



# SUSTAINABILITY STUDY

“Regional Programme for Building Resilient Local Communities in Georgia and Armenia”

**Georgia Red Cross Society  
Armenian Red Cross Society**

**October 2014**

# TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION	2	
2. METHODOLOGY	3	
3. GLOBAL EXPERIENCES AND APPROACHES	4	
4. REGIONAL EXPERIENCES AND APPROACHES	6	
5. PROGRAMME EXPERIENCES AND APPROACHES		8
ARCS SUSTAINABILITY ROADMAP	9	
GRCS SUSTAINABILITY ROADMAP	16	
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE	23	
ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	25	

# 1. INTRODUCTION



The “Regional Programme for Building Resilient Local Communities in Georgia and Armenia” commenced in 2010 and entered its third phase in May 2014. The program is co-funded by European Commission Humanitarian Aid & Civil Protection Department (DIPECHO) and Danish Red Cross, in the led for a consortium of Icelandic & Austrian Red Cross and IFRC.

The aim of the program is to reduce the vulnerability and improve the resilience of the people in the South Caucasus living in rural communities most prone to natural disasters. In Armenia the program is implemented in 18 rural and 2 urban communities in the Shirak region and in Georgia in 7 communities and 9 satellite communities in three different regions, adding up to more than 170.000 beneficiaries in total. Since the initiation substantial progress has been achieved in raising community awareness on disaster risk reduction and preparedness, establishing and equipping community volunteer groups, school-based activities and building strong cooperation with local authorities as well as mainstreaming DRR at a local, regional and national level.

In the evaluation of the previous phase it was underlined that the third phase should put focus on how to consolidate and institutionalize these successes in order to ensure the long-term sustainability beyond the program scope. Sustainability in this sense is understood as the long-lasting effects of the program through maintenance of the achieved results as well as continuation of key activities. For the DRR III this includes considerations on how to further institutionalize and embed activities into formal structures, ensure financial support beyond the current funding mechanisms, enhance community ownership and retain the awareness of risk reduction and preparedness.

A study of global and regional DRR sustainability successes have been undertaken, both within the Red Cross Movement and external stakeholders. Several relevant experiences were identified despite different cultural and institutional contexts as a number of DRR activities are facing similar sustainability challenges. These experiences have inspired and substantiated the discussion of the program experiences to draw on best practices. Combined these have contributed to the development of a roadmap outlining steps to enhance the future sustainability.

The DRR models developed by both Armenian Red Cross Society (ARCS) and Georgian Red Cross Society (GRCS) form the basis of the roadmap with the subsections of Coordination and Cooperation, Community Volunteer Groups, VCA and Community Action Plans, Mitigation Measures and Awareness Raising/School activities. Under each section a number of steps are outlined. The more overall vision for areas or activity is marked in red and supported by a justification and elaboration as well as the reflections from ARCS and GRCS on the current status (as of October 2014) of this highlighted in italics.

The roadmap is to be seen as continuation of good practices and enhancement of existing cooperation rather than as new initiatives or additional workload. Additionally, this initiative will be followed by discussions to maintain the focus and continuously enhance the sustainability towards the end of this program phase.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

During this study and in the following roadmap sustainability will be primarily be considered on a community and activity level understood as the ability to maintain achieved results and ensure long-term impact. For the DRR III program this includes considerations on how to maintain the capacity of the trained community volunteer groups and local staff members as well as how to continue key elements of activities beyond the current program and funding scope (further sustainability successes of the program is elaborated in section 5).

To approach the topic of sustainability in a comprehensive manner the study was made up of three components. Firstly, based desk research of the global sustainability experiences was undertaken and followed by a five week mission to the region gathering and discussing the already achieved successes and future approaches with both the national societies and external stakeholders comprising to a total of over 20 interviews. Finally, this was combined in the development of a “sustainability roadmap” outlining possible future steps for the DRR III program which was validated by both GRCS and ARCS.

The desk study was aiming to inspire the program successes by the global best practices on community-based DRR. The consulted evaluations and delegates were identified in cooperation with the DRC DRR advisor and covered different geographic regions. A common feature for these was the program design centered on the DRC DRR model which made it possible to draw relevant parallels across cultural and institutional differences. Furthermore, the initial desk study and interviews served as an introduction to the topic and challenges of community-based DRR programs.

These interviews were planned as semi-structured interviews on the topic of sustainability in DRR programs. A generic interview guide was developed on basis of the GRCS/ARCS DRR model and program activities and was revised in regard to the specific interviewee. This open and flexible approach provided an opportunity for learning and discussion as well as exploration of new areas.

The same approach was applied for the interviews conducted in the region with GRCS/ARCS and the external stakeholders. For the discussions with GRCS/ARCS these were especially focused around the previous program successes and what was considered challenges and possibilities for the future sustainability. Throughout the missions ideas were shared and discussions held which was an important contribution to the attention around the topic. This was a high priority as the commitment and agreement from the GRCS and ARCS was considered of utmost importance.

An important aim of these discussions was also getting insight into the practical set-up and approach to sustainability. By participating in meetings with regional and local authorities, field staff and local volunteers the various aspects were elaborated from different perspectives and some of the ideas for the roadmap were consulted with the concerned stakeholders.

The external stakeholders were DIPECHO partners (Save the Children, OXFAM and Austrian Red Cross), UNDP, ICRC and IFRC who contributed with in-depth knowledge from the regional context and insight from the current and previous phases.

Bringing all of the experiences and inputs together resulted in a sustainability roadmap for both GRCS and ARCS. This is primarily focused around the sustainability of the activities but also contains a number of cross-activity steps on the organizational and institutional sustainability. A validation workshop was held with both GRCS and ARCS in order to ensure agreement as well as ownership of the ideas and provide comments and input on their practical feasibility. Through this process a number of the steps were revised which was then integrated and share for comments before finalizing the roadmap. This will additionally be followed by discussions on sustainability on the Steering Group Meeting in November 2014 as well as continuous discussion throughout the phase and a review of the progress in the final evaluation.

### 3. GLOBAL EXPERIENCES AND APPROACHES

In order to inspire and substantiate the discussion beyond the program and regional experiences a review of global DRC DRR evaluations have been undertaken. The DRC DRR programs are all built around many of the same key components including community disaster action teams, risk and resources mapping, partnership with local government and community mitigation measures which all are central activities in the DRR III.

#### COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER GROUPS

Central in almost all DRC CBDRR programs are the Community Volunteer Groups<sup>1</sup>. These are often both established, trained and equipped by the national societies and hence the sustainability challenges revolve around retaining volunteers, replenishing equipment and formalizing the teams into the formal structures.

The CVG's will inevitably experience a continuous replacement of volunteers due to factors of mobility which is potentially a challenge to the continuation of the teams and quality of their activities. A **continuous process of recruiting and training new volunteers** is therefore seen to be important to avoid loss of knowledge and experience. Several interviewees highlight the importance of few committed individuals who is often seen to comprise the backbone of the community teams despite a high turnover rate of volunteers. This points attention to the initial recruitment of volunteers where a **combination of different age groups** can be preferable<sup>2</sup>.

Several features seem to be characteristic for the programs where the CVG's have continued activity after the formal closure and withdrawal of both financial and technical support:

- A **strong sense of identity and community** within the groups. This could be through having a formal meeting place or a high level of visibility through e.g. awareness raising activities as well as recognition from community and local authorities.
- **Involving the CVG volunteers in non-DRR activities** such as health can be a way to ensure activity within the teams as the CVG's do not necessarily have regular activities in between trainings and simulations.
- CVG's producing **activity plans for the future** and discussing the needed resources have been a successful way to address the situation beyond the program scope. Overall it is highlighted that these procedures around the teams must not be considered as a linear but instead need to be part of cyclic process.

An additional risk factor for the sustainability of the teams can be if the field staffs are funded completely by the program resources. **The field staffs are often seen to act as facilitators and constitute a vital link** to keeping the teams active and are therefore at risk of creating an institutional gap if these positions are abolished<sup>3</sup>.

Beyond considerations on the sustainability of the organizational set-up one of the common key challenges for the CVG's are **replenishing equipment and refreshing of trainings**. The softer components such as updating of evacuation plans or awareness raising activities are in some cases seen to be easier to sustain through periodic follow-up visits as they do not require as much financial support.

#### VULNERABILITY AND CAPACITY ASSESSMENTS (VCA) AND COMMUNITY ACTION PLANS

Updating of key tools such as VCA and community action plans is also important to the sustainability and relevance of the CVG's as well as maintaining the awareness on DRR in the community and influencing decision making. However it appears from experiences that it might not be possible for teams to carry these out without assistance already after a couple of years. In order for local action plans to be sustainable these should be integrated or serve as input to the official DM plans where possibilities could be through:

<sup>1</sup> Equivalent to the term Community Disaster Actions Teams (CDAT) used in other DRC DRR programs.

<sup>2</sup> In several cases the more mature volunteers are often seen to be more consistent which contributes to the maintenance of knowledge and experience within the teams.

<sup>3</sup> One example to prevent this is seen where the paid field coordinators were supplemented by volunteer deputies in order to ensure continuity and sustainability.

- **Aligning the preparation of the local plan** so that the plan is in place at a proper time in relation to the preparation of the official plan and ideally be cyclic and updated on a regular basis.
- Using a **similar format and structure** as the official plans so that the community plans are able to supplement the formal inputs and create synergies between local development plans and the program which increases the chance of the plans being updated and considered meaningful by the volunteers.

## COOPERATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Partnership and cooperation with local government is identified as one of the cornerstones in ensuring local ownership and continuation of community-based DRR activities. By entering into dialogue with both national, regional and local government the foundation of the advocacy efforts is build. Also, this cooperation is seen to be essential in order to take on a **role as complementary, capacity building and supporting to the existing structures** rather than creating a parallel system. This has succeeded in several programs where local government have replicated the team structure into new communities or chosen to cover the expenses of existing CVG's.

As an entry point to such cooperation with local government several of the interviewees point out how RC/RC can **address the legal responsibilities** which authorities might not fulfill and present how RC/RC could assist them in meeting these. Same cooperation has also been established in cases where the authorities have not had the sufficient technical or organizational capacity to spend relevant DM budget and therefore channeled this through RC/RC DM activities which contributes to the fulfillment of legal responsibilities.

The on-going process of building cooperation with authorities is often seen to be rather reliant on personal relations and sensitive to staff turnovers which challenge the sustainability of the relations. In order to address this challenge and enhance sustainability of community-based DRR activities **tools of coordination and formalization can be valuable** such as standard operational procedures (SOP) and memorandum of understanding (MoU) outlining roles and responsibilities between RC/RC activities and authorities.

Building on the advocacy work another field of cooperation with local government which provides **possibility for enhanced sustainability is by providing "consultancy"**. This could be delivered by both staff and volunteers and have been done in relation to RC/RC core competences and tools<sup>4</sup> and contribute with capacity building of authorities as well as a possibility for advocating<sup>5</sup>.

## PHASE-OUT STRATEGIES

Several different set-ups have been experienced in terms of the closing of a program:

- There have been positive experiences with **phase-out funding or "post program support"** where a relatively small amount of money is saved for the time after the formal closing of the program<sup>6</sup>.
- In programs running over several phases it have also been attempted to **gradually reduce the financial support for branches**. Through this scheme branches and target communities have been compelled to find alternatives funding sources and become increasingly self-sufficient and less reliant on both technical and financial support.

When exiting program communities and entering new ones it have in some cases proven to be advantageous to start up in communities either within the same branch or a branch nearby as well as having a timely exit strategy in place. In this way the "old" communities can still be involved and engaged in trainings and simulations while the new communities can benefit from the lessons learnt<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Such as VCA or assisting government to untangle their responsibilities as set out in legislation

<sup>5</sup> However it is highlighted that this kind of cooperation should be carried out with auxiliary role in mind.

<sup>6</sup> This is based on the notion that a few years may not be sufficient for communities to become financially and socially sustainable. During such a phase-out scheme the financial support would cover e.g. refresher trainings and monitoring.

<sup>7</sup> In general several evaluations and interviewees underline the importance of having an exit strategy in place and emphasize that this needs to be in place relatively early in order to prove useful in terms of enhancing sustainability.

## 4. REGIONAL EXPERIENCES AND APPROACHES

Capturing the successful approaches and experiences at the regional level contributed to an understanding of the contextual challenges and possibilities. The external stakeholders comprised by DIPECHO partners (Save the Children, OXFAM, Austrian Red Cross), UNDP as well as the IFRC and ICRC all hold valuable insight to DRR programs in the region and shared experiences and ideas around sustainability.

### COMMUNITY VOLUNTEERS AND COOPERATION WITH LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Several interesting experiences have been made in terms of local engagement and advocacy with local authorities as well as cooperation with local volunteers.

- In one set-up the community volunteers and the municipality representative were exchanging information on a weekly basis with relevant information on e.g. changing risks patterns. The costs for phone bills, etc. were initially paid by the organization but were taken over by the authorities. Having a **specific counterpart or contact person in the local authorities** can in this way be a method to build and maintain close cooperation at the local level.
- Same form of regular communication was ensured in a different program by field staff **participating in weekly internal meetings for local government**. The field staffs that were in charge of the advocacy efforts were in the meetings given the opportunity for presenting program results and continuously build on and enhance the cooperation.

However, an often mentioned challenge to such close and continuous cooperation with is the frequent turnover rate in local authority staff in Georgia. A way to address this is seen in the presented prospects of establishing “Municipal Resource Centres” owned by local authorities with relevant authority representatives and an organization-paid focal point. The representatives are to be paid by local government and to overcome the turnover challenges these representatives should be selected by a criteria of their position not to be depending on elections<sup>8</sup>.

An approach to enhance the sustainability of the community volunteer groups and make the local set-up less dependent on external support has been through **involving volunteer groups in the training of new groups and hereby ensure activity**, refreshing of knowledge and experience sharing. In line with this it was also suggested that the choice of new target locations could be based on considerations of whether more established groups would be able to assist the training of new volunteer groups.

Additional to this effort of building more capacity and entrust more responsibility to the local level **tasks have been delegated within volunteer groups**<sup>9</sup> similar to those of the DRR III and such internal set-up have been seen to make the volunteer groups more self-sufficient and ensure the handling of vital functions with less support from HQ level.

To maintain the knowledge in the community groups or local branches a “branch manual” outlining the procedures, contacts and guidance has been a useful tool to sustain institutional knowledge.

### SCHOOL-BASED ACTIVITIES

In relation to school-based activities one of the successes in formalization DRR have been the integration of Family Emergency Planning into the UNICEF developed “Head Teachers Book” with various DRR topics, exercises.

---

<sup>8</sup> Additionally, these centers are planned to incorporate the updating of VCA's and have cooperation with volunteer groups providing proposals for future initiatives which will further be a part of institutionalize the present DRR activities.

<sup>9</sup> Focal points have been appointed among the volunteers for e.g. communication, advocacy and school-based activities

Although integrated into curriculum the implementation of the DRR component is still challenging as the material is part of a mandatory subject such as e.g. geography where there could be potential for further integration.

The same challenge of enforcement is seen in other programs where the provision of material and trainings or even mandatory requirements does not automatically imply the use or maintenance of this material as an enforcing body is not in place. In the cases where the teachers have independently continued activities and passed on knowledge **the motivation identified is the usefulness and applicability of the material provided** but this is very much seen to be depending on individuals. An idea is therefore to also **train management in order to engage all levels** and ensure enforcement of the mechanisms put in place.

The engagement of all levels in school-based DRR activities have also been present in the youth clubs developing small DRR initiatives linked to the International Week of DRR. Both principals, teachers and pupils were involved in this process which was highlighted as a good driver for the project. The youth clubs managed to find funding for themselves and did only receive technical support and guidance which is a good basis for future and further replication.

The challenges of enforcement have also been present in relation to program activities of emergency equipment and simulations as well as refreshment of this. The equipment has been provided and agreements on replenishment made but it still remains to be seen whether these will be effective. In terms of school simulations which are mandatory in both Georgia and Armenia these have been supported by **volunteers acting as middlemen between schools and the relevant authorities to ensure the execution** of these after schools have been provided with instructions and equipment.

Finally, a more coordinated approach between DIPECHO partners in relation to educational activities was suggested in order to ensure a unified approach and a better basis for advocacy at the national level.

## **OTHERS**

When discussing future sustainability of DRR programs in Georgia several of the external stakeholders mentioned the current restructuring of the Emergency Management Department as a process causing uncertainty about formal responsibilities of the authorities. The new organizational set-up, responsibilities and budgets should be finalized by the end of 2014 and will clarify future prospects for cooperation and formalization.

Similar to the DRR III experiences small scale mitigation projects co-funded by local authorities are considered to be a good step towards sustainability by creating awareness and ownership through the financial set up. From other experiences with small scale mitigation projects funding from local authorities have also been ensured. However, there is not necessarily separate DRR funding in the local budgets but the budget lines of "Others" or "Community development funding" have been used for these projects.

To ensure future financial sustainability the assessment of new funding sources is highlighted as a key aspect as the general expectations are that the DIPECHO funding will not be increasing. However, there are identified possibilities in the direction of climate change hence an increased integration of this into the on-going DRR programs is considered.



## 5. PROGRAM EXPERIENCES AND APPROACHES

In the roadmap the identified global and regional experiences are to inspire the future process of enhancing the sustainability of the DRR III. A number of program successes have already been achieved and will form the basis of the future sustainability steps outlined.

Over the previous phases the DRR models have been developed by GRCS and ARCS as a good way to capture the experiences of implementation. Further these have been consolidated and promoted and have provided an entry point to local authorities for integrating activities of the CBDRR model in local development planning. In both Georgia and Armenia the cooperation with relevant authorities is very close and have been vital to the successful implementation of program so far.

The disaster risk management capacity in the target communities is seen to have been strengthened through the program at both the national, regional and local level. This capacity has also been built through institutional linkages, coordination and advocacy efforts. An example of this is the ARCS participation in the National DRR Platform is also seen as a good step to influence policy processes and coordination at a national level. Regular meeting between the DIPECHO partners have also contributed to this coordination and enhancement of relevant alignment.

The dissemination of lessons learned reports, sunshine stories and case studies to regional stakeholders have attracted attention around the program and its activities and forms a good basis for advocacy. This has also been the case of the public DRR events such as DRR Day or the program launches which have been part of raising the public awareness around risks and disaster management.

The disaster management capacity has also been enhance through the establishment of the CVG's who are seen to be well-established and recognized within the local communities and relevant authorities seen e.g. through a unification of the naming of these groups. Teams are seen to be activated and used by local and regional rescue services and included in their simulations as well the teams are responding to small scale events on their own. In some cases the teams have also been integrated into local or regional response plans which is a good step towards the formalization and sustainability of these.

Also, the GRCS Branch Development program has had success in getting financial support from local authorities for e.g. buildings, staff and utilities and such experience could possibly also be replicated in the DRR III program.

For the small scale mitigation measures a good sustainable setup has been developed. Previously the small scale mitigation measures were funded solely by GRCS/ARCS but now the program provided the materials and the local government is then responsible for the construction and offers the labor. This have been seen enhance the local ownership as well as provide a good example for replication.

The school-based activities have been successful in raising awareness and changing behavior through the Family Emergency Plans which some schools are now seen to be running unassisted. The improvement of the emergency equipment in Armenia is seen to beneficial even without significant maintenance. However, in order to sustain the awareness and mentality around DRR and preparedness some degree of follow-up seems to be required and could be enhanced further.

The following roadmap builds on the experiences mentioned above and discuss how the successes can be maintained and extended. It is not aiming to transform the program design but to increasingly link considerations of sustainability into the implementation and continuation of activities.

# **SUSTAINABILITY ROADMAP**

**ARMENIAN RED CROSS SOCIETY**

**OCTOBER 2014**

## COOPERATION AND COORDINATION



A MoU between ARCS and Regional Rescue Service is signed outlining future cooperation and responsibilities for CVG's.

A strong cooperation is in place between ARCS and the Regional Rescue Services who already hold the formal responsibility the CVG's. By transferring additional practical responsibilities of the CVG's to the Regional Rescue Services the maintenance and sustainability of these can be ensured beyond the current program scope. Refresher trainings and simulations could be provided here through existing institutional capabilities while the possible mechanism for replenishment of equipment needs to be clarified further as well as the extent, frequency and cost of the replenishment.

*The initial discussions with Regional Rescue Services have been had and the process of developing a draft for the MoU is in progress. The MoU will clearly specify roles and responsibilities of ARCS, Rescue Service and local authorities in CVGs further maintenance and use.*

Annual updates in regional Rescue Services Response Plan according CVG's are consulted and amendments shared with ARCS.

The successful cooperation between ARCS, regional and local authorities have resulted in the formalization of the CVG's through the inclusion in Regional Emergency Response Plan. This is an important step to ensure activation and institutionalization of the CVG's and ownership from the Rescue Service and authorities of the CVG's and to build on this achievement ARCS should continuously be included in the regional planning.

*This can be included in the MoU with Regional Rescue Services.*

ARCS to have a contact person in the Regional Rescue Service with coordination functions of CVG's.

In the process of linking the CVG's closer with the Regional Rescue Services a contact person could ensure that the basic coordination functions of the CVG's are sustained regardless of the current program structure. With time these tasks could also include communication with CVG's, initiation of simulations and updating of community action plans. Depending on whether ARCS is to fund a Regional DRR Team Focal Point by 2015, a set-up to be considered is for ARCS to fund a 6 month position at the Regional Rescue Services and advocate for Regional Rescue Service to continue the funding and keeping of this position.

*ARCS is in dialogue with Regional Rescue Services around the CVG responsibilities which will include the communication process. By end-2014 it should be clear if ARCS can fund a 6 month position.*

Local Field Officer' salary is covered jointly by local authorities based on a clear job description.

Due to the central setup with one Field Officer covering all CVG's a joint community funding for this salary could be a possibility which would enhance the longevity of this coordinating role activating the CVG's. The Field Officer' responsibilities should be clarified in relation to those of the Regional Rescue Services as well as outline how this position will support communities. This could include the Field Officer to participate in regular meetings with local authorities to share information on CVG activity and advocate for further priority given to DRR in the local planning and budgeting.

*The Field Officer is currently covered fully by ARCS and the prospect of having this position funded by local authorities will depend on if a regional position can be funded. Local authorities are supporting CVGs transportation costs for drills, trainings and other events so the current level of ownership and support is obvious and could be further enlarged.*

ARCS to be assigned a seat in Crisis Coordination Commission.

Creation of the Shirak Regional Crisis Coordination Center presents a possibility for further institutionalization of the DRR structures. This would be both through ARCS being assigned a seat in the Commission as well as having the center as a meeting point for CVG's and for Field Officer to engage with authorities outside the time of disasters. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that CVG's have relevant space for meetings and equipment storing in their communities provided by local authorities.

*This should be possible but a discussion with Regional Rescue Services is needed to clarify in the relevant situations for ARCS presence and this should be part of the MoU to be signed.*

ARCS involved in development of "white paper" for volunteers in emergency management with OXFAM.

The close cooperation and coordination meetings with DIPECHO partners as well as the ARCS participation in the National DRR Platform are seen as good sustainability steps which should be continued in order to learn from best practices as well as build a stronger foundation for national advocacy efforts.

*ARCS is part of Commission of Certification of Rescuers and are therefore involved.*

## COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER GROUPS



The team leader of each CVG to communicate to Field Officer when responding to events.

The ability to provide updated information of the activity of CVG's and their role in the community can further enhance the support and recognition from local authorities which is valuable in the continuous process of ensuring local ownership. The developed template for regular CVG reporting to Field Officer is not properly used in the practice and should be further enhanced for ensuring systematic collection of data and successes advocacy.

*Enhance systematic and regular reporting from the CVG's to Field Officers and potentially Rescue Services.*

ARCS to conduct survey among CVG volunteers to assess the level of activity and engagement.

To ensure that the volunteers are engaged and their future expectations fulfilled a survey could be conducted to identify the motivation and priorities of the CVG volunteers. Such knowledge could inform the future planning and assess the possibility and wish of CVG's to be more involved in "branch development" activities which would provide more continuous activities and possible enhance the volunteer retention.

*A survey can be developed and carried out by ARCS HQ in combination with field visits.*

ARCS to support CVG's in developing "team activity plans."

Stimulating discussion on the CVG's future wishes and activities could strengthen the long-term planning and ensure common goals as a team as well as overview and follow-up of activities. Through such process it will also become clearer for ARCS where the CVG's will potentially require additional assistance or activation.

*Several of the CVG activities are currently reflected in the community action plan which could be specified and complemented by more specific discussions on future plans in the "team activity plan".*

CVG's are increasingly engaged in facilitation of trainings and possibilities for experience sharing and joint simulations to be identified.

In order to activate, refresh knowledge and share experience of the volunteers CVG members could be more involved in facilitating trainings of new volunteers and CVG's. This could be operationalized by the creation of a facilitation "roster" of CVG volunteers, their capacities and interest of facilitating. Also to increase the frequency of activities and experience sharing joint simulations could be encouraged.

*There are volunteers in each CVG's which would be capable of facilitating and the "roster" can also be shared with Regional Rescue Services. The team action plan could include a suggestion to conduct joint activities.*

"Wrap out" meetings to be held in communities before phasing out.

Closing discussion with local authorities and other stakeholders can be held to ensure that unresolved responsibilities are addressed and the withdrawal of ARCS support to happen with minimal negative impact for the achieved results. This could include the status of the CVG's, areas where future support is needed and future potential for replication is discussed with local government and other stakeholders.

*With developing MoU with Regional Rescue Services it will be outlined how phase out could happen.*

## VCA AND LOCAL ACTION PLAN



### Develop local capacity to continue updates of VCA's.

While the VCA requires technical support for updating it could be interesting to activate the Field Officer and CVG's more in this process and link closer with local authorities. The regional teams under the National DRR platform have also been trained in VCA's and could possibly support the process if gaining more practical experiences and this opportunity could be assessed.

*The CVG's are not trained in VCA as it is not considered realistic for them to be able to conduct these unassisted. The Field Officer is part of the collecting data and analysis is conducted at ARCS HQ. The goal is not to have annual assessment as the conditions are not changing very frequently but rather to monitor the hazards which can be done by CVG's.*

### The Community Action Plan to be increasingly integrated into local development plan.

One of key objective of the Community Action Plan based on the VCA is to integrate considerations of risk reduction into local planning and in this way achieve long-term results. In Armenia 4 year local development plans are developed and updated and in order for the Community Action Plan to serve as input to this alignment of timing is a priority. In addition it could be beneficial for ARCS to identify relevant sections in the plan and budget and to develop a template and standard formulations for integration of DRR which could be provided for the CVG's. To address these priorities possible ways for CVG's to be involved in meetings with local authorities before local development plan is updated should be considered.

*The next 4 year plan will be made in many of targeted rural communities in 2016 and it will be considered how Community Action Plans can feed into this. There are currently no separate budget lines for DRR but it should be possible to include risk reduction under other budget lines such as "Social activities" or "Construction".*

### Systematic follow-up, dissemination and discussion when updating VCA and Community Action Plans.

The results of the VCA and Community Action Plans are currently being shared with local authorities to advocate for their engagement in DRR. A yearly follow-up on these would be a way to capture the progress and identify steps that authorities are already taking which contributes to the risk reduction. This process could also be scaled up to a joint workshop with authority representatives including experience sharing and practical application of integrating DRR into local plans and budgets. This could be followed by the development of "Brief Guide" distributed to local authorities with practical experiences on how to integrate DRR. The updating of VCA and Community Action Plans also provides a good opportunity for CVG's to disseminate information to maintain the knowledge and awareness on risk reduction within the community.

*There are good possibilities of increasing experience sharing between communities as some of the mayors are very active.*

## AWARENESS RAISING



### Schools to update Family Emergency Plans without ARCS assistance.

The FEP is a key element in the process of raising awareness on DRR in communities. From being driven and funded solely by ARCS some schools are now seen to be updating the FEP independently without the program funded competition. This proves the usefulness of the tool and serves as basis for a model to sustain the FEP where the school military instructors could be central to initiating the updating. A number of recurrent DRR events could be captured in an annual calendar for schools (DRR day, FEP update, simulations) to enhance the awareness and visibility around these and stress the execution of these. The new manual titled “Safe Family” developed by ARCS is other advantage for ensuring family level attitude change towards DRR which will result in higher safety and preparedness, meantime, formulating DRR culture.

*It is difficult to ensure that teachers will initiate the FEP. During this phase an evaluation of the “Safe Family” manual which integrated part is FEP might be done to assess the effectiveness of the tool and show the value of the tool. In terms of dissemination discussions are being had with the National DRR Platform to distribute “Safe Family” manual countrywide to community DRR libraries and other organizations like OXFAM and UNICEF are also applying to ARCS developed FEP and “Safe Family” approach by incorporating into their DRR projects and distributing ARCS material on “Safe Family”, including FEP.’*

### Schools to replenish safety equipment and initiate simulations without ARCS assistance.

ARCS has during the 2nd and 3rd phases provided schools with safety equipment such as evacuation signs, fire panels and fire extinguishers. The schools have agreed to refill the program provided extinguishers which has initial 5 year guarantee which is an important step towards the sustainability of the school safety component. Some schools are also seen to conduct simulations unassisted and some even more than the legal requirement which should be promoted even more and tied closer to the rescue services and fire departments.

*ARCS support and instructions have improved school capacity but there is still a need for ARCS to push schools to conduct simulations. Such reminders could be promoted in planned calendars but this depends on budget.*

## MITIGATION MEASURES



### Local authorities agree to maintain already completed projects

Based on the VCA small scale mitigation measures have been constructed to reduce risks within the community. Good sustainability practice have been developed as ARCS provides materials only and local authorities are responsible of the planning, implementation and further maintenance of these enhancing the local ownership of these projects. The mitigation measures are seen to have led to several cases of behavioral change and also attracted attention from neighboring communities wanting to replicate these. To build on this successful approach and increase the sustainability of these further the maintenance of the small scale mitigation measures should also be ensured by local authorities.

*The mitigation projects with garbage bin does not require maintenance as the structures are in place but for riverbank protection or mudflow channels the maintenance should be ensured by local authorities. Nevertheless, local authorities are in charge for organization of permanent garbage removal from the community which they do with high responsibility. Approaches are differ from community to community, but as a best practice there are some communities where people agree to pay monthly garbage fee which is small amount but they pay very punctually.*

### Increased visibility of small scale mitigation measures.

To enhance community recognition and awareness on risk reduction the CVG's can distribute information during the construction of mitigation measures as well as the Field Officer should ensure that signage is in place when finalized.



# **SUSTAINABILITY ROADMAP**

**GEORGIA RED CROSS SOCIETY**

**OCTOBER 2014**

## COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION



A briefing package for local authorities on GRCS DRR to be compiled and an "information folder" to be in place in each community.

The high turnover rate in focal government positions requires the GRCS representatives to repeatedly provide information which could be eased by having standard briefing package distributed to new authority staff members containing general information on the program as well as updated information on the local results and CVG activities. This can be complemented by an "information folder" to capture that the institutional knowledge of the Field Officers and contain community VCA's, action plans, templates and contact information. This would also present the possibility of displaying progress compared to old plans after a continuous presence in the same community and by this feed into the briefing package.

*GRCS does already have information material in place which could be supplemented with local material developed by Field Officer who can also collect the material for the "information folder".*

HD/advocacy strategy to be finalised and include calendar of relevant, recurrent processes for GRCS.

Through numerous DRR activities GRCS is already involved in many advocacy processes. To build on the previous HD training a yearly calendar outlining events such as the time of yearly budget planning and local development processes could enhance a more strategic approach. Such overview would also provide opportunity for discussions on how to implement this plan on local level and increasingly include and build capacity for Field Officers and CVG's in advocacy processes.

*The elaboration of HD/Advocacy strategy is on-going in GRCS and after completing the strategy this will be disseminated to the field officers for further steps.*

Senior management are comfortable and capable of advocating for the sustainability approaches with other stakeholders

Senior management are often the spokespeople for the key actions with government. A dedicated briefing package on the DRR principles and sustainability strategy will ensure their understanding and support is in place prior to the commencement of negotiations. Entry-points of regular updating of senior management could be around the program initiation and reviews or following larger events.

*Senior management has the information regarding the GRCS projects and they are using on high level meetings and this approach should be continued and enhanced.*

Roundtable meeting to be continued as well as GRCS participation in public DRR events.

The previous roundtable meetings and joint meetings for local authorities have proved very effective to raise awareness around GRCS activities, promote integration of DRR and ensure coordination between stakeholders. This is a very good step towards sustainability that should be continued and replicated throughout the program.

## COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER GROUPS



**A strategy is in place for future replenishment of equipment.**

The CVG's have been trained and provided with equipment through the program which has made them able of responding to disasters in their community and supporting local rescue services. To ensure that the CVG's will continuously be able to do so and be considered a valuable assistance by the authorities additional funding will have to be ensured for replenishing their equipment in the future. This could include a clarification of the extent, frequency and cost of the replenishment to be presented to local authorities.

*A proposal outlining possibilities for joint cooperation with local authorities as well as financial contribution to activities is planned to be sent to target communities prior to the updates of budgets in December.*

**CVG's are included into municipal emergency plans**

The inclusion of CVG's into the municipal emergency plans could be promoted through Field Officers providing local authorities with CVG contact details and identifying relevant sections of the plan where CVG's can be included and develop a template for formulations which can be applied. Some communities already have good experience of integrating the CVG's into the municipal emergency which is likely to increase the formal recognition and deployment of the teams.

*On-going effort for Field Officers advocating for integration of CVG's. However, restructuring of EMD might influence the structures of these plans.*

**All CVG's have a place to meet provided by local authorities.**

Most CVG's have an office provided by local authorities which provides a frame and sense of identity for the activities and meetings. In communities where social activities are implemented it would be good to consider how these can increasingly be linked in order to increase activity within the CVG's.

*It will be possible to discuss with local authorities to provide a space for CVG's and identify funding in GRCS program budgets for the refurbishment of local office spaces.*

**Field Officers' salary to be covered jointly by local authorities based on a clear job description.**

The Field Officers are vital links to keeping the CVG's active and thereby an important role in terms of sustainability. Presenting clear job description to local authorities outlining responsibilities could be a step in assessing the possibilities for funding for this salary. If receiving financial support for the Field Officers it could be beneficial for these to participate in regular meetings with local authorities to share information on CVG activity and results and to advocate for further priority given to DRR in the local planning.

*A proposal outlining possibilities for joint cooperation with local authorities as well as financial contribution to activities is planned to be sent to program communities prior to the updates of budgets in December.*

## COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER GROUPS

GRCS to support CVG's in developing "team activity plans".

Stimulating discussion on the CVG's future wishes and activities could strengthen the long-term planning and ensure common goals as a team as well as overview and follow-up of activities. This could also assess the possibility and wish of CVG's to be more involved in "branch development" or social activities which would provide more continuous activities. Through such process it will also become clearer for GRCS where the CVG's will potentially require additional assistance or activation.

*In the branches where different activities are on-going the CVG's are involved and their future "team activity plans" could be shared with other CVG's as inspiration.*

CVG's to be increasingly engaged in facilitation of trainings and possibilities for experience sharing and joint simulations to be identified.

The capacity building of the CVG's during the previous phases have resulted in experiences of these facilitating trainings for other organizations as well as providing information to local authorities. In order to activate, refresh knowledge and share experience even further the CVG members could also be involved in facilitating trainings of new CVG's. This could be operationalized by the creation of a facilitation "roster" of CVG volunteers, their capacities and interest of facilitating. The team action plan could also include plans on joint simulations and activities with neighboring CVG's.

*Some CVG volunteers have the capacity to facilitate trainings which could be activated more and be coordinated through GRCS HQ contacting Field Officers when planning trainings.*

Local authorities to initiate joint simulations and cover CVG costs for these.

The joint simulations initiated through the program have provided good opportunities for coordination between the CVG's and local authorities as well as practice of skills. As for future sustainability of these simulations it would be a step to have local authorities planning and initiating simulations. A suggestion could be presented to local authorities outlining necessary procedures and participating stakeholders and possibly having the Field Officer assisting the planning as a transition phase.

*The current EMD restructuring creates opportunity for greater ownership of simulations by local stakeholders.*

"Wrap out" meetings to be held in communities before phasing out.

Closing discussion with local authorities and other stakeholders to ensure that unresolved responsibilities are addressed and the withdrawal of GRCS support to happen with minimal negative impact for the achieved results. In addition to a review of all the structures that have been put in place throughout the previous years of the program this could include a discussion with local government and other stakeholders of the status of the CVG's, areas where future support is needed and future potential for replication.

*All the results of the GRCS activities will be shared and information will be provided to local authorities and stakeholders during the wrap out meetings. At the same time further steps for continuation of the activities will be discussed and planned*

## VCA AND COMMUNITY RESPONSE PLAN



### Field Officers and CVG's take lead role in updating VCA and 3W's.

The VCA is a key tool to identify risks in the community and informs decision making for CVG activity and mitigation measures. Strengthening the local capacity among both Field Officers and CVG's to use and update this tool could benefit the local ownership of this process as well as the CVG's ability to share this information with their community.

Also if the Field Officers' salaries are to cover by local authorities it could be considered how these could be involved more in the process.

*The Field Officers are currently included in the VCA process by providing data but would also be able to analyze parts of this if required.*

### VCA and Community Response Plan to be increasingly integrated into local authority plans.

Local authorities are included in the preparation of the VCA and to build on this having further discussion on the process and results of the VCA would be a good step to advocate more for the integration of DRR in local plans and budgets. A yearly follow-up on these would be a way to capture the progress and identify steps that authorities are already taking which contributes to the risk reduction.

Likewise, the Community Response Plan could potentially be linked closer to the municipal response plan in order to create synergies between the plans. A way to increase this integration could be ensuring that the timing of these are aligned in order to provide updated input as well as develop template with standard formulations and identify relevant sections for of the local authority plan.

*Field officers will be working constantly to integrate the Community Response Plan into municipal plan.*

## MITIGATION MEASURES



Local authorities to maintain already completed projects and continuation of successful setup.

Based on the VCA small scale mitigation measures have been constructed to reduce risks within the community. Good sustainability practice have been developed as GRCS provides materials and local authorities are responsible of the planning and construction of these enhancing the local ownership of these projects. To build on this successful approach and increase the sustainability of these further the maintenance of the small scale mitigation measures should also be ensured by local authorities.

*Contracts are currently developed before the construction of a mitigation project and can also include a section on maintenance. Further, a proposal outlining possibilities for joint cooperation with local authorities as well as financial contribution to activities is planned to be sent to program communities prior to the updates of budgets in December.*

Increased visibility of small scale mitigation measures.

In addition to reducing risk the small scale mitigation measures are also a way to raise awareness and generate discussion on risk reduction in the community. Increased visibility of the small scale mitigation measures could be promoted by distributed information to households or put in central places in the communities. This could both be during the construction informing on the risks and project or after finalizing the project informing on the maintenance and further risk reduction. CVG's could provide this information as part of awareness raising campaigns.

*Field Officers are currently responsible of ensuring that signage is in place after construction of mitigation measures.*

## SCHOOL ACTIVITIES



### Schools to update FEP unassisted.

The Family Emergency Plan is central to the program's awareness raising on the community level. To be considered a very successful step in terms of sustainability is the inclusion of the FEP into the UNICEF developed "Head Teachers Book". This also provides a further opportunity for Field Officers to advocate to teachers and educational resource centers to initiate and support an annual update of the FEP without GRCS initiating this or funding competitions. To build further capacity the interest for trainings among the teachers could be assessed as these can be provided by UNICEF/Ministry of Education. Another opportunity could be for GRCS to support day for teachers on climate change and FEP which could be hosted by local educational resource centers and also include the CVG's.

To specify a future setup for the FEP a testing setup could be suggested to the Ministry of Education where local resource centers are running and funding FEP and the youth camp with technical GRCS assistance in the three communities where phasing out late-2014. This should be followed up with an evaluation and discussion of the replication of this approach.

*UNICEF material can be requested to be available at schools and the possibility of closer cooperation with resource centers can be assessed.*

### "Committee of Five" initiating small scale DRR initiatives.

The pupil-based "Committee of Five" can possibly be an important factor for the sustainability of the school DRR activities. Assisted by the Field Officer the Committee could develop an annual calendar for the school with recurrent DRR related events (FEP, DRR day, simulations, etc.) which should be put in a visible place and enhance incentive for the execution of these. Also a linkage between the "Committee of Five" and CVG's could promote awareness across the community and CVG's and Field Officer could assist the Committee in arranging small scale DRR initiatives based on the UNICEF template.

*The "Committee of Five" is to be established in target communities during the next months.*

### Schools initiate simulations unassisted

The simulations in schools were originally driven by GRCS but some schools are seen to initiate these independently which is a good step for the sustainability of the activity and towards increased safety in schools. In order to build on these experiences it could be valuable to gradually decrease the GRCS support for these. As a setup the Field Officers could be in charge for arranging the simulations together with the school based on previous experience and instructions from GRCS. Along this building a closer cooperation between the fire brigade and schools would be a step towards having schools initiating the simulations unassisted.

*Field Officers will have the ability to initiate and plan these if provide with instructions and scenarios.*

## **ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **Terms of Reference for Intern In Georgia & Armenia, South Caucasus**

#### **1. Background**

The Danish Red Cross's (DRC) partnership with Georgia and Armenia Red Cross Societies (GRCS & ARCS) related to the implementation of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Programme commenced in April 2010.

South Caucasus is highly exposed to natural disasters, including earthquakes, landslides, floods, mudflows, droughts and avalanches. The risks of earthquakes are particularly high as SC is placed along several fault lines, which makes it one of the most seismically active regions in the world and have caused large casualties and damage in Spitak (Armenia) 1988 and Tbilisi (Georgia) 2002.

Although national governments have established structures to deal with disaster management, under resourcing and poor coordination between agencies means these structures are not yet able to meet the challenge of major disasters. The authorities have only recently started incorporating the civil sector in their operational schemes, which is especially true at community level, where there is little, if any, funding for disaster mitigation and preparedness. Based on experiences and knowledge gained during the implementation of the initial DRR Action, it is evident that further action is required to systematically consolidate and institutionalise the DRR, with special attention to the local/community level. The NS's, acting as auxiliary to the government are playing a key role bridging between communities and government institutions through DRR projects.

The programme is co-funded by European Commission Humanitarian Aid Department & Civil Protection (DIPECHO) and Danish Red Cross, in the led for a consortium of Icelandic & Austrian Red Cross and IFRC. The programme is in the proposal evaluation stage for the third round of action supported by DIPECHO.

In addition to this DRC is supporting GRCS with;

1. Branch development programme since 2009, funded by DRC
2. Joint local authorities / civil society organisation development of social strategies and services to most vulnerable in Georgia 2012 – 2015, co-funded by EuropeAid & DRC

#### **2. Objective of the Internship**

To draft a report with recommendations for the sustainability of the Disaster Risk Reduction Program beyond the current funding support mechanisms.

#### **3. Outputs**

**A brief evaluation of DRR sustainability successes worldwide** – A literary review of Community Based DRR programs both internal and external to the Red Cross movement that have undertaken successful steps to sustainability, including but not limited to, at the community level, institutionally for Red Cross National Societies and institutionally within the humanitarian sector and public authority strategic priorities.

**A brief evaluation of contextual successes and opportunities** - Facilitate participatory discussions with GRCS and ARCS staff and other humanitarian partners to identify contextually appropriate opportunities for sustainability.

**Sustainability Final report** - maximum 15 pages, outlining the recommendations with milestones and clear objectives for the future sustainability of the DRR program.

#### **4. Scope of Work**



The Internship, will comprise - but not necessarily be limited to - the preparation and drafting of the Sustainability Final Report in close cooperation with ARCS & GRCS DM teams and DRC's Regional DRR Delegate.

#### **5. Method of work**

1. Study of programme documents for DRR I, II and III and additional documents listed under paragraph 8.
2. Remote discussions with the relevant DRC, PNS and IFRC DRR Technical Advisors on their relevant experiences and resources
3. Remote discussions with relevant DRC DRR Program Delegates in other countries (where appropriate)
4. Meetings with GRCS & ARCS DM and Senior Management staff.
5. Meetings with Branch staff and volunteers in Racha-Lechkhumi & Imereti Regions, Georgia and Shirak Region, Armenia (where applicable)
6. Meeting with DRC Regional DRR Delegate
7. Meetings with DRR and humanitarian stakeholders in respective countries
8. Drafting of the final report, including the inclusion of stakeholder feedback
9. Submission of the final report prior to departing the region.

#### **6. Time frame**

Subject to the availability of the selected individual, the internship will be conducted over a five-week period between 01/08/2014 and 31/10/2014.

#### **7. Station base and supervision**

The Intern refers to DRC Regional DRR Delegate based in Georgia where the Intern will also spend the majority of his/her time but with frequent visits to the field. As a DRC representative, the Intern will be under the responsibility of the DRC Head of Region.

#### **8. Documents (made available to the Student)**

- Programme documents DRR I 2010 – 2012, DRR II 2012 – 2013, DRR III 2014 - 2015
- Hyogo Framework for Action
- GRCS & ARCS DM strategies and Country Strategies
- DRC International Strategy 2011-14
- Relevant DRC strategic guidelines
- IFRC and other humanitarian actors DRR Program evaluations
- DRC DRR Program Evaluations, PPR Reports and Program documents

Tim McInerny  
Regional Disaster Risk Reduction Delegate South Caucasus  
Tbilisi February 2014

## ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Name	Title
Kahka Mamuladze	GRCS, Head of DM Department
Tamuna Kamkamidze	GRCS, DRR Programme Coordinator
Nino Didberidze	GRCS, Social Program Coordinator
Giga LASTNAME	GRCS, Social Program Coordinator
Anne Kobæk	DRC, Regional Programme delegate (Armenia, Belarus and Georgia)
Edmon Azaryan	ARCS, Head of DM Department
Sergie LASTNAME	ARCS, DRR Programme Officer
Narek LASTNAME	ARCS, DRR Programme Officer
Head of Regional Rescue Services	Shirak, Armenia
Local governor	Name of community??, Armenia
Local governor	Ambrolauri, Tsageri and Lentekhi, Georgia
Field Officer	Ambrolauri and Lentekhi, Georgia
Community Volunteer Groups	Tsageri and Lentekhi, Georgia
Rostom Gamisonia	Consultant, Rural Communities Development Agency
Mette Petersen	Head of Country Cluster, Budapest, IFRC
Regina Szwadzka	Regional Cooperation Delegate, ICRC
Malkhaz Kharebava	TITEL, ICRC
Michael Grabner	Programme Officer, Austrian Red Cross
Louisa Whitlock	TITEL, Austrian Red Cross
Tea Tsagereli Sopho Andguladze Sandro Stazhadze	TITEL, Save the Children, Georgia
Giorgi Datusani	TITEL, Oxfam
Nino Gvetadze	TITEL, UNDP, Georgia
Anne Mette Meyer	DRC, DRR/CCA Advisor, Former DRC Delegate in Mozambique
Hans-Jakob Haussmann	DRC, Desk of Europe Region, Former DRC Delegate in Indonesia
Knud Falk	DRC, DRR/CCA Advisor
Anders Skjelmosse	DRC, Delegate in Nepal
Jeanette Bækmark	DRC, Delegate in Kenya