

Module 3: Strengthen Financial Capacity for Resilience (including Business Continuity)

Uscore2: City-to-City Peer Review Tool

This document has been prepared as part of the Uscore2 - City-to-city local level peer review on Disaster Risk Reduction project. The sole responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the author(s). This document covers civil protection activities implemented with the financial assistance of the European Union's DG-ECHO **Call for proposals 2016 for prevention and preparedness projects in the field of civil protection** programme under, agreement number: ECHO/SUB/2016/743543/PREV04. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Website: www.Uscore2.eu
Twitter: @Uscore2EU



CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Background	4
Further Information	5
How can Financial Resilience be Assessed and Improved?	6
How can this be measured?	7
Methodology	8
Phase 2, Step 7: Information to send to Review Team prior to the Review Team visit	8
Suggestions for the type of pre-visit evidence that could be shared between cities	8
Phase 2, Step 8: Arrangements for the Peer Review Visit	10
Who should the Review Team interview?	10
How can the Host City multi-agency capacity be demonstrated?	11
Phase 2, Step 9: Review Team: Gathering Evidence	12
Phase 3, Step 11: Recording Information and Drafting Initial Recommendations	16



INTRODUCTION

Uscore2 is a peer-to-peer review process for cities. Designed with funding from the European Commission, it enables cities to share and learn from good practice in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in other cities across the world. Uscore2 focuses on the use of city-level peer reviews as a tool with which the activities of one city in the area of disaster risk management and civil protection are examined on an equal basis by fellow peers who are experts from other cities. This approach facilitates improvements in DRR through the exchange of best practice and mutual learning, whilst also maintaining impartiality and transparency. This peer review programme integrates an evidence based methodology for impact evaluation, enabling participants to demonstrate the value generated by the investment in the peer review.

Cities undertaking a peer review to Strengthen the Financial Capacity for Resilience will generally be undertaking this as part of a wider review as outlined in the 'Uscore2 Step-by-Step Guide to City-to-City Peer Reviews for Disaster Risk Reduction'. The Step-by-Step Guide provides an essential overview of the peer review process, the Impact Evaluation Methodology (IEM) used to measure the impact of the peer review, and the 11 Modules for conducting city-to-city peer reviews for DRR. It is strongly recommended that cities

interested in inviting another city to peer review their DRR activity work through the Step-by-Step Guide as a precursor to undertaking Module 3. This Module Guide gives information relevant to those steps in the peer review process which are specific to Essential 3 and includes considerations relevant to that part of Essential 7 exploring business continuity.

During the development of Uscore2, the peer review process has been piloted by three cities: Amadora (Portugal), Salford (UK) and Viggiano (Italy). This pilot demonstrated that exploring business continuity planning as a key part of delivering continuity of the city's economy post-disaster and in maintaining citizen's livelihoods, was more effectively achieved as part of Module 3 than as part of Module 7 which is where the indicator for this activity lies.

Reflecting on peer reviews in DRR, the pilot cities spoke positively of their experiences:

"Peer reviews are interactive and about mutual learning, exchange of best practice and policy dialogue, a support tool for prevention and preparation under the EU civil protection mechanism and promote an integrated approach to disaster risk management, linking risk prevention, preparation, response and recovery actions."

BACKGROUND

This peer review Module corresponds to Essential 3 of the United Nation's 'Making Cities Resilient Campaign' – Strengthen Financial Capacity for Resilience. This acknowledges the importance of understanding the economic impact of disasters and the need for investment in resilience, as well as identifying and developing financial mechanisms that can support resilience activities (UNISDR n.d).

One of the seven global targets of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030 is to reduce economic losses (Sendai Framework, 2015). Priority 3 is to encourage investment in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) for resilience, with public and private investment in DRR recognised as essential to enhance the economic, social, health and cultural resilience of persons, communities, countries, their assets, as well as the environment (UNISDR, 2017).

Cities are the economic engines of the world, responsible for more than 70% of global GDP (IEC, 2016). Resilience and DRR are critical considerations for cities as they drive the prosperity agenda and become the focus for investment opportunities (UNISDR, 2017). Key actions that should be taken into account when a city is strengthening its financial capacity for resilience include:

- Prepare a financial plan and procedures that recognise the city's context and risks, making available resources to allow resilience building activities to be realised, including long-term climate adaptation
- Ensure that there are means in place for financial support to protect vulnerable segments of the city's population
- Establish a specific budget, appropriate resources, and contingency fund arrangements for local DRR (mitigation, prevention, response and recovery) that recognise and reflect the city's circumstances and the risks it faces (UNISDR, 2017).

Research conducted into how cities finance DRR has shown a range of approaches being used, often in combination.

These are described below:

Type of Financing

Budgets for DRR directly allocated by municipality or other government body

Budget for DRR mainstreamed into other city budgets or development projects

National budget for DRR available to local governments

Budget for disaster relief / response / recovery available if needed (including microcredit to households)

Measures to support vulnerable households in pre-disaster times

Economic incentives for households and businesses investing in DRR

Source: Johnson, C. and Blackburn, S., (2014). Advocacy for urban resilience: UNISDR's Making Cities Resilient Campaign, Environment and Urbanization, 26(1), 29–52.

In addition to financing DRR activities and therefore supporting work to prevent, adapt, respond to and recover from disasters, cities that understand the relationship between finance and resilience can leverage further benefits (GAR, 2015; UNISDR, 2017). For example, international financial institutions are increasingly assessing a city's resilience and using this as a factor to influence long-term investment decisions (GAR, 2015). City resilience can therefore assist economic growth.

People make cities, and a people-centred approach to resilience that recognises the importance of financial self-sufficiency, should therefore acknowledge the criticality of maintaining livelihoods and household incomes during and post-disaster (Johansen et al. 2016). Promotion of risk-aware business continuity planning for businesses in the city can support their continued function in the face of disaster and therefore maintain people's incomes after a disaster (Henstra, 2010). Post-disaster restoration of sustainable livelihoods should be an agreed priority as cities recover and rebuild (GAR, 2015; UNISDR, 2017).

There is also potential for the private sector and other economic actors to contribute to a greater extent to DRR (GAR, 2015; McAllister, 2013). While business is directly responsible for economic growth, the need for businesses to engage in DRR is growing. The city can play a role in supporting risk aware decisions, ensuring that the exposure of capital to hazard-prone areas, and therefore the value of exposed economic assets are reduced, together with encouraging businesses to integrate disaster risk into their management processes (GAR, 2015). Disaster risk should be an explicit consideration for investors.

Cities tracking the costs of disasters and disaster losses, which could help to make the case for investing in DRR and may help to lower tax revenues and boost expenditure so that unexpected post-disaster demands can be met. The knowledge and learning exchange which takes place as a result of peer reviews is also likely to help cities make the case for investing in DRR further, ultimately protecting the city, its assets and its citizens.

References

GAR, (2015). Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015, United Nations, Geneva, available from: https://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/2015/en/gar-pdf/GAR2015_EN.pdf.

Henstra, D. (2010). Evaluating Local Government Emergency Management Programs: What Framework Should Public Managers Adopt? *Public Administration Review*, 70(2), pp. 236–246.

IEC (2016). Smart Cities, International Electrotechnical Commission, available from <https://www.iec.ch/about/brochures/pdf/technology/smartcities.pdf>

McAllister, T. (2013). Developing Guidelines and Standards for Disaster Resilience of the Built Environment: A Research Needs Assessment, pp. 1–142.

Johansen, C., Horney, J., & Tien, I. (2016). Metrics for Evaluating and Improving Community Resilience, *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, pp. 1–11.

Johnson, C., and Blackburn, S., (2014). Advocacy for urban resilience: UNISDR's Making Cities Resilient Campaign, *Environment and Urbanization*, 26(1), 29–52.

Sendai Framework (2015). Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030, United Nations, Geneva.

UNISDR. (2017), How to Make Cities More Resilient: A Handbook for Local Government Leaders, UNISDR, Geneva, available from: http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/assets/documents/guidelines/Handbook%20For%20Local%20Government%20Leaders_WEB_May%202017.pdf

UNISDR. (n.d), Essential Three: Strengthen Financial Capacity for Resilience, available from: <http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/index/Essential%20Three:%20Strengthen%20Financial%20Capacity%20for%20Resilience/?id=3>

Further Information

For further information on peer reviews visit: www.Uscore2.eu. Also refer to ISO 22392 when published. Currently it is in draft and will contain further information about peer reviews.

HOW CAN FINANCIAL RESILIENCE BE ASSESSED AND IMPROVED?

The description of Essential 3: Strengthen Financial Capacity for Resilience taken from the UNISDR's Making Cities Resilient website and given below, describes the activities a city should be demonstrating to improve resilience in this area. A city's capacity for resilience is the responsibility of a number of organisations, though it is usual for local government to take the lead and enable effective collaboration.

Essential Three: Strengthen Financial Capacity for Resilience

Recognise opportunities where building resilience contributes to a sound economic strategy

- Understand and assess the significant direct and indirect costs of disasters (informed by past experience, taking into account future risk), as well as the relative impact of investment in prevention rather than incurring more significant costs during recovery;
- Assess disaster risk levels and implications from all planning, permitting and capital spending decisions, and adjust those decisions as needed.

Ensure a budget for resilience

- Assign a ring-fenced capital budget for any major works found to be necessary to improve resilience;
- Include risk management allocations in operating budget as required to maintain the required state of resilience over time (together with supporting the actions set out in the Ten Essentials).

Disseminate risk information and apply to development decisions

- Create incentives for homeowners, low-income families, communities, businesses and public sector to invest in reducing the risks they face (for example, applying local taxes for assessing, strengthening and retrofitting vulnerable housing; giving recognition to businesses incorporating risk data into their investment decisions and setting risk management standards in their supply chains, etc.);
- Applying (if necessary, generating) insurance coverage for lives, livelihoods, city and private assets;
- Exploring as needed innovative financing mechanisms such as specialised bonds, specialised insurance, tax efficient finance, development impact bonds, etc.

Although mainly focused on community resilience, Essential 7 recognises the importance of business continuity planning for sustaining economic activity post-disaster. In 2017 the UNISDR published 'How To Make Cities More Resilient A Handbook For Local Government Leaders' which suggests cities should:

“support a culture of DRR in the private sector and ensure business continuity” (page 64).

HOW CAN THIS BE MEASURED?

The following table describes the high level indicators for Essential 3, together with one from Essential 7, taken from the Disaster Resilience Scorecard Preliminary Level Assessment. These are used in this Module as indicators against which to gather evidence and make recommendations.

Ref	Subject / Issue	Question / Assessment Area
P 3.1	Knowledge of approaches for attracting new investment to the city	The city / lead agencies understand all sources of funding, and the “resilience dividends”, are well connected, understand all available routes to attract external funding and are actively pursuing funds for major resilience investments.
P 3.2	Financial plan and budget for resilience, including contingency funds	Does the city have in place a specific ‘ring fenced’ (protected) budget, the necessary resources and contingency fund arrangements for local disaster risk reduction (mitigation, prevention, response and recovery)?
P 3.3	Insurance	What level of insurance cover exists in the city, across all sectors - business and community?
P 3.4	Incentives	What incentives exist for different sectors and segments of business and society to support resilience building?
P 7.3	Private sector / employers	What proportion of businesses have a documented business continuity plan that has been reviewed within the last 18 months?

The full Detailed Assessment from the Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities is available through the following link:

<http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/toolkitblkitem/?id=4>

METHODOLOGY

PHASE 2, STEP 7: INFORMATION TO SEND TO REVIEW TEAM PRIOR TO THE REVIEW TEAM VISIT

Please refer to the Step-by-Step Guide for advice on both conducting and hosting peer reviews. This section sets out information that is specific to this Module, which begins in Phase 2, Step 7.

As set out in the Step-by-Step Guide if Modules 1 (Organise for Disaster Resilience) and 2 (Identify, Understand and Use Current and Future Risk Scenarios) are not undertaken at the same time as Module 3, then an overview of both the Host City's disaster risk governance and DRR risk assessment should be included in the pre-visit information sent to the Review Team.

The Host City should aim to send the pre-visit evidence to the Review Team three months ahead of the review visit. It is recommended that the pre-visit evidence is limited to 3 – 5 items for each Module.

Suggestions for the type of pre-visit evidence that could be shared between cities

A selection of evidence should be sent to the Review Team before their visit to the Host City. This could include the type of information listed below or any other information that the two cities agree would be of benefit.

It is **highly recommended** that the Host City prepare a **summary** of how the city promotes financial resilience including:

- An overview of the financial arrangements for resilience activity and how the Host City invests in understanding disaster risks; risk mitigation and reduction; disaster preparedness; capabilities for disaster response; potentially funding post-disaster recovery and building back better
- The stakeholders involved in financing DRR and any coordination mechanisms
- The governance systems in place to ensure that financial resources are used effectively to reduce disaster risk.

In addition, **no more than 4 other items** should be selected from the suggestions below to demonstrate the city's baseline capacity.

Overview

- An action plan for the Host City or similar document designed to strengthen financial capacity for resilience
- Details of any public facing website, application or social media platform that gives information on financing disaster resilience
- A report for audit, assurance or scrutiny detailing the Host City's approach to financing and investing in disaster resilience
- A city-level report from, or description of, an example of a city-to-city knowledge exchange that has strengthened the Host City's financial capacity for resilience
- The outcomes of local completion of the UNISDR's Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities, Essential 3 and Essential 7 (indicator 7.3 only).

P3.1 Knowledge of approaches for attracting new investment to the city

- A structure chart and / or description of any teams or mechanisms that the Host City has in place to identify possible sources of investment
- An example of a research report or analysis exploring the potential solutions to a resilience issue within the Host City and an investment options appraisal
- A report or analysis of applying a resilience appraisal to an investment scheme to identify additional resilience benefits that could be delivered alongside the primary purpose of the scheme

- An example of how the Host City supports residents to draw down national funding, for example, to retrofit their homes
- A case study of new investment drawn into the Host City to finance a resilience project
- An example of a capital investment that has delivered resilience benefits for the city. This may be the primary function of the investment (for example flood defences) or a co-benefit from a wider investment.

P3.2 Financial plan and budget for resilience, including contingency funds

- Published accounts for the Host City illustrating the budget for resilience and contingency funds
- A case study describing how the Host City financed the response to a recent disaster
- A case study describing how the Host City financed the recovery from a recent disaster.

P3.3 Insurance

- Statistical summary of the level of insurance cover that exists in the city including in the business sector and community
- A description of any insurance schemes offered by the Host City to assist residents in insuring their homes against disaster risks.

P3.4 Incentives

- A description of an example of incentives offered to businesses or the community to support resilience building
- A statistical summary illustrating the take-up rates of different incentive schemes within the Host City.

P7.3 Private sector / employers

- The municipality's business continuity plan to ensure continuity of its services in a disaster
- A debrief report following a business continuity exercise, illustrating the lessons identified during this activity
- A description of the arrangements in the Host City to promote business continuity including to SMEs and the voluntary sector

- An example of any leaflets or other information offered by the Host City to businesses to assist in business continuity planning
- An example of a contract between the Host City and a business within its supply chain requiring that business continuity planning be in place.



PHASE 2, STEP 8: ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PEER REVIEW VISIT

As described in the 'Step-by-Step Guide', in the 3-6 months before the peer review visit, the Host City and Review Team are recommended to agree an agenda for the visit. This will include a range of activities to enable the Review Team to understand how the city is strengthening and improving its financial capacity for resilience. The type of activities could include some or all of those listed below, or any other relevant actions. It is anticipated that the review of this Module will take a day. For all interviews, the Host City should ensure translators are available if they are required.

At the start of the Review Team's assessment of Module 3, the Host City is **highly recommended** to make a **presentation** to the Review Team which sets out its approach to financial resilience. This could include information about:

- The institutions in the city that are involved in financing disaster risks
- Arrangements in place within the Host City to consider financing the mitigation, preparation, response and recovery for specific risks, especially the most probable and most severe disaster risks
- How the institutions within the Host City, including both public and private sector organisations, that invest in DRR are coordinated and work together
- Sources of revenue and capital funds that the Host City can access to invest in DRR.

Who should the Review Team interview?

When considering who is important for the Review Team to interview and / or receive a presentation from, it is **highly recommended** that **the Mayor** and / or other key local political leaders who give DRR leadership and a mandate to strengthen the financial capacity for resilience across the city are included and available. The Host City and Review Team should consider all Modules being assessed

during the peer review and combine relevant questions with each senior politician or officer into one appointment.

The Host City and Review Team may also wish to consider who would be most appropriate in the light of their initial exchange of pre-visit information. Suggestions include:

- Senior officials in the Host City who are responsible for resilience budgeting and reporting on DRR spend
- Senior managers within the municipality who are responsible for securing new investment in DRR
- Local government representatives who support the attraction of new investment into the Host City and who agree the location and siting of new businesses to discuss how resilience and DRR influence the decisions made
- Researchers / analysts who have explored potential DRR projects within the city and carried out an options appraisal of potential funding
- Investors within the Host City who are seeking resilience improvements through their investments
- National or regional government representatives who can describe the national DRR funds made available at a city-level for DRR or that could be drawn upon in an emergency
- Representatives from the insurance industry to discuss some of the opportunities, challenges and products available for DRR insurance across all sectors (including domestic) in the city, the level of insurance coverage and the protection afforded to the Host City's commercial and residential sectors in a disaster

- Representatives from appropriate regulators who mandate the level of investment certain sectors can make in strengthening resilience
- Practitioners who have been involved in city-to-city knowledge exchange about financing DRR
- Community representatives who are financing community resilience measures, for example, through grants
- Community representatives to discuss the understanding of disaster risk amongst residents and any issues around insurance uptake or other incentives to reduce disaster risk at the household or community level
- Home or business owners who have secured and used funding to strengthen their resilience
- Business owners who have developed business continuity plans for their operations. This could include large businesses who are key to the economy of the Host City and / or SMEs.

How can the Host City multi-agency capacity be demonstrated?

In addition to the interviews and presentations, suggestions for activities within the programme for the visit include:

- Site visits to installations and facilities in which the Host City has invested to mitigate or reduce disaster risk
- Visits to any community resilience schemes financed with assistance from the Host City or from funding drawn down from other sources
- Visiting areas at risk from the most probable or most severe disaster scenarios to understand how the Host City is investing in these areas and their communities to reduce exposure and vulnerability to disaster risk
- Visiting any organisations or projects established to improve the financial resilience of those in poverty and / or more vulnerable communities

- Visiting any insurance industry led projects to reduce disaster risk.

Exercises and Training

Observing an example of an exercise to rehearse the municipality's or another organisation's business continuity plan would be helpful. However, given the limited time available, if this is not feasible, the Host City may wish to include video or other evidence from these activities.



PHASE 2, STEP 9: REVIEW TEAM: GATHERING EVIDENCE

The Review Team will gather evidence from the pre-review information submitted before the peer review visit, together with information from interviews and activities undertaken during the visit, to gain a view of the effectiveness of the existing financial capacity for resilience. This will include:

- Understanding whether specific budgets for DRR are in place and / or whether DRR is a consideration in all budgetary expenditure in the Host City
- How investments in the Host City are used to address the known risk scenarios, especially the most probable and most severe disaster risks
- The level of insurance cover and whether this is comprehensive or limited to certain risks
- How appropriate levels of disaster awareness are promoted in businesses and communities, encouraging investment in business continuity planning and the take-up of incentives and other schemes for DRR.

The Review Team will structure their evidence gathering and interviews to enable the Host City to describe and demonstrate their approach against each of the indicators included in the Disaster Resilience Scorecard Preliminary Level Assessment. Overall, the Review Team should determine:

- Who leads / contributes / coordinates / assesses performance in this area? Is this effective? Is shared ownership of DRR evident?
- Who is missing / underperforming or underrepresented?
- What skills and experience are evidenced? Are there deficits?
- What activities currently support performance in this area and are these activities effective?

- What, if any, additional activities would the Host City like to undertake in future? What are the barriers to extending activities?
- How are resources / information / training shared? Are there exclusions or barriers to access?
- How is the Host City accessing local / national / international sources of expertise to improve DRR in this area? Which networks is the Host City part of to support this activity?

Although the Review Team should design their own detailed questions in order to explore issues they consider relevant in the context of the Host City, the following questions are offered as suggestions that may be helpful in stakeholder interviews for Module 3. They are example questions and it is wholly acceptable to tailor them or, equally, not to use them, according to the individual peer review. The Review Team could choose to select just the relevant questions as well as asking additional questions that have not been listed below.



Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 3.1	Knowledge of approaches for attracting new investment to the city	<p>The city / lead agencies understand all sources of funding, and the “resilience dividends”, are well connected, understand all available routes to attract external funding and are actively pursuing funds for major resilience investments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the city used financing products for resilience-building from international financial institutions (such as the World Bank, European Investment Bank, etc.)? How have these products been used? • How does the Host City access national or regional finance? What types of projects and resilience benefits have been secured through this route? • How does the city invest in prevention and mitigation of risk as well as spending on disaster response? • Does the Host City use any processes or tools to seek additional resilience benefits from major investments where the primary purpose may not be resilience? • Would the Host City like to see alternative or additional arrangements put in place to finance DRR and how these might work? • How has the Host City connected to other cities, within the same country or internationally, to understand examples of good practice in financing DRR? • What level of understanding does the Host City have of the most probable and most severe risks and the funding needed to mitigate and prepare for these disaster risks?
P 3.2	Financial plan and budget for resilience, including contingency funds	<p>Does the city have in place a specific ‘ring fenced’ (protected) budget, the necessary resources and contingency fund arrangements for local DRR (mitigation, prevention, response and recovery)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the Host City finance DRR? How is investment and budgeting balanced against the most probable and most severe disaster risks? • How does the city undertake long-term financial planning that supports investment in long-term resilience projects, such as infrastructure?

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 3.2	Financial plan and budget for resilience, including contingency funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What arrangements does the Host City have for contingency funds in case of a disaster? How easily can the Host City rapidly mobilise financial resources to implement disaster response and disaster recovery plans? • What mechanism does the Host City have to establish if DRR expenditure is value for money and achieving its objectives? How does the Host City audit and account for DRR spending? • What arrangements are in place for the Host City to rapidly establish a disaster fund to receive, manage, disburse and account for financial donations in an emergency? • What arrangements are in place for the Host City to provide financial assistance to businesses and communities in a disaster?
P 3.3	Insurance	<p>What level of insurance cover exists in the city, across all sectors - business and community?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What level of insurance does the Host City have, for example, in insuring its public infrastructure for natural hazards and other risks? • Has the Host City reviewed its insurance requirements to take account of climate change projections? • How does the Host City encourage businesses and households to invest in insurance cover? • What arrangements does the Host City have to work with the insurance sector?
P 3.4	Incentives	<p>What incentives exist for different sectors and segments of business and society to support resilience building?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the Host City promote access to financial support and incentivise improving the resilience of properties and households in high risk areas? • How does the Host City invest in supporting vulnerable communities in DRR? • How does the Host City incentivise resilience building in high risk areas and especially with vulnerable people within these areas?

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 7.3	Private sector / employers	<p>What proportion of businesses have a documented business continuity plan that has been reviewed within the last 18 months?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the Host City promote business continuity planning within its business community? • What arrangements are in place to share data on risk scenarios with businesses undertaking business continuity planning? • How does the Host City support businesses in rehearsing and exercising their business continuity plans? • How does the Host City ensure that businesses are aware of how public agencies will respond in a disaster and what support businesses might or might not expect in the aftermath of a disaster? • How does the Host City ensure that essential services are protected with robust business continuity plans? • How does the Host City ensure that organisations providing services to vulnerable people have business continuity planning in place?

PHASE 3, STEP 11: RECORDING INFORMATION AND DRAFTING INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The 'Step-by-Step Guide' describes how the Review Team can record information during the peer review visit and includes a generic form that can be used to capture information during individual presentations, interviews and other activities.

At the end of each day, it is recommended that the Review Team assemble to consider all the information that it has heard during the day and summarise the evidence to understand:

- Areas of good practice and strengths on which the Host City can build
- Areas where further information may be needed before the peer review visit is finished
- Areas where possible recommendations for the future may be made.

This process will help to inform both the remainder of the visit and the drafting of the peer review outcome report.

The two tables below are offered as a way of recording the overall findings for Module 3 together with the initial recommendations arising from the activities experienced during the day.



SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS

	Comments	Justification for assessment	Good practice identified
P 3.1 Knowledge of approaches for attracting new investment to the city The city / lead agencies understand all sources of funding, and the “resilience dividends”, are well connected, understand all available routes to attract external funding and are actively pursuing funds for major resilience investments.			
P 3.2 Financial plan and budget for resilience, including contingency funds Does the city have in place a specific ‘ring fenced’ (protected) budget, the necessary resources and contingency fund arrangements for local DRR (mitigation, prevention, response and recovery)?			
P 3.3 Insurance What level of insurance cover exists in the city, across all sectors - business and community?			
3.4 Incentives What incentives exist for different sectors and segments of business and society to support resilience building?			
P 7.3 Private sector / employers What proportion of businesses have a documented business continuity plan? Of those businesses that have a documented business continuity plan, what proportion have been reviewed within the last 18 months?			

SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS

	Comments	Justification for assessment	Good practice identified
Other			

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

	Description of areas for potential development	Justification	Time horizon
E.g. Extent to which data on the city's resilience context is shared with other organisations involved with the city's resilience.	E.g. Ensure a consistent flow of information between multi-agency partners.	E.g. A regular flow of information would improve understanding of risk and aid planning for partner agencies.	E.g. Short, medium, long term implementation.
P 3.1 Knowledge of approaches for attracting new investment to the city The city / lead agencies understand all sources of funding, and the "resilience dividends", are well connected, understand all available routes to attract external funding and are actively pursuing funds for major resilience investments.			
P 3.2 Financial plan and budget for resilience, including contingency funds The city has in place a specific 'ring fenced' (protected) budget, the necessary resources and contingency fund arrangements for local disaster risk reduction (mitigation, prevention, response and recovery).			

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

	Description of areas for potential development	Justification	Time horizon
P 3.3 Insurance Insurance cover exists in the city, across all sectors – including business and community.			
P 3.4 Incentives Incentives exist for different sectors and segments of business and society to support resilience building.			
P 7.3 Private sector / employers The proportion of businesses that have a documented business continuity plan. Of those businesses which have a documented business continuity plan the proportion that have been reviewed within the last 18 months.			

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS			
	Description of areas for potential development	Justification	Time horizon
Other Area / issue			

