Community Resilience Performance Measurement Methodology and Standard Indicators

Final report

Bonaventure Gbétoho Sokpoh

Valérie Léon

Groupe URD

23 September 2014

Contents

Introduction

The concept of Resilience has become omnipresent today in the field of humanitarian action. It has been endorsed by bilateral and multilateral organizations and NGOs are now increasingly exploring how to implement it in the field. Nevertheless, measuring resilience achievements or the performance of resilience programmes remains very challenging due to major difficulties linked to the definition of resilience itself, the level of analysis (global, regional, national or community), the standardization of measurements, etc.

Resilience to shock and stress is the result of a complex and multi-layered process, which ought to be analyzed at several interconnected levels involving individuals, communities, and national and global actors. Community resilience puts the focus on the ability and capacity of communities to deal with shocks and stresses. However, resilience is also strongly influenced by external factors and institutions.

Therefore, community resilience might be measured either by assessing the impact of resilience strengthening activities on communities or by considering the timeframe in order to progress towards resilience. At the same time, it is crucial that such resilience measurements be context and risk-specific.

Groupe URD was commissioned by the IFRC to conduct a consultancy on "Community Resilience Performance Measurement Methodology and Standard Indicators".

The aim of the current study is:

- To compile, synthesize and highlight some emerging theories, practices and tools in measuring community resilience outside the RCRC movement, which will be useful for the further elaboration of the IFRC approach. An annotated literature review of the most useful references is attached in Annex 1.
- To draw lessons, from both internal and external sources of information, and suggest an approach for Community Resilience (CR) measurement, whose application would be compatible with the M&E systems currently in place and feasible in relation to the different capacities of National Societies (NS).
- To provide recommendations and outline the possible next steps towards the adoption of a common approach for CR measurement within the IFRC.

The present report provides a critical overview of the ongoing methodological process in the IFRC, and it takes stock of emerging trends in measuring CR. This process led to proposing a CR measurement methodology and operational approach for the IFRC to encourage the National Societies to adopt and implement.

1. Background

1.1. Why measure Community Resilience?

Based on the initial briefings with the IFRC at the launch of this study[1], Community Resilience (CR) measurements should have three objectives:

- **Visibility**: To showcase the added value of IFRC work in the field of resilience (possibly globally), internally as well as externally, which in turn will serve several goals of communication and accountability (towards beneficiaries, donors and other stakeholders).
- **Programmatic guidance**: To allow the reorientation and adjustment of NS programmes according to achievements and remaining gaps (in terms of CR).

The CR metrics should not become an end, but rather serve as an indication. The measurements should be used to determine if the programme is on track, to help defining corrective actions and programme adaptations. They can also serve as a validation of initial assumptions, including the various causalities on which the logical framework is based.

- **Advocacy**: To potentially scale up and mobilize additional funds for the identified priorities.

To respond to a communication purpose (visibility, advocacy and fundraising), some proxy indicators can be found, in particular to illustrate the outcomes or impact of resilience-building programmes. However, they cannot be objective measures of resilience, since the purpose of their use necessarily skews their nature. In this case, it would be even better not to speak about measurement.

1.2. A challenging exercise

Measuring a multi-level, multi-dimensional and multi-factorial phenomenon such as resilience is extremely challenging. Notably, because there are tensions between complex realities (including volatile environments) and the simplification of metrics, between the adequate contextualization of programmes (including risk analysis) and the sharing of their results.

Resilience does not pose a problem of measurement, but of understanding the measuring process and how it is connected to the management of a programme. Measurements of resilience also often reveal a misunderstanding of the objectives of programme management tools (logical framework, results-based management…).

Finally, a potential risk would be that the measurement process does not deserve the purposes of resilience.

Hence, the difficulty of the task may lead us to acknowledge what is feasible and what is impossible to measure in the field of resilience.

The best answer to such complexity may lie in the trust and empowerment given to the communities themselves, thus allowing durable and resilient systems to be developed.

[1] Groupe URD, "Community Resilience Performance Measurement Methodology and Standard Indicators - Inception Report", August 19, 2014.

"Empirical evidence, not definitions, is required to understand what needs to change in the lives of people constantly at risk of falling into crisis, and to identify what influences how people cope and (to use the language of Sen) their range of freedoms. (…) Analysis should start, not from what we think resilience is about (i.e. how it is defined), but instead by using a wide set of lenses to look at how people are coping in real situations, what opportunities might exist for them to enlarge their freedoms and what constraints they face in achieving this." Levine S. (2014)[2].

Keeping in mind the above challenges, the formulation of CR metrics needs to be in line with the following principles.

- **Keep measurements simple**, in order to allow regular collection and reproducibility, between various contexts and according to operational capacities of NS.
- **Make measurements fit into the existing M&E practices** within the IFRC (for instance, when a Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) is carried out).
- Resilience measurements must be **multi-dimensional**, in order to reflect the whole spectrum of underlying vulnerabilities.

  Since resilience is a multi-dimensional concept, it cannot be captured by only a couple of indicators. Besides, it should be monitored and updated at regular intervals, notably after a shock or during a long period of stress, at the end of a programme, or possibly if some changes in the project assumptions and/or risks have been observed.
- Resilience measurements should take into **account shocks** (driven by large-scale natural or man-made hazards), **more gradual stress processes** (such as food price rises, epidemics, effects of climate change, urbanisation, political instability or economic decline) **and other low-intensity events** (such as localised violence, economic hardship, etc.)
- Adopt a **predominantly bottom-up (participatory) approach**, in order to define, in consultation with the communities, what resilience empirically means to them and what actions favour it, or conversely what actions undermine it.
- To come up with measurements **compatible with existing frameworks of analysis, accountability and advocacy**, such as the post-2015 MDG, the AGIR Regional Roadmap or the HFA monitoring system[3].

1.3. The methodology employed

The methodology employed for this study included the following steps:

- **Initial briefing meeting**. This took place on 12th of August 2014 at the IFRC headquarters in Geneva. It allowed the scope of the study to be clarified, i.e. its purpose, expected outputs and other important issues to be taken into consideration. The Terms of Reference of the consultancy and the inception report are attached in Annexes 2 and 3.

[2] Levine S. (2014), *"Political flag or conceptual umbrella? Why progress on resilience must be freed from the constraints of technical arguments."* HPG Policy Brief 60, July 2014, P. 2-3.

[3] A set of recommended indicators for implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) was set up in 2008. The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) is monitored through the HFA Monitoring and Progress Review process. Cf. www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/

- **Documents review**: The methodology used was mainly based on a documents review and key informant interviews (internal and external to IFRC). Annex 1 presents an annotated bibliography review which shows the main external documents reviewed (articles and studies talking about the challenges of CRM, several resilience measurement initiatives and resilience indexes).

- **Interview with key informants**: Apart from a review of the recently produced documentation, some key informants involved in CR measurement were interviewed, both from other agencies (especially research institutes, independent consultants, and donor institutes) and from the IFRC or RCRC movement. The selection of key informants within the IFRC aimed to cover the diversity of geographical zones (Latin America, Africa and MENA zone were covered) and operational sectors (health, DRR, Policy, shelter and settlement, urban contexts, etc.). The list of interviewees and the interview guide are attached in Annexes 4 and 5.

- **Intermediate feedback session**: An intermediate report was prepared and shared with IFRC and an intermediate feedback session took place on 5th September 2014 at IFRC headquarters in Geneva. This session was an opportunity for discussion between the consultants and key informants from IFRC and the intermediate report and gave rise to fruitful exchanges.

- **Final report**: The present final report took into account the comments of IFRC staff at the feedback session.

1.4. Constraints and limits of the study

The constraints encountered during this study were of several types:

- The relatively short time of the consultancy mission. It was originally planned to take place from 12 August to 12 September 2014. After the intermediate session additional time was given to allow the consultants to interview a few key informants who were not available during the original period.

- Limited representativeness of the people consulted. As the time period devoted to this study was very limited, the number of persons was consequently limited. After the initial briefings, half the consulted persons were from external organizations (1 independent consultant, 1 from a research institute, 2 from the European Commission and ECHO). IFRC staff were mainly based at the headquarters in Geneva (only two based in regional offices).

- No feedback session with field-based staff about how practical the proposed approach was.

The following constitute the limitation of the methodology of CRM proposed in this report:

- As mentioned previously, CRM is complex; therefore we are aware that the template proposed in this report won't capture all the aspects of the CR, we will only be able to capture a part of the reality of CR.
- To fully use the template, the national societies or branches need to have previous experience in measurement and participatory approaches. These capacities will be necessary in order to conduct the participatory approaches to identify the context specific characteristics of

community resilience, the main risks and stresses, the community capacities, the indicators, etc. Existing participatory assessment tools in the IFRC may require adaptation in certain cases.

- As urban communities have particular characteristics (heterogeneity, mobility, highly dependent on external environment, etc.), in order for National Societies and branches to use this template in urban contexts, they have to have:
    - A clear understanding of the urban community organization,
    - Clearly identified channels of communication with the different entities in the urban community
    - A certain confidence established between the NS or branches and the urban community

2. IFRC and Community Resilience

2.1. The community resilience concept within IFRC

2.1.1. The IFRC Community Resilience Framework

Building on previous policies and commitments, the 2013 General Assembly of the IFRC issued a declaration concerning the post 2015 Development Agenda. The declaration specifically noted that 'Strengthening resilience should be a central component of the new development framework'.

> *This Framework for Community Resilience (FCR) has the goal of guiding and supporting the work of NS through the following three strategic objectives:*
> *1 - Supporting NS efforts to assist communities as they adopt risk-informed, holistic approaches to address their underlying vulnerabilities,*
> *2 - Supporting NS efforts that encourage communities to adopt demand-driven, people-centred approaches to community resilience strengthening, and*
> *3 - Supporting NS to be connected to communities - being available to everyone, everywhere to prevent and reduce human suffering.*
> IFRC (2014), « IFRC Framework for Community Resilience », 17 July 2014 - Draft.

One of the major strengths of the IFRC and the operational network that it represents is undoubtedly its community roots, whether in terms of continuous presence in the field, of acceptability and trust (vis-à-vis the population and the authorities) and as a consequence, of humanitarian access.

Based on this strong added-value and "identity" mark, the forthcoming conceptual framework for Community Resilience[4] puts the people and the communities at the center of the IFRC operational approach.

Various mentions suggest a change of paradigm where programming will be even more driven by communities and where those will be better informed of the potential future risks. In this perspective, community participation must be contemplated all along the project cycle (and even out of the cycle), either at the stages of assessment (analysis of risks and context), of priority formulation and programme conception, of implementation and monitoring, of evaluation…..

This will also tend to favor the accountability towards the populations and not only to the donors.

[4] IFRC (2014), « IFRC Framework for Community Resilience », 17 July 2014 - Draft.

This appreciation of the complexity and dynamic nature of communities and their vulnerabilities reinforces for IFRC that the members of the community itself are most likely to know how things around them work and how their lives can be improved.
(…) IFRC believes that strengthening community resilience is a process owned by communities - resilience is not something NS can 'do' or 'bring to' individuals or communities.
(…) IFRC recognizes that programmes developed from risk-informed decisions that adopt a holistic approach are more likely to contribute to reducing the underlying vulnerabilities of communities and ultimately to lead to more resilient communities.
(…) Community resilience is about a demand driven, people-centred approach. Resilient communities are more likely to be empowered, whilst vulnerable communities are more likely to be disempowered.
(…) The IFRC approach to community resilience strengthening ensures communities are placed at, and remain at the centre of decisions and actions that impact their future and that programmes respond to objectives defined by the community.
IFRC (2014), « IFRC Framework for Community Resilience », 17 July 2014 - Draft.

2.1.2. Resilience

Currently, the IFRC framework for CR defines "resilience" as:

"*The ability of individuals, communities, organizations or countries exposed to disasters, crises and underlying vulnerabilities to anticipate, prepare for, reduce the impact of, cope with and recover from the effects of shocks and stresses without compromising their long-term prospects*".

Based on the IFRC definition, the CR metrics will have to take into account resilience, in view of a various set of hazards. For instance, S. Powell uses a typology of 4 types of risks: shocks, variable stresses, constant stresses, and any unforeseen or underlying shock/stress[5].

The IFRC definition of CR implies considering a typology of risks (against which to consider and measure the phenomenon of resilience). This may be equivalent to distinguish between generic or standard indicators for resilience[6] (or any development-type indicators) and some hazard-specific resilience determinants.

2.1.3. Community

The definitions of a community found through the IFRC documents review are the following:

"*A community is a group of people who may or may not live within the same area, village or neighborhood, share a similar culture, habits and resources. Communities are groups of people also exposed to the same threats and risks such as disease, political and economic issues and natural disasters.*" From the updated Framework for Community resilience (FCR)

"*A group of people with diverse characteristics who are linked by social ties, share common perspectives, and engage in joint action in geographical locations or settings*" (MacQueen et. al. 2001).

Hence, the definition adopted by the IFRC framework for CR applies to communities which are not defined exclusively by their geographical boundaries. This allows for the inclusion of all sorts of

[5] IFRC (2014), "East Africa Logframe template for community resilience", draft version, Steve Powell, March 2014.
[6] These generic indicators relate to the "Community backbone" according to the terminology used by S. Powell.

communities, either rural or urban, either concentrated or dispersed on a given territory (such as faith-based communities or diasporas).

In this sense, defining urban communities is usually a more difficult task than for the case of rural communities, where geographical boundaries, leadership and representative roles are more straightforward.

Urban communities can therefore be defined in several ways:

- By administrative boundaries (such as districts, neighborhoods...). This geographical approach for defining CR does makes sense in terms of operational programming, if a particular area of a city is threatened or affected by a certain risk or hazard. For instance, some marginal neighborhoods in Latin America faced with regular violence (between families, sexual violence, socio-economic violence….) can be prioritized, so as to reinforce RC field presence and to maintain the access to basic services for all (health, education, other municipal services…).
- By function. For instance, the community is represented by users' groups of a certain range of services (health, markets, schools, etc.).
- By civil society network. The community is composed of the representatives of several civil society groups.

Whatever the definition chosen, defining the boundaries of a community in any urban context will require a thorough analysis of the main stakeholder groups, their interests, levels of influence and mutual interactions (political economy-type analysis). This understanding of urban communities and of their internal dynamics requires time, as well as trust and acceptance. This will be crucial in particular when carrying out a consultation process with the concerned communities about what constitutes "their" resilience (as is suggested in the methodology outlined below).

Besides, community resilience in urban areas is a much more inter-connected phenomenon than in rural areas. Indeed, the abilities of people to cope in cities, which includes meeting basic needs and accessing resources is largely dependent on the external environment, and especially on city-level actors and decisions.

Any approach which aims at measuring CR will have to take into consideration the specificities and different configurations of what a community means to its members. In urban settings, agreeing upon the right definition of the community that the RC branch plans to work with, finding communication channels with the concerned communities or groups and ensuring the "right" representativeness of people to be consulted will be particularly key.

This engagement with urban communities may be delicate in some contexts. As a consequence, time and field presence should be invested in urban settings, with a view to building trust and confidence before setting any resilience-strengthening objectives.

2.1.4. A systemic approach

IFRC adopted a system-wide approach, in which resilience is seen as a process (not only an outcome). The Community Resilience framework of the IFRC is composed of 5 key elements: Basic needs / Assets / External resources / Capacities / Qualities[7].

> "*No community is ever free of risks or absolutely resilient against all hazards. Building resilience is therefore an ongoing process, rather than an outcome. A safe and resilient community is the result of cumulative action and intervention over time, involving multiple actors operating across multiple sectors. CBDRR programmes are one component of this process. Greater impact can be achieved if CBDRR programmes are integrated with other community based and national activities and programmes*". Cf. Characteristics study, P.6[8].

In this perspective, such a resilience approach does not pretend to programme anything new. Its novelty rather resides in bringing together disparate initiatives within a common framework, either for anticipating crises, launching multi-sectoral programmes or better coordinating a multi-stakeholder response to a complex and interconnected landscape of risks.

This type of concept helped to identify a common objective between disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and poverty reduction. Such a joint approach for resilience (also called integrated) can bring together the work done on chronic vulnerability, DRR and climate change adaptation and tackles all the aspects of vulnerability, whether economic, social, climatic, etc. This is also illustrated by the EU Communication on Resilience.[9]

Consequently in the field of measurement, since resilience is seen as a system of systems, there is a '*need for a multi-scale, generic, and multi-dimensional metric'* for resilience (Béné 2013)[10].

IFRC favors a systemic (or holistic) approach of resilience which calls for a broad measurement of resilience (i.e. not narrowed to a specific sector), and which will represent all of its components.

Besides, measurements of resilience should take into consideration the mutual interactions (and influences) between dimensions of resilience (food security, health, education, conflict & security...) and between different stakeholders (power relations dynamics).

2.1.5. The components of Community Resilience

Along the "Characteristics study", the drivers of resilience have been identified by the communities themselves (resulting in 68 factors, through a participatory approach). This took place within the Tsunami Recovery Programme (TRP), i.e. 30 communities in 4 countries.

Confronting those community-defined factors to the initial 5 elements of the conceptual framework, the study came up with 6 dimensions and corresponding characteristics of resilience.

---

[7] IFRC (2012) "Understanding community resilience and programme factors that strengthen them. A comprehensive study of Red Cross Red Crescent Societies tsunami operation" June 2012. Also in IFRC (2011), "Saving lives, changing minds. Characteristics of a Safe and Resilient Community - Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Study", ARUP International Development, September 2011.

[8] The "Characteristics study" will hereafter refer to the two previously mentioned documents: one synthesis (2012) and the integral study (2011).

[9] EC (2012), "Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - The EU approach to resilience: learning from food security crises", COM (2012)586.

[10] Béné (2013), Towards a Quantifiable Measure of Resilience, IDS Working Papers no. 434, IDS.

Thus, as a result of an empirical testing of the conceptual framework, several dimensions of resilience have been deduced: Assets (physical / economic / environmental / social / human) and External Resources (6).

Finally, the main resilience determinants and subsequent characteristics were identified through a community participatory approach, in one operational context and only with assisted populations of a CBDRR[11] programme (no comparison with a control population). This limits the generalization of such factors to other types of contexts, hazards and populations.

In a way, the initial CR conceptual framework has been transformed in order to encompass the community-defined resilience factors. Thus, several questions arise: Is the initial conceptual framework still valid and useful? ; Can the newly formulated framework (of 6 characteristics or dimensions) be representative of all contexts?

More generally, there seems to be a lack of internal consensus about the key components of resilience, as IFRC documents talk either about the "Five Capitals" (like in the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework - SLF[12]), the 6 or 7 Characteristics.

In two IFRC documents[13], a 7th characteristic relates to a political dimension (elaboration of development policies), which did not show up along the participatory process led along the "Characteristics study". In the other documents, information or data about public policies and political authorities (e.g. the community's connections to them), if they exist, are included within the Social or External Resources dimensions.

There is a need to clarify the main CR dimensions and their contents (hereafter called sub-components), especially between Social assets, Political assets and External resources.

The current IFRC architecture on CR makes one wonder why not keep a standalone dimension on Political assets, since power dynamics and political processes are crucial factors of resilience building?

2.2. The purposes of CR measurements within IFRC

2.2.1. What to measure?

Currently, the IFRC distinguishes 3 kinds of resilience measurements[14], namely:

1. **CR levels**: "A composite measure of various elements (characteristics) that comprise community resilience (as defined by the IFRC)."
2. **IFRC impact on CR**: "Measurement of the attribution of IFRC work to community resilience. (*How much of the measured impact on CR is the result of the IFRC versus other factors?*)."

[11] CBDRR: Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction.

[12] Cf. DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance sheets.

[13] IFRC (2012), "The road to resilience: Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future", IFRC discussion paper on resilience, June 2012. As well as, IFRC (2013), "The road to strengthening community resilience in East Africa Advocacy Report", May 2013.

[14] IFRC (2014), "Measuring Community Resilience in the IFRC", Planning & Evaluation Department (PED), January 2014.

3. **IFRC contribution to CR**: "Measurement of the incorporation and achievement of specific (best) practices supporting community resilience strengthening. (*Whether we accomplish objectives we identify as supporting CR - but not CR itself and the degree our work has impacted it.*)"

2.2.2. Some methodological dilemmas

These various potential measures raise the following methodological questions:

1. **CR levels.** This is considered similar to the CR capacities, which could possibly encompass the absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities. The measure could include several indicators for every characteristic (or dimension) of resilience. Thus, the overall CR level could possibly be captured by a composite index of several indicators, either quantitative or qualitative, but quantified through a scoring system. This type of measure could be monitored on a regular basis and especially during a significant period of stress or after the occurrence of a shock.
2. **Impact on CR.** According to the proposed definition, this would consist in measuring the link between IFRC programme results and CR levels, which would subsequently be called the "attribution factor". At this stage of the reflection, this probably represents the trickiest measurement, in terms of calculation method and practical feasibility.

   > *"In order to better understand which actions contribute to the measured change in resilience, the **contributions of shocks and stresses (normally a negative impact) and response measures to address risk (normally a positive impact)** need to be measured in order to better explain changes between the initial and final states of the resilient system components, aiming to attribute what has caused this change. For example, a greater positive change in the resilient system component may be linked to a period of less severe shock than normal, rather than as a result of more successful risk management actions."* Mitchell A. (2013)[15]

3. **IFRC contribution to CR**. The main limitation of this measurement, and principally its qualification as a "contribution to CR", is that it suffers from a cyclical argument. Indeed, if some activities are named as "resilience building or strengthening" by those who conceived the programme (at the time of formulating the Problem and Objective trees), then the contribution factor is presupposed.

   This basically questions the robustness of the causal links, between the project's activities and its goal (also called specific objective) or its overall aim (placed at the top of the Objective tree, it is also equivalent to a general objective).

In the same way, it is not really possible to claim that an aid project produces a certain level of resilience, but rather favours resilience or contributes to it. Therefore, one should consider avoiding using the term resilience in the formulation of any General Objective (in contrast to the example provided in the PPP Manual, P.24).

> *"If it is the case that there is no separate class of resilience-building interventions (as this paper also contends), then there is no need to see impact monitoring of 'resilience-building interventions' as different from any other kind of impact measurement".* Levine S. (2014)[16]

Besides, if this type of measure is understood as a realization rate of resilience building activities, then it goes back to measuring some **performance indicators** of the project/programme, as implemented

[15] Mitchell A. (2013), *"Risk and Resilience: From Good Idea to Good Practice: A scoping study for the Experts Group on Risk and Resilience",* OECD, December 2013. P.20.

[16] Levine S. (2014), *"Political flag or conceptual umbrella? Why progress on resilience must be freed from the constraints of technical arguments."* HPG Policy Brief 60, July 2014, P. 4.

by the operational teams. The essential guidelines for defining, measuring and monitoring the adequate indicators are then given by the PPP Manual[17].

3. The CR measurement proposal

3.1. Guiding elements for the elaboration of a CR measurement methodology

The following elements will guide the elaboration of the proposed methodology for CR measurement (CRM).

High consideration given to the voices of the communities

The present methodology intends to foster the engagement of the IFRC to put the communities at the center of decisions and actions that impact their future. This is why the appreciations of community members will be valorized when trying to define empirically and to measure the main factors, either positive or negative, which have an influence on community resilience. Based on these subjective appreciations, the aid interventions should be regularly adapted to the priorities of the people, as well as their vulnerabilities and capacities. Besides, these latter will be tested after the occurrence of a shock or a significant period of stress.

If this participatory process is properly owned by the community, it could possibly lead to the definition of priorities that may not be consistent with the usual RCRC activities. Therefore, a real open-mindedness and flexibility will be required from the operational actor (NS, RC volunteers, IFRC staff…).

Particular attention should be paid to the institutional and governance aspects

As previously observed the institutional and governance aspects are rarely highlighted in the current IFRC documents and most often, integrated into the Social or External Resources dimensions. However, according to several authors and key informants interviewed, the existence of stable and functioning institutions such as disaster risk management services and of a proper system of laws and regulations, among others, play a crucial role in the building of communities and households' resilience.

Measurement to support the orientation of the interventions

In fact, measurement can help for communication/visibility, for improvement of the IFRC interventions and for advocacy. However, the main aim of the proposed methodology is the continuous review and orientation of the RCRC interventions in line with the appreciations of the community members and their definition of top priorities.

This key role for programmatic orientation put aside, the CRM template essentially provides a compiled tool of various indicators and sources of information, which must serve as a basis for analyzing a set of various resilience factors and thus, could help for strategic decision-making. Indeed, such a complex phenomenon as resilience cannot be captured by a fixed number of determinants and corresponding indicators, besides in the same way across very different contexts and over time.

[17] IFRC (2010), "Project/Programme planning Guidance manual.

The CRM template can also produce some scoring indicators (mainly based on qualitative data, i.e. the communities' perceptions), which could be used for communication and advocacy purposes. However, this type of aggregation should be manipulated very cautiously. First, aggregating some subjective values cannot be considered as objective measurement of resilience (as previously highlighted in section 1.1.). Secondly, such aggregations at a global level do bear a meaning provided that they relate to similar situations, as far as the type of risks and hazards, the people's priority concerns and underlying vulnerabilities are concerned. For instance, one can synthesize and compare the resilience scores of regularly affected rural communities by tsunamis, although located on different continents. It would be less meaningful to compare rural and urban communities affected by the same type of risk (e.g. earthquakes), and even less significant to compare indifferently rural and urban settings to various shocks and stresses (either natural disasters, technological accidents, conflicts or other recurrent, gradual or low-intensity stresses such as food insecurity, epidemics or localized violence).

Resilience must be analyzed, rather than measured

Following the previous point, the CRM methodology was conceived so that it is useful for the RCRC operational staff and of benefit to the communities affected by shocks and stresses. Although it mainly uses qualitative data from the field, the CRM template needs to be complemented by other sources of information (external to the programme and the community) and analyzed at higher levels of responsibility.

Finally, the proposed template consists of a combination of macro indicators (or generic) and more context-specific indicators (community-defined). This mix prevents important factors of community resilience from being missed out.

For example, if the main risk identified by a community is the recurrence of floods, its members may not analyze some of its causes, such as the extent of deforestation in the surrounding area. Programme teams could therefore include indicators related to environmental assets, such as forms of resource management, the extent of protection and the current state of environmental resources.

Lastly, and most importantly, such a monitoring system will only become meaningful if the analyses conducted in parallel, especially on underlying vulnerabilities and their structural causes, and the interrelations between the various components of resilience are considered.

The choice and analysis of the mix of indicators could be produced together by the field teams and other staff working at a more strategic level and therefore, based at either regional, national or international headquarters.

Complementarity with the existing tools and data

Given the multiplicity of tools and measurement methods, the present CRM proposal strongly relies on the complementarity of approaches and the already existing information and mechanisms in place. In the sophisticated and expanding field of "resilience operability", one of the biggest challenges is probably to remain relevant and to simplify what already exists.

That's why, the CRM template is built upon the assessment tools (VCA[18], KAP[19], CBHFA[20], PASSA[21], PHAST[22], etc.) and other M&E guidelines currently in use within IFRC. Still, adapting some of these in order to collect the required information may prove useful. In a few contexts, series of data have been collected in sophisticated processes of CR measurement (for example, the RITA and LARRA programmes in the Americas). These data would only need to be analyzed and presented in line with the proposed CRM template.

It also gathers a series of information from different sources (national services, NGOs, UN, etc.) and takes into consideration some useful datasets (e.g. HDI, InfoRM) and other political frameworks (post-Hyogo, MDG, AGIR Sahel…). This information (education levels, HDI[23], prevalence of global chronic malnutrition, HEA[24] data, etc.) can thus be used as generic indicators within the CRM template.

Any monitoring system (combination of macro indicators such as InfoRM, more context-specific indicators vulnerable level) is meaningful only in terms of the initial analysis (macro, multidimensional, structural causes, etc.).

Encouragement for a collaborative work with external actors

In many cases, the RCRC branches are not the only organizations present and active alongside local communities. Since the IFRC adopted a holistic and multi-sectoral approach of resilience, the proposed CRM template allows presenting the perceived capacities and weaknesses for resilience in many aspects (seven domains of resilience have been retained). As a result, some priority risks or people's concerns may not have been necessarily included in the planning of RCRC activities. In this case, the mobilization of and collaboration with external actors will be required. Along the proposed approach, the NS and RCRC branches will be encouraged to strengthen their ability to engage with those actors who have a comparative advantage on certain domains of expertise (e.g. urban planning and reconstruction, protection of the civilians affected by violence and conflicts). The compilation of the information required within the CRM template could even be considered in collaboration with other actors (national NGOs, local authorities, other aid organizations, etc.).

A blended approach

Given the multiplicity of measurement methods, the present CRM methodology combines the advantages of several approaches. Finally, this mix of complementary approaches and perspectives will provide a context-specific analysis, as well as allowing international comparisons to be made.

- **Inductive approach and independent approach**: The inductive approach uses pre-determined characteristics or determinants of CR while the independent approach uses non-predetermined factors, for instance the perceptions of key informants and community members. While the seven dimensions of resilience are predefined, its sub-components would come up from the participatory process, and would be formulated according to the major factors of resilience as identified by the community. This is basically the methodology

[18] VCA: Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment.
[19] KAP: Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices.
[20] CBHFA: Community-Based Health and First Aid. More information at : http://www.ifrc.org/fr/introduction/health-activities/community-based-health/
[21] PASSA: Participatory Approach for Safe Shelter Awareness. More information at: http://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/95526/publications/305400-PASSA%20manual-EN-LR.pd f
[22] PHAST: Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation.
[23] HDI: Human Development Index.
[24] HEA: Household Economic Analysis.

employed by the studies conducted by ARUP, in South East Asia (the "Characteristics study") and Latin America[25].

- **Quantitative and qualitative data**: The participatory approach will bring both qualitative data (e.g. context-specific characteristics of a resilient community, description of CR capacities and weaknesses, etc.) and quantitative data (e.g. number or percentage of households threatened by a shock/stress, percentage of households which possess a certain capacity). For the surveys, the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) is encouraged (as this was used in the case of the RITA program).
- **Objective and subjective data**: Some data could be either objective (e.g. number of households affected by a shock) or subjective (level of importance of a change in people's life).
- **Generic indicators and context specific indicator**: The CRM template suggests the use of generic indicators at national, sub-national or district level to describe the general context and living conditions of the communities. Still, the current methodology is mainly based on context specific indicators.

3.2. Description of the proposed CR measurement template

The CRM methodology, proposed in the form of a template (§ 3.3.), is made up of 3 tables. Each of them describes a different level of resilience, namely:

- **Community resilience capacities (Table 1),**
- **The RCRC's contribution to community resilience (Table 2),**
- **The real usefulness of particular resilience capacities, following a shock or at a certain point during an extended period of stress (Table 3)**.

In the three tables, the first three columns (in gray) are the same, including:

- The **main determinants of the type of resilience being studied**. The CRM template is made up of 7 components (or dimensions) of CR, which are predetermined on the basis of the document review and interviews with key informants. On the other hand, the corresponding sub-components of CR will be defined along a participatory process with the communities concerned. Through focus group discussions, key informants or individual surveys, resilience sub-components, and potential indicators, will be formulated in accordance with the specific characteristics of the community.
- **Generic indicators**. The RCRC branch is asked to collect existing data on generic indicators that describe the context in which its interventions are taking place. They are also asked to fill in some specific data about the RCRC.

The list of sub-components and generic indicators mentioned in the following template is only given as an example. It is not an exhaustive list of all possible elements which could emerge from analyses and participatory community processes.

[25] ARUP (2013) "Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction study – Latin America and the Caribbean", July 2013.

3.2.1. The status and evolution of the community's resilience capacities (Table 1)

The status of the community's capacities (versus its weaknesses) reveals the extent to which the community is prepared to face any type of shocks and stresses. Practically, the process should be based on a participatory approach using existing assessment tools or adapted versions of these, and should aim to:

- Identify the **main shocks and stresses** that the community is facing. For each priority shock or stress, the community should estimate its level of concern or importance, in as far as it represents a danger for their lives or can hamper their livelihoods. The scoring system goes from 1 to 5, representing the lowest to the highest levels of concern. In each context, a detailed description should be given to the community members to help them score different shocks and stresses. The percentage or number of households affected by the shock or stress also makes it possible to establish a "realistic" evaluation of the scope of the hazard among the community.
- Describing the community's **capacities and weaknesses**. For each shock and stress, the community will be consulted to define the endogenous factors, which either help the community/households to cope (CR capacities) or conversely, worsen the effect of the main shocks or stresses (CR weaknesses). For each capacity and weakness, the community members will be asked to what extent they contribute to their resilience, either positively or negatively. A scoring system will be used to measure the community's propensity for resilience: vulnerabilities will be rated on a scale of -5 to -1, and capacities on one of 1 to 5.
- The percentage or the number of the households concerned by a certain capacity or weakness is also estimated.

These different elements will establish how well a community is able to cope with some types of hazards. Initially, this could serve as a baseline which would be regularly updated (once a year for instance), to help define or reorient the priorities of an operation.

Annex 3 presents an example of Table 1 which has been completed for a drought-affected community in Sahel.

3.2.2. The communities' appreciation of the RCRC's contribution to its resilience (Table 2)

While designing a resilience-building programme, several assumptions are made about the planned activities and expected outputs/outcomes and their respective contributions to community resilience. Firstly, the actual contribution of the RCRC activities/programs could be discussed and estimated by the targeted communities themselves. Even if all the planned outputs and outcomes are achieved, the RCRC's real contribution to community resilience will only truly be tested and established when a shock occurs.

In order to estimate the people's appreciation of the RCRC contribution to "their" resilience, the following guiding questions could be asked: What are the most significant changes that have taken place during this period of time? What are the activities/projects that contributed the most to these changes? This type of information, translated into scored indicators, could thus serve as one element for reorienting a program towards the most meaningful and impactful activities.

This assessment aims to establish all the important changes which have occurred within the community and its close environment, whether or not related to the RCRC intervention. It should take

place after a minimum period of implementation (between one to two years) in order to observe any significant changes.

It will include two stages:

- **The community's perception of changes**, which can be positive or negative. For each of these changes, their importance in people's lives is evaluated and scored. The guiding question towards the community members can be: To what extent did this change help to strengthen your resilience or, on the contrary, weaken it? The scoring system is similar to the one previously described in Table 1.
- **RCRC's contribution to the changes.** For each change, the most important activities that contributed to it are listed by the community members. Then for each activity, the community members offer their perception of the activity's level of contribution to the change.
- In the scoring scale, 1 represents a change mostly generated by factors external to the RCRC intervention, while 5 represents a change mainly due to RCRC activity.
- In parallel, the **percentage of realization** of the RCRC activities mentioned is extracted from the regular M&E system and integrated into the template.

The comparison of this qualitative and quantitative information will help to adjust the implementation of a RCRC program on the basis of the community's perception about what is useful in terms of their own resilience.

3.2.3. The capacities really used to cope with shocks or stresses (Table 3)

When a shock occurs or a stress has been identified as affecting a community for a certain period of time, the CRM methodology identifies what capacities were really useful to cope and recover, as perceived by the community members.

Measuring some indicators at a significant moment of time (after a shock or along a period of stress) gives a new light on the resilience capacities (or weaknesses) of the concerned populations. And, these are likely to be crucial in any resilience-strengthening process.

Therefore, the elements to be assessed and the way of measuring them are similar to the logic explained for Table 1, i.e.:

- The impact of the shock or stress: Type / Priority of concern / People affected (% or number).
- The most significant capacities and weaknesses involved in the response: Description / People possessing it (%)/ Propensity to resilience.

In this exercise, it is also important to be attentive to the capacities or weaknesses which were not foreseen as useful or harmful before the occurrence of a shock/stress. This information empirically tests the initial assumptions of the resilience strengthening activities and will contribute to the capitalization of good practices for future programme design.

3.3. The proposed CRM template

Table 1: Community resilience level measurement

CONCEPT OF RESILIENCE		GENERIC INDICATORS	STATUS OF THE COMMUNITY RESILIENCE'S CAPACITIES					
			Community identification of shocks and stresses			CR capacities and weaknesses		
Community Resilience components/ Dimensions	**Sub-components/CR Characteristics**		Description	Priority of concern *(1:low to 5:high)*	% of HH under threat	Description of the CR capacities/ weaknesses	Propensity to resilience *(-5 to 5)*	Indicators/% of HH which possess this capacity/ weaknesses
1. Human	- *Knowledge/education,* - *Attitudes and practices in basic sectors: health & hygiene, nutrition, food security, water and sanitation,* - *Disease prevalence*	**General development indicators** - *Prevalence of global chronic malnutrition,* - *% of HH above livelihood Protection threshold (HEA)* - *% of people accessing hygiene-water-sanitation* - *HDI* - *Disaster index* - *MDG* **IFCR specific indicators** - *Number of HH connected to RCRC* - - *Community's level of trust in RCRC*						
2. Physical	- *Access to Infrastructures and services (Heath, Shelter, education, water and sanitation, transport, communication)* - *Livestock* - *Agricultural tools*							
3. Economic	- *employment opportunities* - *Access to financial services (credits, saving, insurance, etc.)*							
4. Natural/environmental	- *Natural resources (Rivers, forests, lands, …)* - *Natural resources management system*							
5. Social	- *Social organization (leadership)* - *Social network* - *Social cohesion* - *Social efficacy* - *Relation with the emigrants (remittance)*							
6. Institutional and Governance	- *Functioning of institutions* - *Public policies* - *Rights*							
7. External resources	- *National and international aid system*							

Table 2: Community's appreciation of the RCRC's contribution to its resilience

CONCEPT OF RESILIENCE		GENERIC INDICATORS	COMMUNITY'S APPRECIATION OF THE RCRC'S CONTRIBUTION TO ITS RESILIENCE				
			Community's perception of changes		RCRC's contribution to the changes		
Community Resilience components/ Dimensions	**Sub-components/CR Characteristics**		Most significant changes observed *(+ or -)*	Importance in people's lives *(-5 to 5)*	List of the most important activities that contributed to the changes	Level of contribution *(1:low to 5:high)*	Level of realization of the activity by RCRC (*data from M&E system*)
1. Human	- *Knowledge/education,* - *Attitudes and practices in basic sectors: health & hygiene, nutrition, food security, water and sanitation,* - *Disease prevalence*	**General development indicators** - *Prevalence of global chronic malnutrition,* - *% of HH above livelihood Protection threshold (HEA)* - *% of people accessing hygiene-water-sanitation* - *HDI* - *Disaster index* - *MDG* **IFCR specific indicators** - *Number of HH connected to RCRC* - - *Community's level of trust in RCRC*					
2. Physical	- *Access to Infrastructures and services (Heath, Shelter, education, water and sanitation, transport, communication)* - *Livestock* - *Agricultural tools,*						
3. Economic	- *employment opportunities* - *Access to financial services (credits, saving, insurance, etc.)*						
4. Natural/environmental	- *Natural resources (Rivers, forests, lands, …)* - *Natural resources management system*						
5. Social	- *Social organization (leadership)* - *Social network* - *Social cohesion* - *Social efficacy* - *Relation with the emigrants (remittance)*						
6. Institutional and Governance	- *Functioning of institutions* - *Public policies* - *Rights*						
7. External resources	- *National and international aid system*						

Table 3: After a shock/ during a stress period (any point of time)

CONCEPT OF RESILIENCE		GENERIC INDICATORS	THE CAPACITIES REALLY USED TO FACE THE OCCURRED SHOCKS OR STRESSES					
			Impacts of the shock or stress			Most significant capacities and weaknesses involved in the response		
Community Resilience components/ Dimensions	**Sub-components/CR Characteristics**		Description	Priority of concern *(1:low to 5:high)*	% of affected HH	Description of the CR capacities/ weaknesses (+ or -)	% of HH which possess this capacity/ weaknesses	Propensity to resilience *(-5 to 5)*
1. Human	- *Knowledge/education,* - *Attitudes and practices in basic sectors: health & hygiene, nutrition, food security, water and sanitation,* - *Disease prevalence*	**General development indicators** - *Prevalence of global chronic malnutrition,* - *% of HH above livelihood Protection threshold (HEA)* - *% of people accessing hygiene-water-sanitation* - *HDI* - *Disaster index* - *MDG* **IFCR specific indicators** - *Number of HH connected to RCRC* - - *Community's level of trust in RCRC*						
2. Physical	- *Access to Infrastructures and services (Heath, Shelter, education, water and sanitation, transport, communication)* - *Livestock* - *Farming tools*							
3. Economic	- *employment opportunities* - *Access to financial services (credits, saving, insurance, etc.)*							
4. Natural/environmental	- *Natural resources (Rivers, forests, lands, …)* - *Natural resources management system*							
5. Social	- *Social organization (leadership)* - *Social network* - *Social cohesion* - *Social efficacy* - *Relation with the emigrants (remittance)*							
6. Institutional and Governance	- *Functioning of institutions* - *Public policies* - *Rights*							
7. External resources	- *National and international aid system*							

4. Next steps and recommendations

For the IFRC to push further the reflections led on the CRM, and in order to reach a fully adapted tool for CRM, we suggest the following elements:

- **Opt for a clear position** on the political dimension of resilience, i.e. the **institutional and governance** aspects that this study has emphasized in the template as a capital in its own.

- To give due consideration to the **particular complexities of urban contexts**, within IFRC internal documents (CR framework, guidelines and manuals…) and especially at the time of formulating and launching resilience-strengthening programs.
  Aid interventions in urban settings are complex by nature as they involve the intertwining of knowledge and expertise from different sectors (habitat, health, legal, psychological, employment, security, etc.), while not being limited to mere technical solutions. Therefore, the role of the IFRC could be:
  - To ensure that the **multiplicity of voices** (in terms of actors, roles, skills…) are **represented and expressed** within the defined community (a district, a neighborhood or based on a social, economic or cultural link). As previously mentioned (§ 2.1.3), the "right" representativeness will depend on the initial background analysis of the main stakeholders (e.g. civil society groups, local authorities, other informal but powerful groups such as gangs…), their respective power positions and mutual interactions.
  - To act as **a facilitator** in order to articulate various viewpoints within the community and **formulate clear demands for support**. In urban contexts, IFRC will often have to **pass them on to other relevant actors**, such as municipal authorities, and other actors involved in habitat and development issues. In the end, the demands of the community will need to be translated into action plans which will be implemented by different sectors of expertise and responsibility (land tenure, public services, habitat, mobility, infrastructures…).
  - To **support and catalyze the empowerment** of several segments of the urban community where RCRC branches implement programmes. This will be all the more fruitful in terms of resilience strengthening when the RC branches and operational teams are well established, accepted and recognized for the value of their work at the community level. If this is the case, the IFRC will possess a certain **leverage capacity in order to stimulate joint-initiatives**, in complicated scenarios where different levels of responsibility (from grass-roots to political authorities) are involved and joint solutions are needed.

- To **sensitize about and support the internal buy-in** of a practicable approach for CR measurement.

  This process of internal ownership of a commonly shared approach for CR measurement should rely on a field test period and go through the following steps:

  - Gathering comments from the candidates on the field test and possible adaptation of the initial template proposed. Ideally, 3 to5 NS representing different risk types and geographical areas, could participate (on a voluntary basis) in the first wave of field testing.

- The field test period should last 12 to 18 months. It should be implemented by NS which fulfill a minimum of conditions: 1) Having a certain familiarity with the concept of resilience and possibly, having already led some reflections in relation to it; 2) Possessing some good capacities for data collection and analysis, and possibly the use of similar M&E tools than the proposed template.
- Collection of feedbacks and adaptation of the tested methodology. At the end of the testing period, some core elements of the template could be revised while additional options, more specific to the context, could be included.
- Provision of technical support, by the IFRC Secretariat, for the proper application of a standard CR measurement template. This will include the possibility of introducing some context-specific options, so as to render the tool tailored to the context of the testing candidate. After one or several phases of field testing, the IFRC would provide regular methodological support for applying and adapting the template for the NS willing to implement it.
- Production of a guidance manual, for the proper use and application of the CR template.

On IFRC side, this process will involve designing a focal person to follow up on the testing exercises and all adaptations or revisions required.

Annexes

Annex 1: Annotated bibliography

A) The debate on resilience measurement

The following references propose different views on the resilience measurement and show that the identification of metrics and standards for measuring resilience remains extremely challenging. Thus, there currently exists no consensus on how to measure resilience.

- **Levine** S., "Assessing resilience: why quantification misses the point", *HPG Working Paper*, ODI, July 2014. Over the past years, "resilience" was used to encompass a wide range of issues, from sustainable development to food security and adaptation to climate change with the need to give greater priority to the fight against vulnerability.
- **Levine S.**, "Political flag or conceptual umbrella? Why progress on resilience must be freed from the constraints of technical arguments", *HPG Policy Brief*, no.60, ODI, July 2014.

These two papers critically examine current approaches for measuring resilience. They emphasize that the main difficulty for measuring resilience lies in the tension between the technical and the political impetus for resilience, between varied program objectives, the evaluation of their impact and the expansion of people's abilities to cope.

- **Béné C.**, "Towards a Quantifiable Measure of Resilience", *IDS Working Paper*, no. 434, IDS, September 2013.

To overcome some of the concerns and limitations of resilience measurement using a set of characteristics, this **new approach** puts '**costs of resilience'** at the centre. Costs of resilience refer to the different ex-ante and ex-post investments, losses, sacrifices, and costs that people have to undertake at individual and collective levels to 'go through' a shock or an adverse event. The assumption is that quantifying these resilience costs gives an **indication of the level of resilience of a system** (or component of that system). The lower the resilience costs, the more resilient the system is (to a given shock).

- **Constas M. & Barrett C.**, *Principles of Resilience Measurement for Food Insecurity: Metrics, Mechanisms, and Implementing Issues* (paper presented at the Expert Consultation on Resilience Measurement Related to Food Security), Rome, February 19-21, 2013.

- **Gall M.**, "From Social Vulnerability to Resilience: Measuring Progress towards Disaster Risk Reduction," *Interdisciplinary Security Connections*, UNU-EHS, No. 13/2013.

- **Mitchell** M., "Risk and Resilience: From Good Idea to Good Practice: A scoping study for the Experts Group on Risk and Resilience", *Working Paper,* no. 13, OECD, December 2013.

Several recent documents provide a good overview of the different approaches and latest practices in measuring resilience. They also list a series of measurement principles.

- **Frankenberger T. & Nelson S. (TANGO International)**, Background paper for the Expert Consultation on Resilience Measurement for Food Security, FAO/WFP February 2013. **Winderl** T., *Disaster Resilience Measurements – Stocktaking of ongoing efforts in developing systems for measuring resilience*, February 2014, UNDP.

B) Methods of measurement

The below list is not exhaustive and was based on the previously mentioned literature reviews on resilience measurement (§ A).

B.1) Tools

The formulation of resilience measurements and the methodological approaches adopted greatly vary according to the set objectives, from measuring a community's capacities or assets for resilience to the disaster outcomes or the recovery responses. The below-mentioned methodologies often rely on a mix of quantitative scores and of the communities' perceptions (qualitative tools).

- The **Community Based Resilience Analysis (CoBRA)** is a conceptual framework and methodology to measure resilience, which was commissioned by UNDP's Drylands Development Centre in mid-2013. The measurement framework foresees both **universal** as well as **contextual** indicators of resilience. To define a universal threshold for resilience based on food and basic needs, the approach uses the **Household Economy Approach** (HEA) **Response Thresholds**. The proposed methodology uses an inductive approach and independent approach. It also gives an importance to participatory approach. The methodology is test in Kenya and Uganda.

  UNDP & ECHO, *Community Based Resilience Analysis (CoBRA): Conceptual Framework and Methodology*, Drylands Development Centre 2013, April 2013.

  UNDP, *Understanding Community Resilience: Findings from Community-Based Resilience Analysis (CoBRA) Assessments; Marsabit, Turkana and Kajiado counties, Kenya and Karamoja sub-region, Uganda*, April 2014.

- The **DRLA/UEH Evaluation Resilience Framework**, designed for a large scale evaluation of humanitarian assistance in the wake of the **Haiti** earthquake (2010), measures the **relationship between a shock, humanitarian assistance and resilience outcomes** (at the household and individual levels). By combining multiple relevant indicators, the evaluation calculated seven **quantitative composite scores**, one for each dimension of resilience. In order to include the impacted communities' perceptions, the results were then triangulated with **qualitative tools** (e.g. focus groups).

  Tulane University, *Haiti Humanitarian Assistance Evaluation, From a Resilience Perspective*, Disaster Resilience Leadership Academy, 2011.

- **Expert Consultation on Resilience Measurement for Food Security**, Rome (February 2013). The three-day expert consultation, organized by the FAO and the WFP, proposes measures to

estimate **food security resilience.** The proposed measurement consists in **four sets of indicators** for:

a) baseline well-being and basic conditions,
b) disturbances,
c) response,
d) end-line well-being.

Work on the proposed measurement continues under the umbrella of a newly constitutional **Food Security Information Network** (FSIN) (www.fsnnetwork.org). One important function of the FSIN will be to serve as an umbrella mechanism under which follow-up actions for resilience measurement will be undertaken.

Frankenberger T. & Nelson S. (TANGO International, 2013), previously mentioned under § A.

Constas M., Frankenberger T. & Hoddinott J., "Resilience Measurement Principles: Towards an Agenda for Measurement design", *FSIN Technical Series*, No1, WFP, 2014.

- The **Network of Adaptive Capacities** understands community resilience as a process (not as an outcome) **linking a network of adaptive capacities to adaptation after a disaster**. The term "adaptive capacities'' refers to the fact that in this model, resilience relies on both the resources themselves and the **dynamic attributes** of those resources (robustness, redundancy, rapidity). The network also encompasses contemporary understandings of **stress, adaptation, wellness,** and **resource dynamics**. Together they provide a strategy – and in turn a measurement framework - for **disaster readiness**.

  Norries/Stevens/Pfefferbaum/Wyche/Pfefferbaum (2008), "Community Resilience as a Metaphor, Theory, Set of Capacities, and Strategy for Disaster Readiness",*Am J Community Psychol* (2008).

  Jamil S. & Amul G., "Community resilience and critical urban infrastructure: Where adaptive capacities meet vulnerabilities", *NTS Insight*, no. IN13-07, December 2013.

- The **Overseas Development Institute** proposes a comprehensive set of indicators to be part of the post-2015 development goals. The indicators cover **all levels of the result chain** (inputs, outputs, outcome, impact) and **geographic scales** (individual, household, community, sub-national, national, international).

  Mitchell T. /Jones L. /Lovell E. / Comba E. (2013) (eds), *Disaster Risk Management in Post-2015 Development Goals: potential targets and indicators*, ODI, April 2013.

- The **PEOPLES resilience framework** aims at defining and measuring disaster resilience for a community while addressing simultaneously the assets of the community and their functionality at various geographic and temporal scales. **Community functionality** is characterized by **seven dimensions** from which the acronym is derived: Population and demographics, Environmental/ecosystem, Organised governmental services, Physical infrastructure, Lifestyle and community competence, Economic development and Social-cultural capital. It includes the definition of sub-systems[26]. For each of the seven dimensions

[26] For instance, the environmental/ecosystem dimension comprises water quality/quantity, air quality, soil quality, biodiversity, biomass (vegetation) and other natural resources.

there are some proposals for **potential indicators** to measure the functionality of these sub-systems. The framework also foresees the aggregation of these potential indicators into **community resilience indices for the specific dimension** as well as an overall **community resilience index**.

Renschler C. / Frazer A. / Arendt L. / Cimellaro G-P. / Reinhorn A. / Bruneau M., "Framework for Defining and Measuring Resilience at the Community Scale: The PEOPLES Resilience Framework", *Technical Report MCEER-10-0006*, October 8, 2010.

- The **Tsunami Recovery Impact Assessment and Monitoring System (TRIAMS)** used a limited set of indicators to track recovery after the Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami in 2004 in four affected countries (Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Maldives and Thailand). TRIAMS uses existing routine and survey sources for **quantitative** data, but **triangulates** by using the **perspectives** of beneficiary to better understand how affected people view the quality and relevance of the recovery assistance.

  UNDP/WHO/IFRC, *Tsunami Recovery Impact Assessment and Monitoring System - TRIAMS, Lessons learned in post-crisis recovery monitoring*, 2009. **WFP** has taken steps to incorporate the concept of resilience into WFP's Strategic Framework. WFP is using trend analysis of **historical food security indicators** to monitor household resilience in Niger. Analysis focuses primarily on the **speed and extent of recovery** following the drought in 2009. WFP is piloting a similar approach in several other countries for measuring resilience. In partnership with FAO, WFP also developed a **Shock Impact Simulation (SIS) Model** for estimating the ex-ante, current, and ex-post **impacts of shocks** in order to support intervention decisions, policy and planning (WFP and FAO 2012).

  WFP, "Measuring household resilience in a shock-prone environment: trend analysis of food security indicators in Niger (2006-2011), 2012.

  WFP and FAO, *WFP/FAO Shock Impact Simulation Model for food security analysis and monitoring*, 2012.

B.2) Indexes

Indexes using region or country level

The most common way of measuring resilience is constituted by a series of indexes. Those ranking regions and/or countries on the levels of risks, vulnerabilities and responses capacities are the most widespread. However, the typical feature of these data is that it cannot be broken down to sub-national geographic areas.

- **WorldRiskIndex**

The index is reported on in the World Risk Report: www.worldriskreport.com/

Indicators for the WorldRiskIndex (Global scale) are found at:

www.worldriskreport.com/uploads/media/Indicators_for_WRI_final_draft_01.pdf

- **Global Focus Model**

2013 Global Focus Model, OCHA, www.cwger.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/17.-DRR-GFM-2013.pdf

- **Country Resilience Rating**

Global Risks Report 2013, World Economic Forum, www.reports.weforum.org/global-risks-2013/section-three/special-report-building-national-resilience-to-global-risks/

- **Prevalent Vulnerability Index (PVI)**

Cardona O., "Indicators of Disaster risk and Risk Management", Inter-American Development Bank, 2007.

Cardona O. & CarreñoM., "Updating the Indicators of Disaster Risk and Risk Management for the Americas", *Journal of Integrated Disaster Risk Management*, IDRiM, () vol. 1, No 1), 2011.

- **Risk Reduction Index (RRI)**

daraint.org/risk-reduction-index

daraint.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/How_does_the_RRI_work.pdf

daraint.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/4_QUESTIONNAIRE_EN_dist.pdf

- The **InfoRM** initiative began in 2012 as a convergence of interests of UN agencies, donors, NGOs and research institutions to establish a common evidence-base for **global humanitarian risk analysis**. The InfoRM index. It may prove helpful for an objective allocation of resources for disaster management as well as for coordinated actions focused on anticipating, mitigating, and preparing for humanitarian emergencies. In support of a **proactive crisis management** framework, InfoRM identifies the countries at a high risk of humanitarian crisis that are more likely to require international assistance. Based on risk concepts, the model envisages **three dimensions of risk**: Hazards & Exposure, Vulnerability, and Lack of Coping Capacity. Furthermore, it is split into different levels to provide a quick overview of the **underlying factors** leading to humanitarian risk. After a series of implementation cases, as well as generic feedbacks, an **updated version of the methodology**[27] is planned to be released around **November 2014**, after which it is intended to stay unchanged for a few years to ensure comparability over time.

More information is available on the InfoRM website: http://inform.jrc.ec.europa.eu.

Indexes using sub-national level

Other indexes can be produced at sub-national levels: either at community or household levels. In this case, these measurements usually take three forms: a) using political boundaries (e.g. county, district), b) distinguishing between urban and rural (e.g. cities), c) defining a geographic area with shared

[27] JRC (2014), "Index for Risk Management - InfoRM: Concept and Methodology" - Version January 2014.

characteristics. The following indexes measure either the capacities of communities for resilience, and/or for recovery.

- **Baseline Resilience Indicators for Communities (BRIC)**

Cutter/Barnes/Berry/Burton/Evans/Tate/Webb, "A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters", Global Environmental Change 18, 2008, pp. 598-606.

Cutter/Barnes/Berry/Burton, Evans/Tate/Webb (2008), "Community and Regional Resilience: Perspectives from Hazards, Disasters, and Emergency Management", *CARRI Research Report 1*, Hazards and Vulnerability Research Institute, Department of Geography, University of South Carolina, September 2008.

Cutter S., Emrich C. and Burton C., *Baseline Indicators for Disaster Resilient Communities*, Hazards & Vulnerability Research Institute, University of South Carolina, CARRI Workshop in Broomfield, USA, *no date*.

- **Resilience Capacity Index (RCI)**

More information is available at: brr.berkeley.edu/rci/

- **Indonesia Disaster Recovery Index (DRI)**

UNDP, *Launching of the world's first disaster recovery index*, 27.11.2013 (press release).
UNDP, *Merapi Longitudinal Study*, 2010.

- **ResilUS**: Modeling community recovery from disasters

More information available at: huxley.wwu.edu/ri/resilus
www.iitk.ac.in/nicee/wcee/article/14_09-01-0095.PDF
www.conference.net.au/cibwbc13/papers/cibwbc2013_submission_250.pdf

Indexes using household level

At the household level, one resilience index was developed by the FAO.

- **The FAO Resilience** framework looks at the **root causes of household vulnerability** instead of trying to predict how well households will cope with future crises or disasters. It also considers how household food security links to the entire **food system**. These factors are combined into an index which gives an **overall quantitative 'resilience score'**. The score shows where investments need to be made to further build resilience. The resilience tool uses **data available** in national household budget surveys such as the Living Standard Measurement Surveys or Household Income and Expenditure Surveys.

FAO/EC, *Measuring Resilience: A Concept Note on the Resilience Tool*, no date.

Alinovi L., Mane E. and Romano D., *Measuring household resilience to food insecurity: application to Palestinian households*, Working paper, January 2009.

B.3) Donors' approaches

The approaches for resilience measurement adopted by donors include a significant focus on the most cost effective way to help targeted beneficiaries. These are based on the cost-benefit, or 'value for money', theory that investing in resilience is less expensive than humanitarian assistance. However, some initiatives that provided value for money today may not be equally cost effective tomorrow. During the Expert Consultation on Resilience Measurement for Food Security, this led to the conclusion that "*an emphasis on value for money over programme impact may not prove satisfactory from a donor perspective in the long run, particularly when considering the cost of not taking action*".

- The **European Commission** communication on resilience[28] outlines ten steps aimed at enhancing resilience and reducing the vulnerability of the world's most vulnerable populations. These steps include support for the design of **national resilience strategies**, disaster management plans and efficient early-warning systems in disaster-prone countries, as well as supporting innovative approaches to risk management in partnership with private industry (e.g. insurance). Today, the European Commission is systematically including resilience in its **Humanitarian Implementation Plans** and is currently developing a **Resilience Marker**, which will serve as a tool to assess to what extent humanitarian actions funded by DG ECHO integrate resilience considerations. The Resilience Marker (still under formulation) will notably be based on 4 criteria, namely: Negative effects / "Do no Harm"; Adapted project design; Analysis of potential hazards, threats and vulnerabilities; Longer-term strategy to reduce future humanitarian needs.

- **DFID** published in 2011 a guidance entitled "Defining Disaster Resilience: A DFID Approach Paper", in support of its commitment to **embed resilience building** in all DFID country programs by 2015. It also recently developed a methodology for the measurement of resilience that allows ICF[29] projects to report against certain **Key Performance Indicators** (KPIs), specifically **KPI4**, i.e. numbers of **people with improved resilience to climate shocks** and stresses as a result of project support. The KPI4 is a mandatory indicator specified in the **BRACED[30] log-frame**, at the outcome level. In recognition of the diversity of project contexts, and the different levels of complexity and rigor that will be possible in these contexts, the methodological guidance specifies a set of **'bronze', 'silver' and 'gold' standards** for the measurement of numbers with improved resilience.

  DFID, *Methodology for reporting against KPI4 – Number of people whose resilience has been improved as a result of project support*, 2014.

- **USAID**'s multi-dimensional approach to measuring resilience in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel seeks to identify resilience factors contributing to food security in the face of droughts. The model focuses on creating indices around six domains of resilience: income and food access, assets, social capital/safety nets, nutrition and health, adaptive capacity and governance. Adapted from the **FAO resilience domain framework**, the USAID model identifies a number of potential indicators under each domain. It makes use of **existing indicators** and data already collected in standard FFP[31]/FTF[32] baseline surveys, adding in a limited set of

[28] EC (2012), "Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - The EU approach to resilience: learning from food security crises", COM(2012)586.
[29] ICF: International Climate Fund.
[30] BRACED: Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters program.
[31] FFP : Food for Peace.
[32] FTF : Feed The Future.

additional measures. As part of this, USAID is piloting a **resilience module in Kenya and Ethiopia** that focuses on measuring resilience capacities. The module uses a **survey** on self-perception and includes retrospective as well as prospective questions.

Collins, G. 2012. Measuring the results of USAID resilience investments in the Horn and Sahel. Concept Note.

Collins, G. 2013. Measuring resilience to recurrent crises in the Horn of Africa and Sahel: Initial approaches and challenges. PowerPoint presentation to the *Expert Consultation on Resilience Measurement Related to Food Security* sponsored by the Food and Agricultural Organization and World Food Program, Rome, Italy, February 19-21, 2013.

USAID, *The Resilience Agenda: Measuring Resilience in USAID*, no date.

Frankenberger, T., Mueller M., Spangler T., and Alexander S., *Community Resilience: Conceptual Framework and Measurement Feed the Future Learning Agenda*, Rockvil le, MD: Westat, 2013.

B.4) Political frameworks

- The **Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)** is monitored through the HFA Monitoring and Progress Review process (www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/). The monitoring framework relies (with the exception of the 3 numeric indicators) on a **self-assessment by governments**, which remains by definition subjective. This does not allow for inter-country comparison. Nearly all indicators on the level of 'goals' refer to national policies, plans and programmes. Element of **resilience** are captured at the level of goals (mostly national policies) and priorities (activities to help reduce disaster risk).
- Led by the European Commission, **Alliance AGIR-Sahel** (www.oecd.org/site/rpca/agir/) was launched in December 2012. Involving a range of stakeholders including USAID, UN agencies, and host governments, AGIR-Sahel serves as the vehicle for **better coordinating humanitarian and development efforts in the Sahel region**. Besides, the AGIRs roadmap (www.oecd.org/swac/publications/AGIR%20roadmap_EN_FINAL.pdf) includes a set of key performance and impact indicators focusing on **food and nutritional vulnerability and resilience**. Three out of four outcomes and the related indicators refer to food and nutrition, while one refers to social protection. The indicators are mostly drawn from the region's **existing policies and programs**, as well as from regional and international initiatives in which many countries in the region participate, such as the Scaling-Up Nutrition movement (scalingupnutrition.org).
  AGIR's roadmap, www.oecd.org/swac/publications/AGIR%20roadmap_EN_FINAL.pdf

Annex 2: List of IFRC internal documents reviewed

A) Internal Guidelines and manuals

- **IFRC,** *A framework for community safety and resilience - In the face of disaster risk*, Geneva, 2008
- **IFRC,** *Project/programme planning Guidance manual*, Geneva, 2010
- **IFRC**, *IFRC Framework for Evaluation*, Planning and Evaluation Department (PED), February, 2011
- **IFRC**, *Project/programme monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guide*, Geneva, 2011
- **IFRC - Scott Chaplowe**, *Measuring Community Resilience in the IFRC*, January, 2014

B) Studies

- **ARUP**, "IFRC Dhuvaafaru Island Tsunami Resettlement Study, Maldives, Final Report"*,* London 2012
- **ARUP**, *"*IFRC Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction study - Latin America and the Caribbean", London, 2013
- **ARUP & The Rockefeller Foundation**, "City Resilience Framework", London, 2014
- **IFRC**, *"*Saving lives, changing minds. Characteristics of a Safe and Resilient Community - Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Study*"*, ARUP International Development, Geneva, 2011
- **IFRC**, "The long road to resilience - Impact and cost-benefit analysis of community-based disaster risk reduction in Bangladesh", Geneva, 2012
- **IFRC,** "The road to resilience, Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future, IFRC discussion paper on resilience", Geneva, 2012
- **IFRC**, "Understanding community resilience and program factors that strengthen them - A comprehensive study of Red Cross Red Crescent Societies tsunami operation", Geneva, 2012
- **IFRC**, "The road to strengthening community resilience in East Africa, Advocacy Report", Geneva, 2013

C) Draft version

- **IFRC**, *IFRC Framework for Community Resilience*, July 17, 2014. Including Annex One FCR.
- **IFRC***, Options for including community resilience in the post-2015 development goals,* September 24, 2013
- **Powell S.**, *East Africa logframe template for community resilience*, March 3, 2014

- **Powell S**., *Report on IFRC EA community resilience consultancy*, June 3, 2014.

D) Tools

- **American Red Cross**, *Community Resilience Assessment Tool*, 2014
- **IFRC / Habitat for Humanity,** *Participatory Approach for Safe Shelter Awareness (PASSA),* (no date)
- **QSAND / IFRC / BRE**, *Quantifying Sustainability in the Aftermath of Natural Disasters - Guidance manual,* 2014
- **Pfefferbaum R.L., Pfefferbaum B., Van Horn R.L., Neas B.R., Houston J.B.***, "Building community resilience to disasters through a community-based intervention : Cart@ applications"*, Journal of Emergency Management, 2013
- **White G.**, *LARRA 2 South America Baseline / Endline - Presentation of disaggregated results*, Q&L Panama, August 21, 2014

Annex 3: Example of a filled CRM template (Table 1)

This table is based on an imaginary case and is simplified. The case is inspired by the situation of a village located in Sahel with the following characteristics: Arid climate, regular droughts and floods, approximately 1000 inhabitants corresponding to approximately 150 households (HH). Agro pastoralism is the main activity. The village is situated alongside a river.
In this table the characteristics are inspired by the IFRC's resilience characteristics study. We suppose that any RCRC branch has previous intervention in this community.

CONCEPT OF RESILIENCE		**GENERIC INDICATORS**	**STATUS OF THE COMMUNITY RESILIENCE'S CAPACITIES**					
			Community identification of shocks and stresses			**CR capacities and weaknesses**		
Community Resilience components/ Dimensions	**Sub-components/Characteristics**		**Description**	**Priority of concern *(1:low to 5:high)***	**% of HH under threat**	**Description of the CR capacities/ weaknesses**	**Propensity to resilience *(-5 to 5)***	**Indicators/% of HH which possess this capacity/ weaknesses**
1. Human	- Knowledge/education, - Attitudes and practices in basic sectors: health & hygiene, nutrition, food security, water and sanitation, - Disease prevalence - Knowledge of adapted agricultural techniques ***Resilient community is knowledgeable and healthy so it can assess, manage and monitor its risks, learn new skills, and build on past experiences.***	**General development indicators** - *Prevalence of global chronic malnutrition (26%),* - *60% of HH are very pour* - *20% of HH are pour* - *15% of HH are middle* - *5% of HH are rich* - *75% of people accessing drinking water through a borehole installed In a neighbouring village* - *HDI: The country is ranked 184th on 187 in 2014 by UNDP* **IFCR specific indicators** - *Number of HH connected to RCRC* **[0%]** - *Community's level of trust in RCRC* **[0%]**	Cholera outreach	**2** (in 1992, cholera outreach has caused the death of one or two members of almost all the HH in the village)	**100%**	Attitude and practices in health hygiene and water and sanitation are nonexistent in the community	**-4**	% and/or # of people who have adopted attitudes and practices health hygiene and water and sanitation **[0%]**
			Nutrition crisis	**4** (this is permanent problem the village regardless the period of the year (harvest period or lean season)	**100%**	Attitude and practices in nutrition are nonexistent in the community	**-4**	% and/or # of people who have adopted attitudes and practices in nutrition **[0%]**
2. Physical	- Access to Infrastructures and services (Heath, Shelter, education, water and sanitation, transport, communication) - Livestock ***Resilient community has infrastructure and services with a strong system in place to help mitigate adverse effects of change and the ability to maintain, repair and renovate the system.***					Ownership of donkey carts for transport to health center and market	**4**	% and/or # of HH who possess a donkey carts **[20%]**
						Absence of health center in the village (the nearest health center is situated at 30 km and the district hospital, at 90 km)	**4**	% and/or # of people with access to health services **[15%]**

CONCEPT OF RESILIENCE		GENERIC INDICATORS	STATUS OF THE COMMUNITY RESILIENCE'S CAPACITIES						
			Community identification of shocks and stresses			CR capacities and weaknesses			
Community Resilience components/ Dimensions	**Sub-components/Characteristics**		**Description**	**Priority of concern *(1:low to 5:high)***	**% of HH under threat**	**Description of the CR capacities/ weaknesses**	**Propensity to resilience *(-5 to 5)***	**Indicators/% of HH which possess this capacity/ weaknesses**
3. Economic	- Access to employment and other income generating activities - Availability/access to productive assets, access to financial services (credits, saving, insurance, etc.) ***Resilient community has economic opportunities with a diverse range of employment, income and financial services. It is flexible, resourceful and has the capacity to accept uncertainty and respond (proactively) to change.***		Food shortage during the lean season	**5 (**droughts, floods, soil degradation, etc. create food shortage every year. The lean season can last from 4 to 8 months)	**100%**	Being member of a farmer's group (cooperative)	**3**	% and/or # of HH connected to farmer's groups **[50%]**
						Having access to market garden group (especially women)	**2**	% and/or # of HH having market garden activities **[20%]**
						Having diverse source of income	**4**	% and/or # of HH who have a minimum of three different source of income **[15%]**
								% and/or # HH above the livelihood protection threshold (see HEA) **[5%]**
						Lack of money to invest in agriculture/ livestock	**-3**	% and/or # of HH who have access to financial services (credit, saving, etc.) **[0%]**
4. Natural/environmental	- Natural resources (Rivers, forests, lands, …) - Mode of natural resources management ***Resilient community can manage its natural assets by recognizing their value and, through the ability to protect, enhances and maintains them.***					Mobility of the livestock	**5**	% and/or # of HH (having livestock) capable to move **[100%]**
						Having cultivable plots simultaneously in lowlands and in highlands	**4**	% and/or # of HH who have simultaneously plots in lowland and in highlands **[30]**
						No dike exists along the river to channel it.	**-5**	% and/or # of HH who have their inhabitations protected from flood **[20% mostly HH living in highland]**
								% and/or # of HH who have their plots protected from flood **[60% of the plots are in highland]**
						Use of soil conservation techniques (zaï, half-moon)	**4**	% and/or # of HH that adopt soil conservation techniques **[10%]**
5. Social	- Social organization (leadership)					Solidarity between the village inhabitants	**5**	

CONCEPT OF RESILIENCE		GENERIC INDICATORS	STATUS OF THE COMMUNITY RESILIENCE'S CAPACITIES					
			Community identification of shocks and stresses			CR capacities and weaknesses		
Community Resilience components/ Dimensions	**Sub-components/Characteristics**		**Description**	**Priority of concern *(1:low to 5:high)***	**% of HH under threat**	**Description of the CR capacities/ weaknesses**	**Propensity to resilience *(-5 to 5)***	**Indicators/% of HH which possess this capacity/ weaknesses**
	- Social networks - Social cohesion - Social efficacy - Relationships with migrants (remittances…) ***Resilient community is organized so it can identify issues, establish priorities and act.***					Emigrants are organized in association in their host countries and send money for establishment of infrastructures (school, warehouse, etc.)	**5**	
						Traditional law forbids the woman to own land (the women headed HH have limited access to land)	**-4**	% and/or # of women headed HH who own their plots **[0%]**
6. Institutional and Governance	- Functioning of institutions - Public policies - Rights and legislative frameworks ***Resilient community is engaged in development of local policy for reducing risks.***					No information on governmental institution (who do what, contact information, etc.)/Limited agricultural extension work/ No access to veterinary clinics/ No livestock disease surveillance system	**-4**	% and/or # of HH who have access to agriculture and livestock extension services **[0%]**
								% and/or # of HH who have learned new adapted agricultural techniques **[0%]**
								% and/or # of livestock breeders with access to veterinary services **[0%]**
								% and/or # of HH involved in a national or district livestock surveillance system **[0%]**
						Limited opportunity to discuss the community's challenges with the district administrators	**-4**	# of people who participate regularly in meeting with the district administrators **[2 people (chief of the village and his deputy]**
7. External resources	- National and international aid system, including RCRC ***Resilient community is connected with external actors who provide a wider supportive environment, and supply goods and services when needed.***					Very limited access to NGOs (National and international)/No skills for advocacy	**-4**	# of community representatives who are trained to advocate **[0]**
								% and/or # of HH who are involved in NGO's interventions **[10%]**

Annex 4: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference (TOR)
Community Resilience Performance Measurement Methodology and Standard Indicators

1. Background

The concept of 'resilience' and more specifically 'community resilience' continues to attract attention within the international humanitarian and development communities.

For the IFRC the concept of resilience represents a unique opportunity. The concept itself captures the totality of what IFRC is working to achieve to a much greater extent than is the case for many other organizations as building local communities' resilience is, in many ways, the essence of what the IFRC is about and reflects decades of effort by RCRC National Societies in support of their local communities.

In 2008, IFRC published the original Framework for Community Safety and Resilience as a guidance for RCRC National Societies and in 2012 this was followed up with a discussion paper, the Road to Resilience, timed to raise policy and programming issues relating to community resilience with global thought leaders attending the Rio +20 forum.

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) is currently finalizing a project, titled 'The Roadmap to Resilience', that will deliver three key products to guide and support future RCRC efforts in strengthening community resilience:

a. The Community Resilience Framework – this revision of the 2008 Framework for Community Safety and Resilience will guide ***what*** the RCRC does in relation to community resilience and ***how*** it does it,
b. The Road to Resilience – a position paper that ***articulates and communicates*** what the RCRC does in relation to community resilience, and
c. Community Resilience Financing – a mechanism that supports the long-term, predictable ***funding*** of community resilience programming.

Key objectives of this programme include:

- Providing a framework that guides IFRCs community resilience programming at scale,
- Communicating, articulating and advocating IFRCs position in relation to community resilience and
- Identifying financing methodologies that support community resilience programming.

The availability of a reliable performance measurement approach, including performance indicators, relating to community resilience, remains a gap. This study is intended to go some way to address this need and provide a methodology whereby practitioners can confidently gather evidence about the effectiveness of the community resilience approach.

IFRC wishes to develop a clear understanding of the current thinking and practice relating to the measurement of community resilience that can be reflected in the Roadmap to Resilience products. This is particularly important given these documents are intended to guide and support RCRC efforts in this field for years to come.

2. Review Objective

This review has the objective of identifying a performance measurement methodology, including performance indicators, that supports and guides IFRC community resilience strengthening activities. The analysis, findings and recommendations will also provide new ideas and contribute to wider efforts to improve performance measurement across IFRC.

3. Review Outcomes

The key outcomes of this review are:

a. A comprehensive, documented review of current knowledge and practice in relation to the measurement of community resilience that includes an annotated literature review as an attachment,
b. A recommended performance measurement methodology that includes standards, performance indicators and that is applicable at the project, programme and global levels and consistent with the latest version of the community resilience framework.

4. Key Considerations

Specific issues to be discussed in this review to include:

a. Knowledge
    i. Is a 'generally accepted' position about measuring community resilience present or emerging?
    ii. What are the issues and thinking reflected in the literature about measuring community resilience?
b. Practice
    i. What examples of successful community resilience measurement are emerging from the literature?
    ii. Are there consistencies/differences in the approaches/methodologies in measuring community resilience within IFRC?
c. Analysis and comparisons
    i. Is a particular approach/methodology to measuring community resilience emerging in the literature? In practice?
d. Recommended method and performance indicators
    i. What methods for measuring community resilience are recommended for adoption at IFRC? Identification of specific aspects of the current IFRC M&E system where development, improvement or adaptation would support better measurement of community resilience. Provide a rationale supporting recommended developments, improvements or changes.
    ii. What are the standard community resilience performance indicators applicable at the project, programme and global levels? What is the rationale supporting this recommendation?
    iii. What are the method's benefits, risks, costs and trade-offs for communities, National Societies, partners and other stakeholders?

5. Scope and Method

The scope of this review extends to community resilience practice in the humanitarian and development sectors.

The consultant will review the literature and interview key informants, generally via telephone or other virtual mechanisms. A detailed methodological approach should be outlined by the consultant in their study implementation proposals.

Analysis, findings and recommendations are to be framed taking account of the Roadmap to Resilience programme, RCRC community resilience strengthening activities and IFRC Evaluation framework, guidance and tools.

6. Review Management

This review is being managed by the Community Preparedness and Risk Reduction Department of the IFRC, Geneva and the contact office is Mr Chris Staines, email: Chris.Staines@ifrc.org.

Following selection of the preferred proposal a contract will be established, the IFRC pro-forma consultancy contract shall apply and a copy is available upon request.

Implementation shall commence immediately upon contracting of the consultancy and be completed no later than 29th August 2014.

7. Specific Deliverables and Schedule

Schedule	Activity	Deliverable & Proposed Schedule
Week One	1. Initial briefing (Geneva x 1 day) 2. Stakeholder interviews 3. Inception Report 4. Literature Review 5. Key Informant Interviews	Inception Report by end of Week One
Week Two	1. Literature Review 2. Key Informant Interviews	
Week Three	1. Finalizing Literature Report 2. Drafting Report 3. Submit Draft Report and Annotated Literature Review as an Attachment	Draft Report by end of Week Three
'Wrap Up' Week	1. Review feedback 2. Draft and Submit Final Report 3. De-briefing Meeting (Geneva x 1 day)	Final Report De-briefing Meeting

8. Consultancy Qualifications and Experience

Proposals to deliver this review will be accepted from individuals, non-profit organizations, private firms, academic institutions or a consortia of these.
The successful proposal shall demonstrate:

- Extensive experience in evaluations and statistics, documenting meta-synthesis and conducting literature reviews
- An understanding of, and practical experience in resilience, systems strengthening, integrated community development
- Proven capacity to deliver complex reviews, undertake complex analysis and deliver succinct and precise findings, reports and recommendations.
- Excellent writing and documentation skills in English.
- Excellent communication skills.
- Results focused, accountable and punctual.
- Extensive experience working with the Red Cross Red Crescent preferred.

9. Application Procedure and Timeline

- Interested consultancies are invited to submit a study implementation proposal by 11th July 2014 in accordance with the instructions to tenderer attached to this document.
- The proposal to conduct this review should:
    - Not exceed 6 pages.
    - Include as annexes the CVs of all envisioned participating individuals (additional to the max. 6 pages for the concept proposal).
    - Include an indicative budget not exceeding CHF20,000.
- Enquiries are only permitted in writing and up to 3 days before the deadline for submission. Answers will be sent by e-mail. Inquiries to be addressed to: Mr Chris Staines of the IFRC Community Preparedness and Risk Reduction Department, Geneva: **chris.staines@ifrc.org**

Ends.
23rd June 2014

Annex 5: Stakeholders and key informants

Briefing meetings, on 12th August 2014 at the IFRC Geneva

Name	Position
Chris Staines	Community Preparedness and Risk Reduction
Shaun Hazeldine	Volunteering & Youth
Nathan Cooper, Pankaj Mishra & Chris Staines	Zurich file & DRR
Valpuri Saarelma & Karen Hostens	Community Resilience and IFRC policy
Scott Chaplowe	M&E and Community Resilience

IFRC Internal Stakeholders

Name	Position
Sandra Durzo	Shelter & Settlements, IFRC Geneva
Mostafa Mohaghegh	Partnership for Urban Disaster Risk Reduction, IFRC Geneva
Gabriel Pictet	Health, IFRC Geneva
Ramzi Saliba	MENA Zone, Disaster Management Unit, IFRC Beirut
Bhupinder Tomar	Africa Zone, Head of Programme Support and Corporate Services, IFRC Nairobi

Key Informants

Name	Organization	Content to Cover	Email
Jo daSilva	Arup International Developement	General community resilience, urban, etc. Consulted for IFRC on previous CR projects.	jo.da-Silva@arup.com
Gavin White	American Red Cross	M&E expert	gavin.white@redcross.org
Steve Powell	Independent	Resilience, Organizational Learning	steve@promente.net
Jan Eijkenaar	ECHO AGIR Sahel	Resilience & AGIR, Technical Assistant, ECHO	jan.eijkenaar@gmail.com
Dominique Albert	ECHO	Resilience and LLRD, referent person, Unit A4, European Commission.	Dominique.ALBERT@ec.europa.eu

Interview schedule

Times (Geneva time) Dates	9:00 - 10:00	10:00 - 11:00	11:00 - 12:00	12:00 - 1300	14:00 - 15:00	16:00 - 17:00
28 August 2014			Jan Eijkenaar, DG ECHO Dakar			Gabriel Pictet, IFRC
01 September 2014						White Gavin, American Red Cross
03 September 2014		Bhupinder Tomar, Africa zone	Ramzi Saliba, MENA zone		Steve Powell, Consultant	
12 September 2014			Sandra Durzo, Shelter & Settlements			Mostafa Mohaghegh, Partnership for Urban Disaster Risk Reduction
16 September 2014				Jo da Silva, Arup International		
17 September 2014	Dominique Albert					

Annex 6: Interview Template

Study: IFRC's Community Resilience Performance Measurement

Template for the interviews (internal and external key informant of IFRC)

Name of the interviewee(s):
Position of the interviewee(s) and key information about him (or them):
Date of the interview:
Participants of the interview:
Remarks (e.g. any constraints or limitations…):

The interviewer will fill in this template during the interview. Each Chapter should be documented during each interview. However the list of points for each chapter is just indicative. This list is neither exhaustive nor compulsory to be filled in entirely. The information will not be asked in a linear manner. At the beginning of each interview, the interviewers will introduce themselves and the aim of the study. The interview will be adapted interview according to the type of interviewees (internal or external of IFRC).

RESILIENCE CONCEPT (for the IFRC internal key informants): - Level of clarity, appropriateness, and use for the IFRC-led interventions - Areas of improvement to make the concept more understandable, more appropriate and usable

DESCRIPTION OF PREVIOUS EXPERIENCES or ATTEMPTS OF COMMUNITY RESILIENCE MEASUREMENT (CRM) Describe the geographic situation of the CRM experience (country, region, etc.) Describe the context: - The crises: natural disaster (rapid onset, slow onset), conflict situation, protracted crisis, complex emergency, scale of the crisis, etc. - The main Stakeholders involved in the CRM experience (donors, RCRC movement, UN agencies, NGOs, government bodies, etc.) – Individual initiative of an organization or a collective effort involving several organizations - Operational sectors (Food Security, Disaster Response, Livelihood support, Water and Sanitation, Health, Migration (IDPs, Refugees), Housing, etc.) - Period covered *For the IFRC internal key informants, if there is not yet an experience related to the CRM, we can talk about other initiatives of measurement or M&E experience, but with a link to resilience strengthening projects or activities.*

INTERESTS/CHALLENGES OF CRM: - Position/ interest of the Key informant's organization vis-à-vis measurement of resilience - Opportunities and constraints (availability of data, organisational capacity, resource availability, time availability, coordination with other stakeholders, etc.) - Other relevant issues regarding the CRM.

METHODOLOGY USED:

- Main principles adopted for the CRM experience
- What was measured (Resilience capacity, Programmeme results (or programmemes' contributions to the CR), Well-being, Vulnerability, Impact of disasters, Communities or households' recovery responses, etc.)
- Level of analysis (Global, National, Sub-national/Community, households/individual, etc.)
- Examples of standard indicators
- Inductive approach / independent approach/ mixed approach?
- Existing assessment tools considered (IPC, CHB, CFSVA, HEA, CHB, VCA, CVCA, CRISTAL, etc.)[33]
- Have the approaches been tested in the field?

LESSONS LEARNT FROM CRM EXPERIENCES:

- Describe the specific characteristics of a successful CRM.
- Describe what worked, what didn't work, what were the main problems and how were they overcome
- Feedbacks from any testing process?

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- What would you recommend for launching any process of CRM?
- Main elements/principles to keep in mind when designing a CRM methodology
- Do you have any 'out of the box' thoughts that you would like to share with us?

[33] **IPC: Integrated Food Security Phase Classification; CFSVA: Comprehensive Framework for Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis; HEA: Household Economy Analysis; CHB: Cadre Harmonisé Bonifié d'analyse de la Sécurité Alimentaire (used in Sahel); VCA: Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment; CVCA: Cadre d'analyse de la Vulnérabilité et de la Capacité d'Adaptation, CRISTAL: Community-based Risk Screening Tool – Adaptation & Livelihoods.**