Uscore2

Funded by
European Union
Civil Protection

Module 1: Organise for Disaster Resilience

Uscore2: City-to-City Peer Review Tool

CONTENTS

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) from 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 good 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 of Organising for Disaster 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 1. This Module Guide gives information relevant to those steps in the peer review process which are specific to Essential 1.

During the development of Uscore2, the peer review process has been piloted by three cities: Amadora (Portugal), Salford (UK) and Viggiano (Italy). 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 Module addresses the ways in which cities can strengthen their local level capacity, establish coordination within the city, build networks and form legislative frameworks for resilience (UNISDR, n.d). To strengthen disaster risk governance in order to manage risk, cities must consider action within and across sectors at local, national, regional and global levels (Sendai, 2015).

In the Making Cities Resilient Campaign, the importance of disaster risk governance in enabling effective urban disaster risk reduction is reflected in its position as the first essential activity: to organise for disaster resilience: to put in place an organisational structure and identify the necessary process to understand and act on reducing exposure, impact and vulnerability to disasters (UNISDR, n.d).

To achieve effective and efficient management of disaster risk, cities need to consider how well they establish a clear vision and plans for DRR and resilience building (Sendai, 2015), and how the city coordinates within and across sectors (Sendai, 2015). This should include how coordination can be effectively decentralised for maximum efficiency and effectiveness (Gilissen et al. 2016).

In addition, it is vital to consider how the city will engage all relevant stakeholders (Sendai, 2015) and address its communication, knowledge exchange and resource mobilisation with them (Kamh et al. 2016). Also important to disaster risk governance is the building and maintenance of alliances with various groups including communities, businesses and scientists in order to effect change in DRR decision making (Hamdan 2012). Finally, strong risk governance should consider disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery and rehabilitation (Sendai, 2015) in accordance with relevant risks identified (UNISDR, n.d).

To further support national and local government the Sendai Framework (2015) sets out some mechanisms to support the strengthening of disaster risk governance. In summary these include:
• Use of frameworks of laws, regulations and public policies
• Development of Disaster Risk Reduction strategies
• Assessment of disaster risk management capacity
• Mechanisms and incentives to ensure compliance with safety-enhancing laws and regulations
• Mechanisms to assess progress against and promote scrutiny of Disaster Risk Reduction plans
• Ensure disaster risk management institutions are set clear roles and tasks
• Multi-stakeholder coordination forums for multi-sectoral disaster risk reduction
• Coordination with civil society, communities and indigenous peoples and migrants
• Allocation of budgets to Disaster Risk Reduction
• Development of quality standards
• Prevention or relocation of settlements in risk-prone zones.

Disaster risk governance is therefore central to managing and responding to risks. Peer reviews offer a means to assess strengths and opportunities for cities through exchanging good practice, receiving recommendations from expert reviewers and mutual learning exchanges.

References
Gilissen, H. K., M. Alexander, P. Matczak, M. Pettersson, and S. Bruzzone. 2016. A framework for evaluating the effectiveness of flood emergency management systems in Europe. Ecology and Society 21(4): 27.

Hamdan, F. (2012). Intensive and Extensive Disaster Risk Drivers and Incentives for Disaster Risk Management in the MENA region, Disaster Risk Management Centre, Geneva, Switzerland, 2013.

Kamh, Y. Z., Khalifa, M. A., & El-Bahrawy, A. N. (2016). Comparative Study of Community Resilience in Mega Coastal Cities Threatened by Sea Level Rise: The Case of Alexandria and Jakarta. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 216(October 2015), pp. 503–517.

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

UNISDR. (n.d). Essential One: Organise for Disaster Resilience, available from: http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/index/Essential%20One:%20Organise%20for%20Disaster%20Resilience/?id=1

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 A CITY'S CAPACITY TO ORGANISE FOR DISASTER RESILIENCE BE ASSESSED AND IMPROVED?

The description of Essential 1: Organise for Disaster 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 and governance arrangements.

Essential 1: Organise for Disaster Resilience

Establish and strengthen the local level institutional and coordination capacity
- Establish a single point of coordination in the city, accepted by all stakeholders;
- Exercise strong leadership and commitment at the highest elected level within the city authority, such as the Mayor;
- Ensure that all departments understand the importance of disaster risk reduction for achieving objectives of respective department's policies and programs and identify measures to reduce disaster risk within their roles and responsibilities; and that they have a framework within which to collaborate as required.

Build alliances and networks
- Engage and build alliances with all relevant stakeholder groups including government at all levels, such as national, state, city, parish or other subdivision, neighbouring cities or countries when applicable, civil society, community organisations and the private sector;
- Engage and learn from other city networks and initiatives, for example taking part in city-to-city learning programmes, promoting climate change and resilience initiatives, etc.

Form a legislative framework and action mechanisms for resilience
- Establish necessary strategies, acts, laws, codes or integrate resilience qualities into existing policies aimed at preventing the creation of risk and reduction of existing risk;
- Create policies to gather and manage data for sharing amongst all stakeholders and citizens, ensuring that all city government discussions routinely capture resilience implications, that the resilience implications of policies and standards in use are also assessed, and that action is taken upon these as needed;
- Put in place reporting mechanisms that capture key information about resilience and promote transparency, accountability and improved data capture over time (e.g. consider use of UNISDR tools Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities Preliminary and Detailed Level Assessment).

HOW CAN THIS BE MEASURED?

The following table describes the high level indicators for Essential 1 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 1.1	Plan making	Does the city master plan (or relevant strategy / plan) include and implement disaster risk reduction approaches in line with the Sendai Framework?
		By 'plan' we typically mean some form of city wide plan, cross cutting strategy or vision. This could be a spatial plan, an infrastructure plan or an environmental or sustainability plan, providing it complies with the criteria from Sendai Framework paragraph 27 (b).
		Alternatively, if a city has a stand-alone disaster risk reduction plan / policy / strategy in place in line with the national strategies this can also demonstrate compliance.
		For compliance the plan should have coverage across all of the Ten Essentials.
P 1.2	Organisation, coordination and participation	Is there a multi-agency / sectoral mechanism with appropriate authority and resources to address disaster risk reduction?
P 1.3	Integration	Is resilience properly integrated with other key city functions / portfolios? (e.g. planning, sustainability, investment case approval, finance and compliance, community engagement, emergency management, code compliance, infrastructure management, communications, etc.)

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 Essential in Phase 2.

As set out in the Step-by-Step Guide if Module 2 (Identify, Understand and Use Current and Future Risk Scenarios) is not undertaken at the same time as Module 1, then an overview of the Host City's 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 peer review visit. It is recommended that the pre-visit evidence is limited to 3 – 5 items for each Essential.

Suggestions for the type of pre-visit evidence that could be shared between the Host City and Review Team

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 Host City and the Review Team agree would be of benefit.

It is **highly recommended** that the Host City prepare a **summary** of how the Host City ensures it is organised for effective disaster resilience including

- A description of how leadership for DRR is delivered in the city
- A structure chart of DRR governance showing key stakeholders, organisations and community representation
- An example or case study describing how the Host City's DRR governance arrangements have helped to prevent the creation of disaster risk or reduced an existing disaster risk or strengthened city resilience (economic, social, health or environmental)

- If carried out, the outcomes of local completion of the UNISDR's Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities, Essential 1.

In addition, **no more than 4 other items** should be selected from the suggestions below to demonstrate the Host City's baseline capacity for organising for disaster resilience.

P1.1 Plan making
- The Host City's DRR / Resilience Strategy and / or a city vision (master plan or management plan) that incorporates the Host City's approach to disaster risk reduction
- A summary of how stakeholders and the wider society have been involved in developing the strategy and approach the Host City is taking to DRR
- A description of how local DRR arrangements are aligned with national strategies
- An analysis or academic study of the effectiveness of the Host City's approach to organising for disaster resilience
- A report from, or description of, an example of a city-to-city knowledge exchange that has strengthened the city's disaster risk governance arrangements.

P1.2 Organisation, coordination and participation
- A description of the local platform for DRR
- Minutes from a recent meeting of the local platform / multi-agency mechanism for DRR
- A description of a cross-sector project within the Host City to reduce disaster risk
- A summary of how the Host City's cross-sector arrangements for DRR are resourced (finance, staff etc.).

P1.3 Integration

- A short description or overview as to how the city ensures it has the skills, knowledge and experience to identify risks, mitigate risks, plan for and respond to disasters, drawing down relevant expertise available within institutions, e.g. academic institutions

- A description of how resilience properly integrated with other key city functions / portfolios (e.g. planning, sustainability, investment case approval, finance and compliance, community engagement, emergency management, code compliance, infrastructure management, communications etc.).

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 effective organisation for disaster resilience. The types 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 Essential 1, the Host City is **highly recommended** to make a summary **presentation** to the Review Team which sets out the approach to organising for disaster resilience. This could include information about:

- How the Host City governance arrangements for DRR operate
- The authority and influence the city's governance structures have across different sectors and portfolios within the Host City
- How those involved in DRR governance are informed about the disaster risks the Host City faces and their role in efforts to reduce these risks and strengthen resilience whilst avoiding the creation of new risks
- Future aspirations and ambitions of the DRR governance structures.

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 engaged in disaster risk governance within the Host 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 light of their initial exchange of pre-visit information and also given the most probable and most severe disaster scenarios for the Host City. Suggestions include:

- Senior managers of institutions that are part of the Host City governance arrangements
- Author(s) of the Host City's master plan or equivalent that sets out how the Host City will address disaster risk reduction
- Senior managers from other city functions / portfolios that have a role in DRR
- Senior managers in different organisations and from different sectors who are part of the Host City's multi-agency and cross-sector mechanism / local platform for DRR
- Senior managers from organisations in the Host City that invest in DRR
- Representatives from the national level who have a responsibility for DRR (e.g. planning, sustainability, investment case approval, finance and compliance, community engagement, emergency management, code compliance, infrastructure management, communications etc.).

How can the Host City demonstrate Organising for Disaster Resilience?

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

- Site visits to projects within the Host City demonstrate organising for disaster resilience?
- Community visits to observe programmes organised by the Host City, in collaboration with partners, to strengthen community resilience
- Visiting a team researching and assembling data in relation to disaster risk governance
- Observing or participating in a meeting of the local platform for DRR / multi-agency and cross-sector mechanism for DRR.

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 Host City approach to organising for disaster resilience. This will include:

- Whether there are suitable and sufficient organisational arrangements for DRR in place
- Effectiveness of the governance structures within the Host City in engaging all relevant agencies and organisations to support DRR
- Effectiveness of communication within the governance structures.

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, 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 aligning with national and international sources of expertise in DRR? 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 Essential 1. 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 1.1	Plan making	**Does the Host City master plan (or relevant strategy / plan) include and implement disaster risk reduction approaches in line with the Sendai Framework?** By 'plan' we typically mean some form of city wide plan, cross cutting strategy or vision. This could be a spatial plan, an infrastructure plan or an environmental or sustainability plan, providing it complies with the criteria from Sendai Framework paragraph 27 (b). Alternatively, if the Host City has a stand-alone disaster risk reduction plan / policy / strategy in place in line with the national strategies this can also demonstrate compliance. For compliance the plan should have coverage across all of the Ten Essentials. Does the Host City master plan (or relevant strategy / plan) include and implement disaster risk reduction approaches in line with the Sendai Framework? • How is the Sendai Framework reflected in the strategy / vision / master plan? For example: o Planned across different timescales o Targets, indicators and timeframes included o Addresses preventing the creation of risk o Addresses the reduction of existing risk o Strengthens economic, social, health and environmental resilience • What makes the city's DRR governance effective? What are the particular strengths of current arrangements? • How is progress against the Host City's DRR strategy and / or actions measured? How is the impact of DRR activity measured? • How does the Host City assure itself of the effectiveness of its DRR governance? • How is the Host City using any quality standards to support its work e.g. ISO, CEN, LGSAT, Disaster Resilience Scorecard? • How does the Host City tackle its disaster risks especially the most probable and most severe, including reducing exposure and vulnerability (e.g. reduce, mitigate, prepare for)?

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 1.1	Plan making	• How do the governance arrangements ensure their decisions are informed and evidence based? How do they draw on scientific, technical or academic advice and knowledge? • What is the approach in the Host City to ensuring an all-of-society approach to DRR that recognises the needs of vulnerable people? • How is the community involved in DRR governance? • What are the barriers to the Host City strengthening its DRR governance? • How does the Host City's DRR governance draw on learning and good practice from other cities?
P 1.2	Organisation, coordination and participation	• How does the Host City ensure there is an effective, functioning, multi-agency, cross-sectoral mechanism with appropriate authority and resources to address disaster risk reduction? • Who is in overall charge of DRR in the Host City? Who has the authority in the Host City to strengthen approaches to DRR? • How do the Host City's DRR governance structures ensure DRR activities are joined up across different departments / organisations to ensure maximum DRR benefit from DRR investments? • How do regional and national governments work with the Host City government to strengthen DRR? • How does the Host City influence the regional and national direction in DRR? • What evidence is available to confirm that institutions charged with civil protection and the safety of citizens together with those responsible for economic and social infrastructure understand and accept their specific DRR responsibilities for hazard assessment, vulnerability analysis, mitigation and DRR? • How does the Host City's local government assure itself it has proportionate and adequate capabilities in place for disasters? • Who can mobilise and allocate resources and funding to DRR activities? • How does the DRR governance structure budget for DRR activities? • How does the Host City align contributions across all sectors to maximise available resources to deliver efficient and effective DRR?

Funded by
European Union
Civil Protection

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 1.3	Integration	**Is resilience properly integrated with other key Host City functions / portfolios? (e.g., planning, sustainability, investment case approval, finance and compliance, community engagement, emergency management, code compliance, infrastructure management, communications etc.)** • How does the Host City work across silos to make DRR "everyone's business"? • How is the Host City encouraging all of its departments and key institutions to plan for changing risks, including those due to climate change? • How does the Host City factor climate change projections into key decision to mitigate disaster risks, especially in vulnerable areas of the city? • How does the Host City actively promote principles of equality and non-discrimination in the DRR activities undertaken by all departments and critical city services? • How are civil society, communities and indigenous peoples and migrants involved in setting the Host City's future direction for DRR? • How does the Host City's DRR governance contribute to and support public awareness and education about disaster risk, facilitate community resilience and advocate for an all-of-society approach in disaster risk management? • Does the Host City have a standard procedure to engage citizens in the development / assessment of DRR activities?

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 of 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 the Essential and the initial recommendations arising from the activities experienced during the day.

SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS

	Comments	Justification for assessment	Good practice identified
P 1.1 Plan making a) Does the Host City master plan (or relevant strategy / plan) include and implement disaster risk reduction approaches in line with the Sendai Framework? b) Alternatively, if the Host City has a stand-alone disaster risk reduction plan / policy / strategy in place in line with the national strategies this can also demonstrate compliance.			
P 1.2 Organisation, coordination and participation Is there a disaster management / preparedness / emergency response plan (strategy) outlining the Host City mitigation, preparedness and response to local emergencies?			
P 1.3 Integration Is resilience properly integrated with other key city functions / portfolios?			
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 1.1 Plan making a) The city master plan (or relevant strategy / plan) includes and implements disaster risk reduction approaches in line with the Sendai Framework			
b) The city has a stand-alone disaster risk reduction plan / policy / strategy in place in line with the national strategy which demonstrates compliance			
P 1.2 Organisation, coordination and participation There is a multi-agency / sectoral mechanism with appropriate authority and resources to address disaster risk reduction			

Funded by
European Union
Civil Protection

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

	Description of areas for potential development	Justification	Time horizon
P 1.3 Integration Resilience is properly integrated with other key city functions / portfolios			
Other Area / issue			

NOTES:

Module 1: Organise for Disaster Resilience

NOTES:

Further information is available from: www.Uscore2.eu

ISO22392 is being drafted and will contain further information about peer reviews