Final Evaluation Report
A Safer Tomorrow-Disaster Preparedness in Schools Pakistan" in District Chitral, KPK, Pakistan

Submitted by
H&H Consulting

Evaluation Team
Aslam Aman
Ali Sher Khan

Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO), HOPE'87 and Hashoo Foundation. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way to reflect official opinion of ECHO, HOPE'87 and Hashoo Foundation.

Table of Contents

Annexures

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADA	Austrian Development Aid
AKDN	Aga Khan Development Network
AKHSP	Aga Khan Health Services
AKRSP	Aga Khan Rural Support Program
AKPBS	Aga Khan Planning and Building Services
CBDM	Community-Based Disaster Management
CDRMOs	Community Based Disaster Risk Management Organizations
CERT	Community Emergency Response Team
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DART	Disaster Assessment and Response Team
DCO	District Coordination Officer
DDMO	District Disaster Management Organization
DDMA	District Disaster Management Authority
DDRMOs	Disaster Risk Management Organizations
DRM	Disaster Risk Maps
DRR	District Risk Reduction
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
EDO	Executive District Officer
FGD	Focused Group Discussion
GLOF	Glacial Lake Outburst Floods
GPS	Government Primary School
HCVRA	Hazard Capacity and Vulnerability Risk Assessment
HEC	Higher Education Commission
HF	Hashoo Foundation
ICBRR	Integrated Community Based Risk Reduction
KAP	Knowledge Attitude and Practice
KP	Khyber Pakhtunkwa
LSO	Local Support Organizations
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
UN ISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
GLOF	Glacial Lake Outburst Flood
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
NDMA	National Disaster Management Authority
SART	Search and Rescue Team
SEP	School Evacuation Plans
SSP	School Safety Plans
STDP	Safer Tomorrow-Disaster Preparedness in Schools Pakistan
TMA	Tehsil Municipal Administration
TOF	Training of Facilitators
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UC	Union Council
VO	Village Organization
WASH	Water Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion
WO	Women Organization

Executive Summary

This document reports on the final evaluation of "A safer Tomorrow-Disaster Preparedness in Schools Pakistan" (STPD), a project implemented by HOPE'87 Pakistan in collaboration with Hashoo Foundation (HF), Regional Office Chitral as the local partner. The project, financed by European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) and co-financed by Austrian Development Aid (AID), was implemented between May 2011 to October 30, 2012 in three Union Councils (UCs) of Chitral, namely Shoghor, Ayoun and Chitral 1

Chitral is the northern most district of Khyber Pakhtunkwa (KP) province. Chitral is located in one of the highest risk zones in Pakistan for earthquakes.Owning to its topography Chitral is prone to many other hazards such as floods, flash floods, avalanches, landslides, mudslides, glacial lake outburst floods (GLOF) and rock falls. Over the past few years Chitral was affected by different harzards of varying intensity, including glacial lake outburst floods, river and flash floods, avalanches, landslides, mudslides, causing serious loss of lives, property and public and community infrastructure.

The three target UCs of the project--Chitral-1, Ayoun and Shoghore—are also prone to disasters. In the past, they were affected by floods, avalanches, landslides and earthquakes. Government schools in the target UCs also remain prone to disasters. Instead of serving as refugee during disasters schools themselves could potentially become the site of highest losses if disasters like earthquakes strike.

The evaluation is done to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project and draw conclusions and recommendations for future school-based disaster preparedness programs. Two consultants were chosen to conduct the evaluation, a team leader and a local team member. The consultants used both qualitative and quantitative methods for evaluation. Qualitative methods used for data collection included review of project documents, in-depth interviews, and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Quantitative questionnaires were used to collect data from 200 students and 14 teachers from 10 schools. Findings are organized around DAC Criteria for evaluation.

Key Findings

Relevance

- The school safety project, STDP, designed and implemented by HOPE'87 and HF was a highly relevant intervention given the fact that Pakistan is one the most disaster prone countries in the world. District Chitral ranks among the highest risk prone areas in Pakistan and remains prone to multiple hazards such as earthquakes, floods, flash floods, landslides and rock falls.

- The specific objective of the project "enhanced awareness raising and capacities building in Disaster Preparedness in schools in Pakistan" is equally relevant, as the issue of safe schools was never taken seriously in Pakistan, as evidenced the fact that a large number of schools were seriously affected by the 2005 earthquake, causing heavy loss of lives and disruption in education.

- Two result areas identified for the project, one focusing on non-structural measures and other on structural measures were relevant and consistent with the specific objective of the project. The results were mutually reinforcing as well.

- The project was also consistent with European Commission's policy priorities for humanitarian assistance, HOPE87's country strategy for Pakistan, Chitral Development Strategy and objectives of District Disaster Management Authorities (DDMA), Chitral. The project also drew on HOPE'87s international and Pakistan-specific experience, particularly experience of implementing a school safety project in Gilgit-Baltistan.

- The project was also in line with the local needs and priorities as reflected in Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) survey conducted by HOPE'87 and HF in 2010. The survey revealed serious vulnerabilities and lack of capacities in Chitral.

Efficiency

- In terms of time project was generally efficient. The project did encounter some delays because of external challenges related to weather conditions and security situation, including killing of more than 40 security personnel in an attack by militants on a security check-post, the worst security incident in Chitral for past many years.

- The total direct cost per beneficiary for Result 1 is EURO 10.60 and EURO 28.15 for Result 2, indicating that the project was cost efficient. More sophisticated economic models may reveal high Internal Rate of Return (IRR) if benefits such as lives saved and reduction in potential damages to physical infrastructure are factored in.

- Audit reports reviewed by the consultant show evidence of appropriate utilization of financial resources as per the financial guidelines provided by ECHO.

Effectiveness

- The project has effectively contributed to achievement of its principle objectives i.e. to promote a culture of safety and resilience in Chitral, in general, and three target UCs, in particular. However, it must be acknowledged that changing a culture is essentially a slow process and need continuous efforts in the right direction.

- Quantitative data as well as qualitative data collected by consultants indicate that the project successfully achieved the specific objective. The sample survey questionnaires administered to students and teachers revealed that more than 90% of trained teachers and students participated in planning exercises for developing School Safety Plans (SSP) and were aware about different hazards and measures to address or mitigate risks.

- The ICBRR trainings were effective in enhancing awareness regarding school safety among HF volunteers, government officials and staff of STDP project. The trainings helped the project staff and volunteers to understand the project better and implement the project activities effectively.

- A comparison of pre-KAP survey and post-KAP survey shows that awareness among general community members has increased during the project period. Community members who thought that risk of disasters could be mitigated has increased from 52.6% to 79.1% during the project period and those who believed that they share the responsibility for reducing risk and responding to disasters has increased from only 7.7% before the project to 28.4% at the end of the project.

- There is evidence that some students used newly acquired knowledge and took precautionary measures to avoid the risk of damages in a disaster. Comparison of KAP survey shows that percentage of students who had reported taking precautionary measures increased from 43.3 percent to 76.1 percent.

- The project successfully facilitated the 20 target schools to develop well-documented School Safety Plans (SSP), including Disaster Risk Maps (DRM), DRR School Action Plans and School Evacuation Plan (SEP) through intensive exercises. 98.5 percent students confirmed that they understood the plans and said that it would be useful in case of any disaster.

- The project team was very effective in creating opportunities to use alternative media to promote messages regarding disaster risk reduction and school safety e.g. the STDP project staff participated in Qaqlasht Festival in 2012 and District Football Championship.

- One of the most significant successes of STDP project is introducing DRR curriculum in 20 target schools. 93.5 percent of the students interviewed for the survey confirmed that they participated in DRR related classes. Students interviewed for the evaluation also said they were quite satisfied with DRR curriculum being taught by the teachers.

- The project successfully achieved the Result 2 by identifying appropriate "safe places" in the project areas and improving the quality of physical facilities through retrofitting. The retrofitting activities in "safe places" were complemented by minor DRR measures, which included provision of missing WASH facilities, changing the direction of classroom doors and provision of emergency kit.

- 96 percent students knew about safe places in their schools and 94 percent students confirmed that they had participated in identification of safe places. The post-KAP survey noted an increase of 7.3 percent (from 78 percent to 85.3 percent) in awareness among the general community members about the safe places.

- DRR Kits provided by the project are appreciated, but access to DRR Kits was pointed out to be an issue that might need to be resolved. Since DRR Kits are kept in schools, kits are not easily accessible to general community members.

- The project was successful in ensuring participation of 30 percent women in trainings despite the fact that TOF and HCVRA trainings had to be shifted to Islamabad.

- The project team effectively documented the project activities. Progress reports, however, needed some improvement. The progress reports were effective in documenting the events but fell short in documenting outcomes.

- The project was effective in responding to emerging community needs and adjusting the project strategy and activities accordingly.

- The project team developed excellent relationship with district administration, which contributed to increase awareness about DRR among government officials so much so that DCO issued a notification asking C&W department and Tehsil Municipal Administration (TMA) to replicate minor DRR activities in government buildings in Chitral. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed with provincial government was another success of the project in building relations with the government agencies.

- The project team also held meetings and developed linkages with the important NGOs including Focus Humanitarian Agency and the Aga Khan Education Services (AKESP)

- Coordination with the stakeholders at Islamabad level was notably effective, as evidenced by formation of Higher Education Commission-DRR (HEC-DRR) Working Group and successful execution of national DRR workshop. HOPE'87 is also one of the pioneering members of the National DRR forum that was formed in September 2011. Although formation of DRR forum was not an output directly related to the project, but in-house capacities built through participation in the project facilitated this process.

<u>Sustainability</u>

- The retrofitting carried out by STDP project was of high quality and contributed to make the school buildings more resilient and durable.

- Minor DRR measures such as provision of WASH facilities in "safe places" and changing the direction of doors are likely to be sustainable. The increased awareness regarding DRR measures was reflected in the directive issued by the DCO, directing C&W and TMA to replicate minor DRR measures in the construction of government buildings.

- DRR curriculum was still being used in the schools after the end of the project, but it remains to be seen whether this practice would continue in future. It is difficult to expect, without a certain measure of doubt, that the curriculum would continue be taught in the schools, because there won't be any institutional incentives for teachers to continue.
- The project has developed a critical mass of people who are more aware and skilled in implementing DRR projects, in general, and school safety projects, in particular. This critical mass exists in the form of trained staff of HF regional office Chitral, HF volunteers, CBDRMOs members, teachers trained as facilitators and government officials trained by the project.

- Establishment of 20 Community Based Disaster Management Organizations (CBRMOs) was an important step towards institutionalizing community support for school safety.

- Formation of Higher Education Commission-DRR (HEC-DRR) Working Group will contribute to institutionalization of DRR at higher education level, potentially leading to production of high quality applied and basic research on DRR in Pakistan.

Impact

- The project has increased awareness about DRR and School safety in a cross section of society, particularly in target UCs, but also in Chitral in General.

- A more visible impact of the project is a directive issued by the DCO Chitral to C&W department and Tehsil Municipal Administration (TMA) directing them to replicate minor DRR measures in construction of government buildings in future.

- Potential knock-on effect of retroffting is that individual households who have seen schools being improved through retrofitting may realize that they can improve their houses through retrofitting. They may also be more mindful about safety elements while constructing their own house.

Recommendations

- The project has successfully showcased the importance and efficacy of integrated school safety programmes. The project can build on the success of the project in two ways: 1) it can replicate the project in others parts of Chitral or other parts of Pakistan, 3) HOPE87 can also use the evidence to advocate for replication of the programme.

- Trainings offered by the project to HF, teachers, government officials were found to be effective, but participants would need refresher trainings from time to time. The refresher training would need to be institutionalized, possibly be including DRR in the curriculum of teacher training institutes. HOPE87 can use the evidence from the project advocate for inclusion of DRR in curriculum of teacher training institutes.

- Linking CBDRMOs and DDMROs with DDMA is a good initiative provided that CBDRMOs and DDMROs become sustainable. Engaging more deeply rooted CBOs or LSOs in DRR activities and engaging them with DDMA was more likely to be sustainable, although it is

recognized that CBO and LSO members are also part CBDRMOs. In future, it would be advisable for HOPE87 to engage with and mainstream DRR in current institutional structures.

- It would be advisable to keep DRR Kit outside school, possibly in a shop in the local market, ideally a shop whose owner lives close to the shop, as shops remain open from dawn to dusk. This would make DRR Kits more accessible to the community. It would also counter an impression of DRR Kit only being associated with the target schools.

- HF volunteer found monitoring project activities in schools challenging because, according to them, they did not formally represent HF. It would be more effective if HF had drawn volunteers from Community Based Organizations or LSOs.

- Invovling communities in structural measures achieved two important results: 1) increased ownership of schools (and check dam in Shogor) among community members, 2) increased awareness and understanding about risks and ways to reduce risks through structural measures. Therefore, it is highly recommended that community participation should be made integral part of the structural measures in fturue projects.

- Involving PTAs was an important step in building bottom-up support for school safety and institutionalizing DRR in schools. HOPE'87 should build on this success and advocate for involvement of PTAs in promoting school-safety. Capacities of PTAs to do community-based advocacy can also be ehanced through trainings on advocacy.

Acknowledgment
We would like to express my gratitude to all those who facilitated the end of project evaluation, Shoaib Haider, Ahmed Abbas, Jannat Durrani and Sultan Mahmoud. We are also grateful to project staff of HF and all the volunteers who administered the household survey.

Last but not least, I am thankful to all the community members (men and women) for their generosity in sharing information through participation in the group discussion, individual interviews, and informal discussions. Without their cooperation and help this exercise would not be as meaningful as it is now.

Aslam Aman
Consultant

1. Introduction

This document reports on the final evaluation of "A safer Tomorrow-Disaster Preparedness in Schools Pakistan" (S(ECHO/DIP/BUD/2011/93015), a project funded by European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) and co-financed by Austrian Development Aid (ADA). The project was implemented by HOPE87 Pakistan in collaboration with Hashoo Foundation (HF), Regional Office Chitral as the local partner from May 2011 to October 30, 2012 in three Union Councils (UCs) namely Shoghor, Ayoun and Chitral 1.

1.1. Geographic Context

Chitral is the northern most district of Khyber Pakhtunkwa (KP) province. It borders with Afghanistan, Gilgit-Baltistan and district Dir. It ranks among the highest regions of the world, ranging from 1,094 meters at Arandu to 7,726 meters at Tirichmir. It is home to over 40 peaks of more than 6,100 meters in height. With total geographic area of 14,850 square kilometres, it is the largest district of KP province in terms of territory. The total estimated population of Chitral is 500,000, which is the lowest of any districts in KP province. About 90 percent population of Chitral lives in 523 small villages with populations ranging between 20 to 3573 persons, scattered across different valleys separated by large mountains. Administratively, district of Chitral is divided into two Tehsils-- Mastuj and Chitral -- having 24 Union Councils. The project area is located in Tehsil Chitral.

Chitral is located in one of the highest risk zones of Pakistan for earthquakes. Owning to its topography Chitral is prone to many other hazards such as floods, flash floods, avalanches, landslides, mudslides, and glacial lake outburst floods (GLOF). Over the past few years Chitral was affected by different hazards of varying intensity, including glacial lake outburst floods, river and flash floods, avalanches, landslides, mudslides, causing serious loss of lives, property public and community infrastructure1.

The three target UCs of the project--Chitral-1, Ayoun and Shoghor—are also prone to disasters. In the past, they were affected by floods, avalanches,land sliding and earthquakes. For example, UC Chitral-1 and Ayoun suffered heavy losses of lives and infrastructure as a result of an earthquake in 1991: in Ayun five people were killed, 18 were injured and 260 houses were completely or partially damaged. In UC Chitral-1 10 people were killed in the earthquake in 1991 and in the floods of June 2010 thirteen people lost their lives and 50 houses were washed away. Union Council Shoghor has been consistently hit by flooding in Murdan Gol, Arkari Gol, Aviret Gol and Ozhor River. According to estimates24 houses were washed away and 73 partially damaged rendering members of 73 households as IDPs as a result of the floods of 2010.[2]

Government schools in the target UCs also remain prone to disasters. Instead of serving as refuge during disasters schools themselves could potentially become the site of highest losses if disasters like earthquakes or floods strike. Many schools buildings have cracks in the walls and need serious repair and maintenance. For example the building of Government Primary School (GPS) Momi has been cracked due to abrupt jolts of an earthquake. Similarly the GPS Safid Arakari, Sewaht, Pachali, Ruji, and Middle school Mogh and High school for girls Shoghor have been affected by the floods 2010 and are highly vulnerable to damage in floods.

1.2. The project

The principle objective of the project, Safer Tomorrow- Disaster Preparedness (STDP), was to promote a culture of safety and disaster resilience in Pakistan. The entry point selected to achieve the principle objective was promotion of school safety through project implementation in 20 schools in the target UCs of district Chitral.

---

[1] *District Disaster Management Plan developed by FOCUS Humanitarian Assistance for a comprehensive list)*

[2] *The data is drawn from the project proposal and need assessment report prepared by HOPE'87 which cited Focus Humanitarian as a source for the information.*

The project activities can be divided into two broad categories: 1) structural measures and 2) non-structural measures. These broad categories roughly corresponded with two result areas identified for the project. The result 1 was to be achieved through non-structural measures. Result 2 was to be achieved largely through structural measures, with some elements of non-structural measures as well.

The non-structural measures related to Result 1, in turn, can be sub-divided into two categories: 1) school-based non-structural activities to increase capacities of schools, 2) non-structure activities to create an enabling environment for school safety. The capacities of schools was enhanced by training teachers, introducing DRR curriculum, facilitating development of school safety plans, provision of DRR kit and IEC material, and conducting evacuation drills.

To create an enabling environment and building support for school safety activities the project trained relevant government officials (Education Department and Civil Defence Department) and held regular coordination meetings with District Coordination Officer (DCO) and key NGOs operating in Chitral including Focus Humanitarian, the Aga Khan Health Services (AKHS) and the Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP). HOPE87 and HF also signed an MOU[3] with Provincial Secretary of Education to include Disaster Risk Reduction in the school curriculum. In the same vain, community support for the school safety activities was built by undertaking rigorous social mobilization activities and developing Community Based Disaster Risk Management Organizations (CDRMOs) and District Disaster Risk Management Organizations (DDRMOs) and linking these with District Disaster Management Authority (DDMA).Area opening meetings was another mechanism through which not only activities of project were facilitated but also a wider community was exposed to DRR messages.

To spread the messages related to disaster risk reduction and school safety to wider audience and create a link between school-based structural and non-structural activities and measures for creating an enabling environment the project used socialization events and "alternative media" campaigns.
The structural measures (or activities related to Result 2) included retrofitting activities in two schools identified as safe places, construction of check dam in Murdan village, and minor DRR measures, including changing the direction of the doors in the schools open and provision of wash facilities.

1.3. Objective of the Evaluation

Objectives of the evaluation were:

- Assess relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, immediate impact and sustainability of the project
- Identify and document lessons learned for future programming
- Provide practical recommendations for future school-based disaster preparedness programs

1.4. Methodology

The consultants used mixed-methods approach to carry out this study. Qualitative methods used for data collection included review of project documents, in-depth interviews, and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Quantitative questionnaires were used to collect data from a sample of students and a sample of teachers.

The evaluation began with an inception meeting with senior management of HOPE'87 in Islamabad. The lead consultant interviewed the head of HOPE'87 and Project Manager at HOPE87's office in Islamabad. It was followed by desk review of key project documents and development of survey questionnaires and semi-structured interview guides for interviews with key informants. Relevant project documents provided by HOPE'87 and HF were reviewed. The documents included single form application, progress reports, Gantt Chart, baseline and end-line survey reports, and various activity reports.

[3] *Term MOU is interchangeably used with agreement in the project documents.*

In-depth interviews were carried out with Project Manager and other staff members and staff members of coordinating partners such as FOCUS Humanitarian Assistance. FGDs and informal discussions were carried out with a cross-section of the project beneficiaries, including HF volunteers, LSO members, village and women organisations and school heads, and teachers.

For quantitative survey 200 students and 20 teachers (5 female and 15 male) from 10 schools (50% of the total target schools) were sampled. The schools were chosen from all three target UCs and included both girls and boys schools.

The quantitative data was entered and analysed in MS excel. Qualitative data collected through in-depth interviews, FGDS, and informal discussions with the different stakeholders was analysed using DAC criteria as a broad framework. Within the broad framework, specific findings emerging from the data were compared, verified and contrasted to delineate key findings.

1.5. Limitations

- Since the project had already ended project staff members, except those who work with HF regional office, were not available for interviews. It was also not possible directly observe the project activities.

- Weather conditions and a local festival in Kalash valley also made it difficult to contact people for interviews and discussions, especially in Rambor.

2. Findings

Findings of the evaluation are organized around DAC Criteria for evaluation. In addition to DAC Criteria for the evaluation the report will also draw conclusions and provide recommendations for future programming,

2.1. Relevance

The school safety project, STDP, designed and implemented by HOPE'87 and HF was a highly relevant intervention on several counts. The overall objective of the project "[to promote] a culture of safety and resilience" still remains relevant given that Pakistan is one the most disaster prone countries in the world, as evidenced by the history of disasters over past 10 years. District Chitral itself, where the project was implemented, is one of the highest risk prone areas in Pakistan. It is prone to multiple hazards such as earthquakes, floods, flash floods, landslides, and rock falls.

The specific objective of the project "enhanced awareness raising and capacities building in Disaster Preparedness in schools in Pakistan" is equally relevant, as the issue of safe schools was never taken seriously in Pakistan.[4] This explains why school buildings were seriously affected by the 2005 earthquake, causing heavy loss of lives and disruption in education. School safety remains a "matter of choice rather than a mandatory requirement" despite the fact that promoting the culture of safety in school can also contribute to implementation of Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA).[5] In this context implementing a school safety project in one of the highest risk-prone areas in Pakistan was highly relevant both as ways to address some of the existing school safety needs and, perhaps more importantly, to showcase a successful school safety model for replication.

[4] *Remarks were expressed by a representative of UNESCO at workshop for School Safety Action Plan for Sindh organized by NDMA in Karachi. http://www.safe-schools-hospitals.net/en/NewsandEvents/ViewNewsandEvents/tabid/91/ArticleId/181/Efforts-for-safe-school-action-plan-in-Pakistan.aspx*

[5] *Working paper: culture of safety in schools mandatory or by choice. Source(s): ActionAid - Bangladesh; Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC). Publication date: 201*

Two result areas identified for the project, one focusing on non-structural measures and other on structural measures were relevant and consistent with the specific objective of the project. Similarly, outputs and activities of the project, for example, developing school safety plans, retrofitting, minor DRR measures, introduction of DRR curriculum in schools, social mobilization activities, and coordination with key stakeholders were consistent with results and specific objective of the project and intended impact and effects of the project. However, results and indicators could have been phrased better to reflect outcomes as well.

The project is also consistent with European Commission's policy priorities for humanitarian assistance which stress the importance of making resilience an integral element of humanitarian and development interventions in fragile countries and calls for continued focus on disaster risk reduction and improved local capacities and development of national structures in disaster prone countries.[6] Keeping in view the disaster prone nature of Pakistan, in 2012 European Commission had placed disaster preparedness and risk reduction high on the agenda together with potential response to natural disasters.[7]

The project was consistent with Chitral Development Strategy, that aims to achieve sustainable development by reducing people's vulnerability and risks, and also in line with the objectives of District Disaster Management Authorities (DDMA), Chitral.[8]The project is relevant and consistent with HOPE'87s country strategy and draws on HOPE'87s international experience and Pakistan-specific experience, particularly experience of implementing a school safety project in Gilgit-Baltistan. In Giligit-Balistan, HOPE'87 with the collaboration of the Aga Khan Planning and Building Services (AKPBS) implemented a school safety project and retrofitted a number of schools buildings owned by the Aga Khan Education Services (AKES).

The project is also in line with the local needs and priorities as reflected in Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) survey conducted by HOPE'87 and HF in 2010. The survey based on a large sample (90 villages and 300 in-depth interviews with key informants) revealed serious vulnerabilities and limited capacities of communities with respect to school safety. The survey found that 350 out of 912 schools in Chitral, with an estimated student population of 25,000, were at the risk of floods and other natural hazards. The assessment also found that an estimated 5000 parents and 2000 teachers associated these schools were not well informed about disaster risks their children face and how these risks can possibly be avoided or mitigated. The School Management Committees (SMCs) were not well equipped, conceptually as well technically, to carry out any disaster risk reduction activities. The assessment also found that many schools buildings were not resilient to disasters and needed serious structural changes to reduce risks.

The selection of the three UCs and 20 schools was based on the need assessment and understanding of their vulnerability to various disasters. However, there was an additional consideration that influenced the choice of UCs that makes the choice of UCs relevant. Of the three target UCs two were in *Sunni* majority areas where communities, presumably influenced by conservative elements in the communities, had resisted the entry of agencies associated with the Aga Khan Development Network (AKDN), including Focus Humanitarian Agency, the only humanitarian agency with a permanent presence in Chitral.

One of the UCs, Shogor, however, is located in traditional target areas of Focus Humanitarian Agency. According to HOPE'87 team, besides being highly vulnerable Shogor was included because they were not sure how the communities in Ayoun and Chitral 1, known for oppositions to NGOs, would react. Shogor in a sense was relevant and also a safer option. But in the end, successful entry strategy symbolized by "area opening meetings," careful planning and support from district

[6] *Commission Staff Working Paper: Humanitarian Aid Strategy for 2012. European Commission. 21 November 2011.* *http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/strategy/strategy_2012_en.pdf*
[7] *ibid*
[8] *Chitral Sustainable Development Strategy*

administration and Secretary of Education in KP, the project activities were successfully implemented in all three UCs.

2.2. Efficiency

Given the short duration of the project and challenging context targets were ambitious. However, the project exceeded many of its targets. The table below shows achievements of the project against the targets.

Activities	Targets	Achievement
ICBDRR trainings	1	2
Training of Facilitators	4	4
HCVRA Training	2	2
Mega Socialization Events	4	4
School Safety Training Sessions	100	116
Action Days	2	2
Retrofitting	3	3
Minor DRR measures in schools	20	19*

**The reason why minor DRR measures on one of the schools could not be completed was that GMS Rumbore in Rumbor valley (UC Ayun) was taken over by the Pak Army in November after the August 2011 security incident in Chitral to use it as a ammunition depot. Since students continued classes in the open field, HOPE'87 continued with the soft activities with the school children and teachers.*

In terms of time project was generally efficient. The project did encounter some delays but mostly because of external challenges related to security and weather conditions. During winter season Chitral not only remains cut off from rest of Pakistan, but access between different valleys within Chitral also becomes difficult, which hampered construction and distribution related activities. The unforeseen security incident in 2011 in which militants attacked a security check post on Pak-Afghan border and killed more than 40 security personnel was beyond anyone's reckoning and it was by far the worst security incident in Chitral for past many years. The incident was followed by enforcement of Article 144 in Chitral that barred gathering of five or more people.

All the project activities, with the exception of minor DRR measures and major DRR activities (retrofitting of safe places) were completed before the initially planned closing of the project on October 31, 2012. Minor DRR measures in 16 out of 20 target schools were completed before October 31, 2012. Most of the work related to retrofitting in community safe places was completed by October 2012, except some electrical wiring related work and some finishing touches to other retrofitting related work. These activities were subsequently completed under the close watch of HF's regional office. All the structural DRR measures were completed in the extended time duration of month that is 30th November 2012.

The security incident involving killing of security personnel forced the project team to shift the TOF and HCVRA trainings to Islamabad. Shifting trainings to Islamabad presented additional challenges: Some women candidates who had agreed to participate in the trainings in Chitral were not ready to

travel to Islamabad partly because they were concerned that their absence would compromise their daily household chores (reproductive role[9]) and partly because they did not have permission from their families to travel outside Chitral. The second challenge was related to selection of four teachers from each school for the trainings. Head teachers of the schools were not ready to spare four teachers for the trainings at one time for they feared that if they let four teachers from their school to Islamabad, they wouldn't be able to complete required syllabus.

The project team made concerted efforts to address these issues. The project mobilized communities and identified new candidates as a replacement for those who were not ready to travel to Islamabad. Ensuring presence of 30% women participants was particularly very challenging. But project team did manage to ensure the participation of more than 30% women. The issue of participation of four teachers from each school was resolved in consultation with EDO by agreeing to have only two teachers from one school, at one time, in the TOF.

The total cost per beneficiary is for the project is EURO 19.02, indicating the project was cost efficient. More sophisticated economic models may need to be applied to judge the value of the project in terms of live saved.[10]

Audit reports reviewed by the consultant show evidence of appropriate utilization of financial resources as per the financial guidelines provided by ECHO.

2.3. Effectiveness

The project has effectively contributed to achievement of its principle objectives i.e. to promote a culture of safety and resilience in Chitral, in general, and three target UCs, in particular. However, it must be acknowledged that changing a culture is essentially a slow process and need continuous efforts in the right direction. The project has taken an important first step in Chitral in promoting school safety, particularly in Ayoun and Chitral 1, where Focus Humanitarian, with a strong history of implementing Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM), did not have meaningful ingress.

The assertion that the project has successfully contributed to promote the culture of safety and resilience is based on assessment of achievement with respect to specific objective and two associated results. The achievement of principle objectives and the two results are analysed below:

Specific objective

"Enhanced awareness raising and capacities building in Disaster Preparedness in schools in Pakistan"

Associated indicators:

- In approximately 20 schools 600 school children, 80 teachers and additionally 15 education department officials are trained and aware of and 20,933 community members are aware of DP/DRR in Chitral
- 60% knowledge increase in DP/DRR among the beneficiaries.

Quantitative data as well as qualitative data collected by consultants indicate that the project successfully achieved the specific objective. In fact, the specific objective as well as indicators

9 According to Caroline Moser's framework women perform two important roles: 1) reproductive role, and 2) productive role. Reproductive role entails carrying out activities like fetching water, fuel wood, prepare food, childcare, cleaning and repairing, and daily purchases from market.

10 Cost per beneficiary is obtained by dividing total expenditure EURO 474,138 by 24933 (4000+ 20933 or sum of beneficiaries for result 1 and result2)

associated with the specific objective are rather narrowly framed and do not reflect full extent of project's achievements. For example, it does not reflect structural measures.

The sample survey questionnaires administered to students and teachers included a number of questions to assess the awareness level of students and teachers. For example, 96 percent of students interviewed for the evaluation said they knew about the safe places in their schools and 91.5 percent students knew about the school safety plan. 94.5 percent students said, not only they knew about the school safety plan but they had participated in identification of safe places in their schools, indicating effectiveness of the process through which safe place were identified. Similarly, the students were also able to identify important hazards faced by their community. 98.5 percent of the students were able to identify different hazards they face e.g. earthquake, floods, landslides, thunderbolts and rock falls.

All the teachers who responded to quantitative survey said that they were aware of school safety plans developed with the assistance of project team. Similarly, 100 percent of teachers interviewed for the survey also said that in their opinion the project was successful in reducing the vulnerability of the schools and children.

Result 1:

"School students, school management committees, teachers, education department staff, two regional offices of Hashoo Foundation, volunteers and community members of the target schools understand the importance of DRR/DP."

Associated Indicators for Result 1

- Integrated Community Based Risk Reduction (ICBRR) training for 20 HF Volunteers (30% female), 15 education department staff and 15 project staff.
- DRR(school safety) training of 80 facilitators (school teachers) and 20 HF Volunteers.
- Disaster risk map and DRR school action plans available for each of the 20 schools
- Contingency / evacuation plan available for each school
- Emergency mock drills at each school run every year
- 4 socialization events and 2 action days at each schools enhances DRR knowledge among the communities
- DRR education as extra-curricular activity practiced at 20 schools

The ICBRR trainings were effective in enhancing awareness of HF volunteers, government officials and staff of STDP project about disaster risk reduction and school safety. The trainings helped the project staff and volunteers to understand the project better and implement the project activities effectively. Training of Facilitators (TOF) helped the teachers to effectively implement DRR curriculum in respective schools. HVCRA trainings increased the capacities of HF staff to facilitate development of school safety plans and implement project activities effectively. The training of District Education Department contributed to develop support for the project activities within District Education Department. Talking about the effectiveness of the trainings provided by the STDP project, Alla Uddin, who participated in an FGD in UC Ayoun shared the following thoughts:

> *"The training programs were highly effective. We were provided with the opportunities to question the training manuals regarding its relevance to local environment. For example, in case of an earthquake in local context it is not safe to hide under tables, because the mud roofs are heavy. Therefore, it is much safer to run outside in case of an earthquake because there are no narrow streets and multi-storey buildings which would make running away difficult ".*

The consultant noted a significant increase in awareness among community members about disaster risks and ways to reduce risks. A comparison of pre-KAP survey and post-KAP survey shows that awareness among general community members has increased during the project period. For example, the percentage of community members who thought that disaster risks could be mitigated has

increased from 52.6% to 79.1% during the project period. Similarly, percentage of community members who believed that they share the responsibility for reducing risks and responding to disasters has increased from only 7.7% before the disasters to 28.4% by the end of the project. Since no other intervention was implemented in the target UCs during the project period, increase in awareness can be attributed entirely to the project.

The project activities that contributed to increased awareness among general community members were area-opening meetings, continuous social mobilization activities through formal and informal community meetings, mega social mobilization events, Action Days/mock drills and alternative media events. Communities and students took particular interest in mock drills. A woman social mobilizer representing CIAD, an LSO, who was interviewed for the evaluation said, "children and their parents as well as education department staff took great interest in mock drills, as they got an opportunity to see demonstration of measures to respond to risks in everyday lives." The quantitative survey of students for the evaluation found that 97 percent of the students attended mock drills.

Interactions of trained teachers and students with their families and peers were other sources that served to increase awareness among general public. This validated one of the important assumptions underlying the project that children would be an excellent conduit to increase awareness among their parents and their peers. When students were asked whether they shared what they learned in their schools with their family members and friends, more than 99 percent said they shared information with their friends and equal percentage of students, 99 percent, said they shared information with their family members. 98.5 percent students mentioned that their family members took interest in disaster risk reduction related activities in their school.

There is evidence that some students used newly acquired knowledge and took precautionary measures. Comparison of KAP survey shows that percentage of students who had reported taking precautionary measures increased from 43.3 percent to 76.1 percent. However, it did not specify the kind of precautionary measures they took.

The project successfully facilitated the 20 target schools to develop well-documented School Safety Plans (SSP), including Disaster Risk Maps (DRM), DRR School Action Plans, and School Evacuation Plan (SEP). The SSP in each school was developed through an intensive four day planning exercise. The consultant found well-documented evidence of different components of SSP. In all the schools visited by consultant for evaluation SSP manuals were available in hard copy form. The schools also had School Evacuation Plans (SEP) displayed on the walls showing the direction of 'exit' routes. The emergency School Evacuation Plans made for the targeted 20 schools were pretested through mock drills. It was also observed that the target schools had Disaster Risk Maps for the whole village in which school is located.

The efficacy of four day exercise for developing SSP is confirmed by the quantitative survey which found 91.5 percent of the students knew that there was a safety plan for their school in place, and of those who knew about the plan 98.5 percent confirmed that they understood the plan and said that it would be useful in case of any disaster. Similarly, 96 percent of students confirmed that they participated in the identification of safe places in the school. Safe places were identified and developed under result 2, but it was directly linked to school safety plans.

The project team was very effective in creating opportunities to use alternative media to promote messages regarding disaster risk reduction and school safety. The STDP project staff participated in Qaqlasht Festival in 2012, a cultural event of relatively recent origin that features traditional music, singing, dance and games. The project team used banners and megaphone announcements to spread messages regarding disaster risk reduction and school safety. Since such events are attended by a large number of people from across Chitral, it provided an excellent opportunity to disseminate DRR related messages and helped to create goodwill for ECHO, HOPE'87 and HF. The project also used the District Football Championship organized from 5-19 September 2012 as an opportunity to disseminate information about DP/DRR among the community members. Mr Ghulam Dastagir, Chief

Secretary, Government of KP participated in the concluding ceremony of football tournament as the chief guest, which provided an opportunity to the project team to inform the Chief Secretary about the project, which has the potential of influencing government policy and actions. STDP project also supported and participated in World Literacy Day celebrated on September 11, 2012 in GCMS Chitral Town and used the opportunity to highlight key messages about school safety and DRR.

One of the most significant successes of STDP project is introducing DRR curriculum in 20 target schools. During field visits to the some of the schools for the purpose of evaluation it was observed that DRR was included in the official timetable of the schools. 93.5 percent of the students interviewed for the survey confirmed that they participated in DRR related classes and said, God forbid, if a disaster struck their village they can apply their knowledge to reduce the negative impact. For example, they said they know where to go in case if an earthquake hits when they are in their schools.

Students interviewed for the evaluation also said they were quite satisfied with DRR curriculum being taught by the teachers. 92.5 percent of the students who responded to quantitative survey said they were satisfied with the trainings or instruction regarding disasters in their school.

Teachers also viewed introduction of DRR curriculum in their school as an important contribution of the project and said to a great extent sustainability of outcomes depended on incorporation of DRR lessons as part of regular classes. One of the teachers from GMS Rombor, UC Ayun, who participated in an FGD conducted for evaluation, reflecting on the DRR curriculum said, *"students take keen interest in DRR classes because they can relate to what is being taught quite easily as it touches their everyday lives. It gives them knowledge and skill to cope with real life challenges."* The Executive District Officer (EDO) Education, members of SMCs and parents are also very appreciative of intervention, particularly introduction of curriculum, and expressed hope that in the long-run this would create positive impacts regarding disaster management initiatives within the selected Union Councils.

The project has increased awareness among the target communities about importance of engaging with government and other institutions mandated to address the effects of disasters. There was very little knowledge about presence of Government District Disaster Management Authority (DDMA) in the target areas. It appears that as a result of the project activities there is greater awareness about presence of DDMA and its role. Earlier many people thought it was NGOs who identified "disaster risks and red zones."

Result 2
Community safe places are enhanced and DRR measures to reduce vulnerability are carried out in 20 schools.

Associated indicators
- 3 communities safe places are available for about 4,000 persons
- Non- structural DRR measures in 20 schools.

The project successfully achieved the Result 2 by identifying appropriate "safe places" in the project areas and improving the quality of physical facilities through retrofitting. The retrofitting activities in "safe places" were complemented by minor DRR measures, which included provision of missing WASH facilities, changing the direction of classroom doors and provision of emergency kit. Emergency kits included First Aid kit, fire extinguisher, and Search and Rescue Kit. Retrofitting activities were further complemented by non-structural measures such as preparation of layout of schools and identification of safe exit routes and installation of exit signs at appropriate locations.

The major retrofitting activities were carried out in "safe places" only; the minor DRR measures and non-structural measures were carried out across 20 beneficiary schools.

Talking about the safe places the project had intended to identify and improve, it is important not to miss a modification project team introduced in response to community demand. In Ayoun and Chitral community "safe places" were implemented as intended i.e. by identifying a school building and improving the resilience of buildings through retrofitting activities so that these buildings could serve as transit/first shelter in case of an emergency for the most vulnerable people (children under 5 years, women, young girls, elderly). Since it turned out that target schools in Ayoun and Chitral 1 did not have WASH facilities, the project also provided WASH facilities. In GHS Ayun the project rehabilitated dysfunctional toilets. In Government Middle School Murdan the project rehabilitated toilets, repaired and restored supply of piped water.

In Shogor , however, the community demanded construction of a check dam, instead of retrofitting of school, to protect the village from floods which had ravaged the village on number of occasions in the past. For example, in 1967 following heavy rains floods washed away 6 houses, a number of animals and standing crops. The community members argued that the construction of check dam would prevent the flood from ravaging the village and save the school as well. The project team found the argument sound and supported the construction of check dam. A notable from the village interviewed for the evaluation shared the following thoughts:

> *"For a long time we have been requesting the government and non-government organisations to save us from floods. We move to safer places when it rains in summer especially whenit rains at night. We are thankful to Hashoo Foundation for constructing check dam. We further hope that they will help us in making the check dam stronger in future".*

The project team helped to develop safe places and took steps to increase awareness about safe places. The sample survey for the evaluation found that 96 percent students knew about safe places in their schools and 94 percent confirmed that they had participated in identification of safe places (see tables No. 7, 8, 9, Annex 1). The post-KAP survey noted an increase of 7.3 percent (from 78 percent to 85.3 percent) in awareness among the general community members about the safe places. As teacher in GGMS Murdan, Shoghor talking about safe places remarked *"We already knew which place is safer in case of emergency but did not have a clear understanding about such an organised response which we learnt about and observed during mock drills".* Referring to retrofitting of three big classrooms, the head teacher in GHHS Ayoun said: "*living in dilapidated buildings students and teachers always harboured fears of becoming victims of a natural disaster, especially an earthquake. After the retrofitting this building has become the stronger part of the school."* He said knowing what retrofitting can do he would like to use the annual repair fund for retrofitting purposes so that the school becomes a safer place for children.

It is important to recognize that the safe places developed under result 2 and activities carried out under the rubric of Result 1 were mutually reinforcing. For example, ICBDRR, TOF, teaching of DRR curriculum in the schools provided a larger context to retrofitting activities and development of safe places.

The school staff members appreciated the value of DRR kits provided by the project to each participant school. However, access to DRR kits was pointed out to be an issue that might be need resolved for the DRR kit to be effective. Head teachers and teachers responsible for maintaining DRR Kits generally lock the kit to avoid the risk of items being stolen or being misplaced. Some community members contend that if the kit is not easily accessible what is the point of having the DRR Kit. The dilemma related to management of DRR Kit is highlighted by the following incident narrated by a teacher in Chitral 1:

> "*One day in my absence a project staff member visited the school. He was upset to see the safety kit box locked. If I were around I would have handed over the keys to him, but I cannot leave the box open to children and risk the items being misplaced*

or stolen. If something happens during school hourswhich may require use of items in DRR kit, we use issue those items to students and then return these items tokits."

The project team members on the other hand wanted the kit to be available and accessible round the clock to meet any emergency. This dilemma was yet to be resolved at the time of field visits for evaluation.

Other Dimensions of Effectiveness

The project was successful in ensuring participation of 30 percent of women in trainings despite the fact that TOF and HCVRA trainings had to be shifted to Islamabad. This was possible because of strong social mobilization activities carried out by the project team in Chitral. Not only did they manage to influence and cater to the beneficiaries keeping the gender equity in mind but they tried to maintain a considerable balance in terms of reaching out to females of the community, they used media channels to sensitize the females who couldn't benefit from the public events such as the football tournament and other socialization events. At the socialization events conducted exhibit a mix of gender approach ensuring a maximum outreach to the female segment of the community.

HOPE'87 provided effective and relevant technical assistance through regular field monitoring visits, emails and phone communication. HF team appreciated the supportive nature of monitoring visits. They said the feedback provided by HOPE'87 was very helpful in improving the quality of project activities.

The project team regularly and effectively communicated with ECHO and updated them about the progress of activities. This was particularly important because donor representatives were unable to visit the project area frequently because of security. They visited the project in the beginning, but their subsequent planned visits were cancelled because of security concerns.

The project team effectively documented the project activities. Progress reports, however, needed some improvement. The progress reports were effective in documenting the events but fell short in documenting outcomes.

The project was effective in responding to emerging community's needs and adjusting the project strategy and activities accordingly. For example, in Shogore keeping in view the community demand the project team built a check-dam instead of retrofitting in a school. The project team accepted their demand because it was based on a well-founded argument that check dam would save the village as well as the school initially identified as a site for retrofitting activities.

Keeping in view the security situation the project improvised and shifted the trainings to Islamabad even though it was more challenging and costly to organize the trainings in Islamabad. The project team addressed the issue of participation of four teachers from each school in the trainings by changing the strategy and having only two teachers in training from each school at one time.

Some HF volunteers found it challenging to monitor project activities, because, as some volunteers said, they felt they were not given much importance by school teachers because they did not formally work for any civil society organization. They were merely representing HF as volunteers.

The project team developed excellent relationship with District Coordination Officer (DCO) and relevant district government line departments, including District Education Department (DED), Construction and Work (C&W) and Civil Defence. The project trained officials of these departments and contributed to increase awareness about DRR within these departments. The project team continuously updated the DCO about the project activities and success, with the result that the DCO appreciated the value of the project. One outcome of the increased appreciation of project's contribution on part of DCO was that he issued a notification asking C&W department and Tehsil Municipal Administration (TMA) to replicate of minor DRR activities, particularly direction of doors, in government buildings in Chitral. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed

with provincial government was another success of the project in building relations with the government agencies.

The project team also held meetings with the important NGOs. The project team held number of meetings with Focus Humanitarian Agency to discuss the possibility of merging HF volunteers with volunteer structures developed by Focus Humanitarian in its target areas, which include Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), Disaster Assessment and Response Team (DART) and Search and Rescue Team (SART). This objective, however, could not be realized by the time project came to an end.

The project trained 10 teachers from The Aga Khan Education Services (AKES), the biggest provider of education after government in Chitral, in DRR and facilitated the introduction of DRR curriculum in 10 AKES schools.

2.1. Sustainability

The retrofitting carried out by STDP project was of high quality and contributed to make the school buildings more resilient and durable. As a result, the retrofitted sections of the school buildings are likely to serve as "safe places" for a long time to come.

Minor DRR measures such as provision of WASH facilities in "safe places" and changing the direction of doors are likely to be sustainable. There was one caveat expressed by teachers in some schools regarding change in direction of doors. They complained that after changing the direction, the doors were not fixed properly and as a result they cannot lock the doors. The problem, however, was not with the principle, rather with implementation at some places.

More important aspect of sustainability is increased awareness regarding minor DRR measures. The increased awareness regarding DRR measures was reflected in the directive issued by the DCO, directing C&W and TMA to replicate minor DRR measures in the construction of government buildings. But there is a flip side to this directive as well. A change resulting from an administrative fiat is not likely to be sustainable unless these changes are incorporated into building codes.

At the time of fieldwork for the evaluation, which took place six weeks after the completion of the project, DRR curriculum was still being used in the schools. However, it remains to be seen whether this practice would continue in future. HOPE'87s own background research for the project highlights how challenging it is to sustain such an initiative. HOPE'87 team found that DRR curriculum was actually approved by KP government (then NWFP) in the wake of the 8th October 2005 earthquake with the efforts of GIZ. But HOPE'87 found that let alone schools and district Education Offices, provincial officials did not know/remember that curriculum was ever approved. In this context, one cannot expect, without a certain measure of doubt, that the curriculum would continue to be taught in the schools. In short, chances of curriculum being taught in future are at best mixed.

There is another question related to sustainability of DRR curriculum i.e. what if teachers trained to implement the curriculum are transferred to another school. The project had to face this issue even during the project implementation period. This issue was resolved with the intervention of EDO Education and trained teachers were retained in their schools. Nevertheless, trained teachers wherever they teach can pass on the knowledge and skills to their colleagues and students in other schools in case they are transferred, if not formally at least informally.

The project has developed a critical mass of people who are more aware and skilled in implementing DRR projects, in general, and school safety projects, in particular. This critical mass exists in the form of trained staff of HF regional office Chitral, HF volunteers, CBDRMO members, teachers trained as facilitators and government officials trained by the project. They represent a cross-section of society in the target areas. This critical mass is a key to sustain the support for DRR and school safety activities.

However, it remains to be seen whether presence of this critical mass is enough to generate demand for mainstreaming school safety in Chitral. The projects that specifically seek to address DRR may not receive sufficient attention in an environment where there are many competing demands on government's meagre resource. However, at the very least, the critical mass of human capital (trained stakeholders) would come handy to support projects sponsored by other agencies. In other words, the project's legacy is to leave behind a large cadre of trained individuals.

Given that the capacities of 80 teachers from 20 target schools have been enhanced and district Education Department officials now better understand the importance of DRR curriculum, if a serious effort for mainstreaming DRR Curriculum is made in KP or in Chitral, the target schools of the STDP project would be in an excellent position to serve as models and spearhead this initiative. Having said that it also needs to be recognized that trained teachers would also need refresher trainings to sustain their interest, improve their knowledge and hone their skills.

In Pakistan, support of higher-ups in the government is often ensured through use of informal and personal channels. Therefore, support for projects from senior government officials remain highly dependent on transfers and postings of officials. The project successfully cultivated relationship with DCO and ensured support for the project, but more sustainable constituency for the school-safety activities is goodwill earned by the project team from government officials who are more permanently based in Chitral.

Establishment of 20 Community Based Disaster Management Organizations (CBDRMOs) was an important step towards institutionalizing community support for school safety. Since CBDRMOs are linked with DDMA, to some extent sustainability of CBDRMOs will remain dependent on how active DDMA is and whether DDMA also takes CBDRMOs seriously. In case a disaster strikes in the target UCs, DDMA may contact CBDRMOs for support, but it must also be kept in mind that CBDRMOs might be pitted against more deeply embedded government structures or traditional structures for influence.

2.2. Impact

The evaluation was carried out immediately after the completion of the project, therefore it was not possible to document the long-term impacts of the project, but some immediate impacts are discernable and it is also possible to point towards potential knock-on effects of the project.

Impacts of trainings on knowledge and skills are clearly noticeable. The project has increased awareness about DRR and School safety across a cross section of society, particularly in target UCs, but also in Chitral in General.The KAP data shows that awareness among students regarding disasters and disaster risk reduction has increased and that they also share this information with their peers and parents, an indication that awareness has gone beyond direct beneficiaries.

Enhanced skills are also discernable among HF staff, HF volunteers and teachers, as evidenced by the successful implementation of project activities despite several challenges, including implementation of DRR curriculum in the target schools by trained teachers. Increased awareness among students is evidence that teachers were successful in teaching DRR curriculum.

Perhaps a more visible impact of the project is a directive issued by the DCO Chitral, who by virtue of his position also happens to be the head of District Disaster Management Authority (DDMA), to C&W department and Tehsil Municipal Administration (TMA) directing them to replicate minor DRR measures in construction of government buildings in future. This was the result of DCO's exposure to project activities and project team's effort to update DCO about project's achievements. It is also possible to imagine that he may also use his enhanced understanding regarding DRR measures and school safety in other districts where he might be posted in future.

Major DRR measures (retrofitting of two school buildings and construction of check dam) have served two important purposes. Retrofitting of school buildings have increased the resilience of two school buildings and check dam has made a village,Murdan, safer against floods. However, a larger potential impact is convincing the key stakeholders, particularly community members, that existing structures can be made safer by retrofitting. This has opened new possibilities. Retrofitting of schools or building is no more an innovation in the context of Pakistan, as similar initaitives have been taken elsewhere in Pakistan by other agencies as well as by HOPE'87, but in case of Chitral this was innovative. The possible knock-on effect is that individual households who have seen schools being improved through retrofitting may realize that they can improve their houses through retrofitting. They may also be more mindful about safety elements while constructing their own house. Since evaluation was conducted immediately after the completion of retrofitting activities, it was not possible to note any such impact. A more detailed study of impact at a later stage might reveal these and some other subtle impacts.

There is one example the consultants came across where impact has gone beyond increased knowledge. A head of teacher of school in Bombor reported that there was a landslide in his village, which had blocked the traffic. He mobilized school students and used the DRR Kit to clear the debris quickly. According to him if they had not cleared the debris it would take a long time for the landslide to be cleared. On one hand its shows teachers and students are sensitized and provision of DRR Kit has increased their capacities to respond to such a disaster. On the other hand, it raises questions as to why volunteers trained by the project and other community member did not take part in the exercise. Probably because DRR Kits are kept in schools and responsibility of handling DRR Kit rest with designated teachers, it gives rise to an impression of DRR Kit as being the property of school, which can create a disconnect between school and community.

3. Recommendations

The project has successfully showcased the importance and efficacy of integrated school safety programmes. The project can build on the success of the project in two ways: 1) it can replicate the project in others parts of Chitral or other parts of Pakistan, 3) HOPE'87 can also use the evidence to advocate for replication of the programme.

Linking CBDRMOs with DDMA is a good initiative provided that CBDRMOs become sustainable. Engaging more deeply rooted CBOs or LSOs in DRR activities and engaging them with DDMA was likely to be more sustainable. In future, it would be advisable for HOPE'87 to engage with and mainstreaming DRR in current institutional structures.

Trainings offered by the project to HF, teachers, government officials were found to be effective, but participants would need refresher trainings from time to time. The refresher training would need to be institutionalized, possibly including DRR in the curriculum of teacher training institutes. HOPE'87 can use the evidence from the project and advocate for inclusion of DRR in curriculum of teacher training institutes.

The strategy of conducting formal and structured area opening meetings was highly successful in clarifying expectations of the project and proved an effective point of entry at the community level. Since district administration and local leadership were invited to area opening meetings it built the ownership of the project. This strategy should be made part of the standard operating procedures for launching projects, particularly for launching projects in new areas or for projects that address issues which communities are not accustomed to.

Keeping in view the challenges faced by the project regarding training four teachers from each school, it would be tempting to recommend that only two teachers from each school should be trained. If risk of schools losing trained teachers on account of transfers and postings is juxtaposed against the management challenges presented by training four teachers, it would be advisable to train three or four teachers from each school. Even if one or two teachers are transferred from the beneficiary

schools, the remaining teachers can take the work forward. The strategy adopted by the project to train two teachers from one school at one time was highly appropriate.

The project has proven the efficacy of promoting awareness among communities about DRR through school children. HOPE'87 should build on this success and mainstream this approach in future DRR projects.

It would be advisable to keep DRR Kit outside school, possibly in a shop in the local market, ideally a shop whose owner lives close to the shop, as shops remain open from dawn to dusk. This would make DRR Kits more accessible to the community. It would also counter an impression of DRR Kit only being associated with the target schools.

The progress reports effectively highlight key events and activities but fell short on capturing outcomes of the project. This was partly because the project indicators did not sufficiently focus on the outcomes. It is recommended that in future capacity of local partner should be assessed and if need be partner staff should be trained in writing reports that reflect project outcomes. Phrasing of indicators and results could be improved as well.

HOPE'87 should explore the possibility of using local trainers to conduct the DRR related trainings. They may be individuals in Chitral previously trained by Focus Humanitarian or those who have experience of working with other NGOs in downcountry. For example, SAR trainings were conducted by trainers from Gilgit-Baltistan who were previously trained by Focus Humanitarian Agency through RAPID UK. Using local trainers would reduce the risk of trainings being postponed because of security or weather related risks. Local trainers can make the trainings more relevant to the local context.

HOPE'87 and the IP have put many efforts to ensure a gender balanced outreach but it will be better if they increase the number of their own female staff, as the current IP staff had just 2 female staff with 15 male staff.

ECHO team could not carry out planned monitoring visits because of weather related delays and security situation. HOPE'87 compensated this by ensuring regular and frequent visits to project areas. In such cases where ECHO team's monitoring is restricted by security situation, ECHO can consider outsourcing the monitoring to a third party.

HF volunteer found monitoring project activities in schools challenging because, according to them, they did not formally represent HF. It would be more effective if HF had drawn volunteers from Community Based Organizations or LSOs.

Invovling communities in structural measures achieved two important results: 1) increased ownership of schools (and check dam in Shogor) among community members, 2) increased awareness and understanding about risks and ways to reduce risks through structural measures. Therefore, it is highly recommended that community participation should be made integral part of the structural measures in fturue projects.

Involving PTAs was an important an step in building bottom-up support for school safety and institutionalizing DRR in schools. HOPE'87 should build on this success and advocate for involvement of PTAs in promoting school-safety. Capacities of PTAs to do community-based advocacy can also be enhanced through trainings on advocacy.

Annexures

Annex 1: Findings of Sample Survey of Students

Table No 1.

Union Council Name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Ayun	80	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Chitral-1	60	30.0	30.0	70.0
	Shoghor	60	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 2.

Village Name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Ayun	20	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Bohtoli(Krinj)	20	10.0	10.0	20.0
	Khukhshandeh	20	10.0	10.0	30.0
	Kuru	20	10.0	10.0	40.0
	Muldeh Ayun	20	10.0	10.0	50.0
	Murdan	20	10.0	10.0	60.0
	Rumboor	20	10.0	10.0	70.0
	Shiaqotek	40	20.0	20.0	90.0
	Shoghore	20	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 3.

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	F	85	42.5	42.5	42.5
	M	115	57.5	57.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 4.

Class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Grade-10	26	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Grade-6	13	6.5	6.5	19.5
	Grade-7	39	19.5	19.5	39.0
	Grade-8	74	37.0	37.0	76.0
	Grade-9	48	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 5.

School Type

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Boys	66	33.0	33.0	33.0
	Girls	60	30.0	30.0	63.0
	Mixed	74	37.0	37.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 6.

School level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Higher Secondary	37	18.5	18.5	18.5
	Middle	100	50.0	50.0	68.5
	Secondary	63	31.5	31.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 7.

Do you know about safe places in your school in case of emergency?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Know	1	.5	.5	.5
	No	6	3.0	3.0	3.5
	No Response	1	.5	.5	4.0
	Yes	192	96.0	96.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 8.

Did you participate in the identification of safer places?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	10	5.0	5.0	5.0
	No Response	1	.5	.5	5.5
	Yes	189	94.5	94.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 9.

To what extent you think identification of safer places is important

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	31	15.5	15.5	15.5
	No Response	1	.5	.5	16.0
	Very Important	168	84.0	84.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 10.

What are some of the disaster threats to your school? Flood

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Earthquake, Avalanche, Flood	21	10.5	10.5	10.5

	Earthquake, Avalanche, Flood, Rock fall	18	9.0	9.0	19.5
	Earthquake, Fire	27	13.5	13.5	33.0
	Earthquake, Fire, Flood	56	28.0	28.0	61.0
	Earthquake, Flood	14	7.0	7.0	68.0
	Earthquake, Flood, Rockfall	21	10.5	10.5	78.5
	Earthquake, Flood, Sliding	8	4.0	4.0	82.5
	Earthquake, Flood, Thunderbolt	6	3.0	3.0	85.5
	Earthquake, Flood, Wind	26	13.0	13.0	98.5
	No Response	2	1.0	1.0	99.5
	Old Tree	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 11.

Do you know about disaster plan of your school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	16	8.0	8.0	8.0
	No Response	1	.5	.5	8.5
	Yes	183	91.5	91.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 12.

Did you participate in making the school disaster plan

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	19	9.5	9.5	9.5
	No Response	1	.5	.5	10.0
	Yes	180	90.0	90.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 13.

Do you think it is useful in case of disaster

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	No Response	1	.5	.5	1.5
	Yes	197	98.5	98.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 14.

Do you know about the emergency exit of your school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	No Response	1	.5	.5	1.5
	Yes	197	98.5	98.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 15.

Did you attend mock drill activity at your school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	6	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Yes	194	97.0	97.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 16.

If yes, what was interesting in it?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Calling, CPR, Doctor	12	6.0	6.0	6.0

	CPR, Calling, First aid, Rescue, SAR	23	11.5	11.5	17.5
	Evacuation	13	6.5	6.5	24.0
	Evacuation, Artificial Organs	6	3.0	3.0	27.0
	Evacuation, Breathing, Awareness	5	2.5	2.5	29.5
	Evacuation, Calling, Line Formation	14	7.0	7.0	36.5
	Evacuation, First aid	58	29.0	29.0	65.5
	Evacuation, Rescue	5	2.5	2.5	68.0
	First aid, Calling, Recue, Bandaging	33	16.5	16.5	84.5
	First aid, Rescue, CPR, Calling	12	6.0	6.0	90.5
	NA	3	1.5	1.5	92.0
	No Response	9	4.5	4.5	96.5
	Stretchers, Artificial Organs	7	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 17.

Do you normally discuss about disaster management with your family?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Yes	198	99.0	99.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 18.

Do they take interest in the school activities of disaster management

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Yes	197	98.5	98.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 19.

Do you have disaster management/rescue plan at your home?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Valid	No	128	64.0	64.0	64.0
	Yes	72	36.0	36.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 20.

Who you think are most vulnerable to disaster at your home

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Men	10	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Women	188	94.0	94.0	99.0
	women , Children	1	.5	.5	99.5
	Women, Children, Aged	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 21.

Do you normally discuss it with your friends at village?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Yes	198	99.0	99.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 22.

Do they take interest in it

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	12	6.0	6.0	6.0
	Yes	188	94.0	94.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 23.

Do you know how to save your friends/family in case of emergency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Yes	195	97.5	97.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 24.

If yes, from where you learned?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	From Project	196	98.0	98.0	98.0
	From Project & Other Sources	3	1.5	1.5	99.5
	No response	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 25.

What steps should be followed during disaster?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Awareness, Capacity Building	10	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Calling, exit, SAR	18	9.0	9.0	14.0
	Calling, Rescue	12	6.0	6.0	20.0
	Emergency Bell	6	3.0	3.0	23.0
	Evacuation	2	1.0	1.0	24.0
	First aid, Rescue, CPR, Calling	19	9.5	9.5	33.5
	No Response	3	1.5	1.5	35.0
	Safe Place	32	16.0	16.0	51.0
	Safe Place , Evacuation	16	8.0	8.0	59.0
	Safe Place, DDR Cur, Capacity Building	32	16.0	16.0	75.0
	Safe Place, Don't Panic	16	8.0	8.0	83.0
	Safe place, Making line, Calling	34	17.0	17.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 26.

What steps should be taken after disaster

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Calling	1	.5	.5	.5
	Calling , CPR, Food	2	1.0	1.0	1.5
	First aid	4	2.0	2.0	3.5
	First aid, Search Missing, Hospital	20	10.0	10.0	13.5
	No Response	14	7.0	7.0	20.5
	Rehabilitation,	2	1.0	1.0	21.5
	Rehabilitation, First aid, CPR, Calling , Food, Shelter	29	14.5	14.5	36.0
	Rehabilitation, Food, Calling , First aid, CPR	36	18.0	18.0	54.0
	Rehabilitation, Food, Shelter, medicine	2	1.0	1.0	55.0
	Rehabilitation, Food, Shelter, medicine, Calling	16	8.0	8.0	63.0
	Sear Missing, Calling , First Aid	73	36.5	36.5	99.5
	Search , Rescue , Hospital	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 27.

Did you have personal experience of disaster during the project?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	188	94.0	94.0	94.0
	Yes	12	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 28.

If Yes, did you apply the lessons you learn during disaster management

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Valid	NA	186	93.0	93.0	93.0
	No	2	1.0	1.0	94.0
	Yes	12	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 29.

Elaborate your experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Carry Stracher	1	.5	.5	.5
	NA	197	98.5	98.5	99.0
	Rescued Children	1	.5	.5	99.5
	Safe Exit	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 30.

Did you receive any training in search and rescue, first aid and fire fighting

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	13	6.5	6.5	6.5
	Yes	187	93.5	93.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 31.

If yes are you confident you can apply that during disasters?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	13	6.5	6.5	6.5
	Yes	187	93.5	93.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 32.

Are you satisfied with training?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	7.5	7.5	7.5
	Yes	185	92.5	92.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Table No 33.

If No, what could be done to improve it?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extra Training , More Practice	43	21.5	21.5	21.5
	NA	154	77.0	77.0	98.5
	No Response	1	.5	.5	99.0
	Renumeration	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Annex 2: Findings of Sample Survey of Teachers

Table No 1

Union Council Name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Ayun	2	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Chitral-1	7	50.0	50.0	64.3
	Shogore	5	35.7	35.7	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 2

Village Name

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bokhtuli	2	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Khurkhashandeh	3	21.4	21.4	35.7
	Murdan	1	7.1	7.1	42.9
	Rumboor	2	14.3	14.3	57.1
	Shiaqotek	6	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 3

School Type

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Boys	2	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Girls	5	35.7	35.7	50.0
	Mixed	7	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 4

School level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Higher Secondary	3	21.4	21.4	21.4
	Middle	8	57.1	57.1	78.6
	Secondary	3	21.4	21.4	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 5

Do you think the training you received is useful for the safety of school children?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table No 6

If yes, in what ways?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Awarness	5	35.7	35.7	35.7
	Awarness, DDR Cur, DDR Training	5	35.7	35.7	71.4
	Awarness, DDR Cur, Safe Place	1	7.1	7.1	78.6
	Prepardness, Rescue, Rehabilitation	2	14.3	14.3	92.9
	Training & Equipments	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 7

Was the training appropriate according to the local environment conditions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table No 8

To what extent this training will decrease the vulnerability of school children

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	To grate extent	13	92.9	92.9	92.9
	To some extent	1	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 9

To what extent the community members took interest in the project activities?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	3	21.4	21.4	21.4
	To great extent	9	64.3	64.3	85.7
	To some extent	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 10

To what extent children took interest in the drill sessions?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	To great extent	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table No 11

Do you have evacuation plan for your school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table No 12

If yes, has it been helpful?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table No 13

Is there any safe place for the students/teachers in case of disaster?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table No 14

Does everybody in the school know about it?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table No 15

Do you think project was successful?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	To great extent	12	85.7	85.7	85.7
	To some extent	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 16

Was any retrofitting activity carried out in your school?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	5	35.7	35.7	35.7
	Yes	9	64.3	64.3	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 17

If Yes, was it helpful in decreasing the vulnerability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NA	5	35.7	35.7	35.7
	Yes	9	64.3	64.3	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Table No 18

If no, what are factors behind its failure?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NA	14	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table No 19

General Comments

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NA	12	85.7	85.7	85.7
	Project Extension, Community Involvement, More Training , Refresher Training , More Trainings	2	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	14	100.0	100.0	

Annex 3: Questionnaire for Sample Survey of Students

Questionnaire for Children Interview

Final Evaluation of "A Safer Tomorrow – Disaster Preparedness in Schools Pakistan" in district Chitral KPK

Name of Interviewer: _____

Interview Date: _____

Data Entry Operator: _____

Data Entry Date: _____

District: _____ Tehsil: _____

Union Council Name: _____ Village Name: _____

1. Name of Respondent: _____
2. Gender: _____ 1= M 2=F
3. Class: _____ 1=grade 6 2=grade 7 3=grade 8 4=grade 9 5=grade 10
4. School Type: 1= Boys 2=Girls 3= Mixed
5. School level: 1= Primary 2Middle 3=Secondary 4=Higher Secondary
6. Do you know about safe places in your school in case of emergency? 1=Yes 2=No
7. Did you participate in the identification of safer places? 1=Yes 2=No
8. To what extent you think identification of safer places is important 1=very important 2=important 3= Unimportant
9. What are some of the disaster threats to your school? 1=_____ 2=_____ 3 _____ 4_____
10. Do you know about disaster plan of your school? 1=Yes 2=No
11. Did you participate in making the school disaster plan 1=Yes 2=No
12. Do you think it is useful in case of disaster 1=Yes 2=No
13. Do you know about the emergency exit of your school? 1=Yes 2=No

14. Did you attend mock drill activity at your school? 1= Yes 2=No

15. If yes, what was interesting in it? 1=_____ 2=_____ 3=_____

16. Do you normally discuss about disaster management with your family? 1=Yes 2=No

17. Do they take interest in the school activities of disaster management 1=Yes 2=No

18. Do you have disaster management/rescue plan at your home?

19. Who you think are most vulnerable to disaster at your home 1=men 2=women

20. Do you normally discuss it with your friends at village? 1=Yes 2=No

21. Do they take interest in it 1=Yes 2=No

22. Do you know how to save your friends/family in case of emergency? 1=yes 2=No?

23. If yes, from where you learned? 1=From project 2=Any other source 3=Both

24. What steps should be followed during disaster? 1---------- 2---------- 3----------4----------6----------

25. What steps should be taken after disaster? 1---------- 2----------3----------4----------6----------

26. Did you have personal experience of disaster during the project? 1=Yes 2=No

27. If Yes, did you apply the lessons you learn during disaster management classes 1=Yes 2=No

28. Elaborate your experience

29. Did you receive any training in search and rescue, first aid and fire fighting 1=Yes 2=No

30. If yes are you confident you can apply that during disasters? 1=yes 2=No

31. Are you satisfied with training? 1=Yes 2=No

32. If No, what could be done to improve it? 1---------- 2----------3----------4----------6----------

Annex 4: Questionnaire for Sample Survey of Teachers

Questionnaire for Teacher Interview

Final Evaluation of "A Safer Tomorrow – Disaster Preparedness in Schools Pakistan" in district Chitral KPK

Name of Interviewer: _____

Interview Date: _____

Data Entry Operator: _____

Data Entry Date: _____

District: _____ Tehsil: _____

Union Council Name: _____ Village Name: _____

1. Name of Teacher: _____
2. Experience (in years): _____
3. School Type: 1= Boys 2=Girls 3=Mixed
4. School level: 1=Primary 2=Middle 3=Secondary 4=Higher Secondary
5. Number of enrolments in your school: _____
6. Number of total teachers: _____
7. Number of class rooms in the school_____
8. Do you think the training you received is useful for the safety of school children?
   1=Yes 2=No
9. If yes, in what ways? 1_____
   2_____3_____
10. Was the training appropriate according to the local environment conditions? 1=Yes
    2= No
11. To what extent this training will decrease the vulnerability of school children?
    a. 1=To great extent 2=To some extent 3=I do not know 4=Not at all

12. To what extent the community members took interest in the project activities?

    a. 1=To great extent 2=To some extent 3=I do not know 4= Not at all

13. To what extent children took interest in the drill sessions?

    a. 1=To great extent 2=To some extent 3=I do not know 4=Not at all

14. Do you have evacuation plan for your school? 1=Yes 2=No

15. If yes, has it been helpful? 1=Yes 2=No

16. Is there any safe place for the students/teachers in case of disaster? 1=Yes 2= No

17. Does everybody in the school know about it? 1=Yes 2=No

18. Do you think project was successful?1=To great extent 2=To some extent 3=I do not know 4=Not at all

19. Was any retrofitting activity carried out in your school? 1=Yes 2=No

20. If Yes, was it helpful in decreasing the vulnerability 1=Yes 2=No

21. If no, what are factors behind its failure? 1_____ 2_____ 3_____

Annex 5: Checklist for Focused Group Discussions

1. Project contribution in the development disaster response mechanism in the village
2. Project contribution in helping identify of various kind of disasters
3. Project contribution in helping identify safe areas in the village
4. Project contribution in developing disaster plan in the village
5. Kind of trainings received by Hashoo Foundation
6. Search and rescue
7. First aid
8. Fire fighting
9. Can you confidently handle situation in case of disasters
10. Was the training appropriate according to the local environment conditions?
11. This training will decrease the vulnerability of school children
12. Community members took interest in the project activities
13. Children took interest in the drill sessions
14. Do you have evacuation plan for your school?
15. Is there any safe place for the students/teachers in case of disaster?
16. Does everybody in the school know about it?
17. Do you think project was successful?
18. Was any retrofitting activity carried out in your school?
19. If Yes, was it helpful in decreasing the vulnerability?
20. Any disaster experience

Annex 6: Participants of Focus Group Discussion

Participants of Focused Group Discussion

FGD Participants in Rombor, UC Ayun

S/No	Name	Organisation	Designation
1	Allawuddin	GMS Rombor	Teacher
2	Mohammad Nadir	GMS Rombor	Teacher
3	Quid-e-Azam	VO Rombor	Community member
4	Malshan	WO Rombor	Community member
5	Fatah	VO Rombor	Community member
6			
7			

FGD Participants in LSO AVDP, UC Ayun

S/No	Name	Organisation	Designation
1	Gulistan	KESP Rumbor	
2	Saifullah	Kalash Representative	Community leader
3	Munir Ahmed	Kalash Community	Repersentative
4	Engineer Khan	Kalash Community	Representative
5	Taj Khan	Community member	HF Volunteer
6	Muhkamuddin	AVDP	Chairman
7	Wazir	AVDP	Manager

FGD Participants in LSO CIADP, UC Chitral 1

S/No	Name	Organisation	Designation
1	Sher Aga	ICDP	Chairmanr
2	Irfan Elahi	ICDP	Manager
3	Munira Sultana	Hashoo Foundation	HF Volunteer
4	Shabana Gul	Hashoo Foundation	HF Volunteer
5	Rehmat Ghafoor Baig	SO ICDP	HF Volunteer
6	Abdul Nasir	Community Representative	leader
7	Qimat Khan	Community Representative	Leader

FGD Participants in Murdan, UC Shoghor

S/No	Name	Organisation	Designation
1	Gul Baiz Khan	Village Organization	Manager
2	Zaibar Khan	Village Organization	Member
3	Noor Alam	Village Organization	Member
4	Safida	GGMS Murdan	Teacher
5	Haibar Bibi	GGMS Murdan	Teacher
6	Shaista Bini	Women Organization	Representative

7	Sakina Bini	Women Organization	Representative

FGD Participants in Shoghor, UC Shoghor

S/No	Name	Organisation	Designation
1	Hakim Khan	GHS Shoghor	Headmaster
2	Israr Uddin	KADO	Chairman
3	Muhammad Iqbal	Hashoo Foundation	HF Volunteer
4	Iqbaluddin	Village Organization	Member
5	Nasir Ali	Village Organization	Member
6	Rajuli bibi	Women Organization	Member
7	Shahida begum	Women Organization	Member

Annex 7: Terms of Reference of Evaluation Study

Terms of Reference (ToR):

Final project evaluation

Title: "A Safer Tomorrow – Disaster Preparedness in Schools Pakistan" in district Chitral KPK.

Country: Pakistan

Project number: ECHO agreement no. ECHO/DIP/BUD/2011/93015.

1. Background

Pakistan has been at risk to various types of natural disasters of which cyclones, flooding, landslides,

earthquakes and drought are most common. The country is one of the most flood prone countries in South Asia. During its history the floods of 1950, 1992, 1998 and 2010 resulted in a large number of deaths and severe loss of property. The flood of 2010 is estimated to have cost damages of more than $ 10 billion[11]. Pakistan is also located in a seismically active zone on account of its proximity to the Indo-Australian and Eurasian plates. This vulnerability was proven in October 2005 when a major earthquake measuring 7.6 on the Richter scale hit 9 Districts in KPK and Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK), killing over 73,000 people and damaging/destroying about 450,000 houses. Droughts are also a serious hazard in the country as 60 percent of the country is classified as semi-arid to arid. The droughts of 2000-2002 are estimated to have cost economic losses of about $ 2.5 billion. The country does not have a very high risk to cyclones; however fourteen cyclones have been recorded between 1971 and 2001 which have caused a certain amount of damage.

There are a number of underlying risk factors that increase vulnerability and contribute to the severity of disasters in Pakistan. These include:

• Poor construction practices and limited enforcement of existing building codes

• Weak early warning systems

• Lack of awareness and education on disasters and response

• Limited capacity and coordination between various government disaster response agencies

• Disaster susceptibility of large number of impoverished communities

Despite the immense human and capital loss during the earthquake 2005, the Government's response to make local communities aware, streamline and mainstream seismic safety and construction skills, and awareness and education on school safety and safe designs for buildings, has been limited in Northern Areas, i.e. standard designs for critical community and public

1. World Bank Disaster Needs Assessment (DNA) December 2010. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PAKISTANEXTN/Resources/293051-1264873659180/6750579-1291656195263/Exe_PakistanFloodsDNA_December2010.pdf

infrastructure, such as seismic resistant school design and construction in Northern Areas have not been revised yet and even there is no monitoring mechanism in place to ensure adherence to the existing housing and building designs (such as being recommended by NDMA in Kashmir) that may have some seismic resistance elements built into it.

Target area – District Chitral, KPK

Among the highest regions of the world, sweeping from 1,094 meters at Arandu to 7,726 meters at Tirichmir, and packing over 40 peaks more than 6,100 meters in height in an area of 14,850 square kilometers, Chitral is the northern most district of Pakistan bordering Afghanistan. It is the largest district of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) in terms of territory and smallest in terms of population. About ninety percent of the people are rural, residing in 523 habitations of 20 to 3,573 persons. The district of Chitral comprises two Tehsils - Mastuj and Chitral and 24 Union Councils.

Chitral's History of Disasters

Chitral District is prone to various kinds of disasters earthquakes, floods, avalanches, land/mud slides glacial lake outburst floods (GLOF) and rock falls. An expert disaster mitigation committee, comprised of a core group of seismic and structure experts from across the country including Imtiaz Hussain Gilani, Vice Chancellor of University Engineering and Technology Peshawar as convener, Dr Qaiser Ali, Director at Earthquake Engineering Centre University of Peshawar and Dr. Asif of the Centre of Excellence in Geology, University of Peshawar as members published a report in the Daily News, dated 13th August 2007. The experts committee has classified all parts of the country into minor, moderate, upper moderate and severe earth quake zones. Chitral district falls in seismic Zone 4, the severe damage zone (refer Annex VI of the need assessment report – Seismic zones of Pakistan published by Geological Survey of Pakistan).

The district Chitral has witnessed disasters of varying intensity over the past few years. The incidents of glacial lake outburst floods, river and flash floods, avalanches, landslides, mudslides and earthquakes have caused life, property and infrastructure losses across the district. A recent history[12] of significant natural disaster in Chitral is as follows (please, refer to page 14 of the Chitral, District Disaster Management Plan developed by FOCUS Humanitarian Assistance for a comprehensive list)**:**

Vulnerability Assessment of three target UCs of Chitral-1, Ayoun and Shoghor:

Chitral-1, Ayoun and Shoghor are the three union councils which are most prone to natural disasters. In the distant as well as recent past, these areas faced floods, avalanches and land sliding, besides earthquakes. Due to population density, UC Chitral-1 and Ayoun suffered heavy losses of lives and infrastructure as a result of the earthquake in 1991, which were compounded by lack of safety and risk reduction awareness.

In UC Ayon five people were killed, 18 injured, 60 houses completely damaged and nearly 200 houses partially damaged. The UC is also prone to floods and has been hit on regular intervals each year. In the floods 2010 22 households in the Kalsh valley of Bumburat in the jurisdiction of UC Ayon were completely damaged and 8 households partially affected. Standing crops and agriculture farms were also washed away besides affecting water supply schemes and irrigation channels. Three government schools namely High school Bumburat, Middle school Birir and High school Rumbur are vulnerable to floods.

[12] Focus Humanitarian Assistance (Aga Khan Foundation) Chitral office and OCHA, 2011

In UC Chitral-1 almost 10 people were killed in the earthquake of 1991 and in the floods that occurred June 2010 13 people lost their lives and 50 houses were washed away.

Union Council Shoghor has been consistently hit by flooding in Murdan Gol, Arkari Gol, Aviret Gol and Ozhor River. According to estimates 24 houses were washed away and 73 partially damaged rendering members of 73 households as IDPs as a result of the floods of 2010. Many schools in the jurisdiction of UC Shoghaor are prone to disasters. For example the building of Government Primary School (GPS) Momi has been cracked due to abrupt jolts of an earthquake. Similarly the GPS Safid Arakari, Sewaht, Pachali, Ruji, and Middle school Mogh and High school for girls Shoghor have been affected by the recent floods 2010 and are highly prone to future floods. Among community schools, Pamir public school is the most vulnerable to floods.

The intensity of disasters and magnitude of losses could have been reduced, had the people been educated and trained in disaster risk reduction, involving preventive as well as curative measures. Preventive measures included knowledge about land management, forest conservation, reforestation and widening of river beds. Curative measures included awareness raising about safety and risk reduction measures through popularizing innovative and traditional wisdom by involving educational institutions and other public platforms.

The Project:

The project titled “A Safer Tomorrow – Disaster Preparedness in Schools Pakistan” is co-financed by European Commission humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO). The project locations are in a total of 3 Union Councils in District & Tehsil Chitral namely Shoghore, Ayun, Chitral – 1

HOPE’87 Pakistan implements the project in district Chitral, KPK, through HASHOO Foundation (HF) as local partner.

The project was designed with the following **principal objective**:
A culture of safety and disaster resilience in Pakistan.

The **specific objective** of the project is:
Enhanced awareness raising and capacities building in Disaster Preparedness in schools in Pakistan
The project started on **1st May 2011 and will end by 30th November 2012.**

Major results to be achieved, respective indicators and related activities under this DRR intervention are as follows:

Result 1:
School students, school management committees, teachers, education department staff, two regional offices of Hashoo Foundation, volunteers and community members of the target schools understand the importance of DRR/DP
Indicators:

- Integrated Community Based Risk Reduction (ICBRR) training for 20 HF Volunteers (30% female), 15 education department staff and 15 project staff.
- DRR(school safety) training of 80 facilitators (school teachers) and 20 HF Volunteers.
- Disaster risk map and DRR school action plans available for each of the 20 schools
- Contingency / evacuation plan available for each school
- Emergency mock drills at each school run every year
- 4 socialization events and 2 action days at each schools enhances DRR knowledge among the communities
- DRR education as extra-curricular activity practiced at 20 schools

Activities:

1.1 Conduct 2 ICBRR training, 8 TOF – Trainings of Facilitators (DRR and school safety) and develop risk maps and DRR school action plans for 20 schools.

1.2 DRR education through extra-curricular teaching sessions (multi-hazards) for 600 selected students (1st stage) and school population (2nd stage)

1.3 Organize regular socialization sessions, drills and simulations for schools, communities, local government bodies and CBO's

Result 2:

Community safe places are enhanced and DRR measures to reduce vulnerability are carried out in 20 schools.

Indicators:

- 3 communities safe places are available for about 4,000 persons
- Non-structural DRR measures in 20 schools.

Activities:

2.1 Technical assessment & recommendation to identify 3 appropriate "safe places" in the project areas

2.2 Propose and undertake retrofitting activities and advocacy for sustainability / maintenance needs.

2.3 Identify and provide minor DRR measures for 20 schools and advocacy for maintenance and refilling needs

The project locations are in a total of 3 Union Councils in District & Tehsil Chitral namely Shoghore, Ayun, Chitral – 1

The project started on 1st May 2011 and will end by 30th November 2012.

The total project budget sums up to **EUR 472,500.00.**

2. Objectives of the Evaluation

The final evaluation is to review the achievement of the project's results and indicators, the short and medium term impact and the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation process to receive lessons learnt and practical recommendations to improve future actions and to provide ECHO and HOPE'87 with sufficient information to make an informed judgment about the past performance of the project.

The evaluation should be based on assessment of the extent to which the project objective had been met i.e. to enhance awareness raising and capacity building of schools in Disaster Preparedness. Following this to provide an assessment of the technical soundness and potential sustainability of the project components by evaluating its main project components ie : 1) capacity building and awareness raising of school children, education staff, communities, 2) improved awareness of education staff and especially local authorities/education department awareness on DP importance 3) and community safe places and retrofitting.

The evaluation should also provide – practical recommendations to for future school based disaster preparedness programs with the view of sustainability

The final evaluation will involve to an appropriate degree all interested parties, and will be undertaken by HOPE'87 by hiring an external consultant.

3. Key Question

The evaluation shall focus specifically on results and (short and medium term) impact. It shall be a desk and field study with recommendations and lesson learnt for future interventions.

4. Evaluation Criteria

Relevance (appropriateness)

- To what extent did the intervention design conform to the findings of the needs assessment?

Effectiveness

- To what extent the project was successful in achieving the specific objective "Enhanced awareness raising and capacities building in Disaster Preparedness in schools in Pakistan"

- To what extent has the project made technically sound progress in the components of capacity building and awareness of the school children, education staff and communities?

- To what extent has the project made a technically sound progress in ensuring improved awareness of the education staff and especially the local authorities/education department awareness on Disaster Preparedness?

- To what extent has the project made a technically sound progress in identifying appropriate safe places and retrofitting of the safe places?

- To what extent were the Material/kits useful/effective provided to the different stakeholders?

  What have been the usefulness and the impact of the social events?
  To what extent the project staff used mitigating measures to overcome any changes?
- To what extent did the project take account of cross-cutting issues such as gender and environment?
- To what extent or how effectively the Partner and IP have documented processes, methodologies , experiences and lessons learned for further learning and sharing

Efficiency

- Is the relation between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable (specific personnel, information and risk)?

How connected and complimentary are the undertaken awareness raising /capacity building of community and schools

Impact (effects)

- Analyze the impact of the project in terms of knowledge increase through awareness dissemination by HOPE'87 among the communities.
- To what extent have the planned targets have been achieved, and how far that was directly due to the project?
  Has any unplanned activity affected the overall impact of the project and how?
- To what extent have the targeted schools used their learning in incorporating/strengthening and continuing the disaster preparedness planning in their schools?

Sustainability

To what extent the intended beneficiaries were able to adapt to and maintain the knowledge acquired without further assistance?
- How sustainable are the implemented activities and approaches used in the project?

- How can the present strategy be improved to ensure sustainability/replication/scale up?

Participation

- How did HOPE'87 harmonise and coordinate their intervention with partners and key stakeholders?

-How well did the project coordinate with other actors in DP locally and nationally?

5. Evaluation Expert/Consultant:

The consultant is expected to:

- Have records of at least 5 to 7 years of experiences in Humanitarian/Development field out of which at least 2 years in independent consultancy.
- Have records or references of previous consulting experience in Pakistan or proven knowledge of the region.
- The consultant shall have experience or knowledge of DRR/DP (preferably) and community based approach (either s/he has some relevant degree or worked on similar nature of projects in the past).
- The consultant shall be fluent in English, Urdu and preferably in the local language Khowar,

The consultant will be paid an agreed amount for the evaluation including the evaluation report, and costs associated to visits to Chitral like travel, boarding and lodging costs. HOPE'87 Pakistan staff and local partner in the field will assist in hotel bookings and for field visits.

HOPE'87 takes no liability for security risks related to the service.

6. Timetable and Work plan:

The relevant personnel of the HOPE'87 team in Pakistan will assist the consultant in the project evaluation. The consultant will report to the Director Humanitarian Aid of HOPE'87 Headquarters in Austria. HOPE'87-Pakistan Islamabad office staff including the Sr. Program Manager with support from local partner Hashoo Foundation, will assist in coordinating the field visit and meetings with beneficiaries, stakeholders and relevant authorities/agencies.
The work plan with methodology will be as follows:

- Briefing in the office of HOPE'87-Pakistan in Islamabad with analysis of project secondary information i.e., grant agreement, project proposal, interim report, training reports, ECHO and HOPE'87 guidelines etc. (about 3 person days)
- Development of detailed checklist for each key evaluation questions (about 1 person day)
- Meeting with staff and field visit to Chitral (about 3-4 days each location). The consultant will meet with stakeholders and visit the project area. The participation of women shall be promoted through CBOs or handouts/questionnaires.
- Post-evaluation de-briefing to the Director Humanitarian Aid of HOPE'87 Headquarters in Austriathrough email/phone (about 1 person day)
- Drafting evaluation report against the evaluation objective (about 3-4 person days)
- Finalization of report after receiving feedback and comments from HOPE'87 Headquarters Austria (about 2 person days)
- Presentation and submission of the report (about 1 person day)

The evaluation exercise is expected to be held within the calendar period of 15th October to 15th November 2012 with the final report to be submitted by the consultant within one week after the review to HOPE'87 headquarters (review of HOPE'87 HQ shall be shared within 12 working days) but no later than 30th November 2012.

7. Report:

- The consultant will submit a precise report in English in printed and electronic version to HOPE'87 Headquarters Austria.

- The consultants will map relevant supporting documentation in a bibliography and include them on a CD/DVD whenever appropriate.
- The report will include an executive summary and will address all the key questions as identified.
- The document format must be adhered to:
- Cover page
    - ! Title
    - ! Date of the final version
    - ! Name of the consultants
- Table of contents
- Executive Summary
- Methodology
- Annexes, including bibliography and supporting documents
- The report will include the objectives, framework, collection of information and analysis, reporting and work schedule.
- The report will be structured to provide key findings/conclusions for each evaluation question.
- Recommendations for improvements and future programs will be provided.
- The report will be submitted to HOPE'87 Headquarters Austria within the timing defined above.

Date: Signature:

HOPE'87 Director Humanitarian Aid
Karin Czermak

Annex 8: Evaluation Team members

S/No	Name	Position
1	Aslam Aman	Team Leader
2	Ali Sher Khan	Field Supervisor and Enumerator
3	Murad Akbar	Enumerator

Annex 9: List of Documents Reviewed

- Documents Reviewed
- STDP Pre KAP Study
- STDP Post KAP Study
- Monthly Report on STDP Project
- Reports on Refresher Courses
- Reports on ICBDRR, ToF and HVCRA
- Progress Report August 2011
- Progress Report September 2012
- End Report of STDP Project
- Exit Strategy of STDP Project
- Reports on Socialization Events
- Reports on Village Opening Meetings (VOMs)
- Report on Inter School Speech Competition
- DIPECHO LFA Achievement
- DIPECHO Assessment Report
- Project Work Plan
- Revised Grant Chart
- Documentary on STDP Project
- Movie Clips and Pictures of Project activities