



PARTNERS FOR RESILIENCE

Working together on disasters, climate, ecosystems



The Netherlands
Red Cross



care

Cordaid



Climate
Centre



Wetlands
INTERNATIONAL



In cooperation with:
Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

Annex 9

Horn of Africa Case Study

External End Evaluation

Partners for Resilience

2016-2020 programme

Final

25 June 2020

Lidet Tadesse Shiferaw

By the European Centre for Development Policy Management

ecdpm

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1.Introduction	3
2.Methodology	3
3.Overview of the PfR Horn of Africa programme	4
3.1. From PfR I to PfR II.....	4
3.2. Development of a theory of change.....	5
Bibliography	26
Annexes	27
Annex A – List of people interviewed for the HoA programme case	27
Annex B – Preparatory document for PfR Regional Horn of Africa e-workshop	28

1. Introduction

This report describes findings and analysis from the evaluation of the PfR II Horn of Africa (HoA) 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. As such, this report should not be seen as an evaluation of the HoA programme. It is rather an overview and analysis of the HoA programme, and it is prepared with two objectives in mind i) to provide input into the evaluation of the PfR Alliance broadly, which is the main purpose of the evaluation and ii) provide insights into the performance of the programme for learning purposes.

The report is organised along evaluation questions (EQs) and judgement criteria (JCs) that were agreed on by the EMT and represent the areas of evaluation for the whole PfR Alliance. The final report of the PfR evaluation will be structured along these EQs and JCs, followed by conclusions and recommendations concerning the entire PfR programme. The five case studies including this one, feed into this final report. For this reason, the structure of these case studies is uniform, and is based on these same EQs and JCs.

The report starts with a short description of the PfR II HoA programme, followed by a description of the methodology used to produce it. This is followed by the findings along the above mentioned EQs and JC. The report ends with a section that lists a number of emerging observations and preliminary conclusions from this case. The annex compiles the documents reviewed, the persons interviewed and outcomes validated by staff online.

2. Methodology

The compilation of this report was done in three phases.

1. Document review: in the first phase, the consultants reviewed PfR and HoA programme documents that were shared with them to elicit information towards the data grid. A list of documents reviewed is attached in the annex.
2. Interviews: the data gathered from reading the documents was complemented with interviews with six programme staff members and one external interlocutor from the AU. A list of interviewees is given in the annex.
3. E-workshop: in this third phase, Lidet Tadesse and Tony Land facilitated an interactive online workshop on 27 March 2020 in lieu of a physical workshop that couldn't be carried out due to the outbreak of COVID-19. The purpose of the workshop was to validate preliminary findings and to allow the team to reflect on lessons learnt. Information gathered from this e-workshop has also been fed into the report. Background material for the e-workshop was sent to workshop participants for comments ahead of the workshop. The material is presented in the Annex.

Limitations: This case study encountered limits due to the Covid-19 crisis which did not permit the evaluation team to hold a workshop in Kampala as originally planned. Another limitation was that not all persons who were originally signed up to participate in the e-workshop could join the call due to technical problems. From the originally planned 10 PfR staff members (2 from the global programme), eight could eventually participate with varying degrees of participation, e.g. due to technical interruptions.

Another limitation of the evaluation was that it was not possible to speak with PfR's interlocutors in Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD) and the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) to validate and enrich preliminary findings. In addition to the general difficulty of securing time with officials in these regional organisations, the COVID-19 outbreak also further negatively affected their availability. In the end, it was possible to interview only one person from the African Union Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (DREA).

3. Overview of the PfR Horn of Africa programme

3.1. From PfR I to PfR II

The HoA programme is a new addition to the PfR alliance as it only came into action in PfR II. The programme was conceived to address issues that are important for country programmes in the HoA but could not be dealt with at the national level, due to their transnational nature. Given that communities (eg. pastoralists), environmental traits (e.g. dry and arid lowlands), natural resources (e.g. wetlands) cut across borders, a programme that would address IRM related issues at the regional level was found necessary.

More specifically, the programme was set up with the following three overarching **rationales** in mind:

1. The realisation that in addition to national issues, that are addressed by country programmes, there are common and cross border issues affecting communities in the Horn of Africa. These are drought, the use of common resources and changing gender structures as a result of climate change. Those are beyond national borders and require a regional approach.
2. Bringing experiences together from the different countries will allow for richer and deeper learning and evidence building, especially in relation to common livelihoods in the Region.
3. Regional bodies and policies such as from the African Union, IGAD and EAC require an engagement at the regional level.

Within PfR II, the programme started its implementation towards the second half of 2016 and first half of 2017. This was because it needed to build up from the experiences of the country programmes, to identify the issues and policy processes the programme would work on.

Team composition: The programme is composed of eight team members. The team composition reflects a fair representation of constituting member organisations of the Alliance, as well as adequate coverage/representation of four countries the Alliance works in – Ethiopia (Red Cross and CARE), Kenya (Red Cross Climate Centre/Red Cross Kenya and Wetlands International), Uganda (CARE and Climate Centre) and South Sudan (Cordaid). The overall programme coordination is also led by Cordaid.

All team members of the regional programme, except for the programme coordinator - work on the HoA programme partially (roughly 15-20% of their time). Five team members of the HoA programme work on PfR projects at 100% their time divided between the regional programme and the country programmes; around 75-90% of their time is allocated to PfR country programme activities. This arrangement is designed to ensure that there is greater alignment between the work of country programmes and that of the regional programme. Two members of the HoA team work on other non-PfR programmes of their respective organisations at the country level do not allocate 100% of their time on PfR. The programme coordinator works on the HoA programme at 100%.

The programme's approach to advocacy and policy influencing:

Lobbying and policy engagement through meetings, consultations, participating in major IRM relevant events and making the case for IRM smart approaches, producing policy briefs.

Providing technical assistance to regional organisations when they need it (through taking on commissioned work, e.g. Wetlands developing a wetlands management strategy for NBI; conducting analysis on behalf of regional organisations, e.g. Red Cross Climate Centre; conducting IRM gap analysis for IGAD IDRISSI, or by contracting consultants that can develop a strategy for them, e.g. AU DREA and the African Climate Change strategy).

Building capacity, primarily of the programme's own capacity and the capacity of country programmes through workshops, producing and sharing knowledge products such as manuals, policy briefs, reports with relevant practitioners, donors and, in one case, the broader public.

Creating awareness of communities of practice (other international organisations or donors), the media and affected communities (e.g. in Kenya vis-à-vis LAPSSSET), on DRR, CCA, IRM and IRM related regional policies.

3.2. Development of a theory of change

The programme was designed at an inception workshop in Kampala that was conducted in December 2016, under Cordaid's lead. PfR staff from country teams of the HoA region across PfR organisations were invited to this meeting during which the structure and nature of the regional programme was decided. Five key staff were identified from the country programmes to join the Regional Team. End of February 2017, a two-day meeting was done in Nairobi for the Regional Team, to formulate the Regional Plan including a workplan and budget.

Focus areas of work

The programme works along three trajectories, with one partner taking a lead in a trajectory or taking a lead in the stream of work concerning a specific regional organization/policy process.

- **Trajectory 1 - Policies:** IRM is mainstreamed in the relevant regional policies, action plans and monitoring processes. Red Cross is the lead.
- **Trajectory 2 - Investments:** Generating interest among investors and authorities on risk sensitive and risk proof investments. Wetlands International is the lead.
- **Trajectory 3 - Practice:** IRM integration in Regional Initiatives through documentation and sharing of Cross border good practices (this is the revised and latest formulation of the trajectory)

The programme's **theory of change** can be summarised in the table below

	POLICY	INVESTMENTS	PRACTICE
IF	The IRM SP engage with AU and IGAD to advocate for the adoption of IRM in their relevant policies, strategies, action plans and monitoring tools.	Risk Screening for IRM is integrated in policies, frameworks and action plans relevant to Investments at regional level.	If we collaborate with CSOs at regional level to identify, document, and share IRM solutions and principles at regional level.
THEN	IRM will be recognized and have legitimate ground to address risks.	Investments may become more risk and gender responsive.	IRM solutions / practices and IRM principles are recognized as good experiences for resilience building.
WHICH RESULTS IN...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More resource commitment • Increased political commitment to IRM • Increased awareness of risks, vulnerabilities and gender roles and relations. • Reduced vulnerability for especially women and youth among pastoralist communities and small holder farmers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced ecosystem degradation • Increased resilience of especially women and youth among small holder farmers and pastoralists • Increased awareness of the importance of gender responsive risk screening for investments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replication of those good practices / adoption of IRM principles in flagship programs across the region; • Acceptance of the IRM approach as a result of IRM practices presented as evidence.
BECAUSE	PFR 1 experiences showed that political commitment at higher level is a best way to replicate good practices and ensure resource allocation towards resilience strengthening interventions.	Risk screening for IRM reduces negative impacts of investments on communities and their environment.	PFR I experience shows there are good IRM practices, that can be replicated beyond national level across the Region.
IMPACT	Pastoralists and small holders' farmers, with specific attention to women and youth in the HOA are more resilient to climate shocks and other associated and identified hazards.	Especially women and youth among pastoralists and small holder farmers are more resilient in the face of negative impacts from investments.	Especially women and youth among pastoralists and small holder farmers in the region are more resilient as a result of wider replication of good IRM practices and adoption of IRM Principles.

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

Summary on coherence: The set-up of the alliance, with each partner organisation coming up with its own skills-sets, expertise, organisational experience and networks was relevant for the promotion of IRM at the regional level. This is because the HoA programme works at the policy level and policy dialogue and sometimes contributions often require deep technical knowledge but also practical evidence on all areas of IRM (climate change, restoration of ecosystem, disaster risk reduction, etc). All PfR partners have subject matter expertise in components of the IRM approach that make the partnership appealing: Red Cross in DRM, the Climate Centre on Climate change, Wetlands on ecosystem management and environmental restoration, CORDAID in DRM in practice; CARE on gender. This set-up has allowed the programme to do policy engagement in an informed and evidence-based manner. Therefore, the diversity, and set up of the programme was indeed relevant for the promotion of IRM.

Summary on relevance: the programme's regional policy engagement is based on an assessment of existing policies that need to be IRM smart, is relevant to the region and also relevant to the institutions it targets. The programme has identified the right policies and also regional actors (or departments within regional organisations) to carry out its work. The regional organisations engaged AU DREA (Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture), IGAD IDDRISI (IGAD Drought and Disaster Resilience Sustainability Initiative) and the Nile Basin initiative which are the appropriate actors to engage on issues of DRR, CCA, and ecosystem management. The programme had also at the earlier stages identified COMESA and EAC as relevant regional organisations, but there is no evidence that any concrete activities were undertaken to work with these institutions.

Further, in order to target its policy engagement and to make its interventions even more relevant, the programme had carried out a 'gap analysis' of seven regional policy frameworks to strategize on what's missing and what it can contribute. However, this was done in 2018 and finalised mid-2018. The programme could so far only make some use of the findings from this gap analysis. Most notably it has used the analysis to engage with IGAD IDDRISI and make IGAD institutions more familiar with DRR and CCA. The HoA programme was also planning to spearhead an engagement with the EAC, in collaboration with PfR country programmes in 2020 (although the feasibility of this latter idea is now questioned due to the outbreak of COVID-19).

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: Adaptation to local context in the case of the HoA programme is visible in the set-up of the programme itself as well as in its content work.

Programmatic adaptation: The programme has adapted by centring its programming not on CSOs but rather on regional policy actors, institutions and policy processes and to some extent the media and investors (although at the end investors weren't directly involved). This is based on the acknowledgement that: i) the issues such as drought, shared natural resources and climate change

which are issues the Alliance works on, are regional in nature, and ii) there are already policy frameworks from regional policy bodies such as IGAD, AU, and EAC that would require regional engagement. Based on this, the programme targeted regional policy bodies as well as the media which plays the role of informing the public and holding authorities to account.

Context adaptation: There is also some evidence that, while implementing the programme, the programme had to adapt to a changing policy context. For example, working with the AU on a climate change adaptation strategy as opposed to continuing work on making the Programme of Action of the implementation of the Sendai Framework IRM sensitive. This shift was made due to the realisation that the adoption of the Programme of Action of the Sendai Framework would need to be made by all AU member states. This was found to be a lengthy process, while the AU's climate change adaptation strategy had been on the pipelines and is an area the AU DREA needed support on.

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

Summary: Generally, the regional and global programmes coordinate their actions to ensure that the HoA programme is aligned to global IRM priorities. This coordination is however on a project/issue/event basis and not sustained or systematic. The programme has also made attempts at aligning its work to continental priorities by attending and actively participating in regional and continental events. For example, it took part in the African Landscapes Dialogue in Addis Ababa (6-9 March 2017) and the 11th International Conference on Community Based Adaptation to Climate Change (CBA 11) where it actively contributed to these discussions by making presentations of organizing side events. In 2018, the programme took further action in terms of aligning its programming with regional priorities by commissioning an analysis of the IRM needs of relevant regional policy frameworks. But this was done half way through the programme and has had its limitation on the extent to which the programme could make use of it.

In terms of aligning with regional IRM priorities, in 2017, the programme had identified nine policy frameworks across the AU, IGAD, NBI, EAC and COMESA which the programme would focus on¹. However, it wasn't clear at that point how the programme could and should influence these policy frameworks. Entrance points for influencing these policies were also not clear. The programme nonetheless attended and made contributions at regional conferences and events such as the African Landscapes Dialogue in Addis Ababa (6-9 March 2017) and the 11th International Conference on Community Based Adaptation to Climate Change to expand its visibility and inform the policy discourse on these issues.

¹ These were: i) the Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (AU); ii) Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) (AU); iii) Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities (AU); iv) Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI)(IGAD); v) Disaster Risk Management Strategy to strengthen sub-regional disaster preparedness and response capabilities (IGAD); vi) Making cities sustainable and resilient: Implementing the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 - 2030 at the local level (AU); vii) Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework (Nile Basin Initiative /EAC); viii) East African Community Climate Change Strategy (EAC); ix) Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoral Areas (COMESA)

In 2018, the programme went further and commissioned a gap analysis, to identify the state of play with a focus on seven policy frameworks/processes² in order to explore how it can influence these processes in a targeted and strategic manner. This report was finalised in June 2018, leaving only 2.5 years for the programme to take insights from this report and design its activities. Nonetheless, the programme did use it to shape its engagement with the AU (focusing on processes around the Sendai Framework), and IGAD (strengthening linkages between DRR and CCA in IGAD institutions). The programme had also planned to use the findings of this study to engage the EAC on its climate change strategy in 2020. But how this will unfold during the rest of 2020 is now unclear due to COVID-19.

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

Summary: Due to the nature of the programme (regional level engagement, with a team composed of staff from country programmes who can only allocate some time to the regional programme) attention was given to working in complementarity with each other instead of trying to press all PfR members into working along one particular approach. But to facilitate alignment, the programme has produced an IRM advocacy manual to assist each partner organisation and country programmes on how to do IRM advocacy and how to broadly align approaches of the respective partners with regard to doing advocacy and lobbying work.

Since the HoA programme deals mainly with policy processes and advocating for the integration of IRM approaches in policy processes, the more obvious effort by the partners is in amplifying their complementarity to effectively advocate for IRM-sensitive policies more so than aligning their individual organisational approaches on IRM. In a way, each brings unique skill-sets and technical expertise to their advocacy to give a solid base to the IRM approach. More specifically, Red Cross and Cordaid bring DRR expertise; the Climate Centre brings expertise on climate change; Wetlands International brings knowhow on Environmental protection and ecosystem restoration; CARE had a strong Gender experience and Cordaid had extensive experience in IRM practice. The IRM approach is therefore promoted with the skill-sets each brings to the table.

In addition to bringing expertise to the respective components of IRM, the programme's staff also participated in workshops where the concepts and approaches of IRM were discussed. This process has helped to bring all partners on the same page on the concept of IRM. In addition to this capacity enhancement activity, the programme developed an IRM-advocacy manual to standardize IRM advocacy across partner organisations and also country teams. This manual was followed by a training to all country teams.

Moreover, according to staff, the fact that this is a partnership dating back to 2014 in PfR I has helped to create synergies across organisations on IRM. This is because the partner organisations have started to better understand the IRM concept and the working methods of each partner over the years. The fact that many of the PfR staff (at least the ones in the HoA programme) have been working on PfR I as well helps retain knowledge on approaches.

² These were: i) Africa regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction; ii) the African Union Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP); iii) the Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa; iv) the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI); v) Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework; vi) the Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework; vii) and East African Community Climate Change Policy.

Two interviewees also noted that the global programme offers support on conceptual clarification on the IRM approach, particularly at the country team level, which the regional programme also benefit from, by the virtue of its staff members being also members of country teams.

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: Templates for M&E (annual reports) include a section on inclusion were issues regarding gender and the inclusion of marginalised groups are recorded. The HoA team has at times expressed challenges to report on inclusion, e.g. PfR Annual 2018. But it should also be noted that the HoA programme is different in design and operation from the county studies, and hence its challenges and possibilities for inclusion are different.

For the HoA programme inclusion is seen more from the point of view of calling for inclusive policies that are sensitive to the needs of marginalised groups such as pastoralists, women, etc. The view from the programme is that by working on regional programs that address marginalised groups (e.g. African framework for pastoralism, IGAD IDRISSI/ICPAL) it is indeed promoting inclusion.

The fact that the programme and its direct policy stakeholders such as IGAD and the AU do not directly work with affected communities, means that the programme cannot directly integrate the concerns and interests of marginalised groups in its work. Countries on the other hand have the opportunity to ensure gender mainstreaming in their activities and also include marginalised groups (be it of women or other marginalised groups such as youth or pastoralists, depending on the context). They can also plan around 'gender' or 'youth' empowerment activities to enhance the capacity of marginalised communities.

That said, the programme jointly reflected in the e-workshop that there is room for improvement in terms of how it can promote the interests of marginalised communities at the regional level as well. While not tried before, perhaps enhancing the interface between communities and regional policy stakeholders is an approach the programme is planning to explore. For example, a meeting is considered between IGAD and members of communities (eg. pastoralists) that PfR works with across countries in the Horn.

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: According to the set-up of the programme each partner identifies activities they think are relevant to implement under the respective trajectories or components of the programmes they are leading. Then the HoA team collectively agrees on which activities could indeed be undertaken under the umbrella of the regional programme (vs. the umbrella of the country programmes). Activity leads are then selected and other partner organisations are asked to support the implementation financially or technically when needed. In terms of coordination, there is strong evidence that the programme partners coordinate well among themselves at the regional level. In interviews, team members were positive about the progress towards result they have made and believed that their efforts were well coordinated.

The programme has one programme coordinator who works 100% of her time for the programme. In addition to coordinating the activities of the respective partners, the coordinator also maps relevant regional events or policy processes and coordinates a response from the regional programme.

The team felt that coordination could be better or more thought-through concerning the coordination between county programmes and the regional programme. While all members of the HoA team (except the coordinator) are also involved in PfR country programmes to varying degrees, the team indicated during the virtual workshop the need to coordinate activities more systematically across the national-regional-and global levels in PfR III.

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: The respective partners allocate and manage their own budget at both the country and regional programmes. As such, there's no budget that is allocated to the HoA programme collectively. The programme coordinator also does not have a budget allocation or management responsibility on behalf of the entire regional programme. Rather, each partner organisation decides and announces the budget it has allocated for the regional programme every year and uses that budget for activities it plans to do at the regional level (with the agreement and support of other partners in the Alliance who form the regional programme). The programme staff is happy of its progress so far and individual partners have indicated that they are well in line with their planning.

It should also be noted that the staff set up of the programme is unique in that it is based on the contribution of 7 staff members who allocate roughly 15% of their time to the programme and only one programme coordinator who dedicates 100% of her time. This clearly has implications on how much could be achieved by the programme.

But with regards to timely delivery, the team has also indicated that one of the structural limitations they had was the bureaucracy and institutional set-up of the regional organisations they are trying to influence. Since these organisations are political in nature and are driven by member states' political and technical positions via consensus, there are various barriers that are outside of the control of the programme. For example, the programme had planned to influence the programme of action for the Sendai Framework. However, during implementation, the programme learnt that the plan of action of the Sendai Framework is one that needs to be approved by all member states and that would take a significant amount of time. The programme decided instead to look for ways of influencing the AU's climate change adaptation strategy which the AU had planned to formulate but hadn't gotten started with. The PfR programme tried to assist by supporting this work with a consultancy. However, this too proved to be difficult to realise as getting the procedural requirements, such as signing an MoU with the AU and formulating a ToR for the consultant and contracting the consultant has taken more than a year and a half. The programme was awaiting progress on the AU side at the time of this evaluation (in February 2020), so that a consultant could be recruited to start the drafting of the strategy.

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 operational coordination of the HoA programme should be seen in light of the nature of the programme as one where 7 to 8 team members dedicate roughly 15% of their time to the regional programme; and one programme coordinator works at 100%.

In the HoA programme, each partner is in charge of its own activities (budget and planning wise) although these activities are always discussed and agreed on, and other partner can also provide support. This set up already pre-empts that unlike the country programmes, the HoA programme functions in a system where organisations “work separately, together” under the coordination of the programme coordinator. Hence, for the HoA programme more so than **operational coordination**, issues of complementarity and synergy are more relevant. More practical types of coordination are conducted during annual planning meetings, monthly team meetings (virtual) and activity specific exchanges which are organised on a need's basis.

On complementarity and added value: Each partner leads on one line of engagement, i.e. the Red Cross leads the policy trajectory, Wetlands International the investment trajectory and Cordaid and CARE the practice trajectory based on each's comparative advantage. For example, the Red Cross (through the International Federation of Red Cross Societies) has a liaison office at the AU which has placed the Red Cross in the best position to lead on the trajectory in policies. The Red Cross is similarly well placed regarding IGAD. This means that the Red Cross uses its relationships with these regional organisations as an entry point for the Alliance. This has proven very useful as the policy space in the region, and most notably vis-à-vis intergovernmental organisation like the AU and IGAD, is not easy to access for CSOs.

However, each being a lead on one trajectory doesn't preclude other partners from providing inputs in the process; in fact, all partners being able to contribute to an ongoing policy process from a DRM, CCA and environmental angles is what makes the IRM approach. For example, while the Red Cross could be used to access regional organisations, when the engagement goes out of Red Cross' organisational expertise, e.g. DRR, then the Red Cross would rely on other partners to contribute. This was for example seen in the programme's engagement with the AU whereby the Red Cross, as the leading organisations was engaging the AU to start with the process of drafting the African

Climate Change strategy informed by the IRM approach. Red Cross led on all the strategic and administrative discussions but also relied on the Red Cross Climate Centre and also Wetlands International when the discussion was technical.

Coordination: In annual planning meetings, each partner shares their plan for the upcoming year, their budget and what kind of support they may need from partners. The programme then jointly decides on its activities for the year. In addition, partners also discuss how they may support each other. This happens during the monthly meetings which the programme coordinator convenes and during which joint decisions on key issues are taken (for example, participation in key conferences or operational matters such the formulation of ToRs for studies and consultants). Partners communicate with each other also outside of the monthly and bi-annual meetings on an as needs basis.

The programme coordinator helps to coordinate the mutual cooperation of PfR partners, identify and galvanise action on emerging policy engagement opportunities and manages the learning and reporting aspects of the programme.

Partners in general assess their collaboration on the HoA programme positively, noting how each member has a comparative advantage in the partnerships and stressing that close collaboration is necessary for them to achieve programme objectives. They also commended the programme coordinator for convening the regular meetings, keeping activities in check and coordinating support across partners as well as identifying regional events and processes and opportunities for engagement.

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 programme puts an emphasis on learning, and reporting. Positive achievements as well as challenges are reported on. The programme reporting template leaves room for reflection on challenges per trajectory and where the programme needs support from the global programme. It also asks where the programme is in terms of its schedule for implementation. There is sufficient evidence that the programme also uses its learnings to redefine and redirect its activities. This was notably felt in trajectory 2.

The mid-year and annual meetings conducted to report on progress of the programme and plan ahead, coupled with the monthly team meeting have been helpful in inspiring learning and reflection within the programme.

In addition, the HoA programme itself has organised learning and experience sharing workshops for country programmes in the HoA where all teams shared their experiences with each other. This has helped to stimulate south-to-south learning among countries in the region, as contexts (geographical/ environmental) and thematic focus areas (e.g. problems surrounding pastoralists) are similar across countries. The programme was also scheduled to organise a 'write shop' to identify major lessons learnt in each country programme, to write about them and disseminate throughout the PfR partnership and beyond. But this is unlikely to happen for the time being due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

The programme also uses its reflections and lessons learnt to adapt its programming. For example, the trajectory on investments had sought to engage the private sector and relevant authorities at the regional level. But in the case of the HoA, it was not possible to engage the private sector directly, as there are no private sector groups operating at the regional level. The programme however worked on public private investments such as the LAPSSET project, and also tried to influence regional policies and frameworks that are relevant or instrumental in guiding private sector engagement or government action in environmental protection. Most notable in this direction is the programme's engagement with the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI), where Wetlands International supported the NBI to develop its wetlands management to three transnational wetlands in east Africa.

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: There is ample evidence that indicates that the programme was well managed, well-coordinated across partners and that the programme was well in line with its programme implementation plan.

The programme is largely on track in terms of implementing its activities and staff interviewed were content with the progress the programme has made towards achieving its objectives. The programme team appreciated the collegiality and collaborative spirit of the team and mentioned that relationships they have built with each other by virtue of having worked together since PfR I has facilitated their communication. The fact that team members have worked on PfR also meant that they are familiar with the concept of IRM. Having working on IRM over the years has also facilitated knowledge exchange among the team in such a way that team members and organisations fostered 'cross fertilisation' within the team and the partnership. Team members could learn from each other and expand their understandings of IRM topics and specific themes beyond their respective areas.

The programme holds monthly meetings to update each other on developments, to report on planned activities and seek support. There is consensus among team members that these monthly meetings have been helpful and strike a good balance of being flexible (in that not everyone may be present at all meetings) and consistent so that information can easily be exchanged, problems jointly solved and activities continuously monitored. The convening role of the programme coordinator and her ability to bring everyone on the same page with regards to programme activities, and flag relevant policy processes including events and coordinate the programme's activities vis-à-vis these was appreciated.

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: This EQ and the underlying JCs are not quite applicable to the HoA programme. However it's worth noting that due to the political identities of the African regional organisations the programme works with (e.g. IGAD, AU which are intergovernmental bodies), it wasn't always wise for the programme to work with or partner with non-PfR CSOs and other organisations to influence regional policies vis-à-vis these organisations. For example, at the AU, the Alliance relies heavily on the Red Cross and its affiliation with the IFRC which has a liaison office at the AU on disaster response. This affiliation is the Alliance's entry way into the AU. The AU is critical of collaboration with CSOs and is selective.

However, there are a few reported activities in which the programme convened other relevant practitioners, donors or academics to promote IRM or to exchange experiences. These exchanges were however focused on technical and content-related discussion on IRM and geared towards trajectory 3 (informing practice). These were not geared towards influencing policy outcomes (trajectory 1).

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: The evidence for the programme's interface and complementarity with other non-PfR actors working on IRM is very thin.

There are a few activities reported where the programme convened academia and other actors (USAID, WISER, Global Framework for Climate Services) on a learning session on resilience and disaster response in 2018. It also provided evidence to donors, UN agencies and organisations like Oxfam in 2017. However, these activities are done in light of sharing lessons learned and while it is plausible that those that were able to take part in these activities have made use of the learning opportunity, the extent to which this has been so cannot be gauged. There is no evidence about the extent to which synergies or complementarity with the work of other organisations was realised (no follow-up activities were jointly planned or undertaken).

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: This is not applicable to the HoA programme as the programme doesn't work with Dutch embassies which operate at the national level.

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: The setup of the HoA programme is different in that the capacity building aspect of the work is done with the policy stakeholders (not CSOs) and sometime the media by way of policy dialogue and information provision. Therefore, the ToC that capacity strengthening of CSOs will lead to better IRM policies and practices doesn't quite apply to the HoA programme. Hence, the extent to which the programme has applied good practices in strengthening capacity in support of IRM cannot be assessed.

However, there is evidence that the programme has increased the capacity of its own staff (covered in EQ 5) and the staff members of country programmes. There is also evidence that the support the programme has given to media, and policy stakeholders on integrating IRM in their policies have had positive reception (see also EQ 6).

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 aspect of capacity diagnostic doesn't apply to the regional programme. However, the programme commissioned a 'gap analysis' in 2018, to identify the existing regional policy frameworks, their level of development and potential entry points for influencing policies relating to IRM. In the context of the nature of the HoA programme this could be considered a 'diagnostic exercise'. This exercise was done half way during the programme implementation. This report had a capacity building element as the findings of the report enhanced the knowledge of the programme team and that of the country teams on the content of regional policy frameworks and existing opportunities for engagement.

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 programme doesn't have a capacity strengthening strategy or plan per se. However, it does report on the capacity strengthening aspects of its work which has been directed to the PfR country teams and to selected media in the region.

Because the programme doesn't work with CSOs, its capacity building activities are provided for:

- PfR Alliance partners: on knowledge on IRM, advocacy and lobbying skills, policy dialogue.
- Capacity of country teams as well as IFRC: on IRM, IRM advocacy, cross learning on the LAPSET corridor (in order to identify areas of policy engagement).
- Capacity of selected media in the region: on the Sendai framework, the EAC climate change strategy and IGAD DRR strategy and IRM principles.

This deviates from the country programmes which allocate a significant part of their programming towards the enhancement of the lobby and advocacy capacities of intermediate organisations. However, this is to be expected as the HoA's main objective is to influence IRM-relevant regional policy processes directly. In order to do so, it needs to enhance the capacity of its own staff (it should be noted that the HoA programme and hence IRM advocacy at a regional level is a novel addition to the PfR partnership); the capacity of its country teams and the media.

Media engagement is based on the fact that the media is seen as an important stakeholder in educating and informing the policy makers and citizens on topical issues relating to IRM. With an enhanced understanding of the media about the Sendai Framework, the IGAD DRR strategy and the East Africa Climate change strategy, journalists have increase their capacity to put information into the public domain.

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 HoA programme hasn't developed a results framework for progress monitoring on capacity enhancement. However, the annual and bi-annual reporting format contains a matrix where the programme can include information on capacity strengthening, in particular what was done to enhance capacity, how it helped the country programmes (and the regional programme) and how it relates to achieving the programme goals in 2020. In its reporting, the HoA programme team shares information on the workshops it conducted and the knowledge products it produced.

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 capacity development work of the HoA programme is directed towards its own team members and the country teams and in some cases the media. The programme has organised workshops to increase the awareness and capacity of its own team and country teams on IRM and IRM advocacy. Based on this capacity, the programme has been able to participate in various regional and continental meetings relevant to DRM, make presentations, lobby and engage with decision makers. They have also been able to approach, build rapport with and engage policy makers in IGAD, AU and NBI and have made contributions to various policy-related processes and documents with regards to climate change adaptation (AU), DRM strategy and ecosystem management (NBI). These have resulted in tangible positive outcomes (as described under EQ 6).

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 capacity building activities of the programme (outlined in JC 4.2), even if limited, have enabled the programme to engage in regional and continental high-level and technical meetings in order to influence policy-related processes and documents.

Most notable engagements that were enabled by the various capacity enhancement activities of the programme and other actors the programme invested in include:

- The 6th High Level Meeting on Disaster Risk Reduction for Africa and Arab Countries in 2018; it contributed to the Tunisia Declaration; the programme held some pre-conference events and side events during the conference.
- The PfR HoA team reviewed and made inputs into the African Regional Position Paper presented by AU to the 14th African Technical Working Group on DRR in Hawasa, Ethiopia, in March 2019, which provided an opportunity to incorporate IRM-related aspects in the Global Platform Declaration Document.
- The programme also participated and made a direct contribution to the Global Platform declaration Disaster Risk Reduction, in Geneva May 2019.
- It organized a roadshow in partnership with BRACED and IGAD and held the first of a series of Resilience Roadshows which included high level policy discussions. The meeting brought together 30 practitioners from Academia, EAC and PfR in the HOA region, the IFRC and Kenyan government representatives.
- HoA team members participated in an IGAD IDDRSI steering committee meeting that reiterated the need to link humanitarian development to sustainability, highlighted the need for more coordination amongst actors, the need for risk mapping within the region and the need to change focus to development programming as opposed to emergency response.
- It participated and shared experiences during the LIFE AR (LDC initiative for Effective Adaptation and Resilience) Regional Consultation Meeting in Addis Ababa.

The programme has also reported that capacity building workshops provided to journalists from the region has increased the awareness of journalists on disaster risks and the Sendai Framework and that they have seen an improvement in the content and quality of reporting of these journalists on DRR. But these could not be verified during this case study as it was not possible to speak with participants who took part in the training.

The HoA programme produced the “IRM advocacy resource pack” and accompanied trainings given to PfR country teams on how to undertake advocacy work. These capacity building exercises were well received by country programmes. In separate FGD with the Kenya country team, the team indicated that they have indeed benefited from this training and that their capacity on IRM advocacy had been enhanced.

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: In what seemed like one-off engagements, the programme has conducted capacity building activities for media (journalists) and communities on the ground. The programme reported that the journalists and communities targeted have been able to use the support provided by the Alliance to improve the quality of their news coverage on DRM and also engaged with local government actors – respectively.

The media engagement was a training for around 30 journalists from the HoA region to raise their awareness of DRM, climate change and environmentally-induced disasters with the understanding that media is an important stakeholder in educating, informing the policy makers and citizens on topical issues and for holding governments to account. The team then reported that it has seen an increase in media coverage of topics relating to disaster risk reduction and climate change.

The community engagement involved the development of an impact screening log on LAPSSSET and sharing it with Communities in Isiolo County (Kenya) and Torit (South Sudan) to get a better understanding of the negative impacts of the LAPSSSET project.

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: The main objective of the programme is to facilitate and engage in lobbying and advocacy at the regional level. The programme has been doing so directly, i.e. without linkages with the country programmes, although it often uses evidence from the country programmes to make its advocacy more tangible and evidence based. The programme has also provided capacity building to country programmes on IRM advocacy (as described above). But the evidence is thin in pointing out the ways and the extent to which the support received from the HoA regional programme (though not one of the main mandates of the programme) has helped country programmes engage in IRM advocacy at national, regional or international levels.

In order to facilitate its own lobbying and advocacy, the programme undertook a mapping of relevant regional policies and identified the policy gaps of each. The report came out in mid-2018 so it has had a limitation on how fast and how much it could be used. However, the HoA programme used the findings from this gap analysis to engage with the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRISI) and share findings on IRM gaps in the IGAD IDDRISI. Similarly, engaging with the East African Community (EAC) on its work on climate change was planned in the programmes plan of action for 2020, based on the recommendations from this gap analysis.

In some of its reporting as well as the e-validation workshop, the HoA team has indicated the need to strengthen linkages with and across countries in the Horn.

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: No unintended results – positive or negative – were documented or gathered through interviews.

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: There is sufficient self-reported evidence (though not verified as it was not possible to conduct interviews only with one external stakeholder) that regional policy stakeholders have raised their awareness on IRM and are more willing to engage on IRM. There is also evidence that various common positions of regional organisations, which the programme had targeted and engaged with, have been formulated with more sensitivity to IRM. However, such observations of course face the contribution vs. attribution challenge (to is difficult to demonstrate the level of contribution to these results by the HoA programme, given the multiplicity of actors and factors involved in such processes). A list of the most important outcomes could be found in the Annex of the preparatory materials for the e-workshop.

The longer-term outcomes of the programme should be contextualised around the following three unique realities of the programme, which all affect its ability to achieve longer term outcomes:

- The HoA programme is new and the regional policy engagement is a new area of work for the PfR Alliance.
- The staffing of the programme is limited and fragmented, i.e. it doesn't have designated staff members except for the coordinator. Other team members dedicate roughly 15% of their time only.
- The PfR's advocacy work is done under a regional institutional context with regional organisations that generally hold back on engaging with CSO, hence it is not easy to find open doors for a CSO initiative.
- The HoA programme is dealing with intergovernmental (regional) organisations that are bound to get higher level policy decisions agreed by all its member states. This has an impact in decision making timelines and processes which can be tedious.

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: There is self-reported evidence that the programme has managed to mainstream IRM sensitivity in various position papers, management plans and policies, as a result of its engagement. There is also preliminary evidence that there are high level outputs, e.g. commitments from policy stakeholders, that could eventually materialise in longer-term and significant outcomes in terms of changes in policy, investments and practice. The most important ones in both categories (realised and potential outcomes) are summarized below.

Realised changes towards trajectory 1 (policies): IRM is mainstreamed in the relevant regional policies, action plans and monitoring processes.

- **IRM aspects are integrated into the Declaration of the 6th High Level Meeting on Disaster Risk Reduction for Africa and Arab Countries;** “The Tunisia Declaration 2018”. This will influence Governments priorities in accelerating the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030 and especially the Programme of Action for the Implementation of Sendai Framework 2015-2030 (POA) and the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction. The programme had done a couple of pre-conference and conference side events.
- **The Africa Common Position to the 2019 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, conference includes DRR, CCA and sustainable development (i.e. elements of IRM).** The PfR HoA team has reviewed and made inputs into the African Regional Position Paper presented by the AU to the 14th African Technical Working Group on DRR in Hawasa, Ethiopia in 2019.
- **IGAD has committed to merging its DRR and CCA departments (2018).** The commitment to merge the two departments will set pace for Government agencies in the Horn of Africa to adopt a similar approach. KRCS in partnership with BRACED and IGAD held the first of a series of Resilience roadshows with high level policy discussions. The meeting brought together 30 practitioners from Academia, EAC, PfR in the HOA region, IFRC, and Kenyan government representatives.

Potential changes in trajectory 2: Generating interest among investors and authorities on risk sensitive and risk proof investments

- **NBI has an IRM-smart wetlands management strategy, Conservation Investment Plans (CIPs) and wetland monographs for 3 transboundary wetland landscapes:** Sio-Siteko wetlands (Kenya and Uganda); Sango Bay-Minziro wetland landscape (Tanzania and Uganda); and the Semliki delta wetland. Wetlands International had been engaging with NBI and the South Sudan National Ministry of Environment and Forestry through the Directorate of Wetlands and Biodiversity landscapes.
- **Nile Basin Initiative has shown interest in Mainstreaming IRM in Wetlands Management** including supporting the development of Wetlands policy for Ethiopia. This was as a result of a one-week wetlands management and policy instruments benchmarking tour facilitated by Wetlands International and hosted by the Ramsar Center for Eastern Africa (RAMCEA) and NBI with a delegation from Ethiopia.
- **NEMA and LAPPSET accepted the community recommendations on LAPPSET** and temporarily stopped the construction of the Mega Dam that should serve the proposed Isiolo Resort City with water due to considerations that had to be given to environmental issues raised by the local community. PfR had submitted recommendations on the Strategic Environmental Analysis Report to the Director General of LAPPSET Authority and Natural Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) of Kenya. The current status of this project is however not known.

Realized changes towards trajectory 3: IRM integration in regional initiatives through documentation and sharing of cross border good practices (this is the revised and latest formulation of the trajectory).

- **Journalists and media houses improved the content quality of reporting on integrating DRR, climate change and ecosystem issues.** Media is an important stakeholder in educating, informing the policy makers and practices on topical issues and holding government and other stakeholders to account. The HoA programme trained 39 journalists from Ethiopia,

Kenya and Uganda on the Sendai Framework's Programme of Action, the EAC Climate Change Strategy and IGAD's DRR strategy and IRM principles.

- **Some members of the public community of practice (students, IFRC, ICPAC, USAID, WISER, Global Framework for Climate Service) increased their awareness** on resilience programming. The need to link forecasting to preparedness and DDR has been raised. The programme shared its lessons on resilience with students and lecturers at the University of Nairobi in an open public event. It also organized a workshop with selected practitioners to catalyse a discussion on how predictions can help better prepare for and mitigate the impacts of disasters

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: This doesn't apply to the HoA programme as it doesn't have implementing partners.

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: Because the HoA programme doesn't work with CSOs directly, it's approach to sustainability is different and is based on three characteristics of the programme:

- **Influencing policy and institutions as a way of effecting long term change:** The programme works to influence regional and continental policies, which could have lasting impacts. Similarly, working with or influencing how regional organisations like the AU, IGAD and NBI conceptualise and work with DRM, DDR, CCA and ecosystem management would mean that these organisations could continue to act in an IRM smart way even after the PfR programme life. This would also require to make their organisational set-up, or management strategies and approaches IRM sensitive
- **Working through established partners:** The Alliance works in particular with the IFRC when engaging with the AU. Since the IFRC has a liaison office at the AU and has a long-standing partnership and engagement with the AU, there is a chance that the IFRC takes IRM as an approach and applies it to its engagement with the AU, even after the life cycle of the PfR partnership. This also applies to the media, which the programme can work with to ensure that there is continuity to the prominence of IRM given in public and policy domains.
- **Documenting evidence and disseminating knowledge products:** one of the trajectories of the programme relates to documenting and disseminating of knowledge. This can serve the sustainability of the gains made through PfR. Other actors can take up relevant information and lessons learnt and can build on what PfR has done to continue the momentum on IRM.

The above points explain the programme's current thinking around sustainability. Team members highlighted in the validation e-workshop and also in their 2020 planning document, that the programme will examine how it could work more structurally with CSOs and other relevant social platforms/alliances to ensure that others can pick the baton where PfR partners leave it.

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

Summary: This is not relevant to the HoA regional programme as it doesn't have implementing partners.

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

Summary: This is not relevant to the HoA regional programme as it doesn't have implementing partners.

Complementary information, observations and reflections

The following are general observations and lessons learnt that can contribute to the programme's further development.

1. On reporting modalities of PfR and relevance for the HoA

As mentioned in previous sections, the HoA programme works in a policy context that is rather hostile to CSO engagement. In an environment like this, any programme would spend a significant amount of time and resources on building trust, partnerships and understanding the inner workings of its policy environment and how to achieve policy-related targets in its earlier years. Increasing one's visibility by participating in meetings and conferences and generating knowledge products is also a part and parcel of the policy engagement, hence something any programme would invest in, before it could actually influence policies. The programme had various activities in this regard in 2016 and early 2017, where it participated in and organized side events at regional meetings, e.g. UNISDR 6th Africa Regional Platform and 5th High Level Meeting on DRR in Mauritius.

However, from a reporting point of view, this means that much of the work done during this period is more at the output level. And one should recognise that its direct relationship to influencing policies or registering outcomes (which is what this evaluation focuses on) is marginal during such an initial engagement phase. Outcomes are also realized in the form of 'seed outcomes', i.e. higher-level outputs that could eventually become outcomes. For example, the programme reported in 2018, that IGAD committed to merge its DRR and CCA departments. This means that IGAD was convinced of the case the programme made for the inter-departmental linkages and their role in realising effective response mechanisms. However, such a commitment needs to be followed up in order to realise further outcomes in the policy domain.

Moreover, the programme uses a generic reporting tool – an outcome monitoring tool. This outcome harvesting tool does encourage reflection as it asks for changes that needed to be made, where the challenges have been and where the lessons are. However, it is not accompanied by a narrative report which provides the broader contextual overview explaining the environment the programme operates in, important activities that were carried out and outputs that were realized in order to achieve outcomes. It also doesn't allow for the continuous monitoring of each identified outcome, over time. This is problematic for a new programme working on policy engagement as the path to achieving outcomes, the 'seed outcomes' or emerging outcomes, are potentially very relevant towards reaching higher-level outcomes. They could, for example, offer lessons on how to adapt the programme but for knowledge dissemination (e.g. on how to do IRM advocacy at the regional level, pointing out what works and what doesn't).

In addition, the reporting template is developed primarily for country programmes, and could a space to better contextualise the nature and work of a regional programme.

2. On Private sector engagement

The programme much to show on how it influenced the agendas, positions, organisational set-ups and policies of regional actors on IRM. Engagement with the private sector directly was difficult (trajectory 2; investments). This is largely because there are no organised private sector platforms at the regional level. And direct engagement with the private sector, the programme has learnt, is more relevant and applicable at the national rather than regional level.

However, the team has adapted to this reality and looked into influencing various IRM-relevant decisions in public-private investments such as LAPSSSET. It also engaged on approaches and plans of regional organisations with regards to investments in shared natural resources. For example, through Wetland International's lead, the programme is developing an IRM-sensitive wetlands management plan for the NBI. In the validation e-workshop, team members reflected on the lessons on private sector engagement and concluded that as a way forward, the partnership would need to re-direct its work more towards the private sector and investments (influencing regional and continental policy frameworks, e.g. Agenda 2063, relevant to large-scale investment).

3. Alignment, coordination across levels: from nation to regional to global

Much of the evidence the regional programme uses has been generated by the country programmes. Moreover, all members of the regional team are also part of the country teams. This offers the opportunity to highlight issues identified by the country teams as potentially relevant to the transnational and regional level engagement. It also allows for capacity building activities such as IRM policy advocacy to reach to the level of country teams. However, beyond this relationship, it's not always clear how the country programmes and the regional programmes relate to each other and build on each other's work.

In the validation workshop, participants mentioned that the alignment of work is more emphasized between the countries and the global level. The reporting system asks in what ways programmes align with global events or global level policy processes but does not do much to seek alignment of country programmes (in the HoA) to regional IRM relevant processes. Alignment generally happens implicitly, since many of the HoA programme staff are also staff members of country programmes. However more needs to be done to ensure this alignment is done in a more strategic and sustained manner whereby the regional level is fully involved.

4. Challenges of the inclusion agenda at the regional level

As the programme doesn't directly work with communities, its inclusion strategy is to work on issues that affect vulnerable groups such as pastoralists or small-holder farmers.

The challenges withstanding, the programme has so far not explored the inclusion of representatives from the affected communities in their regional activities such as during meetings with IGAD or the NBI. There would be scope to expand the HoA programme's work on inclusion. The programme had planned to take policy stakeholders, like from the AU DREA, to areas that have been rehabilitated through the use of IRM but this activity did not materialise so far.

5. Regional level engagement and expectations

At the onset, when the programme decided to identify and target regional organisations, its assumption was that these organisations have the mandate but not the capacity or knowledge to work on issues with IRM-sensitivity. They also assumed that because international frameworks such as the Paris Agreement and the Sendai Framework were underway, these organisations would need to contextualise them to their region – at which point the PfR alliance could engage them on IRM.

What the practice indicated, however, was that much of the contextualization of international frameworks into regional one and the consultations therein, is done by member state representatives whereby CSOs are not engaged. Finding open doors for policy engagement is difficult.

Another issue is that these regional organisations have a mandate to work on disaster risk reduction and climate change, but the institutional bureaucracy and intra-institutional turf-wars (like over mandates or funding) are obstacles for engagement particularly when it comes to trying to influence the main regional or continental frameworks and strategies. This means that it can take a long time before even very simple procedural steps are taken – making a working and policy-relevant process lengthy for the partnership.

During the e-workshop, team members reflected on this and suggested that going forward, their approach to influencing policies vis-à-vis regional organizations should take a more incremental approach whereby the small gains are appreciated and aimed at, rather than aiming to influence the big policy documents (as the bureaucracy and political sensitivity is higher at that level). Hence, modesty will be required whereby aims of what can be achieved are not set too high.

Bibliography

- Annex to 2017 PME Report – PfR Regional Program Horn of Africa (March 2018)
- HOA Regional IRM Strategic Partnership Program Plan 2016-2020
- Horn of Africa one pager
- Netherlands Red Cross / Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2016*, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016-2020, May 2017
- Netherlands Red Cross Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016-2020 - full application.pdf
- Okowa Duncan. Towards integrated risk Management in the horn of Africa. A gap analysis of regional frameworks for integrated risk management. Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre. June 2018
- Partners for Resilience, (semi) Annual Report 2016. Horn of Africa Regional program. April 2017
- Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2017*, Horn of Africa Regional program, (revised) 31 March 2018
- Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2018*, Horn of Africa Regional program. 15 March, 2019
- Partners for Resilience, *Global Ambitions, Local Answers*, Annual Report 2017, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 2020, 31 May 2018
- Partners for Resilience, *Horn of Africa- summary from PME report, for PfR SP Annual Plan 2019 to MoFA*
- Partners for Resilience, *Local Realities, Global Ambitions* Annual Report 2018 Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 - 2020, 29 May 2019
- Partners for Resilience, Semi-Annual Report 2019 & Annual Plan 2020. Horn of Africa Regional program. September 2019
- Partners for Resilience, Theory of Change
- Partners for Resilience. (Semi) Annual Report 1st half 2017 & Annual Plan 2018. Horn of Africa Regional program. September 2017
- Region Summary Page - Horn of Africa (2017 PME report)
- The Netherlands Red Cross, *Programme Report Inception Phase, January-August 2016*, Netherlands Red Cross/ Partners for Resilience, September 2016
- First Horn of Africa ToC Visualization, April 2019
- TOC final visualization September 2019 (exl)
- Partners for Resilience, Outcomes database, 3 February 2020

Annexes

Annex A – List of people interviewed for the HoA programme case

Sirak Temesgen	Red Cross Netherlands (supporting Red Cross Ethiopia)
Sarah Ndku	Policy and Advocacy manager, Kenya Red Cross
Titus Twame	Regional Policy & Advocacy Officer, Wetlands International
Shaban Mawanda	Policy and Resilience Advisor, Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre
Merciline Oyier	Regional Lead Horn Of Africa, Cordaid,
Annet Kandole	HoA regional Lead, Care
Leah Wanambw	Senior Policy Officer, AU Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (DREA)

Annex B – Preparatory document for PFR Regional Horn of Africa e-workshop

20, March 2020

Introduction to this online review

Dear Colleagues

Lidet Tadesse and I are uploading this short document which attempts to summarise the achievements of the PFR 2 programme in the HOA region.

This is based on our review of your annual reports and as well as interviews conducted over the past 2 weeks.

The document is a “work in progress”. It is presented now to provide an opportunity for you to give further precision and accuracy.

We would like you to focus in particular on **part 3** of the document.

This comprises a matrix that responds to the three core questions you are asked to report on in your bi-annual reporting. These three questions are:

1. ***What are the main outcomes that have achieved?*** – Here we refer to any changes in regional level policy, attitude or action related to IRM that the PFR programme has been able to influence/ contribute to in some way. These can include intermediary outcomes or “stepping stones/ milestones” as well as more concrete final outcomes.
2. ***What is the significance of each outcome achieved?*** – This question answers the “So what?” question and aims to establish why this outcome is significant in the HOA context and how you think it will contribute to improving disaster management and IRM in the region. It’s also important here to identify the **interlinkages** between outcomes where relevant.
3. ***How did PFR contribute to this outcome?*** – This is very important because PFR is an **influencing** programme that does not implement its own programmes but tries to influence key stakeholders, especially governments (but also the private sector and civil society actors) to adopt policies and practices that contribute to disaster management in the HOA region from an IRM perspective. We know that in most cases, PFR has made contributions alongside other stakeholders, that is why we talk of contribution rather than attribution. So we want to understand as best we can **HOW** the programme influenced the outcomes and what **SPECIFIC** inputs it provided (EG: lobby and advocacy activities, capacity strengthening, Knowledge management) etc etc. It is important, wherever possible, to identify those actions that really made an impact on the processes you were working on and how it came about that you got involved.

Completing this matrix will enable us to better tell the “story so far.....” of the HOA regional programme and to position it in the context of the wider evaluation, which will be read by persons who are not necessarily conversant with the specificities of the region.

In so doing, we are mindful that the HOA programme is comparatively new and works with limited resources. We are not therefore here to judge what you set out to do versus what you have achieved but rather to learn how a regional influencing programme sets itself up, establishes relationships with partners, identifies entry points/ windows of opportunities and accompanies policy processes and the achievements recorded thus far. Also to learn what has worked well and what has not, opportunities and challenges. We therefore use the matrix as a tool to achieve this purpose.

Next week, when we meet together on Skype, we will drill down on some more cross-cutting issues related to programme design and operations: including its positioning vis a vis country and global levels; focus and selection criteria for engagement in regional processes; influencing strategy incl. role of capacity strengthening, knowledge management; horizontal linkages among partners etc. We will follow up with additional information in next days, including background note.

Please note that the material contained in the matrix is based on what you yourselves have submitted in your bi-annual reports plus some additional insights obtained from the interviews.

Please therefore carefully review each cell of the matrix and elaborate the text to the extent possible providing as much information that enables us all to tell the story. If there are outcomes, even intermediary outcomes, that are not there, do please add these. If you feel outcomes need to be assigned in different cells, combined or broken up into discrete parts, then please do so. Note that we have included prompts in the cells related to Significance and Contribution. These read: “*The is significant because.....*” and “*PFR has contributed to this outcome by.....*” Please try to be as comprehensive as possible with respect to these two categories of Significance and contribution.

The discussion document remains available for comment up until COB Tuesday 24th. If absolutely necessary this can be extended into Wednesday.

Lidet and I remain available to answer any queries/ clarifications etc so do not hesitate to get in touch with either of us.

1. About this document

As part of the PfR evaluation, ECDPM is taking a closer look at the regional Horn of Africa programme and assessing the relevance, coherence, efficiency, coordination, complementarity, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme.

Accordingly, ECDPM together with PfR partners had organised a workshop due to take place in Kampala Uganda on 21 March, 2020. However due to the COVID-19 outbreak the workshop in Kampala was cancelled and it was decided to conduct the workshop online instead. This will involve a two-step process. The first step is an on-line review of findings (20-24 March) where participants review and comment in writing (24-26 March). The first part focuses principally on the validation of findings using the outcome harvesting core questions. The second part is a follow-up skype conference call (on 27 March) to focus on selected topics focuses primarily on learning and implications for the way forward.

This document lays out ECDPM's findings so far based on its document review and interviews it conducted with some of PfR Horn of Africa team members. It is the main document HoA team members are expected to provide feedback on in step 1 of the processes and facilitates the discussion for the conference call in step 2 as well.

2. Generic findings on the HoA programme: structure, focus approaches

The HoA programme is a new addition to the PfR alliance as it only came about in PfR II. Within PfR II, the programme started its implementation later (towards the second half of 2016 and first half of 2017) than the commencement of the partnership in 2016. This was because it needed to build up from the experiences of the country programmes, which guided the process of which issues (eg. pastoralism) and policy processes (eg. LAPSSSET) relevant to IRM were trans-national and hence to be tackled at a regional scale.

Where the regional programme comes from: the rationale

1. The realisation that in addition to national issues, that are addressed by country programmes, there are common and cross border issues affecting communities in the Horn of Africa, like drought, the use of common resources and changing gender structures as a result of climate change, that are beyond national borders and require a regional approach.
2. Bringing experiences together from the different countries will allow for richer and deeper learning and evidence building, especially in relation to common livelihoods in the Region.
3. Regional bodies and policies such as from the African Union, IGAD and EAC require regional engagement.

Focus areas of work

The programme works along three trajectories, with one partner taking a lead in a trajectory or taking a lead in the stream of work concerning a specific regional organization/policy process.

- **Trajectory 1 Policies:** IRM is mainstreamed in the relevant regional policies, action plans and monitoring processes. Red Cross is the lead.

- **Trajectory 2 Investments:** Generating interest among investors and authorities on risk sensitive and risk proof investments. Wetlands is the lead
- **Trajectory 3 Practice:** Documentation and dissemination of good IRM practices in the region. Cordaid is the lead.

The programme's approach to advocacy and policy influencing

Lobbying and policy engagement: meetings, consultations, participating in major IRM relevant events and making the case for IRM smart approaches, policy briefs.

Providing technical assistance to regional organisations when they need it (through taking on commissioned work eg. Wetlands developing a wetlands management strategy for NBI, conducting analysis on behalf of regional organisations eg. Red Cross Climate Centre sharing recommendations on IRM gap analysis of IGAD IDRISSI, based on a study it had commissioned or by contracting consultants that can develop a strategy for them eg. AU DREA and the African Climate Change strategy).

Building capacity: the programme's own capacity, the capacity of country programmes, producing and sharing knowledge products such as manuals, policy briefs, reports etc.

Creating awareness: of communities of practice, the media and affected communities (eg. in Kenya vis-à-vis LAPSET), on DRR, CCA, IRM and IRM related regional policies.

3. Main outcomes achieved by the programme so far.....

	Outcomes	Significance	Contribution
Raised awareness on the need for IRM	Journalists and media houses improved the content quality of reporting on integrating DRR, Climate Change and Ecosystem issues. (trajectory 3).	<i>This is significant because:</i> Media is an important stakeholder in educating, informing the policy makers and practice on topical issues + holding government and other stakeholders to account.	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> trained 39 journalists from Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda on the Sendai framework programme of action, the EAC climate change strategy and IGAD DRR strategy and IRM principles.
	Nile Basin Initiative has shown interest in Mainstreaming IRM in Wetlands Management including supporting the development of Wetlands policy for Ethiopia (trajectory 2).	<i>This is significant because:</i> Wetlands International engaged the NBI secretariat on the Mainstreaming of IRM in Wetlands management under the Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework and supports Wetlands Policy formulation for government of Ethiopia.	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> This was as a result of a one-week wetlands management and policy instruments benchmarking tour facilitated by Wetlands International and hosted by the Ramsar Center for Eastern Africa (RAMCEA) and NBI with a delegation from Ethiopia.
Changes in behaviour	IGAD to merge its DRR and CCA departments (trajectory 3).	<i>This is significant because:</i> The commitment to merge the two departments will set pace for Government agencies in the Horn of Africa to adopt a similar approach.	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> KRCS in partnership with BRACED and IGAD held the first of a series of Resilience roadshows with high level policy discussions. The meeting brought together 30 practitioners from Academia, EAC, PFR in the HOA region, IFRC, and Kenyan government representatives.

	Africa Union DREA shows willingness to work with PfR to develop AU climate change strategy with IRM lens. (trajectory 1).	<i>This is significant because:</i> Inclusion of PfR in the process will ensure that the new climate change strategy contains IRM safeguards.	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> IFRC, NLRC and RCCC have intensively engaged the DRR Unit, the Environment and Climate change Unit of DREA on the importance of integrating DRR and CCA strategies. -NLRC, IFRC and RCCC contributed to the drafting of a ToR for the development of the Climate Change Strategy, and an MOU in AU DREA.
	NEMA and LAPPSET acceptance of the Community recommendations on LAPPSET which has led to temporary stoppage of the construction of Construction of the Mega Dam that should serve the proposed Isiolo Resort City with Water due to consideration of the Environmental issues raised by the local community (trajectory 2).	<i>This is significant because:</i> Recommendations will be shared with South Sudan and Ethiopia to inform their contribution when a similar session shall be convened in those LAPPSET Countries.	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> Submitted recommendations on the Strategic Environmental Analysis Report (SEA) to the Director General t LAPPSET Authority and NEMA Kenya.
Changed policies	NBI has an IRM-smart Wetlands management strategy, Conservation Investment Plans (CIPs) and wetland monographs for 3 transboundary wetland landscapes: Sio-Siteko wetlands (Kenya and Uganda); Sango Bay-Minziro wetland landscape (Tanzania and Uganda); and the Semliki delta wetland. (trajectory 2).	<i>This is significant because:</i> PfR Regional programme is using this opportunity to integrate IRM principles within the wetlands management plans, Conservation Investment Plans (CIPs) and wetland monographs for the 3 transboundary wetland landscapes which are important for the implementation of the Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework.	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> Wetlands International (WI) was recognized by the Nile (commissioned to draft) Basin Initiative (NBI)'s wetlands management plans, landscape (Uganda and Democratic Republic of Congo). Wetlands International has been engaging with NBI and the South Sudan National Ministry of Environment and Forestry through the Directorate of Wetlands and Biodiversity landscapes .
	IRM aspects are integrated into the Declaration of the 6 th high level meeting on disaster Risk Reduction for Africa	<i>This is significant because:</i> This will influence Governments priorities in accelerating the implementation of the	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> The programme had done a couple of pre-conference and conference side events.

	and Arab Countries; “The Tunisia Declaration 2018” IRM aspects also integrated in the Declaration of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in Geneva 2019 (trajectory 1) .	Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030 and especially the Programme of Action for the Implementation of Sendai Framework 2015-2030 (POA) and the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction that are among the seven frameworks targeted for the IRM integration.	
	Africa Common Position to the 2019 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, conference includes DRR, CCA and sustainable development. (trajectory 1) .	<i>This is significant because:</i> providing opportunity for the IRM aspects to be incorporated in the Global Platform Declaration Document.	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> PFR HoA team reviewed and made inputs into the African Regional Position Paper presented by AU to the 14 th African Technical Working Group on DRR in Hawasa, Ethiopia.
	LDC negotiators chair, Representatives of Governments, WB Global Facility for DRR, IIED aware of IRM principles and include them in the draft LDC vision for 2050 on effective Adaptation and Resilience (trajectory 1) .	<i>This is significant because:</i> The inclusion of IRM aspects of LDC Vision for 2050 on Effective Adaptation and Resilience is relevant to PFR in enhancing climate resilience.	<i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i> RCCC participated shared experiences during the LIFE AR (LDC initiative for Effective Adaptation and Resilience) Regional Consultation Meeting in Addis Ababa.

Background document for HoA E-workshop

Lessons Learnt and Way Forward

Friday 27th March, 2020

Topic 1: Programme assumptions

1.1. Related to programme design:

1. (Explicit) Assumptions at the start of the programme:

- There will be sufficient access to regional decision-making institutions and programs that have the mandate and the capacity to mainstream the IRM principles at regional level
- Policy and investments related decisions will translate to practice
- Adequate IRM evidences will be generated to back up the policy dialogues at regional level
- Political commitment at regional level

2. Implicit assumptions at the start of the programme

- The existence of a viable private sector operating at the regional level trajectory 2.
- Influencing these regional policies will help trickle down some impact at the national level as member states of these organisations both drive but also take down the policy directions of these regional organisations.

Questions for reflection: how did the explicit assumptions play out in reality? What are some of the lessons learnt around assumptions?

1.2. On Regional level policy engagement

Organisational politics: even when an issue is on the agenda and within the mandate of a regional organisation, work could be staggered because intergovernmental organisations are wary of engagement with CSOs lest they (CSOs) dilute or diverge their core interests or mandates.

Further, within regional organisations especially the African Union, inter departmental competition also prevents organisations from adapting to more effective ways of responding to IRM

Timing of policy processes: these regional organisations are intergovernmental organisations which are driven by their member states. As a result, major decisions often take time and are also stalled due to political dynamics either within member states or among member states in these regions. As a result, it takes a long time – perhaps even longer than the duration of the programme for tangible outcomes by way of policy change, behavioural change etc. to be realised.

Contributions vs. attribution of outcomes: in general in policy influencing, one could have contributed to a significant outcome but there are too many other variables and actors contributing towards the same results that it's very difficult to derive attribution. Therefore, the reflection on outcomes by the PfR should also be contextualised in terms of this reality.

Questions for reflection: what were your starting assumptions vs. reality of the ease of and effectiveness of working with intergovernmental organisations? Did you anticipate internal organisational politics, inaccessibility, and slower pace? And what were the assumptions and reality of the effectiveness of working with regional organisations as a means of promoting IRM not only in regional policies but national policies; is there really a trickle down from regional policies to national policies?

Topic 2: Partnership, Complementarity and Coordination

2.1. On the partnership:

Complementarity: the partnership is based on the strategic value in terms of technical expertise and or access to policy spaces each organisation brings. Red Cross for example, in addition to its expertise in DRR can use the offices of the IFRC to engage with the AU. The Red Cross Climate Centre brings in expertise on climate change adaptation and also sits in the Steering Committee for Ending Drought Emergency programme for IGAD. Wetlands International comes with extensive experience in wetland management and restoration of ecosystems. Cordaid comes with a wealth of experience in the practice on IRM and also its documentation and dissemination. CARE has experience in policy engagement but is particularly well resourced and advanced in its thinking and practice around gender and brought this experience to the partnership.

Support: even if there are leads to each trajectory, and partners also plan their own strands of activities and policy engagement in each trajectory, the programme is jointly owned by all partners and support is always afforded by the other partners to the lead partner. This comes in the form of technical assistance i.e. thematic expertise, advice of processes and approaches (e.g. procurement), co-financing activities.

2.2. On complementarity and coordination: horizontal, vertical

The regional programme builds on country programmes: The country levels help generate evidence for the country levels to lobby at the regional level, as the actual implementation is at the national level. Thus much of the evidence the regional programme uses are ones that have been generated by the country programmes. Further, all members of the regional team are also part of the country teams. This offers the opportunity to bring up to the regional programme, issues the country teams notice are transnational and need a regional level engagement. It also allows for capacity building activities such as IRM policy advocacy to reach to the level of country teams.

Questions for reflection: The themes and topics the regional programme works on align with those of the country teams. Beyond this alignment, could it be said that all activities of the regional programme were building on, or were done as a result of demand from one or two country programmes? Or are some/most of its activities a result of assessing and identifying opportunities for engagement at the regional level and promoting IRM at that level?

The regional programme serves a mid-way medium for translating global IRM policies to national/local action: in some cases, the regional programme also helps country programmes to cope up with global frameworks... passing on information from global processes e.g. Paris, to the country programmes. It translates the global process to what needs to be done at the country level. It also helps identify expertise within the partnership on who needs to help them e.g. Climate risk management for South Sudan was supported by the IFRC; the climate bill in Uganda was advised to get support from IFRC. But sometimes this type of support could also be done directly between country teams and the global programme which takes on the primary role of refining IRM concepts, ensuring consistency across country teams, and providing technical support in localising/contextualising the concept to national contexts.

Questions for reflection: are these observations accurate? to what extent do you see a role for the HoA programme in 'translating' knowledge from the global to the national/local i.e. advising country programmes on how to take part in and align with global IRM related frameworks, initiatives and processes - when these topics/issues affect the HoA region as a whole? In PfR III, what are some of the lessons learnt and best practices on how to synergize across country, regional and global programmes? what could be done better?

Topic 3: Private Sector engagement

3.1. Trajectory 2: Private sector engagement: the absence of organised forum for the private sector operating at the regional level, has encouraged the team to look into supporting the engagement types/approaches and plans of regional organisations with regards to major (public or public-private) development projects e.g. LAPSET or shared natural resources such as regional Wetlands - with the hope that these will have a trickledown effect. This has then triggered a discussion around the programme's approach to private sector engagement in this trajectory.

Questions for reflection: Is private sector engagement more suitable at the national level rather than regional level? The regional programme has initiated and is finalising a private sector mapping in Uganda, South Sudan, Kenya to establish a database. However, perhaps this engagement with the private sector (how, at what level, who etc.) needs to be revisited.

Topic 4: Cross cutting issues

4.1. On Inclusion

The earlier documents (programme proposal) emphasizes on inclusion of and sensitivity of the needs of vulnerable groups such as pastoralists, small holder farmers, especially the women and youth among them.

For the HoA programme inclusion is seen more from the point of view of calling for inclusive policies that are sensitive to the needs of marginalised groups such as pastoralists, women etc. The view from the programme is that by working on regional programs that address marginalised groups (e.g. African framework for pastoralism, IGAD IDRISSI/ICPAL) it is indeed promoting inclusion.

Questions for reflection: Beyond working on issues that would affect them (climate change, disaster risk are generally issues that perhaps disproportionately affect these groups), in what other ways has the programme promoted their beneficitation + representation and participation of these groups in the programme's work with regional bodies? e.g. by facilitating their direct interface with regional policy bodies/makers? What does it mean for your future planning/programming?

4.2. On Sustainability

The main 'theory of change' strategy of the programme to ensure sustainable impact of its efforts is indeed by focusing on influencing policies, which if made IRM-smart, will have a positive impact well beyond the lifetime of the programme.

While this is one approach, the nature of the HoA programme, as one that works directly with policy stakeholders means that it should think about its sustainability strategy and exit plan differently from the PfR country programmes. It may not be time yet to think about an exit plan, however, looking ahead in the future, how should PfR III be built in a way that builds on results from PfR II and cements the impact of the Alliance for a longer term?

Questions for reflection: in the absence of CSO partners, how does the programme ensure that the regional stakeholders it targets will continue to adopt IRM in their policies, and practices even after the life of the regional programme? How will this play out, particularly noting the fact that these regional/intergovernmental bodies are political where interests and incentives continuously evolve?