Independent evaluation of the second phase of the Preparedness for Climate Change programme ('PfCC2')

Red Cross Red Crescent
Climate Centre
The Hague, Netherlands

A Red Cross worker speaks to a villager in the east of Rwanda, where the Red Cross is promoting disaster risk reduction. The GDP of Rwanda, one of only two countries to take part in both phases of PfCC, is being hit by climate change. (Photo: IFRC)

This is an independent evaluation commissioned by the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre in The Hague on behalf of the Netherlands government, the project donors. It draws on the submissions of Red Cross Red Crescent National Societies to the Climate Centre and the research of the authors. The opinions expressed herein are the authors' alone, as is responsibility for any errors.

Alex Wynter
Patricia Leone Fay

July 2011

Alex Wynter consultancy
alex.wynter@btopenworld.com

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their gratitude to all those Climate Centre and IFRC personnel who contributed to this evaluation in one way or another, by answering our questionnaire, by agreeing to be interviewed, by providing comments in writing, or by pointing us to other sources of information. We would especially like to thank Fleur Monasso and Desiree Davidse at the Climate Centre in The Hague for all their practical assistance, guidance and support over a period of more than two months.

"Climate change is its own form of early warning; scientists have described what changes to expect. Now the Red Cross Red Crescent can use that information to prepare."

Amy Stypa, MA in Climate and Society at Columbia University and a PfCC2 intern

Table of Contents

Evaluation methodology and goals 4

The background to PfCC2 4

Step analysis 6

Programme review 7

- Survey results 7
- Working through the IFRC zones/regions 8
- Adaptation or mitigation? 8
- The science 9
- The IFRC view 9

Conclusion and recommendations 11

APPENDICES 13

- Appendix One: full questionnaire results 13
- Appendix Two: National Society PfCC2 background reports 15
- Appendix Three: the IRI helpdesk 20

Evaluation methodology and goals

This evaluation has drawn on five main sources of information:

- The Climate Centre's "step analysis", showing in a simple binary spreadsheet which Red Cross Red Crescent National Society completed which step of the PfCC2 programme, as well as their current reporting status.
- Questionnaire responses from zone and regional focal points of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) secretariat. (This provided the evaluation's other main data set after the above.)
- The testimony of Climate Centre personnel and other specialists involved.
- Regular programme reporting by the IFRC secretariat.
- The National Societies' own "output materials", particularly the background reports that constituted the second step of the programme, some of which are précised below as an appendix.

It is apparent from the general level of technical detail in the first part of the National Society background reports, on climate change locally and globally, that they have been thinking deeply about the issue for some time, even if with specialist help. However, this evaluation is not intended to review actual climate impacts in the project countries.

Its primary goal is to validate the largely quantitative results for PfCC2 given as part of the monitoring procedure by the National Societies; and secondarily and more qualitatively – using the information and testimony from the societies themselves and their IFRC zonal and regional counterparts – to gauge general progress in addressing the rising risks of climate change and their bearing on Red Cross Red Crescent work.

The background to PfCC2

The second phase of the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre's Preparedness for Climate Change programme, "PfCC2", is the direct successor of the first, which ran from 2006 to 2009 and helped nearly 40 Red Cross Red Crescent societies assess the implications of rising climate-risk and its consequences for their work. For most, it was the first time they had embarked on such an exercise.

PfCC2 ran from 1 December 2009 to 30 June 2011.

The two programmes (both funded by the Netherlands government) shared the same overarching goal: to generate concrete proposals to improve the resilience of communities in the global South that are most vulnerable to climate risk. The main difference between them is that PfCC2 was conducted and, in the administrative sense, financed entirely through the multilateral coordination structure of which these National Societies are a part: the Geneva IFRC secretariat and its geographical zone[1] and regional offices. Since decentralization in 2008, the IFRC secretariat's work in both humanitarian and developmental arenas is coordinated at the zone level, rather than centrally in Geneva.[2]

A second important difference between the two PfCCs – one consciously designed-in as a result of feedback from PfCC1 – is that "the order and content of the components… are not rigid [the societies were told] and if you find it useful to change the order or incorporate these elements in other activities you are encouraged to do so. Likewise, the actions in each step can be taken in conjunction with existing IFRC or National Society plans and events or separately."[3]

[1] Usually referred to as "the Americas" (based in Panama City), "Europe" (Budapest), "MENA" (Amman), "Africa" (Johannesburg), and "Asia-Pacific" (Kuala Lumpur). The relevant regional offices of the IFRC, which report to the zones, are referenced in the text.

[2] Strictly speaking, "International Federation" or "IFRC" denote the Geneva and field offices *and* member National Societies together; IFRC/Federation "secretariat" refers to the Geneva and field offices: zones, regions and delegations or country offices. However, "IFRC" and (as an adjective) "Federation" are commonly used alone, including here, to refer to the secretariat.

[3] From the introduction to the programme, written for National Societies by the Climate Centre.

The specific goal of PfCC2 was to strengthen the ability of National Societies to address rising risks related to climate change by assessing the way they affect work in the field and on the beneficiaries of that work, and (a key concept) integrating them into their programmes and partnerships.

As the IFRC's official "reference centre" on climate change, established in 2002, the Climate Centre's advice has always been that it is not necessary to create entirely new programmes to address the humanitarian impacts of climate change. The best approach, it argues, is to use climate information to enhance what National Societies are *already good at* and integrate it into existing plans. "Climate-risk management" means looking at what is predictable, what is changing, and how best to prepare.

Further lessons from PfCC1 incorporated into the second phase were that professionals from the health and care and organizational development (OD) communities should be fully involved, as well as disaster management (DM) specialists; and that all levels of National Society personnel, from leaders to volunteers, should participate.

Although it remained at one remove from the National Societies throughout the implementation of the programme, the Climate Centre provided technical support to IFRC focal points and input for the national background reports (step 2), as well as financial support and operational donor-reporting. A priority of this evaluation has been to assess via questionnaire the usefulness of this technical support as perceived by those focal points.

During PfCC2, IFRC focal points were also invited to contact the email helpdesk managed through the organization's partnership with the International Research Institute for Climate and Society (IRI) at Columbia University in New York. This covered both climate science and climate-related health issues.

Like its predecessor, PfCC2 comprised four specific deliverables or steps for each National Society:

1. An internal *workshop* on climate change.
2. A *background report* containing a climate-risk assessment and an account of implications for programming.
3. An *action plan* on ways of addressing climate risk, focusing on integration into regular activities.
4. *Communications products* to disseminate key messages.

The Climate Centre monitored the completion of these steps as the programme progressed using a simple binary spreadsheet, and this forms the basis of the "step analysis" below.

Separately from PfCC2 but coinciding with it, the Climate Centre encouraged National Societies to take part in specialist regional workshops involving other societies and the IFRC to develop their understanding of how climate change can be addressed, possibly alongside another event.[4]

The Climate Centre's programme designers made evident efforts to minimize the workload on hard-pressed National Society staff – many of them facing ongoing humanitarian operations like the Haiti earthquake response; it was carefully spelt out that all the above steps could be integrated into pre-existing work.

The workshop was the most transient of the deliverables, while the communications materials also have a shelf life and are connected with dissemination and advocacy rather than actual operations, relating to efforts to raise the general level of awareness and expertise with National Societies. The steps that are of most direct relevance to the overarching PfCC goal of improving resilience, and to this evaluation, are the second and third: the background documents and the action plans.

The national background report was intended to generate recommendations on how to make programming more "climate smart", to help National Societies better understand the main climate-risks they face and to help them create and/or integrate with networks of like-minded

[4] PfCC1 feedback indicated that National Societies felt a regional event prior to completing all programme components would have been more useful rather than undertaking work nationally then sharing regionally.

agencies – including from the government and scientific sectors. The Climate Centre provided templates to assist the compilation of these reports, especially in light of the relatively short time frame of PfCC2, as well as scientific and technical advice specific to countries.

In terms of the effectiveness of the PfCC process, the fourth section of these templates was especially significant: "Preparedness for Climate Changes", along with its sub-sections. This evaluation has followed the precedent set by the evaluators of PfCC1 in providing précis of these reports on what was then called the "intersections between climate change and Red Cross Red Crescent work"; this 2009 description of the crux of the issue remains very apt for PfCC2.

In the design phase of PfCC2, the Climate Centre also emphasized the importance of ensuring that all interested departments within National Societies were involved in the production of the document. For example, the Centre provided a one-page guidance sheet on climate and increasingly important *health* issues.

In the action plans (step 3), National Societies were to outline concrete programme activities and identify possible donors, with the aim of this work being integrated with existing programmes rather than becoming a separate "climate change" programme. These action plans were intended at least to form the basis of actual funding proposals for the implementation of climate-related programming, as the Climate Centre put it. In other words, their very existence constitutes significant progress toward the overarching goal of both PfCC programmes.

Step analysis

The complete list of National Societies which took part in PfCC2 is:

Angola	India	Papua New Guinea
Armenia	Mali	Rwanda
Bangladesh	Mexico	Sudan
Bhutan	Micronesia	Suriname
Cameroon	Mongolia	Syria
Cape Verde	Morocco	Tajikistan
Chile	Myanmar	Timor-Leste
Dominican Republic	Namibia	Turkmenistan
Fiji	Nepal	Yemen

The headline figure for general completion of PfCC2 is 70 per cent,[5] according to data relayed by the IFRC zones/regions and logged by the Climate Centre. That is, out of the 27 National Societies which took part, 19 *undertook all four prescribed steps*. This figure compares to 64 per cent in PfCC1.

Since the objective of PfCC2 was to build capacity at both the National Society and zone/regional level – that is, to dovetail with the pre-existing disaster-management structure of the IFRC – this represents a significantly better overall rate of participation than PfCC1 if the IFRC zones/regions are taken into account and weighted equally, since 100 per cent of them took part. From the Climate Centre's point of view, the project was conducted entirely through the zones: Climate Centre personnel had almost no direct contact with the National Societies on PfCC2 matters.

The step analysis shows that all societies organized a national workshop on climate change (step 1) and generated communications materials (step 4).

All but six (Cameroon, Cape Verde, Mali, Papua New Guinea, Syria and Yemen) submitted background reports (step 2). This was the weakest result of all the four steps, but this may be partly explained by the observation that the background reports were also probably the most demanding in terms of staff time, and with hindsight the Centre recognized that even some of the ready-made templates were simply too technical for some National Societies.

All but three – Bhutan, Cameroon and Papua New Guinea[6] – submitted an action plan (step 3).

[5] All percentage results are given to the nearest whole number.
[6] Papua New Guinea effectively withdrew from PfCC2 midway because of administrative difficulties.

Programme review

Survey results

As is usual in the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement, PfCC2 was implemented by individual National Societies, their staff and volunteers; it was coordinated and supervised by disaster managers in IFRC zones or their regional equivalents, not (as with PfCC1) Climate Centre personnel.

There were three patterns of engagement by the IFRC, which were fortuitous and, broadly speaking, a reflection of the continuing relevance of its previous "regional" structure. (Some IFRC regions continue to function as an administrative layer between zones and country delegations.)

In the first of these patterns, followed by Europe and MENA (Middle East and North Africa), the zone offices, in Budapest and Amman respectively, themselves dealt with *all* the National Societies taking part in PfCC2.

In the second, followed by the Panama City-based Americas zone, the provision of assistance to the PfCC2 countries was shared between DM personnel based in the zone and the Caribbean regional office in Trinidad; likewise in the sub-Saharan African zone, based in Johannesburg, which shared PfCC2 countries with the regional offices in Dakar (West and Central Africa) and Nairobi (East Africa).

In the third pattern, followed by the Asia-Pacific zone, by far the largest in terms of the frequency and severity of climatic disasters occurring within its bounds, liaison with the PfCC2 societies was shared entirely between four of its regions: east, south and south-east Asia and the Pacific,[7] with the zone offices in Kuala Lumpur taking a more supervisory role.

There were, finally, 12 different IFRC offices – all five zones and seven regions (the Caribbean, two sub-Saharan African regions other than southern Africa, and the four Asia-Pacific regions) – involved in PfCC2, with a small degree of overlap.

This does not have any great evaluative significance except to explain why 12 questionnaires were circulated to PfCC2 focal points (the DM coordinators) in IFRC zones and regions, with whom the Climate Centre dealt directly during the course of the programme. Twelve completed questionnaires were returned to the evaluators. (In the narrative below, the language in quotes is from the questions; the full questionnaire and results are in Appendix One.)

From the Climate Centre's point of view, possibly the most encouraging result was Q7: all but one of the respondents agreed that "as a result of the two PfCC programmes, climate risk is now increasingly considered in regular planning and programming with National Societies." This question could be said to encapsulate not just the purpose of PfCC but the very raison d'être of the Climate Centre itself.

There was also a clear, positive consensus around Q1 and Q4, in response to which, again, all but one of the respondents agreed, respectively, that Climate Centre staff "communicated the purpose of PfCC2 well" and that the transfer funds from the Climate Centre to the zone "went smoothly".

There was a similar but less favourable consensus on Q9: eight respondents believed that "the general level of 'buy-in' to climate issues exhibited by National Society leaderships" has increased "somewhat" as a result of PfCC2. This is not entirely surprising, since Climate Centre staff report that converting senior National Society leaders to the idea of climate-risk management has long been one of the most challenging aspects of their work.

Q10 produced a similar result: seven respondents believe the number of National Societies "actively engaged in dialogue with governments on national adaptation strategies" has increased "somewhat" as a result of PfCC2. This is a slightly more disappointing result, since encouraging partnership with government agencies on climate-change adaptation (CCA) in general has been such a fundamental part of both PfCC programmes.

There was a reasonable consensus on Q3: eight respondents agreed "the guidance materials and templates supplied by the Climate Centre were very useful", while three believed they were of "limited use" and one did not answer. This is a slightly disappointing result for the Climate Centre since it has total control over the production of these materials.

Likewise six respondents believed PfCC had been a "qualified" success; five felt it had been a "great success", but only one believed it had been a disappointment.

[7] Respectively based in Beijing, Delhi, Bangkok and Suva, Fiji.

There was no clear consensus around the remaining questions, covering technical support, the place of climate issues and interdisciplinary involvement in IFRC office structures, and the perception of the prominence of climate issues in IFRC appeal documents.

Fewer IFRC respondents were willing to attribute the integration of climate risk into regular programmes to PfCC2 specifically (Q8) than the two PfCC programmes together (Q7). But between these two questions, only two respondents did not feel there had been any progress at all on this fundamental issue, which is encouraging for the Climate Centre.

Working through the IFRC zones/regions

As noted above, during PfCC2 the Climate Centre did not deal directly with National Societies as it did with PfCC1 but operated almost entirely through IFRC zones and regions. This might reasonably be expected to have slowed things down and made it more difficult to move forward with the programme.

There were some exceptions. In the Americas zone, for example, having established a channel of communication through the zone headquarters in Panama City, scientists at IRI in New York did respond directly to requests for technical advice received from National Societies. But broadly speaking, the IFRC secretariat (its zones and regions) "took ownership" of PfCC2 as planned from the outset. It is also worth mentioning that, from the Climate Centre's point of view, PfCC2 was also consciously intended to build both the capacity *and* the willingness of the IFRC to incorporate climate-risk into programming.

That this modus operandi, in fact, seems *not* to have injected undue delay into the programme can be evidenced in two ways. Firstly, more National Societies completed all four steps of PfCC2 in comparison to PfCC1 (even just taking the societies alone) .

Secondly, there is also testimony to this effect gathered by the evaluators. One Climate Centre interviewee said: "We have done in a year and a bit what took three years with PfCC1." This interviewee added that the "zones were very receptive and aware of their need to learn along the way."

Another interviewee in a position to compare the two PfCC programmes said it was "a little bit harder" to work through the IFRC secretariat, but "still possible".

It's also worth mentioning here that so well received were the PfCC2 country reports by Caribbean National Societies that the IFRC stepped forward to fund a further four non-PfCC2 societies to do their own: Belize, Dominica, Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Adaptation or mitigation?

The issue of whether to prioritize *adapting* to the humanitarian impacts of climate change that are now considered inevitable, whatever happens with greenhouse gases, or actively campaign for reductions in emissions ("mitigation") arose in the interaction with National Societies with PfCC2 as it did with PfCC1.

The Climate Centre's advice has always been that for the Red Cross Red Crescent, CCA represents the best use of time, expertise and resources. The reality it faces, however, is that some National Societies are actively engaged in campaigning for mitigation and indeed play a role in the political debate about how and at what rate greenhouse gases might be reduced. The picture changes greatly from country to country, and the proportions of adaptation versus mitigation work among all National Societies worldwide probably varies from 100% the former to 100% the latter.

In its role as a membership organization, the IFRC secretariat must perforce reflect this reality, and its Strategy 2020 document says Red Cross Red Crescent

> *climate change adaptation work is through scaling up disaster risk reduction measures and strengthening traditional methods of coping with disasters that are relevant in particular environmental contexts. We also contribute to mitigating the progression of climate change through advocacy and social mobilization to promote sustainable community development that optimizes [i.e. reduces] communities' carbon footprints.*

The Climate Centre, on the other hand, as the IFRC's specialist reference centre, if asked to advise a National Society seeking to make a *choice* between the two, will submit that adaptation represents the best "fit" with the Red

Cross Red Crescent mandate and enables societies to make the biggest humanitarian contribution. In other words, the IFRC secretariat must encompass the full range of activity engaged in by its members; the Climate Centre is more concerned with *comparative advantage* and the optimal use of resources.

It could be argued that this is as much "constructive ambiguity" as incoherence. However, some Climate Centre interviewees expressed frustration that with PfCC2 it was difficult to get the adaptation message across (one described it as "the biggest challenge"), and that in the communications materials they produced as step 4, which were in no sense edited or approved by the Centre, some National Societies veered toward a focus on mitigation at the expense of adaptation.

It is not clear to the evaluators that this issue and the likelihood of it cropping up again, was fully aired within the Climate Centre itself before PfCC2 got underway.

One IFRC interviewee pointed out that, even within the CCA sphere, National Societies had "different reasons" for integrating climate risk into planning. Some actually experience repeated climatic disasters: "…flooding in areas where it never happened before, dry seasons that impacted on water availability, very heavy and unusual rainfall." Others simply found it easier to get climate-related projects funded, in comparison to risk reduction and preparedness in general, for which the humanitarian community as a whole has historically found it difficult to get backing.

The science

One of the goals the Climate Centre has set itself has been to make climate science accessible to National Societies; by all accounts it remains a challenge.

In PfCC2 several Columbia University interns working with IRI and selected by the Climate Centre helped staff in a number of IFRC zone offices to incorporate scientific information and analyse forecasts and meteorological data, as did some other students. As technical advisers they worked on different components of PfCC2 over a two-month period and successfully helped to bridge the gap between climate-science providers and humanitarian consumers of this information, which is by no means always presented in a user-friendly way.

The National Societies also received tailored climate-information at the beginning of PfCC2 from the IFRC/IRI helpdesk with a template for the background report (step 2), "enabling them to focus more on the climate risks that actually influence their own programmes," according to one Climate Centre interviewee. However, this interviewee felt some of the material produced by the helpdesk was "too technical", and some societies "felt intimidated".

The helpdesk itself was well utilized during the PfCC2 period, receiving more than 40 requests for assistance and advice on a wide range of issues (*see* Appendix Three).

The IFRC view

The Climate Centre received final programmatic reports on PfCC2 from all the IFRC zones and from the East Africa and West and Central Africa regions. What follows is a brief summary of their general evaluative comments.

PfCC in Southern Africa is one of several climate-related initiatives that together make up the Zambezi River Basin Initiative (ZRBI) – a community-based Red Cross programme aimed at increasing the resilience and preparedness of communities living along the Zambezi river in seven countries and launched in June 2009. The IFRC final report for the *Southern Africa zone/region* spoke of an "increased frequency and severity of droughts, floods and cyclones," while "malaria and cholera have increased and are expected to increase further during the course of this century" – all exacerbated by poverty and HIV/AIDS.

PfCC2 appears to have been successfully woven into ongoing ZRBI initiatives, with the zone DM office, through a range of partnerships, "expanding focus from response to DRR [disaster risk reduction] and CCA with support from the Climate Centre." As part of PfCC2, a ZRBI-wide DRR and CCA training pilot was developed, as well as relevant educational materials – a point the IFRC report stressed.

The two regional PfCC countries, Angola and Namibia, were planning to develop an adaptation "atlas" of the entire ZRBI region.

The National Societies of the *East Africa region* – mainly Rwanda and Sudan but also Ethiopia, which participated through the Climate Change Innovations Fund (CCIF) that ran alongside PfCC2 – were not able to follow the project's agreed time line due to demands from other emergency operations.[8] Since they were new to the issue of climate change, "this project was viewed as an added task to already-stretched personnel," according to the IFRC final report. However, PfCC2 has helped to change their perception of the importance of climate change to their work.

These National Societies require support to be able to position themselves strategically with their governments to access CCA funds. They "are not perceived as a credible climate-change partner", but collaboration with environment ministries and meteorological departments supported by PfCC2, it's hoped, "will build long-term linkages".

"Connecting communities with this information through volunteer networks can be a powerful early-warning tool," the report adds. "The project helped to establish the importance of building a culture of risk reduction in the work of National Societies." A better understanding of climate change has built confidence with staff and volunteers in providing risk-reduction advice and positioning with local authorities in advocating for climate-related investments in their communities.

The *West and Central Africa region* pointed out that PfCC workshops in Cape Verde and Mali included both those countries' met offices: the National Institute of Meteorology and Geophysics and the National Meteorological Department respectively.

Malian communities have developed capacities for adaptation through management of water resources for agriculture, the use of fast-cropping seeds, farming in wetter areas and varying livestock feed; but such actions "are not often coordinated or have limited scope [and it] has been imperative to develop a climate-change programme with a more coordinated process, making it possible to find responses to the impact of climate change". The IFRC report suggests, but does not explicitly state, that PfCC2 went some way toward fulfilling that need.

Cape Verde is "highly vulnerable to climate change with a low capacity to adapt", according to the IFRC. It is also disaster prone. PfCC discussions there "enabled the identification of the most vulnerable communities…[and] highlighted the potential impact of climate change on public health and the need to insure that health is an integral part of further planning."

IFRC West and Central Africa reported in most detail on the third country in its group: Cameroon, where nearly 120 trainers from the country's ten regions were tutored on climate change and risk reduction, then went on to reach some 50,000 residents with advice on activities like the planting of trees, cleaning of gutters and reducing the use of wood as fuel. During the second half of 2010, climate-change focal points were appointed and trained in all the local committees of the Cameroon Red Cross.

Throughout PfCC2 there was a "clear understanding" among National Societies in the *Asia-Pacific zone* (*see* countries listed on page 6) that climate-change issues need to be addressed across all programme sectors. But it is still a "struggle" to get information through to field level to inform adaptation planning and work. "This applies both to using Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (VCA) to identify community-level climatic risks," said the zone's final report, "and [the] availability of scientific information to inform longer-term planning, as there is no long-term climate information for specific geographical locations."

While *Strategy 2020* mentions mitigation as well as adaptation, there has been "strong debate on this issue" in the Asia-Pacific region, with most National Societies arguing the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement should focus on adaptation. The PfCC2-associated regional workshop "is now seen as a model" for any future workshops or training aimed at mainstreaming CCA into programming.

The National Societies of the *Americas zone* (including the Caribbean) have been especially active in the PfCC programmes, with at least 100 Red Cross branches from ten societies involved in either PfCC2 (Chile, the Dominican Republic, Mexico and Suriname) or the CCIF (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua). "During 2010," said the zone report, "the National Societies of the Americas approached their national and local governments and increased collaboration [with them]. This improved the positioning of National Societies regarding climate change [achieving] greater internal and external awareness on the humanitarian consequences of climate change."

The PfCC2 National Societies developed technical documents "on how climate change affects these countries

[8] As this evaluation was being drafted, the IFRC regional office in Nairobi again found itself facing a full-scale humanitarian emergency in the Horn of Africa (mainly Somalia, south-east Ethiopia and northern Kenya), rooted in long-term drought and conflict.

and promote the areas for action for each." They are also committed to updating these action plans as necessary.

Among the recorded constraints in this zone were staff turnover (a problem also observed in the Pacific region), and limited coordination with experts and scientific institutions. There was a need for more technical expertise at the zone headquarters in Panama City, and it was felt the "time frame was too short for the overall project, considering the confirmation dates and closing dates for [funding] approval."

A point about Chile was that institutions there are still undergoing modernization and restructuring after the 2010 earthquake.

Despite many challenges due to the unrest sweeping the Arab world, numerous investments in climate work have been made by the National Societies over the past two years, according to the final report from the *MENA zone*. At the beginning of PfCC2, an IRI intern helped develop a generic presentation on adaptation for National Societies, and developed relationships with experts at the American University in Beirut and Jordan University.

Baseline climate change information has been collected and translated into Arabic for five countries in the region: Egypt, Libya and the PfCC2 countries – Morocco, Syria and Yemen. This was used to build several proposals at national and regional level.

PfCC2 ran parallel to the ongoing Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction programme, which took place in Morocco, Syria and Egypt. The report adds: "There has been a lot of overlap between the two efforts and we believe the flexible nature of PfCC contributed to strengthening different aspects of the DRR programmes.

Interviews and training for CCA in the field in the *Europe zone*, especially Central Asia, indicated that rural communities have a "basic knowledge about climate change and its risks, but they do not know how to deal with and/or adapt to them". In one of the PfCC2 countries, Turkmenistan, there was "insufficient involvement of scientists and researchers in researches and activities of the Red Crescent Society of Turkmenistan (RCST) due to lack of financial incentives in the programme."

The RCST analysed the level of people's knowledge about climate change and concluded more information was needed "on adaptation, changing behaviours, and rational resource management through [the] mass media, in order to target a wider population."

The Europe zone, interestingly, recommended stepping up the involvement of *scientists* in future programmes. (The other Europe zone countries were Armenia and Tajikistan.)

Conclusion and recommendations

The Preparedness for Climate Changes programmes have been operating for roughly half the Climate Centre's existence. Together they are its principle contribution to the mainstreaming of climate issues into Red Cross Red Crescent disaster preparedness, and if judged only by the degree to which these issues *are*, in practice, now embedded in Red Cross Red Crescent work, the programmes have been an undoubted success.

Climate Centre staff report they made good progress during the PfCC2 period in the delivery of services to support climate-informed decision-making within the Red Cross Red Crescent at the multilateral level. The partnership between the IFRC and IRI facilitated improvements to the IFRC map room and helpdesk; led to the development of the Haiti weather and climate-risk website; and provided La Niña updates, scientific inputs on climate variability, and improvements to PfCC background documents.

Most of the criticisms of PfCC2 that did emerge from this evaluation were more procedural than conceptual. One IFRC interviewee, for example, felt there was a confusion between workshops and proper training, possibly because the former do not routinely incorporate the latter: at workshops, genuine technical expertise may be available or it may not.

Another, however, argued that a longer funding period, for something as innately long-term as climate change adaptation, would be useful. And some National Societies are clearly still grappling with the science behind the climate issues they face. A lesson of PfCC2 as much as PfCC1 seems to be that you can never have too much technical knowledge and advice.

One Climate Centre interviewee said the IFRC zones and regions were too focused on "administration" at the expense of actual programme content.

But a very basic point about PfCC2 is that the Climate Centre does not plan PfCC3.

Broadly speaking, the stated objective of the PfCC programmes, as one interviewee put it, was to promote "a period of assessment of climate risk and humanitarian impacts, and the establishment of relevant partnerships in as many countries as possible." The feeling in the Centre (not itself an "implementing agency") is that the time is now right to move to supporting actual adaptation projects in the field. The involvement of the Climate Centre in the new Partners for Resilience (PfR) programme should be seen in that light.[9]

Given that there is to be no PfCC3, it would clearly be otiose for this evaluation to make too many practical recommendations based on criticisms or lessons learned from PfCC2. However in one important respect the evaluation failed to unearth any hard evidence in support of PfCC2 – evidence that, as the Climate Centre's own monitoring protocol put it, "the programme contributed to reducing the impact of…disaster," meaning an actual disaster that occurred within the time frame of PfCC2. Nor, as far as the evaluators have been able to determine, was any such evidence put forward by the IFRC focal points.

All the other targets in the PfCC2 monitoring protocol bar three were numerical and were either approached or met; the three exceptions, all inputs (technical advice, guidance materials and the helpdesk), were said to have been provided at least "adequately" by almost all questionnaire respondents.

The "impact" objective is the only target the protocol describes as qualitative, and this may be part of the reason why it does not seem to have been fulfilled. Who would have made such a qualitative judgment? It may not have been (in fact, almost certainly wasn't) entirely realistic to have included this target in the first place. But from some donors' point of view, in straitened economic times worldwide, the need to demonstrate programme *impact* has intensified over the past year or so, as the recent Multilateral Aid Review by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) may illustrate.

- As the Climate Centre moves forward from PfCC into PfR – a very different proposition – the main recommendation of this evaluation, therefore, is that it should seek to fill this one serious gap in the record of the former, and do more to demonstrate programme impact in the field. This may be especially apt as the Centre moves toward a focus on PfR, which is a field-based operational programme – a distinct step forward from the largely educational character of PfCC1 and 2. The evaluators make no particular recommendation about how this might be done: whether through operational reporting by implementing partners, web-based public communications targeted at an external international audience, or internal or external periodic and final evaluations.

As already observed, there is now little doubt about the degree to which climate issues and the addressing, if not actual management, of climate risk is embedded in the work of the Red Cross Red Crescent. There can equally be little doubt that the Climate Centre – a reasonably well-resourced and proactive IFRC reference centre with access to genuine scientific expertise which provides a vibrant and regularly updated website – has been instrumental in achieving this. A background document issued in late May 2011 for the Movement's 31st International Conference, which coincides with the tenth anniversary of the first "International Year of Volunteers", notes: "Volunteering is at the heart of the Movement's history and remains just as important in responding to today's humanitarian challenges, ranging from *climate change* [emphasis added], migration and the constant threat of disasters and conflicts to emerging public health threats."

However, donor funding for DRR overall, of which climate-change is increasingly seen as a subset, may not be quite as well established. Nor is the exact operational relationship between DRR and CCA fully clear.[10]

AW/PLF July 2011

[9] An alliance between the Netherlands Red Cross, the Climate Centre, CARE Netherlands, Cordaid and Wetlands International, which joined forces to increase the resilience of vulnerable people through DRR-CAA. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs awarded PfR 36 million euros for work in nine countries in Africa, Asia and Central America up to 2015.

[10] See, for example, Gero, A., Méheux, K. and Dominey-Howes, D., *Disaster risk reduction and climatechange adaptation in the Pacific: The challenge of integration*, University of New South Wales, 2010. This argues that "Integrating [DRR and CCA] is identified at the policy and practical level as crucial to aid effectiveness."

APPENDICES

Appendix One: full questionnaire results

Twelve multiple-choice evaluation questions for programme focal-points in IFRC zones

Guidance for responders:

- This questionnaire should take only take a few minutes of your time, but please read the A options first as many provide context on which B and C rely.
- Select one only of the three possible answers to each question; whichever you think is the best fit.
- If you feel none of the options comes close, however, please answer 'None', and add a qualifying remark if you like.

1.
   A) Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre staff communicated the purpose of PfCC2 well. (10)
   B) They communicated it adequately. (1)
   C) They did not communicate it well.

2.
   A) The ongoing technical and general support offered by the Climate Centre to the zone on the four components of PfCC2 was excellent. (5)
   B) It was adequate. (5)
   C) We would have appreciated more assistance and technical support from the Climate Centre. (2)

3.
   A) The one-off guidance materials and templates supplied by the Climate Centre were very useful. (8)
   B) They were of limited use. (3)
   C) They were not particularly useful.

4.
   A) The process of transferring funds from the Climate Centre to the zone went smoothly. (10)
   B) The process of transferring funds took longer than necessary. (1)
   C) The process of transferring funds was difficult and time-consuming.

5.
   A) Since PfCC2, there is now a single, designated zonal focal-point for climate issues. (4)
   B) There was one before PfCC2. (1)
   C) The zone does not have a single zonal focal-point for climate issues; they are a shared specialism. (4)

6.
   A) As well as a disaster-management professional with a specialised interest in the issue, zone colleagues from the fields of organizational development and health and care are now *fully* involved in discussion of climate issues. (4)
   B) They are *somewhat* involved. (5)
   C) At the zone, climate issues largely remain a sub-specialism of disaster management. (3)

7.
   A) As a result of the two PfCC programmes, climate risk is now increasingly considered in regular planning and programming with National Societies. (10)
   B) It is considered to about the same degree as it was before even PfCC1.
   C) Climate risk is still not considered in regular planning and programming with National Societies. (1)

8.

A) The number of National Societies that have integrated climate risk into regular programmes has significantly increased as a result of PfCC2. (7)
B) It has increased *somewhat*. (3)
C) It has not significantly increased. (1)

9.

A) The general level of buy-in to climate issues exhibited by National Society leaderships has significantly increased as a result of PfCC2. (3)
B) It has increased *somewhat*. (8)
C) It has not significantly increased. (1)

10.

A) The number of National Societies actively engaged in dialogue with governments on national adaptation strategies has significantly increased as a result of PfCC2. (4)
B) It has increased *somewhat*. (7)
C) It has not significantly increased. (1)

11.

A) The number of IFRC appeal documents that explicitly include climate risk has significantly increased as a result of PfCC2. (3)
B) It has increased *somewhat*. (4)
C) It has not significantly increased. (3)

12.

A) Our participation in PfCC2 has been a great success. (5)
B) Our participation in PfCC2 has been a qualified success. (6)
C) Our participation in PfCC2 has been a disappointment. (1)

Appendix Two: National Society PfCC2 background reports

National Society "background reports" on the climate risks they faced were mostly compiled within a template provided by the Climate Centre and constituted the second step of the PfCC2 programme. In most cases, the fourth section of these reports discussed the key area of the intersection between the climate risks National Societies face and their preparedness work. Some of these are précised below in what are still essentially their own words, barring some editing for clarity. Included are the four National Societies independently funded by the IFRC aside from PfCC2. (The authors have followed the societies' practice about whether the word "society" is included in their names.)

Armenia

Armenia is one of the most disaster-prone countries in its region, and the 2010 strategic plan of the Armenian Red Cross Society (ARCS) strongly advocates for the need to reduce the vulnerability of the population to natural disasters. Climate change will have an "enormous" impact, as both cause and accelerator of natural disasters in Armenia. Although climate change is a new area of activity for the National Society, DRR was already a priority area. The main points of ARCS activity here are public awareness, capacity building and advocacy. The ARCS believes it can provide effective public guidance on *specific* risks; trainings in communities and schools in climate-related fields will be an important new focus. The integration of climate-related components into VCAs will encourage communities to prioritize the issue and integrate adaptation into plans, budgets and programmes. The development of different types of assessments of possible disaster areas might follow.

Bangladesh

The Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS) has developed a four-year CCA programme with which PfCC2 was integrated and coordinated. The country is extremely vulnerable to climate-change impacts because of its geographical location, high population density, high levels of poverty and the reliance of many livelihoods on climate-sensitive sectors, particularly rural agriculture and fisheries. Bangladesh's food is its income too. Its economy hinges primarily on agriculture. The main factors negatively influencing agriculture are cyclones, floods, drought, salinity, tidal waves, seasonal variability, erratic rainfall patterns, heat and cold waves. Climate change, which brings more intense extremes, therefore has a major impact on the agriculture and food security of the country. Climate change is a significant and emerging threat to public health in Bangladesh. Attention is paid to reports from the IPCC and WHO that urge health adaptation mechanisms be implemented as impacts increase. Water resources are probably one of the most affected sectors in Bangladesh. Climate change has already caused serious drinking water scarcity especially in the coastal areas due to salinity intrusion. People living in the coastal areas of Bangladesh face extreme poverty, have limited livelihood options with poor economic linkages to the rest of the country.

Belize

Raising awareness of the impacts of climate change by expanding educational programmes is a main priority of the Belize Red Cross (BRC). Another priority is capacity building. In addition to ongoing volunteer recruitment, communities are being encouraged to participate to a greater degree in the programmes intended to benefit them. There is a plan to incorporate climate change considerations into existing and future programmes. It is likely that some considerations, such as documenting the impact climate change will have on disasters, can be incorporated easily. However, in order to address other aspects of climate change, such as changing rainfall patterns, gradual warming or sea level rise, new programmes would have to be devised or current programmes changed. The BRC is developing more systematic and organized systems to replace the local unstructured early warning systems by building capacity at the community level. There are existing collaborations between the Red Cross and its partners, as well as with organizations such as the National Meteorological Service and the National Emergency Management Organization. The society is aware that fostering more partnerships with bodies such as government ministries would increase its capacity to address climate change across Belize.

Chile

In its region, Chile is regarded as a pacesetter in efforts to address climate change – specifically within a three-year plan organized by the environment ministry. But the Chilean Red Cross points out that although many NGOs work on climate themes, they do so largely with *mitigation* objectives in mind, not adaptation. The society says that a concrete plan to incorporate humanitarian agencies into work on climate impacts awaits development. For its part, the National Society is clear that climate impacts are

already being felt in its four main areas of work: risk management, where communities face more disasters; health, where changes in disease vectors are being observed; youth work, where the need to expand is very evident; and a general decline in social well-being, especially, for example, among the elderly in the south-central area of the country, linked to failed harvests. Since the 2010 earthquake, the Red Cross has been working hard to expand its volunteer base, and this effort now includes significant CCA components.

Dominica

The Dominica Red Cross (DRC) plans to incorporate information on the impacts of climate change into its health programmes. Educational and prevention programmes inform the population about risks and recommended actions associated with new or re-emerging illnesses linked to climate change. The DRC already has links with the Ministry of Health and plans to further utilize them. The DRC feels it could explore the possibility of forming health partnerships with regional organizations or local NGOs. Empowering communities through capacity building will allow them to participate in adapting to and mitigating climate risks, and safeguard livelihoods. The DRC has contributed to capacity building at the community level through programmes such as disaster-reduction training for communities, VCAs, and several micro-projects. Pre-emptive measures could include planting resilient crop varieties or trees on deforested hillsides to prevent soil loss and landslides. New plans must be created to integrate climate information into existing programmes, and contingency and disaster plans may have to be updated to reflect changing risks. The society can help communities consider alternative means of livelihood or broaden definitions of traditional livelihoods that are threatened by climate change.

Dominican Republic

The Dominican Republic, which shares the island of Hispaniola with Haiti, one of the most vulnerable countries in the world, faces a wide range of climate impacts, and the Red Cross there is seeking to address them across its entire portfolio of programmes. It also foresees the need to develop entirely new programmes in the field of risk reduction, including, in collaboration with other agencies, the conservation of mangrove fields and reforestation; projects to help people cope with extreme heat at sea level; and, in the face of worsening drought, the conservation of spring water, and rainwater harvesting. With drought especially, and the general availability of potable water, the Red Cross is now trying to move to a more proactive approach centred on conservation from a hitherto largely reactive one, in which a response was only mounted at the point at which an actual disaster was observed. The National Society is well staffed with volunteers, though it lacks volunteers with the *skills* likely to become indispensable with these new programmes. Of the approximately 5,000 distinct communities in the Dominican Republic, the Red Cross has been active in about 10 per cent.

Fiji

Tropical Cyclone Amy in 2005 was the catalyst for the Fiji Red Cross Society (FRCS) to redesign its preparedness and response methods spanning training, communication, assessments, needs analysis, effective existing responses and reporting. Today, climate change projections require integration of climate change impacts into all plans. Potential areas of impact are water resources, livelihoods, agriculture and food security, health, coastal areas and on the very nature of the disasters. When taking climate change into consideration preparedness has to be redefined. Climate change awareness must be integrated into all programmes in order to maximize capacity and decrease vulnerability. Preparedness requires a view to the future which now includes the possibility of more frequent extreme-weather events. Planning ahead may reduce the cost and effort to provide disaster relief. And, the potential of increased and new health risks may require more volunteers and more rigorous training. Climate change impacts also affect the nature and state of relief items. For example, increased heat and rain can damage the disaster preparedness containers which will then require maintenance. The FRCS must work with multiple stakeholders to develop systems, processes and techniques by which official information can more quickly be disseminated, in simple language, to the community before an event. Communities who are prone to disasters must learn to identify the early triggers or warnings which precede and event. FRCS communications may be expanded to include satellite phones and VHF radios and repeaters.

Mexico

The leadership of the Mexican Red Cross is aware that the humanitarian impacts of climate change are increasing in severity year on year, and of the importance of not relaxing the effort to build awareness of this reality. Fortunately, the National Society's track record of dealing with the relevant government authorities is a good one, providing scope for expansion. However, the fact is that many communities are ill-prepared for climate impacts, and the Red Cross needs to

emphasize its efforts in this area, starting with local branches. It is also on communities that the climate-related capacity-building effort is centring – both in remote rural areas far from state capitals and on provincial urban centres. Early warning systems have been instituted in states like Tabasco, where there were disastrous floods in 2007. The UN COP 16 climate-change talks in 2010 in the Mexican resort of Cancun is providing the National Society with an opportunity to showcase its work in the climate change field, and above all what it's doing with young people, to whom courses like the society's Introduction to Disasters are now available with modules on climate impacts.

Micronesia

Although the Micronesia Red Cross Society (MRCS) is an organization of limited capacity, its strength lies in its partnerships with key stakeholders in the Federated States of Micronesia. As climate change-related threats will affect all, these collaborations will result in comprehensive common strategies and approaches. The early warning system was strengthened after the 2010 climate change workshop in Pohnpei. The MRCS reached an agreement with the meteorological office to forward detailed and accurate forecast information from the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in Guam. The MRCS DM officer has recently signed onto the Global Disaster Alert and Coordination System (GDAC) – a free tool that can be used to disseminate warning information to communities. Radio stations could be encouraged to broadcast forecast information received directly from met office. The MRCS is beginning to strengthen its DM programmes across the territory of the FSM and is working with its branches and volunteers to create *standardized* programmes. This will build sustainable organizational capacity. Pohnpei state has been identified as a possible pilot site for a VCA.

Mongolia

The population of Mongolia is scattered over the whole of the country and faces unique disasters, ranging from earthquakes to extremely cold winters. Because it is difficult to send and receive information throughout the geographic area when disaster strikes, the Mongolia Red Cross Society (MRCS) aims to serve the most vulnerable people through a volunteer-based network. With 33 mid-level branches and 902 primary-level branches, the MRCS network extends to communities all over Mongolia. Improvement is needed in the stocking of its seven regional disaster preparedness centres to eliminate gaps. Although it is a priority of the MRCS to build up the resilience of communities, this is a challenge due to the nomadic lifestyle of herders. The current disaster preparedness and relief programme focuses on identifying vulnerabilities, capacities and gaps in selected communities. The MRCS is one of the few National Societies that receives no government funds. It has worked with long-standing bilateral partners, both regionally and internationally, which continue to support the National Society with funding and technical support. A high priority should be given to CCA through building local community resilience to natural disasters. It is important not to think of climate change as a separate topic, but as an issue to be integrated into all existing risk reduction strategies. The MRCS can help educate and train communities on mitigation and "no-regrets" adaptation. In Mongolia a monitoring and warning system is in place but widespread dissemination of forecast information that is easily understood and actionable is lacking.

Morocco

Climate-related catastrophes become more evident every year through the prevalence of floods, landslides and cold spells or heat waves and drought. The Moroccan Red Crescent (MRC) is the auxiliary of the public authorities in the humanitarian field and serves the kingdom with 40,000 trained volunteers. The MRC recognizes that the impacts of climate change need to be integrated into their programmes; specifically in the areas of risk reduction, climate change adaptation strategies, behavioural changes in relation to the environment (water, consumption, sustainable development), community health programmes, building capacity through institutional reinforcement, and improved logistics management. With awareness of future challenges, the MRC has developed partnerships with various departments of the government as well as the private sector. The MRC would like to pursue the development of an effective early warning system that incorporates the use of meteorology and spatial remote imaging and implement adaptation micro-projects. There will also be continued development of community-based DRR and health programmes.

Nepal

Under its current development plan, the Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) seeks to make its programming "adaptive" by integrating climate risk into planned DRR activity while simultaneously working towards developing the society's capacity to address climate change issues. Concretely, the society's own community-based disaster risk reduction will include piloting adaptation to climate change in three districts (out of a national total of some 300) by 2015. District-level VCAs will be carried out in at least five

districts, while early-warning and climate-based plans will be developed by 2013. An "integrated programming approach" is to be followed in which project assessment and planning considers both climate-change issues and indigenous practices. The NRCS believes good DRR helps reduce the risk of climate change, even when climate is not explicitly addressed, but can be made even more effective by directly addressing climate change. Disasters, particularly floods, have had a direct impact on public health in Nepal. Malaria, *kala-azar* (leishmaniasis), dengue fever, Japanese encephalitis, filariasis and waterborne diseases such as diarrhoea, cholera and typhoid are common, and climatic variability has worsened the health situation of vulnerable people. There is a need to carry out research to understand the epidemiology of climate change.

Rwanda

Rwanda is an overwhelmingly agrarian country where some 80 per cent of the population are farmers. Climate impacts, mainly drought and floods, are leading to food insecurity, displacement, migration, and the selling-off of household possessions. The main programmatic burden this imposes on the Red Cross is the result of people moving to areas where there is insufficient water. The chief activity the National Society would like to expand in the face of this rising climate risk is rainwater harvesting, mainly in the east of the country, where water stocks are being expanded to see communities through dry periods. El Niño years tend to see heightened rainfall during the September–December rainy season, while La Niña years tend to see reduced rainfall. But the relationship is inconsistent and it is possible to have reduced rainfall and an increase in the presence of short droughts even during El Niño years. Abnormally high temperatures are known to occur in association with La Niña episodes.

Saint Lucia

The effects of climate change on Saint Lucia Red Cross (SLURC) programmes will vary to a large extent; it is necessary to determine those which will have the greatest affect on the greatest number. Information on health issues related to climate change is provided by WHO while the Ministry of Health assesses local conditions. The best thing the SLURC can do is to partner with the ministry and translate this information into educational programmes. Community-based programmes should be of higher priority in order to involve community participation in adaptation measures and risk reduction. The SLURC has solid capacity in community work and has completed 11 VCAs. It would be advantageous for the SLURC to look through the potential impacts brought about by climate change. Scientific data will need to be gathered, best practice and other valuable information needs to be collected from partner organizations and disseminated to volunteers and communities. Pre-emptive measures may need to be taken. The early-warning system in place is clearly defined in the way information is received and delivered. As an important member of the national disaster plan, the SLURC has influence and could attempt to expand the early-warning system.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

The primary planned role of the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Red Cross is educational. Raising awareness of the impacts of climate change, along with the steps that can be taken to lessen adverse impacts will build capacity at the community level. In addition, planning is underway for new projects that will deal directly with climate change impacts, including the impact of changing rainfall. Water security is already a problem in St Vincent and the Grenadines, and one project involves distribution of water tablets. Other proposed projects include involving children in the design of wind turbines (linked to raising awareness), a flood-prevention scheme, and water tanks for those most in need (determined through humanitarian assessment). To replace the informal early-warning systems currently in use, the National Society is training communities in the use of radios. The National Emergency Management Organization issues early warnings to the Red Cross which then communicates the warnings to communities.

Sudan

The climate-related disasters that have the greatest impact in Sudan are floods, drought and desertification. To address the impacts of these and related hazards, the Sudan Red Crescent Society (SRCS) needs to expand its programmes for food security, livelihoods, health emergency preparedness, risk reduction, desertification, climate change advocacy, sociological support for communities at risk, improvement of the early warning system and raising community awareness. Although the SRCS already collaborates with partners, enlarging and strengthening partnerships with organizations and relevant institutions that work in the same field would further expand its own capacity to address the areas of vulnerability. The SRCS contingency plan depends on volunteer community teams, branch emergency-response teams and the highly trained National Disaster Response Team. A community-based disaster preparedness programme has been implemented in several states, including Darfur, to strengthen community capacity. This will be expanded. A flood-risk reduction programme has been implemented through collaboration

with a partner. However, risk reduction actions need to be addressed as an overall strategy. The SRCS is a very lean organization and faces many challenges, some of which are related to the separation of both the country and the National Society, and the lack of funding.

Suriname

As a result of a formal analysis in 2010 the Suriname Red Cross (SRC) is undertaking the task of understanding how to reduce and adapt to the effects of climate change. New methods and programmes are needed to strengthen its capacity to target the existing risks. Partnerships with external organizations and institutes must be formed in order to establish a well functioning platform. The government is responsible for the early-warning system. A significant level of capacity building must occur before a concrete plan can be finalized. The SRC can use its resources and expertise to assist the government in the training. This will require a closer collaboration between the SRC, the National Contingency Coordination Centre, and the government. To help anticipate floods and droughts, monitoring of forecast information on all timescales is necessary. A national disaster plan that will address multiple timescales related to weather events is being produced. The government is also producing a national climate action plan. The SRC can inform and advise the government about their responsibilities regarding adaptation measures. The Red Cross is already using instruments such as VCAs to collaborate with local communities. This information is used to increase the awareness of policy makers and the public to repair, prevent and reduce the risk of climate-related and other natural disasters.

Timor-Leste

It is understood that the likely effects of climate change are an increase in the frequency or intensity of extreme weather events, and that the most important step for the Red Cross is to strengthen the current disaster management programmes and to form a volunteer-based disaster response team. Capacity must be built through a greater number of volunteers and larger stockpiles. Health teams will require training for new volunteers and technical training on new technologies for all. Community health and livelihood programmes should be continued, strengthened and supported. Micro-insurance schemes should be strongly advocated to protect the needs of marginal farmers. Currently, the available scientific information is not very detailed and meteorological services are not yet set up to provide detailed weather predictions. Incorporating seasonal weather forecasts into the existing early-warning systems run by the disaster management team will allow better planning and preparation for disasters. Partnerships with other organizations dealing with climate change will become more important as a way to keep informed about ongoing research, updates to climate change predictions and learning from the experiences of other adaptation programmes.

Appendix Three: the IRI helpdesk

The following is a breakdown of the requests for advice and assistance that came in to the IFRC/IRI helpdesk from IFRC zones/regions and National Societies during 2010, with the actual number of individual requests for information in brackets.

- Regional or country-specific climate-change information (8)
- Climate variability, including El Niño (8)
- Forecast information (7)
- Climate and weather information for Haiti (6)[10]
- Interpretation or verification of forecasts from another source (6)
- Comparisons between forecast and aftercasts (4)
- Extreme-weather events (3)
- Links between climate and health (2)
- Map-room issues (2)
- Water crises. (1)

[ENDS]

[10] This led to the creation of the Haiti climate and weather risk website: http://iri.columbia.edu/haiti/.