

Progress Report Guatemala

January – June 2013



Period of Progress Report	January – June 2013
Budget for the total period of the report	Red Cross: € 103,030 CARE: € 94,684 Cordaid/Cáritas: € 162,390 Wetlands International: € 57,993.45
Name of the person who elaborated the report	Andrés José Molina Echeverría
Date of the report	15 August 2013

1 Part I – Intra-organizational developments

Are there developments within individual organisation(s) that impact on the ability of the organisation to implement the agreed activities? These can be e.g. reduced availability of staff or financial resources, because of or as a reaction to external developments: has staff been involved in the development of proposals or the management of other programmes? Is staff reduced or replaced? Have resources become available in less quantity and/or later than planned?

As part of its new Strategic Plan 2013-2016, the Guatemalan Red Cross (GRC) has made changes in its organizational chart in order to strengthen the delegations, self sustainability and leadership in managing their projects. This plan establishes a thematic linking and therefore, within the Risk Management Division which is the focal point for the PfR program, there has been created a program coordination for Resilience, Climate Change, disaster prevention and responses. These coordinations are linked with the PfR program to support and to help out.

Regarding the GRC technical team, there were changes. In February a new national coordination of the program and a new environmental engineering technician were selected. This has led to the restart of training, induction and planning processes that already had begun with the new crew. Although one has looked for mitigation, the GRC is aware of the delays in implementing activities and the achievement of results due to these changes. On the other hand, during the reporting period, the technical team was not involved in activities outside the program and in emergencies, and as expected, the technical team has the resources necessary for the implementation of project activities.

CARE and Asociación Vivamos Mejor (AVM) continue managing the program in a coordinated and complementary way in the micro basin of the River Masa. The amount for execution remains as it was approved. In addition, it keeps the same staff of 2012 for implementation. However, in early 2013, the team structure was modified: CARE hired directly a technician, who was part of AVM, who is now in charge of the execution of six of the 13 activities of the strategic lines 1 and 2¹, and supports the program coordinator in the implementation of all activities set out in the strategic line 3 and the learning agenda. In turn, the local partner AVM is responsible for 7 of the 13 activities of the strategic lines 1 and 2². To meet the objectives, AVM has hired another technician and also has a micro river basin strategy with other projects which has facilitated the working time of at least two more technicians for some linked actions and thus promoting the continuity of the activities.

In addition, CARE has promoted linking the DRR/CCA/ERM and together with partner Wetlands International (WI) maintains links with the Bio-Rights project that started in 2012 and will end in October 2013.

In late 2012, the Bishop of Zacapa was moved and in his place Diocesan Administrator, the priest Juan María Boxus, has been appointed who is also Director General. This has not affected the continuity of the program, because he already knew and was briefed on the progress of the program. Caritas has kept his staff in the eleven communities who maintain involvement as a team, and at certain moments,

¹ The 6 CARE activities are: Document and make visible the role of good management of wetlands in providing water public, education campaigns in schools, promoting exchanges, forums and networking processes for building agendas, local organizations share knowledge/agendas with communities, open spaces for the recovery for local and traditional knowledge, working with universities in aligning topics.

² The 7 AVM activities are: Development of risk analysis, implementation of micro community projects, facilitation and knowledge sharing, implementation of community early warning systems, training and development of local organizations, develop and strengthen development and preparedness plans and facilitate the integration and strengthening of local organizations.

the facilitators support the activities of others in other communities. Cordaid is supporting Caritas Zacapa in looking for new funds with other international agencies even in other communities of Zacapa and Chiquimula to continue the program. Also, Caritas agencies are managing funds with related agencies like Manos Unidas, Caritas International and Populorum Progressio in the line of community management with the holistic approach in DRR and environmental stewardship, broad themes depending on the incidence and/or geography area.

In May 2013, WI has contracted a technician for micro projects in order to prioritize the implementation of micro projects. With this addition to the technical team, it is expected to speed up the review of partner profiles, as well as the technical and financial implementation of those micro-projects that are co-financed with partners and/or implemented directly by WI. Significantly, for implementation of shared micro projects it is necessary to streamline administrative processes, agreements with implementing partners and eventual disbursements.

Finally, the Climate Centre of the Red Cross (RCCC) has indicated that there are no changes in their capacity to implement the agreed activities.

Are there changes in the external environment of individual organisations that impact on its ability to implement the programme activities, eg. security issues or legislative changes?

Despite the insecurity in Guatemala, partner organizations reported no significant security problems, nor that physical integrity of the staff who execute the program or their property have affected. In the same way, there is no evidence for significant changes in policies, laws, regulations or staff of institutions related to DRR/CCA/ERM compared to 2012. This has led to progress in the coordination process with relevant institutions related to the holistic topics of PfR.

WI reported that in April 2013 the appointment of Benedicto Lucas as Executive Secretary of the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP) was confirmed. Lucas has always been open for collaboration with PfR which has facilitated the advocacy and technical cooperation for joint actions in ERM.

Finally, Caritas reported that although farming began in May, the rains were moderate and therefore, the communities are concerned about the possible loss of their crops due to drought dormant. As a result, there could be internal migration in search for work to support their families and in turn, reforestation activities could be at risk due to lack of soil moisture.

2 Part II – Functioning of the country team

Does the team meet frequently, are all partners able to participate? Does the team effectively reach decisions?

The Alliance partners meet regularly to coordinate joint activities under the following procedures:

- a) Under the leadership of the regional coordination, the frequency of meetings of the Technical Committee with representatives from partner organizations is maintained to discuss progress of activities, agree on common actions and unify criteria for implementation. Although participation in these meetings depends on the availability of staff of each partner (geographic dispersion), recently the teleconferencing mode via Skype has been used and those who were not present, are informed of the results to take decisions.

Without physical presence in the country, RCCC participates in meetings via Skype when possible and/or necessary, although sometimes the internet connection problems hinder the participation.

CARE has mentioned that the fact that the regional coordinator is not physically located in the region has hampered some coordination and created some communication problems. Previously, there was direct communication with the coordinator who participated in the joint meetings and in meetings with other non PfR actores. Furthermore, situations were analyzed and decisions were taken in function of the results of the activities.

- b) When necessary, representatives from partner organizations at country team level, meet without the presence of representatives of regional coordination to make decisions about ongoing activities.

In general, members of the PfR alliance have reached agreements and run the activities of common interest, maintaining a good working environment in the country team. There is a good communication and coordination between partners and procedures for effective decision making are improved, looking for consensus. On the other hand, GRC reported that the technical team, under the leadership of the national coordination, have planning meetings to review planning, methodologies, results of key activities reaching key consensus for its implementation.

An example is the facilitation of common actions regarding the advocacy at national level which has created the need for more frequent meetings between the partners in order to organize and share program activities, like conducting a National Forum with leading institutions and other actors working on related integrated DRR/CCA/ERM approach.

Does it operate collectively vis-à-vis stakeholders (if not, why not?)

CARE and GRC have indicated that the joint working path which seeks common achievements and results at national level has resulted that non PfR organizations and other institutions recognize the alliance, without affecting the independence of each organization regarding their policies and internal strategies. Therefore, there is a good visibility and identification as an alliance by institutions. However, GRC indicates that due to the geographical dispersion, locally the partner organizations have more visibility than the alliance, however the team has always presented itself as part of an alliance and has used the PfR alliance logo as its visibility.

In the same way, the partners agree that it has maintained a unified posture particularly since the National Forum of January that allowed starting interinstitutional relationships between alliance partners and NGOs, United Nations agencies and strategic institutions related the holistic PfR approach³. This has allowed concrete advocacy and follow-up and coordination, especially with the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), National Coordinator for Disaster Reduction (SE-CONRED), National Council for Protected Areas (CONAP) and Ministry of Education (MINEDUC). For example, an inter-agency workshop with CONAP, SE- CONRED and MARN is planned for August 2013 to define a common agenda for the remaining period of the program. Furthermore, through a consultancy the development of educational DRR/CCA/ERM modules is coordinated with MINEDUC. Finally, Caritas emphasizes that the realization of actions with these institutions, may be confirmed by letters of understanding or cooperation agreements which are expected to sign.

Are activities of all partners aligned?

Generally, the partners themselves are aligned, because they have a logic framework and a common work plan and there are tools like the Micro project Protocol and the Information, Education and Communication (IEC) Strategy. Additionally, as a result of this alignment, the consultancy for the design of educational modules on DRR/CCA/ERM is being implemented, a consultant to develop the monitoring and evaluation system that measures the progress of the program is contracted (by GRC) and the Advocacy Strategy to guide actions in the three programmatic results is being reviewed.

As for the administrative operation in order to streamline procurement and purchasing processes, it has been agreed that each partner covers parts of the service and/or materials required for the implementation of joint activities. For example, GRC has hired the consultant to implement IEC strategy and the other partners shall employ and/or buy printing, editing or reproduction of the designed materials for the awareness campaign.

Although partners are not aligned in specific tasks or methodologies, the interest in the homologation of certain elements is maintained, like the minimum standards and eco-criteria (RCCC and WI), and the mapping of the minimum contents for the DRR/CCA/ERM training is pending.

On the other hand, to maintain the homogeneity of the intervention, the partners still continue with the initiative of common activities through bilateral interventions. For example, WI notes that at technical level progress has been made in the alignment of activities regarding the integrated approach, however, depending on prior skills and experience, some members advance more than others at community or municipal level. WI as a technical advisor of all partners accompanies when required. However, it recommends that any process involving common activities should look for a similar execution times for a more efficient technical input. Finally, although each partner organization conducts its business according to their experience and knowledge, all are looking for the same goal, responding and contributing to the same indicators and results of the program

How do partners support each other's programme development and implementation in this respect?

The partners have indicated that the willingness of the country team to maintain and promote mutual support among members of the alliance remains, especially in implementing activities and support on issues where one organization has more knowledge and experience than the others. Such is the case of strategic line 3 activities where there is a mutual support and work on the basis that each achieve as planned, a partner leading an activity with the common objective of all. For example, the National

³ The National Forum entitled: "Approach to an integrated approach to Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change Adaptation, Ecosystem Management and Restoration with National and Regional Actors" was attended by 112 representatives of international and local NGOs, community grassroots organizations, universities, UN agencies and national institutions.

Forum held in Antigua in January 2013, where each partner made a significant contribution to the organization, content, methodology and results.

Other examples are the Regional Workshop on the use of minimum standards and eco-criteria carried out in Zacapa by RCCC and WI in March 2013, with positive results in the elaboration of profiles for micro projects with an integrated approach. On the last day in Guatemala City, there was a session on climate forecasts in the short, medium and long term, with governing bodies of government, NGOs and local partners. A result of that session was the agreement to implement weather stations that record data for a possible EWS⁴ supported by GRC and endorsed by the National Institute of Seismology, Volcanology and Meteorology and Hydrology (INSIVUMEH).

As for bilateral activities between partners, the work of WI with the PfR partners needs to be highlighted:

In general, the coordination with the National Roundtable on Climate Change to strengthen the work of each partner in its intervention areas, and the support as ecosystem adviser at community forums.

With CRG through consultancies on ecosystems, local and traditional knowledge Q'eqchi' and the micro-project on forest nurseries in El Estor.

With CARE, WI technically and financially supported the development and implementation of studies on agro-biodiversity species potential for food security and local / traditional knowledge in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Solola in the middle river basin of the River Masa.

Additionally, some upcoming activities have been planned like the support that Caritas provide to CARE and AVM for staff training in the participatory video methodology as a technique for collecting information regarding community perceptions of risk.

During the Regional Workshop of March 2013, the teams showed interest in collaborating with external entities to facilitate the implementation of their programs. Furthermore, the partners confirmed their willingness to collaborate with meteorological services authorities and other stakeholders to:

- a) assist the national meteorological services to improve the content and dissemination of its forecasts to stakeholders.
- b) help partners PfR to understand what services can and can not offer the national meteorological services.
- c) Develop a joint plan with PfR partners in what could be improved on the use of information for decision-making in the coming months.

As a result, the partners confirmed their common interest in supporting the organization of a workshop on EWS facilitated by RCCC, in order to identify opportunities for collaboration with meteorological services authorities (INSIVUMEH) and learn from the experiences of NGOs outside the PfR consortium (for example ASORECH) in the use of climate information to inform and support adaptation actions at local level. Finally, the RCCC introduced new participatory games to facilitate dialogue and learning on DRR/CCA/ERM. Guatemala has established a subgroup to explore the potential and develop opportunities for using games in PfR activities and the work of their organizations.

Are staff members invited to (planning) meetings or of partner organisations?

Despite the geographical dispersion has not allowed a closer relationship, the partner organizations exchanged invitations to meetings or activities such as training workshops. Internally Caritas, CARE, AVM, WI and GRC have invited each other to various training activities.

GRC has coordinated with the technical team of the Nicaraguan Red Cross (NRC) internship exchange with learning visits between the teams and also shared educational materials that have served as reference for GRC, to retake several tools like the short story "My friend the weather", "Nature show", and the game of the stairs is a joint effort with technical support from WI-Nicaragua. Also during the municipal forum on "The role of ecosystems in CCA" on the International Day for Biological Diversity, WI gave a presentation in Quiché on the ecosystem component and supported in writing press releases.

Due to its role as technical advisor, WI is developing a GIS Atlas for all the working areas of the alliance. Likewise, Caritas/Cordaid and WI have coordinated with the Center for Conservation Studies (CECON) at the University of San Carlos de Guatemala (USAC), supported students in the practice of a graduate course in Ecological Restoration in the community Lantiquín in Camotán and have delivered the draft document on the status of the pine-oak forest to the community and to Caritas Zacapa. The closing of the course involved a press conference and two keynote speeches on "The challenges of ecosystems in tropical dry forests" given by Dr. Jarrod Thaxton professor at the

⁴ The stations will be located in Joyabaj, El Estor and Cabañas, and will be part of the national system.

University of Puerto Rico students of the University Center East (CUNORI), institutions government, NGOs and private sector.

Finally, Caritas has invited the alliance partners in Guatemala and Nicaragua to capacity building activities, as in the case of the Workshop on Community video provided by the Pool of Trainers in Zacapa in July 2013.

Have field visits to each other's project sites already taken place?

Several partners affirmed the importance of the mode of Technical Committee meetings in different areas of intervention. Moreover, it is positively valued because it provides insights into the context of the working areas of each partner, facilitating mutual learning and sharing experiences. Although this has not been a constant, there have been three exchange through field visits to areas of intervention of other partners:

- a) Regional Workshop in March, where members got to know the working area of Caritas applying minimum standards and implemented micro projects in the communities Lantiquín, Cerco de Piedra and Los Encuentros in Zacapa and Chiquimula.
- b) Mid-term review in Quiché in March where several communities in the working area of GRC were visited.
- c) The meeting of the Technical Committee in Estor in June, where the area of micro project of the community nursery has been visited.

RCCC didn't participate in the above mentioned field visits.

However, bilaterally, AVM has carried out an exchange of experiences with Caritas and ASORECH in Chiquimula with the intention of learning more about the experience on climate and EWS. In the same way, WI has visited at least once all the working areas of the partners, namely: 1) construction of micro-project profile for the municipal nursery in El Estor, Izabal, with GRC, 2) follow-up on the consultancy of the ecosystem characterization of Cucubá in Quiché with GRC, 3) identification of micro-projects with Caritas Zacapa and Chiquimula, 4) identification of micro projects in the watershed of Masa in Solola with CARE and AVM, 5) recognition visit of WI and the regional coordination visiting the micro projects carried out in some communities of Zacapa and Chiquimula as preparation for the Regional Workshop in March.

The RCCC was unable to participate in field trips during the midterm revision. However, answering the request of the country team, agreed to facilitate a workshop on EWS in late July. This will include field visits to facilitate a discussion on the design and development of a EWS in vulnerable communities.

Does the team apply a strategy or implementation plan for the remaining years under PfR?

Although there is no specific strategy, the country team has an implementation plan (POA) related to the logical framework of the program that is reviewed and updated every 3 months retaking the progress and results achieved to date, as well as the activities that have not been met. In addition, every year there is a projection of activities and expenses according to the logical framework which is adjusted according to the progress and delays obtained. However, the team tries to comply with the logic path for each strategic line. During the next meeting of the Technical Committee in late August, will develop and review the POA 2014 and define more specifically the exit strategy of the program which will include elements of sustainability in all three levels. Similarly, each organization has its own mechanisms for coordinating and monitoring the activities of the program. In the case of GRC, it has an annual operating plan which derive monthly operating plans that guide the achievement of expected results and indicators and the review of an appropriate methodology.

Caritas prioritizes the exit strategy with actions at community level including elements like the modification of the action plans, Participative Risk Assessment Tool because of the update of the disaster risk analysis in the eleven communities Zacapa and Chiquimula, the homologation of the DRR plans with the development plans of SEGEPLAN to develop more comprehensive plans, the inclusion of minimum standards and eco-criteria in the micro projects in order to ensure sustainability of the processes and signing letters of understanding, cooperation, socialization and standardization of tools, research and consultancy with other institutions at national and departmental level. Meanwhile WI emphasizes the realization of joint actions locally and keep track of meetings between CONRED, MARN and CONAP as a way that transcends program after 2014.

How is the DRR/CCA/EMR approach internalised, both contents and co-operation-wise? Is it applied in other DRR programmes as well?

The holistic approach is a standard program aligner and on this basis the activities and community and institutional arrangements are defined. In the case of GRC, there is a multidisciplinary team and although there have been moments of bias, in general the technical team maintains and works with the integrated approach of the program. There are several examples of linkage like community risk analysis (VCA) that have an ecosystem, climate and climate change adaptation, the study on the ecosystem services of the watershed of Cucubá, which includes environmental and ecosystem

analysis and also evident risk conditions (threats and vulnerabilities) and communities receive training that incorporates the integrated approach.

CARE believes that the country team has advanced in the process of internalizing the comprehensive approach of the program through the implementation of micro-projects, training content and other activities with governing bodies in the light of an integrated approach. Although there has been a willingness by all partners, the process need to be extended to other operational and programmatic organizational structures. In the same way, Caritas highlights that activities like the National Forum and subsequent monitoring with governing bodies and NGOs, the Regional Workshop challenged to consider the minimum standards and eco-criteria as viable and achievable and can serve as a tool for the design of initiatives and sustainable policies.

In addition, CARE uses the comprehensive approach of the program in other DRR programs:

- a) The Bio-Rights project with WI⁵: Due to the four supported communities are located in the same geographic area, there is greater coordination between technicians of both initiatives and it is expected that when Bio-Rights is finished in October 2013, the communities continue to participate in the activities of the strategic line 3 of the PfR program as a follow-up on the established work.
- b) The project "Building disaster resilient communities in the municipality of Chichicastenango, Quiché, Guatemala" executed under the VIII action plan of the DIPECHO Programme funded by the Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection of the European Commission. There have been advanced methodological exchanges between technicians, in addition to providing resources to some municipal building processes intended to promote and advocate for the approach of DRR/CCA/ERM. However, the implementation of the comprehensive approach should be adjusted in the coming months due to the DIPECHO runtime is smaller and the number of activities involved reduces the chances of taking a holistic approach is under construction.

According WI, remarkable progress has been made in the internalization of the integrated approach, through the implementation of eco-criteria where it is expected greater ownership by the partners. Added to that, WI has identified training needs in ERM and is developing training modules on ecosystems as a followup on the training minimum content. Furthermore, it is expected to provide tools so the MRE approach will not only internally strengthen the Alliance but also can be projected to strategic external local stakeholders.

Finally, RCCC minimum standards were designed to support country teams to integrate climate dimensions in PfR work. Currently, they are being adjusted to better reflect the needs and opportunities of local partners. In the same way, the partners have shown interest in better understand and implement the minimum standards which would help them internalize the comprehensive approach in DRR/CCA/ERM.

Is there more co-operation with organisations involved in PfR outside the PfR programme?

At the national level, the partners note that there has been good coordination and acceptance with the governing bodies of the integrated approach: CONRED, MARN and CONAP, each has a focal point for coordination and define actions of mutual interest. In the same way, it highlights the relationship with MINEDUC and INSIVUMEH has materialized some actions with carried out agreements to follow up the National Forum. This highlights the relationship with CONAP (WI is the link) who has requested support to implement actions in line with the National Biodiversity Strategy in the PfR territories and even support the publication of the Policy and Strategy of Biodiversity referring to the approach DRR/CCA/ERM.

At the territorial level (departmental, municipal and/or community), has established communications and collaboration with different stakeholders, thanks to the willingness of cooperation and trust. Some activities to consider are: facilitation support of issues during training, provide technical advice and support in local impact activities, financial contributions in materials and skilled labor in two micro projects, or the signing of cooperation agreements to develop specific activities program topics. In summary, the response has been positive in territorial level of holistic approach:

Cruz Roja	CARE - AVM	Cáritas
The Ministry of Environment in Quiché and El Estor through CODEMA (has promoted the formation of the climate change department roundtable) INSIVUMEH SE-CONRED	Association of Friends of the River Ixtacapa Climate Change Institute, City officials, District authorities of the Ministry of Education	Municipality of Cabañas Zootropic Actors joint officers Mancommunity roundtable on Climate Change and Gender

⁵ Bio-Rights is a project funded by the Humanitarian Innovation Fund and is implemented in four communities (Pakim, Pasaquijuyupltahuacán, Chicorral and Tzambajltahuacán) located in Solola, same region as PfR communities.

Ministry of Education in El Estor and Quiché MAGA Quiché INAB CONAP Quiché Municipal mayors of Santa Cruz del Quiché, Joyabaj, San Bartolomé Jocotenango, Sacapulas and El Estor	Local centers of the Ministry of Health Departmental delegates of CONRED, MARN and MAGA	Region East (Zacapa and Chiquimula) Governmental Entities NGOs Private sector Universities
--	--	--

WI maintains active cooperation with the following organizations:

- As joint effort of WI with the partners, a work plan has been established with the coordinator of the National Roundtable on Climate Change (MNCC) and it is expected to strengthen or form regional roundtables at different levels: micro (Masa in Solola), municipal (El Estor), departmental (Solola and Quiché) and regional (Zacapa and Chiquimula).
- The CECON of USAC with collaboration with the University of Puerto Rico and the ECOSUR of Mexico, the first graduate course in Ecological Restoration was carried out. Capacities of 25 professionals from different areas (academia, government, environmental NGOs) were strengthened. The last field trip of the course was done in Lantiquín, Camotán in coordination with Caritas and is pending receipt of the report to a possible technical and social mediation restoration recommendations in dry tropical ecosystems for strategic local actors.
- Other organizations with whom WI maintains good cooperation are: Defenders of Wildlife, Pine-Oak Partnership and Private Institute on Climate Change (ICC).

Is senior management of the organisations actively supporting the PfR alliance? Why (not)?

In general, the partners have highlighted the support and good relationships with the senior management of the partner organization of the PfR Alliance.

For the NLRC PfR represents a great challenge and has direct engagement coordination with other alliance members at headquarters and PfR direct responsibility with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has therefore appointed a technical team for operational coordination but also monitoring and tracking. Regarding GRC, they are directly responsible for their implementation through the Risk Management Division. The program has created a monitoring mechanism involving the GRC representative delegations where it operates and the general direction of GRC as are the technical committee and steering committee are spaces which presents progress, problems challenges, budgets, commitments to reflect and improve on the progress of the program. This year three meetings (March, May and July) have been held and in two of these CEO was present who is providing direct monitoring given the delays that have had the program and the commitment expressed to the NLRC to effectively run the program.

On the other hand, internal within CARE, the support of the national director of programs and the initiatives manager is maintained. This support is provided as follows: Track deployment activities and management support for the provision of resources. During the last meeting between the regional coordination and national director of CARE Guatemala in March, the director has expressed some ideas on how to implement the advocacy strategy that is expected to develop in the remainder of the period of implementation of the Programme .

Caritas/Cordaid is supported at the level of country representative and the Netherlands, maintaining constant communication, focusing on the technical, political and financial aspects. The Country representative visited the eleven communities on several occasions, including meetings with the Director General and CEO of Caritas Zacapa, after incorporation of Father Juan Maria Boxus, has strengthened the program. In addition, Caritas Zacapa and Cordaid constantly check the POA and budgets to continue and/or adjust the planned joint activities. In addition, Cordaid is strengthening Caritas Zacapa at institutional level through training/workshops to their staff, as well as seeking funds to continue with the actions implemented after 2014.

WI maintains a strategic and timely communication with WI-HQ for information on progress and overall guidance. Panama Regional Office is actively involved and informed of all actions in Guatemala and provides guidance and direct support for decision making both technically and financially. Example: it has a quarterly budget projection, which is reviewed and updated monthly.

Finally, the senior management of RCCC supports the Alliance to identify, collect and share experiences and lessons learned globally. An example of this effort is the report on the lessons learned from the evaluation phase of PfR, being finalized to share with partners. The RCCC will facilitate a workshop on SAT in July 2013 as an example to seek innovative ways to respond to the interests and requests of Country Teams despite having less presence in the region and regional budget.

3 Part III – Progress on programme implementation

3.1 Activities under the three strategic directions

# of beneficiaries reached	# 13,421 ⁶
# of female beneficiaries reached	# 6,369 ⁷

1.a # of mitigation measures implemented per community	A.1.1.2, A.1.1.3, A.1.1/2.1	# 0,57692 ⁸
<p>Although GRC is reporting one measure of fruit trees in the community of Chiquis, six profiles are agreed with the communities still lacking details. The actions identified are: saving stoves, construction of convergence center, kitchens in schools used as shelters. It is still necessary to identify the actions that will take place in the three newly selected communities.</p> <p>In the same way, GRC has continued reviewing the micro profiles with community leaders to have their own and shared profiles for review according to the ecosystemic criteria (WI) and that are consistent with the micro-protocol (regional coordination). In addition, progress was made with administrative procedures and purchase materials to the kitchens of families selected in Chiquis and Laguna Seca and it has coordinated with INTECAP (Technical Training Institute) that will train community leaders in the development and monitoring of kitchens. It has been valued to not only give the stoves to the families, but also train them so they can develop them or repair themselves.</p> <p>In the six communities in Solola there is proposed one mitigation measure through the implementation of two micro projects: 120 stoves and the implementation of 36 schools or Learning Centers for Rural Development (CADER) with focus on Climate Change and coordinated livelihoods and with technical assistance from MAGA, with the intention that the experience can be replicated in neighboring communities.</p> <p>Finally, in Zacapa, the eight communities of Cabañas continue to work with schools and municipal forest nurseries and transplanting remaining deforested areas.</p>		

1.b % of community mitigation measures environmentally sustainable	A.1.1.2, A.1.1.3, A.1.1/2.1	%100 ⁹
<p>In Quiché and El Estor, GRC has shared with WI 7 micro profiles for its review (2 stoves, 1 forest nursery and 4 Convergence Centers and kitchen for housing). Therefore, they consider that any measures implemented are environmentally sustainable and not have a negative impact on the ecosystem of the area.</p> <p>In Solola, the identified mitigation measures are environmentally sustainable because it does not negatively impact ecosystem services and biodiversity and help in understanding and recognition of ecosystem functions. In addition, these measures have been identified from risk analyzes and validated with community leaders who are integrated in a micro watershed committee.</p> <p>Caritas: The eleven mitigation measures are environmentally sustainable communities in the sense that they don't harm the environment and make the necessary efforts to ensure that these measures are sustainable. It is using the eco-criteria recommended by RCCC and WI for the 11 new proposals micro projects, like ecofritros, healthy cooking, dry latrines with dual purpose and zinc roofs for rainwater collection.</p>		

1.c # of community members reached with DRR/CCA/EMR activities	Línea estratégica 1 y 2	# 9,939 ¹⁰
<p>In Quiché, some activities included the review of the six COLRED that were appropriate according to the SE-CONRED guidelines in order to have their institutional endorsement. Similarly, training in basic first aid (PAB), temporary shelter, psychosocial support, basic concepts of risk management, linked to risk analyzes, safe water evacuation drill in an earthquake, and coordination with COCODE representatives of the committees well structured response delivery of basic equipment. Additionally, they were trained in ecosystems and CC issues related to DRR, a reforestation journey to celebrate Tree Day in Chiquis schools. The Departmental Delegation of the Ministry of Education authorized the engagement of teachers and students of the communities in the training process.</p> <p>On the other hand, in El Estor the functions/role in DRR was given to the COLRED, response measures promoting protection of resources and environment, population health linked to flood. In addition, data collection began with representatives of COLRED for developing local response plans according to the guidelines of CONRED. In both departments, the following activities are performed: Workshop on DRR, formation of school response committee in 15 schools (5 Quiché, 10 El Estor), first aid, school-level ecosystems and reforestation activities.</p> <p>In Solola, 1,723 community members (men, women, girls and boys), according to census prepared by the program are covered by both response plans as the management plan (risk reduction plan). However, it is important to mention that due to the watershed strategy this plan covers 37 communities including the 6 of the PIR, with a population of 27,255. Some activities were workshops for updating risk analysis using the methodology of features of a resilient community, integrated fire management as a restoration and conservation of ecosystems, two exchanges of experiences under AVM initiative (aimed at community leaders knew the structure CONRED</p>		

⁶ CARE: 2,544; RC: 4,002 and Cáritas: 6,875.

⁷ CARE: 1,297; RC: 1,772 and Cáritas: 3,300.

⁸ CARE: 6; RC: 1 and Cáritas: 19 (26 measurements in 15 communities).

⁹ In its midterm report, CARE had stated a 75%. The calculation only compare the amount of non-local materials with local materials. However, because WI has revised these project profiles, the Regional Coordination decided to indicate 100%.

¹⁰ CARE: 1,723; RC: 3,343 and Cáritas: 4,873 (70%).

operation and basic elements to develop a local approach EWS / community and developed in coordination with the Regional Association Campesina Chortí (ASORECH) with the focus on climate monitoring, EWS and water management and livelihoods). Additional minimum content¹¹ for training and first aid training provided by the Fire Volunteers of Nahualá.

In Zacapa, children, youth and adults are engaged in reforestation activities, updating community risk analysis, action plans and contingency brigades DRR training in sustainable management of watershed, effects of climate change, community video as a tool for DRR, recovery of traditional knowledge for CCA, exchange of experiences between communities and gender training. In addition, we worked in eight schools of Cabañas in issues like reforestation, preservation of the environment, earth day, tours of knowledge, issues that affect the natural environment and the importance of personal commitment to the environment with the support of the private reserve ZOOTROPIC.

1.1a # of communities that conducted climate trend risk mapping	A.1.1.2	# 17 ¹²
<p>In Quiché, the update of the nine diagnoses of the Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis (VCA) has been started in the communities served, however it will end with the defined tool for risk mapping including weather trend. Subsequently, a consultancy for a climate baseline is planned including analysis of projections of climate change and variability and it allows to show some maps of climatic trends as advocacy tool or generate a proposed adaptation measures or CCA plan in these municipalities. Additionally, it is developing the study on forest cover, characterization of ecosystems and ecosystem services, linked to local livelihoods of populations within the watershed of the river Cucubá.</p> <p>In Solola, AVM has supported the development of designed community-level risk maps based on aerial photographs where leaders and community members identify threats and vulnerabilities. However, although it has been difficult to map them, the incorporation of climate trends is in development and in turn the leaders are taking data with rain gauges to analyze weather trend indicators and compare them with observation.</p> <p>Finally, the eleven communities in Zacapa and Chiquimula its risk analysis and risk maps have been made and updated, including their seasonal calendars.</p>		

1.1b # of communities that developed collective risk red. plans based on climate trend risk mapping	A.2.1.2	# 17 ¹³
<p>GRC has indicated that the review of community development plans has begun, including a comprehensive approach. In this review in which also the plans of Caritas/Cordaid were revised, SEGEPLAN participated and the review and definition of tools for making development plans with PfR approach was defined. Also initiated the development of local response plans according to the methodology of CONRED and it is expected to be ready next semester.</p> <p>In Solola, the six communities have developed their emergency response/disaster plans. In Masa watershed they are consolidating the management plan of the watershed, which in turn is an instrument of DRR and in this sense, communities are reducing their vulnerabilities. This plan was formulated in a participatory way and covers 37 communities including the six PfR program communities in the middle of the watershed. Furthermore, two coordination committees of the watershed are established: one at high stream and one at low stream. On the other hand, the eight communities of Zacapa have updated the DRR plans taking into account the weather trend. However, they are still in the renovating process in the three communities of Chiquimula.</p>		

1.1c # of community members covered by risk plans	A.2.1.2	# 13,182 ¹⁴
<p>In Quiché and El Estor, five municipal response plans in all 5 COMRED of Sacapulas, Joyabaj, Jocotenango, San Bartolomé, Santa Cruz del Quiché and El Estor have elaborated and updated.</p> <p>In Quiché, local response plans and disaster development plans are under development and a participatory and inclusive approach to facilitate its adoption has been defined and subsequently will be socialized with community and municipal authorities. These will be useful tools as a guide to the work of community leaders in emergency situations and disasters. In addition, it is intended to include the integrated approach of the program in the development.</p> <p>In Solola, 1,723 community members (men, women, girls and boys), according to census prepared by the project are covered by both response plans as by the management plan (DRR plan), however it is important to mention that due to the strategy for the watershed this plan covers 37 communities, including the six PfR program, and a population of 27,255. The communities in Zacapa and Chiquimula, and the community members (children, women, men and the elderly) are covered by the risk reduction plans with the DRR/CCA/ERM focus.</p>		

1.2a # community members are trained in ecosystem-based livelihood approaches	A.1.2.1, A.2.1.1	# 242 ¹⁵
<p>In two Quiché communities as part of the implementation of the micro projects of iron stoves, beneficiaries will be trained in the construction and basic knowledge to reply useful actions for livelihoods approach based on conservation local forests.</p> <p>In Solola, 178 community members have been trained on issues like conservation of ecosystems using guide environmental education for schools and supported by MINEDUC. Additionally, it provided training on issues of environment and climate change with facilitators of MARN, MAGA and CONAP.</p>		

¹¹ Designed by AVM consisting of 8 modules and training sessions has been carried out in the following themes: Module I: Organization and Environment; Module II: Preparation of response and forest; Module III: Organization for response, water and watersheds; Module IV: Water, sanitation and promotion of hygiene and soil; Module V: Basic first aid.

¹² CARE: 6; RC: 0 and Cáritas: 11.

¹³ CARE: 6; RC: 0 and Cáritas: 11.

¹⁴ CARE: 1,723; RC: 4,584 and Cáritas: 6,875.

¹⁵ CARE: 178; RC: 0 and Cáritas: 64.

In Zacapa, eight brigades of Environment and Agriculture of the DRR Committee have been trained on topics like proper use of agricultural chemicals, effects of climate change, forest care, promoting the Forestry Incentive Program for Small Holders Extensions Ground (PINPEP) to implement agropastoral systems, improvements agriculture, agroforestry with annual or perennial crops.

In addition, a diploma jointly implemented by AVM and ICC has trained 20 people (10 men and 10 women) with a focus on agricultural issues of climate change adaptation. The ten women in training are implementing gardens and the ten men are committed to implement soil conservation measures in at least one area of approximately 425 m² of land, although activities are not funded 100% by PfR, they are related to the program.

On the other hand, to monitor the minimum agenda MRE trainings, WI hired a consultant to develop thematic training modules on Ecosystems and drafts of these products¹⁶ are there. Training to trainers is expected during second half of 2013.

1.2b # community members have undertaken actions to adapt their livelihoods

165¹⁷

GRC has reported two measures, the reforestation that was done in the nine communities in Quiché and El Estor. The diversification of fruit and forest species in Chuiquis with specific families of some communities and more structured activities with the micro project initiative. Furthermore, it has started with the implementation of the micro projects of the plate-saving stoves in two communities in Quiché. Furthermore, measures for adapting livelihoods of beneficiaries will be supporting. It has encouraged communities to focus with the adaptation measures on diversification of their livelihoods.

In Solola, the implementation of two micro projects has started: a) Implementation of improved stoves because 79% of the population does not have stoves b) Learning Centers for Rural Development with a focus on Climate Change (CADER) which involves 36 families in order to diversify production (agriculture, livestock, forestry, etc.. c) Diversification of food intended for consumption.

Caritas Zacapa has established a link with the Institute of Agricultural Science and Technology (ICTA) that pushed demonstration plots with sorghum varieties resistant to drought covering 30 producers and collecting native seeds of corn and beans in the community of El Solis where 15 farmers participated.

On the other hand, WI, GRC and CARE-AVM tendered following consultancies:

- a) "Study of the Worldview Q'eqchi and Wetlands Livelihoods of the Municipality of El Estor, Izabal with emphasis on DRR/CCA/ERM". WI and GRC hope to systematize this traditional knowledge to strengthen livelihoods and replicate good practices in DRR/CCA/ERM from the worldview of the nine communities.
- b) "Study on agrobiodiversity species with potential for food security in the municipalities of Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Solola (middle river basin of River Masa)", in partnership with CARE-AVM. The goal is to identify the species of agrobiodiversity used, production systems (agriculture and agroforestry) and farming practices (new and native), considering the potential for CCA of species and diversification of livelihoods of 10 communities.

2a # communities where partner NGOs/CBOs have facilitated access to knowledge on disaster trends, climate projections, ecosystem data

Línea estratégica 1 y 2

20¹⁸

In Quiché, the Institute of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment (IARNA) of the Rafael Landívar University, has provided information on the water situation in the Guatemalan highlands in regard to climate change and options for adaptation in the river basins of Quiché. This information has been disseminated by the IARNA to municipalities and it is expected to socialize information to the community.

In Solola, the six communities receive information emitted by official bodies (INSIVUMEH, CONRED, MARN) on climate trends and the trend in DRR issues and actions to take in an emergency. The information emitted by these bodies is of a technical nature that require further interpretation. To get this information out to communities easily, it is done via mediation by AVM Technician. In addition, the local partner has produced technical and climatic related information that contributes to the characterization of the region of the micro river basin Masa which facilitates transmission at the community level.

In Zacapa and Chiquimula: The eight communities of Cabañas have socialized the research on Characterization and Micro river basin Management Plan of San Vicente River before authorities like SEGEPLAN, Municipality of Cabañas, MINSA, USAC, Fire Department, City of Huité, CONALFA, RENAP, ZOOTROPIC, ASIVESCA and the COCODES Presidents of 32 Communities the Municipal Cabañas. In the same way, the TOR of the consultancy "Minimum Characterization of the Water Fountains and validation of Ecosystem Services in the Mountains The Granadillas" was developed and the consultant has selected to start with the characterization early in the second half of 2013. Additionally, Caritas has a working agreement with the reserve ZOOTROPIC to develop training on the importance of preserving the environment in schools.

Lastly, WI has participated/tendered consultancies with the following partners of the Alliance:

1. "Forest Cover, characterization of ecosystems and ecosystem services linked to local livelihoods of the populations within the watershed of the river Cucubá, Santa Cruz del Quiché, Quiché Department" together with GRC.
2. "Minimum Characterization of the Water Fountains and validation of Ecosystem Services in the Mountains The Granadillas" together with Caritas Zacapa in which one of the goals is to develop an assessment of water services based on local water main uses as a tool to promote the conservation and sustainable management of the area between the users and beneficiaries
3. Due to the midterm evaluation, WI partners proposed the development of a GIS Thematic Atlas through the

¹⁶ The training modules on Ecosystems are: Framework document (Ecosystems and human wellbeing, a contribution to DRR) and six modules (Wellbeing, Ecosystems, Ecosystemic services, Watersheds, Ecosystemic focus and integrated management of watersheds).

¹⁷ CARE: 120; RC: 0 and Cáritas: 45.

¹⁸ CARE: 6; RC: 6 and Cáritas: 8.

AVM in order to provide analytical tools for making decisions that strengthen their intervention strategies DRR/CCA/ERM at the municipal level and watersheds.

2b # network/umbrella organisations, developed and active	A.2.2.1, A.3.1/2.1	# 13 ¹⁹
<p>GRC has strengthened or created the following platforms and/or networks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conformation of the Departmental Roundtable on Climate Change in Quiché with direct support from the National Roundtable on Climate Change and the CODEMA (Departmental Environment Committee). This process has been decided that the Board is a committee of the CODEMA and not a parallel structure. • Together with WI, CRG, MNCC and key institutions of El Estor are accompanying the formation of Municipal Roundtable on CC. • Formation and strengthening of the COMRED in five municipalities served by RC. <p>CARE: Conformation of the Departmental Roundtable on Climate Change in Solola, formed within the departmental territorial strategic plan and the working committees of the Departmental Development Council (CODEDE). It is in the process of developing the strategic plan for this table. A Coordinating Board of the lower part of the watershed of the Rio Masa that brings together community leaders has organized and trained with the assistance of AVM.</p> <p>Cáritas Zacapa:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Roundtable on Climate Change and Gender Region East • Association for the Protection and Defense of Granadillas Mountain • Giant Mountain Association • Copan Commonwealth Chortí <p>WI as a member of the alliance, has assumed leadership in the accompaniment of the National Roundtable on CC. Therefore, it is accompanying the establishment of the municipal, departmental or regional Roundtables together with PIR partners according to the intervention area and it is intended that the PIR actions with the CC roundtables are part of the Strategic Plan.</p>		

2c % partner NGOs/CBOs engage in structured dialogue with peers and government on DRR/CCA/EMR	A.3.1/2.1, A.3.1/4.1	% 80
<p>At national level, CARE, GRC, Caritas Zacapa and WI have maintained a structured dialogue with various government institutions like MARN, SE-CONRED, CONAP, MINEDUC, and SEGEPLAN. This process of advocacy at various levels began in 2012 but until now it is reflected in concrete actions. While some partners have framework agreements with those institutions, a limitation of the Alliance has been its lack of legal representation when legal backing to support such actions is necessary.</p> <p>Furthermore, the National Forum for an integrated approach in which more than 110 representatives of government institutions, NGOs, UN agencies, regional and local governments, academia and universities has been carried out. As a result, some gaps and priorities identified in the three areas and there is a commitment of the Alliance to establish a direct dialogue with the governing bodies. To this end, there have been bilateral coordination meetings resulting in the planning of a workshop with the three governing bodies to define a strategic agenda between SE-CONRED, CONAP and MARN. Additionally, a direct dialogue has been established with MINEDUC to develop educational modules on DRR/CCA/ERM and there is a direct coordination between MINEDUC, the Alliance and the consultants of Defenders of Wildlife in order to train teachers in how applying modules.</p> <p>In the same way, CARE, Caritas and regional coordination participated in the Fourth Ordinary Session of the National Dialogue Committee for Disaster Reduction led by SECONRED, where the importance of implementing risk transfer mechanisms, prevention actions and mitigation of risk was discussed. Furthermore, in order to promote the Resilient Cities strategy campaign of DIPECHO there has been a meeting with the national coordinator to explore possibilities for synergies and coordination with the regional initiative.</p> <p>At departmental, municipal and local level, partners have noted the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) GRC maintains a working relationship with the municipalities of the five municipalities where it works to strengthen the COLRED, and receive direct support of MARN through the CODEMA actions. In El Estor, there is a close dialogue with the Mayor and Council, and MAGA (reforestation coordination and preparation of the municipal nursery). b) CARE has supported the restructuring of the Municipal Coordinator for Disaster Reduction (COMRED). Furthermore, the Coordinating Board of the lower part of the micro Watershed Masa and six communities representing PIR, constantly engaged in dialogue with other institutional actors that comprise the Municipal Development Councils (COMUDE) in the municipalities of Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Solola c) Caritas maintains a dialogue with actors like MARN, MAGA, ICTA, CIAG, Municipality of Cabañas, Volunteer Firefighters, SECONRED, ASIVESCA, ZOOTROPIC, MSPAS, MINEDUC, CONAP, SESAN and INAB. However, it remains to strengthen dialogue with the municipalities of Concepción Camotán and Las Minas. At departmental level, there is an interrelation between all the actors but the encounters depend on the theme of each relevant organization. 		

2.1a # (Partner) NGO/CBO staff trained on DRR/CCA/EMR.		# 43 ²⁰
---	--	--------------------

¹⁹ CARE: 2; Cruz Roja: 7 and Cáritas: 4.

²⁰ CARE: 3; Cruz Roja: 34; Cáritas: 5 and Wetlands International: 1.

Cruz Roja	Regional Workshop for the socialization of minimum standards and eco-criteria from WI and RCCC (GRC technical staff). Training in coniferous forest pests, organized by the CODEMA in Quiché. National Workshop on meteorology and agriculture, organized by SE-CONRED (GRC technical staff). Internal training on the course of national intervention teams, training of 29 volunteers and staff from the national delegations (involving 22 volunteers and 7 staff GRC). Training and experience exchange during the Technical Committee meeting. CRG shared with partners on the learning experience of the implemented EWS, the process of shaping and developing COLRED Committees and School Risk Management Plans.
CARE	Training of 2 Technical staff of AVM and the CARE program coordinator in the implementation of minimum standards and eco-criteria developed by WI and RCCC during the Regional Workshop in Zacapa.
Cáritas	Three field facilitators of Caritas Zacapa were strengthened with the training course "Capacity Study of Land Use," taught by INAB to develop capacity studies land use, with the tool of Geographic Information System (GIS) in order to establish demonstration plots as soil suitability. Regional Workshop: eco-criteria minimum standards and WI and RCCC.
WI	One person has been trained in the minimum standards of RCCC for the Regional Workshop March with Carina Bachofen and Pablo Suarez.

2.1b # (Partner) NGO/CBO have established cooperation with knowledge & resource organizations (e.g meteorological institutes, universities, etc)		A.2.1/2.1	# 4 ²¹
In the process it has developed partnerships with the following organizations/institutions:			
Cruz Roja	Defenders of Nature Foundation: Q'eqchi' Worldview Study and Livelihoods in the municipality of El Estor. University Rural Guatemala: Model of El Estor as a tool for education and awareness on DRR/CCA/ERM issues. Technical Training Institute (INTECAP): technical assistance in training for micro proyectos of stoves. CONRED, EWS department to coordinate field visits and assess the type of EWS required in Quiché. Institute of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment (IARNA) of Rafael Landivar University.		
CARE	University of San Carlos de Guatemala (USAC), Social Work Career of the University Center South West where three students will make a professional internship to provide an academic foundation of the comprehensive approach of the Alliance PfR, generate experiences and lessons learned to be socialized to teachers and students of this university. Climate Change Institute (ICC) to contribute their experiences and knowledge during the training to municipal structures. Latin American Faculty for the Study of Social Science (FLACSO) endorsed diploma on climate change aimed at teachers and community leaders in coordination with MARN and implemented by AVM.		
Cáritas	Valle University of Guatemala for diagnosis of nutritional status of children and women in communities Cerco de Piedra and El Arenal and awareness lectures on hygiene practices and agribusiness. Rafael Landivar University. University Cooperation in Rural Guatemala socialization CBDRR methodology/CCA/ERM in related careers. Agricultural Engineers Association of Guatemala (CIAG), Guatemala Rural University (GRU) headquarters Cabañas and Caritas Zacapa, signed Memorandum of Understanding for the coordination of activities and socializing together on CBDRR methodology.		
WI	Graduate course on Ecological Restoration taught this semester in coordination with CECON-USAC.		

2.2a # Organisations (including non-PfR) involved in DRR/CCA/EMR coalitions		A.2.2.1, A.3.1/2.1	# 71 ²²
Organizations participating in departmental coalitions in Quiché and El Estor: Quiché: (16) MARN, SEGEPLAN, INAB, CONAP, SOSEP, Ombudsman for Indigenous Women, Water for People, MINEDUC. CODEMA/MDCC: Forestry Association Quiché (AFORQ), National Literacy Committee (CONALFA), Maya Chilam B'alam Council, Departmental Government Quiché, Municipal Development Institute (INFOM), MAGA, INFORM, GRC Board Delegation Quiché. El Estor: (17) CONRED, MARN, AMASURLI, MAGA, Defenders of Wildlife, MINEDUC, Guillermo Toriello Foundation, Social Environmental Observatory, National Women's Forum, Foundation Guatemala, AEPDI, CGN Community Affairs, FUNDAECO, UGAM El Estor, Integral Indigenous Association Cerr Lola Ak 'Kalebal, COMUDE			

²¹ CARE, Cruz Roja, Cáritas Zacapa and Wetlands International.

²² CARE: 26; Cruz Roja: 33 and Cáritas: 12.

Sector VII, Delegation COMRED/Sindico II Muni.

Solola (CARE and AVM): (26) MARN, INAB, CONAP, CONRED, MAGA, Technical Cooperation Unit Andaluza in Santiago Atitlan, Association of Friends of Lake Atitlan, Universidad del Valle de Guatemala, Africa 70/Canton Development Partnership Panaj (ADECAP), Action Movement and Exchange in the Area of Central America (MAIZCA), Rural Economic Development Project of Solola (PROSOL), Association of Municipalities Kakchiquel Chichoy, Atitlán (Mankatitlan), Association of Municipalities Tzolojya (MANKTZOLOJYA), Municipality association of Laguna (MANKLALAGUNA), Ounce Clean, Sustainable Management Authority Basin Lake Atitlan, Ecological Heart of the Forest, Municipal Ecological Park and Volcanoes Toliman-Atitlán/Municipalidad Ikitiu San Lucas Toliman, Municipal Ecological Park of Rey Tepepul and Volcanoes Atitlán-Toliman/Municipalidad of Santiago Atitlan, Municipal Ecological Park Chuanimajuyu/Municipality of San Pedro La Laguna, Municipal Ecological Park of Panan and Ajaw/Municipality of San Juan La Laguna, Municipal Ecological Park Chuiraxamolo/City of Santa Clara La Laguna, Municipal Ecological Park Xiquichoy/City of Santa Maria Visitacion, Municipal Ecological Park Cerro Papa/City of San Marcos La Laguna, FLACSO, ICC.

Zacapa and Chiquimula: (12) MAGA, CIAG, Municipality of Cabañas, Volunteer Firefighters, SE-CONRED ASIVESCA, ZOOTROPIC, MSPAS, MINEDUC, CONAP, SESAN, MARN.

2.2b # of times DRR/CCA/EMR related topics on agenda of platforms/networks	A.2.2.1, A.3.1/2.1	# 49 ²³
<p>Alliance: Antigua Guatemala: 1 (National Forum) and 1 in coordination meeting DIPECHO VIII partners in Guatemala.</p> <p>Quiche: 1 (CODEMA/MDCC), 6 (CONRED), 6 (CODEMA), 2 (Forums for outreach and socialization with the presence of governmental and municipal organizations), 2 (Departmental Roundtable on Climate Change).</p> <p>EI Estor: 1 (COMRED), 1 (Municipal Roundtable on Climate Change), 6 (COMRED).</p> <p>Solola: 3 (Board Committee or Coordinator Micro Masa River Basin), Departmental Roundtable on Climate Change Solola.</p> <p>Zacapa and Chiquimula: 1 (National Roundtable on Climate Change), 4 (National Network of Diocesan Caritas, Social Pastoral Vicariate), 6 (Parish Red of the Diocese of Zacapa with 24 parishes involved in the different municipalities of Zacapa and Chiquimula), 1 (Giant Mountain Association), 2 (Commonwealth Copan Chortí), 6 (Network of Agricultural Engineering, Forestry and Environmental Guatemala).</p>		

3a # of processes started to reduce identified national and local institutional obstacles to DRR/CCA/EMR activities in the communities (in terms of communication between departments, appropriateness of laws)		# 13 ²⁴
<p>A national level as Alliance following initiatives have been achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Forum in Antigua in January has been the most strategic result. • Coordination with the three governing bodies of the comprehensive approach: SE-CONRED, MARN and CONAP, a workshop is planned to develop an Interagency Strategic Agenda. • Consultancy for the development of educational modules on the integrated approach is expected to strengthen capacities of local technical teams of the members and at least 80 teachers in priority PfR municipalities. • Meetings with SEGEPLAN to develop a methodology for Community/Local Development Plans. • Coordination with CCAD and CEPREDENAC and to link national efforts with regional proposals on PfR themes. <p>In Quiche and EI Estor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialization of the work and the setting of goals for the creation of the Municipal Roundtable on Climate Change in EI Estor. • Organization and implementation of departmental and national thematic Forums for awareness and socialization on issues related to the integrated approach with the participation of national and international organizations and institutions. <p>In Solola:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At community level, awareness of community leaders and local/traditional authorities for topics: DRR/CCA/ERM and within which the organization and strengthening of the COLRED was possible. • Institutional level with municipal authorities and officials of the health centers and the local supervision of MINEDUC to achieve institutional support activities in schools located in PfR communities. • Reorganization and training of the COMRED of Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán. <p>In Zacapa:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement to sign a letter of understanding with the City of Cabañas. • Signing of agreement with the Departmental Delegation of MARN on the development of two educational modules Environment and Community Management in Disaster Risk Reduction for students in the communities Huité, Cabañas and San Diego. • Letter of Understanding with Educational Supervision Cabins (DIDEDUC) to work on socialization of the issues CBDRR/CCA/ERM in eight schools in communities of Cabañas. 		

²³ Alianza: 2; CARE: 3; Cruz Roja: 24 and Cáritas: 20.

²⁴ Alianza: 5; CARE: 3; Cruz Roja: 2 and Cáritas: 3.

3b % of increased local government budgets in target areas on either early warning, mitigation of natural hazards and/or natural resource mgt on community level.	A.3.3.1	% 33,5 ²⁵
At the municipal level in Zacapa, Caritas has achieved that the Municipality of Cabañas has in its budget with a stipulated amount (10-33% accorded to the executed) to perform actions on the issues of DRR/CCA/ERM. In the same way, GRC and WI influenced the municipality of El Estor that committed Q.42, 244.25 (34% of total budget) as part of co-financing for the implementation of the micro project Nursery. Shortly they will sign a letter of understanding signed by GRC, the Municipality and WI. Finally, lobby and advocacy will be continued to achieve the budget allocation for activities in DRR/CCA/MRE with the implementation of community micro projects.		
3.1a # Governments/institutions reached with advocacy activities by Civil Society and their networks and platforms	Líneas estratégicas 2 y 3	# 46
<p>Government institutions (19): National Coordinator for Disaster Reduction (CONRED), Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), Ministry of Public Works of the First Lady (SOSEP), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (MAGA), National Institute of Forests (INAB), Government department of Quiché, National Civil Police (PNC), Volunteer Fire Guatemala, Municipal Fire and departmental Volunteer Fire Zacapa, Guatemala Army, National Institute of Public Administration (INAP), National Council for Protected Areas (CONAP), Ministry of Culture and Sports (MICUDE) and Ministry of Economy (MINECO), National Institute of Seismology, Volcanology, Meteorology and Hydrology (INSIVUMEH), General Secretariat of Planning (SEGEPLAN), AMASURLI (Izabal).</p> <p>Municipalities and Governors (6): Municipalities of Santa Cruz del Quiché, Joyabaj Sacapulas Jocotenango San Bartolomé, El Estor, Izabal and Zacapa departmental government.</p> <p>Networks and Platforms (21): Departmental Committee on the Environment (CODEMA) Quiché, municipalities COMRED Sacapulas Joyabaj Jocotenango San Bartolomé, Santa Cruz del Quiché and El Estor, Izabal, Masa Coordinating Board, Municipal Development Council (COMUDE) of Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, National Network of Diocesan Caritas, Social Pastoral Vicariate, Red Parish of the Diocese of Zacapa, 24 parishes involved in the different municipalities of Zacapa and Chiquimula, Giant Mountain Association, Copan Chortí Commonwealth Network of Agricultural Engineers, Forestry and Environmental Guatemala, National Dialogue Committee for Disaster Risk Reduction, Indigenous Climate Change Roundtable, National Roundtable on Climate Change, Municipal Roundtable on Climate Change of El Estor, Jointly Roundtable on Climate Change and Gender Region East, Departmental Roundtable on Climate Change Solola, Departmental Roundtable on Climate Change Quiché.</p>		
3.1b # of (local) government institutions actively engaged in activities (meetings/field visits/training)	Strategic lines 2 & 3	# 31 ²⁶
<p>In the working areas of the RC, the government institutions involved in the activities are: National Coordinator for Disaster Reduction (CONRED), Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), Ministry of Social Works of the First Lady (SOSEP), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (MAGA), National Forestry Institute (INAB), Government department of Quiché, 4 municipalities of the department of Quiché (Santa Cruz del Quiché, Joyabaj, Sacapulas, San Bartholomew Jocotenango) and the municipality of El Estor, Izabal, National Civil Police (PNC), Volunteer Fire Guatemala, Municipal and Departmental Fire, Guatemala Army, National Institute of Public Administration (INAP), Interior Department of Quiché, Council National Protected Areas (CONAP), Ministry of Culture and Sports (MICUDE), INSIVUMEH and Public Health.</p> <p>In Solola, the government institutions that continue to participate actively in the program are: health centers of the Ministry of Health located in Village Xejujub (Nahualá) and Guineales (Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán), Technical Administrative Coordination of the District of Village Xejujub of Ministry of Education and Departmental Delegate of Executive Secretariat of CONRED in Solola. Extension agents the Ministry of Agriculture have joined, that are collaborating with the implementation of community micro.</p> <p>In Zacapa and Chiquimula: National Coordinator for Disaster Reduction (CONRED), Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), Ministry of Public Works of the First Lady (SOSEP), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (MAGA), National Forestry Institute (INAB) in field visits and trainings related to DRR/CCA /ERM.</p>		
3.1c # of countries, where the connection between DRR, CCA and EMR has explicitly been mentioned in official government documents		# 0
In the framework of the Alliance PfR, WI led advocacy and negotiation so CONAP would include the explicit mention of holistic DRR/CCA/ERM focus in publication of the National Biodiversity Strategy. However, this will included in the annual report of 2013.		

3.2 Initiatives related to the Learning Agenda

From 11 to 15 March 2013, the Regional Workshop, organized and co-funded by RCCC and WI, was held. The focus of the workshop and the training was the discussion on minimum standards and eco-criteria for establishing DRR programs with consideration of ecosystems and climate. Both country

²⁵ Cáritas has achieved to lobby in the Municipality of Cabañas with a budget of an estimated amount of 33%, and RC and WI have lobbied in the Municipality of El Estor to co-finance a micro project of 34%.

²⁶ CARE: 4; RC: 21 and Cáritas: 6.

teams internalized and gave feedback on the implementation, challenges and difficulties. During this workshop interest in sharing information, learning from the experiences of other partners, and collaborate with external entities to facilitate the implementation of their programs was demonstrated. In the same way, there was a brief exchange session on video editing provided by Caritas Zacapa.

In terms of monitoring the progress in the Learning Agenda, a specific session was organized during the meeting of the Technical Committee 25 to June 27 2013. At that meeting, there was an exchange of knowledge, because each partner had exposed its experience and there was feedback and learning between the partners. The country team and technical team members were asked to review the 5 questions and indicate what the purpose and/or product should be, what still needs to be done and who is responsible.

Households

Question 1: *What knowledge and tools do communities need to carry out integrated risk assessments?*

Purpose and/or product	¿What needs to be done?	Responsible
Promoting the independency of the communities to create and/or adopt integrative tools that are easy to use by communities and contribute to integrated risk assessment approaches in DRR/CCA/ERM.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easily integrate existing information. • To be presented in a form accessible, simple and practical (easy and quick application), • Validate the structure and content of the tool with the communities, • Generate approved tools that are adaptable to the different intervention areas. 	Each partner is responsible, given that each tool and partner organization has its own dynamics. Therefore, it was agreed that each organization will try to get as close as possible to the community.

Question 2: *What are effective/ innovative (technical and 'social capacity') measures to reduce disaster risk and to adapt to climate change in a sustainable way?*

Purpose and/or product: Effective and innovative measures, meaning:

- Community ownership and involvement (self sufficiency).
- Develop a local development plan.
- Sustainable micro projects.
- Resilient Communities.

What needs to be done:

- Strengthen local capacities (knowledge sharing, retrieving local knowledge).
- Changing mindsets and attitudes (technical equipment, communities).
- Systematize innovative experiences.
- Replicate innovative experiences.
- Systematic update of risk analysis.

Who is responsible?: Each partner is responsible considering that each partner has its own dynamics.

Communities

Question 3: *What community structures and mechanisms facilitate households to apply the DRR/CCA/EMR approach?*

Purpose and/or product: In general, as a measure of sustainability, strengthen/support existing structures like support entities for COLRED.

What needs to be done?:

- Starting from COLRED as the convergence point of the community/village/town.
- Generally, the starting point is the existing COCODES. It needs to be harmonized with the COLRED.
- Facilitate involvement of other communities, but this could lead to conflict. It is key to achieve coordination between local committees.
- COLRED forming process not only meets the criteria of Act 109 but also local customs and community context.
- Accreditation of COLRED by the SE-CONRED, then there may be a gap in coordination with the municipal authority. To settle this need, promote to organize Municipal Coordinators in which all public bodies or civil society participate. For example, the Municipality of Santa Catarina de Ixtahuacán.

- Looking for budget that are not only for the response, however include preparedness and prevention. After that, promote the formation of a Municipal office for DRR Management to support the use of municipal funds to DRR and response.
- Support Municipal Coordinators in knowing and interacting with all COLRED of a municipality (mapping, institutional support, budget, etc.). This information could be of help to influence the approval/increase the funding for the Municipal DRR Fund. Also incorporate actions that contribute to CCA and ERM.
- Build on the (cultural) willingness of the community to contribute with volunteer work via incentive programs such like PSA or Bio-Rights.
- Another body that support however from the school structure are the DRR School Committees. It is necessary to assist in diagnosis and response plan generation.
- Involve other stakeholders, for example, health sector (Permanent Care Centers). In addition, rural health technicians and community facilitators could provide a follow-up after the establishment of COLRED and training, and youth groups can engage with the Commission and volunteer.

Who is responsible?: Each partner is responsible fconsidering that each partner has its own dynamics.

Southern Partners

Question 4: How to facilitate application of integrated DRR/CCA/EMR with communities?

Purpose and/or product	¿What needs to be done?	Responsible
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The watershed is managed through the Comprehensive Management Plan. • The communities have the tools to diversify their livelihoods. • Schools are integrated via the School Committees for emergency and risk reduction. • Early Warning Systems in operation. • Operation of the COMRED and COLRED independently if there is a distaster or not. • DRR through the recovery of ecosystems via reforestation with endemic species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidate and strengthen management capabilities of the Coordinating Board (the Board of Micro watershed) • Ownership of the provided tools by the communities. • Follow-up on training and involvement of teachers and educational supervisors. • Strengthen local coordinators through equipment and interpretation of data for the EWS. • Training and basic equipment for COMRED and COLRED. • Technical and financial support from the INAB and other related institutions. 	Each partner is responsible considering that each partner has its own dynamics.

Question 5: What steps are needed to incorporate integrated DRR/CCA/EMR approaches into policy at different levels (local to international)?

Purpose and/or product		
Local (community or micro region)	Municipal	National
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link community representatives with governing bodies and municipal authorities. • Develop a pilot for PfR region (one per member) based on priorities set by governing bodies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positioning PfR approach (socialization of policies and strategies, campaigns, training with emphasis on DRR/CCA/ERM). • Contributions from the municipal point for PfR approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated positioning of the three governing bodies. • Construction of a joint agenda with integrated approach by the three governing bodies. • Structuring minimum contents. • Appointing responsables. • Establish dates
¿What needs to be done?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening networks. • Construction of thematic agendas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEC campaigns at municipal level. • Strengthen coordination with regional delegations of governing bodies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops (1-3 or more?) to construct the agenda. • Consensus on action lines, few but strategic and priority to all. • Establishment of working subcommittees.
Responsible		
Each partner is responsible, given that each partner organization has its own dynamics. With regard to National level it will be done with common actions.		

4 Part IV – Sustainability, quality, efficiency

4.1 Sustainability

Which agreements have been made with communities on how results will be maintained?

Currently, the agreements with communities initially established on the conditions of support and assistance provided by the PfR and the contribution expected of each community are maintained. To date there are no concrete continuity agreements with communities and municipalities and NGOs. However, as they progress in the production of products/results, agreements will be established when the program will withdraw from their intervention areas of.

For example, CARE and GRC agree on the capacity building of organizations (COCODES and COLREDES) because they are structures that have been trained to lead development processes in their community and advocacy with local authorities as well as leading DRR actions through tools like local response plans and community development plans, and is making the necessary arrangements to be supported by SEGEPLAN. Similarly, GRC has highlighted the development of micro training for community and be able to transform them into other projects that can be managed with the municipality and the promotion of good practice, focused on DRR/CCA/ERM issues and traditional local knowledge to be retaken, appropriate and replicated by the communities themselves.

Additionally, Caritas has considered updating risk analysis by the COCODES, using the Participatory Risk Assessment (PRA) tool. Such is the case of the implementation of action plans based on risk analysis for supply, maintenance and service monitoring drinking water. Furthermore, Caritas highlights the following modalities: Legalization of water committees of the communities Lantiquín, Arenal and el Volcan to its municipalities; reforestation plans with actions to protect water sources and forests in Cabañas with support from the municipal nursery which will be monitored by the Municipal Planning Department (DMP), the use of video as a tool for advocacy in community management for new programs with a focus on DRR/CCA/ERM, training of environmental brigades of the DRR Committees in the implementation of the Forestry Incentive Program for Holders of Small Land Extensions (PINPEP) of INAB and the use of local, traditional knowledge as a way to develop their skills of expression and participation of Practice environmental stewardship and will be passed on to future generations.

WI has not yet mentioned agreements with communities, probably with the implementation of co- and directly financed micro projects, some direct relations will be established through partners, particularly for those activities (eg reforestation and / or restorations) which scope goes beyond the micro-project time and PfR.

Which agreements have been made with local or national government how results will be maintained, and/or how the programme will be continued after its timeframe (2014 or 2015)?

Although no written agreement has been established for the continuation of the strategy of the program after its finalization, contacts and relationships with municipal officials have been strengthened. CARE and RC have noted that at the municipal level there is support of the municipalities involved in the program. There is the intention to link the results of the program with the priorities of the Municipal Departments of Planning in Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán.

Caritas has initiated and achieved a draft letter of understanding in which each activity is specified, to be performed after completion of the PfR program and the commitments the municipality acquire in January 2015²⁷. In addition, WI has indicated that for the micro-project of the multipurpose nursery in El Estor it is expected to sign a letter of understanding between GRC, WI and the Municipality to ensure the sustainability of the project beyond the PfR program.

Also, at national level, from the results of the National Forum, the alliance is collaborating and seeking to influence the governing bodies: CONRED, CONAP and MARN so the PfR comprehensive approach will be considered in interventions of each institution to arrange an Interagency Strategic Agenda so that lessons learned from PfR may be appropriate and replicated. This is a progress and consolidation process that could take the remaining period of the PfR intervention.

Which agreements have been made with partner NGOs/CBOs on how they will be involved during and beyond the programme's timeframe to continue activities and sustain the results?

Generally, partners are under development agreements with NGOs and community organizations to provide continuity to the activities and results of the program. In the case of CARE/AVM, an intervention of mid- and longterm has been provided not only on issues of DRR/CCA/ERM but also in

²⁷ Some activities are part of everyday life of the municipality like accompanying communities in programs, reforestation, agricultural input delivery, food bags, COMUDES meetings, among others.

health and education, in the intervention area and the rest of the coast municipalities of Nahualá and Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán funded by other donors. Therefore, it is expected that continuity will be given to the results achieved under the program.

In the same way, Caritas has said that the College of Agricultural Engineering, Forestry and Environmental of Guatemala situated Zacapa is willing to support communities in the development of proposals and fundraising, when it is required (no deadline). In addition, the Rural University of Guatemala situated in Cabañas accompanies to meetings of the Community Network of San Vicente River watershed, providing technical and scientific advice.

Lastly, WI does not rule out the possibility of signing agreements with NGOs or community organizations after the implementation of micro-projects. Also, although the Municipal, Departmental or Regional Climate Change Roundtables cannot be classified either as NGO partners and community organizations, in these settings organizations of the program intervention areas are participating. However, the strategic plans with a comprehensive approach that are prepared will be valid for at least 10 years and is expected to transcend the PfR period.

The RCCC seeks to support and facilitate dialogue between partners and meteorological services and other relevant NGOs on how to use scientific information (seasonal forecasts, short term, etc..) and translate it into action at the local level so you can continue to the end of the program. To achieve this goal, it has started to bring together partners and external actors during the Regional Workshop in March and the PfR partners continued communication with ASORECH, ICC and other institutions, and in July, it is organizing a workshop to continue this process and is sustainable.

Which decisions have been taken on how to continue the programme or sustain the results in case of reduced budget and/or reduced staff capacity?

Several partners agree that in the event of budget cuts, it would have to reformulate the intervention strategy or reduce the execution time of the program. On the one hand, the NLRC has indicated that it has talked with the management of the GRC in order to check the actual performance and the capacity of the National Society to take the challenge of completing the project effectively and with quality process within the remaining period. In addition, also praised some drawbacks associated with selected staff from the start of the project due to constant rotation from coordinating national to local government. However, the NLRC believes that GRC has the capacity and commitment to complete the project with the staff and the budget allocated to date.

As for the budget reduction decision, CRG should assess whether reducing the execution time of the project, could adjust the budget allocated to specific activities, but logically affect the achievement of expected results. CARE has indicated that it will have to reformulate the program intervention strategy. This strategy could include actions for greater coordination and facilitation processes jointly with other non PfR and to a lesser extent evaluate the reduction in the number of communities without affecting the quality of the results and products to be validated, considering systematized and shared integrated program approach.

On the other hand, Caritas stressed that it is in constant search for agencies like the Caritas network at national level with the International Caritas that want to join the efforts initiated in the intervention areas keeping the integrated approach in DRR/CCA/ERM and Community Management methodology. Note that this methodology encourages communities to continue with the same steps taken and resources management with other actors in addition to preparing development plans, participative monitoring and evaluation and advocacy for resource mobilization.

WI has not established agreements, they are exploring continuity activities not only with government agencies, environmental organizations, research centers and universities nor rule out the possibility of collaboration with alliance partners as a result of the implementation and with other identified external actors (ICC, Defenders of Wildlife, Heifer Foundation, CONAP). However, time needs to be given to prepare proposals.

4.2 Quality

(How) is the satisfaction of beneficiaries (community members) assessed?

In general, the partner organizations have received good comments or feedback from the PfR program beneficiaries. For **GRC**, this satisfaction is assessed in two ways: a) through frequent conversations with beneficiaries who spontaneously indicated the utility of the training received in their daily activities or when they have completed some processes like delivery of equipment to COLRED or being involved in the selection process of micro project models according to their needs, and b) through field monitoring visits of the activities by the NLRC delegation, in which questions are used to know the level of acceptance of the project, knowledge of the subject and the activities done with leaders or other participants in the activities.

For **CARE**, although studies that measure beneficiary satisfaction about the quality of the activities and products generated are not established, at the end the activities are evaluated based on the following simple questions: What did they like, what didn't they like? and what are the suggestions for improvement? For example, participants have recommended topics of interest, matching schedules and it was also positively valued that training has been provided in the language K'iche'. In this sense, the degree of satisfaction is evidenced by the level of participation in activities which has been remained so far.

Meanwhile, **Caritas** highlights that at the community level much satisfaction with the process that is being developed and the commitment to continue with it has been expressed. One aspect valued by the residents of the communities is the level of organization achieved and a different style of working relationships that breaks with the traditional scheme of "technical" know and becomes a facilitator of community processes where the community is the protagonist. Also suggest that Caritas has made a difference in community life and this has been documented through video tool and training conducted. Finally, this question does not apply to **WI** but it is expected to report output when implementing co-and directly financed micro-projects.

Have measures been taken to ensure a standardised way of working (use of formats, process, standard ways of working and reporting)?

Several partners, **CARE**, **Caritas** and **WI**, have suggested two ways to ensure standardization work. The first involving the Alliance partners, in regular meetings where progress is reviewed by each partner, problems encountered, etc.. In addition, the annual operating plan tools and reports (interim and annual) have a unique format that is standardized internally and ensures that the work of each partner must be aligned to the program. Furthermore, it is applying and/or developing additional standardized work tools like a monitoring and evaluation system, micro project protocol, IEC strategy, minimum training content, and eco-criteria and minimum standards. An advocacy strategy that regional coordination has developed with input from the partners is expected.

At the organizational level, **GRC** has identified three types of measures to ensure a standardized way of working: a) induction workshops with technical staff in order to unify criteria for work methodologies, training topics according to level (community, institution, schools, guides and support tools for training), also delivered planning formats, logs, reports, as well as planning and logical framework in detail. This helps the technical team guide its work on the results the project, b) every month or three months, depending on perceived need, there has been a review of progress, retaking the review of activities to help technicians to focus on the activities and priorities of the period; c) GRC reports monthly to the NLRC who in turn reviews the media planning and to assess the relationship between expenditure activities.

How is programme implementation assessed, and are improvements introduced?

CARE, **Caritas** and **WI** have pointed out that the implementation of the program is evaluated jointly through meetings with the Technical Committee. In the same way, in the country team meetings, the Regional Workshops, teleconferencing via skype with the Regional Team have been moments of reflection and decision making, as well as reviewing the dynamics of activities (traffic light) created by the regional coordination.

Internally, the **RC** has identified the following ways: a) monthly monitoring field visits by the NLR to verify progress and process quality, satisfaction of the beneficiaries and representatives of the RC delegations. Besides during the visiting the coordination receives feedback with recommendations and technical support technical when required, b) meetings of the NLRC country representative with the overall direction and management of Risk Management to communicate potential operational and budgetary delays and an assessment of technical performance and corrective action and support have been agreed when necessary, c) communication via e-mail to follow up outstanding issues to the national coordination with copy to the GRC focal point for monitoring, and d) conducting technical and management committees at internal level in which decisions about program development are made with the presidents of the RC subsidiaries, and the overall direction and management responsible for the project (Risk Management) and the NLRC representative are involved.

Bilaterally between partners, **CARE** and AVM assisted by **WI** do a field review progress regularly with staff meetings and field visits. Meanwhile, Caritas Zacapa/Cordaid makes a field monitoring and office work to review progress of activities and the financial part. Each year there is a scan for institutional strengthening.

Finally, **CARE** and **GRC** said they are waiting to receive the results of the mid-term review carried out in March 2013, because surely provide inputs to improve the intervention logic in the remaining period of the program.

(How) is innovation stimulated?

CARE, **Caritas** and **WI** have noted that some measures implemented by the program are innovative, for example, the focus on its three axes DRR/CCA/ERM, recovery and self-recognition of traditional and local knowledge, incorporating climate trend risk analysis, community participatory video, the establishment of a protocol for planning and design community of micro projects and the incorporation of minimum standards and eco-criteria, experience sharing, publications, participatory games, among others. **GRC** has indicated that another way to visualize the innovative approach is the replication of good practices on DRR/CCA/ERM that are useful, appropriate and recognized by the community.

However, **CARE** has indicated that when promoting the integrated approach of the program and these measures at the institutional level, it is necessary to show its functionality with concrete actions to achieve greater stimulation for replicating the approach in other initiatives. **GRC** indicates that in the learning among partners and other agencies, successful experiences are retaken and replicated at all levels, particularly focusing on the integration of DRR/CCA/ERM.

At the institutional level, **GRC** has indicated that it has more expertise in DRR. Therefore it has looked for support by other partners like the RC in Nicaragua and Colombia that have more experience in addressing DRR and CCA. Furthermore, it has asked help of WI regarding the ecosystem approach and environmental approach and the innovation was retaken using knowledge and/or methodologies that are useful for the implementation of the program.

4.3 Efficiency

How are costs per beneficiary kept low (without compromising the ability to achieve the intended results or the quality of the programme)?

Both **GRC** and **CARE** match with three actions taken to keep the costs per beneficiary of the program low without compromising the achievement of the expected results or quality:

- a) **Training:** They try to reach more people through measures like training and awareness in schools in the region (schools as disseminators of information) and training on issues of the comprehensive approach in DRR/CCA/ERM addressed at community, national and institutional level in organizational strengthening, diagnostics, institutional arrangements governing bodies to set priorities for joint work.
- b) **Micro projects:** They promote the contribution that beneficiaries in activities such as micro or mitigation measures where each community could contribute local resources for implementation. For example, GRC has initiated the installation of wood-saving stoves in two communities in Quiché. However, it is expected a higher budget execution in the second half to achieve the expected results.
- c) **Administrative processes/purchases:** For the procurement of goods or services, quote processes and assessment of various offers that provide a better relationship between service quality and prices are applied, without compromising the quality of the processes and maximize the projected budget based on strategic planning prior expenditures projection.

GRC underscores the complexity in the execution related to holistic focus due to the uncoordinated context between national and municipal government agencies. This has required additional multilevel advocacy to facilitate coordination of processes and deliver results.

CARE has highlighted the agreements between the partners to distribute common expenses or bilateral activities. These agreements do not provide funds transactions among members.

Caritas Zacapa/Cordaid has mentioned that the cost per beneficiary is low due to the methodology used (GCRD), that is looking for community capacity building and each makes an analysis of available resources vs. their needs, advocacy for resource mobilization at the community, municipal or other organizations.

WI emphasizes that a constraint to the achievement of the results, has been administrative-financial level because there have been many delays in the execution of studies and consultancies due to each partner's internal procedures for disbursement and procurement. For example: The consultancy on educational modules on DRR/CCA/ERM should have started in January but started in June.

Has the target group been increased or has there been spent less while achieving the planned results?

GRC has reported that it had difficulty working with three of the nine planned communities (Chupac Balam, Patulup, Nimchaj). Although there was already an advanced process in these communities with training, reforestation, risk analysis, all the effort has stopped in the middle. However, in order to maintain the target group at the community level and to avoid that program results are affected, GRC has started the selection of three new communities where a consultation is done to obtain a written approval. It is expected to start with the community work in the second half of 2013 which already is scheduled at technical level and the budget will not be affected.

CARE and **Caritas** have indicated that the target group is the same as reported for 2012 and the amount of operating expenses is the same as last year. However, Caritas Zacapa/Cordaid emphasizes community organization to manage their resources and as a way to keep spending constant that had been budgeted.

5 Part V – Activities related to strengthening Civil Society and Southern Partner organizations

Civil engagement

<i>The organizations are accountable and responsive to stakeholders.</i>	<p>CARE and GRC have noted that all planned processes and implementation of activities are participatory and based on the needs and priorities of key stakeholders (community leaders, local authorities and institutional) who are consulted to have their endorsement. Furthermore, the development of activities are accompanied by community leaders and local authorities and seeks to keep them informed of the activities carried out in their areas.</p> <p>Caritas tries to fulfill its commitments and reports periodically to Cordaid. Also, maintains respectful relationships with key stakeholders like: MARN, MAGA, SE-CONRED, CONAP, INAB, Universities, Municipalities and Departmental Government.</p> <p>WI tries to maintain open and transparent relationships with stakeholders on ERM issues. After identifying common interests, specific activities, responsibilities and deadlines for implementation by both parties are defined. An example is the creation of regional roundtables on CC in which the mentioned role for WI is the facilitation and support for the duration of the program. It respects the decisions of each roundtable regarding work mode, processes and coordinations.</p>
<i>% of supported community committees are invited to participate in regular dialogue with government bodies</i>	<p>Both GRC and CARE have reported that 100% of the Local Coordinators of Risk Reduction (COLRED) consist of representatives of the Community Development Councils (COCODE), who by the dynamics of the municipality maintain a regular and direct communication with the municipal authorities represented by the municipal Development Councils (COMUDES). Such is the case of CARE, where COCODES and COLRED representatives also participate in the Coordinating Board of the lower part of the watershed of the River Masá.</p> <p>GRC also noted that it has organized forums and workshops with community leaders and representatives from government organizations like INAB and CONAP to analyze the situation of deforestation and receive recommendations on forest management. However, it still necessary to promote more opportunities for dialogue (exchange of experience and presentation of development plans) with local government agencies, COLRED and COMUDE.</p> <p>Caritas has supported the conformation of eleven Risk Reduction Committees (one per community) that maintain in eventual dialogues with the municipality, ASIVESCA, MAGA, Zootropic, SOSEP, MOH, COMUDE and CODEDE, among other actors.</p> <p>Although it is in line with the role of WI, it is not ruled out to include regular dialogue with government bodies during the implementation of micro-projects.</p>

Practise of values

<i>The target group is involved in decision making</i>	<p>GRC and CARE emphasize maintaining the dynamics of consultation meetings with the target group. Before taking decisions about community activities, consultation meetings and encounters to agree on the operational decisions taken with community leaders are performed. For example, GRC notes that micro projects have been identified and prioritized by the communities, like school activities are coordinated with the municipal office of the Ministry of Education to have the endorsement and prior acceptance.</p> <p>Caritas Zacapa uses the methodology of GCRRD that includes a focus on community participation in essential decision making and is prerequisite for sustainable interventions.</p> <p>WI highlights that this is a working principle in the case of co-financed or directly executed micro projects.</p>
<i>The organizations have transparent financial procedures and practices transparent</i>	<p>NLRC and GRC are jointly responsible for the implementation of activities. They produce a monthly financial expenses report that is shared with NLRC and the presidents of the subsidiaries of the RC in Quiché, El Estor and Sacapulas to ensure transparent management of funds and activities undertaken and to be undertaken. Also during induction workshops and when necessary, the regional administrative department of the NLRC explains the procedures and management of technical administrative support for the transparent management of funds. In</p>

financial reporting	<p>addition, this department makes field visit to verify field expenses, as part of monitoring. Similarly, the NLRC has a procedures manual that complements the GRC procedures for the management of funds.</p> <p>CARE and Caritas Zacapa maintain the application of their own accounting and financial procedures recognized and validated, ensuring transparency in the management of resources. Additionally, both partners have indicated that applies an external audit covering financial covenants established with local partners, in case of AVM.</p> <p>WI has established a monthly and weekly reporting process with technical and financial formats to the Regional Office in Panama. Budgetary outlays are made based on planning and also using preset formats.</p>
----------------------------	--

Capability to act and control

Strategy is elaborated in workplans and activities/projects	<p>GRC indicates as a limitation of the program that is has failed from the start with a description of the activities and a clear implementation methodology in order to unify work criteria between alliance partners. These are created in the development of program.</p> <p>CARE, Caritas and WI still maintain the logical framework and annual operational plans that are linked to financial budgets and a monitoring protocol in which global approaches of the partners is integrated.</p>
The organization's leadership is accountable to staff and stakeholders	<p>GRC has good leadership in program implementation and handling of accounts. They have taken up the steering and technical committees as spaces to account with representatives and technical person.</p> <p>The National Program Direction of CARE maintains the responsibility for promoting internal accountability. The program coordinator has been delegated the responsibility to promote and ensure that the accountability processes will be met by the technical staff and the local partner who runs some activities.</p> <p>Caritas reports a constant monitoring of field activities and transparency of funds invested in the three strategic lines, from the direction of Caritas Zacapa, Caritas Guatemala and Cordaid. In the same way, Caritas at national supports the program with the involvement of the 14 Diocese of Guatemala with the holistic theme.</p> <p>WI has indicated that there is constant coordination with the Regional Office in Panama and regular consultation with WI-HQ in the Netherlands.</p>

Capability to achieve, adapt and renovate

The organizations have a well-functioning PME system	<p>As a partnership the need for a monitoring and evaluation has been acknowledged. The preparation of such a system has been started with field visits and meetings, and coordination meetings with the selected consultant who is hired by the RC. The completion of the consultancy is expected in September.</p> <p>The NLRC and GRC have an dynamic Excel table that records the data generated in the activities at a quantitative level and to view monthly progress of each activity which allows to assess with the coordination the causes of the delays and how to improve the processes.</p> <p>CARE has indicated that internally, each program or project plans to establish a monitoring and evaluation system that meets the programmatic priorities of the organization.</p> <p>Cordaid/Caritas have a Monitoring, Evaluation and Participatory Learning (MEAP) system that allows you to track and monitor each project.</p> <p>The Regional Office of WI in Panama reports against the overall organizational objectives set out in its Strategic Intention 2011-2020.</p>
---	---

Capability to achieve coherence

% of organizations in which efficiency is addressed in the external annual financial audit	<p>In August 2013, the NLRC has scheduled an intermediate external audit to review the management of Pfr funds. In addition, GRC counts with an audit department that supports budget execution of the national society.</p> <p>CARE has indicated it will have a external annual audit that includes reviews about financial accounting procedures and at internally with the support of the finance unit. Efficiency aspects will be analyzed, considering that the budget is implemented by CARE and partly by the local partner AVM.</p> <p>Caritas has indicated that Cordaid has established remarks on efficiency and audit settings.</p> <p>WI-HQ audit sets the parameters for the regional offices and the Regional Office in Panama could establish additional audits according to their financial capacity.</p>
---	---