exercises, hazard mapping and facilitated action planning.

- One of the more significant challenges to sustainability has been economic constraints which make the DRM process overly dependent on resources from external sources. For example, faltering DRM equipment (radios, bicycles, spare wheels, kits given at the beginning of the programme only) have caused a lack of motivation and inability to function according to local DRM committees. While two interviewees mentioned that there is the ability to access funds for community level DRM plans from district budgets, the communities interviewed seemed entirely unaware of this possibility and felt powerless to implement their action plans.

- Another challenge to sustainability was the lack of institutionalisation of the integration of DRM/CCA into planning processes. While interviewees from two target districts were still actively practicing integration of DRM in planning, they explained that the DRM elements are often cut out of the plans at the provincial level (PRO-GRC, 2009). In one district, the issue was successfully addressed by making DRM a cross-cutting issue in the plans rather than something that was added to the bottom on the plan. A former district administrator said, "We learned that it's too easy [for the provincial level] to cut something off the bottom of the budget and plan. It looks less important if it's the last thing." Two interviewees suggested that the lack of attention to planning stakeholders at the provincial and national levels was a shortfall of the programme.

- PRO-GRC was managed using a GTZ management model for sustainable development called Capacity WORKS. The PRO-GRC monitoring system was based on the model and gave a useful and flexible approach that was highly appreciated by interviewees from GIZ and from INGC. Monitoring for PRO-GRC was the responsibility of the M&E officer and was conducted four times per year. An annual report was also produced following facilitated meetings with stakeholders. Monitoring reports were designed around programme indicators. A colour-coded reporting system quickly showed the reader the status of each indicator. This reporting system

was adapted to also use shapes to indicate indicator status after it was discovered the INGC did not always have access to colour printing.

- Evaluations were conducted four times during the life of PRO-GRC I and II. The baseline survey at the beginning of each programme was used to create the reference parameters for future evaluations, thereby enabling measurement of the progress and the impact achieved by the project (PRO-GRC, 2010). A year before the end of Phases I and II, an evaluation of the programme was conducted to assess programme impact and identify best practices and lessons learned. It was also used to determine whether another phase would be needed. The evaluations were semi-independent in that they were done by GIZ staff or consultants visiting from Germany. The evaluation visit was typically 2-3 weeks followed by a discussion with the teams about the findings. Evaluations were used to improve approaches and inform future BMZ/GIZ programmes. Formal reports were sent to BMZ in German and generally not shared with the GIZ team members in Mozambique.

- All GIZ team members in Mozambique spoke highly of the M&E system for the following reasons: 1) There was a 1-week training for the GIZ team at the beginning of the programmes on how to use the system which contributed to more effective programme planning and collaborative working; 2) The approach to M&E was participatory and offered opportunities for open and solution-focused discussions with partners; 3) The monitoring focused on outcomes rather than activities giving maximum freedom to adapt activities so they were appropriate to the local situation.

3.5.3 Ownership / partnership

Definition: *The need to ensure that those targeted for capacity development have a clear stake in the initiative and its design and implementation, again to help ensure it is appropriate, effective and sustainable. Ownership is likely to rest on active participation, clear statements of responsibilities, engagement of leaders, and alignment with existing DRM/DRR strategies.*

Research question: *How has ownership been fostered?*

- Disaster risk is not generally a programmatic priority for GIZ/BMZ in Mozambique. However, as one interviewee described it, “DRM was pushed onto the agenda as a result of the 2000-2001 floods”. The government of Mozambique requested BMZ to help them in the process of improving DRM to include a shift of focus from response to prevention. BMZ brought a specialist from Latin America with extensive experience of developing DRM systems after Hurricane Mitch in Central America to assess the situation and design a response. As a result, PRO-GRC was preceded by a programme called “PRODER” which was conducted from 2000-2003 and promoted rural development and decentralisation of DRM in Buzi district, an area heavily affected by the 2000 floods.

- The programme implementers and designers were INGC (in partnership with GIZ) and thereby PRO-GRC reflected national strategies and priorities for disaster risk management. PRO-GRC I was aligned to national food security policies and the Action Plan for the Reduction of Poverty in Mozambique (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper-PRSP II). In this paper, the devastating effects of natural disasters on the country’s economic development are noted and improved disaster risk management support was seen as an important contributing factor to reducing poverty (PRO-GRC, 2005). PRO-GRC I and II contributed to the development of the National Master Plan for Prevention and Mitigation of Natural Disasters. PRO-GRC was also aligned to the Hyogo Framework for Action, of which Mozambique was a signatory (GFDRR, 2009).

- PRO-GRC was aligned to government strategy from the earliest stages which helped to ensure that INGC and other stakeholders in DRM would prioritise the programme activities. Several interviewees also attributed a strong sense of ownership to PRO-GRC to the fact that the floods of 2000 and 2001 had such devastating effects on the country and that the frequency and impact of disasters had increased dramatically in the past fifteen years. The context of frequent disasters provided an enabling environment for PRO-GRC.

- The GIZ team strongly emphasised the importance of building strong and inclusive relationships with stakeholders as tantamount to CB for DRM programme success in Mozambique. As a first step to building partnerships with stakeholders, it was important to fully recognise the context of working with government. One interviewee said, “You have to have a lot of respect for bureaucracy. If you don’t take the time and resources to fully address the required protocols with government, you cannot function in Mozambique”. INGC staff recognised that GIZ was respectful of government protocols, as opposed to some other international actors, which facilitated better working and enhanced the relationship. GIZ and INGC interviewees alike also found that GIZ’s physical presence in INGC’s offices as an important success factor for positive relationships. This arrangement meant that there could be regular interactions and constant support. One interviewee from CENOE commented, “GIZ were accepted by INGC and treated as staff members during the project”.

- Interviewees also stressed that stakeholders in Mozambique build trust with each other through social interactions more than written agreements. One interviewee reflected, “Verbal relations are more important than written words in this context. You would never take a signed Memorandum of Understanding to the government and remind them that they didn’t do their part. It would not get you anywhere here”. The GIZ team highlighted that sitting together, socialising and sharing food and drink with stakeholders was an important way of building partnerships. In this sense, GIZ staff needed to have respect for people in their interactions and know the context very well to be able to conduct programme activities well.

- The role of leadership in galvanising the sense of ownership and partnership emerged as a common theme amongst PRO-GRC stakeholders. GIZ leadership was described as innovative and dynamic in their style of working. One GIZ team member expressed, “Because people were motivated on the [GIZ] team, they attracted other people to get involved”. When it came to motivating DRM stakeholders to participate in the programme, it was felt that the advisors must have influential skills and the capacity to galvanise ownership when it was not there before. For example, at the national level, CENOE was made possible by a strong involvement of several institutions that provided crucial information to enable the emergency centre to operate. The PRO-GRC team met planners, the water department and the meteorological departments. An interviewee from the PRO-GRC team explained, “You must build a strong relationship with them and give them very strong roles, so they feel they are a part of the process”. An interviewee from the government also emphasised that leaders play a crucial role in effective capacity building. It was very important that leaders were respected. He said, “A community leader should never be seen in any way as an assistant in your programme, but as a key decision-maker in disaster risk management”.

- One GIZ team member also underlined that it was important to be empathetic and sensitive to programme counterparts who are potentially contending with heavy workloads, working with limited resources and who may have different priorities. Where possible, the GIZ team took steps to ensure they were limiting the burden to be placed on government staff during

programme implementation. As an example, if a DRM document needed to be translated into Portuguese, copied and disseminated to stakeholders, GIZ would attempt to lighten the burden by doing the first two steps for INGC rather than giving them the entire task. While the focus was to build capacity to continue without GIZ's help, it was important to find the right balance in the level of support.

- There was a strong indication that community level ownership was essential to the success of CB for DRM in PRO-GRC. One representative from INGC said, "Involving communities was the most important element to our success. We showed them the advantages of the system and gave them space to do the monitoring themselves. We monitored their progress and provided support". Another GIZ team member explained that convincing communities that DRM was their own problem and they should be part of the solution as a way of stimulating community contributions. The three local DRM committees met by the research team had all be in existence for over nine years. The teams are self-motivated to reduce disaster risk because of the continued threat of disasters in their context and their commitment to improving the lives of their fellow community members. All individuals interviewed were confident in their ability to carry out their roles and they were proud of the fact that no lives had been lost in disasters since their teams came into existence. Longer term committee members indicated that they were motivated to stay on the team by being promoted into roles with increasing responsibilities, attending trainings where they could mix and share ideas with other committees and representing their committees at higher levels such as meetings at the district and provincial levels.

- A key challenge for maintaining motivation for DRM work at the community level was identified as lack of incentives such as equipment for the team (radios, batteries, emergency kits) and compensation for their time and efforts. Some DRM committees had received equipment in the early stages of the programme and others had not. Regardless, according to interviewees all committees were currently working with insufficient equipment and lack of DRM supplies. The longest standing DRM committee felt strongly that they had contributed a lot of work over the years and that since INGC staff are paid, they should also be paid. One interviewee commented, "[Participating on the committee] is difficult. We are poor. We have to manage our farms. We need to eat and we need to send our kids to school". INGC and GIZ had policies against paying incentives to any programme participant because it was not seen as sustainable.

- In the vulnerability reduction component, establishing ownership was a challenge due to the front-loaded work requirement to implement new agricultural practices. A "groove-based" ploughing technique required a labour intensive movement of earth at the start which put several farmers off. Eventually, the programme component lost interest and farmers began using the seeds and tools with other intentions. GIZ staff remedied the situation by suggesting that farmers pool together to help each other with the heavy labour at the beginning. It was found that farmers were unable to keep their motivation to help the others for such intense work. The solution was to do the work in the dry season when there was more free time and only help each other for two hours/day. Another challenge to partnership was using seconded staff from the ministries to conduct trainings and participate in DRM activities. These seconded staff members were given no incentives and when presented with the additional work, they lacked ownership to participate fully.

3.5.4 Integration of Actors and Scales

Definition: *The need to build capacity to coordinate across scales and to work with other stakeholders. Capacity building can act to bridge capacity and communication gaps that commonly exist between national and local levels. Initiatives can focus on building capacity of coalitions of stakeholders, and on building local people's capacity to interact with other stakeholders.*

Research question: *How has the programme built capacity across scales and actors?*

- PRO-GRC was designed to improve capacity at the national, provincial, district and community levels. At all levels, support was provided for institutionalisation of DRM structures and systems through technical, procedural and organisational advice, training, provision of guidelines and manuals to establish a DRM/CCA knowledge base. One of the programme's main features was to decentralise responsibility both in emergency response and reducing risk from the national level to provincial and district levels (PRO-GRC, 2009). Additionally, at community and district levels the programme aimed to reduce vulnerability to extreme weather through improved agricultural practices and established local DRM committees to improve DRM and manage river-based EWSs.

- The PRO-GRC team prioritised improved communication and interactions between stakeholders at all levels. According to a PRO-GRC partner and a commentator, the PRO-GRC team actively pursued meeting and engaging new stakeholders throughout the programme. DRM stakeholders such as civil society, the private sector and churches were actively engaged in PRO-GRC activities which contributed to better inter-scalar and inter-actor understanding of DRM/CCA issues.

- Learning from the south-south cooperation improved Mozambique actors' understanding of how to devolve DRM decision-making authority from the provincial level to lower levels. Prior to PRO-GRC, Mozambique had a more hierarchical and vertical structure so the introduction of the bottom-up approach was quite new. As a rule, the PRO-GRC team prioritised working from the community level as communities are the first to experience and respond to disasters. According to four interviewees, this process of linking government to traditional leaders paved the way to the successful establishment of inter-scalar DRM between communities and government.

Box 4 PRO-GRC Techniques for Improving Inter-Scalar DRM Capacity

Evidence indicated PRO-GRC excelled in improving inter-scalar DRM through the design of structures, systems and activities. Below is a list of some of the notable mechanisms used in PRO-GRC:

- **Sub commissions for DRM**: The establishment of sub commissions with parallel designations between levels proved to be an effective strategy. The individuals on the local, district and provincial level DRM committees were nominated to perform distinct DRM-related roles such as: early warning systems representative, disaster needs assessment representative etc. This helped them to gain ownership in their individual roles in DRM. There were separate activities for the sub commissions to meet and discuss issues related specifically to their counterparts at different levels. Sub-commissions knew who to discuss concerns with and report to at each level. Interviewees felt that this system worked well in terms of improving communication at all times, but the impact was most evident when it came

time to preparing for approaching hazards and responding to hazard events. One member of the CTDG shared the example: "…the local level assessors all report to the CTDGC level damage assessment commission. At this level, we can globalise and harmonise the findings and react quickly".

- **Inter-Scalar Exposure Visits**: PRO-GRC also prioritised offering different levels of the DRM structure to visit each other's meetings as a learning experience. There were visits between different technical councils and district councils. Participants of these meeting appreciated the opportunity to meet DRM counterparts at different levels. One interviewee reflected, "This is a way to make people feel special. At every meeting at the beginning, people take turns to introduce themselves. One interviewee recalled that some people from the DRR committees went to the technical councils at the provincial level. She reflected, "The DRR committee members were really motivated and quite proud to be in the group and share what they had done".

- **Mixing Training Participants from Different Locations**: Local DRM committee participants valued the opportunity to mix with committees from different locations. Each DRM committee had an action plan and the trainings provided a space and opportunity to discuss what they were doing with others. One local DRM committee member shared, "We used what we learned from other committees on how to solve problems in different ways".

- **Opportunities to Facilitate**: The PRO-GRC team promoted opportunities for actors at different scales to present and facilitate exercises with each other. As an example, a member of a local DRR committee came to a district council meeting and facilitated the group to do a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis. Also, when international visitors came local DRR committees were invited to give presentations to them. One GIZ team member explained, "They were proud about what they had accomplished. Then they would show them their DRR kits and materials available for DRM. Even the director from the National Institute of Meteorology went for a visit and that had a big impact in the people".

- PRO-GRC actors also identified effective ways of enhancing DRM communications with communities. Within Mozambique, there are several local languages and many people do not speak the national language of Portuguese. The coordinator from the local DRM committee attends CTDGC meetings to learn about DRM and get updates to share with communities. The leader then adapts the messages so they will be meaningful to communities. One local DRM Committee coordinator said, "There is no use telling communities that the weather forecast is for normal to above-normal precipitation. You recommend to them what actions should be taken in practical terms". Interviewees stressed that it was also important to explain the nature of forecasts, that they are not definite and that the situation may change. This was important because they needed to retain trust with communities. One of the monitoring and evaluation officers also found that adapting the monitoring approach to focus on practical aspects of DRM was detrimental to understanding the outcomes of PRO-GRC at the community level. Community members failed badly when it came to recalling DRM terminology such as vulnerability, hazards and risks because those concepts did not exist in their culture. However community members could describe in great detail the threats that affected their community and exactly what they did and why in practical terms demonstrating a keen understanding of effective DRM practices.

3.5.5 Attention to Functional Capacity

***Definition**: The need to focus on functional capacity building – i.e. building the managerial and organizational capabilities needed to ensure effective decisions and actions can flow from technical know-how. It includes aspects such as improving coordination and decision-making processes. It also includes fostering an enabling environment, such as developing incentive structures for good performance and to ensure staff retention, as well as promoting the wider political conditions to support DRR as a priority.*

***Research question**: How is the mix of potential elements for CB targeted?*

- PRO-GRC combined technical and function aspects of CB, however greater emphasis was placed on functional elements to ensure sustainability. In terms of technical capacity, the programme offered DRM/CCA technical trainings, technical advice from GIZ and the representatives from other Southern countries on management DRM/CCA systems and structures and support for the creation of training materials and manuals. In addition the programme provided some materials and equipment to enable the implementation of DRM activities. The creation of improved technical capacity created the enabling environment for functional capacity to take place.

- Functional capacity was addressed by improving managerial capacity and coordination of INGC at all levels and to some extent between levels. GIZ's approach of modelling approaches and then gradually shifting responsibility to relevant institutions as well as their strategy to improve INGC's capacity to monitor and maintain their own work appears to have been a successful in improving functional capacity. Of note was the increased understanding and ownership of new roles and responsibilities between INGC and wider range of inter-sectoral DRM stakeholders from the national to district level. Participatory trainings and facilitated workshops allowed these stakeholders to apply new technical knowledge, recognise their responsibility for DRM and make better decisions on DRM issues.

- At the national and provincial levels, PRO-GRC has contributed to a strengthened legal framework and improved DRM/CCA planning with the Master Plan and inter-sectoral annual contingency planning. CENOE and its regional counterparts capture all information related to DRM in the country and it is now commonly referred to as the "heart of INGC". In addition, there was a strong indication that INGC is now proactively maintaining and replicating the work of PRO-GRC nationally and providing high quality DRM/CCA trainings.

- Integration of DRM/CCA into planning processes has had limited success, although evidence suggested that it does continue to be practiced in selected districts. In those districts visited by the research team, new public buildings are now located in areas deemed as lower risk. As mentioned previously, the impact would likely have been improved with more attention at the provincial and national levels to institutionalise the practices.

- Coordination and collaboration between communities and the district level through the creation of local and district level DRM committees and the establishment of EWSs were a significant achievement of PRO-GRC. Despite the challenges to programme sustainability, the structures and systems for DRM have continued and in some examples upscaled independently of GIZ since the end of the programme. For example, at the finish of PRO-GRC there were approximately 200 local DRM committees created through the programme. As of May 2015, there are approximately 1,000 local DRM committees operating across the country.

- The combination of technical and functional capacity building was seen as successful senior management of INGC and representatives at all levels. Interviewees agreed that DRM stakeholders are now actively pursuing a more holistic approach to DRM as a result of PRO-GRC. Interviewees at the provincial, district and community levels all pointed to reduction in lives lost as a result of disasters as the primary indicator that PRO-GRC has had its intended impact.

3.5.6 Contribution to Disaster Resilience

Definition: *The need for a more holistic DRR-influenced approach to DRM capacity. This includes attention to: understanding and planning for long-term changes in risk; moving beyond a focus on short-term emergency management to capacity in disaster prevention, mitigation and long-term recovery; prioritizing the reduction of vulnerability; targeting the needs of vulnerable groups; and addressing gender disparities in both vulnerability and capacity.*

Research question: *How has the programme captured wider aspects of the DRR approach?*

- PRO-GRC was designed to shift focus of DRM efforts from response-focused to mitigation and prevention-focused. The systems and structures created and supported served to improve response capacity through trainings, improved planning, provision of equipment and the creation of DRM structures at all levels including DRM committees and CENOE. These systems and structures; however, have also created and strengthened a more holistic approach to DRM to include a strengthened legal framework, and integration of DRM into cross-sectoral development planning. The vulnerability reduction component helped communities and farmers to be more resilient to disasters through improved agricultural practices and more sustainable livelihoods. The CCA elements were addressed more so towards the end of PRO-GRC II through awareness-raising and trainings. GIZ is currently implementing a new programme which further addresses CCA measures which were started in PRO-GRC.

- There was evidence that the PRO-GRC team prioritised the needs of vulnerable people through their programming approach. Firstly, the programme was targeted in areas that are highly vulnerable to disasters. Local DRM committees and district level government were keenly aware of the vulnerabilities in their geographic area and consciously made new decisions as a result of PRO-GRC. DRM committees at the community and district level shared several examples of how their activities led to improved DRM action. For example, the location of new social infrastructure is now located in areas of low risk. Hundreds of families reported moved from low-lying areas to higher areas as a result of the activities of local DRM activities and district administration.

- PRO-GRC placed a higher emphasis on addressing gender than was seen in any other case study example in this research. Training on gender issues was provided in Inhambane and Sofala districts as part of the DRM curriculum. District level DRM committees were able to discuss in detail the gender analysis they performed to inform decision-making in DRM planning. However, it was much more challenging for them to articulate exactly how that made any implication on contingency, response or development planning. The example of how they recognised gender roles was that women play an important role in society and therefore there is at least a 40% representation of women on the local DRM committees. The feeling was that representation of women in decision-making bodies (such as the local DRM committee) meant that their gender-related needs would be addressed. A gender analysis study was conducted specifically for the drought resilience component which identified how the agricultural practices

taught would have implications on gender roles. According to one interviewee INGC did not prioritise responding to the findings from the report.

- There was evidence that some progress has been made towards improved understanding of longer-term risk including climate change. GIZ has included CCA in the training curriculum through PRO-GRC and several interviewees felt confident in their knowledge of it. In one example, the GIZ discussed climate trends and potential impact of climate change during strategic planning at the national level. However, as one member of the GIZ team explained, “Wider resilience and prevention has a long way to go and remains at a low level”. GIZ continues to work in Mozambique to build on capacity gains from PRO-GRC. The current programme focuses specifically on CCA.

4 The Safer Schools Project

Table 2: Safer Schools Project at a glance

Research question	Overview at a glance
Which actors are involved in the CB activity?	The project was funded in part through the World Bank's Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) with additional funding from the implementing partner, UN-Habitat. National counterparts in the project included the Faculty of Architecture and Physical Planning of Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM-FAPF), Ministry of Education and Human Development (MINEDH), Ministry of Public Works, Housing and Water Resources (MOPHRH) and INGC.
What is the funding level and duration?	Total budget: approximately USD $600.000 for the project period of 31 months, July 2012 – February 2015. GFDRR contributed approximately $200,000 and UN-Habitat contributed $400,000 (UN-Habitat, 2014).
What is the scope of the activities?	Developing disaster resilient school building codes and guidelines on school safety and recommendations for their effective implementation through analysis of existing norms and regulations and risk mapping.
What is the geographical focus?	The project targeted the national level with most activities in Maputo. Assessments covered seven hazard prone provinces including Gaza, Inhambane, Maputo, Nampula, Sofala, Tete and Zambezia.

The second project selected as a case study was entitled *"Safer Schools Project: Developing Guidelines on School Safety and Resilient School Buildings Codes in Mozambique"* hereafter referred to as the Safer Schools Project (SSP).

The project was implemented by UN-Habitat and UEM-FAPF with a consortium of government ministries and agencies, with support from GFDRR. The overall project objective was:

- To develop disaster resilient school building codes and guidelines on school safety, and to produce recommendations for their effective implementation.

Project activities were targeted mainly at the national and institutional level. The capacity building activities included the creation of a consultative technical group (CTG), establishing an inter-ministerial working platform, outlining the guidelines on school safety and resilient school building codes, and producing a diagnostic of the current school construction environment and school risk assessment in Mozambique (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015, 2013; MINED, 2015).

This project is part of the GFDRR portfolio of projects in Mozambique. Although Phase 1 of the project only finished recently, it was selected as a case study by the research team because INGC

and the World Bank identified it as a strong example of a CB for DRM project with a high level of impact.

The OPM team focused on Phase I of the project, however the Safer School Project is about to start Phase II. Although the team did not study in-depth the components of Phase II, it will be referenced in this report to demonstrate certain points.

Phase II of Safer Schools will have three components: enhancing the policy and regulatory environment to increase the resilience of schools; understanding disaster and climate risks relevant to school construction; and improvement of the implementation of resilient school construction at the local level. In short, Phase II will serve as a pilot project to implement the building codes and recommendations created in Phase I (GFDRR, 2014a).

The activities of Safer Schools Phase I are described in more detail in sections 4.1 to 4.4, followed by an extended analysis in relation to the 6 principles of CB[3] in section 4.5.

4.1 Programme actors

The World Bank's GFDRR and UN-Habitat co-funded the project and provided technical assistance and strategic advice. GFDRR has operated in Mozambique since the 2000 floods, when Mozambique started to adopt a proactive risk reduction approach. They support the government in the integration of DRR into development policies and plans, the DRM legal framework, risk financing, risk assessment and contingency planning (GFDRR, 2014b). UN-Habitat has worked for more than a decade in Mozambique. They have worked and coordinated with the government and other partner organisations to reduce the vulnerability of the local population living in disaster-prone areas. (Francioni, 2012).

The project was conducted in partnership with a consortium of stakeholders from the school construction sector. The primary institutional counterparts for Safer Schools were:
MINEDH as the lead institutional coordinator of the project, MOPHRH and the Ministry of State Administration and Civil Service (MAEFP) through the National Institute of Disaster Management (INGC).

The project operated with the support of a technical team, comprised of 16 professionals from University Eduardo Mondlane-Faculty of Architecture and Physical Planning (UEM-FAPF) and UN-Habitat. This team provided expertise on DRM /DRR, architecture, engineering, legal advice, governance and sociology. A consultant partner from Madagascar was engaged to share recent experience in implementing a safer schools campaign and provide advice and guidance to the project team based on the experiences of Madagascar. In this south-south learning arrangement, the consultant was responsible for reporting on project outputs.

Partnerships were built with several institutions and agencies concerned with school building and building codes in general. International and national organisations, CSOs, private and public sector and other relevant government institutions were engaged to contribute towards the consultative processes and to ensure awareness, and adoption, of the code. Amongst these institutions were UNICEF, the Institute of Meteorology (INAM), various faculties from Eduardo Mondlane University and the Technical Council for Disaster Management (CTGC), (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015; MINED, 2015).

[3] The six principles were identified following a global literature review early in the research. A definition for each one is included in the text below.

The beneficiaries of Safer Schools Phase I are primarily government counterparts at the national level. Ultimately in Phase II, the programme is planned to benefit institutions at national, provincial and district levels, schools, school staff, students and communities.

4.2 Funding and timescales

The Safer Schools Project was originally envisioned to take 18 months. However the actual implementation time was 31 months. Amongst the challenges that delayed the project were stakeholders being diverted to respond to floods in 2013 and 2014, and the national elections in 2014 (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2014).

Funding for capacity building activities was provided by GFDRR and UN-Habitat. According to information provided by UN-Habitat, GFDRR provided USD 206,500 with support from the Brazilian government. UN-Habitat provided USD 406,000 from different sources including ECHO and UNICEF.

GFDRR sub-contracted UN-Habitat and the University of Eduardo Mondlane as the implementing partners. One interviewee stated that the budget was sufficient to cover all the project's activities. Government counterparts provided staff time and expenses for project activities.

Detailed information on the budget was not made available to the team, and figures given by GFDRR differ slightly from those provided by UN-Habitat. The table below was provided by UN-Habitat and is the most detailed breakdown available.

Table 3: Safer Schools budget breakdown

Description	World Bank (USD)	UN-Habitat (USD)	Sub-Total (USD)
Personnel & Contracts	160,000.00	260,000.00	420,000.00
Workshops	16,000.00	36,000.00	52,000.00
Missions & Field Assessment	12,500.00	86,000.00	98,500.00
Miscellaneous	18,000.00	24,000.00	42,000.00
Total	**206,500**	**406,000.00**	**612,500.00**

4.3 Geographical coverage

The Safer Schools project was primarily targeted at the national and institutional level; hence the majority of activities were conducted in Maputo (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015; MINED, 2015; GFDRR, 2015. However, to create the diagnostic of the current school construction environment in Mozambique, the project carried out field surveys at provincial level to technically assess the vulnerability of school buildings. A total of 637 classrooms in seven out of ten provinces in Mozambique were visited and assessed by the project. Gaza, Inhambane, Maputo, Nampula, Sofala, Tete and Zambézia were included in the assessment as they are categorised as highly exposed to natural hazards (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015; MINED, 2015).

4.4 CB activities

The Safer Schools Project operated at two scales: national and provincial level. The activities are described below by scale.

4.4.1 National / institutional level

Safer School Phase I was divided into five components:

Component 1 – *Inception package and launching of the project.* The first programme activity for Safer Schools was a workshop to launch the project. This was a key activity to map all the actors involved in the different aspects of the school construction cycle and to promote a participatory and collaborative approach to the Safer Schools Project. Representatives of technical institutes, academia, the private sector and central government participated in this workshop. As a result a Consultative Technical Group (CTG) was created to ensure the continuity of the participatory approach and to gather technical advice on risk mapping aspects, institutional arrangements, legal issues and technical solutions. In this workshop it was recognised that the problems with the school buildings were associated with factors such as limitations in norms and legislation and institutional and governance frameworks (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2014, 2015).

To formalise and officially establish the CTG, each institution involved in the workshop, as well as the project partners, were asked to appoint someone with the capacity to take decisions and respond to technical and institutional questions to act as a focal point. Eight meetings with the CTG were conducted during the life of the project (ibid.).

Component 2 – *Elaboration of a diagnostic of the current school construction environment in Mozambique.* This component was mostly addressed at the provincial level and described in the following section. Part of this component was a review of the legislation regarding the legal and technical building standards. With the data collected in the different provinces, the project also produced maps specifically relating to four hazards: floods, droughts, cyclones and earthquakes. These maps included, for the first time in Mozambique, the intensity of the natural hazards and covered different geographical areas (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015; MINED, 2015).

Component 3 – *Drafting the outline of the Guidelines on School Safety and Resilient School Building Codes.* The drafting of the codes was done taking into consideration the outcomes of various bilateral meetings, the findings of the assessments done in Component 2 and consultative meetings with CTG. Different construction stakeholders discussed and pre-validated the codes in the second workshop organised by the project. Comments and suggestions for improvement of the guidelines were made. From this workshop emerged a recommendation to establish an inter-ministerial working platform to increase institutional synergies (ibid.).

Component 4 – *Validation of the proposed guidelines and building codes.* For this component a third and final workshop was organised. Senior level stakeholders including department level directors, deputy directors and members of the CTG, as well as provincial technicians, attended the workshop in which the updated versions of the codes were presented. In this workshop all outputs that resulted from Components 1, 2 and 3 were presented. The different institutions attending committed to implement one or more recommendations derived from the diagnostic (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015).

Component 5 – *Documenting the implementation of the Safer Schools Project in Mozambique*. As part of the planned activities, the project documented the processes undertaken by the Safer Schools Project. The objective was that lessons learnt in Mozambique could contribute to the capacity of other countries. Therefore as part of the project a 'lessons learnt' report was produced and all the project outputs were translated from Portuguese to English (ibid.).

4.4.2 Provincial level

Component 2 was the only project component to include the provincial level. The provincial level activities included:

- Data collection and organisation of the data and information.

This was done through systematic interviews and questionnaires to institutions and professionals. A total of 20 in-depth interviews were conducted. As a result a matrix demonstrating institutional competencies and areas of responsibility was produced.

- School buildings vulnerability assessments.

Forms and surveys were used to collect data on general aspects of the schools in seven provinces. The results of the assessment demonstrated similar sets of challenges and problems which provided evidence of the shortfalls of school construction methods currently being used in Mozambique. Two booklets were produced: 1) a School Risk Assessment which covered four hazards: floods, droughts, cyclones, earthquakes (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015, MINED, 2015); and 2) a Catalogue of Technical Measures to Improve School Construction to inform school planners on how to plan for and build hazard-resistant structures. This document will be used in Phase II of the project to support trainings, the preparation of standards and capacity building activities in general (ibid.).

4.5 Analysis in relation to the six principles

In this section, the above-described programme is analysed in relation to six principles for effective capacity building in disaster risk management.

4.5.1 Flexibility/Adaptability

Definition: *The need to approach capacity building interventions flexibly, ensuring that the design of the programme can be adapted to the context in which it is applied rather than applied as an externally-imposed 'blueprint'. It includes working with and reinforcing existing skills, strategies, systems and capacities. It also includes understanding and accounting for the political and power dimensions that can contribute to or undermine capacity building.*

Research question: *How has the programme approached capacity development in a flexible manner, adapting the approach to context?*

- The Safer Schools project was designed to fit a need in Mozambique. Although the project is linked to the global UNISDR/GFDRR campaign entitled "One Million Safer Schools and Hospitals[4]," the trigger was the destruction of thousands of schools as a result of Cyclone Funso in 2012. The project is aligned to Mozambique's Master Plan for Prevention and Mitigation of Natural Disasters. UN-Habitat and UEM-FAPF was selected as a key partner to build and reinforce their capacity for DRM. The project was also shaped by the Mozambique government in partnership with World Bank and in this sense it reinforces existing national strategies and systems.

[4] This initiative is part of the Resilient Cities Global Campaign of UNISDR for 2010 and 2011, and builds upon the 2006-2007 Global Campaign on Safe Schools, and the 2008-2009 Global Campaign on Safe Hospitals. (=http://www.safe-schools-hospitals.net/en/AboutUs.aspx)

Box 5 Orienting CB to institutional needs

The guiding framework for the GFDRR requires 'evidence-based policy and strategy formulation'. This extends to CB efforts, which first require a capacity assessment in order to identify capacity development needs (GFDRR, 2010). One interviewee explained how this operated in Mozambique, noting that the institutional strengthening strategy was based on assessment of institutional needs, including, but not limited to, staff skills. "We identified that disaster risk institutions are still weak on risk assessment and on post-disaster recovery. We also recognise that the same institutions are very good on disaster response". The balance of support was therefore directed to prevention/mitigation and recovery, rather than preparedness and response, including strengthening the way that institutions contributing to DRM work together and share information. However, it also should be noted that these priorities accord strongly with those of the GFDRR in general.

- After Cyclone Funso, a post disaster needs assessment exercise was completed by INGC, UEM and UN-Habitat, with the Madagascan consultant as lead, to diagnose the damage of schools. The assessment led project stakeholders to realise that the problems identified could not be addressed solely by the INGC, but would require a multi-agency solution with shared responsibilities. Safer Schools was developed according to a series of assessments and consultative workshops to ensure the project evolved to build capacity across institutions to provide safer schools in Mozambique. According to a lessons learned report, relevant ministries and partners highly appreciated the participatory process used and the technically sound decisions made possible by multi-sectoral input. Stakeholders felt that the project responded to needs and adapted to demands over time (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015).

- Interviewees from several agencies appreciated the active role of the World Bank in project design and implementation. The World Bank provided partners with advice and helped them to make effective decisions during the project.

- One of the project's first steps involved engaging a consultant from Madagascar to benefit from a south-south learning arrangement. Interviewees from the project agreed that this was a useful approach. The fact that Madagascar had a similar context to Mozambique contributed to the relevance of their suggestions. The experience from Madagascar was found to be useful and easily adapted to the Mozambique context.

- INGC's flexible approach to project management meant that they were willing to transfer programme responsibility and power to MINEDH. When INGC realised that MINEDH was better positioned to take leadership of the project, they willingly did so. GFDRR also demonstrated flexibility in the change of project leadership. This enhanced the sustainability and ownership of Safer Schools.

4.5.2 Comprehensive Planning

Definition: *The need to carefully design interventions so that they are appropriate, responsive and sustainable. It includes planning on the basis of existing capacity and capacity gaps, and appropriate scheduling of interventions so that pressure to show visible results does not undermine capacity development. Also critical is planning for the long-term sustainability of capacity gains after the withdrawal of interventions.*

Research question: *What has been the approach to full programme planning?*

- There was evidence of wide consultation with different stakeholders during the process of assessing needs and identifying solutions, which helped to inform project planning. Needs assessments played a crucial role in identifying an appropriate and responsive design for the Safer Schools project. As mentioned in the previous section, the project began with a post disaster needs assessment. The findings indicated a need for new schools, retrofitting of damaged schools and a longer-term strategy to institutionalise safe building practices for schools. The existing pool of donors had already been financing school construction programmes but these were not based on DRM-informed practice. The World Bank, therefore, decided to support the institutionalisation of safer schools practices and the building of new schools.

- A high level Steering Committee was created to guide the project and drive forward decision-making processes. The Steering Committee was comprised of the main directors of the initiative including the Director of Planning and Cooperation from DIPLAC-UCEE, the Directors of MOPH-DNE and the Director General of INGC, with advisory support from GFDRR. As the project evolved, strong leadership was maintained by MINEDH in close coordination with MOPHRH. The Safer Schools team was invited to several national level meetings to present progress. Several interviewees commented that one of the more important project achievements was the effective and collaborative working between ministries and the high profile afforded to the project (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2014).

- Timetabling for the project was a challenge. It was originally designed to match the 18 month timescale specified in the Terms of Reference, but in reality it took nearly twice as long. Despite getting off to a rapid start with quickly released World Bank funding and a high level of commitment from stakeholders, the project was subsequently delayed. The time delay was attributed to four main factors: the results of the needs assessment produced a higher level of need than was originally anticipated, the participatory nature of the project required more time than was anticipated, further flooding in 2013 and 2014 detracted attention from the project to disaster response and the elections in October 2014 made an impact on project stakeholders. Interviewees stated that political elections slowed down project progress for up to six months while the newly elected governments agreed roles and responsibilities. Because Safer Schools was highly involved with the ministries at the national level, the project had to be flexible to cope with challenges.

- The sustainability of the capacity built by the Safer Schools Project is mixed according to interviewees from different agencies. On the positive side, there has been evidence of a high degree of ownership from the MINEDH, the MOPHRH, INGC and UEM-FAPF during Phase I. INGC initiated the engagement of UEM-FAPF on the project to ensure that capacity gains would be retained in Mozambique. Some stakeholders argued that because the project is within government, there is commitment and political will which will therefore make the project sustainable. This appears to be more of an assumption than a systematically formulated exit strategy from the donor.

- Progress towards sustainability is likely to be a key challenge for the next phase – especially ensuring that district level can effectively plan and design using the recommended measures, and have adequate access to resources to do so. Phase 2 will include piloting the project in two provinces and then expanding the project nation-wide. Capacity building activities planned for Phase 2 are training of building contractors and government technical staff and the creation of risk-informed building regulations from the MOPHRH and construction norms for schools

from the MINEDH. Interviewees were optimistic that these activities will help ensure the sustainability of the activities done in phase 1 of the project. They are confident that the project will progress to the next phase as the MINEDH has endorsed the recommendations from the Safer Schools Final Report and there are indications of interest from donors.

- Monitoring and evaluation for Safer Schools was done through regular updates and reports on deliverables from UN-Habitat to World Bank. No M&E framework was put in place. UN-Habitat performed a final evaluation in the form of a Lessons Learned report.

4.5.3 Ownership / partnership

Definition: *The need to ensure that those targeted for capacity development have a clear stake in the initiative and its design and implementation, again to help ensure it is appropriate, effective and sustainable. Ownership is likely to rest on active participation, clear statements of responsibilities, engagement of leaders, and alignment with existing DRM/DRR strategies.*

Research question: *How has ownership been fostered?*

- An INGC interviewee noted that in the years leading up to the Safer Schools Project, school buildings incurred greater damage from disasters than other buildings. The destruction of schools in Cyclone Funso in 2012 was the catalyst to take action to improve school safety. After the disaster, the World Bank through GFDRR approached INGC to agree first steps. At the same time, there was an offer of help to INGC from the former task team leader of Safer Schools in Madagascar. From the beginning of the project, the relevant organisations were involved. The project was a product of needs identified by the Mozambique government which contributed to the high level of ownership of the Safer Schools Project.

- Several interviewees attribute the success of the project to the effective selection of stakeholders to participate. Early in the process, the implementers recognised the project could not be achieved without inter-institutional participation. The assessment identified ownership from key Ministries as essential to the project's success. INGC strongly shaped how the project progressed in terms of actors. For example, they took the lead in identifying UEM as a key partner because they wanted the project to improve institutional disaster risk management practices such as risk assessments, diagnosis and hazard mapping. The MINEDH would play a key role since they have overall responsibility of managing the education sector. In addition those who regulate, design and build schools were targeted for capacity development in the project and gained a strong sense of ownership by becoming a part of the solution to the problem according to an interviewee from the MOPHRH.

- There was strong evidence that the high level of commitment to the project at the leadership level (including political leadership) greatly enabled institutional ownership and thereby the success of the Safer Schools project. In Component 1, a stakeholder mapping exercise was done to target the relevant individuals to engage. An interviewee from UEM shared that gaining support from high level leaders was essential and their engagement was achieved by having an assessment report with solid proof documenting the problem. The Safer School team then requested these high level leaders to designate a focal point to work with who had decision-making power which ensured that those who attended meetings could drive the project forward. The leadership at high levels with the commitment and enthusiasm from key project officers were key in driving the project forward.

- One interviewee from the MINEDH explained that when high levels of government are committed, the same commitment will automatically be channelled to lower government structures and technical staff. He said, “From the commitment of higher government officials, it is easy to get synergy downstream.” It was also helpful that stakeholders could see Ministers and Deputy Ministers physically present in the meetings and seminars which had a positive impact.

- There was a strong sense of ownership of the project achievements by the MINEDH, and a related sense of responsibility and commitment. Interviewees from the MINEDH emphasised that their motivation was based on the cumulative destruction of schools that they had witnessed over several years. The frequency of disasters had increased which heightened their concern for the education sector as a whole. The MOPHRH fully participated in all of the project meetings from the beginning, even though their role did not come into play until later in the project (i.e. when the codes and regulations needed legalisation). This ensured they were aware of the needs and engaged in the process. The level of ownership for the Safer Schools project is likely to have a lasting impact on the education sector. One interviewee commented on the impact of Safer Schools on the relationship between MINEDH and MOPHRH, “This was so successful in terms of engaging them and creating ownership, to the point that those institutions now talk about this project as their project”.

- The GFDRR specialist showed a keen level of interest in the project providing technical advice, support and participating in field visits. Three interviewees pointed out that the sense of partnership with the donor was exceptional in this project and contributed to an improved project outcome.

4.5.4 Integration of Actors and Scales

Definition: *The need to build capacity to coordinate across scales and to work with other stakeholders. Capacity building can act to bridge capacity and communication gaps that commonly exist between national and local levels. Initiatives can focus on building capacity of coalitions of stakeholders, and on building local people’s capacity to interact with other stakeholders.*

Research question: *How has the programme built capacity across scales and actors?*

- A key achievement of the project was seen to be the collaboration between MINEDH and MOPHRH, which created seeds for future coordination. Representatives from both ministries were highly engaged in the project activities. Strong opinions expressed that the new collaboration was extraordinary and had never happened before.

- Safer Schools benefitted from early recognition of the relevant stakeholders for school building in Mozambique. In Component 1, an in-depth stakeholder mapping exercise helped programme implementers to understand the contextual environment and design an appropriate strategy for engaging them. As mentioned in the previous section, engagement of the highest level stakeholders paved the way for successful implementation of Safer Schools.

- A gap in inter-scalar working remains at the end of Phase I of the project. While seven provinces participated in the school assessments, it is the district level who will ultimately decide on the sites and locations for new schools. There was no clear evidence of vertical capacity building in Phase I. It will be crucial that Phase II builds capacity for vertical coordination and capacity at provincial and district levels as well as contractors, the private

sector and other relevant local stakeholders if the Safer Schools guidelines are to work in practice.

- The inclusion of UEM as an integral partner was also seen as a positive experience which built on and reinforced the capacity of the UEM faculty. According to interviewees UEM worked fully with the government system including INGC and the Ministries. UEM also had the capacity to help other partners who were contending with challenges related to the lack of coherent and accurate data. Data from UEM research helped project implementers to validate and substantiate existing information to make informed project decisions.

4.5.5 Attention to Functional Capacity

***Definition**: The need to focus on functional capacity building – i.e. building the managerial and organizational capabilities needed to ensure effective decisions and actions can flow from technical know-how. It includes aspects such as improving coordination and decision-making processes. It also includes fostering an enabling environment, such as developing incentive structures for good performance and to ensure staff retention, as well as promoting the wider political conditions to support DRR as a priority.*

***Research question**: How is the mix of potential elements for CB targeted?*

- In the early stages of the Safer School Project, key stakeholders learned technical aspects of safer school construction through the Madagascar experience and the results of the assessments in Mozambique. Functional capacity was built through the establishment of a platform for discussion and the involvement of actors related to school building. This was followed by a series of meetings and consultations which improved understanding of the legal and institutional environment across a number of sectors and institutions. These meetings and workshops presented opportunities to apply knowledge through the process of coordination and collaborative decision-making in relation to Safer Schools. Evidence suggested that this combination of technical and functional capacity building was an effective means for improving capacity for DRM.

Box 6 GFDRR's approach to capacity building

As a global support facility for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, GFDRR articulates capacity building at a range of scales, from local to international, as one of its core services to low and middle-income countries (GFDRR, 2010). In much GFDRR documentation the terms 'capacity building' or 'capacity development' refer mainly to a system of professional training delivered through online courses and in-country learning events, based around a global DRM core curriculum (GFDRR, 2011). Other activities conducted in-country are also seen to contribute to skills development through a combination of training, mentoring on-the-job and networking/knowledge sharing. A key example of this is post-disaster needs assessment (PDNA), again using established tools and guidance materials (GFDRR, 2010; GFDRR, 2014c). GFDRR also supports policy forums and global dialogues for high-level officials and opinion leaders, which are viewed as a mechanism for raising awareness and fostering cross-country learning (GFDRR, 2014c).

Here we have good examples of the way that it is difficult in practice to separate technical from functional capacity building. Both the PDNA and forum/dialogue activities could be classed as technical capacity building, but both also clearly have a functional element too in fostering new decision-making structures and creating an enabling environment. GFDRR also provides a good

example of how labelling of activities can obscure the extent to which capacity building is integrated into interventions. The capacity building elements of GFDRR activity appear to extend beyond those components explicitly described as capacity building in programme documents. GFDRR also places strong emphasis on support for enhancing coordination mechanisms, strengthening risk assessment procedures, and promoting the integration of DRM into planning processes – all of which we would class in this study as capacity building support.

- There is evidence that the commitment generated through the consultative process during the Safer Schools Project has created an enabling environment for lasting implementation. Some norms and regulations are not yet passed by the Council of Ministers. However, interviewees from the MINEDH have indicated they are already following some of the recommendations now and have reviewed school designs to include them. This is to say that they are prepared to take action even though they are not yet required to do so. Also, two interviewees shared that the provincial level education technical staff responsible for school buildings are already taking the some of the recommendations from the Safer Schools Project into account when planning new schools.

- Safer Schools has undertaken the first systematic analysis of recurrent construction failures and a valid risk assessment (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015). The improved knowledge base regarding school planning is an important output of Safer Schools. The introduction of agreed maps with zoning and risk information and improved building codes and training materials will enhance the sustainability of the project and contribute to a consistent and coordinated understanding of how to address the need for safer schools. Along with expected improvements in regulations, these outputs are enabling MINEDH and MOPHRH and other relevant stakeholders to make improved decisions on the location and construction of schools. The improved knowledge base could also be used as evidence to justify and advocate for further donor investment. One interviewee from government explained, “We have scientific proof to show [potential donors] and the visual materials to convince them to build better”.

4.5.6 Contribution to Disaster Resilience

Definition: *The need for a more holistic DRR-influenced approach to DRM capacity. This includes attention to: understanding and planning for long-term changes in risk; moving beyond a focus on short-term emergency management to capacity in disaster prevention, mitigation and long-term recovery; prioritizing the reduction of vulnerability; targeting the needs of vulnerable groups; and addressing gender disparities in both vulnerability and capacity.*

Research question: *How has the programme captured wider aspects of the DRR approach?*

- Originally, Safer Schools started as an urgent reactionary measure to Cyclone Funso - with the objective to do a needs assessment of school damage and to create a response and recovery project to aid the affected areas. However, through its consultative assessments and alignment to the National Master Plan, the project evolved to a more holistic approach that would address longer-term recovery, prevention and mitigation needs. This project provides a clear case of progression to a DRR-influenced approach. The main objective of Safer Schools was to develop disaster resilient school building codes and guidelines on school safety and to produce recommendations for their effective implementation. The project is fundamentally aimed at reducing risk (UN-Habitat, UEM, 2015).

- There was no clear evidence that Safer Schools directly took climate change specifically into account. One interviewee pointed out that while stakeholders are generally aware of climate change, there is not sufficient data available to adequately address needs in relation to meteorological parameters (such as the possibility of stronger winds). However, the hazard maps and research conducted promoted progress towards resilience by enabling government to make better decisions in terms of what type of school construction to do according to the risk assessment of each area.

- Awareness-raising of the genuine potential for creating safer schools was a key product of the project – hazard impact was already understood well, but stakeholders came to understand that they can take account of risk when dealing with building contractors – especially because the studies demonstrated that this can be cost-effective. The project aims to convince the pool of donors for school construction that investment in risk-informed school building is efficient in the long run even though the initial investment may be higher.

- INGC has an institutional mandate through the Master Plan to ensure that DRR is promoted across sectors in an effort to improve DRR mainstreaming. Safer Schools has been a positive step in this direction by improving awareness and ownership of DRM issues across several ministries and institutions. Interviewees from the UN discussed how the project led to organisational leaders and donors realising the cost-effectiveness of providing school structures that are hazard resilient. An interviewee from the MOPHRH indicated that there is an organisational interest in improving the quality of buildings in general in Mozambique and the Safer Schools experience has added value to their work. There were also signs that mainstreaming of DRR may gain the interest of the Ministry of Health and other sectors as a result of the project.

- There was no evidence that the programme addressed gender whilst designing and implementing the first phase of the project.

- The Safer Schools Project addressed vulnerability in that it was focused on children as a vulnerable group, and prioritized them because of their vulnerability related to the damage susceptibility of existing schools. The experience of Cyclone Funso generated direct concern and urgency. Phase II of the project will be piloted in two vulnerable areas affected by the cyclone, but is expected to reduce risks for children and the education sector nationally.

5 Towards capacity building – key lessons from the Mozambique case study

This concluding section brings together a series of key lessons on CB for DRM derived from the case study – drawing both from discussion of the specific programmes and from the wider context of DRM intervention in Mozambique. The material here is organized on the basis of the six 'principles' of CB for DRM, already introduced in sections 3 and 4, and is accompanied by a set of summary statements with associated levels of confidence[5].

These lessons will be cross referenced with findings from other country case studies conducted for this research project and so are presented here as tentative, initial lessons learned that will evolve and be refined using evidence from other countries. They should not be viewed as final conclusions but as stepping stones that will contribute to the conclusions and policy implications that will be set out in the final analytical report that will be published at the end of the research. With this in mind, after each 'lesson', there is a short statement in italics indicating how it relates to other case studies.

5.1 Flexibility and adaptability

Long-term engagement by donors in a country provides the highly valuable opportunity to build on and adapt experiences gained from earlier programmes (High).

PRO-GRC II was based on the experiences of earlier programmes dating back almost ten years, which had previously tested models and approaches in different geographical areas. This multi-programme, long-term approach has allowed GIZ to continuously adapt and strengthen their previous CB approaches and tools, before replicating them in new areas.

In previous countries we have noted that although specific programme timescales are generally judged as being too short, donors often implement similar follow-on programmes, sometimes over many cycles. Sometimes gaps between programmes, changing approaches and staff turnover prevent smooth continuity and learning between sequential programmes run by the same donor, for example as was the case in Haiti. However, GIZ appear to have done particularly well at ensuring continuity between their programmes, learning from experience and scaling up successes.

Programmes benefit when donors are flexible enough to adapt their plans, allowing national government to shape the programme at the design stage (High).

The GIZ team in Mozambique enjoyed a high level of flexibility in implementing PRO-GRC, both at the design stage (for example in the creation of emergency centres) and throughout implementation (for example in relation to logframe planning). Similarly, in Safer Schools, GFDRR and UN-Habitat were flexible to accommodate INGC's request for MINEDH to take leadership of the project, which enhanced ownership and sustainability. However, in PRO-GRC, the donor demonstrated less flexibility in relation to the identification of target areas, demonstrating the limits to flexibility in cases when there are different organisational perspectives and priorities.

[5] High confidence = conclusion drawn from multiple inputs (3 or more independent sources) with no prominent contradictory views expressed;
Medium confidence = conclusion drawn from more limited inputs (1-2 independent but authoritative sources) with no prominent contradictory views expressed;
(Low confidence (seldom used) = statement drawn from 1 source for which there is doubt over authoritativeness of the source, OR from 1 authoritative source that is countered by contradictory views.)

This finding has emerged from other case studies. Interestingly a similar situation was encountered in the Philippines, when a donor was very flexible on most matters, but not in relation to the selection of target areas. In both cases the national government was concerned to select an area of very weak capacity and high vulnerability where capacity strengthening was clearly needed, whereas the donor agency was more concerned to select an area where there was enough initial capacity to improve the programme's prospects of success. Under the scope of this research it is not possible for us to investigate which area would have been 'better', but it is possible to note that donor flexibility in relation to DRM programmes is generally positive but (possibly) pressure on donors to demonstrate impact undermines that flexibility, as well as their ability to allow national governments to take a lead in geographical targeting.

South-south learning can be a very effective form of partnership for building DRM capacity (High).

In both PRO-GRC and the Safer Schools projects, south-south learning opportunities were used with positive effect. GIZ were clear that German solutions were not necessarily the most appropriate for an African context. Several interviewees from both programmes commented that it is better to learn from countries that experience the same challenges and problems, are at a similar level of development, and have the same natural hazards. Another benefit can be reduced language barriers.

This echoes a finding of the literature review in relation to general capacity building and technical assistance programmes, but we had not had the opportunity to study it in practice in relation to DRM CB in the other case study countries. Our experiences suggest that south-south learning is not yet a widely used approach to capacity building. Our evidence helps to shed light on the reasons why it is so highly valued.

DRM initiatives are more likely to be accepted and sustainable if they incorporate local people's existing activities, routines and rhythms of life (High).

PRO-GRC found that their EWS was more easily established because it was designed around local farmers existing lifestyles and work patterns. Similarly, in the vulnerability reduction component, resistance to new farming techniques was only overcome when the activities were scheduled to take place in routine 'down time' during the dry season.

This is an obvious finding but still worth noting because it is an often-overlooked aspect of programme design. In several countries we have found that CB initiatives are more likely to be successful if they work in sync with, rather than in competition with, target communities' livelihoods.

DRM CB approaches that work in rural areas do not necessarily work in urban areas (Medium).

PRO-GRC found that their EWS that was successful in rural areas had to be completely redesigned for implementation in urban areas. This was partly due to differences in the physical environment and infrastructure, and partly due to different lifestyles, livelihoods and working patterns of urban-dwellers. Increased security concerns in the urban areas also needed to be taken into account.

This finding also emerged from the fieldwork in Haiti, where DRM CB initiatives operated differently in urban and rural areas.

In situations of political tension or conflict, DRM should be presented as a neutral issue, affecting all citizens. It can be useful if CB initiatives are brokered through an external, impartial third party (Medium).

One of the provinces PRO-GRC II worked in (Sofala province) was governed by opposition parties, with growing political tension between them and the national government. As the programme was implemented through national government agencies, in the case of Sofala it was decided that GIZ should act as an impartial facilitator, enabled by a history of working in the province and a perception that they were a neutral actor. GIZ therefore stepped in and successfully undertook activities at the local level normally assigned to INGC staff, enabling the programme activities to continue despite the political challenges.

In situations of conflict or political tension we have typically found that DRM CB programmes are just postponed, or alternative locations are identified as target areas. Also, international consultants often have travel restrictions which prevent them from working in areas with political tensions, and so national consultants would usually be used exclusively. However, this is an interesting example of a programme being able to continue despite political challenges, and international organisations being able to use their position as an indicator of neutrality.

5.2 Attention to Planning

Commitment of time and effort to careful planning in the earliest stages of a CB programme pays dividends in the long-term (High)

Both PRO-GRC and the Safer Schools Project implemented capacity needs assessments and rounds of consultative planning early on in the programme. These inputs were time-intensive but necessary for effective CB. The prelude to Safer Schools was a post disaster needs assessment that identified not just a technical need for improvements in reconstruction, but a need for engagement in functional capacity to help ensure safer building practices were institutionalised for long term DRR. A high-level inter-sectoral steering group was then established to guide and drive the development of the project, leading to a novel case of inter-ministerial collaboration that was seen as vital to its success.

In other case study countries we have found that participatory needs assessments and other pre-design consultations are time-consuming but effective for developing ownership and improving project design, and programmes need to schedule adequate time for their completion. However, in most cases we have observed that needs assessments are generally not done prior to programme announcement, but early on in the programme inception phase. This means that the objectives of the programme have often already been determined, and the capacity needs assessments are used to identify focus areas. Ideally they should be done prior to the main elements of the project being designed, rather than early in the project cycle, if CB is to match more precisely on to priority capacity needs – though we recognize that in practice this ideal is difficult to match to donor programming decisions.

A well-designed ToT approach to training can result in the development of a national pool of DRM trainers, thus developing sustained capacity on a national and organisational level (High).

PRO-GRC used a carefully designed ToT approach to develop a national cadre of DRM trainers which incorporated mentoring and rigorous feedback to participants. This resulted in a clear development of significant capacity as INGC is now able to deliver a range of practical and relevant training workshops without external support from GIZ, including simulation exercises, hazard mapping and facilitated action planning. In this sense the technical CB activity went beyond

capacity development at individual level to capacity development at organisational and national levels.

In some countries we have encountered concerns that ToT approaches lead to a 'watering down' of the quality of training. However, in the Philippines as in Mozambique, when programmes combine ToT with robust feedback to and mentoring of new trainers, we have strong evidence that they can be effective methods of building capacity.

When building capacity for DRM planning, consideration must be made of how new tools and approaches integrate with budgeting and planning mechanisms at different levels.

PRO-GRC established and built the capacity of local DRM committees, but they have typically been constrained in their activities and progress by lack of resources. Some committees have found that when they have integrated DRM into district plans, these elements are then later stripped out of plans at the provincial level. Also, some DRM committees were aware of mechanisms for accessing funds from the district level for their community level plans, but others were not and therefore felt powerless to implement the action plans that they had worked to develop.

Although this is a fairly obvious finding, in several other countries we have found that this consideration has also been overlooked.

M&E systems can be designed to facilitate participation and flexibility (High).

GIZ's approach to M&E for PRO-GRC was highly regarded, with interviewees specifically praising the early training for the whole team and the participatory approach which included partners and offered opportunities for open and solution-focused discussions amongst actors. The monitoring system focused on the outcome level rather than activity level, which allowed the team maximum freedom to adapt activities so that they were appropriate to the local situation. Multiple evaluations were also planned and conducted during the life of the programme.

We have struggled to find effective M&E systems operating in the case study countries so GIZ's approach is a useful example. It is also encouraging to note that our proposed M&E framework focuses on the outcome level, which GIZ has found to be a useful approach.

5.3 Ownership / Partnership

A central role for the key government agency responsible for DRM in the design and implementation of CB programmes ensures that DRM CB programmes are aligned to, and reinforce, national strategies and systems (High)

The INGC was highly involved in both PRO-GRC and the Safer Schools project, acting as the implementing agency in the former case. Interviewees stated that using the national disaster management organisation as the implementing agency contributed to the programmes' appropriateness to the context, created ownership and improved the long-term sustainability of DRM capacity. Even in the latter case, where national leadership was transferred to a sectoral ministry, the foundation for integration into DRM structures was laid by the initial lead provided by INGC.

Whilst this is an approach that worked well in several case studies, it should be noted that it is unlikely to work as productively in countries with less conducive governance contexts and weaker DRM institutional capacity.

Major disasters and a perceived increase in the frequency and intensity of disasters can create political will for DRM and therefore windows of opportunity for specific DRM initiatives (High).

The 2000-2001 floods acted as a trigger for pushing DRM up the government's agenda. The government of Mozambique requested BMZ's help in the process of improving DRM and shifting focus from response to prevention, even though it was not a priority area for BMZ. As a result PRO- GRC, and its predecessor PRODER, had very strong government ownership from the very beginning. Several interviewees also attributed a strong sense of ownership of PRO-GRC to the fact that the frequency and impact of disasters has increased dramatically in the past fifteen years. The recent experience of Cyclone Funso in 2012, when the level of damage to schools compared with other buildings was so striking, proved a key catalyst for the government and the funding agencies already active in school building programmes to prioritise capacity development for school safety.

This finding has emerged in the other case study countries.

Strong and inclusive relationships between all stakeholders are critical and can be fostered through practical measures (High).

Both the GIZ and GFDRR/UN-Habitat teams placed a strong emphasis on building strong and inclusive relationships with stakeholders and viewed this as paramount for CB for DRM programme success. Practical matters such as sharing offices and socialising together were important for building partnerships. The physical presence of GIZ staff in INGC's offices meant there could be regular interactions and constant support. Mutual respect between GIZ and INGC staff was clearly important with GIZ staff deliberately taking an active role in the programme, and being empathetic and sensitive to INGC counterparts' workloads, different priorities and limited resources. For Safer Schools, several interviewees remarked that the keen interest of the GFDRR specialist not just in providing advice and support but in actively participating in field visits helped to forge a strong sense of partnership and motivation for collaboration.

The need for mutual respect between those building capacity and those whose capacity is being targeted has been a recurrent theme throughout the case studies. Similarly, sharing office space was noted as a positive element in Ethiopia.

A lack of incentives (either financial or in-kind) for participation in DRM activities may act as a barrier to motivation and sustainability of capacity (High).

Local DRM committees working with PRO-GRC argued strongly that they should be paid, just as INGC staff were paid, and that their low income levels undermined their ability to participate in the programme. INGC and GIZ were opposed to paying incentives because they felt this would be unsustainable. Lack of functioning equipment was further identified as undermining the motivation of the committees.

In other countries we have encountered differing views on whether CB initiatives should offer financial incentives for participation given the poverty levels of target groups, or whether this undermines ownership. This debate appears to also be relevant in Mozambique, but is here linked more with overall resource constraints and to motivation, as well as participation and ownership.

Engagement from senior officials is very important for capacity gains to be sustained and for generating enthusiasm and motivation at lower levels (High).

There was strong evidence that the high level of commitment to the project at the leadership level (including political leadership) across various ministries and organisations greatly enabled institutional ownership and thereby the success of the Safer Schools Project. INGC shaped the engagement of different actors in the programme depending on their different skillsets and focal areas. Having strong evidence of the needs from capacity assessments was viewed as being important for securing the engagement of senior leaders. There was a belief that when high levels of government are committed, the same commitment will automatically be channelled to lower government structures and technical staff. Having Ministers and Deputy Ministers physically present in the meetings and seminars sent a message to all agencies about the perceived importance of the programme.

In the case study in Myanmar it was similarly noted that high-level engagement is absolutely vital for CB interventions, and that without it any capacity built at lower levels of administration could potentially be undermined by changes in personnel, policy direction or approach.

5.4 Integration of scales and actors

Establishing DRM committees and sub commissions with parallel designations between levels can be an effective strategy for building the likelihood and capacity for inter-scalar integration (Medium).

In Mozambique, the deconcentrated political system allows for symmetry between local, district and provincial level DRM committees. The individuals at each level were nominated to perform distinct DRM-related roles such as 'early warning systems representative' and 'disaster needs assessment representative'. As part of PRO-GRC there were separate activities for the sub commissions to meet and discuss issues related specifically to their counterparts at different levels. Sub-commissions knew who to discuss concerns with and report to at each level. Interviewees felt that this system worked well in terms of improving communication at all times, but the impact was most evident when it came time to prepare for approaching hazards and responding to hazard events.

The example from Mozambique is compelling but is facilitated by their specific governance context and may not be as easily replicated in countries where political devolution means coordination between levels of government is not so easily achieved. It is potentially however, an ideal scenario which other countries can work towards.

Including universities and research organisations in DRM CB programmes can be mutually beneficial for implementing and research staff (High).

INGC initiated the engagement of UEM in the Safer Schools Project as they felt it improved the likelihood of capacity gains being retained in Mozambique. Interviewees agreed that UEM's capacity had been reinforced through their involvement as an integral partner in the project, but also that UEM staff had assisted the project implementers through improved access to coherent and accurate data.

We have investigated the inclusion of research institutes in other case study countries but the Mozambique example gives compelling evidence of the mutual benefit possible through such an arrangement.

Various high-level, multi-sectoral and multi-actor mechanisms can be used effectively to facilitate collaborative working on CB programmes (High).

The Safer Schools Project used a number of mechanisms to encourage on-going collaboration between sectors, ministries and agencies. These included a high-level, inter-institutional steering committee, the Consultative Technical Group (which was identified as a new innovation for collaboration) and a Technical Team of 16 cross-sectoral experts. Multiple cross-sectoral seminars were also held. These opportunities gave a wide range of different stakeholders opportunities to share technical information, concerns and potential solutions and acted as pioneering collaborative approaches for those involved. Safer schools was attributed with creating seeds for future coordination on DRM between ministries.

Multi-stakeholder steering committees have been used successfully in other case study countries, not just for bringing actors together on a specific project but for increasing understanding of others' mandates and skills, thereby increasing effective collaboration in the future.

5.5 Functional Capacity Building

Building technical DRM capacity can lay a strong foundation for subsequently moving on to focus on the development of functional capacities. Developing functional capacities is key for future sustainability and upscaling (High).

Both the Safer Schools Project and PRO-GRC were aiming to build functional capacity, but focused first on technical capacity, moving gradually onto developing functional capacity once a foundation of technical understanding was established. The GIZ team employed two particular strategies that were regarded as particularly successful in improving functional capacity. They modelled activities and then gradually shifted responsibility for that function to relevant institutions. They also focused on improving INGC's capacity to monitor their own work. There was a strong indication that INGC is now proactively maintaining and replicating the work of PRO-GRC nationally and providing high quality DRM/CCA trainings as well as applying new technical knowledge, recognising their DRM responsibilities and making better decisions on DRM issues. This is further evidenced by the continuation and upscale of some of the structures and systems started by PRO-GRC, independently of the programme. For example, at the finish of PRO-GRC there were approximately 200 local DRM committees created through the programme. As of May 2015, there are approximately 1,000 local DRM committees operating across the country.

These findings have emerged from other case studies, but are particularly clear in relation to the Mozambique programmes.

The strengthening of an enabling environment for effective DRM can emerge in a number of forms beyond creation of DRM structures and skills, often not as an explicit objective of CB (High).

The progress of the Safer Schools Project, and the way that it appears to have shifted perspectives in Mozambique, provide evidence of the way that CB efforts can deliberately or inadvertently contribute to an enabling environment. The project achieved this on a number of fronts. It generated awareness in stakeholders that they can work effectively with building contractors on safety provisions and provided the demonstration with which to convince donors that investment in safer schools is both efficient and effective. Even prior to the establishment of new regulations, the project has created a level of commitment in stakeholders such that new school designs are already following the recommendations of the project. Though it is too early to ascertain this for certain, there are also strong indications that other ministries are learning from Safer Schools and considering improved construction quality in other types of public building.

We have increasingly identified a range of cases in which CB activities have contributed to strengthening enabling environments for effective DRM, often when this is not an explicit objective

of the programme – but rather an implicit goal. We suggest that future CB efforts could look more closely at the mechanisms through which programmes may deliberately seek to foster enabling environments, in ways that might not conventionally be conceived as CB activities.

5.6 Linkage to disaster resilience

Although often overlooked in favour of preparedness and response, recovery and mitigation elements can successfully be integrated into, or be the main focus of, DRM CB initiatives (High).

The Safer Schools Project provides a clear case of progression to a DRR-influenced approach. The main objective of the project was to develop disaster resilient school building codes and guidelines on school safety and to produce recommendations for their effective implementation. The project is therefore fundamentally aimed at reducing risk. GFDRR noted that organisations in Mozambique that are very good on disaster response are typically weak on post-disaster recovery. The balance of support was therefore deliberately directed to prevention / mitigation and recovery, rather than preparedness and response. Similarly, PRO-GRC successfully integrated a vulnerability reduction component into their activities, incorporating attention to livelihoods into the DRM programme.

The Safer Schools Project provided us with a useful opportunity to study a CB initiative that focused on the recovery stage of the DRM cycle, as suitable recovery programmes had not emerged as eligible for study in the other case study countries.

Programmes typically struggle to incorporate gender beyond creating targets for the participation of women (High).

Under PRO-GRC gender training was conducted and subsequent gender analysis was performed by DRM committees in order to inform decision making in relation to DRM planning. However, it was less clear how the analysis fed into contingency, response or development planning in concrete ways. The participation of women on local DRM committees was encouraged, with a target of 40%, but this was accompanied by an assumption that representation of women in decision-making bodies (such as the local DRM committee) automatically meant that all gender-related issues and needs would be addressed

This finding has emerged in all the case study countries.

References

BMZ (2015) Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development Website, Sub-Saharan Africa, Mozambique web page. Available: https://www.bmz.de/en/what_we_do/countries_regions/subsahara/mosambik/index.html

Boletim da Republica (2014) Publicação Oficial da Republica de Moçambique. Serie I, Numero 50. Available: https://www.ifrc.org/docs/IDRL/Laws/Mozambique%20Law%20on%20Disaster%20Management.pdf

Francioni, A. (2012) Focus on Mozambique: A Decade of Experimenting Disaster Risk Reduction Strategies. United Nations Human Settlement Programme (UN-Habitat). Nairobi, Kenya. Available: http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=34031

GFDRR (2009) Disaster Risk Management Programs for Priority Countries. Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, Summary. Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery. Available:http://www.unisdr.org/files/14757_6thCGCountryProgramSummaries1.pdf

GFDRR (2010) GFDRR Programs: Disaster Reduction Building Resilience in Changing Climate. Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery. Available: http://gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr/files/publication/GFDRR_Building_Resilience.pdf

GFDRR (2011) Educating for Action - GFDRR Capacity Building and Learning Strategy. Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery. Available: https://www.gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr.org/files/Learning%20Strategy.pdf

GFDRR (2014a) Mozambique Safer Schools Project: Aide- Momaire, draft. Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery in Mozambique. Unpublished document.

GFDRR (2014b) Country Programme Update- Mozambique. Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery. Available: https://www.gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr/files/region/MZ.pdf

GFDRR (2014c) Educating for Action: GFDRR on Capacity Development. Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery. Available: http://www.gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr/files/publication/GFDRR_Capacity_Development.pdf

GFDRR (2015) Mozambique Initiative Aims to Build Safer Schools, Protect Children from Disasters, web page. Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery website. Available: https://www.gfdrr.org/mozambique-initiative-aims-build-safer-schools-protect-children-disasters

GIZ (2011) Mozambique: Disaster risk reduction as the basis for climate change adaptation – A multi-level project of German-Mozambican Development Cooperation. GIZ. Available: http://www.preventionweb.net/files/32970_32970giz20110501enmozambiquedisaste.pdf

IMF (2011) Republic of Mozambique: Poverty Reduction Action Plan. Strategy paper. International Monetary Fund. Available: https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2011/cr11132.pdf

INGC (2012) National Master Plan for Disaster Management. National Institute for Disaster Management Mozambique.

INGC (2013) Tendências Históricas dos Ciclones Tropicais que Afectaram Moçambique entre 1980 e 2012. Instituto Nacional de Gestao de Calamidades 2013, Moçambique.

IP Consult (2015) Strengthening Disaster Risk Management Systems (PRO-GRC II). Web page, IP Consult. Available: http://www.ip-consult.de/projects/strengthening-disaster-risk-management-systems-phase-i-and-ii/

MAEFP (2015) Proposta de Soluções para Prevenir e Reduzir os Efeitos das Calamidades Naturais a Médio e Longo Prazo. Mistério da Administração Estatal e Função Pública—Conselho Técnico de Gestão de Calamidades. Mozambique.

MINED (2015) Projecto Escolas Seguras. PPP. República de Moçambique, Ministério da Educação e Desenvolvimento Humano. Unpublished document.

MOPHRH (2015) Proposta de Medidas Estrategicas para Redução da Vulnerabilidade do pais as Cheias e Secas. Ministério das Obras Publicas, Habitacao e Recursos Hidricos & Ministério da Agricultura e Segurança Alimentar Instituto Nacional de Irrigação. Moçambique.

PRO-GRC (2005) Assistência Técnica na Institucionalização da Gestão de Risco de Calamidades em Moçambique. Institucionalização da Gestão de Risco de Calamidades: Resumo de descrição do Projecto. GTZ. Unpublished document.

PRO-GRC (2009**)** Project for the Institutionalization of Disaster Risk Management in Mozambique, Phase I. Final Report – Caia. GIZ, Unpublished document.

PRO-GRC (2010) Assessoria Institucional para a Consolidação e Ampliação da Gestão de Risco de Calamidades (GRC) em Moçambique. Resumo da Proposta, Objetivo, Indicadores e Prestaçoes Previstas na Nova Fase (2010-2012). INGC, GIZ. Unpublished document.

PRO-GRC (2013) Institutional Assistance for Consolidation and Expansion of Disaster Risk Management in Mozambique, Phase II. GIZ. Unpublished document.

Scott, Z. (2010) Study on Disaster Risk Reduction, Decentralisation and Political Economy Analysis for UNDP contribution to the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2011. Oxford Policy Management.

UN-Habitat, UEM (2014) Developing Guidelines on School Safety and Resilient School Building Codes Project. Interim Reports (WP1 to WP3). UN-Habitat and Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique. Unpublished document.

UN-Habitat, UEM (2015) Developing Guidelines on School Safety and Resilient School Building Codes Project: Lessons Learned. UN-Habitat and Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique. Unpublished document.

UN-Habitat, UEM (2013) Orientações e Princípios para Escolas Seguras em Moçambique – Diagnostico, Recomendaçoes, Orientaçoes. UN-Habitat and Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique. Unpublished document.

UNDP (2014) Human Development Report. Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience. United Nations Development Programme. Available: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr14-report-en-1.pdf

UNRCO (2015) Mozambique: Flooding. Situation Report No. 6. Office of the Resident Coordinator. Available:http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Mozambique-UNRCO-Situation%20Report%206_final.pdf

World Bank (2014) Recovery from Recurrent Floods 2000-2013. Recovery Framework Case Study. World Bank Group. Available: http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Mozambique%20August%202014.pdf

Annex A Perspectives of Interviewees on Key Factors in CB

As part of the research, some interviewees were asked to discuss the factors they felt were most important for the success of CB for DRM in general. The following table lists the responses given, organised in relation to the 6 principles identified in the inception phase of this research project as key for effective capacity building.

Table 4: Interviewee perspectives on DRM CB success factors

Principle	Key factors as expressed by interviewees
Flexibility and adaptability	• Donors and project implementers should respect government institutions and structures and work in close coordination to avoid duplication of projects and to not confuse the population who are ultimately responsible for DRM in the country. • Avoid generic capacity building activities. The project needs to be in line with the context, situation and social community you are working in; ensure that trainers in your project are creative and use innovative methods to engage the beneficiaries.
Attention to planning	**Assessments and consultations:** • Carry out thoughtful community consultations to ensure your programme is in line with the community's concerns. • Plan your capacity building project recognising and drawing upon the existing capacities available. • Comprehensive and participatory needs assessments as well as consultation processes are required; programmes should take account of the views and specific needs of communities in order to link the programme to the community needs. • To ensure you are targeting the most vulnerable in your area of intervention, make sure you carry out a risk mapping as part of the process of your capacity building activity. **Budget:** • It is essential to have financial capacity to implement the initiatives planned but to also implement the recommendations and findings that followed your programme.

	• Build institutional capacity so that the institutions you are working with are willing to allocate institutional budget to your programme. • Make sure that there is funding and available resources so that beneficiaries can implement what has been learned from the capacity building programme. • Target some capacity building activities to decision-makers so as to build awareness of the importance of financing and budgeting for DRM activities. **Resources / Materials:** • At the community level ensure that DRR committees are motivated and that they have all the necessary materials and equipment to carry out their roles. • For capacity building to be sustainable, you should plan to give some form of incentives to the members of the DRR committees. • Building capacity is a long term process and one, two or three years isn't enough time. Ensure you plan an effective timeframe. **Staffing:** • It is important to choose the right people to carry out the capacity building activities; especially the trainers, your staff must be very culturally sensitive and aware. • It is necessary to have knowledgeable, experienced and resourceful staff. For your programme to be successful you should train and capacitate the staff carrying out the training and ensure they own the project. • The staff you bring to your project are crucial to the success of the capacity building project; ensure you choose staff that are focused on finding solutions rather than problems.
Ownership/ partnership	**Community engagement:** • Take into consideration local people; engage communities with your project. • Sensitise communities on DRR issues, people are more likely to engage in your capacity building activities if they realise that disasters are evitable.

	National Institutions: • Create partnerships with government institutions, this can help to make your programme sustainable. • Engage high-level political leaders in the process of capacity building, the commitment of the state is essential for successful capacity build processes; for the capacity building project to work DRM has to be seen as a priority at national level.
Role of functional CB	**Enabling environment:** • The capacity building activity should seek to advocate and / or generate changes in the law, or regulations for institutional arrangements. • The effectiveness of the capacity building activity will depend not only on the capacitated staff but also on the institution. Hence its important that the projects influence institutional set ups and mandates. **Ensuring sustainability:** • Link your capacity building programme with a national academic institution to ensure the retention of knowledge and capacity in country.
Scales/interactions	**Inter-institutional gaps:** • When building capacity at various scales and levels of government, it is important to standardise the knowledge and information that different scales receive in order to close the big knowledge gap that usually exists in government institutions. • Ensure that the capacity building activities reach different actors, not only the community but district and provincial levels of governments. **South–South cooperation:** • The capacity building activity should ensure that cooperation and learning processes are done between countries with similar realities, as this can make objectives seem achievable and enhances the chance of commitment from the capacitated group.
Linkage to disaster resilience	• Advocate for clear governance planning. It is important that programmes directed at CB for DRM advocate the integration of DRM into the planning process and procedures of the country.

	• People need to have access to DRR knowledge and information on how to protect themselves in case of disaster; ensure that your capacity building activities include simulation exercises where all the community and authorities are included. • When capacitating local governments to do planning for DRR, try to include some planning and activities for climate change resilience.

After this open discussion, key informants were then asked to undertake a scoring exercise for the 6 principles. They were asked to give each of the principles a score of 1-4 according to their importance, with 1 as the highest rating. A total of 41 interviewees produced complete versions of the exercise. The results are summarized in the following table which shows how many people scored 1, 2, 3 or 4 for each principle, and the average score for each principle.

Flexibility & Adaptability and **Contribution to Disaster Resilience** emerged as the principles most vital for success of a CB for DRM programme (with 24 and 21, respectively, out of 37 participants giving the top rating). **Comprehensive Planning** and **Ownership & Partnership** were also seen as important factors with 17 and 15 people giving it the top rating respectively. **Integration of Actors and Scales** and **Attention to Functional Capacity** were seen as the least important factor contributing to the success of CB for DRM with 11 and 15 participants respectively giving the top score for these principles.

Table 6: Results of participants rating exercise

	score 1	score 2	score 3	score 4
Flexibility & adaptability	24	11	2	0
Comprehensive planning	17	15	5	0
Ownership & Partnership	15	18	4	0
Attention to functional capacity	15	15	6	1
Integration of actors & scales	11	22	2	2
Contribution to disaster resilience	21	9	5	2

Annex B Interview Questionnaire Schedules

B.1 Initial Workshop/Key Stakeholders' Meeting (and/or contextual interviews as required)

Introduce the project
Ask questions based on the list below
Request any further secondary sources (documents, data)
Request ideas for additional key contacts/interviewees

Module	Questions	Links to RQ
CONTEXT	What are the main types of hazard affecting the country (frequency and magnitude over last 30 years)?	1
	What have been the main recent changes in disaster risk (re hazard, vulnerability)?	1
	What are the anticipated changes in disaster risk?	1
	What other social, economic or political changes are important for understanding current DRM?	2
	Where does DRM fit within the structure of governance?	3
	How does the quality of overall governance in the country affect the work of DRM organizations?	3

	What is the extent of civil society and citizen engagement in DRM?	3
	How do wider social and political issues impinge on DRM?	3
	What recent DRM/DRR programmes have been implemented in the last 15 years (external and internal)?	4
	What other major external assistance programmes relating to disaster risk have been implemented in the country in the last 15 years?	4
PROGRAMME CHARACTERISTICS	*Refer to the CB activities that are being studied.* What role have different actors played in shaping/designing and managing each of these initiatives? Who have been the main actors in this process?	5
CAPACITY	What level of DRM capacity exists generally in the country and what are the main shortfalls?	20
	Has this capacity changed recently?	20

B.2 Interview Question Schedule: CB Actors

Introduce the project & consent procedure
Ask questions based on the list below
Undertake 'principles' exercise

(where appropriate…)
*Ask for financial on the project (budget & breakdowns for CB, plus staffing and staff roles – see note *)*
*Ask for information on M&E procedures (see note **)*

Request any further secondary sources (documents, data)
Request ideas for additional key contacts/interviewees

* We need to compile as detailed **financial**/staffing information as possible for each project. It is likely that a specific data collection activity on this may need to be undertaken with an administrative officer of the project (see Additional note).

** We require detailed information on **M&E** and it is likely that that a specific data collection activity on this may need to be undertaken with an administrative officer of the project (see Additional note)

Module	Question guide	Links to RQ
Programme characteristics	What aspect of DRM is the main focus of the programme - preparedness/relief, prevention/mitigation, recovery, or a combination of those? What is the intended operational objective of the capacity (to educate, train, plan, decide or overall action)? What is/was the level of funding for the CB activity, and what was the allocation of funds between different aspects? *(see also Additional note)*	7, 7, 6

Approach to CB process	How was the time-frame for the activity decided, and is this adequate? How were capacity needs assessed before the start of the programme? At what stage were key national/local stakeholders identified and engaged in the programme development? What roles have national/local partners played in design, implementation and management of the programme? Are there existing skills and resources that were strengthened through the programme? Has the programme been able to work with existing DRM institutions - formal and informal? Has the CB activity been aligned with national DRM/DRR strategy? Did any political/power constraints exist, and how were they managed? What mechanisms are there to ensure sustainability of capacity gains after the programme ends? Is staff turnover likely to be a problem? How has the activity ensured participation/inclusion of women in the CB actvity? Was a theory of change developed for the programme? Please describe the M&E procedures and the ideas behind their design? *(see also Additional note)*	9, 8, 10, 10, 8, 8, 8, 8, 9, 10, 9, 9
Content of CB activities	On what elements of CB does the programme place most emphasis (focus on training/individuals, organizational change/institutions, coordination and on power	11, 11, 11,

	structures, enabling environment)? Has the activity sought to develop incentives for good performance or staff retention? Has the activity involved any kind of political advocacy to reinforce DRR as a public priority? Has the programme sought to build capacity at more than one scale? How has the programme sought to build capacity for coordination and interaction between different groups of stakeholders? How has the issue of capacity to manage long-term change in risk been addressed? Has the CB programme paid attention to reduction of underlying vulnerability of people?	12, 12, 13, 13
Effectiveness	What worked well, and why in the programme? What did not work well, and why? What were the enabling factors? What were the barriers/limitations?	19,19,19,19

Capacity (general)	What factors would you say are key in ensuring the success of capacity building for DRM? *Provide matrix of principles for rating exercise with explanation of what each means and the rating categories* How would you rate the importance of the following 'principles' in enabling effective CB?	21, 21

B.3 Interview Question Schedule: Commentators

Introduce the project & consent procedure
Ask questions based on the list below
Undertake 'principles' exercise

Request any further secondary sources (documents, data)
Request ideas for additional key contacts/interviewees

Module	Question guide	Links to RQ
Programme characteristics	Describe the relationship between the actors funding the CB activity and the actors they are working with What role have different actors played in shaping/designing and managing each of these initiatives? Who have been the main actors in this process?	5, 5
Approach to CB process	What roles have national/local partners played in design, implementation and management of the programme? How has the programme engaged political commitment and local leadership to build ownership? Are there existing skills and resources that were strengthened through the programme? Has the programme been able to work with existing DRM institutions - formal and informal?	10,10, 8, 8, 8,

	Has the CB activity been aligned with national DRM/DRR strategy? Did any political/power constraints exist, and how were they managed? Are the M&E procedures oriented to activities/outputs or to outcomes/impact?	8, 9
Content of CB activities	Has the activity involved any kind of political advocacy to reinforce DRR as a public priority?	11
Effectiveness	Has the CB activity been considered effective in addressing its capacity building objectives? Has this been sufficient to raise functional capacity, and what lessons can be learned in this respect? What lessons can be learned about how effectively the activity integrated CD across scales of DRM? What lessons can be learned about how effectively the activity fostered interaction and coordination between actors? What lessons can be learned about how effectively capacity has been raised to address long-term changes in risk? What lessons can be learned about how effectively capacity to reduce vulnerability has been raised? Whose capacity has been raised?	14, 14, 15, 15, 16, 16, 16,

	Is the capacity gain sustained/likely to be sustained? How closely has the activity addressed pre-existing capacity needs? What worked well, and why in the programme? What did not work well, and why? What were the enabling factors? What were the barriers/limitations?	17, 18, 19, 19, 19, 19
Capacity (general)	What factors would you say are key in ensuring the success of capacity building for DRM? *Provide matrix of principles for rating exercise with explanation of what each means and the rating categories* How would you rate the importance of the following 'principles' in enabling effective CB?	21, 21

B.4 Interview Question Schedule: Group interviews

Introduce the project & consent procedure
Ask questions based on the list below
Undertake 'principles' exercise
(Undertake M&E exercise - if appropriate)

Module	Question guide	Links to RQ
Approach to CB process	How has the programme engaged political commitment and local leadership to build ownership? How has the activity fostered a culture of reflection and flexible learning among DRM actors in how they plan and undertake their work? Did any political/power constraints exist, and how were they managed? What mechanisms are there to ensure sustainability of capacity gains after the programme ends?	10,10, 8, 9
Content of CB activities	How has the programme addressed coordination and communication between scales? Has the activity addressed the capacity needs of highly vulnerable groups? How has the programme addressed the gendered dimensions of vulnerability and capacity?	12, 13, 13

Effectiveness	Has the CB activity been considered effective in addressing its capacity building objectives?	
	Has this been sufficient to raise functional capacity, and what lessons can be learned in this respect?	14, 14,
	What lessons can be learned about how effectively the activity integrated CD across scales of DRM?	
	What lessons can be learned about how effectively the activity fostered interaction and coordination between actors?	15, 15,
	What lessons can be learned about how effectively capacity to address long-term changes in risk has been raised?	
	What lessons can be learned about how effectively capacity to reduce vulnerability has been raised?	
	Whose capacity has been raised?	16, 16, 16,
	Is the capacity gain sustained/likely to be sustained?	
	How closely has the activity addressed pre-existing capacity needs?	
	What worked well, and why in the programme?	
	What did not work well, and why?	
	What were the enabling factors?	17, 18, 19, 19, 19, 19
	What were the barriers/limitations?	

Capacity (general)	How has existing capacity in DRM been achieved? How important has the activity been in this? What factors would you say are key in ensuring the success of capacity building for DRM? *Provide each participant with the matrix of principles for rating exercise with explanation of what each means and the rating categories* How would you rate the importance of the following 'principles' in enabling effective CB?	20, 21, 21

B.5 Final Workshop

Introduce the project & consent procedure
Present and discuss initial findings
Ask questions based on the list below (possibly in breakout groups)
Undertake M&E exercise

Module	Question guide	Links to RQ
Context	What other social, economic or political changes are important for understanding current DRM? How does the quality of overall governance in the country affect the work of DRM organizations? What is the extent of civil society and citizen engagement in DRM? How do wider social and political issues impinge on DRM?	2, 3, 3, 3
Capacity (general)	What level of capacity in DRM exists and what are the main shortfalls? Has capacity changed recently? How has existing capacity been achieved? How important has the activity been in this? What factors would you say are key in ensuring the success of capacity building for DRM? Which of the following 'principles' do you think is most important and why? (*provide list of principles with explanation of what each means*)	20, 20, 20, 21, 21