



PARTNERS FOR RESILIENCE

Working together on disasters, climate, ecosystems



Cordaid



Climate
Centre



In cooperation with
Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

Annex 10

Global Case Study

External End Evaluation

Partners for Resilience

2016-2020 programme

Final

25 June 2020

Eunike Spierings

By the European Centre for Development Policy Management

ecdpm

Table of Contents

1.Introduction	1
2.Methodology.....	1
3.The PfR Global programme - an overview	2
3.1. Global in PfR I to PfR II.....	2
3.2. Development of a Theory of Change for Global 2016-2020.....	3
4.Replies to the Evaluation Questions	4
5. Emerging observations	39
Annexes	41
Annex 1 - Bibliography	41
Annex 2 - Interviewees.....	42

1. Introduction

This report describes findings and analysis from the evaluation of the PfR II Global case. It is one of five case studies which were requested in the ToR and subsequent exchanges with the PfR Evaluation Management Team (EMT) during the Inception Phase. The report starts with a short description of the PfR II Global programme, followed by a clustering of findings and judgements along the structure of the evaluation matrix which had been agreed upon with the PfR EMT during the Inception Phase. The report ends with a section that lists a number of emerging observations from this case. The annex compiles the documents reviewed and the persons interviewed. This case study was carried out by Eunike Spierings, ECDPM.

2. Methodology

Findings and analysis are based on desk research, PfR project document reviews, face-to-face and online interviews as well as two focus group discussions with PfR Global stakeholders in The Hague and one online. Skype/Zoom/Google-based interviews were also conducted with PfR stakeholders suggested by the Global Policy Group alliance members. Interviewees included PfR project staff, officials from intergovernmental bodies, coalition leaders and NGO representatives. Most of the interviews were done online, due to the Covid-19 pandemic restrictions. This also seemed to limit the availability of some of the respondents (including out-of-office reply due to an embassy lock-down). It must be noted that part of the case study, especially in relation to the consultation of external stakeholders, has a more limited evidence base, as even from the list of people suggested by the GPG itself, not all actors were available for an interview. The annexes list the documents reviewed and the list of persons interviewed.

Some additional reporting documents of the Global programme were shared on 10 April. This new information, including the results of the FGD on 20 April, have not yet all been considered in this version of the case study. The author will still include this new information where relevant in the forthcoming final draft version of this case study report.

3. The PfR Global programme - an overview

3.1. Global in PfR I to PfR II

The PfR II programme (funded under the Dialogue and Dissent framework of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands) is a follow-up of the PfR programme (2011-2015). The evaluation also considered the link between the two programmes.

The global policy group only started in PfR II. However, to a large extent PfR I built a foundation for the global policy work in PfR II. The PfR I programme had 3 pillars: strengthen community livelihoods, strengthen civil society & policy influence for eco-based climate smart DRR. The focus was especially on pillar 1: strengthening community-based resilience; local CSOs working directly with communities, developing village level DRR plans and implementing these. Simultaneously, this PfR I work also contributed to building concrete PfR cases. Pillar 3, policy influencing at national level, got less attention and no global component was defined.

Still, the alliance partners individually were involved in influencing these frameworks. A case study included in the application for PfR I, already indicates that these global trajectories were on the radar: 'several key frameworks and policy documents reflect the PfR approaches', and references include the 2014 IPCC 5th Assessment Report and the UNFCCC adaptation finance which is noted to be increasingly focused on DRR. Engagement on the Sendai Framework and the UNFCCC was part of the portfolio of individual alliance partners. For RCCC working on the UNFCCC process is an obvious strategic part of their agenda, and PfR could ride along. WI also already had a strong background on the Convention on Biological Diversity, which was however not part of the PfR programme interventions.

As the Sendai Framework process is all about DRR, this was the most logical framework to engage in. Before the Sendai Framework, the UN had the Hyogo framework for DRR. In PfR I, WI worked a lot on the Sendai Framework text, also on behalf of the PfR alliance. PfR countries were also involved in this lobby work for the Sendai Framework and joined global and regional platform meetings, as Sendai includes not only global, but also regional and national plans. WI worked with PEDDR, but also via other actors. In 2015 PfR effectively influenced the Sendai Framework on DRR, including the preamble and priority actions identified, such as the use of climate information, ecosystem degradation as a root cause of risks, investments in ecosystem-based solutions, and community engagement in DRR planning. Sendai is seen as a huge improvement, but PfR partners still identified several gaps in the Sendai Framework, for example regarding inclusivity and the link with climate adaptation.

All in all, several of these frameworks were influenced in PfR I, but more from the specific interests and own strategies of the five alliance partners. No collective key messages were formulated, but organisations engaged directly or via other strategic networks they were already involved in (like the Caritas network of Cordaid, or PEDDR for WI).

Towards the end of PfR I, in 2015, all the policies frameworks currently followed in PfR II were signed. The PfR II inception report finds there is a steady increase in terms of '[a]wareness, attention and collective action for resilience building through climate change adaptation, protection and restoration of our ecosystems and reducing disaster risk' (PfR Inception report 2016: 9). And as the same report explains, in PfR II, the international agreements will form the umbrella of PfR's work at global, regional and national level. 'In each of these frameworks, there is one overarching objective to mitigate risk and increase resilience of vulnerable people. The success of formulating such far-reaching agreements now presents us

with the next big task: Implementation of these agreements at regional, national and local levels' (PfR Inception report 2016: 9). The focus shifts from influencing the agreement texts in PfR I to accompanying the implementation of these frameworks in PfR II.

Only in PfR II, the coordination in the GPG started and the global level trajectories were distributed amongst the 5 alliance partners. The selected global trajectories clearly show some continuity with PfR I. Only the SDGs trajectory is new and also the new urban agenda wasn't yet on the radar during PfR I. The GPG notes that since 2015, the number of relevant global frameworks and accompanying processes have expanded enormously.

3.2. Development of a Theory of Change for Global 2016-2020

The global Theory of Change was only developed in January 2019 (see box below), which is linked to a stakeholder mapping. This theory of change has been formulated rather late in the implementation period, and is formulated at a quite abstract level. The link to the overall PfR theory of change is not specified. While in the PME formats, the GPG is expected to reflect amongst others on "why this change is important and why the outcome represents progress towards fulfilling PfR's theory of change", this is not included in the 2017 and 2018 PME reports. References to the PfR and global ToC in terms of use, reflection or revision are minimal.

Global programme Theory of Change

A logical sequence that describes what we intend to do and why it will yield favourable results:

If PfR influences key multi-sectoral stakeholders across geographies on IRM, based on local knowledge, evidence and best practices.

Then key policies, legislation, investments and practices will strongly include IRM elements.

Which Results in:

- Acknowledgement by stakeholders of the importance of mainstreaming IRM in sector policies, investments and practice;
- Increased ambition of governments, CSOs, academia, private sector at global, regional and (sub)national;
- Increased coherent action of governments, CSOs, academia, private sector at global, regional and (sub)national;
- Increased coherence between legal/ policy frameworks
- Enhanced 1) legal/ policy frameworks, laws and regulations; 2) responsible public and private investments, 3) and practices;
- Stronger CSO space: meaningful consultation and participation of local actors in design and implementation of policy, practice and investment.

Because global dialogues that are linked to local realities, can influence global, regional and (sub)national dialogues, and therefore promote solutions for real time challenges, needs and good practices to advance community resilience.

Source: PfR Global Policy Strategy and Work Plan 2019 - 2020 Draft January 2019.

4. Replies to the Evaluation Questions

EQ 1 – On relevance and coherence: To what extent was the PfR II programme relevant and coherent for the promotion of IRM?

Summary: The PfR global programme has been relevant and the GPG invested in ensuring a coherent approach to promote IRM. The multiple actors and layers involved in the PfR alliance made it more challenging to coordinate, but at the same time also strengthened the relevance of the work done. The use of inputs from local and national levels has also ensured the GPG contributions are considered very relevant by external stakeholders with which the GPG has interacted. Linking local realities to the global dialogues has clearly been the focus of the GPG. The inclusive approach should also tailor the GPG efforts to the different country contexts. However, the relevance of the GPG to the national and local level, and thus the linking of global dialogues to local realities, is less systematic. Only some examples were identified where the GPG could facilitate exchanges, share knowledge and tools. The four global policy frameworks followed are agreed to be the most relevant ones, though the balance between being more focused versus ensuring a broad coverage is to some extent debated. Gender considerations are included, mainly inspired by local and national examples. It is part of the GPG approach to include the inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups and to make local voices heard at global level, but this is mainly steered and strengthened by the PfR country programmes.

JC 1.1: *The PfR II programme was adapted to local context and has shown responsiveness and adaptiveness to the priorities and needs of their implementing partners and communities in terms of their capacity strengthening and to communities in terms of tackling IRM challenges*

Summary: The GPG adopts an inclusive approach to identify IRM-related needs and preferences by consulting the PfR country programmes. The four global trajectories form the broad overall framework. Choices for engagement are made depending on opportunities and demands identified, especially by the GPG, but in some cases also by PfR country teams. The GPG efforts have been tailored to the ongoing efforts and interests of PfR country leads. The specific country contexts seem to have been systematically considered. Also some cases could be identified where the GPG directly supported PfR country teams. GPG members consider the concept of IRM as helpful and external stakeholders with which the GPG has interacted find it very relevant (note: consultation of external actors has been limited). The GPG adapted to changing circumstances, including applying lessons learnt on its process, and responding to demands from country leads. It is assumed that the many different political contexts in which the GPG operates will have influenced the work of the GPG, though this is not documented.

The theory of change for the global programme, formulated at a quite abstract level, emphasises the key assumption that “PfR influences key multi-sectoral stakeholders across geographies on IRM, *based on local knowledge, evidence and best practices*” because “Global dialogues *that are linked to local realities*, can influence global, regional and (sub)national dialogues, and therefore promote solutions for real time challenges, needs and good practices to advance community resilience” (*text in italics by author*: PfR Global Policy Strategy and Work Plan 2019 - 2020, draft Jan. 2019: 2).

The GPG uses the four global trajectories/policies as a broad framework to engage and coordinate with country teams from the global level. The GPG participated in the inception workshops at country level and contributed to the country inception reports with regard to the lobbying and advocacy aspects. This makes

the global trajectories country specific, implying that for some countries one or the other global trajectory can be more prominent and country teams formulate their priorities. The PfR Annual Report 2018 notes: 'The implementation of the global programme over the last three years has allowed partners to identify and prioritise local, national, regional and global policies that contribute to effectively strengthen community resilience, with a focus on mainstreaming IRM principles'. While the country sections of the annual reports do refer to the selected international frameworks, in the 2016 and 2017 PfR Annual Reports that's not done regularly nor systematically. In the 2018 Annual Report this changes, and references are made systematically for each country programme.

The GPG links with the PfR country teams and communities and consults them. The GPG looks at what the PfR country teams develop to see what the GPG should prioritise and to align country trajectories with the global discourse and policy dialogues. The GPG looks for opportunities to link the global, regional and national work and uses inputs from country teams to share at regional and global fora. For such inputs at global level, the need to co-create at local and country level and having evidence on local trends and solutions are considered key. Multiple examples are available:

In the context of the Sendai Framework, the GPG analysis on the implementation of Target E to have a disaster risk reduction strategy, builds on PfR country experiences. The GPG does not select the countries which participate in this analysis, but presents it as an opportunity to the country leads. Some countries are more, others are less interested, which depends on the opportunities seen by the country leads themselves. For example, the PfR Mali programme staff participated in several global meetings such as the Global Platform for DRR in Cancun (2017). PfR Mali staff participated in panels and knitted international contacts to share experiences in supporting resilience originating from the Mopti region.

In the context of the UNFCCC annual COPs, both PfR Uganda and Indonesia country team members participated in lobbying and advocacy for IRM at the global level. The PfR country teams joined country delegations to the Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC in Madrid (COP 2019) and participated in the COP meeting and side events. This allowed for example the Indonesian country lead to assist the government delegation, but also share information on how the COP is working. The country team is still working with the government on implementation of the review, and information on that process is shared with the GPG.

A practical IRM pilot project, applying the 'building with nature' approach' (linking water infrastructure, DRR and adaptation) was implemented by PfR in Indonesia. Now the GPG sees opportunities to upscale this example by enabling the policy environment. The GPG brings this work from local to global by generating attention for it through publications and for example sharing it at Sendai and UNFCCC meetings.

The GPG developed a strong narrative on PfR's contribution to the SDG agenda jointly with th PfR Mali country team. NLRC staff was invited by the IRCF in New York to participate in the HLPF and the Mali team then got involved following the suggestion of the GPG. The Mali country team presented its engagement with the Mali government in the Mali Voluntary National Review Report as an example of the inclusion of civil society in this process.

In the context of the New Urban Agenda, the Indonesia PfR country team developed city level indicators, and tested how these work in practice. This allowed the GPG to share the guidelines at a World Urban Forum and share lessons on what works and what doesn't work, and especially showing why it is essential to involve communities in city planning and city risk mapping.

While PfR stakeholders are involved in this upstream work, evidence of GPG activities at national level is less clearly documented. The GPG role is also to share the content and learnings of its interventions at global level and support the country programmes to contextualise this to their settings. As the GPG oversees the broader scope it can strengthen the follow up and assist at country level. GPG respondents note PfR country teams have invited them to share their inputs, but it seems this approach has not been applied systematically. GPG respondents indicate they supported country teams with advice on how to do things in practice, what is needed to embed their work at country policy level and what the role of the civil society is. The GPG attending global meetings and working groups allows them to identify opportunities for the national and local level, and translate principles to local work. A few examples have been identified, though the role of the GPG in these is not always clear:

The GPG helps country leads to reach networks and interact. For example, the Mali country team worked with mayors and the GPG connected them to a more global alliance of local authorities. This allows them to influence local authorities, both from a local and from a global perspective.

PfR partners in Uganda have financed participation in the annual COPs. This is said to have contributed to a better information stream from the global level to the national level about the relevance of domesticating global PfR contributions at the national level. Through the PFCC (the Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change in Uganda) PfR Uganda contributed to the domestication of international frameworks such as the UNFCCC. For example, the team was involved in the development of the National Adaptation Plan for Agriculture (NAP-Ag), where PfR local partner PELUM represented civil society in the technical committee and pushed for the integration of IRM principles. Also in Mali, the programme aims to contribute to Mali's National Action Plan for the Paris Agreement, for example by influencing the 'Plans de Développement Social, Economique, et Culturel' (PDSEC) to integrate IRM at the level of municipalities.

Likewise, The Indonesia programme has focused on Indonesia's own policy frameworks and efforts to "localise" the global agreements and frameworks. Likewise, the PfR Uganda team engaged in the national Disaster Preparedness and Management policy and bill to implement the Sendai Framework. In these examples, it has essentially been the domestic policy framework, such as the national disaster management policies, which has guided programme interventions.

As a follow up to the SDG and VNR work (see example above), the GPG is now specifically working with the Uganda, Kenya and India PfR country teams. These countries are identified as having the required access to their government and other actors to influence the VNRs in their countries. However, in this specific work, the GPG also notes it is challenging to provide guidance as the situation differs a lot per country. What the GPG does is inspire country teams to get involved and include the SDG area of work in their annual planning. The GPG facilitates the exchange among the countries involved, shares the key messages and explains the added value for country teams to work on SDGs.

It is not clear if in the initial strategic planning of the GPG and selection of trajectories, IRM-related needs and preferences were identified in consultation with the PfR contracted and non-contracted partners. The global programme has not specifically targeted the capacity strengthening part of the PfR II theory of change (see further in EQ4), and in its annual planning documents, the fields relating to capacity strengthening are left open.

From the evidence shared in interviews, the efforts of the GPG have indeed been tailored to PfR country programmes. GPG efforts were mainly undertaken because the GPG suggested them and country leads showed an interest. All GPG members stress the importance of tailoring and adapting the global policies to national realities. This also means that while the GPG can share lessons and experiences from the global level and other countries, it is in essence up to the country teams to decide on their engagement strategies. Some global agreements have less relevance for certain PfR country teams, for example because some country teams are mostly active in either urban or rural areas. The GPG seems to very much follow the existing traction of the PfR teams at country level. For example, it looked at how the outcomes of the Global Platform for DRR are taken into account in different arena, in different trajectories, and how it relates to other frameworks, so as to make the interlinkages and ensure people talk less in silos.

In addition to GPG members, also all external stakeholders consulted indicate that the concept of IRM is very relevant. It is noted to be 'brilliant' thinking, integrating the perspectives of people most at risk, and putting risks in the centre of their thinking. Stakeholders also note the concept inspires their own work. IRM brings people working on different global frameworks together, so that they can communicate and learn from each other, which allows these frameworks to be coherently implemented at local and national level.

The GPG follows emerging discourses and links the dialogues to what is driving the discussions. For example, an ad-hoc webinar was organised end March/early April, given the sudden shifts needed because of the Covid-19 pandemic. The GPG had conversations with country teams and trajectory leads, to understand how they see policy dialogue and trajectories being impacted by this.

The most visible adaptation the GPG has made is the decision to no longer follow the 'investment' trajectory as a separate one. This was a response to the finding that funding is directly linked to the global policy frameworks, and global investors are more inspired by local initiatives. Countries made commitments to the international frameworks, and now need funding to implement these commitments in national adaptation plans, for example the DRR plans in the context of the Sendai Framework. The funding needed in each of these countries is better brought forward from the engagement of PfR on the specific frameworks.

Another major adaption was made in 2019, when the GPG reports that the policy context has been shifted. As a result, the 2016 objectives became less relevant as integrated risk management principles are in fact effectively reflected in most policy frameworks. Subsequently, the GPG focus shifts to giving more substance to the frameworks by further accompanying them at especially national level.

Most likely, many more adaptations have been made in the GPG work, as changing circumstances and political contexts are part and parcel of the environment in which they work. The GPG has had to adapt because implementing partners could not always join the global meetings as foreseen. In one example, three PfR country teams were considered to present their VNR work at the HLPF, but the Philippines country team did not have the capacity, in the case of Guatemala there was no interest because it was beyond their scope and the Indonesia team couldn't join due to practical circumstances. Annually, the GPG prepares a plan and reports on the previous year, though no direct link is made to the original planning for that year.

JC 1.2: The PfR alliance programme has been aligned with the regionally and globally agreed priorities on IRM

Summary: Globally agreed priorities on IRM are at the core of the GPG. These guide the group's work and the group aims to influence these priorities. The group selected initially five, but later on focused on four trajectories. The selection is not contested by members in the group. There is a consensus that certain policies are more important than others, and that some frameworks are only relevant in certain country or regional contexts. Recently, other global and regional frameworks have been gaining importance. It is suggested that in a potential PfR III programme, more frameworks should be included. Though rather than having additional separate tracks, the main topics might be better addressed in an integrated manner.

International political priorities and policy guidance are clearly reflected and mainstreamed in the GPG's PME workshop reports; i.e. the (semi-)annual reports and work plans. The GPG initially selected five dialogue trajectories to guide their work, of which four are directly linked to international agreements, which all came into force in 2015:

Climate and the UNFCCC trajectory

The Climate trajectory is considered important, also because this is the area which also includes the climate funds. The RCCC is taking the lead in the GPG on the UNFCCC global conferences, the COPs and the in-between meetings, like the regional climate weeks, specifically in Asia and Africa. The RCCC now also supports the UK in their leadership track on resilience, which links to the risk informed early-action partnership (REAP), launched at the 2019 UN summit. WI works with all PfR partners to directly input resilience and Sendai Framework issues in the climate negotiations. The Climate trajectory at country level is also closely linked to the SDG trajectory (see below).

Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction trajectory

The Sendai Framework is an obvious and important framework to follow. It is one of the main trajectories for PfR because it is directly on DRR. The Sendai Framework trajectory is followed by Care and WI. Already since PfR I, the PfR partners worked to influence the implementation of the Sendai Framework through capacity building of CSOs and influencing DRR policy and investments from the local to the national level. In PfR II, the GPG focused on how to translate the agreement to national plans. The Sendai Framework has set various targets, one is Target E, which is about developing national DRR plans. Each country team makes its own analysis for the engagement needed as the objectives are defined at country level and which institutes are relevant and powerful differs per country. All the PfR countries are involved in the Sendai Framework, on global level the lead is taken by GPG, and the key messages for global events are drafted jointly. WI, with PfR and PEDDR identified gaps in the Sendai Framework, and issues getting too little attention, like conflict. The GPG is highlighting these issues and aims to influence the global agenda. At international fora, the PfR alliance is considered to be very up to date on this framework.

Investments

This was a separate trajectory with its own objectives, that was not linked to a specific international agreement. In the 2018 Annual Report it is explained that the Investment trajectory will be linked to the other 4 trajectories, and no longer be a self-standing trajectory.

Urban Resilience and the New Urban Agenda trajectory

The urban trajectory is jointly led by Cordaid and WI. For the urban trajectory the GPG has joined forces with Indonesia and Philippines. The Urban trajectory is only important in some of the PfR countries. For example, in Uganda no explicit linkage is made with the New Urban Agenda due to the overall focus of PfR Uganda on rural communities. (Source: Uganda case study report). In 2016, the PfR alliance contributed key messages to the 'Habitat III' UN conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development in Quito, in 2016.

Sustainable Development Goals trajectory

The NLRC would participate in the GPG, and the SDG agenda was considered to be an interesting opportunity to follow up on. The SDG framework is both seen as an entrance for direct policy work, as DRR is part of the SDGs, but also as the overarching framework, as other frameworks, like Sendai, Urban, Ramsar, all link to the SDGs.

At country level, Influencing the SDG reporting is an entrance point to influences the sustainable development planning of governments. At the HLPF the civil society action is not particularly strong. It is largely an UN, inter-governmental programme, and civil society is not much involved. That is not typical as CS must have concerns, for example ensuring the self-reporting mechanisms are useful. Country level reporting is taken seriously by governments, so this creates opportunities to influence, which would also help governments. This opportunity was followed up on by the Mali country team which had a very specific experience working on the VNRs which was shared during the HLPF (see examples in JC 1.1).

The GPG, together with country teams, aims to get involved in the Voluntary National Review (VNR) processes at country level. The SDG Agenda encourages member states to "conduct regular and inclusive reviews of progress at the national and sub-national levels, which are country-led and country-driven" (paragraph 79). These national reviews are expected to serve as a basis for the regular reviews by the high-level political forum (HLPF) ([source](#)). At the same time, national development planning is influenced by the combined perspectives from the other frameworks too. The COP 21 (linked to the UNFCCC trajectory listed above) for example has invited countries to confirm their intentions by ratifying the Paris Agreement and submitting Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to the UNFCCC ([source](#)). As a result, the NDCs overlap with the VNRs, and the GPG wants to influence what is tackled in country climate and development plans and what is reported on. For that, the GPG aims to work with PfR partners which have access to governments, and their wider network, involving both DRR and development actors. The SDG trajectory is considered relevant, and not being involved in it is noted to be 'counter intuitive', by one external stakeholder.

These four trajectories form the core of the GPG work, and respondents confirm these are the logical trajectories to follow and not one of them can be left aside. The GPG focuses on giving them substance and accompanying their implementation. The approaches and interventions of the GPG all reflect and mainstream these four international agreements. In the years 2016 and 2017 the GPG focused a lot on advocating for IRM principles to be included in the follow up policy statements. Only in 2018, the PfR alliance found IRM inclusion in these international frameworks has been sufficiently developed. But related policies are still being developed at national/subnational levels. As is said by one of the respondents; 'at global level, we all agree about global agreements, now we need to implement'.

Among the four trajectories, the Sendai Framework and Climate trajectory are getting most attention in the GPG. The Urban agenda trajectory is in fact limited to three PfR countries, Philippines, Kenya Indonesia. PfR country contexts define what should be prioritised, and in these countries urban vulnerability is a major issue, while in other PfR countries, PfR partners are not so much active in urban areas.

The GPG agenda is not only steered by the developments in the four global frameworks, but also by inputs of PfR country teams, other external actors like the Global Center on Adaptation, and by new contextual development which drive the discussions. The GPG aims to influence the globally agreed priorities on IRM. Interviewees note that the DRR resilience discourse has been broadened, increasingly linking the humanitarian and development sectors, and linking it to livelihoods. As these topics get much more attention now, the amount of work at global policy level is expanding a lot in comparison with PfR I. This development also implies that other global and regional frameworks may be increasingly relevant for the PfR alliance. Respondents agree with the current selection of frameworks, but also note it is already challenging to keep up with all the developments in these trajectories. At times it is difficult to really press ahead because so many things are happening at the same time.

The Ramsar Convention and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) are followed by WI. These two frameworks are not included in the GPG but belong to WI's own portfolio, since a long time. It was decided not to include them in the GPG trajectories so as to allow the GPG to focus and because these frameworks are quite broad and also cover topics which do not link to PfR themes. However, the Uganda country team also considers the alignment with the Ramsar Convention and the CBD will be renewed in 2020, which is increasingly relevant for PfR as it has links to DRR and has an impact on the Paris agreement, in terms of agenda setting and many synergies. For example, in the CBD there is a growing attention for vulnerable communities. Some respondents suggest the CBD, but also Ramsar, should be considered as an additional area in a potential PfR III programme.

In terms of planning for PfR III, the GPG should redo the analysis and see which topics deserve most attention. A lot is happening in areas such as nature-based solutions or climate risks. Rather than further splitting up the work, a more cross-cutting approach could be considered, as IRM is an integrated theme, which would allow for integrating the focus areas. By splitting the work in various tracks, the GPG risks to have an isolated approach.

JC 1.3: The five PfR alliance partners share and align their approach regarding IRM

Summary: The objective of the GPG is to maintain coherence and link the work done on each of the global trajectories. Each of the PfR partners bring in their own expertise, which jointly adds up to the common understanding of IRM. While it is acknowledged that each organisation brings its own perspectives, priorities and ways of working, respondents note the process to build a coherent approach generally works well. The GPG jointly agrees on its annual work plan, the key opportunities to engage in, and the strategic engagement process to be followed. In this process, the GPG also consults the country leads. For each event in which the GPG engages, a joint strategic dialogue about the approach and objectives is undertaken.

The aim of the GPG is to maintain coherence and link the various trajectories. The group intends to ensure each trajectory is well aligned with the others, and with the global discourse and policy dialogues taking place. For this, the team assumes each member of the GPG follows the relevant policy dialogues that are taking place at the global level. However, given the complexity of the PfR II programme, it is challenging to make the links between the activities of all partners involved. There is a risk that different PfR actors work in a siloed approach. The GPG is about exchanging, making links and identifying common opportunities. In global meetings, GPG members always make sure they have a joint PfR narrative. Though, in some cases it is easier to access some high-level meetings, like the HLPF or the UNFCCC (see examples in JC 1.1), via the own organisations or via country delegations.

Respondents note that each of the five PfR organisations bring their own expertise and experience. Each of them works on DRR but they complement each other and all bring a comparative advantage and different perspective:

The NLRC is strong on the humanitarian side of IRM and has expertise in humanitarian work and early warning. NLRC, as members of the IFRC has a huge network, at global level, but also via its many RC societies. These local RC societies have strong ties in local communities and often have well-established links with local authorities and national governments. While in some countries RC societies invest in DRR, humanitarian action is their main mandate.

Cordaid has a large urban portfolio and NGO and CBO network. Cordaid is a partner of the urban resilience initiative. Cordaid has expertise in working with CBOs, mobilising people and networks and brings an expertise in the community ecosystem.

The RCCC is the global reference centre on climate, which also convenes national dialogues. It has specific expertise on climate change data work, knowledge about early warning systems, using forecasts for climate adaptation, and specifically promotes a stronger disaster focus in the global landscape.

Care is more development-oriented, contributes its gender expertise but it also has expertise through its humanitarian pillar - Care is also part of the Dutch Relief Alliance.

WI has a long history on climate work, specifically wetlands, developing and mobilising knowledge, using practical experiences to advocate for better policies. It has a strong and long-standing cooperation with PEDDR and investment-related networks. It also has expertise in cooperation in local water management.

The global policy trajectories have been evenly distributed among the five alliance partners; NLRC leads on SDGs, Care and WI lead on the Sendai Framework, Cordaid focuses on the New Urban agenda and the RCCC focuses on the climate agenda. WI also follows other frameworks, like the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention. WI updates the GPG on relevant developments in these frameworks.

At the beginning of each year, the GPG makes a schedule of key meetings for all four trajectories. The GPG maps out which initiatives allow for most opportunities to influence policies to select which events should be followed and which critical components need to be considered. This is based on a thorough mapping and prioritisation of the overall global landscape. Within each trajectory there is normally one policy event that brings all partners together. Most of the GPG activities focus on the larger events,

because there the GPG can have most influence. Certain themes will also be included because of their synergies across the four trajectories. For example, COP meetings have a direct impact on the SDGs, on Sendai, and on the urban trajectory. The GPG also knows some processes have the interest of key actors or are important for financing. This annual mapping generally results in about six meetings which are considered critical. New opportunities are always discussed in the GPG, members never just engage themselves. Then on the smaller events the GPG has to reach compromises, and are for example followed up by individual organisations.

The GPG needs to be selective and is continuously reflecting, also considering what other actors do, and whether the PfR involvement will therefore be more or less important. The GPG also considers whether there are opportunities to work with partners. The GPG builds contacts, sometimes together with PfR alliance partners, and in some cases such contacts are handed over to other relevant PfR partners.

The GPG members all work for different alliance organisations, with different perspectives and ways of working. Even more so, the larger PfR family, including the country teams and PfR partners, all have different perspectives, different priorities, and different ways of working. When preparing an event, or key messages for an event, the GPG group discusses the various inputs made. The GPG looks for the synergies, and considers what is important for PfR in general, and what is relevant for individual organisations.

JC 1.4: Gender considerations and inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups have been included, represented, addressed and mainstreamed in design, implementation and M&E

Summary: According to interviewees gender considerations and inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups should be included and addressed at local level by PfR country teams and their partners. The related lessons are included and represented in the GPG interventions at global level. Addressing these considerations and inputs as derived from the global level should then again be translated to the local and national level. A range of references to gender and vulnerable and marginalised groups are found in the GPG work, but that is related to stressing the importance of including and representing these considerations and inputs, and not to actually directly addressing them. More practically, the GPG has a fair distribution of sexes and also considers this in the PfR partners contributions to global fora.

Respondents note that gender considerations and inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups are to be included and addressed at local level, where programmes should mainstream this. The Annual Plan 2017 notes regarding the gender focus at country level that 'From a global perspective PfR will seek opportunities to capitalize on this' (p.6). The learnings on the gender considerations included at the local level are then included by the GPG at the global level. For example, in the urban trajectory, a finding relating to the different needs of women in spatial planning is something that is integrated in the key messages the GPG is sharing in global fora. Like this, the GPG addresses gender issues and inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups by advocating for it on a global level.

Other examples identified:

In the Global Policy Strategy and Work Plan 2019 - 2020 Draft Jan 2019 gender is mentioned in relation to the strategy on the Sendai trajectory, which includes advocating for gender sensitive criteria (p. 7), and the COP26 process also includes the Gender Action Plan (Ibid. p. 9). PfR Indonesia joined the COP as part of the Indonesian government delegation. Together with the GPG it did a review of the GAP (gender action plan). The GPG also has exchanges with the PfR

Indonesia on the links of gender with the climate trajectory and put them in contact with the Care gender expert.

PfR has been approached by UN Environment to be a part of a network leading on conversations about the role of gender in environmental protection.

At the EDDs WI and Care organised a lab debate about women and wetlands ([link](#)). And Care Uganda and UNEP co-publication on women leading on wetlands conservation in Uganda ([Link](#)).

One external respondent specifically appreciated PfR's gender expertise, and the fact that PfR is able to link this with expertise on wetlands conservation and wash initiatives by leveraging the strengths of their partners.

At a more practical level, gender is addressed by ensuring representation of women and men at global events, GPG is supporting the rejection of manels - man-only panels and there is a good gender balance in the GPG team.

EQ 2: On efficiency and coordination: To what extent were the internal governance mechanisms, management approaches and working processes of the PfR alliance efficient and well-coordinated?

Summary: The set-up of the PfR programme, working in multiple countries and on multiple levels, has been extremely beneficial to the GPG programme. It allowed the GPG to create links and synergies between trajectories and levels in a far more coordinated manner. The GPG approach integrates the consultation by individual trajectory leads of the respective country offices, which has resulted in a lot of links and synergies from the country level efforts up to the global level, and between different trajectories. In comparison with PfR I, the coordination on the global policy work has been greatly facilitated by the GPG. It seems the GPG efforts were undertaken efficiently though some capacity challenges were observed. It should be noted however that with the current capacity, it is challenging to really follow all the ongoing developments and there is not always sufficient capacity to follow through on some efforts. The internal governance of the GPG took some time to find its feet and while respondents generally emphasise the benefits of the GPG, the internal strategic management and coordination are not optimal. The group invested in building trust and keeping the dialogue open and going. Still, GPG members are in the first place representing their individual organisations, pushing the individual agency agendas, which counteracts the coordination efforts of the GPG. The cooperation and coordination in the GPG has also been hampered by some staff renewals, and delays in replacements. While it is acknowledged that lobby approaches differ among GPG partners, and a more political role may conflict with the neutral position of NLRC, in practice this has not caused an issue at the global level. The outcome monitoring for each trajectory is a useful way to capture results, though the longer-term narratives are not well represented. The PME workshops are noted to provide a useful space to exchange and learn, though the reports are not complete and do not capture much of the exchanges that took place, or lessons identified. The PfR overall ToC appears to not have played a major role in the planning, monitoring and learning process of the GPG. This overall ToC does not clearly visualise how the various levels at which the PfR programme should work interact. As the, rather abstract, global ToC was only drafted early 2019, there is little evidence that the GPG worked for the first three years with a coherent and clearly described strategic intervention logic, clarifying the engagement ambitions and priorities of the GPG overall and vis-à-vis the other PfR II interventions. While the GPG is a real step forward in comparison with PfR I, the potential of what this group could bring both at global level and towards the PfR partners at large, has not been fully exploited.

JC 2.1: The PfR programme has been delivered in a timely manner, against reasonable overhead costs and, given the resources available, been spread appropriately across regions and countries (incl. the focus on facilitating Southern ownership and South-South cooperation, and linking/ creating synergy of our work at the different levels, i.e. local to regional to global)

Summary: For the GPG, the set-up of the PfR programme working at local, national, regional and global levels and involving multiple organisations, alliance partners but also in-country, has been a real added value. This allowed the GPG to link their efforts and create synergies by using country level efforts as examples at global level, and link different trajectories. The capacity available to contribute to the GPG differs a lot among alliance partners, which is directly related to the DNA of the respective organisations. This is not considered problematic among GPG members. It is a challenge however that GPG members are employed by different organisations and therefore push their individual agency agenda's. It is also noted that it is challenging to follow all the ongoing developments and there is not always sufficient capacity to follow through on some efforts. It took

time to find an effective way of working together in the GPG. As a result, the GPG has not been fully using the potential it could bring in terms of coordination and coherence.

As the selected Frameworks were all agreed in 2015, the PfR II programme, starting in 2016, had the ideal timing to give substance to these frameworks in PfR II.

The institutional set-up to link the work at different levels has paid out at global level. The GPG has relied a lot on the work done at local and national levels, and would not have been this relevant without creating these synergies. This upstream work is based on demand and interest expressed from the PfR countries. The downstream added value of the GPG is less visible in the evidence available.

The DNA of the respective organisations carrying PfR forward is diverse. It is rich to be working with 5 different organisations and it brings strengths. Overall, members of the GPG assess the group's work as an advanced experience of a global dialogue. The PfR programme has a very horizontal culture, and is based on finding consensus. While this approach has clear advantages, it can also delay processes, even more so when people come from their own organisations with their specific focus and priorities, and several GPG members also have additional tasks for their own organisation.

The focus on global policy trajectories was to some extent a turn to be made from PfR I to PfR II, but all the organisations already had specific L&A capacity. It differs per organisation to what extent PfR is linked to the core mandate. If the link is closer, more capacity will be available. RCCC has always been working on regulations and financing for climate, and PfR allowed them to strengthen that. The RCCC has a complete team available to follow the UNFCCC climate trajectory. In the NLRC, SDGs are not the first priority and only limited capacity is available. In the SDG trajectory, the GPG joined forces with several PfR country teams. In WI, the lobby capacity is distributed over multiple trajectories with one advocacy lead for the PfR GPG. Cordaid has one, and Care has two persons in the GPG, with additional responsibilities in their own organisations. The PfR alliance organisations also strategically use their directors, CEOs, or in case of the NLRC the IRF to leverage their efforts or get access to certain fora.

The GPG respondents do not think more capacity is needed. Having more, or too many cooks in the kitchen, would not necessarily strengthen the work. One risk is that the GPG efforts are not focused enough. One respondent finds the GPG has too many priorities and trajectories at global, regional and EU level, another respondent confirms that it is challenging to follow all the many developments going on and there is not always sufficient capacity to follow through on some efforts. For example, in the SDGs trajectory, several opportunities could be identified to follow that better if more capacity would be available, like to strengthen the link with the humanitarian perspective and DRR, and give more body to the understanding of the sustainable development planning process.

Cooperation in the GPG requires time, as it entails working and reporting with many different partners on many different frameworks. Even keeping each other up to date and informing and understanding each other well, and sometimes building each other's capacity, requires quite some time. As a result, also the reporting - outcome monitoring and maintaining a logbook to capture work at activity level - is more time intensive.

At the start, the GPG needed time to find an effective way to work together. In the first years, the GPG may not have been benefitting sufficiently from the exchanges in the GPG. It has been difficult to find a balance between sharing and understanding everything and being more selective in what the others need to know. As knowing what everyone is doing is impossible, the GPG had to learn what is too detailed, and what is relevant at GPG level. More and more the GPG found a workable modality, through trial and error. In the end, GPG members have to trust their colleagues are on top of what they are doing.

The approach now is to formulate a clear GPG agenda, selecting trajectories and events to be followed up. Then the GPG jointly formulates the PfR strategy and core messages. As a result, other events are to be followed by alliance members or partner organisations, but should always as much as possible take the PfR message into account. This is a rather basic strategic process, which is captured in annual plans, but it does not support following through a longer-term coherent and strategic vision, see also JC 2.3.

Practically, as part of the engagement strategy, the trajectory lead starts a shared document, before the event, which is open for contributions from the GPG members and country leads. The trajectory lead will contribute information and PfR partners are invited to add to this 'mini' strategy. Then a webinar is organised to gather more information and facilitate further exchange in the GPG together with the country leads. The GPG and PfR partners had to get used to working jointly in google docs, and still people are contributing too much the last minute. Then the GPG coordinator has to chase people. The GPG develops the engagement approach and uses the inputs to decide on the actual strategy to be followed. Reaching consensus in the GPG is noted to go smoothly, though a challenge is that some people are too focused on their own organisation's agenda. This push for individual agency's agendas counteracts the coordination efforts of the GPG. The GPG coordinator has to have the patience and a good understanding of the cultures of different PfR partners to watch and steer that.

JC 2.2: The PfR programme has been operationally coordinated across the five PfR alliance partners at global, regional as well as national levels

Summary: The GPG has seven members. The position of the international humanitarian diplomacy officer was created and staffed from 2016 onwards to facilitate the GPG's work. The monthly meetings and biannual planning and review meetings allow to agree on a joint approach and to reflect jointly. While NLRC has been carefully monitoring its neutrality, it seems this has not been a major issue in the GPG. The GPG leads on individual trajectories ensure the respective country offices are consulted on opportunities. Coordination on the global policy work has been greatly facilitated by the GPG, though there is room for improving the internal coordination and strategic guidance in the GPG. The cooperation in the GPG efforts has been hampered to some extent by staff rotation and delays in staff renewal. A lot of evidence on links and synergies made at global level using examples of country level efforts is identified, as well as examples of exploiting opportunities between different trajectories.

The GPG has 7 members, the coordinator, and lobby staff from each of the five alliance partners, including two people from Care. The position of the international humanitarian diplomacy officer was created and staffed from 2016 onwards to facilitate the GPG's work, contracted by the NLRC. The coordinator is expected to coordinate the group and ensure linkages are made between trajectories and synergies are sought. The four trajectories are followed by appointed leads, distributed among the alliance members, and the coordinator should keep them all in sight.

GPG members each lead on a trajectory and their job is to ensure that there is a link between the global policies and country programmes. The leads try to retrieve the learning experiences from the local and national level, and share the opportunities for engagement they see. The coordinator chairs monthly meetings which are mainly focused on harmonising trajectories. Biannually, the GPG has a PME meeting, reviewing the work done and outcomes achieved, and formulating a joint work plan to select which engagements the GPG should take part in (see further in JC 2.3).

The coordinator also functions as a policy advisor on IRM for PfR, and in that role provides guidance on policy dialogues, suggests policy directions on how to engage, contributes to position papers on emerging themes and engages in networking activities. The GPG trajectory leads flag what is most important in their field of work, and forward these to the coordinator to put that on her radar. One respondent has commented on the balance between these two roles, that in practice this has been being far too much focused on the humanitarian diplomacy work on IRM on behalf of PfR, and giving too little guidance to the GPG to focus and coordinate it. Also the evaluation team experienced some challenges in terms of liaising and retrieving the relevant documents.

Coordination on the global policy work of the different PfR alliance organisations has been greatly facilitated by the GPG. The GPG members trust each other in following the individual trajectories and keeping each other up to date. All members have to rely on each other to know what is going on, as it is impossible to follow it all individually. Of the GPG members, only two, the coordinator and NLRC member were involved in the GPG for a longer period. Three members of the group joined it relatively recently; the WI staff member started early 2020; two others, for Cordaid and Care joined between 6-18 months ago. However, several staff members that were new to the GPG, were already involved in PfR work. The staff renewals, and delayed replacements impacted on the 'institutional' memory and have had a negative effect on the efficient implementation of the GPG.

The five PfR alliance organisations do not have the same approach to lobby and advocacy. Especially for the NLRC, securing their neutrality was key: the GPG work should not become political. Therefore, it was important to the NLRC that the coordinator of the GPG would be employed by the NLRC, and her title is 'Global Coordinator for Humanitarian Diplomacy'. Views differ on the extent to which this is a sensitive issue in PfR. A useful distinction can be made between the global and national level. On the global level, and in the GPG, there are no disagreements among the members, and the key messages are quite easily agreed upon. The NLRC rather refers to 'needs' and not to 'rights' of people. But this approach was taken over by the other GPG members. According to the NLRC it works quite naturally, also because in PfR messages, in IRM, it is always about vulnerabilities, so that doesn't require a rights-based approach so much. And even if it becomes somewhat more political, also for the NLRC, at global level the relationships with governments are more indirect. Disagreements on the extent to which a more political role should be adopted are more playing at the national level, also because at national level, RC societies often have strong relationships with governments which can be far more direct and crucial for these organisations.

The annual country leads week is considered an annual key moment for the GPG, as it greatly facilitates the access and exchange with the PfR network. The GPG also joins meetings and conferences at country level, though only a few examples could be identified here. It is noted that the GPG members help each other a lot, which is beneficial to everyone. Each trajectory lead supports every other trajectory, the urban trajectory lead also considers how it can contribute and support the work done in the Sendai Framework trajectory, and likewise the climate change trajectory is supported.

Concretely, PfR offers good opportunities to see how the SDG agenda and the Sendai Framework can interact. And there was a lot of cooperation in PfR in the climate work, which is of growing importance. Examples of synergies between trajectories and intervention levels have also been shared in JC1.1. As explained in more detail in JC 1.2, the GPG links the SDG trajectory to the Climate trajectory in its efforts to influence what is tackled in country climate plans and link this to what is reported on in the VNRs.

JC 2.3: The PfR support has been monitored for accountability and learning on a regular basis to identify and report on results and blockages/problems at the three intervention levels (national, regional, global) and notably at South-South cooperation level

Summary: The GPG has applied the PfR alliance monitoring approach, which includes relevant elements for monitoring progress at outcome level especially. The data collection system in templates is somewhat challenging to follow over multiple years and the presentation of longer-term narratives could be improved. The activities and overall direction of the GPG has been monitored and some of this information is adequately documented. The PME workshops are experienced as a useful space to exchange and learn, though the reports are not complete and do not capture much of these exchanges or lessons identified. The global ToC was only drafted in 2019, and the overall PfR ToC does not seem to have played any major role in the planning, monitoring and learning processes of the GPG. This means, the first three years the GPG worked without a real strategic intervention logic clarifying priorities and engagement objectives for the GPG as a whole, also vis-à-vis the PfR II programme at large. The global ToC of 2019 is rather abstractly formulated which makes it difficult to support strategic prioritising and learning.

The GPG has biannual PME workshops and reports on the results in templates provided by the PfR PME group. In addition to the work plans, also the mini strategies for events guide the GPG biannual PME workshops. The PME meetings are valued as opportunities to come together and share constructive criticism, but also to build support and trust.

The reporting template provides for the monitoring of the complete strategy. The template intends to focus on the outcome level results, and ensures results for each of the GPG trajectories are reported separately. In addition to the 2016 inception report for the PfR programme, elaborate GPG PME reports for 2017 and 2018 and summary pages for both years were available for this case study report. While for 2017 quite long lists of outcomes are reported, 2018 shows a more focused approach. The reporting is done on a semester basis. The linkages between the annual plans and subsequent reporting over multiple years is more difficult to trace. The 2019 PME reports for the GPG were not available, while at least the semi-annual report for Jan-Jun 2019 was expected to be ready.

After global events followed by the GPG, a debriefing report or activity report is done, but it is not clear if this is systematically applied. The debriefing has no structured formal reporting format, but can be done either in a blog, in a short report in the PfR newsletter, in brief thematic reports on key highlights and during the monthly GPG meetings, but no overview of debriefings could be shared with the evaluation team.

GPG members share their outputs and outcomes with the GPG coordinator. The biannual PME reports list for each of the dialogue trajectories the outcomes identified, considering, in line with the reporting format:

1. Who did what, when and where differently that potentially or actually represents progress towards the aim that vulnerable people are more resilient;
2. why this change is important and why the outcome represents progress towards fulfilling PfR's theory of change;
3. and how & when PfR activities or outputs influenced the outcome.

For most of the outcomes reported, also a source or proof of outcome is included.

While the GPG is focused on dialogue trajectories, and not explicitly on capacity strengthening, the reports for 2017 and 2018 also reports on capacity strengthening results, explaining how the capacity was strengthened, who's capacity was increased and the effects of this capacity strengthening on the implementation of the PfR Programme. These sections reflect on how many local representatives were invited to global meetings.

Also, for each trajectory the progress made on knowledge management and learning activities are reported on. Finally, the GPG lists to which country plans the global efforts can be linked.

While the PME templates also suggest the following assessment elements: the DCF; KM & learning; interactions with other stakeholders, notably the NL MFA; gender and inclusive approach; and a general assessment as GPG; these fields are all empty in the 2017 and 2018 PME reports. Track changes in the files suggest some, though quite limited, feedback on the PME reports has been shared.

The PfR Annual reports include GPG highlights, outcomes, and in some cases learning examples. In the Annual Report of 2016, only country level dialogue trajectories are scored, not regional or global level trajectories.

Respondents shared the following examples of lessons learnt:

The GPG has been pushing for IRM, but everyone has their own understanding of what IRM is. As it is a transdisciplinary topic, even if it has been around for over a decade, there are different (levels of) understanding(s).

At the start of the global programme, Investment was a separate trajectory with its own objectives, that was not linked to a specific international agreement. In the 2018 Annual Report it is explained that the Investment trajectory will be linked to the other 4 trajectories, and no longer be a self-standing trajectory, mainly because leveraging and improving investments can better be directly linked to the specific policy frameworks.

A reflection from a PME workshop about targeting stakeholders suggests to adopt a more realistic targeting process as relationships take long to build and it requires considerable time to create partnerships.

Another lesson identified by all trajectory leads is to constantly remember that leadership of a trajectory requires consistent coordination and engagement of other partners. This requires for the lead agency to facilitate inputs and participation in certain trajectories and hold back on prioritising individual agency agendas.

In 2019, the GPG noted that as the principles are already in the policy documents, it was time to change the GPG key messages. Since then, the GPG has been building cases to explain why IRM has to be advocated for.

Development banks are one of the donors, and the GPG learnt it should involve them more from the start, to ensure proposals are bankable, using a mix of finances.

One version of the global ToC was found in the 2019 annual plan. As references to this ToC and the overall PfR ToC are minimal in the documents and during the interviews, it appears that its use for reflection, learning or adaptations have been limited. The global ToC of 2019 is rather abstractly formulated which makes it difficult to support strategic prioritising and learning. The main reference point for strategic planning in the GPG was not a ToC, but annual planning meetings and the resulting work plans. A longer-term strategic guidance for the GPG overall has not been identified. However, given that the four policy frameworks chosen to engage in are very broad, having a clear coherent and strategic intervention logic is essential. It allows to prioritise and agree as a group on what the engagement ambitions are, both as a GPG overall, and also to clarify how the GPG efforts link to the work of other parts of the PfR alliance and work at both regional and country level.

JC 2.4: The PfR alliance was governed and managed appropriately and ongoing and past lessons related to governance and management were identified and taken up

Summary: The governance, management and coordination of the GPG is assessed positively by the respondents. Changes in staff composition did require investment in trust building, while this is considered essential to allow for good cooperation among representatives of different alliance partners. Also now, keeping a good dialogue in the group is considered key. The members of the GPG all participate on behalf of their own organisation, with own mandates and interests. There is a tendency to compete and push the own organisation first. While the PfR I did not yet have a global programme, the overall decision to work as a joint group and coordinate efforts at global level itself is a direct result of a lesson learnt in PR I.

PfR was developed ten years ago, by a group of friends who trusted each other. These people moved on, and the current group consists of almost all new people, so there was a need to build the relationship. The participating organisations in the GPG each join with a strong interest and mandate of their organisation. This may collide with the common good everyone pursues. A tendency to compete and to push for the prominence of the own organisation or agenda has been noted by respondents. The GPG therefore invested a lot in building trust, and ensuring everyone is in this together, so everyone should for example share opportunities, rather than keeping those for oneself. But after all, the GPG members are representing individual organisations, with different bilateral donors, so this will remain challenging and tricky to manage.

The GPG has monthly meetings and organises exceptional additional meetings to get feedback in case of sudden opportunities and risks. Keeping a good dialogue within the team is essential. This requires having the time to explain, share views and build on that. While GPG members have to make sure they are open to everyone, there is always time pressure. So the work is always both about being flexible and inclusive enough while there is little time.

As PfR I had no global programme, no specific lessons were to be applied. Though overall the decision to work as a joint group and coordinate efforts at global level in itself is a direct result of a lesson learnt in PR I.

EQ 3: On value added and complementarity: To what extent has the PfR's support been of added value and complementary to what non-PfR programme actors have been doing in support of IRM and have the efforts of the PfR alliance and the NL MFA been complementary to each other and of added value to both?

Summary: The added value of the PfR is well defined, and confirmed by external stakeholders. Key is the linking of scales: through its community networks and experience the GPG has a good understanding of local risks and of local solutions to build resilience, which it can share at global level. The GPG efforts have been regularly implemented in a complementary and synergistic manner together with non-PfR supported partners. One example is shared where PfR decided it is more effective to work via an alliance, as they have more capacity and influence. Non-PfR actors did share their appreciation for PfR's efforts. The added value and complementarity of the PfR mainly stems from PfR's focused approach, reputation and willingness to collaborate, its expertise, real experiences and case studies, its strength to make unique contributions to global conferences, and the connections PfR makes between different stakeholder groups in different policy fields. The GPG has cooperated well with the NL MFA (Inclusive Green Growth department) in several policy processes, also at the initiative of the NL MFA. The NL MFA reached out to PfR to engage and NL MFA opened doors for PfR to high-level meetings, creating space for PfR partners to engage.

JC 3.1: The PfR support has been complementary and of added value to efforts of non-PfR supported actors for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels

Summary: PfR's key comparative advantages include the combined expertise and experience of the organisations but even more so the linking of scales: through its community networks and experience the GPG has a good understanding of local risks and of local solutions to build resilience. At global level, PfR has built partnerships with governments, inter-governmental organisations, academia and practitioners, bringing local voices to the global arena. The GPG efforts have been regularly implemented in a complementary and synergistic manner together with non-PfR supported partners. One example is shared where PfR decided it is more effective to work via an alliance, as they have more capacity and influence. The choice to have less of a political or confrontational approach, does also mean some partners are considered too activist for PfR. The number of respondents consulted for this case study is limited. Overall, non-PfR actors appreciate the efforts of PfR, and also explain the added value vis-a-vis their own engagements. These include PfR's focused approach, reputation and willingness to collaborate, its expertise, its real experiences and case studies, its strength to make unique contributions to global conferences, and the connections PfR makes between different stakeholder groups in different policy fields.

A lot of other organisations pursue (elements of) IRM. What sets PfR apart is for one that it brings together the expertise, experience and themes of five partner organisations. The GPG is about making lessons coming together, and making the whole greater than the sum of its parts. This allows the GPG to tell a much more complete narrative, and think holistically, by linking messages, and linking fields of expertise and diverse areas of work. This makes the PfR strong in the global debate, having one voice and waiving the same flag in the varying fora.

In PfR's reports, the key comparative advantage of the alliance is identified as the linking of scales. Community networks and experiences allow the GPG to have a good understanding of local risks and local solutions to build resilience. PfR also draws its credibility from being embedded at community level. That sets PfR apart from some other alliances, like BRACED. Everything the GPG does is grounded at the local level, and global exchanges are always linked to evidence.

PfR connects its local work to global policy and financing systems. This creates opportunities for upscaling. While otherwise some efforts would remain working successfully, but only on a small scale, the upscaling approach allows to make the impact much larger. This is also an effective way to draw the interest of investors. At the same time, such global attention also allows other stakeholders to profit from the work done, for example via GNDR.

The choice to have less of a political or confrontational approach, does impact on the choice of partners. The Global resilience partnership (GRP) is about climate action, but is considered too activist for the GPG. PfR rather focuses on bringing common messages and aims for leveraging.

The GPG works well together with other networks and organisations, and actively promotes to strengthen the mutual complementarity, rather than competition. In 2016 and 2017, the annual reports note that the GPG has made 'tremendous strides in the pursuit of establishing partnerships with governments, inter-governmental organisations, academia and practitioners to strengthen especially the GPG trajectories on climate change and ecosystem management'. In 2016 and 2017, these stakeholders included the UNOCHA/UN Environment network in the Environment and Humanitarian Action Network, the African Union, the IFRC-led One Billion Coalition, the UN Secretary General's A2R initiative on Resilience, GFDRR, ISDR's 20 Resilient Cities initiative, and networks like BRACED, PEDDR, and CIDSE. Recent examples include:

A partnership with UNEP, since last May 2019, on a DEVCO funded project Eco-DRR, around upscaling community-based Eco-DRR, 2019-2021. UNEP sees how the two programmes (PfR II and Eco-DRR) can build synergies, in carrying forward implementation and upscaling. It is useful for UNEP to work with PfR partners as it allows them to build on PfR's existing work and because of PfR's field implementation experience. And the integrated DRR approach is noted to be quite similar to Ecosystem-based Disaster Risk Reduction' (Eco-DRR).

WI focuses on wetlands, considering both users and stakeholders, which involves many parties, like engineers, because of the impact of infrastructure, and WI always work with local communities. The impact of degradation on wetlands is huge, with high risks for local communities. The PfR allows to cooperate with humanitarian response, when disasters happen, but also to consider how to limit the impact of disasters. That link is also made with EcoShape. The importance of PfR is linking the response and livelihood focus with the prevention focus.

The GPG also linked to GNDR to see how to strengthen both actor's work, and to strengthen the link between climate change and DRR, in terms of messaging, and by bringing the two communities together to create a better understanding. IFRC, Care and Cordaid are all GNDR members, and Cordaid is one of GNDR's most active members. 'Stichting GNDR' is also registered in NL, hosted by Cordaid. Currently discussions are ongoing how GNDR can partner in PfR III.

WI works with PEDDR, it has been a member of PEDDR for a long time, but now it frames this work as part of the PfR alliance efforts. Where PEDDR is quite academic, and focused on Eco-DRR, it makes no link with the humanitarian organisations. That is now increasingly added to the picture, and that's what PfR has contributed to PEDDR. Currently, PEDRR and WI are working together for the next Words into Action (a series which provides practical guidance to support the implementation of the Sendai Framework). PfR could become a member on its own of PfR, some discussion took place on that, but it never got formalised.

In terms of water management, there are many water conferences and alliances. Also WNF and IUCN work on wetlands, but there is less attention for the relation with DRR. PfR has a very clear role to link the humanitarian side to water management as 90 percent of the disasters are water related.

Resilience Brokers is mainly focused on Cordaid's urban work, and the urban resilience initiative of which Cordaid is a partner. While there is not a formalised cooperation, Resilience Brokers are interested in the peer collaboration and support. Resilience Brokers is now also working with WI in the context of the EC climate-KIC (EIT Climate-KIC is a European knowledge and innovation community, working towards a prosperous, inclusive, climate-resilient society founded on a circular, zero-carbon economy, <https://www.climate-kic.org/>), focusing on nature-based solutions.

PfR sometimes decides it is more effective to work with an alliance, as they have more capacity and influence, and rather supports them. For example, the Global Mangrove alliance focuses on nature-based solutions is both interesting from a climate adaptation and mitigation perspective, and is also an example of how they worked effectively.

One respondent suggests to consider partnering with peer organisations outside the NL. Strengthening the international perspective and experience, may also strengthen the now exclusively Duch partners' advocacy efforts.

The limited group of external stakeholders consulted are generally positive about the work of PfR and see the added value. Several external respondents have been working mostly with one or just a few of the PfR Alliance members, and are not much informed about the role of other PfR alliance members. In such cases, the direct partner's expertise is most valued, and the contributions of others are either not known or assessed quite critically. For example, Cordaid is noted to have a more limited DRR experience and is lagging behind on Eco-DRR.

Several non-PfR actors especially welcome how the PfR leverages the strengths of their partners. The idea of the PfR alliance that all members bring in different strengths and foster cross learning, so as to help each other to learn and fill gaps is appreciated. Also PfR's gender expertise is noted, which is brought together with expertise on wetlands conservation and wash initiatives.

International frameworks like Sendai and the SDGs each recognise the need to work with all stakeholders, multilateral actors, development banks, and the UN. But in practice, people working on SDGs or on Sendai don't know what is happening in the other movements. PfR creates opportunities to collaborate, and bring integrated sectors to the table.

Also, PfR facilitates that CSOs can make inputs to global processes, which is considered of great added value. Global frameworks and processes are not necessarily listening to people most at risks and PfR brings these perspectives to amplify the processes, which allows plans to be informed by practice.

Because PfR engages and is present in ten countries, the alliance can actually influence decisions at UNFCCC level, as the only way to actively play a role in those meetings is by being active at the national level and being able to join the country delegation.

PfR is also valued for bringing a breath of fresh air to conferences. There can be a tendency to have an overrepresentation of different topics, rather than having different perspectives, different types of responses, and modes of analysis. PfR brings in a call to action and shares knowledge that is critical to include in standard practice.

UNEP mainly works with the PEDDR group, a global thematic platform of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) which seeks to promote and scale-up implementation of Nature-based Solutions for Disaster Risk Reduction. PEDDR reaches out to WI especially, since that is one of their closest partners with whom they have been working for over a decade. WI is noted to really understand Eco-DRR. As an alliance, PfR can bring case study material and experiences, but for the respondent, WI has most expertise. What each partner adds individually is not clear, but there is a value added of PfR which should be continued in a potential third phase of the PfR programme.

The name of PfR is recognised, and noted to have a good reputation. PfR organised a well-attended side event during the DRR-PEDDR joint event. PEDDR is interested to collaborate and experienced the same attitude from PfR, for example during the EDDs, but also to join the PEDDR regional hubs.

The IFRC in New York is positive about the involvement of the GPG in the SDG agenda, but also about the linkages that the GPG is assumed to be making between the SDGs agenda and the UN Habitat work which is followed by ICRC in Geneva.

GNDR, the Global Network for DRR, notes it is doing similar things to PfR, but at a different scale. PfR has a very focused and professional approach in 10 countries, GNDR is working globally. GNDR is also invited to be part of their external advisory group.

JC 3.2: The PfR programme and the resilience-related efforts of NL MFA were complementary to each other and of added value to both the PfR alliance and NL MFA

Summary: The global policy group has cooperated well with NL MFA (Inclusive Green Growth, IGG department) in several policy processes, also at the initiative of MFA NL, which indicates their work is considered relevant by IGG. The NL MFA reached out to PfR to engage with the UNFCCC COPs, and NL MFA opened doors for PfR to high level meetings like at the COP24. This strategic partnership also created space for PfR partners to engage. Also with other NL government representatives, cooperation is good. For example, joint efforts were undertaken with the NL DRR Focal Point, and PfR engaged with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment in context of the New Urban Agenda and with the Ministry of Economic Affairs. Consistent interactions between PfR and NL MFA strengthen knowledge on policy directions of the Netherlands government.

In different trajectories, the GPG has cooperated both with NL MFA (Inclusive Green Growth, IGG department) and also with other NL government representatives. Especially with representatives from the IGG Department, there is good collaboration and joint preparation for (international) events.

In the context of the urban trajectory PfR engaged with the NL MFA and the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment during the preparatory meetings in Indonesia to explore opportunities for PfR's inclusion in the NL government delegation during the Habitat-III Quito meetings.

The PfR Networking event at the Global Platform in Cancun received strong support from the NL DRR Focal Point. The meeting was a success, bringing many relevant actors together to discuss experiences from the global, national and local levels on initiatives to strengthen community resilience.

The NL MFA reached out to PfR and suggested ways of engaging with the UNFCCC COP TEP meetings in Bonn in May 2017. The ministry also actively connected PfR to the Stockholm Environment Institute with whom PfR actively engaged to secure a speaking slot for PfR to advance the community resilience agenda during the UNFCCC COP23 preparatory meetings.

Subsequently, in the 2017 UNFCCC-Technical Examination Meetings, IGG was instrumental in facilitating access for PfR to Task Forces designing sessions on resilience. The access and presence of PfR at the Technical Expert Meeting (TEM) in Bonn in April 2017 further opened doors for PfR to be considered as a credible partner to be in the organising committee for TEM 2018. PfR was then included in the Dutch government delegation during COP23; Dutch Government officials actively participated in PfR events during GPDRR and subsequent government communication on Cancun reflected this engagement.

Collaboration between PfR and NL's MFA's IGG remained strong in 2018. Good relations open doors to high level meetings (e.g. access to Minister Kaag at the COP24). Consistent interactions strengthen knowledge on policy directions of the Netherlands government and feedback on where programme can be strengthened and what opportunities can be optimised (e.g. on the Climate Agenda/ Technical Examinations Meetings. Other Ministries (e.g. the Ministry of Economic Affairs) have been valuable in getting PfR to high level policy making platforms (e.g. NL Embassy in Rome and access to meetings advancing the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 2417 on Hunger and Conflict).

EQ 4: Effectiveness of engagement (from inputs to results/ capacity strengthening support): To what extent has the PfR alliance been effective in applying good practices in the design, delivery and monitoring of capacity strengthening support for IRM to PfR contracted and non-contracted partners working at national and sub-national levels?

Summary: While the inception report does anticipate that the GPG will contribute to the strengthening of capacities, capacity strengthening interventions were not explicitly part of the GPG approach. It is not clear why it was decided the GPG would not play an explicit capacity strengthening role in supporting country programmes to understand global IRM priorities and contextualise them to their setting. The GPG has not applied the DCF as a tool to strengthen dialogue capacities and the GPG has not developed a capacity strengthening planning document or diagnostic exercise to justify the choice of tools or instruments proposed. In the biannual PME reports, the GPG does report on capacity strengthening efforts and results, using the global consultations and conferences as opportunities for learning on the job, and making people aware of the bigger agendas at play, so as to become familiar with and effective at international policy forums.

JC 4.1: The PfR has designed capacity strengthening interventions at country level on the basis of a structured and participatory capacity diagnostic exercise that has examined different dimensions of capacity and engaged local stakeholders in the diagnostic process, including taking account of local contextual/ political dynamics.

Summary: The GPG has not applied the DCF as a tool to strengthen dialogue capacities. Capacity strengthening interventions were not explicitly part of the GPG approach. Still, the PfR II inception report (2016) does anticipate that the GPG will contribute to the strengthening of capacities. The GPG did do a stakeholder analysis but that is not related to specific capacity strengthening efforts.

The inception report does anticipate that the GPG will contribute to the strengthening of capacities:

Global and regional 'consultations' or conferences also serve to instil the urgency for change and create momentum for personal transformation. Where people initially may not perceive their work as part of a bigger agenda, when confronted with this agenda they may realise their professional missions link very well to it. [...] Together with the Humanitarian Diplomacy officer of PfR, responsible for the global advocacy program, relevant gatherings will be regularly reviewed for relevance to capacity strengthening. (PfR Inception report 2016: 41)

The global programme budget covers activities that support the actual strategic participation of civil society organisations, -networks representatives, and NGO in global conferences and fora and the joint (informal) preparation of such meetings. .. At the global level the development of L&A capacity is not so much the result of CD interventions, but rather the outcome of continuous M&E and learning from the engagement itself. (Ibid. 56)

However, at some point, it is unclear when and by whom, it has been decided that the GPG would not apply the DCF and related processes and interventions.

JC 4.2: The PfR has developed a capacity strengthening change strategy/ capacity strengthening plan at country level that reflects the findings of the capacity diagnostic process and which applies a range of complementary capacity strengthening tools/ instruments appropriate to addressing the identified capacity needs

Summary: The GPG has not developed a capacity strengthening planning document or diagnostic exercise to justify the choice of tools or instruments proposed. The global consultations and conferences are used as opportunities for capacity strengthening, learning on the job, making people aware of the bigger agendas at play, so as to become familiar with and effective at international policy forums. However, it seems especially PfR partners were involved in these, as for example in Indonesia, the programme's intermediary organisations have not been involved in activities or processes at the regional and global levels. In Mali, coalition members from the local level were hardly involved at any level beyond local government.

The GPG has not developed a capacity strengthening planning document or diagnostic exercise to justify the choice of tools or instruments proposed.

The global consultations and conferences are used as opportunities for capacity strengthening, learning on the job, making people aware of the bigger agendas at play, so as to become familiar with and effective at international policy forums. Evidence includes:

The PfR Global team supports capacity strengthening of CSOs from country and sub-national levels by facilitating dialogue opportunities to oftentimes closed global platforms. The learning is often a two-way stream as examples and experiences from the field tend to equally enhance knowledge and strengthen the evidence that the GPG uses in their lobby efforts.

The GPG developed a guideline on how to write a good policy brief .

PfR Uganda and Ethiopia requested the GPG to provide trainings on climate finance.

Local representatives brought compelling stories from their countries to demonstrate how communities are being supported to partner with their governments, academia and engage private sector to address resilience. In both Cancun and COP23, PfR ensured the presence of local CSOs at panels with global players and actively debated the implication of global policy frameworks in their contexts. Though in Indonesia the programme's intermediary organisations were not involved in activities or processes at the regional and global levels. Also for Mali, contributions to global and regional activities were principally carried out by staff from PfR Alliance partners.

JC 4.3: The PfR has developed a results framework and arrangements for progress monitoring (dialogue) that facilitate the tracking of changes in capacity over time, adjusting the sequencing and prioritisation of interventions (flexibility and responsiveness), and for reviewing the quality of the partnership (mutual accountability for results)

Summary: The GPG has not developed a results framework spelling out expected results to be achieved through capacity strengthening interventions. In its biannual PME reports, the GPG does report on capacity strengthening efforts and results.

EQ 5: Effectiveness and direct outcomes (capacity strengthening results & processes): To what extent have PfR implementing partners and communities built internal capacities and reached out, including with support of the five PfR partners, to advocate and lobby for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels?

Summary: The GPG built its own capacities, both within its own group and in the individual PfR alliance organisations. The group strengthened its knowledge on IRM based on the local and national PfR experiences. It also strengthened its support base and network, partnering with governments and other actors and alliances and bringing CSOs together. As an unintended effect, the PfR work leveraged several spin offs resulting in new projects and funding. The GPG strengthened the capacity of PfR implementing partners at the national level, through sharing knowledge, feedback and lessons learnt from the global level. The global consultations and conferences in which the GPG engages were at the same time also used as opportunities for learning on the job and broadening the network of PfR implementing partners. This way, the GPG facilitated PfR implementing partners' access to government and private sector actors, CSOs and knowledge organisations. In these engagements, primarily PfR staff from the national level amplified PfR's work from community frontlines to global platforms. At national level, the GPG supported country teams by creating space for dialogue and making inputs from a global perspective.

JC 5.1: The PfR support contributed to strengthening capacity of PfR contracted partners and other CSOs for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels

Summary: The GPG strengthened their own group's 'enabling capacities' for IRM, especially on knowledge and information, by learning from the local and national experiences of PfR implementing partners. Also vice versa, the GPG has shared knowledge and lessons learnt with the PfR country teams. In addition, the GPG has strengthened the understanding of IRM and its relevance also in the individual PfR alliance organisations. Through the GPG efforts, PfR implementing partners could expand their networks and ameliorate their understanding of global processes. At global level the GPG also strengthened their own support base for IRM, by bringing civil society together, mobilising actors and alliances and partnering with governments. The global consultations and conferences were used as opportunities for learning on the job, and making people aware of the bigger agendas at play, so as to become familiar with, and effective at, international policy forums.

The GPG has strengthened its own knowledge base through close collaboration with PfR country teams. Through its downstream work, including sharing knowledge and lessons, the GPG also strengthened the capacity of the PfR country teams.

The GPG has had an effect on the capacities of the individual alliance partner organisations. The GPG indicated they use their IRM examples also in their own organisation. For example, in WI, colleagues work now both with 'response' and 'prevention' actors because of PfR. And in the IFRC, PfR has been able to put environmental concerns much higher on the DRR agenda.

Especially in the IFRC, there is not a huge policy capability, and bringing in these policy interlinkages is noted to be important. A general disconnect between the daily RC work at country level and the global level frameworks is observed. While, as the RC societies have strong ties with the local authorities and governments, they could benefit from these linkages. The NLRC work on global frameworks is noted to be quite unique and new for the RC national societies in general. Initially, the NLRC also has to convince its

RC partners as, because the RC positions itself as neutral and impartial, the way the IFRC and RC movement relate to global frameworks is an ongoing debate. As a result, in the IFRC and RC movement the 'lobby' role of NLRC can be quite sensitive as some staff may see it as drifting the RC away from its humanitarian core mandate. However, according to a respondent from the IFRC, the joint GPG - PfR Mali (from the Malinese national RC) contribution to the HLPF is actually a good example of the way IFRC seeks to further strengthen the RC Movement's engagement to contribute to the SDGs.

Through the GPG linking efforts, the group facilitated access of PfR implementing partners which were able to broaden their networks and ameliorate their access to global processes. The skills of advocacy officers opened doors for PfR country teams to interact in high-level dialogues. As part of their role, the GPG ensures communities and people involved in local PfR processes can share their experiences at the global level. The global meetings in which PfR country teams participate are often jointly planned by the global, regional and country teams. The number of participants from the various PfR partners varies. Attendance at key meetings, like the biennial Global Platform for DRR conference can be quite large; in 2017 PfR participated with 26 people, 8 from the GPG, and 18 country participants and in 2019 PfR participated with 16 people, 6 from the GPG and 10 country participants.

The PfR country team lead from Mali was closely involved in the HLPF, joining the event under the 'umbrella' of IFRC. In Indonesia, the country lead already worked with the Indonesian government, and then joined the COP as part of the country delegation. Also the Uganda country team participated in the COPs. And for Indonesia, the country case study finds that PfR alliance members have incorporated learnings and insights obtained from the global level and regional levels into the training events and knowledge products they have organised for their stakeholders and intermediaries. This includes the Humanitarian Diplomacy Course and guidance note/ check list on lobbying and advocacy.

At global level the GPG strengthened their own support base for IRM and mobilised actors and alliances. The GPG used unofficial side events at COP meetings to bring civil society together by accommodating sessions on lesson learning and experience building. External stakeholders confirm that the PfR has a recognised role, as they are able to understand the trend and capture it.

Globally, PfR is noted to have enough credibility to be seen as a partner and alliance of choice for governments to turn to for assistance to develop DRR policies. For example, when DEVCO was negotiating the new deal with UNIP, PfR was included with these negotiations.

Strengthening the role of CSOs to be more articulate in policy fora and engaging in global policies is agreed to be an important agenda. The global consultations and conferences were used as opportunities for learning on the job, and making people aware of the bigger agendas at play, so as to become familiar with and effective at international policy forums. While no specific examples could be identified in this case study, one respondent referred to an example where people from Kenya needed to be pushed to speak out at a global forum. The GPG then explained to them that it is fine to share their opinion, and they took that lesson back and applied it in their own work, building on what they learnt.

The country lead of Indonesia was at the COP as part of the Indonesian government delegation. The GPG then exchanged information on how the COP is working to develop negotiation skills around the COP. In the context of the GAP analysis, the GPG put the country lead in contact with the CARE gender expert.

JC 5.2: The PfR supported PfR contracted partners and other CSOs strategically engaged with IRM stakeholders in their environment at local, national, regional and global levels to promote IRM in policies, influence investment mechanisms in support of IRM and influence practice that takes of IRM.

Summary: The GPG mainly engages through lobbying activities in support of IRM at a global level. It engages with a diverse range of actors, including government, private sector and knowledge organisations. In these engagements, the GPG also engaged local and national voices to amplify PfR's work from community frontlines to global platforms. The GPG also engaged with the regional level, but to a more limited extent. At national level, the GPG added value by creating space for dialogue and making inputs from a wider perspective, always in a support role to the country teams.

The GPG has engaged with PfR implementing partners at national levels, but always in support of the PfR country teams who take the lead at national level. The bureaucratic levels in countries can be quite political and difficult to access. At country level, GPG members explained they can play a role by creating more space for CSOs so that conversations can take place. The GPG joined the country teams, and provide a 'buffer' to political conversations by bringing in a different perspective. That way, the GPG can take the local issues out of the local context. In such cases, the country teams are in the lead as they are the experts, and GPG members play a support role.

The GPG has also engaged at regional level, but references to cooperation and coordination at regional level are more limited. The GPG facilitated access to networks and contacts, for example at the AU. PfR Mali programme staff participated in several regional meetings to promote the Sendai Framework, such as the Africa-Arab DRR preparatory conference in Mauritius (2016) and the Africa-Arab DRR preparatory conference in Tunis (2018) during which PfR Mali staff participated in panels and knitted regional and international contacts to gradually promote IRM and shared experiences in supporting resilience originating from the Mopti region. The GPG however notes it is challenging to link outcomes of regional platform meetings to the Global Platform on DRR.

The GPG has especially engaged at the global level, and has involved and joined forces with a range of global actors (see also JC 3.1). In 2018, the GPG established several entry points to the Global Centre on Adaptation, identifying various persons of influence and using various advocacy opportunities including the Adaptation Futures Conference in Cape Town, South Africa. The GPG agreed on Action Tracks for influencing with the Global Centre on Adaptation and also in 2019, PfR has looked at coordinating work with GCA (as explained in the annual plan - the 2019 report on results of the GPG was not available for this case study).

PfR has been active in identifying opportunities that bring local and national voices to global platforms to amplify PfR's work from community frontlines. In these efforts, PfR implementing partners from various countries participated (Mali, Indonesia). For example, the engagement in the SDG dialogues was done jointly with the Mali Country Team. The global team and the Mali country team devised a strategy that enabled PfR Mali to engage the Mali government and advocated for the inclusion of civil society in Mali to contribute to the Mali Voluntary National Review Report. This experience was presented at the High-Level Political Forum in New York.

JC 5.3: The five PfR alliance partners assisted and facilitated lobbying and advocacy for IRM beyond national borders with a view to influence decisions at regional and global levels

Summary: A range of examples can be identified where the GPG facilitated PfR-supported CSOs to share their experiences at global level. For example in the urban trajectory, and for the SDG agenda. Reference has also been made to the GPG sharing feedback and new learning on IRM related policies, investments and practices from the global level back to the national and local level. For example in the SDG trajectory and relating to the Sendai Framework Target E.

PfR partners in Uganda financed their participation in the annual COPs, which is said to have contributed to a better information stream from the global level to the national level about the relevance of domesticating global PfR contributions at the national level. The PFCC (the Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change in Uganda) for example organised trainings to members of parliament working in climate change and foreign affairs.

The PfR Mali Alliance partners engaged at West-African regional, pan-African and global level in the lobbying and advocacy for IRM. This engagement mainly manifested itself through inputs provided to conference outcome papers and the organisation of side events or panels to share relevant experiences on how to promote resilience at the local levels.

JC 5.4: Potentially unintended positive and negative effects of PfR support have (not) been identified and addressed by the PfR alliance and its contracted partners and other CSOs

Summary: Positive effects in terms of spin offs of the PfR work have been identified. The extent to which these, or possibly additional opportunities were adequately identified and promoted cannot be judged.

Using the insights of IRM, combining the Global Frameworks and using the space also resulted in various kinds of spin offs, and the creation of new projects, of which PfR has been the driver, though the task division within PfR and the specific role of the GPG has not been clarified.

For example, the DEVCO funded project Eco-DRR, 2019-2021: on upscaling community-based Eco-DRR. This project is implemented by UN Environment and PfR and is focused on increasing community's resilience and reducing disaster risks through ecosystem-based solutions. The project has three pillars; i) Leveraging: public and private investment for scaling up Eco-DRR in two countries, ii) Demonstrating: models for scaling-up Eco-DRR with local actors in five countries, and iii) Mainstreaming: catalyse new investments in ecosystems and new Eco-DRR initiatives through capacity-building.

Also the Water as Leverage programme is a spin off; a joint programme involving a range of actors, including PfR, the Dutch government, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, the Global Center on Adaptation, FMO and UN Habitat.

The work with the Global Mangrove alliance, also brought new funding to the Global Mangrove Watch initiative, and stimulated the Global Mangrove alliance to focus more on *To plant or not To plant*.

EQ 6: Longer-term outcomes and impact (change): To what extent has the enhanced advocacy and lobbying capacity (and activities) among PfR contracted partners and other non-contracted CSOs led to enhanced policies, better investment mechanisms and improved practices for IRM at national, regional and global levels and to more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level?

Summary: The effects of the GPG were positive and have contributed to enhanced IRM policies, improved IRM investment mechanisms and ameliorated IRM practices. The extent to which outcomes could be achieved differs for the four trajectories: the GPG invested varying degrees of capacity in each of them; each trajectory operates in very different contexts and the starting point and enabling environment for each specific lobby activity varies. Even more, for their practical implementation at country level, the local circumstances and political traction have a crucial role and influence on the results. For the individual trajectories, intermediate outcomes identified include an increased awareness and acknowledgement by stakeholders of the importance of mainstreaming IRM in sector policies, investments and practice; and in some trajectories, also increased ambitions could be identified among either governments, CSOs, academia, or private sector actors at global level. Evidence on results of increased coherence between legal/ policy frameworks and more coherent action is more indirect. Some evidence is identified on both enhanced legal/ policy frameworks, laws and regulations, enhanced responsible public and private investments and enhanced investments, including through outcomes related to upscaling. The GPG has created space in the global arena, and used it for CSOs to address issues related to IRM. The effects of these efforts on more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level cannot be established in the context of this case study at this stage.

JC 6.1: Over the course of the past 5 years, IRM policies have been enhanced, IRM investment mechanisms improved, and IRM practices changed for the better at national, regional and global levels and resulted in more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level

Summary: Achieving these types of ambitions generally require long-term efforts, and from that perspective, less than four years of implementation is a rather short time-frame. The contexts in which each of the four global policy frameworks are situated, differ a lot. Even more, implementation of the global frameworks at country level is to a large extent determined by local circumstances and (lack of) political traction. The starting point and enabling environment for each specific lobby activity differs. In some policy areas and countries, changes have been more incremental, in other areas the GPG achieved more progress. The GPG invested varying degrees of capacity in each of the four trajectories. The following section lists examples of GPG's contribution to both intermediate outcomes and outcomes, which have been clustered around changes in terms of i) increased awareness and a broadening of the audience acknowledging the importance of IRM; ii) increased ambitions among key actors; iii) increased coherence between legal/ policy frameworks; iv) enhanced policies, investments and practices, including through outcomes related to upscaling; and v) stronger CSO space at a global level to address IRM issues in policies, investment mechanisms and practices. The effects of these efforts on more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level cannot be established in the context of this case study at this stage because this desk study did not allow to gather the necessary information and data in this regard.

i) Increased awareness and acknowledgement of mainstreaming IRM

Political leaders and policy decision makers at local, national, regional and global levels are more aware of IRM. The importance of mainstreaming IRM is acknowledged by stakeholders in sector policies, investments and practice. Evidence includes respondent's references to the following changes:

- The silos between different trajectories like climate change, SDGs, development and humanitarian were much stronger ten years ago.
- Resilience is much more on everyone's agenda. The GPG used local cases and examples to inspire other actors which helps to set the agenda. While people in global dialogues can exchange a lot about what 'should be done', the PfR shares examples of 'how it can be done' with real experiences.
- GPG inspired GNDR to focus more on ecosystems and even more, the new GNDR strategy is noted to be influenced by PfR.

Specifically on the Sendai trajectory:

- WI, with PfR and PEDDR, identified gaps in the Sendai Framework, or issues getting too little attention, and part of the work has focused on influencing that. Some of these issues have grown in importance and WI drew attention to these at every platform. For example, integrated water resource management and green infrastructure.
- The GPG put topics on the agenda of governments and DRR practitioners that need attention in relation to DRR policy and investments.
- 'Build back better' in DRR gets more attention. In the past, the focus after a disaster was to build the infrastructure back the way it was before. Now there is more understanding that root causes, social capacity and ecosystem need to be taken into account from a system thinking perspective.
- There is an increasing awareness of the role of water management, in which PR contributed the link between the humanitarian perspective and water management, as ninety percent of the disasters are water related.

Specifically on the Climate Change trajectory:

- The GPG put disasters on the UNFCCC agenda, and that way broadened the climate agenda. The group ensured a focus on the most vulnerable stakeholders is included, which supports that global commitments are translated into actions on the ground.

Specifically on the SDGs agenda:

- The GPG was able to localise the SDGs, by sharing how the Mali government does consultations in local provinces, which was a specific theme of the HLPF. In 2018, the Mali government presented its VNR to the UN and PfR Mali paved the way for wider civil society contributions. The importance of risk-informed policies and decisions was highlighted and increased the awareness within the Malinese government. PfR accompanied the official Mali government delegation to the High Level Political Forum. At the conference PfR also participated in panel discussions.

Specifically on the Urban trajectory:

- The last several years there is an increasing recognition of the importance of urbanisation, though, a real urban focus in actual programmes and design has not yet been achieved.
- GPG brought messages to the global arena about the essential role of communities in city planning and city risk mapping.
- PfR worked together with the UN habitat Barcelona DRR office, to organise an event during the 2019 UN Habitat general assembly. (Cordaid applied to organise an event, and it was a coincidence they got put together with UN Habitat.)

ii) Increased ambitions among key actors

Evidence identified relating to an increased ambition on IRM principles among governments, CSOs, academia, private sector at global, regional and (sub)national levels includes referenes to the following changes:

- In 2016 and 2017 the GPG focused a lot on advocating for IRM principles to be included in the follow up policy statements. In 2018, the PfR alliance found IRM principles are effectively reflected in most international policy frameworks.
- The GPG involved PfR implementing partners in the global consultations and conferences which increased their awareness of the bigger agendas, which is noted to have resulted in more southern leadership.
- At global level there has been a shift in the agenda. For example, in climate change discussions, conversations are now more about people and vulnerability rather than simply focussing on CO2 emissions.
- The GPG has established a strong narrative with the NL MFA on why the conversation should be more focussed on vulnerable people.

Specifically on the Sendai trajectory:

- The GPG has been effective in influencing the Global Platform on DRR agenda and hence the stakeholders dialogue on the Sendai Framework implementation with regards to several important PfR topics: Ecosystems and Water-related risks (connected to risk-informed investments and scaling up investments in ecosystems), nature based solutions for peacebuilding, the role of wetlands in water stressed areas, Green-Blue-Grey infrastructure, Gender, Forecast-based Financing, and Urban resilience through the IRM approach (to reduce risks and to avert future disasters).
- The GPG organised an IRM working session on the water sector and on green infrastructure as part of the Global Platform on DRR. These sessions were well attended, including by high-level policy makers. The GPG prepared concept notes, actively invited people, and gave input to the outcome document.
- GPG successfully influenced text in the Global Platform on DRR outcome documents; the Chair's Summary and High Level Outcome document are now both underlining the importance of green infrastructure.
- The GPG has influenced the outcome documents of regional DRR Platforms.
- In the Sendai trajectory, the GPG Influenced some government statements (of Guatemala and South Sudan).

Specifically on the Climate Change trajectory:

- The PfR programme has the advantage of being present in 10 countries, which gives them an entrance point to join the country delegations to for example the UNFCCC meetings. That is noted to be essential to, as otherwise NGOs can only play a role in side events which are far less influential.
- Institutions, science and UNFCCC texts about Climate Action reflect many of the PfR viewpoints, including on issues like the need for more attention for the most vulnerable and a stronger focus on the need for local action.

iii) increased coherence between legal/ policy frameworks

As many people in these policy fields are noted to be still working in silos, PfR aims to make interlinkages and convey how the IRM approach can be used to make their work more coherent. PfR brings actors together from different policy fields and from different countries, who each have different approaches and experiences. While each policy field has its own specific narratives and vocabulary, PfR aims to reach a common understanding. Contributions of the GPG to more coherent action of governments, CSOs,

academia and private sector actors at global, regional and (sub)national and increased coherence between legal/ policy frameworks are challenging to identify, but respondents refer to examples where PfR was able to mobilise other actors and alliances to work more coherently.

Specifically on the Climate Change trajectory:

- In Madrid, the UNFCCC brought development and climate people together for the first time, which was co-facilitated by the IFRC.
- The Global commission on adaptation, convened by the Global Center on Adaptation and WRI, are responsible for different action tracks. IFRC leads on the disaster track, and the GPG recently got the opportunity to cooperate with the UK government who's leading on the resilience track. The GPG has played a thought leadership role, thinking about what the partnership should be about and defining its goals and targets.

iv) Enhanced legal/ policy frameworks, laws and regulations, enhanced responsible public and private investments and enhanced investments, including through outcomes related to upscaling

Some evidence could be found of enhanced policy frameworks and regulations as well as accountability mechanisms.

Specifically on the Sendai trajectory:

- Following the GPG's working session on green infrastructure at the Global Platform on DRR, the GPG was also able to influence the Sendai monitoring document, providing input into (voluntary) indicators on Green Infrastructure.

Specifically on the Climate Change trajectory:

- The GPG has been a steady partner in the UNFCCC arena, continuously sharing the PfR messages and these documents directly inform the decisions of the COPs.
- The GPG has helped shape the international adaptation agenda, strongly positioning resilience as a vehicle for implementation and funding mechanisms. Multiple texts now reflect the importance of ecosystems and landscape approaches, gender and also concrete ideas such as Forecast based Financing.

In terms of enhanced investments, in addition to the above noted outcome in the Climate Change trajectory, spin-offs of the PfR programme did contribute to enhanced responsible public and private investments. The Water as Leverage programme for example is a joint programme involving a range of actors, including PfR, the Dutch government, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, the Global Center on Adaptation, FMO and UN Habitat. In other cases, some intermediate steps have been achieved in terms of opening doors to investors. Catalysing the discourse of IRM down to enhanced IRM responsible public and private investments also requires funders and investors to adapt their policies to make them risk-informed and earmarked for IRM. For that, funders and investors need to have the right incentives, and changing their modus operandi is challenging.

The LSE Research on 2018 has been a key milestone to document case studies on investments based on PfR's experiences in Kenya and Indonesia. This work is expected to strengthen PfR's own lobby positioning with the private sector and business networks on advancing advocacy on responsible investments. GPG's efforts in targeting corporate entities for dialogues has been progressing at a slow pace.

Specifically on the Sendai trajectory:

- The GPG generated a lot of attention for 'building with nature' approach, using a case from PfR Indonesia as an example, and now it seeks development banks to invest in it. The Asia development bank hosted a workshop with the Global Center on Adaptation to stimulate action on a larger scale and to mobilise political support and resources.
- Engagements with the 'Dutch Water Sector' became more successful via the 'Water as Leverage' programmes which opened doors for responsible investments with this sector.

Specifically on the Climate Change trajectory:

- The GPG dialogues on Climate Finance have resulted in an entry and dialogue with the GCF. The first roll out of a Climate Finance 101 in Guatemala has been pioneered. This event was successful and provides a way to scale up the broader need for capacity strengthening on climate finance dialogues.

The material produced by PfR strengthens the capacity in the PfR Alliance and beyond to implement according to IRM principles. It has been used by members of GNDR, and especially PfR work on fragile contexts linked to DRR is noted as an important contribution, as well as the clarification PfR has brought to the landscape approach. PfR is noted to have played a critical role in organising thinking about fragile context experiences.

Specifically on the Sendai trajectory:

- The Sendai Framework has prepared several *Word into action guidelines*, to accompany the implementation. The GPG Influenced this implementation guidance for the Sendai Framework and contributed for example to the Words into Action on Transboundary River Management. The 'Build back better' approach also gets attention in this Words into Action guideline. As these are guidelines for countries, they directly contribute to enhanced practices.
- The 'Build back better' approach is also included in the CBD implementation guidance on Eco-DRR and Ecosystem based Adaptation.

As part of the PfR approach, the GPG has contributed to successfully upscaling several local pilots and solutions. The GPG brings tools and guidelines which are tested locally up to the global fora, and influences publications and initiatives. GPG helps to create political support for IRM approaches, which, when embedded in national policies, can trickle down. The GPG played a role in sharing such cases at regional and global meetings.

Specifically on the Sendai trajectory:

- The green infrastructure approach was applied in a small village in Indonesia, tested and adapted to local circumstances. Then the PfR country team found a political partner to upscale the approach to other settings. GPG used this case as an upscaling example in international fora. As the GPG was also able to influence the Sendai monitoring document (following the GPG's working session on green infrastructure at the Global Platform on DRR), which now also includes green infrastructure. This way the GPG pushes from two sides for better integration of green infrastructure; through the Sendai monitoring as well as by upscaling concrete green infrastructure examples.

Specifically on the Urban trajectory:

- The MURIA (Marunda Urban Resilience in Action) project in Jakarta contains replicable processes and lessons learnt. It is therefore, gaining traction worldwide and has won an award for best practices. The approach is being constantly improved with input from various contexts, sectors and areas. Based on MURIA experiences the approach has been multiplied in Philippines, Myanmar,

South Africa and Sierra Leone. It is strived after that authorities from other cities will endorse the model and solutions and can self-replicate in their city.

PfR also invested in knowledge sharing of the lessons from the ten countries, and produced a lot of material. To bring that further and ensure it is not only about local but about transformational changes, it is essential to reach out to other partners and broaden the audience. PfR presented its experiences from the ten countries at GNDR conferences. This way PfR initiated, or enhanced a thought process among practitioners who can then see how to contextualise and use it themselves. One stakeholder suggests the PfR could strengthen this outreach and invest more in using the existing networks.

v) Stronger CSO space

The GPG contributed to meaningful consultation and participation of local actors in the design and implementation of policy, practice and investment. The GPG has made sure the voices of communities at risk are heard in the policy processes. The GPG uses these examples to speak about their realities, their agenda and lessons learnt in the global arena, so as to make sure it is not just policy makers and academics that make the decisions. The global group invited local PfR representatives with specific experience to global meetings to present or join a panel as they are the critical protagonists of their struggles. Such meetings influence the negotiation processes taking place.

The GPG efforts also opened up space for civil society, as a dedicated actor, to participate in national, regional and global processes. The work of GPG aims to strengthen the role of CS and push for inclusiveness. One outcome reported is that DEVCO has recognised the importance of community resilience, and of enabling Civil Society to play an active role. CS is not necessarily part of the global processes, but resilience can be a contentious issue, so the space to negotiate is needed. GPG created space for its own involvement and opened doors for PfR country teams to interact at high level dialogues. By inviting community representatives or CSOs to the global meetings, who can share their concrete examples, this actually brings people together, and it can create space to 'circumvent the political domain'. At country level the GPG could support the country teams by creating a more neutral space for CSOs to have conversations with policy makers. The exchanges were made less political, by bringing a different perspective so that local issues could be considered in a wider context.

JC 6.2: The enhanced capacity among PfR implementing partners and their networks and communities has contributed to the mainstreaming of IRM in sector policies, improved IRM investment mechanisms, changed IRM practices for the better at national, regional and global levels and resulted in more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level

Summary: The outcomes identified in JC6.1 are resulting from the GPG efforts - as well as from other contributing actors and factors. The GPG regularly involved PfR implementing partners, and even more so, used their experiences as a key input. As such, PfR implementing partners did contribute to increased awareness and a broadening of the audience acknowledging the importance of IRM; increased ambitions among key actors; increased coherence between legal/ policy frameworks and more coherent action; enhanced legal/ policy frameworks, laws and regulations, enhanced responsible public and private investments and enhanced investments, including through outcomes related to upscaling; and stronger CSO space to strengthen the policies, investment mechanisms and practices. However, data available in the context of this case study do now allow to establish more precisely the specific contribution of the 'enhanced capacity among PfR implementing partners' to these results, vis-a-vis other actors' contributions and the role of other factors.

EQ 7: Sustainability: To what extent has the PfR support contributed to a structurally strengthened and sustainable engagements of its implementing partners to promote IRM at national, regional and global levels?

Summary: The GPG did strengthen the implementing partners' engagements at global level, but the extent to which this resulted in more ownership, also beyond specific examples, or whether it is structural, cannot be determined yet. The extent to which PfR partners, beyond the GPG, are able to lobby for IRM on their own at global level is difficult to establish. The strengthened lobby engagement on IRM by joining forces in the GPG has resulted in outcomes. To mainstream IRM, a continuous engagement is needed, especially on 'investments' and 'practice'. And that engagement is stronger when the PfR partners join forces. For that purpose, a coordinating body for global engagement on IRM, representing and used by all the PfR partners will continue to be relevant.

JC 7.1: The effects of the PfR support are owned by the PfR implementing partners

Summary: Looking at the work done by the GPG, the leadership and ownership of PfR implementing actors of this global lobby work has been strengthened to the extent PfR partners were involved in the global processes. It is noted there is more southern leadership. Part of this involvement specifically focused on making PfR implementing partners aware of the bigger agendas at play, so as to become familiar with, and effective at, international policy forums. While this has strengthened leadership and ownership in some specific, somewhat isolated cases, it cannot be expected that PfR implementing actors at large are committed or able to sustain the GPG activities.

JC 7.2: PfR partners are able to lobby and advocate for IRM on their own and without the support of the PfR

Summary: According to GPG members, there is enough capacity among PfR implementing partners to sustain the effects of the PfR programme. The IRM knowledge is absorbed in communities and CSOs and they are able to be involved in IRM related processes. The involvement of both PfR partner country teams and NL PfR alliance organisations gives more legitimacy in global fora. The core strength of the GPG is its potential to bring together the lobby capacity of all PfR partners and implementing organisations. Such effort will require the continued coordination among PfR partners.

5. Emerging observations

The efforts to strengthen international policy frameworks especially relevant for IRM already started during the PfR I programme. Under PfR II, this work was strengthened by the establishment of the Global Policy Group (GPG) in which each of the five PfR alliance members is represented. The GPG is an important innovation of PfR II as it aims to better coordinate and look for synergies between the global lobby and advocacy activities of the different PfR alliance members and link these to the regional and national levels. The position of the international humanitarian diplomacy officer was created and staffed from 2016 onwards to facilitate the GPG's work. The GPG could build on, and benefit from the networks and efforts undertaken in PfR I, especially relating to the Sendai Framework and the UNFCCC.

Relevance

In 2015, just before PfR II started, both the Sendai Framework and the UNFCCC, as well as two additional major global policy frameworks of relevance to IRM; the SDGs agenda and the Urban agenda, were signed in 2015. In PfR II, the GPG focused on (accompanying) the implementation of these agreements at global, regional and national levels.

The four global policy frameworks followed are agreed to be the most relevant ones. Although these four trajectories cover a huge field, being more selective has the disadvantage of missing out on opportunities. Some doubts have been raised regarding the SDG trajectory, being all-encompassing but not sufficiently of direct relevance to the PfR priorities. However, it is argued the SDG agenda is linked to all the other frameworks, and the Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) at country level offer opportunities to engage on IRM, and also directly link with the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) in the context of UNFCCC.

Internal strategic management, coordination and coherence

Lobby approaches differ among GPG partners, but at the global level this has not caused an issue. The internal governance of the GPG took some time to find its feed. While respondents generally emphasise the benefits of the GPG, there is scope to improve internal management and strategic coordination. Changes and delays in the staff assigned to the GPG by alliance organisations were not helpful. It is hard to assess the L&A quality, but generally the team is considered very dedicated and working well together. Individual organisations interests can stand in the way. GPG members are representing their individual organisations which may counteract the coordination efforts of the GPG. The GPG group invested a lot in building trust and keeping the dialogue open and going.

It appears that the PfR overall ToC has not played a major role in the planning, monitoring and learning process of the GPG. Also because this overall ToC is not clearly visualising how the various levels at which the PfR programme should work and interact, while it is identified as one of the 'key' features of the PfR II programme. As the, rather abstract, ToC for the Global Programme was only drafted early 2019, the GPG worked for three full years without a longer-term coherent and strategic intervention logic. The main reference point for planning in the GPG were the annual planning meetings and resulting work plans. Annually, the GPG identifies the key events the GPG intends to work towards as PfR GPG. While the GPG does consult country teams, the annual planning is not specific about the longer term changes the group is working towards and how these relate to the longer-term ambitions of the other PfR efforts at regional and country level. No global strategy has been formulated to clarify the engagement ambitions and priorities of the GPG overall and how this related to the other PfR II interventions.

Added value: horizontal links and ‘upward orientation’

The added value of coordinating the efforts of the individual PfR alliance organisations towards global policy frameworks, linking local realities to the global dialogues, is clear. The GPG approach allows to both look for links and synergies between the four trajectories followed at a global level, linking policy fields and linking the global efforts to the PfR work at local, national and regional level. The GPG distributed responsibilities for each of the four global policy frameworks to be followed, and used the monthly meetings to inform each other so as to feed and strengthen synergies among the trajectories and strengthen the coherent messaging on IRM.

The multiple actors and layers involved in the PfR alliance made it more challenging to coordinate, but at the same time also strengthened the relevance of the work. The GPG especially invested in using the inputs from local and national level to ensure relevant messages could be shared at global level. The GPG focuses strongly ‘upward’: identifying relevant local and country experiences to contribute to global policy discussions. This also allows to consider gender and the inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups in global messaging. PfR alliance staff from different countries were invited to share their experiences at regional and international level. In some instances PfR Alliance staff were able to join national delegations to international policy events. External partners see this ability to share the concrete practical experiences at global level and connect different policy fields as the key added value where the PfR alliance is considered to bring a unique contribution to the global debates.

Added value: ‘downward orientation’ and capacity strengthening

While the PfR Inception Report of 2016 already expects that the implementation of the global agreements at regional, national and local levels will be the next big task, and therefore the focus shifts from influencing the agreement texts in PfR I to accompanying the implementation of these frameworks in PfR II, the added value of the GPG to the national and local level, or the ‘downward orientation’ is less systematic. Only a number of examples could be identified where the GPG supported regional and country teams in accompanying the implementation, to translate the objectives of the global policy agendas or frameworks to the national level and thus link global dialogues to local realities.

Currently, the GPG is a Northern based group, composed of people from the 5 headquarters of the alliance partners. While a lot of interaction does take place with the national and regional PfR partners, this has mainly a supportive or functional role, to contribute to specific regional and global events. The GPG leads on L&A work at global level, and there seems to be little push to bring that more ‘southwards’.

While the GPG is focussing on elements of the overall PfR II ToC, in terms of strengthening policies, investments and practices, the intermediate step, strengthening the capacity of PfR partners to L&A is not systematically considered, and capacity strengthening interventions were not explicitly part of the GPG approach. It is more seen as a side-effect of the L&A work, and as far as it takes place and it is noted, the GPG does report on it.

Lobby and advocacy effectiveness and complementarity

The GPG built its own capacities and strengthened its support base and network, partnering with governments and other actors and alliances, and bringing CSOs together. The GPG had a good cooperation with several Dutch ministries, including one at the initiative of the NL MFA. The group strengthened its knowledge on IRM, based on the local and national PfR experiences and remarkably, some of the lobby efforts also focused on the internal organisation’s colleagues, convincing them of the relevance of (elements of) IRM.

The extent to which intermediate outcomes could be achieved differs for the four trajectories: the GPG invested varying degrees of capacity in each of them and it is noted to be challenging to follow all the many developments going on and there is not always sufficient capacity to follow through on some efforts. The PfR alliance has clearly inspired other actors in the field which has resulted in mainly intermediate outcomes relating to 'practice', notably through upscaling successes, and 'policy' including increased ambitions, enhanced frameworks and strengthening the CSP space. In terms of enhanced investments, first steps are taken but some of these changes also just require more time. As an unintended effect, the PfR work leveraged several spin offs, resulting in new projects and new investments and funding.

The GPG annual plans and outcome reporting do not include an analysis of the different contexts in which each trajectory operates, the varying starting point and enabling environments and related specific objectives, or the role and influence of specific circumstances and political traction, or how external actors (beyond PfR) are used to joining forces and leverage efforts, or if undermining forces have to be mitigated. This makes it hard to establish the longer-term outcome contributions. The GPG outcome reporting is not linked, or a rather flimsy link is made, to the outcomes reported at regional and country level.

Annexes

Annex 1 - Bibliography

Horn of Africa Case Study Report, Partner for Resilience evaluation 2020.

Indonesia Case Study Report, Partner for Resilience evaluation 2020.

Mali Case Study Report, Partner for Resilience evaluation 2020.

Netherlands Red Cross / Partners for Resilience, Annual Plan 2017 Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 - 2020, 9 December 2016.

Netherlands Red Cross / Partners for Resilience, Annual Plan 2018 Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 - 2020.

Netherlands Red Cross / Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2016*, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016-2020, May 2017.

Netherlands Red Cross, *Programme Report Inception Phase, January-August 2016*, Netherlands Red Cross/ Partners for Resilience, September 2016

Netherlands Red Cross Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016-2020 - full application.pdf

Partners for Resilience, Theory of Change

Partners for Resilience, *Accelerating for Sustainable Impact*, Annual Plan 2019, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 2020, 31st October 2018.

Partners for Resilience, *Global Ambitions, Local Answers*, Annual Report 2017, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 2020, 31 May 2018.

Partners for Resilience, Global Policy Group PME workshop reports:

- Monitoring outcomes & Global Policy Group Jan-Jun 2017 Report & Planning 2018
- Global Policy Group Annual Report 2017, 19 March 2018
- Global Policy Group PME Reporting Jan-Dec 2018 Report & Planning 2018 & 2019

Partners for Resilience, Global Policy Strategy and Work Plan 2019 - 2020 Draft Jan 2019.

Partners for Resilience, *Local Realities, Global Ambitions* Annual Report 2018 Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 - 2020, 29 May 2019.

Partners for Resilience, Outcomes database, 3 February 2020

Uganda Case Study Report, Partner for Resilience evaluation 2020.

Annex 2 - Interviewees

MN 005 Marinka Wijngaards, DSO, NL MFA, 17 February 2020

MN 006 Marlou Geurts and Maren Striker, NLRC, 17 February 2020

MN 007 Pieter Copper, IGG, NL MFA, 28 February 2020

MN 008 Bart Weijts, CARE NL, 28 February 2020

MN 010 Marie-Jose Vervest, Wetlands International, 1 April 2020

MN 100 Sille Jansen, CARE Capacity Strengthening Coordinator Global, 20 January 2020

MN 102 Thandie Mwape, Global Policy Group, 20 January 2020

MN 103 Nicola Ward, Knowledge Management and Learning Global, 21 January 2020

MN 105 Margot Loof, Programme Coordinator Cordaid, 17 February 2020

MN 106 Sanne Hogesteeger, Programme Coordinator Climate Centre, 17 February 2020

MN 107 Kim Ogonda, Cordaid, 17 March 2020

MN 108 Carina Bachofen, RC Climate Centre, 20 March 2020

MN 109 Richard Blewitt, IFRC, 20 March 2020

MN 110 Sabrina Marquant, CARE NL, 20 March 2020

MN 111 Karen Sudmeier-Rieux, United Nations Environment Programme, 24 March 2020

MN 112 Andrew Simmons, Resilience Brokers, 24 March 2020

MN 113 Raimond Duijsens, NLRC, 25 March 2020

MN 114 Bijay Kumar, GNDR, 25 March 2020

MN 115 Susanna Tol, Wetlands International, 26 March 2020

MN 116 Thandie Mwape, NLRC, 1 April 2020

MN 502 Conny Hoitink, 17 February 2020

Email exchanges between December 2019 and April 2020