



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft  
Confédération suisse  
Confederazione Svizzera  
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC  
Швейцарское Управление по Развитию и Сотрудничеству SDC  
Раёсати Швейцария оид ба Рушд ва Ҳамкорӣ SDC



## **FINAL REPORT – Feb 2011 (Revision 1)**

To the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC

### **Integrated Local Risk Management (ILRM) Phase III**

Implementing Organisation: PO CAMP Kuhiston, NGO

Project duration: December 2008 – February 2011

(05.02.2011)

## Abbreviations:

ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
AGOCA	Alliance of Central Asian Mountain Communities
ADB	Asian Development Bank
CAMP	(Central Asian Mountain Partnership) CAMP Kuhiston
CoES	Committee of Emergency Situations
EU	European Union
FDP	Family Disaster Plan
GAA	Welt Hunger Hilfe / German Agro Action
GIS	Geographical Information System
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
IGs	Initiative Groups
ILRM	Integrated Local Risk Management
INGO	International Non Government Organisation
IMAC	Information Management and Analytical Centre
L4S	Learning for Sustainability
MECO RAT	Mission East, Caritas, Oxfam – Risk Assessment Tool
PPCR	Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience
PRAM	Participatory Risk Assessment and Monitoring Tool
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development Corporation
UNDRMP	United Nations Disaster Risk Management Project
VDMP	Village Disaster Management Plan
WB	World Bank

## Contents:

1.	Executive Summary.....	2
2.	Background.....	4
3.	Scope of Work.....	6
3.1	Goal.....	6
3.2	Outcomes.....	6
3.3	Activities.....	6
4.	Methodology.....	7
4.1	Selection of Communities.....	7
4.2	Training Module.....	7
4.3	Delivery of Training and Exhibition on Wheels.....	8
4.4	Development of Participatory Risk Assessment and Monitoring Tool.....	9
4.5	Mapping and Geographical Information System Development.....	11
4.6	Project Steering.....	12
5.	Outcomes.....	13
5.1	Outcome 1: Increase awareness and capacity of the local communities and authorities to manage disaster risks at local level.....	13
5.2	Outcome 2: Reduce Disaster Risk in Selected Communities through (small scale) Mitigation Measures.....	14
5.3	Outcome 3: Enhance efficient collaboration on ILRM between local authorities, communities and other relevant actors.....	15
6.	Finance.....	17
7.	Issues and Lessons Learned.....	18
8.	Summary.....	20
9.	Annex (on CD).....	22

## 1. Executive Summary

This was phase III of a Disaster Risk Reduction programme financed by SDC in liaison with UNDP, Caritas, and Oxfam. The goal of CAMP's activities within phase III of this project was: 'Local Risk Management capacity focused at the local level in rural areas of Tajikistan built and strengthened.'

CAMP is a local NGO in a transition period from being an implementing arm of the University of Bern, Switzerland, to an effective independent local public organisation with a mission to assist the mountain communities of Tajikistan. The project faltered at the outset but with a change of personnel it gathered momentum in the summer of 2009, as 15 communities in Nurobod were selected in collaboration with CoES for the implementation of the workshops and a back stopping support from the University of Bern who spent a week developing the participatory risk assessment tools.

During the next six months, seven workshops were held in the Islamic conservative region of Nurobod. The level of participation and interest was high but there were major issues with female participation, with regards to mixed groups and low levels of literacy. During this period, there was significant development of the tools to assist in the effectiveness of the workshops; this included the incorporation of materials developed by other organisations, new posters, a new format for village disaster management plans, use of Google maps and implementation of the new risk assessment tool. The twelve CAMP moderators received extra training in the new tools and were subject to feedback evaluation forms to monitor their performance and the effectiveness of the workshops.

It was apparent from the beginning that the selected villages were exposed to high levels of risk from natural disasters with a reported 32 fatalities in the last 19 years. The communities were very receptive to the workshops with 297 attendees participating in the five-day workshop. The workshop helped the communities understand the causes of natural hazards, how they impacted on their lives and what measures could be implemented to help prevent natural disasters. The workshop went on to discuss and prepare the communities in the event of a natural disaster, with the formation of localized emergency teams.

CAMP shared its newly developed tools, such as posters, family disaster plans and Google maps, with other actors through presentation to the REACT committee, through project steering meetings and implementation of other disaster risk reduction projects for INGO's. As the risk assessment tool developed in conjunction with the MECO vulnerability assessment tool, CAMP continued to train its staff in its development and shared the tool specific trainings for ACTED and representatives from CoES.

The GIS and mapping component of the project was harder to develop, as there needed to be compromise between what could be understood by the communities and other actors, including CoES, what CAMP staff were able to achieve and maintain, and what spatial data could be fed into existing databases. This resulted in several outputs, a hand drawn and adobe illustrator map incorporated in the village disaster management plan that can be easily understood by everybody and a GIS component

using QuantumGIS in Russian to display the results of the risk assessment and the MECO for the selected villages.

Within the workshop CAMP encouraged and supported the community in the development of natural disaster mitigation proposals. As the other partners in the ILRM phase III project were not working in the Nurobod region, there were no pre allocated funds for mitigation projects. However, the communities especially in the two main watersheds did implement some tree planting schemes and constructed bridges and roads, this was supported by CAMP who secured funding for the planting of 2000 fruit trees to stabilize slopes, and training in fruit tree cultivation, pasture management and soil and water conservation. CAMP has also secured funds for further work in these communities to reduce natural resource use through energy efficient measures.

The project came in under budget at 427,091 somoni and has helped CAMP develop the capacity of its staff to be effective in implementing projects and assisting the mountain communities of Tajikistan. The success of the project was demonstrated by the well-attended Feedback Event held in Nurobod district in December 2010, which was attended by the Head of the Khukumat and the Head of IMAC, Dushanbe. A review and Feedback Event for the sharing of the project information was conducted in February 1 2011.

## 2. Background

Tajikistan is a mountainous country that is prone to devastating natural disasters, which can destroy people's livelihoods, and hence significantly impede the sustainable development of the rural population. Inhabitants of the mountain areas generally have traditional knowledge and experience related to natural hazards and their effective mitigation. Due to the recent internal migration former mountain inhabitants - who had been forced to leave their homes during the Soviet period - are confronted with ecological situations unfamiliar to them. Ultimately this leads to inappropriate land use including settlement construction. Many cases show that local populations underestimate the potential for natural risks, and that local decision-makers are unable to enforce the measures needed to protect the inhabitants and their natural resources. In such a situation, awareness building and training of both local decision-makers and people regarding an integrated risk management appears crucial for the future of mountain villages in Tajikistan.

External support is needed to (i) help increase the awareness of the local population and village authorities about the risks concerning natural hazards, and (ii) to enhance their capability to implement measures intended to reduce their vulnerability and mitigate possible negative impacts of expectable natural disasters. Ultimately such efforts will contribute to improve the population's prevention and preparedness to tackle natural hazards at village level.

Tajikistan is cited as the most vulnerable countries in the world to the impacts of Climate Change as reported in the 2010 Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen. Its geography of mountainous terrain, low lying deserts, and highly mobile loess material, compounded by its poor economic status and disjointed social structure due to extensive labour migration, and also the impact of the civil war, have resulted in a country ill equipped to deal with the issue. Many of the natural disasters that occur in Tajikistan are triggered by climatic conditions and present a very real threat to the people. In recent years there were devastating mud flows in Khuroson (2009), and floods in Kulyob (2010), resulting in loss of life, destruction of property, land, livestock, and subsequent loss of livelihood.

The Committee of Emergency Situation (CoES) is the government body responsible for overseeing the management of natural disasters within the country and the Information Management and Analytical Centre (IMAC) hold responsibility for the collation of data. These government bodies are supported by many international organisations, including the United Nations and the World Bank, who share information at the local and national REACT Meetings. However, it still very apparent there is a real need to raise awareness of the threat of natural disasters within the local communities, and enhance the ability and capacity of CoES and IMAC to effectively respond to, and tackle the risk of natural disasters to help save lives, houses, livestock and livelihoods.

## ILRM Phase III Final Report

Since the 15<sup>th</sup> December 2008 , CAMP Kuhiston has implemented the Integrated Local Risk Management (ILRM) Project, Phase III together with the co-funding partners UNDP DRMP, CARITAS and OXFAM and during 2004-2007 CAMP implemented two phases of the ILRM project. The first phase (2004-2006) was implemented as a part of the regional programme and the second phase (2006-2007) was implemented by the newly registered NGO “CAMP – Kuhiston”. This is Phase III of the Integrated Local Risk Management (ILRM) project funded by SDC, with other parts of Phase III implemented by Oxfam, Caritas, and UNDRMP, as a continuation of the previously implemented phases.

Phase III was designed to tackle the issue of natural disaster awareness and preparedness at a community level through to government level, enhance the capacity of a broad range of stakeholders, and improve the collaboration by all the major actors.

### **3. Scope of Work**

Below is a short description of the outline of Phase III as taken from the original proposal and log frame.

#### **3.1 Goal**

Local risk management capacity focused at the local level in rural areas of Tajikistan built and strengthened.

#### **3.2 Outcomes**

1. Awareness and capacity of the local communities and authorities to manage disaster risks at local level increased;
2. Disaster risks in selected communities reduced through (small scale) mitigation measures;
3. Efficient collaboration on ILRM between local authorities, communities, and other relevant actors enhanced.

#### **3.3 Activities**

1. Selection of villages and recognition missions;
2. Preparation and holding of ToT WS;
3. Preparation and holding of 15 L4S training workshops including exhibition;
4. Creation of 'Initiative Groups';
5. Small scale projects elaborated and implemented through IG and co-funding partners;
6. Up-dating of database and GIS mapping;
7. Monitoring of activities and impact assessment;
8. Evaluation of overall project activities (SDC and co-funding partners): lessons learnt and updated 'good practices' in IRLM;
9. Holding of a multi-stakeholder round table;
10. Holding of feedback event with all co-funding partners;
11. Continued PR work and dissemination of lessons learnt etc. of the overall project.



## 4. Methodology

The following section provides an outline of the methodology, this is not necessarily in chronological order as many aspects of the project were reviewed and subsequently revised to improve the quality of the outcomes. More information on the detail of the methodology was included in the quarterly reports submitted throughout the duration of Phase III.

The project was coordinated by Davlatbek Davlatov, with support from the Director, Ms. Roziya Alieva and the financial administrator Jurabek Rahimov. In addition there was backstopping support from Felix Bussman, a Swiss Intern from CDE, Shane Stevenson, a VSO Volunteer, Yvo Weidmann, an International GIS Mapping Specialist and Ernst Gabathuler, from the Centre for Development and Environment, Institute of Geography, University of Bern.

### 4.1 Selection of Communities

The region of the Rasht valley was chosen in a collaboration meeting with Local CoES representative, Mr. Mirzosharipov Nekruz (Head of CoES Rasht Valley) and also close cooperation with Mr. Saidov Saidamin who was the local representative of CoES in Nurobod, at the outset of the project. CoES provided a list of villages in the lower Rasht valley that had experienced losses due to Natural Disasters in 2008/9. From this list 15 villages, in several different Jamoats, were chosen for the implementation of Phase III. A list of the selected villages can be found in Annex 1: Village Information.

1990 - 2009 Combined Losses	No.
<b>Fatalities</b>	<b>32&lt;</b>
<b>Animal Fatalities</b>	<b>524&lt;</b>
<b>Houses</b>	<b>213&lt;</b>
<b>Cow Sheds</b>	<b>30&lt;</b>
<b>Land Hectares</b>	<b>87&lt;</b>
<b>Road (km)</b>	<b>54&lt;</b>

Table 1: Losses Incurred by Project Selected Villages 1990 -2009

As shown in Table 1, there were significant losses in the villages selected for the workshops where there were 32 fatalities, 213 houses destroyed, 524 animals killed in a 19-year period.

It was also noted that other development organisations had ceased to work in the area; GAA failed to secure European Union Dipecho 6 funding for work in the region and their local NGO Azal was concentrating on agricultural improvement further up the Rasht valley, MSDSP had scaled back their operations and closed their local office, and Merlin had ceased work in the country.

### 4.2 Training Module

The L4S participatory training module was updated several times, the original module was developed by the CDE of the University of Bern, Switzerland, however it did not include training material developed by other organisations. After an overhaul of the module (Annex 2: ILRM Training Programme) the L4S

training included films from Oxfam and Caritas, posters from Oxfam, the MECO Risk Assessment, and updated information on the role of CoES.

By the end of the project CAMP had also developed ten new posters on Natural Disasters, a Family Disaster Plan in response to feedback that indicated that information on natural disasters was not reaching households that did not participate in the workshop, and also overhauled the Village Disaster Management Plan (VDMP) to make it an all inclusive document that contained all the relevant information to be used by the community and CoES (Annex 3: VDMPs). The new VDMP includes the following:

- Information on Past Disasters
- Risk Assessment on Natural Disasters
- Annotated Google Maps
- Information on Emergency Groups
- Proposals for Mitigation
- Photographs and coordinates to allow for follow up monitoring.

Two 'Train the Trainers' workshops were held on the 9<sup>th</sup> November 2009, and the 21<sup>st</sup> February 2010, for the twelve CAMP moderators to discuss the alterations to the module and how these should be delivered.

### ***4.3 Delivery of Training and Exhibition on Wheels***

The trainings were delivered over the course of five days within the selected communities, and participation rates varied from 18-25 people from a cross section of the community. The workshop was conducted by three moderators, of which at least one was female.

In some of the more Islamic conservative communities the men refused to sit with the women and the group had to be split by gender. The moderators stayed within the community during the training, which helped to gain acceptance and trust in an area which is openly skeptical of outside help. The participants were provided with lunch and stationery. It should be noted that the participation levels did not drop over the duration of the week and in some communities the numbers increased as the course progressed.

After the completion of the first series of training, CAMP adopted the use of a course feedback form from UNDRMP to monitor the performance of the moderators, and developed a moderator feedback form to record any issues that arose during the delivery of the training.

The timing of the trainings had to be considered to allow for harvest periods and winter periods when availability and accessibility became an issue. It was also noted that Fridays were a difficult day for conduction of the workshop as the men assembled at the local mosque.

The workshop was followed up at the end of the project with an exhibition in the village of the posters, films and maps produced from the workshop. This was displayed in a tent that was manned by two CAMP moderators. The 'Exhibition on Wheels' served to reinforce the information provided in the training, provide information to the community who did not attend, and acted as a vital link in building up the trust between CAMP and the community (i.e. CAMP will continue to support the community).

The two moderators that accompanied the exhibition on wheels were also tasked with supporting the dissemination, and completion, of the Family Disaster Plan (FDP) Annex 5. This one page sheet printed on colored paper for more impact, was developed in response to monitoring work undertaken by CAMP for one of the Steering members, where it became apparent that although areas vulnerable to Natural Disasters were being identified during the workshop, those living there were not been informed of the appropriate action. Therefore, the FDP was developed; so that the household could complete a series of simple questions so that they would know what to do in the event of an emergency. This would then be displayed in a prominent position with the household.

#### ***4.4 Development of Participatory Risk Assessment and Monitoring Tool***

One of the main elements of the project was to develop a Participatory Risk Assessment and Monitoring Tool (PRAM). From the outset of the project CAMP were aware of the MECO Comparative Assessment tool developed by Mission East, Oxfam and Caritas. The MECO is a vulnerability and capacity assessment tool, it does not evaluate the potential risk of a specific hazard is a pre specified location.

In June 2010, Ernst Gabathuler from the Centre for Development and Environment (CDE) of Berne University, spent time working with CAMP alongside Shane Stevenson, who is a Chartered Member of the Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, and Felix Bussman who previously worked in a geological capacity for the Swiss Government, on developing a participatory risk assessment management tool (PRAM).

In brief, field visits were undertaken in the village of Duoba, located on the outskirts of the capital Dushanbe. Duoba was selected due to its proximity, but also because it was familiar territory to the CAMP team and information was freely available from previous workshops and activities in the village.

After some deliberation, a photo monitoring risk assessment tool was developed with a ranking system to weight the evaluation of vulnerability. This information was then displayed in a GIS package, which showed land use, hazard zones, and vulnerability areas. The work was presented in a report (Annex 5).

It should be noted, that the development of the PRAM was ongoing throughout the implementation of the project. The visit by Mr. Galbathuler served as a platform for further development.

As the project developed so did the risk assessment. The risk assessment was simplified to a one page table that mirrored the outputs from the workshops. The risk assessment process was developed to evaluate the risk of one particular hazard in one specified location (e.g. a mudflow coming from the

North of the village). This means that more than one risk assessment may be required for a village depending on the number of potential hazards.

Therefore, the risk assessment included information on past disasters, existing mitigation measures, potential triggers, and vulnerability. This allowed for an assessment of; the intensity of the hazard (i.e. how big) and the frequency of the hazard (i.e. how often), these factors were multiplied together based on a three by three matrix of High / Medium / Low.

Rating	Frequency	Magnitude
High	1-10yrs	Loss of Life / Destruction of property
Medium	10-30yrs	Injury / Damage to property
Low	30yrs <	Loss of infrastructure / crops

$$\text{Hazard Intensity} = \text{Frequency} * \text{Magnitude}$$

Frequency Magnitude	High	Medium	Low
High	High	High	Medium
Medium	High	Medium	Low
Low	Medium	Low	Low

The potential damage from the hazard was evaluated using a simplified version of the parameters used in the MECO e.g. number of fatalities, number of houses destroyed etc. This was developed so that economic costing could be used in the future against each parameter, to allow for the calculation of the actual cost against each hazard. The 'Risk' was calculated on a three by three matrix of High / Medium / Low using the same parameters as magnitude.

$$\text{Risk} = \text{Hazard Intensity} * \text{Vulnerability}$$

Hazard Intensity Vulnerability	High	Medium	Low
High	High	High	Medium
Medium	High	Medium	Low
Low	Medium	Low	Low

It was seen as important to keep the process as simple as possible but still able to provide meaningful results. There were some major challenges in the implementation of the PRAM, the concept of Risk was not really understood by the moderators as they used the same word for 'risk' as they did for 'hazard'; 'Hatar' – Tajik for Hazard. To help explain the process two workshops were held for the moderators, a series of posters were developed explaining the process, and the completed risk assessments were checked and reviewed to provide feedback.

The new PRAM was used for the final seven workshops, and was developed to be completed in parallel with the module. This meant that all the key information for the completion of the PRAM was provided piece by piece after they completed the relevant section of the course.

Once the Risk Assessment was being fully effective, the process was disseminated out to other organisations through presentations at the REACT committee, and the Agrarian University, and finally to the government committee responsible for the development of a standardised natural disaster risk assessment tool in December 2010.

#### ***4.5 Mapping and Geographical Information System Development***

The mapping of hazard, vulnerability and risk of the project continually developed over the implementation period.

During the assessment of Duoba, maps were developed using Google maps overlaid with layers (i.e. land use, vulnerability, and hazard). Coordinates were taken and inputted to provide information on the outer parameters of the layers. The layers could then be overlapped and displayed as required. Although these maps were effective at displaying the relevant information for analysis, it was a leap too far in understanding based upon GIS training provided for CAMP staff, and it became necessary to simplify the process.

However, it soon became apparent that the use of Google maps was an effective tool in the workshops, as participants were able to identify buildings and geographical features such as rivers and pasture. The Google maps were used as the basis to 'draw' hazard maps. This was time consuming and did not fully utilise the fact that there were high-resolution maps of the villages available. This coincided with a mapping contract awarded to CAMP by GAA, who were undertaking mapping work for GTZ. The work consisted of redrawing hazard maps produced by IMAC that although met the requirements of the task, were not readily understandable by members of the community. Using Adobe Illustrator, CAMP produced 23 hazard maps for the communities of the Zerafshan valley. This process was adapted and used for the display of hazard information for the selected Phase III villages. (An example of the map can be found in the VDMP, Annex 1).

A requirement of the project was to develop a GIS component for risk analysis of hazard mapping. From the outset this was ambitious and ground breaking within Tajikistan. IMAC are the government body responsible for collation and control of mapping data, however it became apparent that there is a lack of national standardisation for cartographical information. Other organisations such as the UN, Caritas and FOCUS were all implementing small scale GIS projects in liaison with IMAC, but no standardisation guidelines were available. To rectify this problem a GIS forum group was instigated by Mr. Yvo Weidmann to tackle the following issues including; how GIS mapping information could be standardised, who would own the information, who would have access to this information, and who would pay for this work. A well represented group met twice in 2010 in the UNDP offices, where all the issues were raised; but there was no determinable output other than the recognition of the issue.

During repeated visits to the Phase III villages, CAMP staff collected coordinates and photographs of the key locations within the villages relevant to the risk assessment. This information is now found in the VDMP and can be used as the basis for further GIS work. Therefore, it was decided after consultation with a Caritas GIS specialist that CAMP would follow the same methodology as Caritas (in liaison with IMAC) and produce a district map, showing relevant geographical and infrastructure features and the results of the risk assessment. Whilst working in these communities, CAMP completed the MECO assessment for the CoES database, and incorporated a mapping layer within the GIS to display this information.

As the project progressed it became apparent that the focus of the GIS activities would be to provide a basic understanding of GIS and cartography for the CAMP moderators. Mr. Weidmann conducted several workshops on open source software *Quantum GIS* (qGIS) available in English and Russian. The focus of the training was on concept of layers, data types, and the spatial relationship between landscape features using the data from the Nurobod District.

A simple web application using the open source library *OpenLayers* (OL) was elaborated and published through the CAMP website (<http://www.camp.tj/maps/nurobod/risk.html>). This web portal allows an easy distribution of the information of the area of Nurobod to external bodies. The idea behind this web portal was to establish a way of open distribution of information between the different organisations where accessibility of information is a key factor holding back the effective application of GIS software to benefit the people and government of Tajikistan.

(\* As the MECO and Risk Assessment database inevitable grow it is hoped that IMAC will use all this information in a GIS database at government level. It should be noted that ACTED will be undertaking 130 Risk Assessments and MECO assessments in Khatlon after training for CAMP staff, CAMP have completed assessments in 14 villages for Oxfam, 2 villages for Mercy Corps, 14 villages for Caritas).

#### **4.6 Project Steering**

The direction of the implementation of the project was undertaken by a steering committee consisting of representatives from Oxfam, Caritas, SDC and UNDP. The steering committee met six times during the duration of the project and its effectiveness suffered a little due to change of personnel, and consequently these meetings served more as a reporting mechanism and did not reach their full potential as a steering group. This could have been enhanced by better organisation and planning by CAMP in the presentation of their work and programming, as well as a more active interest by the steering committee members.

However, the fact that the steering committee members were aware of the work within Phase III, meant that they were able to provide short term contracts to CAMP which directly used the tools and experience developed during the project and vice versa. Experiences gained by the completion of other projects, helped to contribute to the improvement of the quality of the outcomes in Phase III.

## 5. Outcomes

### ***5.1 Outcome 1: Increase awareness and capacity of the local communities and authorities to manage disaster risks at local level***

CAMP successfully held 15 workshops in preselected communities in the Nurobod District who are at threat from Natural Disasters. The communities were selected under guidance with CoES based upon events in 2008. In total, 297 participants were trained using CAMP's 5 day L4S ILRM programme, and the follow up Exhibition on Wheels covered a potential 15,518 beneficiaries.

CAMP trained participants on the creation and responsibilities of Initiative Groups (IGs), as part of the training. The IGs are ultimately responsible for the Natural Disaster Management of the community and was referred to as the Management group in the VDMP.

CAMP increased awareness in the villages through interactive mediums including posters, films, drawing of maps, site visits, Family Disaster Plans and use of an interactive training game. This was reinforced by a follow up exhibition of DRR materials several months later. The output from the workshops was the VDMP which included information on:

- Past Disasters
- Emergency Contact Information
- Risk Assessments
- Hazard Maps (drawn and google/adobe illustrator)
- Mitigation Proposals
- Emergency Groups (Management, Welfare, Medical, and Rescue).

CAMP utilised ten moderators to undertake the workshops, and subsequently built their capacity through two ToT workshops and monitoring by international staff. The quality of the workshops improved dramatically with the rewriting of the module and VDMP. This was shown by the course evaluation feedback forms completed by the participants. The interest generated was further emphasised by the participation of over 40 people at the multi-stakeholder event in December 2010.

CAMP also undertook training for the CoES at a national and local level, and slowly built an effective relationship with the local CoES representative Mr. Saidov Saidamin.

## ***5.2 Outcome 2: Reduce Disaster Risk in Selected Communities through (small scale) Mitigation Measures***

As part of the training module, the participants have to devise a project proposal that will reduce the risk from natural hazards to their community. From the outset of the project the moderators were asked to encourage the communities to attempt to implement their own mitigation measures. It was also apparent from implementation of Phase III and other ILRM projects that the community does not always suggest the most appropriate or effective form of mitigation, and at times attempt to treat the symptoms of a natural disaster, rather than tackle preventative measures. Therefore, some level of professional guidance is required.

The VDMP includes proposals for the mitigation that can be presented to donor organisations as well as the local government bodies who receive money from the central government to address the issue. However, it should be noted that some of the communities did instigate their own Disaster Risk Reduction Mitigation measures after the L4S workshop. These included:

1. Mujiharf Watershed - Planting trees, bridge reconstruction into Mujiharf Village and road reconstruction alongside the river near Shaftuti Bolo.
2. Khakimi Watershed - Planting trees, road reconstruction along side rivers and streams.
3. Iston Village - Road reconstruction in Iston village.
4. Samsolik Village - Road reconstruction, planting trees

In February 2010, CAMP started to implement activities in PAMS (Partnership Actions for Mitigating Syndromes) project (NCCR North – South). The purpose of this project was to conduct an evaluation of the use of fruit trees to improve slope stabilisation in loess material and consequently reduce the risk of natural disasters. Through the use of a working group CAMP selected seven locations in five Phase III villages (Shashtuti Bolo, Mujiharf, Sadokat, Kalanak, Navobod,). CAMP planted in total 2000 fruit trees (apples, pear, peach, apricot, cherry, walnut) in areas identified within Hazard Zones. In collaboration with the Soil Institute, soil testing was undertaken to evaluate the quality to help identify potential tree planting sites in the future. In addition to the tree planting, workshops were held on Fruit Cultivation and Soil Conservation measures in all the villages.

In 2009, CAMP conducted workshops for a JICA project on Fruit Culture (2 days) and Pasture Management (3 days) in Phase III villages of Shashtuti Bolo and Mujiharf.

To follow on from this Phase III project CAMP will continue to work in these villages. CAMP has secured funding for 2011 through the Jephcott Foundation (UK) to build energy efficient stoves in seven villages, and the Mountain Partnership has been awarded a grant towards an energy efficient demonstration building.



### ***5.3 Outcome 3: Enhance efficient collaboration on ILRM between local authorities, communities and other relevant actors.***

Liaison with the relevant government bodies has been mixed throughout the Phase III however; it should be noted that the links and cooperation with government bodies became stronger as the project developed.

CAMP has a MOU with CoES / IMAC, and there were several interactions between the parties throughout the project, these included meetings in the CoES national and regional offices, participation of CoES representative Abdulloev Shamsiddin in the TOT conducted by CAMP on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2010, where he also made presentation on “Laws on CoES”, and the training of twelve CoES staff on the new Risk Assessment in June 2010.

Cooperation with the respective Khukhmat and Jamoat representatives was more difficult, they were very skeptical of the work CAMP wished to undertake in the district and unresponsive to requests to provide support. It was only after the initial workshops, and through feedback from the community that the local government representatives became interested in the activities and started to actively participate. The success of this collaboration was apparent during the organisation of the multi stakeholder roundtable event which required considerable support from the local government. CAMP has also signed a MOU with the two main Jamoats, as well as the Khukhmat of Nurobod.

National Government representatives undertook a mission to the region in Autumn 2010 and are aware of the work that CAMP has undertaken in the district. One of the villages that CAMP supported in planting of fruit trees was officially recognized through the presentation of a regional award.

The strengthening of the links with the government institutions became apparent at the roundtable held in Nurobad on the 10<sup>th</sup> December 2010. 41 participants attended, representing the communities, local government and CoES. The head of the Khukmat opened the proceedings, representatives from all the Jamoats and Phase III villages attended, and the event was actively supported by local CoES Representatives and Mr. Alisho Shomahmadov, Head of IMAC.

The roundtable event achieved several key outcomes; it brought representatives from government authorities, villagers and CAMP staff together for the first time to discuss the issues of Natural Disasters. It also demonstrated that there was support available to help the region, and thirdly it appeared to give the participants some a degree of hope that they had not been forgotten and there was some help available.

CAMP presented its work on Disaster Risk Reduction to the REACT committee on the 5<sup>th</sup> May 2010. It was noted that CAMP are the only local NGO represented on the National REACT Committee and it was encouraging that representatives from Caritas and Mission East voiced support for local NGO's and stated that the international community should support the building of the role of local NGO's in the field of natural disasters.

## ILRM Phase III Final Report

CAMP has also participated in the GIS forum; it provided information to the national committee, established to define a national natural disaster risk assessment process; and provided all the information resulting from phase III to IMAC and CoES.

The final feedback event was held on the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2011, where all the key partners were invited to attend a presentation on the project and view the materials developed over the two year period e.g. Posters, VDMPs, Hazard maps, GIS data, etc. A copy of the list of participants can be found in Annex 9.

In addition to the formalised dissemination of information throughout the project, CAMP stretched the reach of the project to the general public by employing an independent journalist Irina Umarova. As a result of her efforts CAMP were able to make several radio broadcasts, publish several newspaper articles and a short TV programme on the activities of CAMP and the SDC project. The media coverage is listed below.

- a. Radio 'Sadoi Dushanbe' 14<sup>th</sup> October 2010, one live 50min broadcast followed an hour later by a repeat.
- b. On the International Day for Natural Disaster Reduction 11<sup>th</sup> December 2010, there was radio interview with CAMP's director Roziya Alieva and DRR Coordinator Davlatbek Davlatov.
- c. In March and April 2009 – a documentary was shown on Tajik TV1 about CAMP's DDR project activities.
- d. News publications:
  - 'World of News' April 2010 – "Natural Disasters or Real Opportunity to Save Yourself"
  - 'Vecherni Dushanbe' June 2010 – "Security Comes First"
  - 'Vercherni Dushanbe' Sept 2009 – "Saving the drowning is in the hands of the drowning"
  - 'Vercherni Dushanbe' Aug 2009 – "Waiting for a New Mud Flow"

CAMP successfully implemented a number of projects for other organisations using the tools and experience developed under Phase III. Below is a list of the interactions with the most relevant actors over the project period.

**GAA** employed CAMP to produce hazard maps using Google Earth and Adobe Illustrator to be displayed within the community after the original set of maps produced by IMAC were too complicated to be understood at village level. 23 maps were produced based upon coordinates collected during site visits. CAMP staff was trained in this technique, and subsequently produced the same maps for the 15 villages selected in Phase III. This has now been extended to work for Oxfam (15 maps) and Mercy Corps (2 maps), it is hoped that IMAC will endorse this technique and that it can be employed to display hazard information for other villages.

**ACTED** employed CAMP to train their trainers on ILRM and provide a four day module to be taught in 130 communities in the Khatlon region, Tajikistan. ACTED staff was provided with a variation of the

Phase III module, posters and films, and training of the MECO and PRAM. This has resulted in CAMP providing a vast amount of materials to an INGO, and information that can be used by the IMAC / CoES.

**UNDRMP** employed CAMP to hold workshops in conjunction with CoES staff in four districts around Dushanbe for representative of the Jamoats. The training resulted in a sharing of information between CoES and CAMP, a strengthening of links, and an appreciation that CAMP can become a valuable support to CoES. The training included the use of the new Phase III module, MECO and the new PRAM.

**OXFAM** employed CAMP as part of their Dipecho 6 project to undertake natural hazard assessment of 14 villages in the Khatlon region. CAMP used the new risk assessment process, new mapping and new VDMP to complete this work, all a continuation of the Phase III work.

**CARITAS** employed CAMP in 2009 to undertake monitoring of the effectiveness of the VDMP and follow up activities in the Muminobod district. The exercise showed that the module needed to be rewritten to become more effective and that the information was not reaching those who did not attend the workshop. This was particularly important as some of those still ignorant of the risks were the most vulnerable. As a result of this work the Family Disaster Plan was developed to ensure vulnerable households retained information on what course of action to take in the event of an emergency.

**Mercy Corps** employed CAMP at the end of 2010 to provide four-day training for the youth of two villages in Rasht valley. Again this work built upon the experiences of Phase III and it is hoped that CAMP will complete further work in the remaining 22 villages.

**The CAMP Forum 2010** was held in Almaty. The theme of the forum was the 'Impact of Climate Change on Central Asia'. CAMP used the experiences of Phase III to inform participants of how it was tackling some of the impacts of climate change with regards to natural disasters.

## 6. Finance

CAMP's original budget for the project was 483,447 somoni, CAMP spent 427,091 somoni to implement Phase III.

As with all projects several issues had to be overcome, these included payments to the Bern University, Switzerland and trainers.

As the project implementation had centred its activities in only one district instead of five, savings were made in travel costs.

## 7. Issues and Lessons Learned

CAMP originally planned to implement DRR activities in the AGOCA villages where it has a pre-existing relationship with the communities. However, after meetings and discussions with representatives of SDC, CAMP was encouraged to work in one vulnerable region (Nurobad district) where no international organisations remained operational. As this was a new region for CAMP, it took more time to build relationships with the Khukumat, local authorities and local CoES representatives. If CAMP was to implement the project again there would be a more assertive effort to at the outset of the project to strengthen this relationship. It was also clear that inhabitants of this district did not understand why a local Tajik NGO was working in their community, and that the role of the NGO in Tajik society is not properly understood.

To compare with CAMPs training experiences in other regions of the Tajikistan, the Nurobod district is arguably the most difficult, there were a range of issues including gender inequality, poor education, high levels of labour migration, the impact of Rogun Dam, high levels of poverty and desperation as not experienced before by CAMP's trainers.

It became apparent early on in the project that the successful inclusion of women in the workshops was not straightforward. Nurobad is a conservative Islamic region of Tajikistan resulting in a very traditional role for women centred on home life. To help combat this issue CAMP always employed the services of a female moderator to help encourage participation, but with the men in some villages refusing to sit with the women, and the high levels of female illiteracy, the engagement of women was compromised. In several villages female moderators held separate workshops for women, covering the basics of the training programme, even then, engagement was difficult.

The time taken to actively engage the local CoES Representative and National Representatives of CoES was too long and slow. Although a MOU was in place, full engagement in the activities was limited until the end of the project. CAMP, however have now strengthened this relationship, by the inclusion of CoES staff in training of moderators, training of CoES staff on the risk assessment programme, and further sharing of information and data from the project. This has provided an invaluable platform from which to build from.

CAMP provided information to other actors on its project via the REACT Committee in Dushanbe; however, there is still remain a very disjointed approach to Disaster Risk Management with a lack of standardisation of tools. To resolve this issue CAMP were able to incorporate tools from Caritas and Oxfam (e.g. films, posters, MECO) and reciprocate with training on FDPs, VDMPs, and mapping. However, there is still plenty of scope for improvement. This issue became most difficult in the development of the GIS component of the project whereby CoES firstly were unwilling to provide the national codes for the villages, and were unable to provide clear guidance on what information would be useful for them. They further stated that all this work should be undertaken by the IMAC and not be completed by outside bodies. This lack of cooperation and collaboration is, and will remain a distinct

obstacle in the development of useful natural disaster databases to be used by the government and non-state bodies.

CAMP has also undertaken workshop monitoring follow up visits in separate contracts for Caritas and Oxfam. This has helped highlight some of the strengths and weaknesses of the L4S module. The main strength is the building of awareness and appreciation of information with regards to Natural Disasters, however, one of the main findings was that individuals living in what are considered vulnerable houses and locations, were not fully aware of what to do in the event of an emergency. (The development and implementation of the family disaster plan has gone some way to rectifying this problem and will be implemented in all villages covered by this project).

The political unrest in the region lead to CAMP applying for a no cost extension to cover the autumn period of 2010, when it was deemed unsafe to visit the region. This obviously interrupted the momentum of the project and the securing of the confidence of the community, who at times were sceptical of the motives of CAMP.

The use of an experienced outside consultant was invaluable in developing the risk assessment process. However, in this case the consultant's input into the project came too early in the contract, and it would have been useful for them to have revisited the project later on to review the implementation of their work. Due to the fact that there were several international staff available to assist on the development of the PRAM this did not become a major issue, but if the methodology developed had been ineffective, the project would have fallen short in the quality of its outcomes. At the completion of the project the PRAM tools developed in Phase III were one of the major successes.

## 8. Summary

The 'Impact Goal' as stated in the project log frame was: 'Local Risk Management capacity focused at the local level in rural areas of Tajikistan built and strengthened'. The outcomes and activities as listed in the *Scope* of Phase III were with varying degrees of success, and resulted in 15 workshops conducted in some of the most difficult and needy communities of Tajikistan. These communities benefited from the continually improving application of the five day training module that was rewritten, and incorporated a variety of new tools from other international organisations and those developed by CAMP. The ability of the moderators improved dramatically as ToT trainings and supervisory support helped provide further focus and structure to the outcomes.

The people of Nurobod district are in need a great deal of support not just in the management of natural disasters, but also around issues of health, education, gender, employment and infrastructure. The people were difficult to work with in comparison to other areas of the country, and were not initially open to allowing the conduction of the trainings in the district. However, as trust developed the community opened up and the levels of interaction increased resulting in a genuine interest in the material provided. This was the most evident at the well attended multi stakeholder event where some participants travelled several hours to attend. This event was used as a platform to review the work within the villages and try to encourage and cajole the participants to push forward and implement their own activities.

After the completion of the workshops the community was left with some very tangible outputs; a VDMP that included hazard maps of the locality; risk assessment of the potential hazards to the community, and proposals on how to reduce the risk by tackling the triggers to the hazard; family disaster plans to help each household in a vulnerable location to consider what action to take in the event of an emergency; and the formation of Emergency Teams (Initiative Groups) with clear responsibilities on what course of action to take to help prevent a natural disaster and what actions to take in the event of a natural disaster. If there was immediate follow-up finance available, it could be spent on kitting out the Emergency Groups with appropriate equipment, and subsidising some of the mitigation proposals developed.

The weakest part of the project but by no means a failure were the follow up mitigation activities. As the other partners of the ILRM project did not work in this region there was no pre-allocated finance for follow up activities. However, through funding from PAMS (Partnership Actions for Mitigating Syndromes) and JICA (Japanese International Cooperation Agency), some soft and hard mitigation measures were successfully implemented by communities themselves, such as bridge and road reconstruction and other mitigation projects instigated by CAMP i.e. planting of 2000 fruit trees, and training in soil and water conservation, pasture management and fruit tree cultivation. The follow up activities will continue in 2011 with the implementation of two energy efficiency projects in the Phase III villages. Through the MOU with the Khukumat, CAMP has committed to assist the people of Nurobod district and CAMP will endeavour to continue to support the communities by seeking finance and support for the proposals elaborated in the VDMPs.

CAMP continues to build strong links with CoES. CAMP provided specific training to CoES staff on the new risk assessment tool, and has handed over the VDMPs and Hazard Maps to IMAC. On the whole CoES has continued to support CAMP; this was shown by their participation at the multi-stake holder roundtable held in Nurobod and an invitation to present CAMP's risk assessment process at to the committee responsible for the development of a standardised natural disaster risk assessment process. It is hoped that with the expected continuation of L4S ILRM training further up the Rasht Valley for Mercy Corps, CAMP can continue to build the capacity of the local CoES representatives.

CAMP has continued to implement sub-contracted work from INGO's on Natural Disasters which has enabled the organisation to develop and use the tools to raise awareness, and collate data on the subject. This has helped CAMP disseminate its learning to the international and national community, in conjunction with presentations, the feedback event, active participation at the REACT Committee, and staged forums.

The mapping of hazards at village level emanated from work undertaken for GAA, this effective tool was easily adapted to illustrate the key information for communities. This however, is severely limited as it is produced in adobe illustrator and does not allow for detailed analysis, or provide the scope for development as a GIS mapping system. As stated in the report, the lack of; standardisation of spatial data, clarity over ownership, user rights, and lack of a national GIS database for organisations to contribute to and access, meant that the GIS component of the project was an adaptation of work undertaken by Caritas, rather than adding to a national database. It is hoped that this work will contribute to the start of process to develop a nationwide database. The GIS component was deliberately kept simple as the GIS capacity within Tajikistan is very limited.

The project came in under budget, and served as a secure platform from which CAMP Kuhiston could reform itself from a highly dependent NGO to a fully functioning effective local non-profit organisation. The project also has help guide CAMP to develop a long term strategy for environmental development assistance for the Nurobod region which has helped CAMP secure funding for two subsequent projects in the district.

## 9. Annex (on CD)

1. List of WSs for partners
2. List of participants at the ToT workshops
3. List of Villages and Risk Assessment Results
4. Participatory Risk Assessment – Duoba
5. GIS Maps Duoba
6. SDC 5 – Day Training Programme and new module
7. List of participants, feedback and evaluation from WSs
8. Village Disaster Management Plan (include maps, risk assessment and proposals)
9. Family Disaster Plan
10. List of Participants at the Roundtable and protocol
11. List of Participants at Feedback Event and protocol
12. Copy of Memorandum of Understanding with CoES
13. Copy of Memorandum of Understanding with Nurobod Khukumat.
14. Copy of Memorandum of Understanding with Geology Institute
15. GIS Presentation
16. GIS mapping
17. PR\_SDC
18. Impact assessment
19. Project Finances