

Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment for the Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)

Summary	
Organisation: Global Facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery (GFDRR)	Date: February 2011
Description of Organisation	
<p>The GFDRR was established only 4 years ago in 2006. It is a facility hosted by the World Bank (WB) and guided by a Consultative Group (CG). The CG comprises donors, developing countries and international partners, and a Results Management Council (RMC) which includes representatives of donors, country level members, partner organizations, sector experts, the WB, and the ISDR. The group has 39 members of which 21 are donors. The GFDRR Secretariat employs some 12 full-time staff at its Washington Headquarters, and relies on a network of World Bank and UNISDR staff to support its three 'tracks' of programming. Since its inception, the GFDRR has experienced significant growth in both funding and programming.</p> <p>DFID was one of the first donors to support GFDRR with a contribution of £5.2 million from 2006-2009. This contribution and strategic guidance have been instrumental in the shaping and development of GFDRR¹.</p> <p>The facility's mission is to mainstream Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation in country development strategies by supporting a country-led and management implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, specifically: "Building Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters".</p> <p>GFDRR's main areas of focus are; global and regional level advocacy – implemented through UNISDR (Track 1), technical and financial assistance to low and middle-income countries – administered through a multi-donor trust fund (Track 2) and a disaster recovery fund which aims to bridge the gap between humanitarian assistance and longer term recovery (Track 3).</p> <p>Track 2 comprises a Multi-Donor Trust Fund contributed to by DFID. Its annual budget is \$131.5m (total funds available taken from financial report 2009-10). GFDRR's budget counts as ODA.</p>	

Contribution to UK Development Objectives	Score (1-4)
<p>1a. Critical role in meeting International Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Is the key multilateral organisation responsible for delivery of the Hyogo Framework for Action's objective to mainstream DRR into national development strategies. + Despite being set up in 2006, it is already undertaking important work in economic analysis on DRR and mainstreaming DRR and climate change at national level. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

¹ Proposal to UK DFID for financial support to GFDRR for FY 2011-2014.

<p>incentives to integrate gender concerns in country programmes</p> <p>= Operational policies in place and gender concerns are recognised by GFDRR but these have not translated to effective implementation on the ground.</p> <p>2c. Climate Change</p> <p>+ (Based on IDA) Increasing integration of climate into existing development work, underpinned by comprehensive strategy documents and robust safeguards.</p> <p>+ GFDRR – all strategy and operations are informed by the clear understanding that integrating climate change adaptation analysis and measures in disaster risk management interventions has become a basic issue of due diligence. They are developing some excellent analysis on this.</p> <p>+ In FY 2010 GFDRR has actively and successfully fostered and improved linkages between country offices, the World Bank Group (WBG), and with external partners by strategically leveraging just-in-time seed funding, targeted investments, and expertise.</p> <p>– There is still a lack of a joined-up approach to climate change adaptation and DRR, although GDRR are working to remedy this</p> <p>= Climate change adaptation is still not yet fully integrated into the Bank’s work but climate change analysis does underpin a lot of GFDRR’s actions, thus meriting a 3.</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>3. Focus on Poor Countries²</p> <p>+ Has focused on the 20 countries most at risk to multiple hazards and natural disasters (DRR does not respond to human generated emergencies) in close consultation with the Consultative Group</p> <p>= GFDRR mainly works in countries with the greatest humanitarian need, but this does not always correspond to those most at risk from hazards and natural disasters (it does not work in conflict settings for example).</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>4. Contribution to Results</p> <p>+ DRR mainstreaming is already underway, aligned with national priorities and development plans and is already showing signs of achievements on the ground.</p> <p>+ In spite of its short lifespan, GFDRR has been able to lever additional investment to support DRR-related activities and thus promote increased ex-ante</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

² Humanitarian agencies have been assessed according to their focus on countries with the greatest humanitarian need

<p>investment, including investment by the World Bank itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + External evaluation noted the many advantages of having WB involvement in DRR – high calibre staff, ability to forge partnerships and GFDRR’s unique role to bridge knowledge, policy and practice in DRR services. – As GFDRR is a relatively new organisation it is difficult to fully assess the results they have achieved. = Despite its ‘youth’, GFDRR has achieved a lot in terms of mainstreaming DRR and aligning national priorities and plans, receiving praise from external evaluators. Results from all its activities are not yet entirely clear, however. 	
Organisational Strengths	
<p>5. Strategic & Performance Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR has a clear mandate, purpose and strategy to deliver on the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) priorities. It has a good, responsive and transparent Secretariat structure in Washington which is influenced by the CG. + Results based frameworks are under development through the Results Management Council and already giving early evidence of performance. – In-country programmes are sometimes of variable quality with a lack of consistency across all programmes. There is a drive to improve this area of work and the Results Based Management System (RBMS) is being implemented for this purpose, but it is at an early stage. = Whilst GFDRR has a clear mandate, purpose and strategy, results based frameworks are still under development and there are doubts as to the effectiveness of in-country programmes. 	Score (1-4) Weak (2)
<p>6. Financial Resources Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Rules based allocation process, multi-year commitments possible, some capacity to reorient resources to better performing areas, heavy penalties if programmes perform poorly, financial accountability process and policies are mostly robust. – Final allocations of funds are not always transparent and are influenced by individual relationships and structures. IDA allocations limit medium/long term predictability of overall financial planning, their systems do not allow pooled funding or innovative/responsive approaches and their financial instruments are not suitable for fragile states. = GFDRR has a good financial management system with mostly robust accountability processes and policies and some ability to redirect funds. It is constrained by some of the WB systems which prevent pooled funding/innovative 	Satisfactory (3)

<p>approaches and a lack of transparency at country-level allocations.</p>	
<p>7. Cost and Value Consciousness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + (Based on IDA) Adequate cost control systems to ensure costs do not inflate. Tracks costs of operations, can demonstrate some efficiency improvements, committed to a flat budget, good systems to ensure costs are controlled. Plays a strong role in helping clients consider public expenditure choices and strengthening financial management. + GFDRR is undertaking work to demonstrate economic benefits of DRR as opposed to humanitarian response. It is focused on cost effectiveness but most purchasing and administrative procedures are as IDA. - (Based on IDA) Not yet developed an overarching narrative on how IDA achieves value for money, admin costs are high compared to peers, no incentives to generate cost savings in projects, staff pay mechanism inflates salaries across Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). = GFDRR's cost and value consciousness is mainly determined by IDA, who have adequate systems but a number of issues in terms of admin and staff costs. GFDRR is beginning to work on demonstrating the economic benefits of DRR, which illustrates their focus on VfM. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>8. Partnership Behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR is a unique model incorporating developing country governments, donors and international partners with an excellent partnership with UNISDR and other UN partners. + It works in 31 priority countries alongside national Disaster Risk Management Departments and is working hard towards a coordinated and coherent approach, thereby enabling effective donor harmonisation and responding to the Paris Principles. + The Consultative Group is a unique model of stakeholder engagement – facilitating top-level discussions with a wide stakeholder group. - Needs to be balanced against broader evidence from external evaluation and country visits in which the Bank does not come out strongly on coordination behaviours. = Although GFDRR's structure and mandate includes working closely with a variety of partners, there is some evidence from the field that it does not always deliver effectively on coordination tasks. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

<p>9. Transparency and Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Very strong policy on disclosure. Signed up to International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI). Extensive publishing of relevant documentation and strong mechanism for redress of grievances. + GFDRR, a Facility of the WB, is answerable to its Consultative Group of partners and donors. This has been extremely successful and has improved transparency and accountability of the facility. - Unable to ensure effective national participation and feedback on its work in country. = Transparency and accountability to donors and international partners is very strong, but the issue of incorporating client country voice has not yet been adequately addressed. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
Likelihood of Positive Change	Score (1-4)
<p>10. Likelihood of Positive Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR strength is its ability to listen and respond to requests from the CG. This has resulted in the Results Based Management Framework, better reporting on country level impacts and continued development of Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs) - World Bank Board legitimacy is limited, reform of corporate governance and shareholder voice much slower and more difficult. Reform pace is slow, especially on decentralisation. = Overall, adequate performance on the strength of evidence of recent operational reforms. Improved performance on corporate reform and voice and faster pace of reform needed to rate this as strong performance. 	<p>Likely (3)</p>

Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment for the Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)

Summary	
Organisation: Global Facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery (GFDRR)	Date: February 2011
Description of Organisation	
<p>The GFDRR was established only 4 years ago in 2006. It is a facility hosted by the World Bank (WB) and guided by a Consultative Group (CG). The CG comprises donors, developing countries and international partners, and a Results Management Council (RMC) which includes representatives of donors, country level members, partner organizations, sector experts, the WB, and the ISDR. The group has 39 members of which 21 are donors. The GFDRR Secretariat employs some 12 full-time staff at its Washington Headquarters, and relies on a network of World Bank and UNISDR staff to support its three 'tracks' of programming. Since its inception, the GFDRR has experienced significant growth in both funding and programming.</p> <p>DFID was one of the first donors to support GFDRR with a contribution of £5.2 million from 2006-2009. This contribution and strategic guidance have been instrumental in the shaping and development of GFDRR¹.</p> <p>The facility's mission is to mainstream Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation in country development strategies by supporting a country-led and management implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, specifically: "Building Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters".</p> <p>GFDRR's main areas of focus are; global and regional level advocacy – implemented through UNISDR (Track 1), technical and financial assistance to low and middle-income countries – administered through a multi-donor trust fund (Track 2) and a disaster recovery fund which aims to bridge the gap between humanitarian assistance and longer term recovery (Track 3).</p> <p>Track 2 comprises a Multi-Donor Trust Fund contributed to by DFID. Its annual budget is \$131.5m (total funds available taken from financial report 2009-10). GFDRR's budget counts as ODA.</p>	

Contribution to UK Development Objectives	Score (1-4)
<p>1a. Critical role in meeting International Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Is the key multilateral organisation responsible for delivery of the Hyogo Framework for Action's objective to mainstream DRR into national development strategies. + Despite being set up in 2006, it is already undertaking important work in economic analysis on DRR and mainstreaming DRR and climate change at national level. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

¹ Proposal to UK DFID for financial support to GFDRR for FY 2011-2014.

<p>incentives to integrate gender concerns in country programmes</p> <p>= Operational policies in place and gender concerns are recognised by GFDRR but these have not translated to effective implementation on the ground.</p> <p>2c. Climate Change</p> <p>+ (Based on IDA) Increasing integration of climate into existing development work, underpinned by comprehensive strategy documents and robust safeguards.</p> <p>+ GFDRR – all strategy and operations are informed by the clear understanding that integrating climate change adaptation analysis and measures in disaster risk management interventions has become a basic issue of due diligence. They are developing some excellent analysis on this.</p> <p>+ In FY 2010 GFDRR has actively and successfully fostered and improved linkages between country offices, the World Bank Group (WBG), and with external partners by strategically leveraging just-in-time seed funding, targeted investments, and expertise.</p> <p>– There is still a lack of a joined-up approach to climate change adaptation and DRR, although GDRR are working to remedy this</p> <p>= Climate change adaptation is still not yet fully integrated into the Bank’s work but climate change analysis does underpin a lot of GFDRR’s actions, thus meriting a 3.</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>3. Focus on Poor Countries²</p> <p>+ Has focused on the 20 countries most at risk to multiple hazards and natural disasters (DRR does not respond to human generated emergencies) in close consultation with the Consultative Group</p> <p>= GFDRR mainly works in countries with the greatest humanitarian need, but this does not always correspond to those most at risk from hazards and natural disasters (it does not work in conflict settings for example).</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>4. Contribution to Results</p> <p>+ DRR mainstreaming is already underway, aligned with national priorities and development plans and is already showing signs of achievements on the ground.</p> <p>+ In spite of its short lifespan, GFDRR has been able to lever additional investment to support DRR-related activities and thus promote increased ex-ante</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

² Humanitarian agencies have been assessed according to their focus on countries with the greatest humanitarian need

<p>investment, including investment by the World Bank itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + External evaluation noted the many advantages of having WB involvement in DRR – high calibre staff, ability to forge partnerships and GFDRR’s unique role to bridge knowledge, policy and practice in DRR services. – As GFDRR is a relatively new organisation it is difficult to fully assess the results they have achieved. = Despite its ‘youth’, GFDRR has achieved a lot in terms of mainstreaming DRR and aligning national priorities and plans, receiving praise from external evaluators. Results from all its activities are not yet entirely clear, however. 	
Organisational Strengths	
<p>5. Strategic & Performance Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR has a clear mandate, purpose and strategy to deliver on the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) priorities. It has a good, responsive and transparent Secretariat structure in Washington which is influenced by the CG. + Results based frameworks are under development through the Results Management Council and already giving early evidence of performance. – In-country programmes are sometimes of variable quality with a lack of consistency across all programmes. There is a drive to improve this area of work and the Results Based Management System (RBMS) is being implemented for this purpose, but it is at an early stage. = Whilst GFDRR has a clear mandate, purpose and strategy, results based frameworks are still under development and there are doubts as to the effectiveness of in-country programmes. 	Score (1-4) Weak (2)
<p>6. Financial Resources Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Rules based allocation process, multi-year commitments possible, some capacity to reorient resources to better performing areas, heavy penalties if programmes perform poorly, financial accountability process and policies are mostly robust. – Final allocations of funds are not always transparent and are influenced by individual relationships and structures. IDA allocations limit medium/long term predictability of overall financial planning, their systems do not allow pooled funding or innovative/responsive approaches and their financial instruments are not suitable for fragile states. = GFDRR has a good financial management system with mostly robust accountability processes and policies and some ability to redirect funds. It is constrained by some of the WB systems which prevent pooled funding/innovative 	Satisfactory (3)

<p>approaches and a lack of transparency at country-level allocations.</p>	
<p>7. Cost and Value Consciousness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + (Based on IDA) Adequate cost control systems to ensure costs do not inflate. Tracks costs of operations, can demonstrate some efficiency improvements, committed to a flat budget, good systems to ensure costs are controlled. Plays a strong role in helping clients consider public expenditure choices and strengthening financial management. + GFDRR is undertaking work to demonstrate economic benefits of DRR as opposed to humanitarian response. It is focused on cost effectiveness but most purchasing and administrative procedures are as IDA. - (Based on IDA) Not yet developed an overarching narrative on how IDA achieves value for money, admin costs are high compared to peers, no incentives to generate cost savings in projects, staff pay mechanism inflates salaries across Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). = GFDRR's cost and value consciousness is mainly determined by IDA, who have adequate systems but a number of issues in terms of admin and staff costs. GFDRR is beginning to work on demonstrating the economic benefits of DRR, which illustrates their focus on VfM. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>8. Partnership Behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR is a unique model incorporating developing country governments, donors and international partners with an excellent partnership with UNISDR and other UN partners. + It works in 31 priority countries alongside national Disaster Risk Management Departments and is working hard towards a coordinated and coherent approach, thereby enabling effective donor harmonisation and responding to the Paris Principles. + The Consultative Group is a unique model of stakeholder engagement – facilitating top-level discussions with a wide stakeholder group. - Needs to be balanced against broader evidence from external evaluation and country visits in which the Bank does not come out strongly on coordination behaviours. = Although GFDRR's structure and mandate includes working closely with a variety of partners, there is some evidence from the field that it does not always deliver effectively on coordination tasks. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

<p>9. Transparency and Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Very strong policy on disclosure. Signed up to International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI). Extensive publishing of relevant documentation and strong mechanism for redress of grievances. + GFDRR, a Facility of the WB, is answerable to its Consultative Group of partners and donors. This has been extremely successful and has improved transparency and accountability of the facility. - Unable to ensure effective national participation and feedback on its work in country. = Transparency and accountability to donors and international partners is very strong, but the issue of incorporating client country voice has not yet been adequately addressed. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
Likelihood of Positive Change	Score (1-4)
<p>10. Likelihood of Positive Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR strength is its ability to listen and respond to requests from the CG. This has resulted in the Results Based Management Framework, better reporting on country level impacts and continued development of Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs) - World Bank Board legitimacy is limited, reform of corporate governance and shareholder voice much slower and more difficult. Reform pace is slow, especially on decentralisation. = Overall, adequate performance on the strength of evidence of recent operational reforms. Improved performance on corporate reform and voice and faster pace of reform needed to rate this as strong performance. 	<p>Likely (3)</p>

Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment for the Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)

Summary	
Organisation: Global Facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery (GFDRR)	Date: February 2011
Description of Organisation	
<p>The GFDRR was established only 4 years ago in 2006. It is a facility hosted by the World Bank (WB) and guided by a Consultative Group (CG). The CG comprises donors, developing countries and international partners, and a Results Management Council (RMC) which includes representatives of donors, country level members, partner organizations, sector experts, the WB, and the ISDR. The group has 39 members of which 21 are donors. The GFDRR Secretariat employs some 12 full-time staff at its Washington Headquarters, and relies on a network of World Bank and UNISDR staff to support its three 'tracks' of programming. Since its inception, the GFDRR has experienced significant growth in both funding and programming.</p> <p>DFID was one of the first donors to support GFDRR with a contribution of £5.2 million from 2006-2009. This contribution and strategic guidance have been instrumental in the shaping and development of GFDRR¹.</p> <p>The facility's mission is to mainstream Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation in country development strategies by supporting a country-led and management implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, specifically: "Building Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters".</p> <p>GFDRR's main areas of focus are; global and regional level advocacy – implemented through UNISDR (Track 1), technical and financial assistance to low and middle-income countries – administered through a multi-donor trust fund (Track 2) and a disaster recovery fund which aims to bridge the gap between humanitarian assistance and longer term recovery (Track 3).</p> <p>Track 2 comprises a Multi-Donor Trust Fund contributed to by DFID. Its annual budget is \$131.5m (total funds available taken from financial report 2009-10). GFDRR's budget counts as ODA.</p>	

Contribution to UK Development Objectives	Score (1-4)
<p>1a. Critical role in meeting International Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Is the key multilateral organisation responsible for delivery of the Hyogo Framework for Action's objective to mainstream DRR into national development strategies. + Despite being set up in 2006, it is already undertaking important work in economic analysis on DRR and mainstreaming DRR and climate change at national level. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

¹ Proposal to UK DFID for financial support to GFDRR for FY 2011-2014.

<p>incentives to integrate gender concerns in country programmes</p> <p>= Operational policies in place and gender concerns are recognised by GFDRR but these have not translated to effective implementation on the ground.</p> <p>2c. Climate Change</p> <p>+ (Based on IDA) Increasing integration of climate into existing development work, underpinned by comprehensive strategy documents and robust safeguards.</p> <p>+ GFDRR – all strategy and operations are informed by the clear understanding that integrating climate change adaptation analysis and measures in disaster risk management interventions has become a basic issue of due diligence. They are developing some excellent analysis on this.</p> <p>+ In FY 2010 GFDRR has actively and successfully fostered and improved linkages between country offices, the World Bank Group (WBG), and with external partners by strategically leveraging just-in-time seed funding, targeted investments, and expertise.</p> <p>– There is still a lack of a joined-up approach to climate change adaptation and DRR, although GDRR are working to remedy this</p> <p>= Climate change adaptation is still not yet fully integrated into the Bank’s work but climate change analysis does underpin a lot of GFDRR’s actions, thus meriting a 3.</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>3. Focus on Poor Countries²</p> <p>+ Has focused on the 20 countries most at risk to multiple hazards and natural disasters (DRR does not respond to human generated emergencies) in close consultation with the Consultative Group</p> <p>= GFDRR mainly works in countries with the greatest humanitarian need, but this does not always correspond to those most at risk from hazards and natural disasters (it does not work in conflict settings for example).</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>4. Contribution to Results</p> <p>+ DRR mainstreaming is already underway, aligned with national priorities and development plans and is already showing signs of achievements on the ground.</p> <p>+ In spite of its short lifespan, GFDRR has been able to lever additional investment to support DRR-related activities and thus promote increased ex-ante</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

² Humanitarian agencies have been assessed according to their focus on countries with the greatest humanitarian need

<p>investment, including investment by the World Bank itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + External evaluation noted the many advantages of having WB involvement in DRR – high calibre staff, ability to forge partnerships and GFDRR’s unique role to bridge knowledge, policy and practice in DRR services. – As GFDRR is a relatively new organisation it is difficult to fully assess the results they have achieved. = Despite its ‘youth’, GFDRR has achieved a lot in terms of mainstreaming DRR and aligning national priorities and plans, receiving praise from external evaluators. Results from all its activities are not yet entirely clear, however. 	
Organisational Strengths	
<p>5. Strategic & Performance Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR has a clear mandate, purpose and strategy to deliver on the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) priorities. It has a good, responsive and transparent Secretariat structure in Washington which is influenced by the CG. + Results based frameworks are under development through the Results Management Council and already giving early evidence of performance. – In-country programmes are sometimes of variable quality with a lack of consistency across all programmes. There is a drive to improve this area of work and the Results Based Management System (RBMS) is being implemented for this purpose, but it is at an early stage. = Whilst GFDRR has a clear mandate, purpose and strategy, results based frameworks are still under development and there are doubts as to the effectiveness of in-country programmes. 	Score (1-4) Weak (2)
<p>6. Financial Resources Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Rules based allocation process, multi-year commitments possible, some capacity to reorient resources to better performing areas, heavy penalties if programmes perform poorly, financial accountability process and policies are mostly robust. – Final allocations of funds are not always transparent and are influenced by individual relationships and structures. IDA allocations limit medium/long term predictability of overall financial planning, their systems do not allow pooled funding or innovative/responsive approaches and their financial instruments are not suitable for fragile states. = GFDRR has a good financial management system with mostly robust accountability processes and policies and some ability to redirect funds. It is constrained by some of the WB systems which prevent pooled funding/innovative 	Satisfactory (3)

<p>approaches and a lack of transparency at country-level allocations.</p>	
<p>7. Cost and Value Consciousness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + (Based on IDA) Adequate cost control systems to ensure costs do not inflate. Tracks costs of operations, can demonstrate some efficiency improvements, committed to a flat budget, good systems to ensure costs are controlled. Plays a strong role in helping clients consider public expenditure choices and strengthening financial management. + GFDRR is undertaking work to demonstrate economic benefits of DRR as opposed to humanitarian response. It is focused on cost effectiveness but most purchasing and administrative procedures are as IDA. - (Based on IDA) Not yet developed an overarching narrative on how IDA achieves value for money, admin costs are high compared to peers, no incentives to generate cost savings in projects, staff pay mechanism inflates salaries across Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). = GFDRR's cost and value consciousness is mainly determined by IDA, who have adequate systems but a number of issues in terms of admin and staff costs. GFDRR is beginning to work on demonstrating the economic benefits of DRR, which illustrates their focus on VfM. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>8. Partnership Behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR is a unique model incorporating developing country governments, donors and international partners with an excellent partnership with UNISDR and other UN partners. + It works in 31 priority countries alongside national Disaster Risk Management Departments and is working hard towards a coordinated and coherent approach, thereby enabling effective donor harmonisation and responding to the Paris Principles. + The Consultative Group is a unique model of stakeholder engagement – facilitating top-level discussions with a wide stakeholder group. - Needs to be balanced against broader evidence from external evaluation and country visits in which the Bank does not come out strongly on coordination behaviours. = Although GFDRR's structure and mandate includes working closely with a variety of partners, there is some evidence from the field that it does not always deliver effectively on coordination tasks. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

<p>9. Transparency and Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Very strong policy on disclosure. Signed up to International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI). Extensive publishing of relevant documentation and strong mechanism for redress of grievances. + GFDRR, a Facility of the WB, is answerable to its Consultative Group of partners and donors. This has been extremely successful and has improved transparency and accountability of the facility. - Unable to ensure effective national participation and feedback on its work in country. = Transparency and accountability to donors and international partners is very strong, but the issue of incorporating client country voice has not yet been adequately addressed. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
Likelihood of Positive Change	Score (1-4)
<p>10. Likelihood of Positive Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR strength is its ability to listen and respond to requests from the CG. This has resulted in the Results Based Management Framework, better reporting on country level impacts and continued development of Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs) - World Bank Board legitimacy is limited, reform of corporate governance and shareholder voice much slower and more difficult. Reform pace is slow, especially on decentralisation. = Overall, adequate performance on the strength of evidence of recent operational reforms. Improved performance on corporate reform and voice and faster pace of reform needed to rate this as strong performance. 	<p>Likely (3)</p>

Multilateral Aid Review: Assessment for the Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)

Summary	
Organisation: Global Facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery (GFDRR)	Date: February 2011
Description of Organisation	
<p>The GFDRR was established only 4 years ago in 2006. It is a facility hosted by the World Bank (WB) and guided by a Consultative Group (CG). The CG comprises donors, developing countries and international partners, and a Results Management Council (RMC) which includes representatives of donors, country level members, partner organizations, sector experts, the WB, and the ISDR. The group has 39 members of which 21 are donors. The GFDRR Secretariat employs some 12 full-time staff at its Washington Headquarters, and relies on a network of World Bank and UNISDR staff to support its three 'tracks' of programming. Since its inception, the GFDRR has experienced significant growth in both funding and programming.</p> <p>DFID was one of the first donors to support GFDRR with a contribution of £5.2 million from 2006-2009. This contribution and strategic guidance have been instrumental in the shaping and development of GFDRR¹.</p> <p>The facility's mission is to mainstream Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation in country development strategies by supporting a country-led and management implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, specifically: "Building Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters".</p> <p>GFDRR's main areas of focus are; global and regional level advocacy – implemented through UNISDR (Track 1), technical and financial assistance to low and middle-income countries – administered through a multi-donor trust fund (Track 2) and a disaster recovery fund which aims to bridge the gap between humanitarian assistance and longer term recovery (Track 3).</p> <p>Track 2 comprises a Multi-Donor Trust Fund contributed to by DFID. Its annual budget is \$131.5m (total funds available taken from financial report 2009-10). GFDRR's budget counts as ODA.</p>	

Contribution to UK Development Objectives	Score (1-4)
<p>1a. Critical role in meeting International Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Is the key multilateral organisation responsible for delivery of the Hyogo Framework for Action's objective to mainstream DRR into national development strategies. + Despite being set up in 2006, it is already undertaking important work in economic analysis on DRR and mainstreaming DRR and climate change at national level. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

¹ Proposal to UK DFID for financial support to GFDRR for FY 2011-2014.

<p>incentives to integrate gender concerns in country programmes</p> <p>= Operational policies in place and gender concerns are recognised by GFDRR but these have not translated to effective implementation on the ground.</p> <p>2c. Climate Change</p> <p>+ (Based on IDA) Increasing integration of climate into existing development work, underpinned by comprehensive strategy documents and robust safeguards.</p> <p>+ GFDRR – all strategy and operations are informed by the clear understanding that integrating climate change adaptation analysis and measures in disaster risk management interventions has become a basic issue of due diligence. They are developing some excellent analysis on this.</p> <p>+ In FY 2010 GFDRR has actively and successfully fostered and improved linkages between country offices, the World Bank Group (WBG), and with external partners by strategically leveraging just-in-time seed funding, targeted investments, and expertise.</p> <p>– There is still a lack of a joined-up approach to climate change adaptation and DRR, although GDRR are working to remedy this</p> <p>= Climate change adaptation is still not yet fully integrated into the Bank’s work but climate change analysis does underpin a lot of GFDRR’s actions, thus meriting a 3.</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>3. Focus on Poor Countries²</p> <p>+ Has focused on the 20 countries most at risk to multiple hazards and natural disasters (DRR does not respond to human generated emergencies) in close consultation with the Consultative Group</p> <p>= GFDRR mainly works in countries with the greatest humanitarian need, but this does not always correspond to those most at risk from hazards and natural disasters (it does not work in conflict settings for example).</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>4. Contribution to Results</p> <p>+ DRR mainstreaming is already underway, aligned with national priorities and development plans and is already showing signs of achievements on the ground.</p> <p>+ In spite of its short lifespan, GFDRR has been able to lever additional investment to support DRR-related activities and thus promote increased ex-ante</p>	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

² Humanitarian agencies have been assessed according to their focus on countries with the greatest humanitarian need

<p>investment, including investment by the World Bank itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + External evaluation noted the many advantages of having WB involvement in DRR – high calibre staff, ability to forge partnerships and GFDRR’s unique role to bridge knowledge, policy and practice in DRR services. – As GFDRR is a relatively new organisation it is difficult to fully assess the results they have achieved. = Despite its ‘youth’, GFDRR has achieved a lot in terms of mainstreaming DRR and aligning national priorities and plans, receiving praise from external evaluators. Results from all its activities are not yet entirely clear, however. 	
Organisational Strengths	
<p>5. Strategic & Performance Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR has a clear mandate, purpose and strategy to deliver on the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) priorities. It has a good, responsive and transparent Secretariat structure in Washington which is influenced by the CG. + Results based frameworks are under development through the Results Management Council and already giving early evidence of performance. – In-country programmes are sometimes of variable quality with a lack of consistency across all programmes. There is a drive to improve this area of work and the Results Based Management System (RBMS) is being implemented for this purpose, but it is at an early stage. = Whilst GFDRR has a clear mandate, purpose and strategy, results based frameworks are still under development and there are doubts as to the effectiveness of in-country programmes. 	Score (1-4) Weak (2)
<p>6. Financial Resources Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Rules based allocation process, multi-year commitments possible, some capacity to reorient resources to better performing areas, heavy penalties if programmes perform poorly, financial accountability process and policies are mostly robust. – Final allocations of funds are not always transparent and are influenced by individual relationships and structures. IDA allocations limit medium/long term predictability of overall financial planning, their systems do not allow pooled funding or innovative/responsive approaches and their financial instruments are not suitable for fragile states. = GFDRR has a good financial management system with mostly robust accountability processes and policies and some ability to redirect funds. It is constrained by some of the WB systems which prevent pooled funding/innovative 	Satisfactory (3)

<p>approaches and a lack of transparency at country-level allocations.</p>	
<p>7. Cost and Value Consciousness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + (Based on IDA) Adequate cost control systems to ensure costs do not inflate. Tracks costs of operations, can demonstrate some efficiency improvements, committed to a flat budget, good systems to ensure costs are controlled. Plays a strong role in helping clients consider public expenditure choices and strengthening financial management. + GFDRR is undertaking work to demonstrate economic benefits of DRR as opposed to humanitarian response. It is focused on cost effectiveness but most purchasing and administrative procedures are as IDA. - (Based on IDA) Not yet developed an overarching narrative on how IDA achieves value for money, admin costs are high compared to peers, no incentives to generate cost savings in projects, staff pay mechanism inflates salaries across Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). = GFDRR's cost and value consciousness is mainly determined by IDA, who have adequate systems but a number of issues in terms of admin and staff costs. GFDRR is beginning to work on demonstrating the economic benefits of DRR, which illustrates their focus on VfM. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
<p>8. Partnership Behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR is a unique model incorporating developing country governments, donors and international partners with an excellent partnership with UNISDR and other UN partners. + It works in 31 priority countries alongside national Disaster Risk Management Departments and is working hard towards a coordinated and coherent approach, thereby enabling effective donor harmonisation and responding to the Paris Principles. + The Consultative Group is a unique model of stakeholder engagement – facilitating top-level discussions with a wide stakeholder group. - Needs to be balanced against broader evidence from external evaluation and country visits in which the Bank does not come out strongly on coordination behaviours. = Although GFDRR's structure and mandate includes working closely with a variety of partners, there is some evidence from the field that it does not always deliver effectively on coordination tasks. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>

<p>9. Transparency and Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Very strong policy on disclosure. Signed up to International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI). Extensive publishing of relevant documentation and strong mechanism for redress of grievances. + GFDRR, a Facility of the WB, is answerable to its Consultative Group of partners and donors. This has been extremely successful and has improved transparency and accountability of the facility. - Unable to ensure effective national participation and feedback on its work in country. = Transparency and accountability to donors and international partners is very strong, but the issue of incorporating client country voice has not yet been adequately addressed. 	<p>Satisfactory (3)</p>
Likelihood of Positive Change	Score (1-4)
<p>10. Likelihood of Positive Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + GFDRR strength is its ability to listen and respond to requests from the CG. This has resulted in the Results Based Management Framework, better reporting on country level impacts and continued development of Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs) - World Bank Board legitimacy is limited, reform of corporate governance and shareholder voice much slower and more difficult. Reform pace is slow, especially on decentralisation. = Overall, adequate performance on the strength of evidence of recent operational reforms. Improved performance on corporate reform and voice and faster pace of reform needed to rate this as strong performance. 	<p>Likely (3)</p>