

---

# **Mid-Term Review of the Integrated Community Resilience Project (ICRP) in Puntland, Somalia**

Implemented by the



Supported by the



and



**Period of the review: February 15 to 21, 2016**

---

---

## Executive Summary

The German Red Cross (GRC) has been a partner of the Somali Red Crescent Society (SRCS)<sup>1</sup> since more than twenty years. From 2010 to 2013, the GRC had supported the Integrated Disaster Risk Reduction Project in six communities in the Regions Nugal and Bari in Puntland. The project evaluation recommended further strengthening of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) measures in the communities and complementing them with Water, Sanitation and Health (WASH) and livelihood activities. This resulted in the Integrated Community Resilience Project (ICRP) in the same target communities, which begun in November 2014 and will end in December 2016.

The ICRP is funded jointly by the German and the British Red Cross with a budget of 600.000 Euros and aims to reach 1.132 households (6.792 people) directly and 4.250 household (25.500 people) indirectly. The main disasters affecting the communities are drought, floods and two communities are also affected by cyclones and prone to tsunamis.

A Mid-Term Review was carried out from February 16 to 20, 2016 by a five-member team consisting of an external consultant and staff from the Cross/Red Crescent Movement. The main methods were a document study, semi-structured group and individual interviews and transect walks in three of the six target communities. The review team presented its findings in a workshop in Puntland's capital Garowe, in which key staff of the SRCS, GRC and BRC participated and discussed also issues around cooperation, ownership and sustainability.

Overall, the ICRP is just beginning to achieve some of its objectives and set indicators, which are very ambitious for a two years project, especially given the fact that the security situation makes regular external technical support and monitoring difficult. The biggest achievements so far are in the area of DRR at community level (Result 1). The Emergency Response Teams (ERTs), which had been established under the previous project, were strengthened and consolidated. They appear to comply with their roles and responsibilities and have established mechanisms to enhance their sustainability. However, the outreach of day-to-day DRR and CCA to the wider community through awareness raising and mitigation measures is not evident. Resilience building of the communities has not yet been addressed strategically yet, mainly because community disaster preparedness and mitigation plans are still to be developed.

With regards to livelihoods (Result 2), the project has provided the required assets and basic training for bee-keeping, irrigation farming and nurseries, but weak technical support and monitoring results in a questionable quality and impact. The aptness of the chosen activities to the local context and especially the outreach to the most vulnerable community members could have been better. Apart from that, the aspect of climate change - more prolonged drought spells and shifted rainy seasons - has not sufficiently been considered, as all activities depend on the availability of the very scarce and unreliable resource: water.

In the field of WASH (Result 3), none of the planned structures have been started yet, though droughts are a chronic problem and the availability and access to water are priorities for the communities.

The impact of capacity building activities at SRCS sub-branch and branch level (Result 4) is not measurable due to weak indicators and mostly unsuitable activities. Instead of focussing on strengthening resilience at institutional level, activities focus on the application of financial and human resources management guidelines. Activities directly linked with disaster management would have been more appropriate and useful.

Overall, the project is very relevant for the target regions, as they are highly prone to disasters and underserved concerning DRR and CCA. The effectiveness and efficiency of the ICRP could have been better. Many activities are seriously delayed due to lack of

---

<sup>1</sup> Ururka Bisha Cas in Somali language.

---

prioritisation, lengthy processes of funds requests to GRC, difficulties of adhering to procurement procedures and overall weak management. Having been aware of this, GRC and SRCS have recently revised the activities and budget and will take steps to accelerate administrative procedures.

Cooperation between the project partners is considered above average, but the mentioned delays and some serious gaps of information reflect that there is room for improvement. So do neither the project partners nor SRCS know the how many people actually live in the target communities and also figures on direct beneficiaries are inconsistent. The lack of essential data, which should have emerged through the VCAs and the baseline survey, makes an analysis of the coverage and impact of project activities difficult. Beneficiary selection criteria and procedures are unclear. This is likely to be the main reason that the project has not yet been working with the most vulnerable sector of the communities, but already fairly successful farmers, bee-keepers and nursery owners.

A proper strategy and its communication to staff and target communities on the dissemination and transfer of knowledge and input to other, more vulnerable community members, needs urgently to be developed. Technical support for the livelihood activities is strongly required and an overall prioritisation of activities should be considered in view of the limited time until project end. Though the ERTs are likely to continue to exist without external input, the sustainability of the livelihood and WASH activities is problematic. During the workshop in Garowe, the SRCS, GRC and BRC have discussed some backlogs and agreed to go into more detail on outstanding issues in the coming weeks to take appropriate steps to improve the quality and timeliness of the project activities.