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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In July 2007, Caritas Keuskupan Sibolga (CKS) commissioned the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) to provide technical assistance in designing and implementing a Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR) pilot project in Nias Island. Using IIRR’s participatory approach to community development, the goal was to develop the capacity of the CKS Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) team to implement a 21-month pilot CMDRR project in three communities within Gunungsitoli and Amandraya. In applying the CMDRR methodology, the pilot project was intended at building disaster-resilient Nias communities by increasing community capacities to address hazards and vulnerabilities.

In November 2008, the SIPA team was commissioned by IIRR to conduct an independent evaluation of the pilot CMDRR project. The evaluation focused on two main areas: (1) the organizational capabilities of IIRR and CKS as shown through the project processes; and (2) CMDRR as an intervention tool, looking at the effectiveness and relevance for the project’s context. Specifically, the following evaluation questions were examined:

Organizational Capabilities

- How effective were the processes through which IIRR transferred knowledge and skills?
- How well was CKS able to implement and manage the CMDRR pilot project within the selected communities?

CMDRR as an Intervention Tool

- How effective was the pilot CMDRR project in addressing vulnerability and hazard and building resilience in Nias?
- How relevant is the CMDRR methodology in the context of Nias?

To address the above evaluation questions, the SIPA team collected data through several sources including: (1) desk research, (2) documentation review, particularly IIRR’s accompaniment reports, and (3) semi-structured interviews, surveys, and focus group discussions with key stakeholders during the team’s January and March field trips. Through extensive analysis of the collected data, the SIPA team synthesized our main findings as summarized below:

- There was general consensus among CKS DRR team members that IIRR’s trainings were effective in transferring CMDRR knowledge and skills. IIRR’s action-reflection training methodology was particularly important in conceptualizing the CMDRR knowledge and tools for application in local Nias communities. However, gaps between theory and practice were evident throughout the project process, most notably during community selection, formation of the task force, participatory monitoring and evaluation learning (PMEL) and organizational self-assessment for sustainability at the community level. Similarly, issues relating to translation, training fatigue, and insufficient supplemental training materials appeared to hinder the learning process.
- Despite the short duration of the pilot CMDRR project, several noteworthy achievements were recognized in the three selected communities including: (1) formation of task forces and
community organizations (COs), (2) increased community solidarity, (3) greater risk awareness among community members, and (4) improved women’s participation. Nonetheless, the pilot project placed little emphasis on other community needs relating to alternative livelihood opportunities, emergency preparedness, and linkage to government and other external stakeholders, all of which are critical attributes to the sustainability of the COs.

- In general, all three communities had implemented DRR action plans that sought to address hazard and vulnerability. Some examples include customary laws to prohibit tree cutting and sand/stone digging and planting of mahogany trees. However, due to a lack of alternative livelihoods, illegal logging and sand/stone extraction activities remained persistent. Such dynamics coupled with the difficulty in managing community expectations on tangible projects (i.e., water and sanitation system, bridge construction), will continue to present a significant challenge to the sustainability of the COs and the resulting DRR action plans. Notwithstanding the above limitations, the communities appeared to be progressing in the direction of building resilience through the pilot project’s emphasis on “community managed” and participation.

- Given that Nias Island is especially prone to hazards such as floods and landslides, CMDRR appears to be a relevant intervention tool and a good entry point into vulnerable Nias communities. Furthermore, its emphasis on “community-managed” is critical to increasing participation of marginalized groups in fairly stratified Nias communities (for example: women). However, to achieve sustainability, the CMDRR approach must address two major development needs: (1) making government a more involved stakeholder in the process and (2) integrating livelihood into the operational strategy.

In light of the key findings for the pilot CMDRR project, the SIPA team has proposed several recommendations to strengthen the project process as well as the effectiveness and relevance of CMDRR as an intervention tool.

**Project Process**

- Community selection should attempt a greater level of objectivity; more attention to various forms of vulnerability and multiple stakeholders
- Strive to achieve greater diversity in the task force
- Ensure greater attention to devising emergency response and preparedness activities
- PMEL should be performed and reported as planned at the community level
- Improve inter-organization reporting and communication.

**Effectiveness and Relevance of CMDRR as an Intervention Tool**

- Social and economic vulnerabilities must be clearly defined, and incorporated into the hazard-focused CMDRR framework
- Community assessments should be done on a continual basis: initial identification of hazards, risks, etc. may change as time goes on
- Better management of community expectations
- Build stronger linkages with government and other external stakeholders
- Incorporate and prioritize alternative livelihoods
2  CLIENT INFORMATION

2.1  International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR)

The International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) is an international non-governmental organization (INGO) devoted to implementing community-managed development programs, providing training and guidance for development workers through customized regional and international courses, and to producing knowledge based on these field experiences. These issues are more specifically organized through three program areas: The Learning Community; Education and Training; and Publications and Communication.1

Since its foundation, the philosophy behind the Institute has been that of an “[…] integrated and fourfold rural reconstruction program of education, livelihood, health and self-government, […] [a] people-centered and sustainable rural development.”2 This philosophy is reflected in the Institute’s credo.

- Go to the people
- Live among them
- Learn from them
- Plan with them
- Work with them

Start with what they know
Build on what they have
Teach by showing
Learn by doing
Not a showcase but a pattern
Not odds and ends but a system
Not piecemeal but an integrated approach
Not to conform but to transform
Not relief but release3

The credo has had a fundamental role in guiding IIRR’s programmatic approach, and experience has consistently reaffirmed the belief that participation is a fundamental aspect of sustainability. IIRR’s recent involvement with post-disaster situations has added more layers to this understanding. Since 2001, the IIRR has been involved with reconstruction in areas affected by tsunami, floods, earthquakes, droughts, hurricanes and conflicts. In each of those circumstances, the Institute has worked to link relief and development efforts. Out of this work emerged the community managed disaster risk reduction (CMDRR) approach that IIRR has been developing and institutionalizing with the aid of partners in Africa, Asia and Latin America4.

2.2  Caritas Keuskupan Sibolga

The Caritas Keuskupan Sibolga (CKS) is one of many local agencies belonging to Caritas Internationalis, the Catholic Church’s network of development and relief agencies5. It was set up in the North Sumatran city of Sibolga, by persuasion of the Caritas Internationalis and the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) Indonesia, to provide humanitarian assistance following the December 2004 tsunami and the March 2005 earthquake. Specifically, the city of Sibolga – which had fortunately been shielded from the December 2004 tsunami – and the island of Nias were heavily damaged by a magnitude 8.7 earthquake whose epicenter was at about 205 km (125 miles) west of northwest Sibolga.6

In July 2005, CKS opened a field office in Gunung Sitoli, the capital city of Nias Island, from where it intends to continuously provide support for emergency and reconstruction efforts in the island,
while linking these actions to a longer-term commitment to sustainable development by aiding in the creation of a disaster risk reduction culture and capacity in the communities of the region.\footnote{7}

CKS has a DRR team of ten staff members working on CMDRR projects in Nias Island. The staff is led by Director Fr. Mikhael To, and the project director for the CMDRR project is Elvina Simanjuntak. The organization is primarily funded by Caritas Italy, with CKS putting emphasis on organizing the community through training and outreach and helps link donors to local projects.
3 BACKGROUND

3.1 National Context: Indonesia

Indonesia is the world’s largest archipelagic state located between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean in Southeast Asia.\(^8\) It is comprised of 17,508 islands, of which about 6,000 islands are inhabited.\(^9\) As the world’s fourth most populous country with 234.7 million people,\(^10\) Indonesia remains one of the poorer countries in Southeast Asia – ranked 107th on the 2007/2008 UNDP Human Development Index.

Indonesia’s geography and topography made it especially prone to natural disasters. With over 400 volcanoes – including 150 that are considered to be active – it falls within the “Ring of Fire”, an arc of volcanoes and fault lines encircling the Pacific Basin.\(^11\)

3.2 Local Context: Nias Island

Nias Island is the largest island group located on the west coast of Sumatra and is part of the North Sumatra province. Nias Island was divided into two administrative districts – Nias and Nias Selatan.\(^12\) Nias district is further divided into 14 sub-districts, 4 urban villages and 439 rural villages, with a total population exceeding 440,000. Nias Selatan district has a population of over 270,000 and is comprised of 8 sub-districts, 2 urban villages and 212 rural villages.\(^13\)

Most Niasans are either Catholics or Protestants – a striking deviation from the rest of Indonesia where 86% of the population practices Islam. Some attribute to this religious difference the unequal treatment the island receives from the central government. According to the World Bank, Nias Island has historically received some of the lowest revenue transfers from the government.\(^14\) For example in 2004, Nias Selatan district received 295,000 rupiahs per capita and Nias district received 497,000 rupiahs per capita, far below the national average of 772,000 rupiah or the provincial average of 702,000 rupiah.\(^15\)

Due to decades of isolation and inadequate government support, Nias Island remains one of the poorest regions in Indonesia. Its poverty rate was approximately 32% in 2004, which was approximately two times the national average of 16.7%. Its GDP per capita was slightly more than 1/3 of the national and regional averages. Adult literacy rate was also significantly lower, especially in the Nias Selatan district, at 62.5% as compared to the national average of 91.7%.\(^16\) The economy of Nias Island is heavily dependent on agriculture, which accounted for over 43% of the local national product and employed over 87% of the labor force in 2004.\(^17\) Other major sectors of the economy include trade, hotel and restaurants, general services and construction.

The development needs of Nias Island were only intensified by the 2004 tsunami and the subsequent earthquake on March 2005. Nias Island suffered significant losses including approximately 1,000 deaths, displacements of 10% of the population and other widespread damage and destruction to infrastructures. The total reconstruction cost was estimated at US$392 million,
equivalent to 108% of the annual GDP for Nias Island. According to the World Bank, these two disasters also contracted the local economy by 3.4% in 2005. 

3.2.1 Gender Dynamics

Social inequities remain prevalent on Nias Island, specifically gender-based discrimination. A distinction exists between women as producers and men as guardians of tradition/custom. This is noticeable from marriage arrangements where the family of the groom must give a huge “dowry” to the bride’s parents. This creates very unequal gender dynamics within the household where some husbands feel that they “bought” their wives. In addition, men dominate most waged employment opportunities. As Beatty explains, “women’s subordination is both expressed in cultural representations and is a feature of the organization of social and economic relations. Women are perceived by men as providers and labourers for the household—a perception they largely endorse.” In Indonesia, the man is the legal head of the household, with the exception of widows or women living independently. The head of the household represents the family in any official community decisions, and in Nias, these are done public meetings called by the Kapala Desa (village leader). Women may attend, but generally defer to the men’s opinions.

3.2.2 Leadership and Social Rankings

Leadership in contemporary Nias reflects the traditional outlook of the village chief and others in control. This is the accepted viewpoint, even if “[…] this leaves out of account the youths who will eventually take over but who, for the moment, have no voice in society.” Villagers’ social rank is generally reflected by the following factors:

- Prestige attained and maintained by hosting feasts, whose scale (i.e. number of pigs slaughtered, number of guests in attendance, amount of gold given away) prompts sense of indebtedness, which translates into increased influence of the host;
- Superior resources in land and labor;
- Descent;
- Achievement in other, potentially rival, systems (such as local government, church).

Pigs have great social and cultural importance in Nias. They are both a status symbol and hold substantial economic value, representing an asset that can be sold in times of need. Disposable wealth exists mainly in investments, because accumulated wealth is considered dangerous (some reasons cited are that it prompts envy and provokes sorcery) and households can only manage several pigs at a time.

3.3 Community Context: Pasar Beringin, Sisobambowo and Ramba Ramba

Pasar Beringin is one of the urban communities in Gunungsitoli (capital of Nias Island) selected for the pilot project; Located next to the Nou River on the eastern coast of the island, it is comprised of 600 people in 160 households. Sixty percent of the population is illiterate and, as a result, most residents do not have permanent jobs. The principal livelihood activities include trade, civil service,
fishing, becak (motorcycle taxi) driving and informal trade. Pasar Beringin lacks educational opportunities, proper drainage, rubbish management, and access to clean water. Its close proximity to the river makes the community especially prone to floods during rainy seasons – generally between August and February each year. Floods coupled with poor sanitation also increase the risk of health hazards such as diarrhea and vector disease in Pasar Beringin.

Sisobambowo is one of the two rural villages selected for the pilot project in Amandraya. Located on the southern tip of Nias, it is comprised of 158 households with 700 people, of which a high percentage does not speak Bahasa Indonesia. Much like the rest of Nias, this rural sub-district is predominantly Christian. As part of earthquake reconstruction efforts a main road was built, which significantly improved access to this village. This also prompted some villagers to move closer to this road, from the original settlement areas to the opposite side of the Neho River. Most villagers are involved in informal trading, rubber tapping, and farming to earn their living, yet there is no irrigation in the area so farmers must rely on natural precipitation and generally farm for subsistence. After the earthquake, some villagers also became dependent on small scale logging and sand and stone extraction for additional income. Similarly to Pasar Beringin, Sisobambowo lacks educational opportunities, proper nutrition, adequate infrastructure (i.e., broken bridge, drainage system, etc.), radio transmission and communications networks. In addition, gender inequality remains an issue within the community. Sisobambowo is highly vulnerable to floods and landslides, especially during the rainy season, and the logging and sand and stone extraction have exacerbated these hazard conditions.

Ramba Ramba is another village in Amandraya that was selected for the pilot project. Located 400 meters above sea level on the southern tip of the island, Ramba Ramba is comprised of four sub-villages separated by rugged terrain. Due to constrained mobility, the pilot project was only conducted in sub-village I. Sub-village I has 137 households with 1100 people and many villagers do not speak Bahasa Indonesia. The main livelihood activities include farming, rubber tapping and informal trading. Again, Ramba Ramba lacks educational opportunities, proper nutrition, a water and sanitation system, adequate roads, and electricity. Gender inequality is also an issue in the community. Ramba Ramba is especially prone to landslides during heavy rains, as it is surrounded by hills and the soil structure is not solid. The continual logging, and other extractive activities also increase the risk of landslides.

3.4 Recent Natural Disasters: Tsunami (December 2004) and Earthquake (March 2005)

On December 26, 2004, one of the most devastating tsunamis in history struck off the coast of Aceh province in Indonesia. As a result, Indonesia suffered significant losses – 130,000 people died, 37,000 people were missing and 500,000 people were displaced. The physical damages were also substantial; in addition to major destruction of housing and other infrastructure, over 800 km of coastlines were also destroyed. Three months later, Indonesia suffered another tragedy when an 8.7 magnitude earthquake struck near Nias Island on March 28, 2005 again causing deaths, physical damage and displacement.
In response to these two disasters, the Indonesian government established the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency (BRR) to coordinate relief and reconstruction efforts. The reconstruction cost for Aceh and Nias was projected at $4.9 billion and was more than sufficiently covered from three funding sources: (1) domestic financing was estimated at $2 billion, which would from central government allocations and other reconstruction resources of the regional government, (2) $2 billion in bilateral donations, and (3) $2 billion of private donations which were channeled through international NGOs such as Red Cross, Oxfam, UNICEF, CARE and Caritas. It was reported that over 500 organizations from more than 40 countries were working in Aceh and Nias Island when the disasters first struck. At the end of 2006, over 89 different agencies were involved in the reconstruction efforts on Nias Island, including 42 international NGOs, 24 national NGOs, 13 United Nations agencies, and eight government agencies. However, many of these NGOs had pulled out by the end of 2008.

Though the projects introduced by these organizations have covered numerous areas of action, from housing and settlements to education to rural livelihoods, a number of international organizations and NGOs have focused specifically on projects related to DRR. Some concrete examples include cooperation between UNDP and Bakosurtanal to prepare disaster risk maps and indices in relation to environmental risk management plans. The UNDP rural livelihoods programs in Nias work with Halcrow, in a program to help selected communities become self-sufficient in rice production by 2011. Some of their specific activities focus on the rehabilitation of community irrigation systems, provision of farming inputs, and training and strengthening of farmer associations. The World Bank created and manages the Multi Donor Fund for Aceh and Nias, and thereby works with a number of projects that are significantly active on the island. Its DRR focus, however, is more on the national level. The World Bank is currently supporting the national action plan for DRR, providing technical assistance and capacity development to Indonesia’s newly formed disaster management agency and working with the Ministry of Finance to create a framework for risk insurance.

The high concentration of non-governmental organizations in the region has had dual effects on the population – on the one hand, it has addressed needs and provided services to the community, particularly in regard to infrastructure, on the other hand there have been some unintended negative consequences, such as creating community dependence on aid (particularly an issue because a number of projects are phasing out by the end of 2008), a rising cost of living (due to an increased demand for housing, goods and services, food prices and even transportation) coupled with lagging rise in real income, and an inability to develop solidarity in Nias (as projects may have unintentionally exacerbated existing social divisions). In some cases, it is simply a problem of an incomplete solution, or a less sustainable approach. For example, building back infrastructure is necessary and promising; however, there may be constraints due to staffing and materials that could easily render a clinic or school inoperable. This has already been the case of a number of health clinics constructed on Nias Island.
3.5 Project Context: IIRR/CKS Pilot CMDRR Project

As aforementioned, CKS was established in July 2005 in response to the 2004 Tsunami and the 2005 Earthquake on Nias Island. While the initial focus was on relief and reconstruction efforts, CKS has committed to transform itself from a humanitarian organization to an “empowerment facilitator” for local Nias communities. In doing so, it recognizes the need to develop an institutional framework that integrates disaster risk reduction strategies with overall development needs in health, education, livelihoods, capacity building, community organization and advocacy in Nias communities. Through its belief that a long-term development strategy rests on community mobilization, CKS found the synergy in the CMDRR framework.

Unlike relief projects, the intention is to set up a program that is not simply community based, but community managed. Such a program would be realized by helping communities build capacity so that they can become self-reliant and be responsible for the reconstruction of their houses, for developing their own livelihood options, for ensuring the good health of their members. With that in place, the program can work on developing the communities’ capacity for mitigating hazards and reducing vulnerability, effectively putting risk reduction measures in place.

Disaster risk reduction is a complex concept, a step ahead from disaster risk management. It deals with the need to anticipate, prepare and prevent, so that emergency work becomes a phase in the cycle of disaster management and not its only component.\(^45\)

The methodology also stresses the idea that disasters are not acts of god, but rather acts of man; this pivots on the idea that both vulnerability and capacity are functions of many factors. In a very straightforward way, this translates into a platform for action in prevention and preparedness, as humans come to terms with the idea that they have a role to play in reducing their own risk.

The pilot project is based on this concept, and broadly on the idea that greater community involvement in reducing risk can promote a sustainable development intervention that builds and expands on reconstruction efforts as well as on local capacity.

In this mindset, CKS commissioned IIRR to provide technical assistance in designing and implementing a CMDRR pilot project in Nias Island. This IIRR/CKS partnership began in July 2007, with the goal of developing CKS’s capacity to implement CMDRR-based projects in three communities\(^46\) within Amandraya and Gunungsitoli. As stated in a recent IIRR newsletter, they stand behind the belief that “[…] if there are efforts to assert the enjoyment of human rights and enhance the foundation for safety, disaster risk reduction measures are necessary to fully attain resilience against any eventuality.”\(^47\)

The project lasted twenty-one months concluding with the writeshop in March 2009. The project sought to accomplish the following objectives:

- Form a project core team composed of staff from CKS and its two selected partner organizations;
Select communities for two projects and determine strategies of CMDRR in the context of selected communities;

Determine capacity development training needs and develop training programs for CKS and its two selected partner organizations;

Equip the project’s core team with concepts, methods and tools of facilitating participatory disaster risk assessment and community action planning;

Provide guidance and support to CKS and its two partner organizations in preparing their own accompaniment plan drawn out of community DRR action plans;

Equip the project’s core team to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework and institutionalize participatory self-monitoring and evaluation within community organizations;

Equip the project’s core team with concepts, methods and tools in facilitating community organizations to integrate self assessment and action process for community organization’s sustainability;

Share, document and publish practice-based mutual learning for capacity building and CMDRR process application.48

Specifically, the CKS-IIRR project was structured in nine programmatic steps and 12 accompaniments. As IIRR employed a “training-action-reflection” cycle for each step of the CMDRR process, a typical step would involve an initial training of CKS DRR team by IIRR facilitators, followed by the application of the acquired concepts, methods and tools in the selected communities by CKS DRR team and concluded with a post-action participatory reflection on the process and outcome of the field practicum. The matrix in section 12.3 of the annexes summarizes the objectives, activities and outputs for each of these steps and the associated accompaniments.
4 RATIONALE

This report evaluates CMDRR's effectiveness and relevance as an intervention tool to reduce vulnerability and strengthen communities that experience risk of disaster in Nias.

The evaluation framework was designed to assess how effectively this pilot project was implemented. This entailed a two-tier investigation of 1) the training methods used by IIRR to transfer knowledge and skills to CKS and accompany the project implementation and of 2) the implementation methods used by CKS to manage the project and bring it to the selected communities. The resulting composite analysis was then used to derive the overall effectiveness of the CMDRR methodology in addressing disaster risk in the selected communities and its relevance for the context of Nias.

This report will present findings in a systematic manner, disaggregated by process, evidencing for each step of the pilot project certain strengths and limitations in their conceptualization and implementation. This report will also offer insights on what lessons can be learned from the project and suggest ways to improve results and address shortcomings.

Because this evaluation was conducted before the end of the pilot project, some of the considerations brought to light here may also be present in the writeshop output. Notwithstanding, this report is aimed at providing a fresh and independent insight into interactions between IIRR, CKS and the project communities.

5 OBJECTIVES

In November 2008, IIRR commissioned the SIPA team to conduct an independent evaluation of the CKS pilot CMDRR project in Nias Island, as discussed above. Thus, in order to evaluate the pilot project, the focused was placed on two main areas: 1) the organizational capabilities of IIRR and CKS as shown through the project processes; and 2) CMDRR as an intervention tool, looking at the effectiveness and relevance for the project’s context.

This evaluation focused on the following questions:

Organizational Capabilities

- How effective were the processes through which IIRR transferred knowledge and skills to CKS?
- How well was CKS able to implement and manage the CMDRR pilot project within the selected communities?

CMDRR as an Intervention Tool

- How effective was the pilot CMDRR project in addressing vulnerability and hazard and building resilience in Nias?
- How relevant is the CMDRR methodology in the context of Nias?
Per the rationale of this evaluation, in order to address the research questions above, it was necessary to investigate every step of the pilot project, both individually and within the broader project context.

Each of the project’s nine operational phases was assessed separately according to its own objectives and intended outputs, as well as the processes carried out in order to achieve them. This meant looking into the relationships between IIRR, CKS and the community organizations (COs) and examining the training-implementation-reflection continuum supposed to guide these interactions.

This entailed following the pilot project’s own rationale and the corresponding multi-step process through which activities were to be carried. As outlined in the IIRR-CKS proposal, the project objectives would be accomplished in nine steps, with every step encompassing training, community facilitation and reflection:

1. Select the participating communities
2. Assess the training needs of all parties involved
3. Identify, discuss and prioritize hazards
4. Identify leaders in the communities and form DRR oriented organizations
5. Develop action plans to reduce disaster risk
6. Devise an accompaniment plan through which CKS would continue the work after the pilot project
7. Implement monitoring and evaluation practices to be conducted regularly by CKS and community organizations
8. Encourage communities to plan and create sustainable activities
9. Document the entire experience including relevant stakeholders in the writing process

To achieve the objectives of this evaluation following the rationale outlined above, the SIPA team devised its own five-step process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background research</td>
<td>November 2008-January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary pilot project analysis / January field trip</td>
<td>December 2008-January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop evaluation framework</td>
<td>January 2009-March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection / March field trip</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of findings and recommendations</td>
<td>March 2009-May 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To gain a better understanding of the project and the participating communities, four integral areas of research were identified:

- National and local political, economic and social contexts;
- History of the tsunami and earthquake including international, national and local responses;
- Organizational background: IIRR and local partner CKS;
- CMDRR and other disaster risk management programs in Indonesia and Southeast Asia.

A literature review of academic and peer-reviewed sources, reports from various research institutions, and government and organizational websites was conducted to obtain this information. Our team also reviewed IIRR’s websites, reports, brochures, training manual and IIRR-CKS’s ongoing training accompaniments to gain organizational information. The January field trip allowed team members to gain critical insight into the local context and participating organizations.

In addition, the SIPA created its own working definitions for the terms that form the foundation of the CMDRR approach: vulnerability and risk. Understanding these terms as they relate to the context of Nias Island was critical to creating an appropriate evaluation and inform our subsequent recommendations.

\[ \text{Risk} = \frac{\text{Hazard} \times \text{Vulnerability}}{\text{Capacity}} \]

In addition, the meaning of social capital was explored as it is commonly referred to in conjunction with ‘local capacity’. The limitations of the term social capital were considered during the evaluation.
6.2 Preliminary Pilot Project Analysis

This analysis was done before and during the January field trip to Nias Island. The goal was to learn about the IIRR-CKS pilot project, but also specifically in what pertains to the two research questions regarding the effectiveness and relevance of CMDRR as an approach to managing disaster risk reduction and the effectiveness of the IIRR trainings as a tool for transferring knowledge and skills to the CKS facilitators and finally to the communities.

Before the January trip, the SIPA team analyzed the accompaniment reports and other relevant project documentation provided by IIRR and CKS against the background of disaster risk management and reduction literature. During the January field trip, the team conducted fourteen semi-structured interviews with all members of the CKS management and DRR teams. In addition, a semi-structured interview with Shayamal Saha, formerly of IIRR, took place in New York. These interviews assisted the team in understanding stakeholders’ expectations toward the project, what they hoped would result from it and what they feel has actually been gained from the project. For a complete list of interviewees and copies of the interview guides please refer to sections 12.4 and 12.7 of the annexes. In addition, the team visited the three communities involved in the project and recorded extensive field notes on their observations and interactions with community leaders and members.

6.3 Evaluation Framework Design

After the January field trip, we compiled and analyzed interview and field notes, and other documents and research in regard to the CMDRR approach and IIRR-CKS trainings.

6.3.1 Choosing a Qualitative Methodology

The decision to use qualitative research for data collection first arose from the stated objectives of the evaluation, and was further informed through desk research and the first exploratory field visit.

Because this evaluation focuses on the many processes through which the pilot project objectives were to be accomplished, it was necessary to conduct a nuanced analysis, based on detailed accounts provided by the implementing team members and beneficiaries. Additionally, given the participatory nature of the intervention, a less rigid approach to questioning and research was well integrated with the project’s own objectives, and better suited to capture the respondents’ perceptions of the pilot project. Furthermore, during the first exploratory field visit it became clear that it would be difficult to access a large and random sample on which to base a quantitatively oriented study. Based on these considerations, it seemed clear that semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and surveys were the appropriate research instruments through which to collect data in the field.

An evaluation matrix was then created to guide the rest of the team’s work. The matrix was first disaggregated by the research questions, and then by issue areas. Judgment criteria were selected for each issue, and then indicators were assigned to each criterion. Finally, sources for each indicator were determined. Please refer to section 12.5 of the annexes for a sample of the evaluation matrix.
6.3.2 Research Instruments

**Semi-structured Interview Guides**

This style of interview is a less rigid form of a question and answer format. Interviewees are encouraged to give “thick descriptions” or “detailed and elaborate” answers. A semi-structured guide gave us a framework for the interviews, but allowed us to explore other topics as they arose in the conversation. In addition, it did not restrict the interviewee to only answering what was asked of him or her.

**Surveys**

To gather summary data about the project, we used structured survey instruments. The questions were derived from the evaluation matrix and helped inform many of our judgment indicators. The surveys acted as structured interviews with some questions allowing a longer response, while others asked the respondent to rank or rate something with given criteria. The surveys were standardized to ensure reliability, generalizability, and validity.

**Focus Groups**

We used focus group discussion in order to supplement the other information we were gathering. A focus group allows for interactive, open communication amongst all involved, and can lead to new topics being explored as the group discussion evolves. In addition, consensus or disagreement on a certain subject can be brought out through this type of research method. Finally, focus groups are useful observational tools to see how a particular social group interacts.

6.3.3 Sampling and Data Collection

During the March field visit, the SIPA team conducted:

- 38 community member surveys;
- 10 DRR team surveys;
- 2 focus groups;
- 1 semi-structured interview with Emily Monville Oro of IIRR.

In addition, the team was able to observe the final two days of the IIRR-CKS writeshop.

The surveys were administered in all three communities, while the focus groups were conducted in Sisobambowo. The table below summarizes the main field research activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Summary of main field research activities in communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pasar Beringin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 task force members surveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 non-task force members surveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 task force members focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The surveys and focus groups were critical in assessing the facilitators and the community members’ perceptions of IIRR and CKS, the pilot project, and the process through which capacities and skills were transferred to CKS and ultimately the community.

The SIPA team also presented the evaluation matrix to CKS at the beginning of the trip, and then the preliminary findings before departure. This presentation prompted feedback from CKS staff, which was incorporated into this final report.

6.4 Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations

All of the data gathered was organized following the categories in the evaluation matrix and analyzed in team deliberation sessions. In analyzing the data, the SIPA team triangulated information by comparing survey and focus group answers with the opinions of key informants, information available from secondary sources as well as field observations.

The findings were then disaggregated following project’s processes such as IIRR training sessions and DRR team implementation activities. The small data sets did not allow for statistical analysis; however, they did provide summary data and allowed for the generalizability of some findings. Conversely, while some of the findings can be generalized for all stakeholders, many are only relevant for one community or for one particular group within a community.

This synthesis of findings, along with outside literature review provided the basis for our recommendations.

6.5 Limitations to the Evaluation Methodology

While the team believes the findings below to be valid and valuable, some constraints to objective data collection were encountered:

Pilot Project Evaluation

As the SIPA team is only reviewing the first year of the project the evaluation will not be able to fully determine if there was an overall increase in the community’s ability to assess risk and prevent, mitigate and prepare for disasters. Some light is shed on this issue by evaluating perceptions and awareness levels. In addition, assessing intermediary outputs, such as the formation of community level organizations, assisted in measuring the level of interaction achieved through the CMDRR methodology and responsiveness to the participatory learning approach of the project.

Surveys

The survey instrument was a closed question tool that can lead to a response bias if a respondent feels there is a ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answer amongst the options. This is sometimes called a social desirability response or the effort to place oneself or project in a positive light. Secondly, there was a selection bias in the sample as the interviews were conducted in the daytime and was limited to
those who were available. The SIPA team attempted to compensate for this by having women focus groups in the evening.

**Focus Groups**

Due to logistical and time constraints the focus groups were only held in Sisobambowo and only at the home of the task force leader. In addition, the groups were held in the evening and did conflict with some church activities. Finally, we were unable to enforce the cap on the ideal number of participants, and there were also many observers at each session. It is possible that some of the participants felt inhibited by this.

**Translation**

There are two languages spoken, Nias and Bahasa Indonesia, on Nias Island, and at times two translators were needed to relay information to the SIPA team. This increases the possibility of mistranslation or understanding. In addition, the main translators for the SIPA team were the CKS core team members. This could have affected the answers some DRR team members or community members gave.

**Community Fatigue**

Some community members that had been interviewed and surveyed repeatedly mentioned that many foreigners had visited them and asked questions. This could have resulted in less thought out answers to the survey and focus groups questions. Additionally, community members repeatedly expressed their dissatisfaction and tiredness with the great number of meetings called by CKS and the task force.
FINDINGS
7 PROCESS FINDINGS

The findings presented here are associated with each of the nine operational pilot project steps evaluated. The findings are presented chronologically, with each step incorporating both the training component, in which IIRR accompanied CKS in developing skills, and then the implementation component, during which CKS carried out this process within the three selected communities. For a comprehensive presentation of projects steps, please refer to section 12.3 of the annexes.

7.1 Community Selection

The first step in the implementation of the pilot project was to select the four communities in which CKS was to pilot the project. For this purpose, IIRR conducted a risk assessment training, in which the DRR team would identify criteria through which communities would be selected for the intervention and develop a participatory rapid appraisal tool to guide the process. Through a role-play exercise (to practice using this tool and learn how to facilitate), the participants reflected on the relevant questions to be posed and identified the attributes a facilitator should have to conduct community selection meetings.

This training aimed at acquainting the DRR team members with the participatory and analytical tools that they would need to select communities, and also at accompanying the team during the process. Only four members of the current DRR team participated in this training.

When surveyed about their opinions regarding this training, all four team members agreed that IIRR’s vulnerability assessment training prepared them well for the community selection process. However, three respondents mentioned that they still faced unexpected challenges that were not addressed in the theory learned during the training.

Of the seven communities that underwent the assessment process, four were selected to host the project, namely Pasar Beringin and Remeling in the urban sub-district of Gunungsitoli; and Sisobambowo and Ramba Ramba in the rural sub district of Amandraya. As the planned activities began to take place, the DRR team made the decision of pulling out from Remeling and continued to develop the project in the three remaining communities.

On the Objectivity of the Selection Criteria

During the IIRR training and facilitation of the community selection process, DRR team members were asked to propose criteria for community selection. Each presented three criteria that were further synthesized and divided in general categories. Using the identified criteria, the participants prepared a community selection matrix-ranking tool based on a risk-ranking matrix.

During two field practica, the DRR team attempted to assess each community’s disaster risk situation through questions formulated on the basis of each criterion. Questions addressed general themes such as the participants’ perceptions of recovery activities, education, infrastructure conditions, risk areas, problems they would like to have addressed, etc. The DRR team was
specifically instructed to not reveal the purpose of the discussions in order to prevent creating expectations within the community.\(^59\)

While the DRR team devised objective selection criteria as well as discussion questions intended at addressing them, the actual amount of consultation with community members was lower than originally intended.

| Table 2: Community related selection criteria\(^56\) |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Category**                    | **Criteria**                                     |
| Disaster risk                   | Vulnerability (Poor, Remote, place- no accessibility, low education, people living in risky area) |
|                                 | Capacity gap (lack of social capacity, lack of skilled persons, lack of awareness, no help from outside, low education, cooperation, lack of water system) |
| Community cooperation to apply CMDRR process | Community willingness to cooperate |
|                                 | Self-help attitude of the community |
| Sustainability                  | Parish-Community relationship (existing or probability in future) |
|                                 | Probability of getting local human resources (skilled persons, volunteers etc.) |
|                                 | Probability of sustainability of CMDRR process (local resources, synergy with [Commission for Social and Economic Development and Credit Union]) |
| Organizational capacity of Caritas Sibolga | Organizational mandate of Caritas Sibolga (Mission, existing program, organizational strategy, policy) |
|                                 | Organizational resource of Caritas Sibolga (Staff, money, material, logistics, etc.) |

Although the DRR team had very practical tools at their disposal, it is difficult to evaluate the inherent objectivity of a given method. One issue that arises is regarding what it means to rank high or low on the identified criteria, since no threshold standards were devised beforehand to guide the ranking process. To analyze how the team utilizes the tools and how it influenced their decision-making may provide a more accurate description of the overall objectivity of the process.

**On the Participatory Character of the Selection Process**

With the criteria and tools defined and potential communities identified, the DRR team set out to conduct the participatory rapid appraisal. The intention was to conduct focus groups on participation with different stakeholders, disaggregated by age, gender, education and income in the communities, and also including government and NGO representatives.

The DRR team was able to carry out field practica in Gunungsitolli and Amandraya, during which they organized focus groups with key informants from villages in each of the sub districts.\(^61\) However, it seems that none of the extra-community stakeholders identified were contacted during the field practica, something that reduced the participatory aspect of the exercise.

The four current DRR team members who participated in the community selection training were surveyed regarding the participatory aspect of the IIRR training. All four respondents said there was an emphasis on participation, and generally thought that it prepared them well for the actual
The relevant accompaniment report includes general accounts of the activities as well as some evidence such as pictures of Venn diagrams made during the meetings.

The accompaniment report also contains much of the information that was gathered through these exercises, although significantly more detailed for Gunungsitoli than for Amandraya. This suggests a difference in the comprehensiveness of the processes carried out in the two sub districts, both in data gathering and its analysis. For example, the accompaniment report does not contain the community selection matrix that would have ultimately informed the DRR team in selecting Ramba Ramba and Sisobambowo. One DRR member who was present during the process commented that the community selection process in Amandraya was particularly lacking in rigor.

Here it becomes important to note that although the assessment process had a participatory character, the communities initially identified as potential sites for the pilot project were approached on the basis of recommendations from parish priests. While this is no doubt an important and relevant point of access to rather distanced communities, this step of the community selection process could benefit from the objectivity of including other criteria.

**On the Role of Vulnerability in the Community Selection Process**

Following the data gathering, the DRR team, with the facilitation of IIRR, engaged in a thorough analytical process, accompanied by much debate on the conditions of each community, all of which was condensed in strategy papers for each of the two sub districts. This was followed by an action reflection exercise in which the team revisited the activities.

According to one of the IIRR facilitators responsible for this step, the DRR team chose Pasar Beringin, Ramba Ramba and Sisobambowo based on results obtained from using the tools, deciding that these areas were the most vulnerable and had the lowest capacity to cope with disaster. This seems to be confirmed by the community selection matrix created for Gunungsitoli, in which the two communities that were eventually selected, Pasar Beringin and Remeling, both ranked high on hazard risk (floods) and vulnerability and low on capacity. The report does not show the equivalent matrix for Amandraya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village (Desa)</th>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Vulnerability</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onozitoli</td>
<td>Earth quake (general)</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remeling</td>
<td>High (Flood)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasar Beringin</td>
<td>High (Flood)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabita</td>
<td>Earth quake (general)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High (generally)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It had been suggested by a DRR team member that the selection process in Amandraya was not as thorough. Another IIRR facilitator present during the process indicated that community selection was indeed not a very structured exercise in general, even if the participatory rapid assessment was carried out as planned, ending with ranking vulnerabilities. From accounts of several DRR team members, it was indicated that the two communities approached by CKS in both Gunungsitoli and
Amandraya had been suggestions of each sub district’s parish priest.

In Amandraya, the relationship with the parish priest was indeed a fundamental aspect behind community selection, as he was a key contact person through which CKS would initiate communications with the communities.

In Gunungsitoli, per the account of a team member, CKS also contacted the respective parish priest to explain the project. They then received a suggestion of five communities, from which they were to choose two after having done an initial vulnerability assessment.

Having the parish priest involved in the community selection was an important aspect of how the process was carried out, particularly if regarded as a way to ensure that it is done in a way that is meaningful for the project scope and objectives. In this case, it also implicated that CKS would only engage communities that were composed principally of Christian households. This is not in itself a problem; however, it was not foreseen in the pilot project proposal and it was not fully explained in the project documentation that recorded the events.

None of these findings negate the vulnerability of the communities selected for the project or that those were indeed the most vulnerable communities. However, it becomes difficult to determine the extent to which the community selection process idealized at the outset contributed to the final decisions. The experience in Remeling shows that the process could have benefited from more objectivity.

**Pulling Out of Remeling**

Although Remeling was selected as one of the project communities, based not only on the suggestion of a Parish but on the initial vulnerability assessment, the DRR team faced great difficulty carrying the project past the PDRA stage. It is interesting to note that the DRR team’s experience in Remeling amalgamates many of the aspects discussed above, also bringing in new issues.

The first is related to the assumption of a homogenous community. One obstacle the DRR team encountered early on in Remeling was that it is a very fragmented community with few of the solidarity ties that are normally attributed to a community in its idealized form. The practical
consequence is that any mobilization took more effort and showed fewer results. The difficulty in mobilizing Remeling was also greater because people do not own the land on which they live. In order to promote any of the activities proposed through the project the community would seek permission from the landowner. This lack of autonomy was coupled with a perception that any activities promoted to improve the quality of the community’s environment could be used as pretense by the landowner to raise rent. Community members feared that any efforts towards improving their living conditions could have the unintended consequence of driving them out of the (then more valuable) land. According to this perception, the implementation of the CMDRR pilot project itself could potentially increase the risk of eviction for the community. Perhaps because this is not an issue that can be assessed ex ante, the DRR team did not have much to do to dispel this concern. Nonetheless, it brought the project to a halt in Remeling, prompting IIRR to assist the DRR team in reassessing its own capacity and relocating its mandate within the scope of the projects.

Dropping Remeling seems to have been a decision based on the fact that the risks the community experienced required a variety of interventions that the DRR team did not have the capacity to facilitate. The process through which this was realized restored some of the objectivity in the community selection process, which had initially been dependent on parish priest suggestions. As mentioned above, the priest suggestion is not inherently problematic, but verifying that it was in accordance with the scope and capabilities of the project contributed to making the process more in line with the selection criteria identified and, consequently, the scope and capabilities of the project.

**The Socio-economic Hazards of Remeling**

In going into Remeling, CKS attempted to mobilize the community members for nearly six months, but frequently found that people showed no enthusiasm for the projects goals of addressing the community’s general wellbeing. According to an IIRR facilitator, the hazards identified during the PDRA session represented an important obstacle. In accordance with the CMDRR methodology, during the PDRA sessions the DRR team approached the community to identify and prioritize disaster-related natural hazards. However, most of the community members’ concerns were placed on issues of low income, lack of a sanitation system and property rights. This left the DRR team unsure of how to proceed, as there was no natural hazard around which to mobilize the community.

IIRR facilitated a revision of the PDRA tools with hopes of refocusing the project and making it accessible for the team. Eventually the community identified malaria as a common hazard. The DRR team argued that, although a socio-economic issue rather than a natural hazard, malaria could be tied to the scope of the project through health, and decided to proceed with the formation of the community organization. Community members became both apprehensive, given the fact they did not own the land they occupied, and resistant to the idea of promoting change on something that could be taken away from them. At this point CKS engaged the community and both parties agreed to terminate the project.
7.2 Capacity Development Training Needs Assessment (TNA)

At the inception of the pilot project in August 2007, IIRR conducted a 3-day participatory workshop to determine the capacity development training needs at the level of the community organizations, the CKS DRR team and the organizational level of CKS. Given that the main purpose of the pilot project was to develop the capacity of the DRR team, the following discussion will primarily focus on this aspect.

**TNA for DRR Team**

The TNA was intended to identify knowledge and skill gaps of the DRR team, specifically in five broad categories of job functions:

- Organizational development: building community organizations and facilitating resource mobilization and linking with other organizations;
- Implementation of the CMDRR process: facilitations at the community level on PDRA, DRR action planning, PMEL, etc;
- Integration of gender into the overall CMDRR process;
- Development of training programs for local communities;
- Project management and documentation.

Five out of ten current DRR team members participated in this activity. Through participatory discussions and the use of logical matrix tools, the participants assessed themselves on three levels to identify the gaps between: (1) required and existing job performance, (2) required and existing competence for each job function, and (3) required and existing Knowledge, Attitudes & Skills (KAS). As a group, the participants also determined whether these KAS gaps could be addressed by training or not. These findings were used by IIRR to develop its training plan.

When examining the TNA exercise as presented in IIRR’s accompaniment report, the SIPA team has noted some methodological limitations:

*The TNA exercise is highly subjective and heavily dependent on the perception and honesty of each participant.* This limitation was also recognized by IIRR facilitators who sought to minimize its effect through continuous clarifications to ensure that participants understood the required KAS to perform a task. Whenever necessary, IIRR also used individual job samples to help contextualize the discussion.

*In order to synthesize the results of the TNA, a composite rating was derived for each job task.* This aggregation process raises questions as to whether it may mask the diverse KAS gaps among participants and how well it reflected individual training needs. As such, the SIPA team administered a survey question to all five participants to assess how well the final TNA composite results reflected their personal KAS gap and the result is summarized in the following table.

| Table 4: How well did the IIRR activities assess your personal knowledge gap? |
|---------------------------------|-------|-----|
| (Sample = 5 DRR Team Members)  | Poorly | Well |
| Survey Rating                  | 0     | 5    |
Despite this TNA exercise, certain important training needs of the DRR team were not addressed. Most notably, IIRR’s training plan had assumed that DRR team members would possess some basic knowledge of organizational and community development, such as community organizing, project design and project management. In reality, many DRR team members are fairly young and have limited development experience prior to joining Caritas. Both IIRR facilitators and Caritas DRR team members had acknowledged this disconnect in their interviews with the SIPA team.

Furthermore, while the TNA exercise identified KAS gaps across all five broad categories of job functions, IIRR’s trainings primarily focused on the CMDRR process. As a result, certain key relevant KAS gaps were not incorporated into IIRR’s training plan. For example, IIRR had initially assumed that the DRR team members would possess some basic proposal writing skills and that it would be sufficient to only provide distant inputs (via phone and e-mails) during the proposal development stage for phase II of the project. However, IIRR discovered during the TNA exercise that none of the participants had any prior experience on proposal writing. It was suggested that a comprehensive training may be necessary but this would require a 7-day on-site proposal writing workshop. In the end, the training plan did not include a proposal writing workshop, potentially due to resource and timing constraints. The second phase proposal was developed by the DRR core team members with strong guidance from the management staff of Caritas and with distant inputs from IIRR.

Notwithstanding the above limitations on IIRR’s training plan, all five participating DRR team members felt that IIRR’s trainings adequately addressed their specific needs. Specifically, the survey question and result is shown in the following table:

| Table 5: How well did the training tools/courses used by IIRR help you acquire knowledge? |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| **(Sample = 5 DRR Team Members)** | Poorly | Well |
| Survey Rating                  | 0       | 5    |
7.3 Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment (PDRA)

Training

A fundamental step of the pilot project is to have the communities identify the hazards they face through a Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment (PDRA). IIRR explains that a PDRA should lead to the analysis and prioritization of hazards, including the community’s vulnerability, behaviors in relation to the hazard, and capacity to reduce risk. It is seen as a community led process that leads to greater social organization around disaster risk reduction projects.

IIRR led a three-day training with the DRR team to learn how to facilitate a PDRA with the communities. The goals of this training were:

- Determine the DRR team’s capacity and knowledge gaps in terms of PDRA;
- Introduce appropriate measures and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) tools to bridge those gaps;
- Augment the facilitators’ experience through a collaborative process.

In one of the survey questions, DRR team members were asked to rate three specific tools used during the trainings to further evaluate their experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: DRR team's PDRA tool Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sample = 8 DRR team members*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Source Force Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Behavior Story Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Whose Reality&quot; Video**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 9 out of 10 DRR team members participated in the PDRA training; however, one of these members did the training in Aceh, not with the rest of the team in Nias, so sample is 8 respondents.

** 5 out 10 respondents did not remember seeing the video.

As the table above shows, many participants did not remember seeing the "Whose Reality?" video. The two respondents who remembered the video and ranked it useful are the core team’s English speakers and one is the team leader. If half of the participants do not remember watching the video then we question the usefulness of this tool. Understanding which tools resonated with the team is relevant as more effort can be put into the development of those tools deemed useful, like the Hazard Source Force Tree and the Hazard Behavior Story Telling, while a more effective video or case study could replace the “Whose Reality” video.

Implementation

At the end of August 2007, the DRR team began implementing PDRA in the selected communities. Nineteen PDRA sessions with 170 people (about 50% women) were held. The attendees were "common people, local government officials, representative from district office, other government staff, other NGO staff, teachers, parish priests, CO representatives, and small traders." While not assessed in the survey, the DRR team commented on this process through written reflections on the
facilitation experience. Some important insights from the team include:

- Application of PDRA in the communities requires the CMDRR facilitator to have good mobilization and organizational skills;
- Majority of the residents in the three communities live in severe poverty and it would be useful to incorporate information about the economic vulnerability they face due to hazards.

During the March field trip to the communities, the SIPA team asked community members whether or not they participated in the PDRA sessions. In each of the communities, the majority of those interviewed said they participated in the PDRA activities. In Pasar Beringin, three respondents commented that they were invited but that they had no time or were busy with family responsibilities.

Although the simple table above does not show this, the twenty respondents who attended the PDRA sessions were the in fact same twenty who answered that the task force has made them more aware of prevention and mitigation strategies for hazards. Conversely, those who did not attend the PDRA session are the same ones who feel the task force has not increased their awareness of hazards.

At this stage, the dichotomy presented in the table is worth exploring. Although the sessions were well attended and prompted discussions of the hazards each community faces, there were gaps in the information disseminated outside of the PDRA session. First is the simple fact that not everyone attended and, therefore, not all community members received firsthand information or training. A second, and more nuanced, gap is that not everyone who attended actually understood the information. It appears that if a person did not attend the PDRA session, then he or she does not believe the task force is increasing their awareness of prevention and mitigation tactics. It is possible that those who did not participate were not interested and did seek for informational on the sessions. It could also be that those who went to the session were not able to explain the hazard assessment or its purpose to those not present. Some possible reasons for the latter are:

- Timing—the CKS DRR team had just recently completed the PDRA training themselves, so they may have not been fully prepared to train others;
- Community limitations, such as education and/or lack of previous exposure to PDRA style trainings;
- A ‘natural’ variation in the sample data. Some people retain information better than others, and there is the possibility that our sample does not reflect these differences well enough.

The goal of the training and facilitation processes is to be participatory in nature. This means that, ideally, all community members should be involved whether directly or indirectly. If those directly involved understand the project and its purpose well, they should be able to spread that knowledge and awareness to those who are not directly involved.
7.4 Identifying Community Leaders/Organizers and Forming the Task Force

An important characteristic of the CMDRR approach as implemented by CKS is that it is supposed to generate “[…] deliberate intent in task force building and leadership development as an integral part of disaster risk reduction targeting poorest community [sic] in need.” In the context of the pilot project, this started even before the community PDRA sessions, which were conducted not only to identify hazards and prioritize community managed initiatives, but also identify those who could assume roles in the task force. This task force would be responsible for mobilizing the community around their common goal of reducing risk.

Community Mobilization and Organization

IIRR believes that PRA tools alone are not sufficient for mobilizing and organizing communities, and emphasizes the importance of “living in the community, working in the community, and learning from the community.” For these purposes, IIRR promoted the importance of “intensive stays”, during which DRR team members would spend a few months in their assigned communities, usually five days at a time, in order to immerse themselves in the customs, gain understanding of the communities internal dynamics and build relationships with community members. During this time, the team members would put in practice IIRR’s training on how to mobilize and organize the communities. This initiative is particularly noteworthy considering that many international development organizations, given their time and financial constraints, would not have the ability to do the same.

When asked about how well IIRR prepared them to mobilize and organize the communities, all nine DRR team members who participated in the training said it prepared them well. The respondents’ overall positive answers indicate that the team felt confident in approaching the communities and that they benefited from the activities.

Managing Community Expectations and other Challenges

As discussed above, before the pilot project, the reconstruction and rehabilitation assistance contributed to the creation of some distortions in the lives of communities affected by the earthquake. One of the most significant in the context of the pilot project was that of a “relief mentality”, a situation of aid-dependency in which people tend to expect hand-outs from whichever outside organizations working in or with the community. Additionally, however intense this reconstruction and rehabilitation phase was, it still left the three project communities without some basic infrastructural needs – a drainage system in Pasar Beringin, a bridge in Sisobambowo, and a water and sanitation system in Ramba Ramba.

Each community wanting its respective infrastructure need met, coupled with the perception that CKS was coming to continue the reconstruction and rehabilitation, furthered hopes that were not in line with the activities planned for the pilot project. Aware of this possibility, IIRR’s training also aimed at providing the DRR team with basic skills for managing community expectations.
To manage such expectations, IIRR’s training emphasized two important aspects that should be highlighted by the DRR team during the facilitation process:

- What CKS does and does not do in the communities;
- CMDRR’s concepts of “community-managed” and self-reliance.

The first aspect can be summarized in the assertion that CKS was not there to provide goods or short-term tangible results, something which the DRR team publicized well in every community. The second is more intricately related to the idea of the pilot project being different from simple community based relief work, and transmitting this to the community required more than stating it as a fact.

The DRR team was asked how well the IIRR’s training prepared them to manage community expectation and other challenges in the field. Eight out of nine respondents said that the training did prepare them well.

Overall, the responses were positive as to how well IIRR's training prepared the DRR team in their community work for this phase. Despite repeated complaints from many team members on the challenge of managing community expectations (i.e., relief mentality), all team members but one rated IIRR's training very highly in this regard. The one team member who disagreed mentioned that there were no recommendations coming from IIRR aside from a rule of denying requests for money from community members.

**Participatory Selection of Community Task Force Members**

Ensuring the community’s general participation in the selection of task force members was also an important part of this training. This meant showing the DRR team how to encourage representatives of all different community subgroups to become involved in the selecting, in hopes that this would enhance the participation of the poor and other marginalized groups.

All nine DRR team members surveyed said that IIRR’s training did emphasize the participatory character desired for task force selection process, and almost all respondents rated IIRR's training very highly in this regard. However, one team member commented that the tools provided by IIRR to identify community stakeholders were not fully applicable to communities and required the facilitators’ own creativity to make it work. Three other team members mentioned that the Venn diagram was particularly complicated and also not applicable to the communities.

Overall, most respondents acknowledged that IIRR played an important role in the task force selection process. The one team member who said that IIRR was not important qualified the answer by saying that, although IIRR was not directly involved, the concepts still came from the training they provided.

**Initial Identification of Community Leaders**

The PDRA sessions helped CKS further mobilize community members around disaster related activities, in hopes of instilling motivation in people. However, the process of identifying people
within the communities who would lead this process started as early as the community selection process, as CKS had already been in contact with key individuals in the village. This, coupled with each community’s social hierarchy customs, meant that the most influential community members who were already in contact with CKS and the parish priest would most likely continue to head initiatives and become official community representatives in the task forces.

In addition to the nineteen PDRA sessions documented, reports also mention that close to 500 people were contacted individually by means of some 200 informal meetings and discussions. From the numbers presented above, one might infer that many were made aware of CKS’s activities and the process of task force formation. However, this does not necessarily translate into everyone being equally aware of its implications, nor does it mean that all will have the same opportunity to engage in the process.

**On the Criteria for Selecting Task Force Members**

This tension arose during surveys done with non-task force members. Across the three communities, 27 non-task force members indicated they felt either unqualified or that they would not have enough time to dedicate to the activities. However, they were also not clear on what the requirements were and this constrained their participation. Without widely acknowledged objective criteria against which to measure eligibility, people may have become self-constrained in their own assumptions of how (un)qualified they are for the job.

Throughout the task force formation process, the one criterion that was strictly followed the gender ratio, namely that of the task force having at least 30% of female members. In Ramba Ramba there are now four women among the thirteen members of the task force, which meets the quota, whereas in Sisobambowo there are six women among the fifteen members of the task force, a close to 40% female presence.

Although some limitations to participation seem very practical, e.g., traditional hierarchy (under which prominent members of the community continue to exert disproportional influence), gender, age, lack of spare time and lack of education, since people did not know what the selection criteria were, they were not able to assess their own participation possibilities. Lack of interest is a good example: it can be a function of indifference towards the project’s goals; but it can also be a direct consequence not even knowing what the goals are how they can benefit the community. Another example is that of people who have low education attainment levels. Limited formal education does not preclude an individual from contributing in a meaningful way to the work of the task force. He or she may not be able to write proposal for external agencies, but may still contribute to the translation of communities needs and into actionable recommendations.

Ultimately, the claim that representatives selected by the community are trusted and qualified to organize the community can only be partially sustained. Even if the community trusts task force members, the fact that they are nominated by general approval does not necessary translate into them being qualified to organize activities within the community.

Overall, the DRR team was somewhat split in their opinions as to the representativeness of the task
force. There appears to be a difference of opinion depending on which community the respondent worked in, and according to team members accounts, the task forces in Amandraya seem to be more elite-based than the one in Pasar Beringin.

Having said this it should be noted that involving community chiefs is a very important enabling factor to an intervention, and also one that is very difficult to avoid. However, if this continues to be the case year after year, it could be a sign that the project is not succeeding in changing the exclusionary and marginalizing dynamics within the community.
7.5 Development of Community DRR Strategy and Action Plan

Training

After forming the task force, IIRR trained DRR staff to guide the newly formed task force in preparing its community risk reduction action plan. This activity includes guidance in identifying organizational purpose, prioritizing needs and developing strategies to achieve them. The plan is usually constructed on an annual basis, but this lies at the discretion of the community members. The team members who attended the training were introduced to a 10-step process that is intended to assist the newly-formed task force. According to the training materials and accompaniment reports, the team then conducted a field practicum in Sisobambowo which closely followed the ten steps for facilitating community managed action planning.

As usual, the training incorporated a day for reflection and debriefing, in which the team received feedback from instructors.

The survey asked CKS to reflect back on the training and rank how well this educational exercise prepared them for facilitating action planning in the community.72

Table 8: How well did IIRR’s “10-step facilitation process” prepare for facilitation
(Sample = 9 DRR team members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well did IIRR’s “10-step facilitation process” prepare for facilitation</th>
<th>Poorly</th>
<th>Well/Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sample = 9 DRR team members)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the team felt very well prepared, yet some respondents did comment that the facilitation process was a bit too difficult when practiced in the community and should be simplified and/or contextualized for greater ease and comprehension. This begins to address the gap between theory and practice that emerges from the subsequent survey question, which addressed the comfort level of team members in facilitating these meetings.

Table 9: DRR team member’s comfort level in facilitating action planning
(Sample = 9 DRR team members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs some guidance</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sample = 9 DRR team members)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a noticeable variation in the comfort level; not all of the team members feel confident in conducting this training at the community level. An important reason for this was that many team members had not yet performed this activity. This was true even of some who replied ‘comfortable’ to the question in table above. This suggests that additional requests for guidance could emerge as
soon as more team members have the opportunity to translate the idea of this process into action.

The DRR team was also asked to rate the importance of IIRR in this step of the project. Here, the different team members interpreted IIRR's involvement differently, with some rating based on how important IIRR was in giving them the skills needed, while others answered based on the fact that IIRR didn't directly intervene in facilitation sessions (with the exception of one field practicum in Sisobambowo).

**Implementation**

The field practicum in Sisobambowo was an important exercise to test the action planning facilitation tools. The community organization there had been formed only a week before, which meant that its purpose and management requirements were still particularly new ideas to the new task force members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of an ideal organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority of households are represented by the general membership of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of all relevant stakeholders in decision making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members are clear about vision, mission and objectives of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have our own resource to run the organization and its programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have good leadership and participatory decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have program management skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To deal with this, the DRR team devised a list of indicators that would characterize an ideal organization, against which the newly formed Sisobambowo task force should measure itself.

It is difficult to evaluate how much benefit would have come from restating these indicators during the action-planning. However, deliberately leaving them aside seems to have been a consequence of assuming that the task forces already had enough capacity to achieve them. In fact, routinely reassessing the task force on the basis of those indicators could have been an important exercise preceding the formal monitoring and evaluation stage. This would have helped CKS better understand in which areas the organizations were advancing and in which areas they were lagging behind. Also, this could have been particularly important for monitoring issues of representativeness and participation within the task force.

A central aspect of the action planning process in all three communities was to defining the purpose of the community organization. It was also a very straightforward matter: the main purpose of the organization is to reduce the risk of disaster in people’s lives.

It is interesting to note, that in Ramba Ramba, of nine non-task force members who said they were satisfied with the work of the task force, seven were still unclear as to its exact purpose. By association, it could be suggested that these seven community members will be similarly unclear about the goals and purposes of the action planning. It is very likely that more community members have a similar experience.
This informational asymmetry could be the outcome of several factors. There is heterogeneity within the community in terms of education, type of income generating activity, size of family and income. So for example, it could be that those with lower income levels have less time away from their livelihood activities to dedicate to learning about or getting involved with the task force.

These are issues that could have been addressed through some type of community mapping activity added to the stakeholder mapping, done ideally as far back as the community selection.
7.6 Development of DRR Team Future Activities (2nd Phase)

**Training: Developing a Strategy of Accompaniment with IIRR Guidance**

According to the initial proposal, IIRR intended to facilitate CKS to prepare its accompaniment following the communities’ identification of priority actions. Out of this exercise, a long-term approach, which would increase the CMDRR project from three communities to fourteen, was designed. Although the DRR team had mixed feelings on the overall involvement of IIRR in this process, as we analyzed the training against the proposal it was evident that IIRR trainers did participate according to schedule. Those who responded affirmatively to IIRR’s importance in this activity place it within the learning process more than that of the project design, as the accompaniment primarily focused on assistance in writing the proposal. In doing so, this lesson seems to have been imparted well.

Our survey also attempted to address the specific question of how well this training assisted team members in preparing the project proposal, as well as how well the 2nd phase proposal reflects lessons learned from the pilot project. Half of the respondents had not actually participated in the session to develop a proposal, due to it being conducted in English. Of the other five, all said the training prepared them well or very well yet one individual mentioned that certain time constraints during the proposal process as a barrier to achieving an optimal learning environment.

Regarding the ability of the 2nd phase proposal to reflect lessons learned from the pilot, the majority of respondents said it did so well/very well. Yet a finding that emerged from additional conversations may shed light on the validity of these particular responses; the SIPA team was surprised to learn that many participants (including those responding affirmatively) have not yet read the project proposal, although this document has been translated into Bahasa Indonesia. We feel that this may have been a negative consequence of the lack of participation in the actual development of the proposal, which was limited to just a few of the team’s members. One DRR team member who began the process actually had to drop out of the activities because the language issue was particularly stressful for him. Similarly there was no participation of community members or consultation with other local stakeholders.

**The 2nd Phase Proposal: Strengths and Limitations**

While the process of developing the proposal might have benefited from wider participation, it does include some important programmatic elements that were not contemplated or that were underemphasized in the pilot project proposal.

The idea of government accountability is introduced from the outset. Specifics of how this is done are reflected in planned activities such as having CKS staff continuously collect and archive relevant national government level policy documents. CKS also plans to organize policy study groups to promote awareness among parish staff and community task forces on how policies can be factored into DRR planning. These initiatives would be furthered by creating a multi stakeholder forum to monitor policy, based in Gunungsitoli. This could perhaps be an opportunity to discuss Remeling’s
eviction risk and the need for relocation.

Some other important initiatives are:

- The plan to organize task force visits to other project communities in order to diversify community interaction and learning. This may be another valuable forum in which people can share grounded and meaningful experiences.
- A three-year funding support for the communities in the second phase. There is a brief discussion on what the resources would be used for, but no detailed disbursement plan.
- A more extensive monitoring and evaluation system from the outset, to be executed at CKS, parish and communities levels.
- Livelihood security has also received a more prominent role in the project goals, but it still lacks a more eloquent argument on how it is related to vulnerability, capacity and disaster risk reduction in an integrated fashion. Matters of overall sustainability that hinge on issues of alternative livelihoods are only briefly touched on and actual sustainability factors are not discussed.
- Gender is again brought to the fore by stating that women should be engaged in the development process. In the proposal terms, this would mean conducting analyses and evaluations disaggregating by gender. It fails to mention, however, the need for further disaggregation along the lines of education, income, age, size and quality of land, and other aspects on the basis of which variations within the community can be identified.

Finally, the list of project activities is more comprehensive and the schedule is more detailed than what was available in the pilot project proposal. This should help CKS keep track of the project achievements and the processes through which they were attained.
7.7 Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Learning (PMEL)

**Training**

One of the main objectives of the pilot project is “[t]o equip a core group of staff composed of Caritas-Sibolga and its two selected partner organization in developing project monitoring - evaluation framework and in institutionalizing participatory self-monitoring and evaluation within community organizations.”

This was restated as the project developed, by describing facilitation of monitoring and evaluation at the community level as “[…] one of the critical aspects of CMDRR.”

This step of the project was to be accomplished through a four-activity process in which the DRR team would:

1. Develop a monitoring and evaluation framework for the project;
2. Be trained on how to institutionalize participatory monitoring and evaluation within the community task forces;
3. Apply gained knowledge, attitude and skills (KAS) to facilitate this institutionalization;
4. Carry out an action-reflection exercise to revisit the process.

Of these four activities, the first two were carried out as planned, while the last two were delayed.

The DRR team was able to prepare both team and project level monitoring and evaluation frameworks, which were formalized in three outputs:

1. A draft training course manual on community leadership and organizational development for disaster risk reduction;
2. A draft toolkit for facilitating participatory monitoring and evaluation of DRR task force;
3. A draft toolkit for project monitoring and evaluation of CKS-CMDRR team.

All three outputs were produced in Bahasa Indonesia and therefore were not evaluated for content directly; they were evaluated instead by using as proxy the ratings of two specific tools used as teaching materials for this process: the “monthly planning and review monitoring” and “the quarterly timeline change spider web.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: DRR team member’s rating of PMEL tools</th>
<th>1=least useful, 4=most useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample = 10 DRR team members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly planning and review monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly timeline change spider web</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the DRR team gave the highest ranking to both tools. However, because rating the tools alone does not provide a complete picture of the process of bringing PMEL to the community level, the DRR team members were asked to rate their more general comfort level regarding the facilitation methodology. There was some variation among the answers, but again the majority of the team indicated feeling comfortable or very comfortable in facilitating PMEL at the community level.
These observations are in line with results from the PMEL action-reflection workshop done with the Amandraya and the Gunungsitoli teams. Team members agreed that there were no difficulties in understanding or facilitating PMEL and that the tools were enjoyable to use. Both teams then indicated feeling ‘comfortable enough’ with the tools.

The results of the PMEL action-reflection and of these surveys suggest that the training was enough to bring almost the entire team to the same comfort level of understanding and using PMEL tools. However, of the ten DRR team members, only six had the opportunity to facilitate PMEL in the communities. Since those who had not practiced PMEL in the field only had a priori perceptions of their facilitation comfort level, it is not possible to draw from the responses further conclusions about how field experience adds value to the training in this case. The implementation of PMEL at the community level, however, sheds more light on the issue.

**Table 11: DRR team member’s comfort level in facilitating PMEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs some guidance</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges to Implementing PMEL in the Communities**

Implementation of the project’s PMEL step did not occur as expected. Although PMEL was facilitated in all three communities, the DRR team has itself provided several anecdotal accounts that, together, create a body of evidence that the communities have not internalized the practice. For example, the Amandraya PMEL team mentioned that because of its infrequent use, task force members usually forget how to use the quarterly timeline change spider web tool. Additionally, there is no evidence that the tool is indeed used every four months as it is intended.

In discussing the effectiveness of PMEL facilitation, all DRR team comments touched on either the lack of participation and engagement from the community, or on the lack of knowledge – regarding the PMEL tools – of those community members who participate more actively (who are generally also members of the task forces). Regarding expected participation, the team pointed out, for example, that there is a tendency for indicators to be chosen based on the opinions of more influential community members, potentially alienating other subgroups from the process. Here, the tension between social hierarchy and representativeness of the task force becomes a concern. A related example emerges in the form of gender dynamics; in Ramba Ramba women’s participation is reduced due to traditional restrictions on male-female interaction coupled with the fact that there are no female CKS facilitators to engage them.

Another obstacle identified by the DRR team in Ramba Ramba was the fact that, during meetings, community members would frequently talk about the urgency of restoring the water and sanitation system that was destroyed in the March 2005 earthquake. The SIPA team’s field experience shows that, similarly, Sisobambowo community members are constantly concerned about fixing a bridge that links the two sub villages and that gives them better market access, and would prefer to talk about that during our surveys.
It seems that rather than an obstacle, this claim by community members could be interpreted as a sign of how priorities may shift as capacity is built and awareness starts to promote more results-oriented thinking, specifically as it targets the community’s immediate needs.

The Gap Between PMEL Training and Implementation

Although many of the team members indicated feeling very comfortable, one of the highlighted aspects of the PMEL action-reflection exercise was an IIRR recommendation that the DRR team dedicate more time to “[…] practice and acquire proper skills in facilitating the tools.” Since then, no additional community PMEL facilitation has happened, and there is no information yet on what kind of progresses were made through field experience.

If DRR team members feel comfortable facilitating PMEL in the communities (now more than before, according to the survey results), then two issues arise: 1) Why has PMEL not been institutionalized in the communities as planned? and 2) Why has the team not consistently conducted PMEL internally?

Given obstacles in the communities, the DRR team has not been able to transmit much beyond the rhetoric of a monitoring and evaluation system. During the Organization Self Assessment for Sustainability (OSAS) exercises with the communities, charts produced in both Pasar Beringin and Ramba-Ramba list monitoring as activities necessary for sustainability. Though, no other evidence was made available or collected that would indicate that communities have since then monitored their activities or consistently collected information for another evaluation round.

In CKS, formal internal self-monitoring and evaluation has been inconsistent and it has been relying on the practice of action-reflection as a source of learning. Here it should be noted that although understood as a very important tool for generating and analyzing performance related information, it does not necessarily share the same objectives of a formal monitoring and evaluation system.

DRR team members may be basing their perceptions of comfort level, and of obstacles, on the more promptly reportable aspects of the facilitation process, i.e., if planned activities were carried out and how closely the script was followed. IIRR seems to corroborate this idea by observing that the PMEL facilitation was “[…] very much tool-oriented; very much focused in filling up the matrix.” IIRR proceeds to suggest that the PMEL tools be complemented with the use alternative methods such as focus group discussion, surveys and household visits.

Overall, the DRR team had difficulty showing the importance of PMEL activities in a way that would prompt community members to prioritize it over other more traditional or immediate matters. To the communities, implementing PMEL still comes across as an unjustified effort. To the DRR team’s more programmatic goals, PMEL has not been shown to add much value beyond action-reflection.

It should be noted that a monitoring and evaluation system is an important framework through which to generate knowledge, promote learning and guide action. A properly implemented monitoring and evaluation system can thus be an important means of capacity development and organization sustainability.
Organizational Self Assessment for Sustainability (OSAS)

The pilot project is an approach intended at helping communities become resilient to disasters. The pilot project emphasizes that communities, as a function of their improved capacity, gradually assume full responsibility for disaster risk reduction activities and no longer rely on the DRR team to facilitate their organizational processes. The second phase proposal corroborates this perception, and goes beyond more general capacity building to mention specific phase-out consideration such as the provision of technical support and the need for additional funding for the next three years.

These are indeed important aspects from a programmatic and operational standpoint, but they have little bearing on sustainability if the communities themselves are not aware of which constraints they face and how to address them. The Organizational Self Assessment for Sustainability (OSAS) exercises were intended to help the communities conceptualize organizational sustainability issues and elaborate their factors and measures to work towards it.

The first problem the DRR team faced was conveying the meaning of organizational sustainability. Using the methodology and tools received from IIRR in Sisobambowo proved to be a rather contrived process, which prompted the team to reassess it and, with the help of an IIRR facilitator, come up with a simplified interface for transferring the concepts and skills.

There were other early difficulties too. In both Ramba Ramba and Pasar Beringin attendance for that particular session was low, even though the meetings had been scheduled in advance. In Pasar Beringin some community members voiced their dislike that some task force members were not always present in meetings. Similar comments came up in Ramba Ramba, where the OSAS session followed a task force meeting on the status of the destroyed water and sanitation system.

Some DRR team members were satisfied that the non-task force members were able to conduct OSAS without the presence of the task force. They interpreted this as a step towards sustainability, with general interest rising and moving the project along. However, this overlooks the point that without CKS to facilitate the process, it would probably not have happened. The fact that the task force (who are the community members that are supposed to take over the role of CKS as facilitators) is not fully engaged in gradually assuming the responsibilities may actually undermine the sustainability of the community organization, as suggested by the comments offered in the meeting.

One of the most pressing questions that arises from this interaction is: Why are there such discrepant levels of interest and a situation in which task force members seem to be more indifferent to the progress of the project than other purportedly less engaged community members? It seems that the answer is inherently connected to issues of incentives and motivations.

**Incentivizing Participation**

Much of the basis for mobilizing the communities within the pilot project is tapping into the idea of solidarity. Togetherness and cohesiveness are words commonly used by the DRR team to describe pre-requisites to meaningful community mobilization and conditions that should be sought if not already in place.
The DRR team emphasized throughout the project the idea of capacity development being a process and not a mean or an end. In this process, community solidarity came to be portrayed as an achievement, through which neighborliness would increase and with it the overall willingness to help each other. Indeed, almost all community members interviewed indicated that community solidarity had increased. But some respondents also took the time to elaborate on what that meant for the community.

In summary, now that solidarity has increased, people are having difficulty perceiving it as inherently beneficial. Many are asking why is solidarity beneficial if nothing is coming out of it beyond this idea that caring more about your neighbor is good. People are becoming skeptical about their efforts to build a more tightly knit community. If that time could be spent working on their own livelihoods, it is a difficult tradeoff to justify.

For some time, solidarity was perceived as both an individual and a community-wide reward that incentivized people to put additional effort into keeping it high. It turned out that this was not a self-sustainable element of capacity, and more was expected to come from being solidary than solidarity in return. This frequently came in the form of request for some tangible result, an idea with which CKS still struggles. CKS has been emphasizing the idea that increased solidarity is a result that the community should acknowledge as a product of the DRR activities. This may be true, but it is still a long way from the tangible results that community members frequently refer to.

The purpose of this discussion is not simply to suggest a rewards system based on immediate and obvious results, but to highlight a more general issue of organizational sustainability: motivation and incentives. Motivation can have many simple and straightforward manifestations, and incentives do not have to be monetary, or even tangible, and can assume many other forms. Solidarity, however, may be outliving its usefulness.

**Incentives as Non-tangibles**

The fact that the pilot project was not elaborated with the intention of funding livelihood activities or providing public goods should not preclude facilitating the community in their own search for tangible results. Infrastructure, for example, is a fundamental tangible aspect of building capacity. Having access to potable water (and all the health implications that follow it), having a drainage...
system that reduces the impact of a flood, and having a safe bridge that gives access to markets are very important vulnerability-reducing measures. They not only incentivize people, but also increase their capacity to deal with the consequences of a hazard, effectively reducing the risk of disaster.

But incentives can also take the form of non-tangibles. Observing participation in the task forces helps illustrate this point. For example, many of the task force members assume their posts by default, as a function of their standing in the community. But as committed as these members are, they still have other activities to tend to that take them away from their task force duties. However, interviews with task force members exposed certain benefits that working on the task force may bring.

One woman task force member in Sisobambowo suggested having gained knowledge and experience about risk reduction, which led her to feeling more prepared to deal with hazards. Similar perceptions were captured in the task force surveys in Ramba Ramba, in which five task force members indicated being better prepared to respond to disaster because of their work in the task force. The same five respondents affirmed having gained skills from being on the task force. One respondent specifically mentioned the training on leadership and organization management and also that improving women’s involvement was a beneficial outcome itself.

In Pasar Beringin the results of the survey were not as conclusive, as four of the six task force members surveyed indicated not having learned any new skills. This may be an artifact of generally higher education attainment levels of Pasar Beringin task force members compared to other communities. This suggests that assessing the training needs of the community is not simply a requirement to start the project but also a continuous necessity with the goal of updating training and facilitation so that they meet expectations and keep motivation high.

In the case of task force members, the lack of tangible results prompts pressure from the community. That, coupled with a lack of individual rewards, potentially alienates both task force and non-task force members from the idea of joining or remaining with the community organization.

From witnessing the election of the new task force in Pasar Beringin, in March 2009, it became more apparent that there is still a general lack of motivation to join the task force. Of the three positions for which new representatives were to be elected, two were reelected. The new member seemed to have volunteered as a last resort: he had been participating in the meeting since the beginning but had not presented himself as a candidate until towards the end, when nobody else had manifested interest in running for the position.

In January 2009, during the election for a community facilitator in Ramba Ramba, only one person was nominated. Some selection criteria were laid out and included that the person be a permanent community member, enthusiastic and able to mobilize others, with no previous experience required. And although the criteria were not restricting per se, everyone else declined to participate because of other commitments.

This kind of hesitance shows a gap in the sustainability of the community organizations. To further explore this issue, task force members in Pasar Beringin and Ramba Ramba were asked if they would continue the DRR efforts were CKS to leave. All eleven respondents said they would but three of
them commented that their organizational capacity was still low. One man in Ramba Ramba said that at first he did not think they would be able to continue without CKS, but that they would try their best.

These are encouraging responses but prompt a question: is this general willingness, though necessary, sufficient for sustaining the community’s organized efforts? Especially when most non-task force members claim that time is their greatest constraint. The opportunity cost of allotting that time to community is still high, especially for those who have less of it to spare.

**Caring (Also) for the Most Vulnerable**

The fact that the communities are re-assessing their priorities and incorporating more diversified activities into their action plans indicates that people are becoming increasingly aware of what it entails to be sustainable. What perhaps is lacking is the notion of how uneven vulnerabilities can be within the community and the impacts that can have on the sustainability.

Six of the seven non-task force members in Sisobambowo asked if everyone was equally vulnerable to disaster said yes, and complemented their answers by saying that even if some houses do not flood, everyone's farmlands are affected. However true this may be, it does not capture the full meaning of vulnerability. As the sand/stone digging example above indicates, income (or lack thereof) is a component of vulnerability, and is an important descriptor of different vulnerability and capacity levels within a community.

Lack of proper representation in the task force has also been an issue for the most vulnerable. The DRR team recognizes that the task forces are not generally representative of the marginalized groups within each of the communities. However, the team is uncertain of how to promote their participation. The dilemma is how to bring in all different stakeholders within the community without suggesting that traditions that designate the social hierarchy be changed to accommodate them.

From the outset, the project had a focus on gender but not on other possible aspects of social hierarchy. Even with this emphasis, and a quota regulating formal participation, women in Sisobambowo and Ramba Ramba who appeared to be well organized still were not comfortable initiating their own activities in the ambit of the task force.

An impromptu focus group with four women in Ramba Ramba further substantiated this. They agreed that women have the opportunity to join the task force and that they are listened to at meetings and community events. Yet they also added that the task force members would still consult with CKS before making any decisions, meaning that suggestions coming from the community are usually validated through the approval of CKS facilitators.

The idea of CKS legitimizing the task force is not problematic per se. It becomes problematic if CKS is seen as a crutch for decision-making within the communities. This may also contribute to a generalized perception in the community that the task force may not yet be prepared to carry out its duties alone, both within and outside the community.
The summary of this discussion is that depending on who is doing the organizing, and why, increased participation in local organizations can either be exclusionary and reinforce existing decision making powers and structures … or can widen the base of voice, information, and participation and increase the responsiveness of local government.91

The quote opportunely brings in another factor of sustainability, that of establishing relations with extra-community actors.

**Links to the Outside: Goodwill Should not Preclude Accountability**

As suggested in the beginning of this section, building capacity should be about assisting communities in their path towards self-reliance. This involves helping communities to assess and meet their own needs by mobilizing not only community resources but also that of external actors.

The need for links with other organization, both governmental and not, was foreseen in the project as an important aspect of building capacity within the communities. However, not much has been achieved and no lasting linkages have been established. But the linkage aspect is actually preceded by a more fundamental one: the community having the capacity to search for its own meaningful interactions.

Thus far, the communities have been highly dependent on CKS for external relationship building. If a community is to become capable of handling its own issues, and ultimately sustainable in its practices for doing so, it will need to engage outside agents to whom they may petition the provision of public goods.

Up to this point, perhaps as an artifact of the post-earthquake reconstructions and rehabilitation phase, much of the emphasis has been put simply on private funding. Indeed, CKS has put two communities in touch with donors to fund a drainage system in Pasar Beringin and a new water and sanitation system in Ramba Ramba. In the spirit of capacity building, CKS facilitated the communities to develop their own funding proposal.

It is interesting to note that three out of five non-task force members surveyed in Ramba Ramba said that the task force has worked with other organizations, but could only name the church and the government’s agricultural department, which provided the mahogany seeds. Similarly, all five task force members surveyed there said that CKS has helped them establish links with the government, specifically for getting the mahogany seeds from the agricultural department. But, as explained before, the government no longer provides the seeds, and the communities have not been able to advocate for them again.

In Sisobambowo, eleven of twelve non-task force members surveyed said that local government officials and other organizations were helping more since the DRR project started. However, it is not possible to link this greater external presence exclusively to the work of the task force. Lingering reconstruction and rehabilitation activities or even vote seeking for the recent legislative election can be seen as plausible explanation of increased external attention. Whichever the case, Sisobambowo has not yet found a source of funding for fixing the bridge. During the surveys, many community
members voiced concerns about the bridge. When asked if the task force had contacted outside organizations or the government to help, one woman answered that the task force had asked for help from the government, who came and assessed the bridge but did nothing else.

But similarly to a water and sanitation system and to a drainage system, a bridge is a public good, whose provision is the responsibility of the government. If the other two communities, with the aid of CKS, were able to find alternative funding sources, it should not preclude the search for government accountability. Facilitating the community to engage the responsible government officials is a fundamental aspect in the process of searching for sustainability.

**Building Capacity and Reducing Vulnerability Through Livelihood**

So far, much of the justification for carrying out the activities is solidarity related. However, this cannot be restated indefinitely, and the community will want to see improvements in the living conditions coming from their mobilization. These are what ultimately will incentivize them to continue with the project. This is not simply a functionalist suggestion but something that seems necessary so that capacity building can go beyond rhetoric and people can realize projects together.

The want for alternative livelihoods, though not a topic addressed through targeted questions, appeared in almost every interview and survey with community members. Although in Ramba Ramba the need for a water and sanitation system is stark, community members still mentioned alternative livelihood activities such as training on hog raising or on increasing farmland productivity as very pressing issues. In Sisobambowo fixing the bridge is the urgent concern, but training on motorcycle repair and vocational training are also mentioned as high priorities. And in fact, when both community task forces developed their first action plan, these livelihood activities were contemplated, but were secondary to the more direct hazard mitigation strategies. In the second action plan they were promoted to higher-order necessities.

The DRR team has demonstrated sensitivity to these issues, but has struggled with how to facilitate

---

**The Risks of Alternative Sources of Income**

Reconstruction and rehabilitation efforts after the earthquake, by following the best practice of using local resources and labor, created a larger market for stones, sand and wood. This effectively incentivized people to extract these materials in hopes of generating additional income. However, this meant engaging in activities that also increase their risk.

In Sisobambowo eight of the eleven non-task force respondents, all men, offered accounts, with varying amounts of detail, of the process through which these activities contribute to the risk of flood, especially the effects of erosion. Similarly, in Ramba Ramba, all nine non-task force respondents were aware that sand and stone digging increases the risk of disasters.

Although there was dissent regarding whether these activities had decreased due to the work of the task or due more simply to lesser demand (two men also said that there no more large tree to be cut), many agreed that if they continue to cut trees and dig for stones and sand it is because there are no alternative livelihoods.

This indicates that activities continue to be demand driven, and whenever there is a contractor who will buy there will be someone to extract and sell. People are still aware of the impacts. But they also know full well the consequences of having no money.
the discussions and integrate the communities’ livelihood concerns into the project. Examples are available as far back as during PDRA activities. From the consolidation of the PDRA activities in Sisobambowo one can see the recognition of how people’s capacity to reduce vulnerability is also constrained by the lack of livelihood alternatives. The discussion addresses the tension caused by banning illegal logging while it is a source of alternative income for many.

More recently, there have been talks within CKS to establish links between their (as of now standalone) livelihood project and CMDRR that show potential in further promoting this integration. The logic for this integration can be made explicit through the example in the box above: trying to generate income from extracting materials is an attempt to reduce vulnerability, as more income also means more resources that can be used for preparing for or recuperating from a disaster. However, that is potentially increasing the risk of disaster. Which one outweighs the other is not possible to know ex ante. The fact remains that, because of lack of alternatives, the immediate coping mechanisms intensify the longer-lasting problem.

At this point, it seems the lack of alternative livelihoods has become an obstacle for further capacity building. Not all resistance comes from the so-called “relief mentality”, under which people expect organizations to simply give them something. It is difficult to expect people to rally around the abstract concept of capacity if they still cannot manage to have their water and sanitation system, their drainage system and their bridge built. Although we present this idea of integrating CMDRR and livelihood, the real suggestion is that the community be continuously assessed so that the facilitation process remains truly connected to what people’s needs and priorities are.

The DRR team has become aware that community members are potentially “[…] under such a poverty situation that every day all of them have to struggle to meet their livelihood needs. [This severe] economic hardship […] does not allow them to participate with the process.” Concomitantly, some team members struggled with the idea that the process was not being properly implemented and that those contextual obstacles could be overcome by better facilitation. The answer lies at the junction of these two propositions. A premise of the project is that overcoming poverty (the contextual obstacle) is not only an intermediate goal aimed at improving participation, but an overarching one. To directly instill motivation should indeed be an intermediate objective potentially achieved through better facilitation. But the power that comes from motivation actually producing results can increase and contribute to the sustainability of the community organization.

The DRR team is aware that sustaining participation may be more difficult than initiating it. If the challenge is known, the team then needs to put in place practices that deal with this potential discontinuity.
7.9 Document and Share Practice-Based Learning (Writeshop)

IIRR emphasizes the importance of the writeshop as a forum for mutual-learning and documenting experiences from the CMDRR training process and field facilitation. The final output of the writeshop is a document consisting mainly of case studies by the DRR team, stories from community members, lessons-learned articles by IIRR trainers, as well as commentaries by other CKS staff.

The SIPA team was present for the last two days of the writeshop. However, by then most of the substantive discussions had already happened and observations were limited to comments of a more editorial nature.

The SIPA team conducted a survey to assess the DRR team’s perception of whether it was an important final step of the CMDRR process in this pilot project. All respondents agreed that it was an important exercise for revisiting their experiences and creating a document that could serve as a learning basis for future activities. One team member further commented that it was also important because the final document could help mainstream CMDRR not only within CKS but also to other organizations and to other areas in Indonesia.

The DRR team was also generally satisfied with how the process was participatory, ultimately bringing in many different viewpoints. Notwithstanding, two respondents mentioned they would like to have seen the writeshop involve additional stakeholders such as government officials and parish priests, so that their opinions and experiences could also have been highlighted in the discussions.

The goal of including more stakeholders is indeed an important one, but it should be tied to the level of participation that different stakeholders had in the project. In this case, parish priest played an important role, especially during the community selection process. However, as much as the government should have a fundamental role in the lives of these communities, government officials were not approached as stakeholders within the framework of the project.

The DRR team was also asked how well the writeshop’s final product explained CMDRR in the context of Nias. Again, the whole DRR team agreed that it was an accurate portrayal of their experiences with the projects. Some respondents, however, said they were skeptical of how representative the document could really be, given that it compiled the experience of only three communities.

Despite its limited reach during this pilot stage, the document produced by the writeshop does succeed in capturing many of the trials and successes that are unique to the CMDRR experience in Nias. For example, one important lesson learned that the DRR team highlight is the importance of livelihood as a means to reduce disasters risk in vulnerable populations. This corroborates recommendations in the present report to consider further incorporating livelihood as a component of CMDRR initiatives in Nias. Overall, the final document is an important step in the direction of further contextualizing CMDRR as an effective and relevant intervention tool for the Nias context.
8.1 Action-Reflection

Action-reflection is the backbone of the project’s methodology, a continuous and recurring process that occurs after every accompaniment and any field facilitation. The CKS team was introduced to this type of learning method during IIRR’s training session and thereby applied it for its own facilitation at the community level.

On this issue, surveys and interviews with the team confirmed that this unique structure permitted them to “follow a process of daily recap and feedback.” If there any clarifications were needed, they would address it right away. Generally, before going on to the next project step, a reflection session would be conducted to discuss the team’s experiences and knowledge from the field practica.

The SIPA team found that all respondents on the DRR team felt that the action-reflection process was very important for learning and sharing field experiences. One DRR team member indicated CMDRR to be the best training she had ever received, referring to its approach as truly integrative. During the reflection process, the DRR team would often translate abstract concepts into simpler language and tools in order to communicate the ideas to the communities. Every survey respondent also acknowledges that action-reflection not only addresses the knowledge gaps among team members, but also empowers team members to learn from each others’ strengths and weaknesses.

8.2 Language and Translation Issues

Training

The language constraint inherent in this multinational partnership was recognized early on in the project, but consistently presented difficulties for both IIRR and CKS. In IIRR’s preparatory plan of operation, scheduled for May 2007, the identification and selection of a local translator would be chosen by CKS in mid-June. This translator would be hired to render a total of 150 days of translation, both simultaneous during all trainings and written translation of post-training documents. Additionally, according to the original project proposal, it was expected that all of the DRR team members would have basic knowledge of English.

As it turned out, these requirements were not met, which presented some considerable roadblocks to a seamless training sequence. Translation during several of the initial trainings was done by Retno Ika Praesty (CRS Medan), who joined the project to assist with logistics and some co-facilitation. She had a number of different roles during the accompaniments but was very important in translating between English and Bahasa Indonesia, particularly because she was familiar with the methodology.

With the development of DRR core team (Elvina Simanjuntak, Activitas Sarumaha and, eventually, Royn Silaen), the group was meant to be a liaison between the team and the trainers, as all of the
core team members have strong capacity in the English language. They also led the team’s internal sessions following accompaniments, held to review main concepts, share experiences and institutionalize the knowledge and skills that had been acquired. About midway through the pilot project, the core team also became the translators during trainings. They described, not only to IIRR but also to former CKS director, Fr. Raymond Laia, the difficulty of learning during simultaneous translation. It grew harder for them to follow the teachings and they wanted to benefit as much as possible from the trainings. During interviews conducted by the SIPA team, numerous team members (not only those performing the translation) expressed that they would have preferred an outside professional translator.

Although the translation fatigue is in itself an important finding, the full weight of this issue must also include recognition of the role of core team members for the DRR team’s internal sessions. As the liaison between IIRR and the DRR team, these bilingual team members were expected to lead the follow-up sessions. Assisting the team to further absorb the knowledge and skills acquired during the accompaniments, these internal sessions were mentioned during January interviews as extremely useful to most team members. Furthermore, because so many staff members joined after the initial accompaniments (only four out of the current ten team members were present from the 1st Accompaniment), most rely on these internal sessions to catch up on methodology, discuss ideas, contextualize the tools, and revise concepts to make them more suitable for their specific use. In the sense that greater preparedness of the core team would improve their teaching and sharing during internal sessions, the case for external translators is strengthened.

**Language Issues in the Field**

Many people with whom this project worked do not speak Bahasa Indonesia but rather Nias, a local dialect that is very different from the country’s national language. In addition to several of the key distinctions of Nias previously mentioned in this report, language is another dividing factor between the island and the rest of the archipelago. Due to the fact that not all of the ten DRR team members speak Nias, the language issue also encroached on facilitation and project implementation. For some of the team members who are not from Nias, this was a challenge. Two of the core team members are not from the island, and they are still in the process of learning Nias. The effort made to learn Nias in order to communicate and facilitate is strong. Still, over the course of the project this language barrier has presented challenges.

**8.3 Time Management**

**Training**

From the very first step of the project, it became clear that the number of days allotted for training sessions in the initial proposal was insufficient and, by the last few accompaniments, the length of trainings grew from 2-3 days to over a week (the 6th accompaniment lasted 11 days). This was intended to enable the trainings to better address the needs of its participants, the majority of whom had little prior experience in community development. In interviews, respondents from the DRR
team often mentioned time management as a less positive aspect of the training; according to their accounts, some of the trainings were unnecessarily long, while others did not leave enough time to cover the material. Concurrently, one person also explained how concerns were communicated and the IIRR trainers were able to address them, but these scheduling changes occurred later on in the project. This speaks to how the flexibility of both parties enabled the scheduling concerns to be addressed through feedback.

Furthermore, the daily schedule kept during accompaniments was one of long hours and extensive time and energy on the part of its participants. This finding is based on feedback from team members, which represents an appropriately subjective opinion due to the fact that they felt that this colored the experience. Still, it is hard to say how much is too much from an objective standpoint. Based purely on this feedback, there still may be some room for improvement in order to scale down on the daily work load and the consecutive days of training.

Implementation

During initial interviews with the DRR team members, there was also feedback regarding difficulties experienced with trying to respect the project’s time frame while understanding the scheduling needs of the communities.

A number of the mechanisms and decisions chosen to address these time constraints were indeed suitable for the situation, but some of the proposed solutions were problematic. It is common for task force meetings to begin after dark (usually around 8 or 9pm) as those attending spend the greater part of the day in the rice fields, or working in construction, for example. In Sisobambowo, a community divided by the Neho River, difficulty arose when the task force members traveled far and in risky conditions to attend these late meetings at the home of another village member. Although this represents dedication to the task force meetings, it leads us to worry about the dangers inherent in this evening commute because of the unacceptable quality of the bridge; it is the only means to cross over the river, to travel from one side of the community to the other.

Several key informants mentioned that the timing of the project must be constantly adjusted to the activities of the people, which shows a degree of flexibility but also suggests that there could be value in revising the scheduled activities well in advance if a particular diversion is identified. One DRR core team member cited the example of Sisobambowo, where for several months residents were hired by BRR to build a road in the village and were indeed compensated for this work. Their enthusiasm about the construction project actually caused many DRR meetings to be postponed, and the team felt they had to be flexible and should not insist otherwise. There was a similar situation in Pasar Beringin, as the durian season prompted community members to make a cake out of the fruit; this is an activity that requires many hands and also one that brings in additional income.

One of the CMDRR trainers acknowledges that “it is important to comply with their speed; sometimes they have different speed than us, different priorities.” The two examples presented here highlight not only the scheduling challenges but also the prioritization of livelihood activities, which are often associated with seasonal cycles. Some of the central activities, such as PMEL, were put on hold in order for the community to participate in these temporary employment
opportunities. Because the initial schedule of activities did change, the DRR team did its best to adjust to these changes and, in doing so, recognized some of the attributes of a more flexible approach.

8.4 Reporting and Communication

The primary means of reporting and communication amongst IIRR and CKS is through the accompaniment reports generated for each phase of the project. There are eight reports from the pilot project, which are prepared by IIRR and disseminated to everyone in both implementing organizations. The goal of these accompaniments is to give “technical support” to teams and to create institutional knowledge by documenting the processes used and learning to implement them “more efficiently in the future.”

The outline of these outputs generally follows a traditional report format, with an executive summary, background section on the stage of the project being taught, methodology and processes used, and a “learning synthesis” or participants’ reactions. Usually all the tools and documents used in the trainings are placed in annexes. Each section of the document is written in English and then translated into Bahasa Indonesia. The length of the report varies with the average being 50 pages including annexes. (Note: this also includes the sections written in both languages).

The SIPA team has read the eight accompaniments and referred to them throughout our evaluation. They were particularly helpful as an initial introduction to the structure, goals, and outputs of the project. However, more substantive research was difficult to achieve through the reports. While the general outlines are similar, within the sections they lack uniformity and the continually switch from Bahasa Indonesia to English can be confusing. Referring back to a specific detail in the reports is difficult as the length and layout discourage easy recall. In addition, the three communities involved in the project are not mentioned in each report, and it can be unclear as to which process has been completed in each one.

The disjointed nature of the documents may be inhibiting effective reporting and communication of the project to all stakeholders. According to interviews in January, many of the DRR team members believed these documents to be reliable, but admitted to not referring back to them after the training. The breadth of information found in the reports is important and with better organization and management of the data, will be even more useful. This is an important component in the creation of institutional knowledge and the sustainability of the project, especially before the final writeshop document is produced.
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CMDRR AS AN INTERVENTION TOOL

Some project outcomes in the three selected communities may shed light on the effectiveness of CMDRR in Nias.

Overall, the pilot CMDRR project was intended to reduce disaster risk by developing each community’s capacities to address hazards through preventive and mitigation measures, and to reduce vulnerability through individual survivability and community readiness measures. These DRR measures, coupled with the emphasis on community-managed and participation, were expected to contribute to building disaster-resilient communities. This section will summarize findings in these regards.

It is important to note that one of the key limitations to the SIPA team’s evaluation is that it was conducted before after the conclusion of the pilot CMDRR project. As such, the findings presented in this section should be viewed within the context of progress-to-date or short-term outcomes rather than a comprehensive impact assessment study.

9.1 Addressing Hazard: Prevention and Mitigation Measures

In order to address the identified hazards in the three selected communities, the pilot CMDRR project was focused on building community capacities relating to preventive and mitigation measures. Overall, progress is still rather limited on the actual delivery of community activities to address the identified hazards. The following table briefly summarizes the major preventive and mitigation activities that were accomplished to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pasar Beringin – Flood</th>
<th>Sisobambowo - Flood</th>
<th>Ramba Ramba – Landslide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Garbage collection system</td>
<td>• Mahogany tree planting along river banks</td>
<td>• Mahogany tree planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drainage system (funding proposal recently approved by Austcare)</td>
<td>• Customary laws to prohibit tree cutting, sand/stone digging and pig roaming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the opinions of community members, most of them recognized an increase in DRR-related activities such as tree planting and garbage collection. However, a few community members in Pasar Beringin stated that garbage collection only benefited certain segments of the community, notably those at the front who are closer to the main roads.

Table 12: Have you noticed an increase in activities such as tree planting and garbage collection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sample = 27 Non-Task Force Members)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, the surveyed community members also acknowledged that prohibitive activities such as tree cutting and sand/stone digging have decreased. Nonetheless, a few noted that this may be due to decreased demand for trees/stone/sand that stemmed from a general decline in rehabilitation and reconstruction projects.
Table 13: Since the task force was formed, have activities such as tree cutting, sand/stone digging decreased?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our survey with community members also uncovered some distressing issues. For example in Pasar Beringin, while community members are generally better educated on the proper disposal of garbage, half of the survey respondents (including task force members) noted that they would collect their garbage and dispose of it in the Nou River. Some indicated that it was due to insufficient garbage collection in the back of the community, as they cannot afford the garbage collection fee. Other community members noted that they would burn their garbage instead, depending on weather conditions. Such community actions pointed to a greater need for Caritas facilitators and the task force to address issues more holistically, rather than on an isolated basis.

9.2 Addressing Vulnerability: Survivability and Community Readiness

Another important facet of the CMDRR methodology is to reduce vulnerability through building capacity on individual survivability and community readiness.

**Individual Survivability**

In terms of survivability, some of the suggested DRR measures from the initial PDRA activities included trainings on risk awareness and alternative livelihood to increase standard of living. In general, there was very little emphasis on this aspect in the pilot project, particularly relating to alternative livelihood trainings. The livelihood component is especially important as some community members suggested that the absence of alternative livelihood opportunities may be the key reasons for continual tree cutting and sand/stone digging activities, despite the general awareness that these activities would increase their hazard risk.

Table 14: Do you think that tree cutting, sand/stone digging, improper garbage disposal increase hazard risk?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Response</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the PDRA activities that were conducted in all three communities, it was apparent that community members generally possessed some basic awareness on the causes of the identified hazard in their communities. In order to assess whether the pilot project had increased their risk awareness, the SIPA team administered the following questions to the surveyed task force members as well as non-task force members.

Table 15: Has your DRR training made you more aware of the immediate causes of the identified hazard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interestingly, most of the non-task force members that responded with “No” or “Don’t Know” did not participate in the initial PDRA activities. This suggested that the task force need to take more proactive steps to ensure that risk awareness messages are spread across the community, especially to non-active participants of DRR-related activities.

Community Readiness

Similarly, the pilot project placed very little emphasis on community readiness. Most notably, none of the communities had emergency preparedness plans in place. While, traditional early warning systems like making noises from wood, bamboo and power pole were left intact, evacuation plans remained nonexistent. This shortfall was also recognized by IIRR and Caritas who cited lack of capacity to conduct these trainings and the costly fee for hiring external experts. The only relevant community action in this regard existed in Pasar Beringin, where community funds were used to buy tents and chairs for a public kitchen in the event of a flood.

Another key measure of community readiness as identified in the PDRA activities involved building linkages with government and other NGOs to support the community in addressing the selected hazard. This remains a weak element of the pilot project – government interactions were primarily limited to the extent of getting mahogany seeds. Nonetheless, many of the surveyed community members perceived that government assistance has increased since the DRR project. Some even attributed road repairs to the existence of the DRR task force, while others pointed out that this may be solely due to the fact that it was election campaign season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16: Has the task force made you more aware of the prevention and mitigation measures for the hazard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sample = 27 Non-Task Force Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, the community’s interactions with other NGOs remained limited. Austcare’s recent approval of the drainage project proposal in Pasar Beringin brings a positive light on this front.

Despite the above limitations, all of the surveyed task force members believed that the communities are better prepared to respond to disasters today than before the inception of the pilot project in September 2007. Several attributed this to increased knowledge on what to do when a hazard occurs. Others indicated that increased community solidarity would help better facilitate the coordination of disaster response efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17: Do you think local government officials are helping more since the DRR project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sample = 27 Non-Task Force Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3 Building Resilient Communities

This evaluation specifically examined three broad themes that are critical to achieving this objective.

Community Solidarity

Overall, there is a general consensus among surveyed task force and non task force members that community solidarity has improved since the inception of the pilot project. The most notable example is in Pasar Beringin, where solidarity was historically very low as residents generally come from different parts of Nias and many treat it as a temporary residence. Through the work of the task force and Caritas facilitators in organizing bible study groups, DRR-related activities and celebration events, the community is now more cohesive and many felt that it is a safer and more peaceful place to live.

| Table 18: Do you think community solidarity has improved since the project began? |
|-----------------|----------------|-------|
|                  | Yes | No | No Response |
| Survey Response  | 25  | 1  | 1             |

Social Hierarchies

Due to the strong patriarchal traditions of Nias culture, unequal social dynamics continue to persist in the selected communities. Social inequalities based on gender, class, age, and ethnicity are major impediments to the inclusiveness and participatory spirit of the CMDRR framework. Currently, the representation of task force members is skewed to the elite end, particularly in Sisobambowo and Ramba Ramba. For example, the coordinator of the task force is often the village chief. To this end, the pilot CMDRR project may merely be reinforcing existing social structures, which may further discourage participation from marginalized groups. However, it should be pointed out that the support of community leaders was important for the project as they often helped mobilize the community on DRR-related activities.

The only facet of social inequality that was addressed in the pilot CMDRR project was gender, with a deliberate intent to impose a 30% quota for women on task forces in all three communities. In addition, gender disaggregated meetings were also organized in Amandraya for the PDRA sessions to encourage women’s participation. During our field visits in January and March, we noticed that there was minimal women’s participation on task force meetings in Sisobambowo and Ramba Ramba. They would generally agree with the male task force members. However, our women’s focus group discussions painted a rosier picture. The participating women indicated that their ideas are heard and well respected. In the urban setting of Pasar Beringin, gender inequality is not so much an issue, but the 30% quota is also in place and we did witness more lively participation from female task force members.
Community Participation

As discussed previously, the dominance of elites in the task force, especially in Sisobambowo and Ramba Ramba, may prompt other less well-established community members to become passive about DRR activities. Such dynamics may undermine the “community-managed” aspect that is so central to the CMDRR framework. Interestingly, when asked why they didn’t join the task force, over 30% of the surveyed community members cited that they didn’t have the necessary knowledge and skills. Over 40% stated that they didn’t have time to participate, which could very well be an indication of class differences, as the poor tend to have less free time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19: Why didn’t you join the task force?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Responses*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sample = 27 Non-Task Force Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One participant wasn’t invited because her husband already served on the task force, another didn’t know about it due to his immobility and another had no response.

Despite their non-participation on the task force, most surveyed community members did indicate that they are well informed about task force projects and meetings. This indicates that the task force and Caritas facilitators are at least trying to make the process as inclusive and transparent as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20: Are you regularly informed (meetings or otherwise) about the task force projects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Response*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sample = 27 Non-Task Force Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No response from one participant.

Despite the shortcomings mentioned above, the SIPA team believes that the pilot CMDRR project has made commendable progress in the three communities. Overall, it has increased community solidarity, increased women’s participation, increased risk awareness, and increased DRR-related activities to prevent and mitigate hazards, all of which would contribute towards reducing disaster risk and building resilience in these three communities. Although the tangible and measurable results that the community seeks are still limited, the underlying strength of instilling the power of community mobilization and participation will be integral to building resilient communities.
IIRR’s CMDRR methodology relies heavily on the interaction of three elements: vulnerability, capacity and hazard. Vulnerability increases the potential impact of a hazard, which if not prevented, prepared for or mitigated through capacity, may become a disaster. Having commented on the overall effectiveness of the CMDRR intervention in addressing disaster risk in the selected communities through these three elements, this report now turns to the relevance of CMDRR for the context of Nias based on three other spheres: 1) hazard as an entry points; 2) the need for addressing hierarchy and gender dynamics; and 3) the community-managed philosophy;

Relevance is defined here as the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the beneficiaries’ requirements. In other words, relevance describes how appropriate the objectives of an intervention are, given the circumstance.

Nearly five years after the tsunami, governments, UN agencies, and NGOs are now reflecting on its legacy – what worked well, what could have been improved, and to what extent are we currently poised to respond in the future? Due to high levels of vulnerability developing countries, coupled with the fact that extreme weather events are expected in increase as a result of climate change, there is strong momentum to ensure that the “response” to disaster (which should also include proactive management and mitigation) is coordinated, equitable, participatory, and accountable to constituents and beneficiaries both. This pilot project in Nias integrates many of the major topical areas emerging as a result of this lessons learned unit, providing a very timely backdrop against which to evaluate its relevance

Hazards as Timely Opportunities

Following the earthquake in 2005, it became evident that the people of Nias were vulnerable to that hazard and that they had low capacity to deal with the aftermath. These conditions effectively created the disaster, and continual exposure to other local hazards such as landslides and floods means that communities in Nias are in constant risk.

For these reasons, hazard, and the potential for disaster, is something around which people could be mobilized. This was especially salient after the island's inhabitants experienced such extreme destruction and loss as a result of the earthquake. Working under the assumption that greater organization within the communities can be used to promote initiatives that indeed increase capacity and reduce vulnerability to hazard, CMDRR is a relevant entry point for trying to help communities become resilient to disaster.

Traditions, Customs and Gender Dynamics

Traditionally-defined gender dynamics in Nias account for unequal levels of participation between men and women. In public, the men will speak on behalf of their respective households and make all pertinent decisions without necessarily consulting with the women of the family. Furthermore, within this patriarchal society are guiding customs that elevate the opinions village elders often to the detriment of youth, whose voices are rarely heard nor respected.
Women play a fundamental role in the sustenance of their families and communities. They are important agents of community change and should not be denied the opportunity to contribute their views on what is best for the community. For the CKS team, many of whom are fairly new to community organizing, the ability to work within the stratified society, and include other younger members of the village to participate alongside village chiefs and other respected elders, was a very appropriate attribute of the community managed approach.

Within the villages, this focus on inclusion was particularly relevant based on the existing challenges that face women, particularly in terms of equal representation. Putting efforts on the ground so that proper gender and age representation is obtained in societies where the converse is default practice speaks positively to the relevance of CMDRR in Nias.

**Community Managed vs. Community Based**

CMDRR upholds the idea that, if sustainability is the goal, then the community needs to lead the processes through which change is to come about. Unlike much of the relief and development work that claims to be participatory while not significantly involving the community in the design and implementation – something an IIRR facilitator has tagged “participulation” –, the intention is to set up a program that is not simply community based, but community managed.

Given the goals and challenges of participatory development, the fact remains that much of the relief and development work that only claims to be participatory fails to deliver the intended benefits to the targeted people, while dispensing fantastic amounts of resources. Unfortunately, relief efforts in Nias also experienced some of this misguidance.

As it turned out in Nias, the post-earthquake reconstruction stimulated markets related to construction, but many of these activities increase disaster risk (for instance, logging and stone and sand). This highlights complex effects of interventions aimed at helping communities. So even though the overall effects of reconstruction are beneficial, some negative outcomes can also arise.

More examples of wasted resources and of incomplete solutions or an unsustainable approaches can be seen when houses are built but not inhabited, when health clinics are erected are no locals are trained to staff it, when a public toilet is a priority in a village that has no water and sanitation system. These all represent concrete examples from the Nias earthquake relief efforts, observed by the SIPA team during these two field visits.

It is important to note that a participatory approach is not free of challenges. A community-wide participatory project will bring together individuals who live under considerably different conditions, thereby exposing the true variation that exists across a collection of households referred to as community. That said, CMDRR, through the philosophy of community managed, makes itself more relevant in Nias by attempting to navigate these difficulties, instead of simply handing out short-term solutions as community based projects tend to do.
10.1 Enhancing relevance

Our analysis indicates that CMDRR is a relevant entry point for reducing disaster risk in Nias. It is also a flexible methodology that can adapt to the specific context of Nias. Additionally, the post-earthquake reconstruction experience indicates that community-based approaches have serious limitations. Now, it is important that the pilot project's outputs, i.e., community organizations, actions plans, knowledge produced and awareness created, last beyond the intervention. However, as an intervention advances organizational sustainability becomes an increasingly pressing issue. People’s daily struggle never ceases, but as the more strictly hazard related activities start to become internalized in the communities, non-hazard related needs come to the fore even in the context of disaster risk-inspired community organizations. Eventually, the pressure increases for a more long-term oriented and encompassing vision of what resilience means. At this point CMDRR must shed its “entry point” character and assume the full role of a development strategy.

Two development needs present themselves as important obstacles to the relevance of CMDRR in Nias: government accountability and alternative livelihoods.

**Government as a More Involved Stakeholder**

The lack of government attention in Nias has prompted private interventions, a situation intensified by the disasters of 2004 and 2005. Necessary as these private interventions are, they should not replace government accountability, for ultimately that is to whom the responsibility of meeting basic needs and providing public goods belongs.

CMDRR importantly recognizes that self-reliance necessitates drawing upon extra-community resources. However, in the pilot project, this was mostly done by helping communities draft proposals for external donors. This kind of funding is indeed an important step in the capacity building continuum, but does not replace government involvement. Highly underdeveloped localities such these communities often lack infrastructure, which requires government spending. Raising this awareness in the communities should be made a priority, accompanied by helping task force members make government officials aware of the community needs.

**The Livelihood Approach to Risk Reduction**

CMDRR rightly locates livelihood as a component of capacity, and recognizes the importance of alternative income-generating activities that add to one’s capacity of dealing with hazard and its consequences. Per what was observed in the pilot project, the methodology is not clear about how to facilitate activities that deal specifically with creating alternative livelihoods. More importantly perhaps, the methodology seems to have difficulty locating livelihoods in the operational space of the intervention and lacks tools to elicit concern of this kind and facilitate activities that address these needs.

Ultimately, maintaining CMDRR relevant for the Nias context will require pay more attention to both the role of government accountability and the need for alternative livelihoods.
11 RECOMMENDATIONS

As highlighted in the findings, the training style promoted and facilitated by IIRR was unique, and the experiential learning was appreciated by all participants. However, this evaluation has pointed to some recommendations for improving the training and implementations aspects of the project with aims at improving overall effectiveness of CDMRR processes in Nias Island. This section also includes a few more general considerations that have emerged over the course of the research, and adds to or affirms some of the realizations that participants have also come to over the course of the pilot project.

As the pilot project concluded in March 2009 and Phase 2 activities have already begun, it is our hope that the following recommendations can inform the development and implementation of future CMDRR training and community managed activities.

11.1 Processes

Community Selection

Community selection should attempt a greater level of objectivity and attention to various forms of vulnerability and multiple stakeholders.

The SIPA team suggests that if the parish priests are to continue having a primary role in the initial selection, they should be given better information on the intentions and objectives of CMDRR. As the initial selection of communities was out of the jurisdiction of CKS objectivity was reduced. It is strongly recommended that during the community selection process the DRR team attempt to consult with other extra-community stakeholders and ensure greater objectivity. Ideally the community selection process would also rely more on PRA and vulnerability assessments.

Training Needs Assessment

When possible, any needs identified during the TNA should be directly addressed in future trainings, even if this requires modifying the original plan.

As the project began, it became clear that the participants’ skills and former experience were both slightly different from the initial expectations expressed in the proposal. TNA is a strong method to identify the needs of the new DRR team member, but it is most useful when the findings are then used to modify the training seminars, workshops and tools. The SIPA team recommends that greater effort be placed in re-designing project inputs depending on the results of this exercise. Making these changes as soon as deemed necessary would contribute to the flow of trainings and the participants’ overall learning experience.
**Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment**

*Additional (or backup) tools on PDRA should be used, particularly to reinforce the importance of participatory methods*

This recommendation emerges from the fact that most DRR team members did not remember the “Whose Reality?” video, although it was expressly mentioned and documented in the accompaniment report as being a part of the PDRA training. It would, therefore, be advisable to incorporate the use of additional/alternative tools to solidify these concepts, in the case that there is one tool—like this video—that doesn’t seem to leave a great impression. The issue is not that of remembering the video in itself, but that of having captured what this tool was meant to convey. Diversifying the methods employed to cover a concept would be one way to ensure deeper learning of elements that are critical to the project’s successful implementation.

*Expand information dissemination to increase awareness among the greater community*

Increased attention to the participation of a wider range of community members (ideally those not in other leadership positions) is desirable, as well as to the dissemination of information to those who are not able to attend meetings and trainings. Radio is generally an effective means of transmitting information in rural settings, yet its success depends on whether any of the villagers have radios. Another idea is to incorporate some of the main concepts and issues from the PDRA sessions into a film or images to show at one of the movie night, as these events tend to have great attendance. A final suggestion is to increase the amount of announcements that are made at community gatherings such as church services or bible studies. However the information is shared, it will serve to increase the understanding and acceptance of the project within the community at an earlier stage.

*Identifying Community Leaders/ Task Force Formation*

*Strive to achieve greater diversity in the task force—gender distinction should be accompanied by consideration of wealth, geographical location within community, education level, age, etc.*

Given that all the project communities show considerable variation in education and household income, these factors should be included when selecting community leaders. This will complement the focus on gender and enhance diversity of the task forces. Furthermore, although a great deal of importance has been placed on creating solidarity, its achievements can be limited by the presence of social hierarchies. The SIPA team suggests that this topic be further explored during PDRA activities; ideally, it should also be assessed as part of the vulnerability assessment, with additional participatory activities (mapping exercises, Venn diagrams, transect walk), to create a greater understanding of the socioeconomic context as perceived by residents.
**DRR action planning**

*Ensure greater attention to emergency response and preparedness activities*

In both Ramba Ramba and Sisobambowo, the emergency response simulation was not completed, despite the fact that it was identified as a key action for the year. Considering the role that preparedness plays in disaster management, as well as in the CKS operational strategy (one of four main themes—prevention, mitigation, emergency response, and organizational development), it is recommended that emergency preparedness and adequate response plans have its importance fully recognized and be subsequently prioritized.

**Participatory Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning**

*PMEL, a key aspect of the project, must be performed and reported as planned at the community level.*

This recommendation is broadly based on devoting greater attention to PMEL from the outset, due to the fact that it did not occur as scheduled during the pilot project and that monitoring was a challenging process in all the project communities. Although the process of action-reflection does indeed offer the occasion for feedback and lessons learned, it cannot fully address the entire scope of the project as well as a monitoring and evaluation plan can. Because action-reflection is not a substitute for PMEL (rather an excellent complement when both are done concurrently over the course of a project), the SIPA team recommends that greater attention be given to ensuring that PMEL is completed to the best ability of CKS and the community organizations.

*Devote more time to developing a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan at the community level*

The PMEL training was intended to prepare the DRR team to develop and use a monitoring and evaluation system, but such a system was not produced during the training. It is recommended that further development occur as soon as possible to improve constant monitoring and evaluation practices, as the project expands to fourteen villages and there is greater need for effective PMEL. There is potential for collaboration with future SIPA workshop teams, or other development consultants, to assess and improve the current monitoring and evaluation system.

**Creating Organizational Sustainability**

*Vulnerability is also linked to social and economic realities. Such links must be clearly defined and incorporated into a notion of vulnerability that adds to the more evident environmental hazards (floods, landslides, earthquakes, drought, etc.)*

There is currently a limited discussion on what can and should be included in a CMDRR approach, particularly as this relates to indirect effects of disaster on livelihoods, health, education, water and sanitation, etc. Generally, vulnerability is considered to be a function of three main components: exposure, sensitivity (ability to cope with stress) and adaptive capacity; all three of these aspects can be influenced by an individual’s livelihood, age or health status just as they could by his or her
The geographical proximity to the river or lack of a garbage disposal system. The SIPA team recommends that the training put greater emphasis on the interconnected nature of these realities, thus helping participants absorb a more comprehensive definition of vulnerability. The SIPA team also feels that an improved conceptual presentation is important to enable the DRR team to thereby express this concept logically and persuasively to CKS management and any potential funders, as the links between vulnerability to hazard and/or climate variability and various aspects of socioeconomic development are increasingly evident.

**Use additional methods to explore variations in vulnerability and capacity levels within a village**

More emphasis should be placed on assessing variations within each community and on developing appropriate strategies for mobilizing people while accounting for them. By considering the many faces of vulnerability and using additional tools to conduct thorough vulnerability assessments, CKS and the task force could make strides in indentifying the households in dire need of immediate assistance. This would then be useful to determine who could benefit from community-wide interventions and/or who might require more targeted mobilization strategies. This is desirable information to inform project activities, but also requires periodic revision through monitoring activities.

**Documenting/Packaging Practice Based Learning**

*Promote participation of additional stakeholders in the writeshop, in order to document a greater breadth of experiences*

The writeshop was a great step towards creating institutional knowledge about CMDRR in Nias; however, the document could benefit from the participation of a greater variety of stakeholders. Further input from beneficiaries, other local organizations and any government officials involved in the project is highly recommended. This could include testimonials, surveys, or findings from a general feedback session. A section on women’s, community elders, or children’s participation would be particularly useful, as these groups are not considered in depth in the current writeshop output. Furthermore, adding depth to the writeshop document could serve as a good evaluative exercise while improving communication with community members who will see their experiences recorded and divulged.
11.2 Cross-cutting Issues

Language Issues and Translation Needs

Ensure that each training and/or field practica employs a third party translator (ideally, one who is capable of translating English ↔ Bahasa Indonesia ↔ Nias and who is familiar with CMDRR/IIRR philosophy)

The importance of ensuring a local, full-time translator cannot be stressed enough. This was an initial objective of the project that was not fully implemented. The SIPA team recommends that this objective be upheld in the future, as the lack thereof will affect how the participants of the training assimilate the concepts and learn the skills. The on-site trainings require someone who can accurately perform simultaneous translation between English and Bahasa Indonesia, but during the field practica it is also useful to have someone fluent in Nias as well.

Reporting and Communication

Standardize accompaniment reports by establishing greater uniformity from one accompaniment to the next

The accompaniment reports are an important means of sharing project information between trainers, trainees and non-participants, such as other IIRR employees, implementing partners and other stakeholders. While these accompaniment reports are often rich sources of data, there is a lack of uniformity from one to the next. The SIPA team is concerned that this could be an obstacle to create and organize institutional knowledge. In order to improve documentation, it is suggested that IIRR develop documentation standards for reporting on CMDRR accompaniments. Brief status updates on all communities as well as updates on CKS progress would also be beneficial additions to the structure of the accompaniments reports. In general, the reports should strive to maintain similar sections for easier cross-referencing.

Time Management

Improve scheduling of classroom trainings/field practica (either decreasing and increasing length of on-site accompaniments according to feedback)

In response to the time management issues expressed by both trainers and trainees, it is recognized that certain scheduling issues cannot be directly addressed (such as unexpected delays in the field). Yet participants recurrently mentioned other more manageable timing issues such as having excess time for necessary activities (mainly as of the 7th accompaniment) or limited time to address all the necessary concepts. IIRR should attempt to improve scheduling of future training activities (including travel to the field) in order to include more breaks and create a daily agenda that is less tiring for participants. This would thereby optimize the learning environment and enable better attention and participation.
11.3 Enhancing CMDRR as Intervention Tool

Community assessments should be done on a continual basis: initial identification of hazards, risks, etc. may change as time goes; knowledge of these variations is essential in order to respond appropriately to community expectations.

Managing community expectations was mentioned as a primary challenge amongst DRR team members. The communities’ needs should be continually assessed so that the facilitation process can remain connected to people’s priorities. This is not a recommendation for more meetings, but rather for the key issues to be consistently revisited in meetings and for monitoring to be improved. Another very specific action that would improve continual assessment is greater communication between the task force and the rest of the community members. This could permit both the task force and the CKS staff to gain a better understanding of the communities’ key priorities, as related to risk, without greatly increasing the time devoted to DRR activities. This would also assist in managing community expectations on project outcomes. As a UNICEF informant mentioned, “[…] there is [no] magic solution for 'correcting' false expectations other than to ensure all potential obstacles are explained clearly in advance with key actors in the community.”

Build stronger linkages with government and other external stakeholders

The participatory nature of the project and its strong emphasis on organizational capacity and solidarity building seems to assume an organic evolution of social capital within communities, to the point where linkages with external social networks would be a natural outcome. Although coordination with local government is recognized in the context of this project, no strong action or communication channels have been created thus far. The SIPA team recommends placing more emphasis on facilitating these linkages, and if possible, early on in the process. The workshop on organizational sustainability occurs rather late in the project timeline; a short workshop on building lasting institutional ties with government and other external actors could be organized soon after the task force is formed, so that this element is present from the beginning.

Consider creative ways in which infrastructure projects and CMDRR can co-exist and complement each other

During this evaluation it became clear that DRR, particularly in Nias and other post-disaster regions, will often encounter the so-called “relief mentality” among project beneficiaries. In reflecting on how to inspire self-reliance and truly participatory decision-making, it is advised that CKS not draw such a strict delineation between infrastructure, for example, and the goals of the CMDRR process. Both aspects are important. The SIPA team feels that an infrastructure project could be done as long as the sequencing conditions were appropriate. A community organization created through CDMRR could very well conceive and implement a project addressing basic needs, from which participants could also develop skills. Initially, this might require diverting attention from other activities, but it would ultimately improve people’s motivation and trust in the project’s outputs. But, as expressed in a myriad of interviews, discussions and focus groups over the course of this evaluation, several difficulties may arise from expecting people to rally around the abstract concept of capacity if they still cannot have their basic needs met.
Incorporate and prioritize alternative livelihoods early on, recognizing the need for substituting income-generating activities that increase vulnerability (ex. sand/stone digging)

At this point, it seems that the lack of alternative livelihoods has become an obstacle for further capacity building. While CMDRR rightly locates livelihood as a component of capacity, and recognizes the importance of alternative income-generating activities, the implementation has not been successful in promoting alternative livelihoods. The methodology does not specify how to operationally address the need for diversifying income-generating activities and lacks tools to facilitate activities that address these needs. The SIPA team strongly recommends the incorporation of a more concrete approach to livelihood activities early on in the facilitation, one that prioritizes alternative livelihoods in the initial community action plans. The promotion of such could also assist in addressing the communities’ general expectations of a result or tangible output from the project.
12.1 Map of Nias Island and Government Organizational Structure
## 12.2 Stakeholder Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Stakeholder’s Status/Role</th>
<th>Stakeholder’s Likely Interest in Project</th>
<th>Stakeholder’s Likely Perceptions / Attitude Towards the Project</th>
<th>Stakeholder’s Likely Influence in Project</th>
<th>Stakeholder’s Capacity, Resources and Constraints Related to the Project</th>
<th>Strategy to Involve Stakeholder in Project (or otherwise address stakeholder’s concerns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-SIPA</td>
<td>Program Supporter / Funder</td>
<td>- Future equipped graduates to meet future career needs - Increase the school’s presence and influence in the development area - Project is for good causes, good for school publicity and image</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources — one of the main funders of the program; as support is important for program survival (i.e., ensuring no change to curriculum). Constraints — often operates under budget constraints.</td>
<td>Not likely involved in the project. Successful completion of project with overall client satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPD Workshop Coordinators</td>
<td>Program Administrators / Coordinators</td>
<td>- Future equipped graduates to meet future career needs - Increase the school’s presence and influence in the development area - Build stronger ties with the development community - Tracks impact in the value of workshop projects and for helping the less fortunate - Job satisfaction / career mobility</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources — meets all workshop projects and budget allocations; secure funding for the program. Constraints — school and donor fundings are often not sufficient to cover program expenses; must ensure that students can cover for out-of-pocket expenses; limited staff and time to oversee 24 projects.</td>
<td>Regular meetings to deliver on project status and solicit advice on all project-related issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birr-CKS IPA Team Faculty Advisor (Social Development)</td>
<td>Project Advisor</td>
<td>- Future prepared for future career needs - Increase the school’s presence and influence in the development area - Build stronger ties with the development community - Tracks impact in the value of the project and for helping the less fortunate - Successful completion of job requirement</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources — one of the main funders of the team dynamics; has limited field work experience and research experience; knowledge of the project, disaster risk reduction strategies and research methodologies. Constraints — first time acting in this capacity for an EPD workshop project (visiting scholar); project team may sometimes operate under tight deadlines which would require prompt responses.</td>
<td>Regular meetings to ensure that everyone is on the same page with any concerns before they are addressable by the rules set forth by the team guidelines; dedicate sufficient time for group meetings and other project-related work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birr-CKS IPA Team Project Implementers</td>
<td>- Future prepared for future career needs - Successful completion of graduation requirement - Acquire field work experience and learn more about CMDRR, IRRI and Indonesia - Tracks impact in the value of the project and for contributing to the overall advancement of vulnerable groups.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources — deep awareness of each stakeholder’s strengths and weaknesses; knowledge of disaster risk reduction strategies and research methodologies; strong commitment to project success; keen appreciation for this learning opportunity. Constraints — most team members possess limited field work experience; none speaks Bahasa Indonesia; limited time in the field to collect relevant information; must work under tight deadlines in addition to other commitments.</td>
<td>Regular meetings to ensure that everyone is on the same page with any concerns before they are addressable by the rules set forth by the team guidelines; dedicate sufficient time for group meetings and other project-related work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) Philipppines Office Project Partner (Client)</td>
<td>- Interested in learning whether CMDRR is a relevant and effective approach for the selected communities and the functions of IIRR’s training methodology in transforming knowledge and skills to CKS. - Gain a clear understanding of the role being of CKS and the sessions of the pilot project - Tracks impact in the value of the CMDRR process in building resilient communities.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources — inside knowledge on the CMDRR process and what seems well and not during each of the IRRI workshops; international recognition for capacity training; strong professional relationships with CKS staff. Constraints — limited staffing and resources; high staff turnover or no field office in Indonesia.</td>
<td>Regular conference calls and e-mails to update on project status; ensure successful completion of project on schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Office Project Partner (Client)</td>
<td>- Independent assessment of IRRI’s training methodology - Tracks impact in the value of the CMDRR process in building resilient communities - Build stronger ties with the academic community.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources — inside knowledge on the CMDRR process; primary advocate for this SIPA IRRI EPD workshop project. Constraints — limited staffing and resources; limited knowledge of IRRI’s field projects.</td>
<td>Regular conference calls and e-mails to update on project status; ensure successful completion of project on schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Stakeholder’s Likely Interest in Project</td>
<td>Stakeholder’s Likely Perception / Attitude Towards the Project</td>
<td>Stakeholder’s Likely Influence in Project</td>
<td>Stakeholder’s Likely Constraints Related to the Project</td>
<td>Strategic to Involve Stakeholder in Project (or otherwise address stakeholder’s concerns)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARITAS AND STRATEGIC PARTNERS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Partner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CKS and Senior Staff</strong></td>
<td>- Interested in learning what CMDRR is and a relevant and effective approach and the effectiveness of IIRR’s training methods for transferring knowledge and skills to CKS DRR team. - Supports CKS’s long-term development objectives for helping build resilient communities on Nias. - Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups on Nias. - More recognition and respect in the development community of Nias. - Expanding CKS program reach.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources—insider knowledge on what worked and not of each CMDRR! – rotation of knowledge; awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of each CMDRR’s techniques; motivation and commitment to build resilient communities. Constraints—limited staffing and resources; ensuring continual donor support for CMDRR projects; community expectations on “tangible.”</td>
<td>CKS provided local support for SIPA teams. January and March field trips.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CKS DRR Team</strong></td>
<td>- Interested in an independent evaluation of their pilot project. - Supports CKS’s long-term development objectives for helping build resilient communities on Nias. - Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups on Nias. - More recognition and respect in the development community of Nias. - Career development/mobility.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources—insider knowledge on what worked and not of each CMDRR’s techniques; motivation and commitment to build resilient communities. Constraints—limited staffing and resources; ensuring continual donor support for CMDRR projects; community expectations on “tangible.”</td>
<td>CKS staff provided local support for SIPA teams. January and March field trips.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caritas International (Italy and Austria)</strong></td>
<td>- Interested in an independent evaluation of the pilot project. - Supports in developing objectives for helping build resilient communities on Nias. - Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups on Nias. - More recognition and respect in the development community of Nias. - Career development/mobility.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources—main funder of CKS’ programs. Constraints—may impose contingencies ranging from commitment to remain as “implementers.” Constraints—step learning curve on CMDRR knowledge and tools; most team members possessed limited community development experience prior to joining CKS; addressing community expectations on “tangible.”</td>
<td>Not already involved in this evaluation project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catholic Relief Services Indonesia (CRS)</strong></td>
<td>- Interested in an independent evaluation of the pilot project for which it provided support. - Supports in developing objectives for helping build resilient communities on Nias. - Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups on Nias. - More recognition and respect in the development community of Nias. - Career development/mobility.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources—main funder of CMDRR for IIRR’s training and CKS’ pilot project. Constraints—may impose contingencies ranging from commitment to remain as “implementers.” Constraints—step learning curve on CMDRR knowledge and tools; most team members possessed limited community development experience prior to joining CKS; addressing community expectations on “tangible.”</td>
<td>Not already involved in this evaluation project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIS, Medan SOA Coordination Unit Assistant (Reni H. Panezi)</strong></td>
<td>- Interested in an independent evaluation of the pilot project for which it provided support. - Supports in developing objectives for helping build resilient communities on Nias. - Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups on Nias. - More recognition and respect in the development community of Nias. - Career development/mobility.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources—act as co-facilitator and translator during IIRR’s training; knowledge of CMDRR (took the CMDRR training in the Philippines); insider knowledge on what worked and not of each of the CMDRR’s techniques; strong professional relationships with CKS staff and IIRR training coordinators. Constraints—no longer involved in the project.</td>
<td>Provided logistical support for the two-day seminar at Medan. - A semi-structured interview was conducted during the January field trip to assess her experience with the pilot project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Parishes</strong></td>
<td>- Interested in learning what CMDRR is and a relevant and effective intervention tool for Nias communities. - Supports their own long-term development objectives of helping to build resilient communities on Nias. - Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups on Nias.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources—carry local knowledge; strong presence in local communities; ability to mobilize community interest and support for CMDRR projects. Constraints—limited time and resources; community mobilization may be difficult under certain circumstances (i.e., Rambling was dropped due to lack of community cohesion and land ownership issues).</td>
<td>Not already involved in this evaluation project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi Stakeholder Community Organization (Community DRR Task Force)</strong></td>
<td>- Interested in learning what CMDRR is and a relevant and effective approach and the effectiveness of IIRR’s training methods for transferring knowledge and skills to CMDRR team. - Supports CKS’s long-term development objectives for helping build resilient communities on Nias. - Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups in their local communities. - More recognition and respect in their own communities.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources—carry local knowledge; strong presence in local communities; ability to mobilize community interest and support for CMDRR projects. Constraints—limited time and resources; community mobilization may be difficult due to existing local barriers; step learning curve on CMDRR process; low community capacity.</td>
<td>Interviews, surveys and focus groups were conducted during the Jan and Mar field trips to assess their experiences with the pilot project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Stakeholder’s Status/Role</td>
<td>Stakeholder’s Likely Involvement in the Project</td>
<td>Stakeholder’s Likely Perception / Attitude Towards the Project</td>
<td>Stakeholder’s Capacity, Resources and Coordination Related to the Project</td>
<td>Strategic Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village Heads</strong></td>
<td>Influential community Members (Chair of community taskforce)</td>
<td>Communities building resilient communities</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Capacity: Resources – enhance local knowledge, political power; ability to mobilize community support</td>
<td>Engagement and exit surveys were conducted during the Jan and Mar field trips to garner their views on CKS and the pilot project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genetically concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups in their local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination – limited resources, not being role model for traditional social leaders which are selected by local villagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More recognition and respect in their own communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional Social Leaders</strong></td>
<td>Influential community Members</td>
<td>Communities building resilient communities</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Capacity: Resources – enhance local knowledge, political power; ability to mobilize community support</td>
<td>Engagement and exit surveys were conducted during the Jan and Mar field trips to garner their views on CKS and the pilot project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genetically concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups in their local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination – limited resources, not being role model for traditional social leaders which are selected by local villagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More recognition and respect in their own communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Leaders (Parish Priests)</strong></td>
<td>Influential community Members</td>
<td>Communities building resilient communities</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Capacity: Resources – enhance local knowledge, political power; ability to mobilize community support</td>
<td>Not actively involved in this evaluation project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genetically concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups in their local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination – limited resources, not being role model for traditional social leaders which are selected by local villagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More recognition and respect in their own communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Action (e.g., leaders of other community groups)</strong></td>
<td>Influential community Members</td>
<td>Communities building resilient communities</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Capacity: Resources – enhance local knowledge, political power; ability to mobilize community support</td>
<td>Engagement and exit surveys were conducted during the Jan and Mar field trips to garner their views on the pilot project as well as their participation on the task force.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genetically concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups in their local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination – limited resources, not being role model for traditional social leaders which are selected by local villagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More recognition and respect in their own communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to participate in community development efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Force - Male Members</strong></td>
<td>CKSP Pilot Project Implementers</td>
<td>Communities building resilient communities</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Capacity: Resources – enhance local knowledge, political power; ability to mobilize community support</td>
<td>Engagement and exit surveys were conducted during the Jan and Mar field trips to garner their views on the pilot project as well as their participation on the task force.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genetically concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups in their local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination – limited resources, not being role model for traditional social leaders which are selected by local villagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More recognition and respect in their own communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in the identification and management of DRR activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved capacity to deal with disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More collaboration on local wisdom activities such as loggining and digging</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Force - Female Members</strong></td>
<td>CKSP Pilot Project Implementers</td>
<td>Communities building resilient communities</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Capacity: Resources – enhance local knowledge, political power; ability to mobilize community support</td>
<td>Engagement and exit surveys were conducted during the Jan and Mar field trips to garner their views on the pilot project as well as their participation on the task force.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genetically concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups in their local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination – limited resources, not being role model for traditional social leaders which are selected by local villagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More recognition and respect in their own communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in the identification and management of DRR activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved capacity to deal with disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher gender awareness in communities</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Villagers (non-farmers, non-loggers/diggers)</strong></td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Participation in the identification and management of DRR activities</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Capacity: Resources – enhance local knowledge, political power; ability to mobilize community support</td>
<td>Not explicitly targeted for the project but surveys were conducted among a random sample of 27 male task force community members to assess their view on the pilot project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved capacity to deal with disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination – limited resources, not being role model for traditional social leaders which are selected by local villagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More collaboration on local wisdom activities such as loggining and digging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Villagers (non-farmers, non-loggers/diggers)</strong></td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Participation in the identification and management of DRR activities</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Capacity: Resources – enhance local knowledge, political power; ability to mobilize community support</td>
<td>Not explicitly targeted for the project but surveys were conducted among a random sample of 27 female task force community members to assess their view on the pilot project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved capacity to deal with disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination – limited resources, not being role model for traditional social leaders which are selected by local villagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher gender awareness in communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Status/Role</td>
<td>Likely Interest in Project</td>
<td>Likely Perception/Attitude Towards the Project</td>
<td>Likely Influence in Project</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources and Constraints Related to the Project</td>
<td>Strategy to Involve Stakeholder in Project (or otherwise address stakeholder’s concerns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources – intrinsic knowledge; more open to new ideas; greater availability to get involved; motivation to learn about CMDRR; Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups; Increased sense of self-worth and social esteem</td>
<td>Not explicitly targeted for the project but surveys were conducted among a random sample of 27 non-task force community members to assess their view on the pilot project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber/Farmer</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources – intrinsic knowledge; Constraints – highly at risk of landslides and floods; demand for rubber/farm stability; Genuinely concerned about the well-being of vulnerable groups; Increased sense of self-worth and social esteem</td>
<td>Not explicitly targeted for the project but surveys were conducted among a random sample of 27 non-task force community members to assess their view on the pilot project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Loggers, sand/stone diggers</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources – intrinsic knowledge; Constraints – highly prevalent in certain communities; Constraints – rely on tree cutting and sand/stone digging activities for additional income</td>
<td>Not explicitly targeted for the project but surveys were conducted among a random sample of 27 non-task force community members to assess their view on the pilot project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nias Island District Government</td>
<td>District Government</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong but not directly involved</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources – political power; control over budget allocations and revenue transfers to subdistricts; Constraints – limited resources and overburdened bureaucracy</td>
<td>Not directly involved in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-district Governments of Andraya, Gunung Sitoli</td>
<td>Sub-district Government</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong but not directly involved</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources – political power; control over budget allocations and revenue transfers to local communities; Constraints – limited resources and overburdened bureaucracy</td>
<td>Not directly involved in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation &amp; Reconstruction Board (BRR)</td>
<td>National Rehab &amp; Reconstruction Agency</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong but not directly involved</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources – support from the president; safeguards against local corruption; Constraints – limited knowledge of CKS and its projects</td>
<td>Not directly involved in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbat NGO working on DRR projects in Nias Island</td>
<td>Potential CKS Partners</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong but not directly involved</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources – motivation to share DRR related experience and lessons learned; increased coordination of community activities to avoid overlaps; Constraints – limited staffing and resources; Constraints – limited knowledge of CKS and its projects</td>
<td>Not directly involved in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NGO in Nias Island</td>
<td>Potential CKS Partners</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong but not directly involved</td>
<td>Capacity/Resources – motivation to share DRR related experience and lessons learned; increased coordination of community activities to avoid overlaps; Constraints – limited staffing and resources; Constraints – limited knowledge of CKS and its projects</td>
<td>Not directly involved in the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12.3 IIRR/CKS Pilot Project: Objectives, Activities and Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Steps and Objectives</th>
<th>IIRR Accompaniment</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Inception</strong>&lt;br&gt;To build shared clarity on CMDRR concepts and processes among core CKS staff</td>
<td>First Accompaniment CMDRR Basic Orientation and Project Operational Strategy Development (on-site: Jul 30 to Aug 4, 2007)</td>
<td>• Using card-charts and venn diagrams, CKS staff were asked to express their expectations on the program, mapped out local development actors, and shared their personal experiences on the earthquake, etc. • Presentation and discussion of CMDRR method and process</td>
<td>• Better understanding of CMDRR process on the part of CKS staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Program Strategy Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;To identify and select communities for pilot project&lt;br&gt;To develop program operational strategies for the pilot projects</td>
<td>First Accompaniment CMDRR Basic Orientation and Project Operational Strategy Development (on-site: Jul 30 to Aug 4, 2007)</td>
<td>• CKS staff were asked to develop a community selection matrix-ranking tool and conducted a full day field practicum using this tool • Sharing of findings and reflections on the field practicum to formalize into project strategy papers</td>
<td>• Selection of at-risk communities for the pilot project • Project strategy papers for the selected project areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Assessment</strong>&lt;br&gt;To determine the capacity development needs at the organizational level of CKS, core CKS staff and desa-based multi-stakeholder organization</td>
<td>Second Accompaniment Capacity Development Needs Assessment (on-site: Aug 7 to Aug 9, 2007)</td>
<td>• A series of needs assessment exercises, informal interviews, job description analysis and work sample studies were used to determine priority capacity development training needs by looking at performance and competence gaps at each level.</td>
<td>• A report on the findings and recommendations for capacity development at each level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4: Planning</strong>&lt;br&gt;To determine the capacity development training plan</td>
<td>Third Accompaniment Development of Capacity Development Training Plan (distance input: Mid-Aug 2007)</td>
<td>• Preparation of the capacity development training plan using the findings and recommendations from step 3.</td>
<td>• A document describing the capacity development training plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5: Implementation</strong>&lt;br&gt;To equip core team with the concepts, methods and tools of facilitating Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment (PDRA) and community DRR action planning</td>
<td>Fourth Accompaniment Training on Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment (PDRA) (on-site: Aug 15 to Aug 18, 2007)</td>
<td>• Participants were trained on facilitating participatory disaster risk assessment (PDRA) and community DRR action planning. • Application of the training tools in field practicum. • Shared and reflected on the experiences of the field practicum and documented in formal reports.</td>
<td>• Identification of community wide risk reduction measures • Formation of multi-stakeholder community DRR organizations • Formal documentation / reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth Accompaniment Backstopping of core team while conducting PDRA in the project community (distance input: End of Aug 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth Accompaniment Reflections and leaning on the application of PDRA and Training on facilitating community DRR action planning (on-site: Nov 5 to Nov 7, 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seventh Accompaniment Backstopping of core team in facilitating community DRR action planning (distance input: Nov-Dec 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Steps and Objectives</td>
<td>IIRR Accompaniment</td>
<td>Key Activities</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6: CKS Accompaniment Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eighth Accompaniment</strong>&lt;br&gt;After Action Reflection on community DRR action planning and development of two partner organizations as well as CKS accompaniment proposal&lt;br&gt;(on-site and distance input: Jan-Apr 2008)</td>
<td>• Participatory reflection and lessons learnt on the process and results of the community DRR action planning&lt;br&gt;• Consolidation of project operational strategy, findings of the capacity development training needs assessments and findings of needs from community DRR action plans to develop the accompaniment proposal</td>
<td>• Accompaniment program proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 7: Monitoring and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ninth Accompaniment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Development of training module on “leadership organization development for the community DRR taskforce members, and Design and development of participatory monitoring and evaluation tool at taskforce and CKS project level&lt;br&gt;(on-site: Apr 10 to Apr 21, 2008)</td>
<td>• Development of course outline, syllabus and training schedules through participatory discussions, with particular attention paid to participatory training methods for illiterate community members.&lt;br&gt;• Training on monitoring and evaluation tools and testing of such tools at both the task force and CKS project level.</td>
<td>• A draft training manual on community leadership and organizational development for DDR in Bahasa.&lt;br&gt;• Draft tool kits for facilitating participatory M&amp;E of DRR task force and CMDRR project in Bahasa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 8: Sustainability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tenth Accompaniment</strong>&lt;br&gt;After-Action Reflection Workshop and Training on Community Organization’s Sustainability&lt;br&gt;(on-site: Sept 2 to Sept 10, 2008)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Eleventh Accompaniment</strong>&lt;br&gt;After-Action reflection workshop on integration of self-assessment and action process of community organizations’ sustainability&lt;br&gt;(on-site and distance input: Nov to Dec 2008)</td>
<td>• Review of overall CMDRR process and the goal, objectives and key steps of the CMDRR project.&lt;br&gt;• Field visit and observation in facilitating participatory M&amp;E process at the community level&lt;br&gt;• Participatory after-action reflection workshop on facilitating M&amp;E process at community level.&lt;br&gt;• Discussion and simulation on organizational self-assessment and action process for community organizations; a field practicum was also conducted.</td>
<td>• M&amp;E reflection guide and matrix&lt;br&gt;• Self-assessment reports of community organizations and CKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 9: Organizational Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Twelfth Accompaniment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Developing a resource tool kit on facilitating CMDRR&lt;br&gt;(on-site and distance input: Dec 2008 to Mar 2009)</td>
<td>• Determine the topics of the resource tool kit via e-mails and conference calls between CKS core team and IIRR.&lt;br&gt;• Develop format and outline of tool kit&lt;br&gt;• Writeshop to develop this tool kit.</td>
<td>• Resource tool kit on CMDRR process application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### January Field Trip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tues, Jan 6   | • Arrived in Medan, Indonesia  
                • Interview with Retno Ika Praesty of CRS                                               | CRS Office - Medan               |
| Wed-Fri, Jan 7-9 | • DRR team retreat (off-site)                                                                 | Lake Toba- Siantar-Sibolga       |
| Sat, Jan 10   | • Arrived in Gunungsitoli, Nias Island                                                       |                                  |
| Mon, Jan 12   | • Meeting with CKS management staff to discuss the evaluation project and planned activities  
                • Coordinated with DRR team leader (Elvina) on schedule for interviews and field visits  
                • Semi-structured interview with Fr. Raymond Laia                                       | CKS Office – Gunungsitoli        |
| Tues, Jan 13  | • Semi-structured interviews with current DRR team members ((Tati, Alex, Daniel and Love)  
                • Field visit in Pasar Beringin  
                o Informal interviews with task force members                                          | CKS Office – Gunungsitoli        |
| Wed, Jan 14   | • Semi-structured interviews with current DRR team members (Aper, Fedi, Herman, Olina, Royn)  
                • Semi-structured interview with Fr. Mikhael                                              | CKS Office – Gunungsitoli        |
| Thur, Jan 15  | • Semi-structured interviews with current DRR team members (Vitas and Elvina)  
                • Field visit in Sisobambowo  
                o Task force meeting  
                o Informal interviews with task force members                                          | CKS Office – Gunungsitoli        |
| Fri, Jan 16   | • Field visit in Sisobambowo  
                o Informal interviews with task force members                                          | Sisobambowo, Amandraya          |
| Sat, Jan 17   | • Field visit in Ramba Ramba  
                o 2009 Action Planning Session                                                            | Ramba Ramba, Amandraya          |
| Sun, Jan 18   | • Departure                                                                               |                                  |
### March Field Trip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sun, Mar 15  | • Arrived in Gunungsitoli, Nias Island  
• Attended task force new election meeting (PB)  
•Wrap-up celebration party for the writeshop | Pasar Beringin  
CKS Office - Gunungsitoli |
| Mon, Mar 16  | • Observed writeshop activities - 3rd draft editing of desa case studies | CKS Office - Gunungsitoli |
| Tues, Mar 17 | • Observed last day of writeshop activities  
• Semi-structured interview with Emily Monville Oro of IIRR | CKS Office - Gunungsitoli  
National Hotel - Gunungsitoli |
| Wed, Mar 18  | • Coordinated with DRR team leader (Elvina) on schedule for the SIPA team's planned activities  
• Informal interview with Elvina Simanjuntak | CKS Office - Gunungsitoli |
| Thur, Mar 19 | • Presented evaluation matrix and discuss our team's goals for the visit with the DRR team and management  
• Conducted DRR team surveys  
• Field visit in Pasar Beringin  
  o Administered surveys to task force and non task force members | CKS Office - Gunungsitoli  
Pasar Beringin, Gunungsitoli |
| Fri, Mar 20  | • Field visit in Sisobambowo  
  o Administered surveys to non task force members  
  o Conducted two focus groups: (1) task force members and (2) women | Sisobambowo, Amandraya |
| Sat, Mar 21  | • Field visit in Ramba Ramba  
  o Administered surveys to task force and non task force members  
  o Impromptu focus group with non-task force women | Ramba Ramba, Amandraya |
| Sun, Mar 22  | • Returned to Gunungsitoli  
• Conducted DRR team surveys | CKS Office - Gunungsitoli |
| Mon, Mar 23  | • Field visit in Pasar Beringin  
  o Administered surveys to task force and non task force members | Pasar Beringin, Gunungsitoli |
| Tues, Mar 24 | • Present initial findings to CKS management and DRR team | CKS Office - Gunungsitoli |
| Wed, Mar 25  | • Observed second training for parish facilitators | CKS Office - Gunungsitoli |
| Thur, Mar 26 | • Departure |
## 12.5 Matrix Sample

### How effective is the pilot CMDRR project in addressing vulnerability and hazard and building resilience in Nias?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Hazard and Vulnerability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of risk in Nias communities</td>
<td>1 Task force members have increased awareness of hazard</td>
<td>1.1 X out of Y people attribute higher awareness to CMDRR activities</td>
<td>Task Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Non-task force members have increased awareness of hazard</td>
<td>2.1 X out of Y people attribute higher awareness to CMDRR activities</td>
<td>Non Task Force Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Task force members have increased awareness of vulnerability</td>
<td>3.1 X out of Y people attribute higher awareness to CMDRR activities</td>
<td>Task Force Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Non-task force members have increased awareness of vulnerability</td>
<td>4.1 X out of Y people attribute higher awareness to CMDRR activities</td>
<td>Non Task Force Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMDRR activities and risk reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hazards targeted by the project are prevented/mitigated</td>
<td>5.1 # of activities identified as important by the project accomplished</td>
<td>IIRR Accompaniment &amp; Writeshop Reports &amp; Community interviews during January trip</td>
<td>Task Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Community is better prepared to deal with hazard</td>
<td>6.1 Status of early warning system</td>
<td>IIRR Accompaniment &amp; Writeshop Reports &amp; Community interviews during January trip</td>
<td>DRR team interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Existence of evacuation plans</td>
<td>6.2 Existence of evacuation plans</td>
<td>IIRR Accompaniment &amp; Writeshop Reports &amp; Community interviews during January trip</td>
<td>DRR team interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 X out of Y people feel better prepared for disasters</td>
<td>6.3 X out of Y people feel better prepared for disasters</td>
<td>Task Force Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Building Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Solidarity</td>
<td>7 Community members feel increased solidarity among them</td>
<td>7.1 X out of Y people feel there is more solidarity</td>
<td>Task Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Women have been empowered through the task force</td>
<td>8.1 Number of women in respective task forces</td>
<td>Women’s Focus Group</td>
<td>Community interviews during January trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Community members are aware of the activities of the task force</td>
<td>9.1 X out of Y people are aware of the activities of the Task Force</td>
<td>Women’s Focus Group</td>
<td>Community interviews during January trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Community members are interested in the work of the task force</td>
<td>10.1 X out of Y people said community members are interested in the work of the Task Force</td>
<td>Task Force Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Non-task force members feel/ have the possibility of being involved in the work of the task force</td>
<td>11.1 X out of Y people feel/ have the possibility of being involved in the work of the Task Force</td>
<td>Non Task Force Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Hierarchies</td>
<td>12 Social hierarchies were taken into consideration and addressed</td>
<td>12.1 Existence of social hierarchies</td>
<td>IIRR Accompaniment &amp; Writeshop Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Social hierarchies addressed in the pilot project</td>
<td>12.2 Social hierarchies addressed in the pilot project</td>
<td>IIRR Accompaniment &amp; Writeshop Reports</td>
<td>DRR team interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12.6 Sample: DRR Team Survey Analysis

#### SURVEY QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY QUESTIONS</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF RESULTS</th>
<th>Sample: 2 DRR Team Members</th>
<th>GENERAL OBSERVATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Did you participate in this training?</td>
<td>4 respondents participated in the training session.</td>
<td>5 respondents who rated the DRR training very well.</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 &quot;Yes, please aim how well did IIR's vulnerability assessment training prepared you for the actual exercise?&quot;</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that IIR's &quot;very well&quot; for the community selection</td>
<td>3 respondents believed that IIR's &quot;very well&quot; for the community selection</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 &quot;What was your favorite training activity?&quot;</td>
<td>2 respondents rated the &quot;participatory selection training&quot; as &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>2 respondents rated the &quot;participatory selection training&quot; as &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Did you participate in the TNA?</td>
<td>4 respondents participated in the TNA</td>
<td>5 respondents believed that IIR's &quot;very well&quot; for the actual exercise</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 How well did the TNA reflect the differences in the community?</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that the TNA reflected the differences in the community</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that the TNA reflected the differences in the community</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Since the TNA, has IIR provided support and resources?</td>
<td>2 respondents believed that IIR's &quot;very well&quot; for the actual exercise</td>
<td>2 respondents believed that IIR's &quot;very well&quot; for the actual exercise</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 If yes, please list three: - CMDRR manual, IIRRR accompaniment report with references</td>
<td>3 respondents believed that IIRRR's &quot;very important&quot;</td>
<td>3 respondents believed that IIRRR's &quot;very important&quot;</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 If yes, please list three: - CMDRR manual, IIRRR accompaniment report with references</td>
<td>2 respondents believed that IIRRR's &quot;very important&quot;</td>
<td>2 respondents believed that IIRRR's &quot;very important&quot;</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 If yes, please list three: - CMDRR manual, IIRRR accompaniment report with references</td>
<td>1 respondent rated this as &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>1 respondent rated this as &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 What do you think of the training?</td>
<td>9 respondents rated IIRRR's training as &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>9 respondents rated IIRRR's training as &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Did you participate in this training?</td>
<td>8 respondents participated in the training</td>
<td>8 respondents participated in the training</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 &quot;Yes, please aim how well did IIRRR's activities on your personal knowledge gap?&quot;</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for assessing their personal knowledge gap.</td>
<td>3 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for assessing their personal knowledge gap.</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 With respect to the formation of the task force:</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1 How important was IIRRR in the task force selection process?</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2 Did IIRRR emphasize participation in selection (in training)?</td>
<td>3 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>3 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3 &quot;Yes, please aim how well did IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>2 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>2 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4 How well did the task force reflect differences in the community?</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>4 respondents believed that IIRRR's activities as &quot;very well&quot; for the task force selection process.</td>
<td>Overall, 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- **Sample:** 10 DRR Team Members
- **Survey Questions:**
  - Building purposes + 2 DRR Team Members
  - Hazard Source Tree
  - Hazard Behavior Story Telling
  - "Useful" in facilitating PDRR.
  - Training needs.
  - Overall, less than 1/2 of the current DRR team participated in the training. Out of those that participated, everyone had valuable experience which made it very well.
  - There were conflicting responses on whether IIRRR had provided any reference materials or supplements for training. It seemed to vary from each person's perception of what counted as supplemental materials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Survey Questions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Summary of Results</strong></th>
<th><strong>General Observations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of community DRR strategy and action plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>How important is DRR in your project?</td>
<td>1 respondent said DRR is &quot;VERY IMPORTANT&quot; for the development of community DRR strategy and action plan. 7 respondents marked &quot;NO RESPONSE.&quot; 1 respondent only participated in planning for Subhasan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>How well did DRR's 10-step facilitation process prepare you to do the action plan?</td>
<td>3 respondents believed that the 10-step facilitation process prepared them &quot;WELL.&quot; 8 respondents believed it prepared them &quot;VERY WELL.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>How comfortable are you in facilitating community DRR action planning?</td>
<td>7 respondents said he &quot;NEEDS MORE GUIDANCE.&quot; 6 respondents said they are &quot;COMFORTABLE.&quot; 2 respondents said they are &quot;VERY COMFORTABLE.&quot; 3 respondents said it in Subhasan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>How well did the administrative process work?</td>
<td>2 respondents said it addressed the gaps in knowledge &quot;WELL.&quot; 7 respondents think it addresses the gaps in knowledge &quot;VERY WELL.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Overall, how important is the administrative process to your learning?</td>
<td>3 respondents marked it as &quot;VERY IMPORTANT.&quot; 3 respondents marked it as &quot;IMPORTANT.&quot; 7 respondents marked it as &quot;NOT IMPORTANT.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of DRR team future activities (phase 2 of project)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Did you participate in PMEL?</td>
<td>10 respondents participated in PMEL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>How useful did you find the following tools during PMEL research?</td>
<td>1 respondent marked the Monthly planning and review monitoring tool with 3. 9 respondents marked it with 4 (&quot;MOST USEFUL&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory monitoring, evaluation, and learning (PMEL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Did you participate in PMEL?</td>
<td>10 respondents participated in PMEL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Overall, how important is PMEL to the project?</td>
<td>10 respondents felt that PMEL is &quot;VER Y IMPORTANT.&quot; 1 respondent felt that PMEL is &quot;IMPORTANT.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document and share practice-based on mutual learning and teaching technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Did you participate in the workshop?</td>
<td>10 respondents participated in the workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Overall, how important is the final step of the pilot project?</td>
<td>10 respondents felt that the workshop is &quot;VERY IMPORTANT.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRR Team Survey

As a follow-up to our discussions in January, we are interested in gathering more precise information regarding the IIRR accompaniments that you have participated in over the past year. Your responses to this survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be used solely for the purpose of our research.

1) One of the first activities carried out in the scope of the project was the community selection.

a. Did you participate in this training? Yes / No

⇒ If yes, please rate how well IIRR’s “vulnerability assessment training” prepared you to carry out the community selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Was there an emphasis on participatory selection in the training? Yes / No

⇒ If yes, please rate how well the “participatory selection training” prepared you for the actual exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) We understand that IIRR conducted an exercise to determine your development training needs.

a. Did you participate in this evaluation? Yes / No

⇒ How well did the IIRR activities assess your personal knowledge gap?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ After assessing needs, how well did the training tools/courses used by IIRR help you acquire knowledge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Since the TNA, has IIRR provided support and reference material to supplement training? Yes / No

⇒ If yes, please list three: __________________________________________________________

⇒ If yes, please rate how well do you think this support/reference material matches your needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) The next section is on the training and facilitation of Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment.

a. Did you participate in this training? Yes / No

b. Please rank the usefulness of the following tools on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being the least useful and 4 being the most useful):

⇒ Hazard Source Force Tree ______
⇒ Hazard Behavior Story Telling ______
⇒ "Whose reality?" (video) ______

4) Identification and development of community leaders and task force

a. During your intensive stay, please comment on how well IIRR’s training prepared you for:

⇒ Community mobilization / organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Managing community expectations (i.e., relief mentality) and other challenges (i.e., apathy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Building purposeful relationships with community members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Identifying community stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Is there anything you would add (i.e. did the training prepare you in other ways)?

_________________________________________________________________

b. With respect to the formation of the task force:

⇒ How important was IIRR in the task force selection process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Did IIRR emphasize participatory selection in its training? Yes / No

  o If yes, please rate how well the “participatory selection training” prepared you for the actual exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ How well does the task force reflect differences in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Development of community DRR strategy and action plan

a. How important was IIRR in this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How well did IIRR’s "10-step facilitation process" prepare you to facilitate this activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How comfortable are you in facilitating community DRR action planning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs some guidance</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Action-reflection process

a. How well did the action-reflection sessions...

- Address gaps in knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Enable the team to share ideas about lessons/trainings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Overall, how important is action-reflection to your learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Development of DRR team future activities (phase 2 of project)

a. How important was IIRR in planning phase 2?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How well IIRR’s training help you prepare your project proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How well does the proposal reflect lessons learned from the pilot project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning (PMEL)

a. Did you participate in this training? Yes / No

b. How useful did you find the following tools in the PMEL process… please rank on a scale of 1-4 (with one being the least useful and 4 being the most useful).

⇒ Monthly planning and review monitoring tool _____
⇒ Quarterly timeline change spider web (for effects on intended change areas) _____

c. How would you rate your comfort level in facilitating PMEL at the community level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs some guidance</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td>response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Overall, how important is PMEL to the CMDRR process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) Document and share practice-based mutual learning (writeshop)

a. Did you participate in the writeshop? Yes / No

b. Overall, how important is this final step of the pilot project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How well does the final document represent everyone's opinions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. How well does it explain CMDRR for the context of Nias?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Force Survey

Interviewer: ________________________________________________ Date: _____________________
Respondent: ________________________________________________ Gender: □ Male    □ Female
Age: _______ Occupation: ________________________________________________________________
What did you earn last week? ____________________ Last month? ____________________________

1. What do you feel is the main hazard you face? ___________________________________________

Note to interviewer: replace “[hazard]” in questions below with the hazard answered in question 1.

2. Has your DRR training made you more aware of the immediate causes of [hazard]?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know
   - No response

3. Is everyone in [community name] equally vulnerable to [hazard] (if YES, skip to question 5)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know
   - No response

4. If no, who is more vulnerable?

5. In [community name], what steps have been taken to minimize this hazard?

   ____________________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________________

6. Of these steps, which do you feel is the most important? ________________________________

7. Has sand digging decreased (if NO, go to question 9)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know
   - No response

8. If yes, is this due to activities of the Task Force?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know
   - No response
9. Is there less cutting of trees (*if NO, go to question 11*)?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

10. If yes, is this due to activities of the Task Force?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

11. Have tree-planting activities increased (*if NO, go to question 13*)?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

12. If yes, is this due to activities of the Task Force?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

13. Do you think the task force helps to reduce risk?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

14. Compared to September 2007 (*project start*), are you better prepared to respond to disaster now?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

15. Do you think community solidarity has improved since the project started?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

16. Has your training prepared you to improve community solidarity in the village?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

17. Have you gained new skills from participating in this project (*if NO, go to question 19*)?

| Yes | No | Don’t know | No response |

18. If yes, which ones?

__________________________________________________________________
19. As a group, have you worked with other organizations (if no, go to question 21)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. If yes, which ones (circle all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Local NGOs</th>
<th>International NGOs</th>
<th>Others: ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Has Caritas Sibolga helped establish any links with any organizations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. Do you feel that the majority of the community members are interested in DRR activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. Why some people are not interested?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

24. Would you continue this project if Caritas Sibolga were not involved (if YES, go to question 26)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. If no, why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of resources</th>
<th>Lack of knowledge</th>
<th>No interest</th>
<th>No tangible results</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. If yes, which activities would you prioritize?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

27. Which activities are more difficult without Caritas Sibolga’s help?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
Non Task Force Survey

Interviewer: ________________________________ Date: __________________

Respondent: ________________________________ Gender: □ Male □ Female

Age: ________ Occupation: _____________________________________________________________

What did you earn last week? ___________________ Last month? ____________________________

1. What do you feel is the main hazard you face? ___________________________________________

Note to interviewer: replace “[hazard]” in questions below with the hazard answered in question 1.

2. Has the task force made you more aware of prevention and mitigation activities for [hazard]?

   Yes | No | Don’t know | No response

3. Did you participate in the PDRA to identify/prioritize community hazard (if NO, go to question 5)?

   Yes | No | Don’t know | No response

4. If no, why?

   No time | Didn’t know about the meeting | Not invited | Not interested | No response

5. Why didn't you join the task force?

   No time | Didn’t know about it | Didn’t have the knowledge and skills necessary | Not invited | Not interested

6. Do you think sand digging and tree cutting increases risk of [hazard] in [community name]?

   Yes | No | Don’t know | No response

7. Since the task force was formed, have these activities decreased?

   Yes | No | Don’t know | No response
8. Have you noticed an increase in activities like planting trees along riverbed, increased rubber plantation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Are you satisfied with the work of the task force *(if YES, go to question 11)*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. If no, what would you like to see them work on?

__________________________________________________________________________________  
__________________________________________________________________________________  
__________________________________________________________________________________

11. Are you regularly informed (meetings or otherwise) about the task force projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Do you think local government officials are helping more since the DRR project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Do you think community solidarity has improved since the project began?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Focus Group Guide – Women

Good morning. My name is _______ (insert moderator name) and I will be moderating our session today. _____________ (insert note taker name) will be taking notes. We are students from Columbia University and we are seeking to learn more about disaster risk reduction your community. We are not employees of IIRR or Caritas Sibolga. I want to let you know that we will be taping this session, but we will not share this information or your names with Caritas or anyone else. Can we all agree that what is talked about here will not be shared outside of the session?

Please keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers; I am here to learn from you. Please feel free to respond to each other. It is not necessary to raise your hand or wait to be called on. Please feel free to excuse yourself to use the restrooms (indicate where they are) or to attend to personal business if needed. Our session will last about two hours.

Before we begin, let’s set a few basic ground rules. 1) Can we all agree to treat everyone with respect? 2) Can we all agree not to interrupt each other? Any questions before we start?

Opening
1. Let’s begin by going around the circle and sharing our first names and something funny that one of your children said or did recently. (opening icebreaker question)

Solidarity between Individuals and within the Community
2. Great! I know that you are all very busy and have many responsibilities, but are you able to attend many community activities? If so, what was the last community activity you attended? If not, go to question 5.

3. Have you or any other women led these events?
   Guiding Questions:
   • Do you as the women of your community organize any specific community events?
   • How many of these events or activities do you all lead?

4. Are there any activities that only women can attend? If so, what are these activities?

5. So, if not, what activities are you interested in?
   Guiding Questions:
   • Would you attend specific activities for women? Which ones?

Community's Perception of CKS as Institution and of Facilitators
6. Are you aware of the Disaster Risk Reduction project facilitated by Caritas Sibolga in your community? If so, how did you find out that Caritas Sibolga was starting a project in your community?

7. What was your first reaction when you heard about the DRR project in your community?

8. What activities have you seen in the community conducted and organized by DRR task force members?

   Follow up (if enough time): What did you think of these activities?
Community Relations with Task Force
9. Did you participate in the formation of the task force in your community?
   • If no, did any women?  
     If no, then why do you think this is? Do women have the opportunity to join and choose not to, or are they not given the opportunity?
   • If yes, how were you or they involved?

10. Is there any way to get women more involved with the task force or community activities?

Awareness of Risk
11. Are all individuals in the community equally vulnerable to hazard?
   • Who is more vulnerable? Who is less? Why?

Capacity Development and Resilience
12. Have you participated in any of the PDRA trainings?
   • If yes, did you enjoy it? What did you learn?
   • If no, why not? [Too busy, not invited, not interested, etc.]

13. In the meetings or at the community events, do you feel the task force listens to both men and women in the community?

   Guiding Questions:
   • Do they respect your suggestions or ideas?

14. Do you think, as a community, you are better prepared to deal with disasters? How?
   • If not, why?

Summarizing the Session

Facilitator should summarize the main ideas that came out of the session and ask for participant feedback about whether the suggested summary was accurate or if they have anything they would like to add.

Example: To summarize, some of the ideas/issues/concerns I heard coming out of the session were _____________. Does that sound about right?

Concluding Remarks:

Thank you so much for sharing your thoughts. I have learned so much. Please feel free to enjoy the lunch provided.

General notes for the facilitator: As this is a focus group, it may not be necessary to ask all the questions listed if they are already being answered by the conversation as the intent is to allow for discussion. To facilitate flowing conversation, the following probing questions may be used: Can you tell me more about that? Does anyone else have anything to add? Has anyone else had an experience with this? Has anyone else had a similar experience?
Focus Group Guide - Task Force Members

Good morning. Thank you for coming today; we appreciate your time and know you are very busy. My name is _______ (insert moderator name) and I will be moderating our session today. ___________ (insert note taker name) will be taking notes. We are students from Columbia University and we are seeking to learn more about disaster risk reduction your community. We are not employees of IIRR or Caritas Sibolga. I want to let you know that we will be taping this session, but we will not share this information or your names with anyone outside this room. Can we all agree that what is talked about here will not be shared outside of the session?

Please keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers; I am here to learn from you. Please feel free to respond to each other. It is not necessary to raise your hand or wait to be called on. Please feel free to excuse yourself to use the restrooms (indicate where they are) or to attend to personal business if needed. Our session will last about two hours.

Before we begin, let’s set a few basic ground rules. 1) Can we all agree to treat everyone with respect? 2) Can we all agree not to interrupt each other?

Any questions before we start?

Opening and Introduction Questions

1. Let’s start by going around the circle and sharing our first names and your favorite food?

2. We are glad to have you all here today. We understand you meet regularly because of your duties within the task force. Aside from that, what was the last community event you attended?

   Guiding questions:
   • Was it a usual event or was it a DRR related?
   • Were there Caritas Sibolga facilitators present?

Community’s Perception of CKS as Institution and of Facilitators

3. The DRR team has been very present in the community since the beginning of the project. Can you tell us about when Caritas Sibolga contacted the community regarding the project?

   Guiding questions:
   • How did the community first meet the DRR team?
   • What did you talk about in the first few meetings?
   • [ACCESSIBILITY] How was information about the project spread throughout the community?
   • [INCENTIVE] Why were you interested in the project?
   • [INTEREST] Did many people in the community demonstrate interest for the project? Was there any resistance? (less important)
4. When you first heard about the project, what did you think it would do for the community?

_**Guiding questions:**_
- Today, is your perception of the project different from your initial reaction? How?

**Awareness of Risk (hazard and vulnerability) in Nias Communities**

5. Once you were selected to form the task force, you started attending training sessions facilitated by Caritas Sibolga staff. What did you think of the trainings?

_**Guiding questions:**_
- When the training started, did you think it was important for you to go to the training sessions?
- [TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT] Was everything in the training session new to you?
- [FEEDBACK] How did you tell the DRR team if you already knew something?
- [CONFLICT WITH OTHER ACTIVITIES] Did you ever have to miss a training session? Why?

6. Part of the training was in Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment. What did you think of the PDRA training?

_**Guiding questions:**_
- Have you been able to use the knowledge from the trainings to help protect your house or the community?
- Today, how comfortable do you feel with PDRA methodology?
- How has your training made you more aware of the immediate causes of hazard?

**Capacity Development and Resilience (preparedness, mitigation and prevention)**

7. Through your training, Caritas Sibolga presented you with the Risk Formula [show paper with the formula]. Can you please explain how the formula has helped organize community activities?

_**Guiding questions:**_
- Can you talk about some of the disaster prevention skills you gained through the trainings?
- What are some of the most important things you learned?
- Can you talk about some specific activities that were started because of the project?

8. Do you think the community is better prepared to deal with disasters now? How?

**Action Plans and Sustainability**

9. During the project, the community developed an action plan. What do you think are the main goals of the action plan?
10. Who participated in making the action plan? Role of CKS?

11. Has the action plan impacted you? Do you think the action plan has impacted the community as whole?

12. What role would organizations outside of the community, such as local government and other NGOs, have in the action plan?

  **Guiding questions:**
  • What other activities are you expecting to develop from now on?
  • [DEPENDENCY] How much would you like for Caritas Sibolga to be involved with the next action plan?
  • What more would you like to put in the action plan?

**Solidarity between individuals and within the community – [ONLY USE IF HAVE TIME]**

13. Do you feel the project has changed the solidarity in the community?

  **Guiding questions:**
  • What are some examples of this impact?
  • Are there more community events now than before? Why?

**Summarizing the Session**

*Facilitator should summarize the main ideas that came out of the session and ask for participant feedback about whether the suggested summary was accurate or if they have anything they would like to add.*

Example: To summarize, some of the ideas/issues/concerns I heard coming out of the session were _________________. Does that sound about right?

**Concluding Remarks**

Thank you so much for sharing your thoughts. I have learned so much. Please feel free to enjoy the lunch provided.

**General notes for the facilitator:** As this is a focus group, it may not be necessary to ask all the questions listed if they are already being answered by the conversation as the intent is to allow for discussion. To facilitate flowing conversation, the following probing questions may be used: Can you tell me more about that? Does anyone else have anything to add? Has anyone else had an experience with this? Has anyone else had a similar experience?
Good morning. My name is _______ (insert moderator name) and I will be moderating our session today. _____________ (insert note taker name) will be taking notes. We are students from Columbia University and we are seeking to learn more about disaster risk reduction in your community. We are not employees of IIRR or Caritas Sibolga. I want to let you know that we will be taping this session, but we will not share this information or your names with Caritas or anyone else. Can we all agree that what is talked about here will not be shared outside of the session?

Please keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers; I am here to learn from you. Please feel free to respond to each other. It is not necessary to raise your hand or wait to be called on. Please feel free to excuse yourself to use the restrooms (indicate where they are) or to attend to personal business if needed. Our session will last about two hours.

Before we begin, let’s set a few basic ground rules. 1) Can we all agree to treat everyone with respect? 2) Can we all agree not to interrupt each other?

Any questions before we start?

Opening and Introductory Questions
Let’s start by going around the circle and sharing our first names and favorite food. Thank you so much for participating in this discussion; we’re very much appreciated for your time and involvement.

1. What was the last community activity you attended?
   Guiding Questions:
   • How did you find out about this event; could you explain to us what you did at the event?
   • How many people attended that event or activity?

Community's Perception of Caritas Sibolga as Institution and of Facilitators
2. Are you aware of the Disaster Risk Reduction project facilitated by Caritas Sibolga in your community? If so, how did you learn about the project?

3. What was your first reaction when you heard about the Disasters Risk Reduction project in your community?

4. What activities or action plans have you seen in the community conducted and organized by DRR task force members?

5. What additional actions need to be taken to reduce hazards and vulnerability in your community?

Awareness of Risk (hazard and vulnerability)
6. Were you involved in a discussion with the task force to identify the hazards? If so, what was the process that you went through with the task force?
   Guiding Questions:
   • Were there Caritas Sibolga facilitators present in the discussion with the task force?

Community Relations with Task Force
7. Were there any restrictions or constraints that prevented you from joining the task force?

8. Has the task force regularly informed you about community activities in your community?
9. Would you be interested in joining the task force in the future?

Social Hierarchies
10. We know that women are members of the task force in your community. Would you encourage and support women’s participation in community activities?
   Guiding Questions:
   • Were there constraints that prohibited you from joining a DRR task force?
   • Are there constraints that make you not able to attend community activities in your community?

Solidarity between Individuals and within the Community
11. Have you noticed more community activities in your community since the DRR task force team has been present?
   Guiding Questions:
   • What were those activities, would you describe them?
   • Have you participated in those activities and how many times?

Capacity Development and Resilience
12. Has the local government helped with your DRR activities?
   • If not, has any other organization helped?
   Guiding Questions:
   • How would you like to see local government involved in prevention of disasters?
   • What do you think the DRR task force team should be doing for prevention of disasters?

13. Do you think community members have decreased their tree cutting / sand digging / pig roaming? Can you share your own experience with us?

14. Do you think you are better prepared to deal with disasters? How?

Sustainability
15. How would you like to see Caritas Sibolga’s involvement in the future community actions plan?

Summarizing the Session
Facilitator should summarize the main ideas that came out of the session and ask for participant feedback about whether the suggested summary was accurate or if they have anything they would like to add.
Example: To summarize, some of the ideas/issues/concerns I heard coming out of the session were ___________. Does that sound about right?

Concluding Remarks
Thank you so much for sharing your thoughts. I have learned so much. Please feel free to enjoy the lunch provided.

General notes for the facilitator: As this is a focus group, it may not be necessary to ask all the questions listed if they are already being answered by the conversation as the intent is to allow for discussion. To facilitate flowing conversation, the following probing questions may be used: Can you tell me more about that? Does anyone else have anything to add? Has anyone else had an experience with this? Has anyone else had a similar experience?
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