

## Urban Resilience Scoping Report, May 2018

### Introduction

---

#### *Purpose*

This document is a summary of information regarding urban resilience initiatives in the Red Cross Red Crescent movement and beyond. The review looked at past and present knowledge and experiences regarding urban resilience to both provide an evidence base and prompt questions for thought and discussion at the Urban Resilience Think Tank.

#### *Methodology*

A selection of reviews, studies, workshop papers and programme documentation has been reviewed, with a particular focus on the Asia Pacific region but including some key documentation from other regions. Key documents from external sources were also reviewed.

The findings have been categorised into themes. However, many findings/issues are cross cutting and interrelated.

### Literature review findings - by theme

---

<b>RCRC auxiliary role: Strengthening/using the auxiliary role to its full potential .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Taking the lead on new urban challenges .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Bridging/linking/advocacy .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Broader approach to partnerships .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Understanding urban context, identifying vulnerability, inclusive programming .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>RCRC reach and relevance in cities .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Leveraging volunteers .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Integrated approach .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Resourcing: Using the right tools for the job, approach, knowledge base.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Resilient National Societies, branch structures – institutional and operational capacity .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Cross cutting issues.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix 1 – External literature review (non-Red Cross Red Crescent) .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendix 2 – Documents Reviewed .....</b>	<b>38</b>

## RCRC auxiliary role: Strengthening/using the auxiliary role to its full potential

Findings	
<b>Strategic direction</b>	<p>National Societies are well positioned to serve as a bridge between the most vulnerable communities and the institutions that govern and serve them.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Leveraging our auxiliary role to local governments, National Societies should create connections between diverse communities and the key city actors (including, city authorities, municipalities, private sector, small businesses, schools, vulnerable groups), and be the convener of key elements of Disaster Management systems.<sup>2</sup></p>
<b>Lessons &amp; challenges identified</b>	<p>The IFRC and National Societies are behind when it comes to Urban DRR, and therefore not also able to suggest recommendations to States as well as local authorities. As a result, most of our National Societies are currently unable to contribute to any of the 10 principles of the UNISDR Campaign, Making Cities Resilient.<sup>3</sup></p> <p>Nepal: Difficulty engaging and coordinating with relevant municipalities due to frequent transfer of key interlocutors in Government departments.<sup>4</sup></p> <p>Kenya: Challenges linking with the Government at all levels to support the development of disaster management laws and regulations at national and sub-national levels.<sup>5</sup></p> <p>RCRC National Societies need a stronger ability to speak out on political issues and on behalf of the vulnerable while still maintaining effective working relationships.<sup>6</sup></p> <p>Bangladesh: The V2R programme is within the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS) auxiliary role - a significant advantage. However, it has not fully leveraged its relations with the district government and there is a need for further clarification about the linkages between the Community Disaster Management Committees (CDMCs)/Community Disaster Response Teams (CDRTs) and BDRCS structure and alignment with the BDRCS “integrated resilience approach”.<sup>7</sup></p> <p>Uganda elections 2011 - to ensure sustainability of the gains achieved in avoiding hostilities towards staff, the Uganda Red Cross Society needs to ensure it defines a strictly auxiliary role in relation to government to help sustain its clearly defined humanitarian role.<sup>8</sup></p> <p>Guatemala: Challenges working with/influencing authorities without entering into political conflicts, getting permission from authorities to work with populations (especially in contexts with a high level of violence).<sup>9</sup></p>
<b>Actions needed</b>	<p>Priority should be given to developing materials that enable National Societies to improve technical and negotiating skills in order to assert their role within urban communities and as auxiliaries to governments<sup>10</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study government disaster response plans and identify areas for community participation</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012

<sup>2</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>3</sup> RCRC engagement in the 9<sup>th</sup> session of the World Urban Forum, 2018

<sup>4</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012

<sup>5</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>6</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop, 2013

<sup>7</sup> Mid-Term Review V2R -Kurigram, 2017

<sup>8</sup> BRRC, Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>9</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop, 2013

<sup>10</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for the inclusion of the voice of communities into long term city planning and for planning decisions to be evidence-based</li> <li>• Creation of city-level agreements (that reflect national law/status). Based on auxiliary role of the NSs, the scope of engagement should be at the level of preparing law and regulations for the country.<sup>11</sup></li> </ul>
<b>Examples</b>	The National Red Cross Society in <b>Costa Rica</b> has been working with communities to identify resilience priorities and has developed new brokering approaches to help communities address needs that fall outside of the RC/RC's own direct services. For example, after a community dengue outbreak in early 2014, a RC/RC-Ministry of Health partnership focused on technical measures, such as fumigation, as well as community clean-up and awareness campaigns, with joint teams of Ministry of Health personnel and Red Cross volunteers going door-to door to explain the simple actions needed to reduce dengue. Within a couple of months, the number of dengue cases in the community fell to three. This demonstrated the power of leveraging existing NS mechanisms for greater impact. <sup>12</sup>
<b>IFRC role</b>	To assist National Societies in developing a strategy to expand their vision of the IFRC auxiliary role to local level and to increase their role as a major stakeholder in cities. <sup>13</sup>
<b>Survey quotes</b>	<i>"The RCRC auxiliary role (if recognized nationally through legislation) provides a solid base to be localized. Branches, chapters or units at city level need to be proactive and to engage actively with city authorities so that they are recognized as key actors. The rightful position will not be handed on a silver platter: it needs to be actively pursued and protected."</i>

## Taking the lead on new urban challenges

<b>Strategic direction</b>	<p>RCRC can be the lead/expert organization in recognizing and responding to "new urban challenges" (i.e. urban refugees, mass migration, returnees, social inclusion).<sup>14</sup></p> <p>Work even more closely with local governments and with special urban development programmes that focus on the poor and marginalised (informal settlement rehabilitation).<sup>15</sup></p> <p>Vulnerability is compounded in urban settings by two factors: migration and informal settlements.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>To fully realize the potential of the RC/RC network and its wider set of partners and supporters at scale, a new commitment to partnership and coalition-building is necessary, particularly targeting government and non-governmental agencies that work in the area of <b>climate risk management</b><sup>17</sup></p> <p>Vulnerabilities relating to livelihoods and markets. Particularly vulnerable groups include migrants, refugees and displaced people who may lack the relationships and economic means to survive in a market economy, as well as the skills necessary to get paid work.<sup>18</sup></p>
<b>Lessons identified</b>	<b>Land tenure</b> is often critical in urban areas. Land tenure issues were among the biggest challenges faced by the British Red Cross team in Haiti. <sup>19</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>12</sup> GDPC Scaling urban resilience scoping study 2014

<sup>13</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012

<sup>14</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>15</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012

<sup>16</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop, 2013

<sup>17</sup> GDPC Scaling Urban Resilience: A scoping study for Global Action, 2014

<sup>18</sup> BRRC, Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>19</sup> BRRC, Learning from the City, 2012

<b>Key points non-RCRC actors</b>	Informal settlements: The major challenges for resilience lie in developing the necessary basic infrastructure for water, sanitation and drainage, improving roads and supporting housing improvements. Upgrading these makes low-income settlements and cities more resilient to a range of natural hazards, including flooding and fires. <sup>20</sup>
<b>RCRC role</b>	<p>Urban displacement and resilience is an increasing concern - including refugees, IDPs and disaster displacement. The RCRC Movement has the ability to promote greater protection for displaced peoples during disasters and protracted conflicts, and to ensure that basic services are maintained for urban dwellers during protracted conflict.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>Land use/access - The confluence of informal settlement with hazard-prone environments should make such settlements prime candidates for resilience activities. However, the politically charged nature of informal settlement requires a delicate balance from the RC/RC and other civil society actors to both support formal governance solutions and respond to needs within the existing informal status quo.<sup>22</sup></p> <p>Water and sanitation projects are one key area where RCRC can make an impact in urban areas, as access to safe water and hygiene facilities are a major concern in informal settlements.<sup>23</sup></p> <p>Building Regulations and Land Use Planning: RCRC can focus on the situation of rural populations migrating to urban areas, as well as those of the people living in periurban areas. Some NS already have services for migrant populations such as registration and documentation which enables them to exercise their legal rights.<sup>24</sup></p> <p>RCRC is in a good position to work towards promoting tolerance and countering discrimination against migrant populations. NS can advocate for proper and safe urban spaces for poor people, women and the disabled such as clean and accessible public restrooms, well-lit and clean parks with playgrounds, and public buses accessible by those with disabilities.<sup>25</sup></p> <p>There is an opportunity for the RCRC Movement to play a leadership role in advocating for climate change adaptation within urban areas. Climate change conversations are still disproportionately dominated by mitigation.<sup>26</sup></p>
<b>Actions</b>	<p>Establish IFRC as a credible contributor and “mediator” for resolving pertinent urban issues related to informal settlers and poorer communities.</p> <p>Negotiate with the government authorities a greater role for the IFRC through informed advocacy and active contribution to poverty and risk reduction efforts.<sup>27</sup></p> <p>Some work areas identified to <b>increase the resilience of migrant population</b> included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Direct work” with people who possess documents, work in border regions (language barriers), joint work between the national societies in the country of origin and the destination country to increase knowledge and awareness of migrants and be better placed to provide basic services.</li> <li>• “Support work” for undocumented-refugees: humanitarian diplomacy and setting up alliances with other actors with advocacy experience with migrants (including church groups, human rights defence groups in migration) to ensure access to basic services.</li> </ul>

<sup>20</sup> Advocacy for urban resilience: UNISDR’s Making Cities Resilient Campaign, 2014

<sup>21</sup> RCRC engagement in the 9th session of the World Urban Forum, 2018

<sup>22</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop, 2013

<sup>23</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>24</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>25</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>26</sup> RCRC engagement in the 9th session of the World Urban Forum, 2018

<sup>27</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dedicating specific funds and resources for reducing stigma surrounding the migrant group; promoting cultural and recreational activities around the culture of migrants to sensitize population and political actors;</li> <li>• communications work with society, information and advice points;</li> <li>• training volunteers for psycho-social support, including the migrants themselves;</li> <li>• providing access to basic services.<sup>28</sup></li> </ul> <p>Urban challenges require a focus on governance and rights, and the RCRC movement should consider partnering with new stakeholders in settings where it can be difficult to advocate effectively on behalf of the most vulnerable urban citizens, such as refugees and informal settlement dwellers.<sup>29</sup></p>
<b>Examples</b>	<b>Solving the problem of property rights in the wake of disaster, Ecuador:</b> Shelter and protection clusters created a joint working group on Housing, Land and Property, coordinated by an advisor from the Ecuadorean Red Cross. Working with community members and municipalities to understand existing complexities in tenure arrangements, land conflicts and insecurity, this group successfully advocated for the inclusion of informal tenants as beneficiaries of the Government's financial assistance for housing repair and reconstruction <sup>30</sup>
<b>Survey quotes</b>	<i>"Meeting the needs of the most vulnerable urban residents requires very different ways of tackling vulnerability and risk and engagement in issues that many NS feel uncomfortable touching such as land rights."</i>

## Bridging/linking/advocacy

<b>Strategic direction</b>	<p>A key role for RCRC National Societies could be to link urban citizens with existing government and other services. Our efforts should aim at strengthening social cohesion and promote the needs and interests of the most vulnerable and marginalized urban citizens.<sup>31</sup></p> <p>RCRC can broker access to city residents and amplify the views of the various urban stakeholders and populations to drive meaningful innovation.<sup>32</sup></p> <p>RCRC should explicitly position itself as informed and neutral advocates for vulnerable and marginalized populations in the overall planning, implementation and evaluation of urban development programmes.<sup>33</sup></p> <p>Advocate for the inclusion of disadvantaged urban citizens in policy decisions to resolve unequal and unjust distribution of services or resources, or health outcomes<sup>34</sup>.</p> <p>National Societies play an important role, as a voice for the most vulnerable, to support and participate in the development of strong legal, policy and institutional frameworks to reduce disaster risk in urban environments.<sup>35</sup></p>
<b>RCRC role</b>	National Societies are in a unique position, as a bridge between communities and national/local authorities, to promote understanding, awareness and implementation of

<sup>28</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, South America workshop

<sup>29</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>30</sup> Habitat III - Humanitarian crises and the city. RCRC engagement

<sup>31</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>32</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>33</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012

<sup>34</sup> American Red Cross, Guidance for Urban Resilience Programming, 2015

<sup>35</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

	<p>DRR frameworks. They can act as knowledge connectors and encourage and facilitate meaningful participation of citizens in policy development and decision-making processes.<sup>36</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The capacity to translate formal urban DRR and DM rules and regulations for communities and families, using members, youth and volunteers to improve compliance and implementation.</li> <li>• The ability, drawing on their auxiliary role, to represent the aspirations, needs and priorities of communities and vulnerable people in formal urban planning processes, as well as to private sector investors, ensuring that urban policies, laws and plans are risk informed, facilitate preparedness and response and help meet the needs of the most vulnerable.<sup>37</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Actions/ ideas</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invest effort in understanding local governing structures, institutional and legal arrangements, decision-making processes, and local urban developmental programmes and communicate this knowledge with marginalised communities</li> <li>• Increase the knowledge and capacity within National Societies of disaster law and legislative advocacy (e.g. peer to peer learning amongst National Societies).</li> <li>• Identify and use opportunities/entry points to engage and collaborate with relevant stakeholders (e.g. national authorities, NGOs, UN).</li> <li>• Enhance capacity of staff and volunteers to mobilize and disseminate information about disaster law and work with communities at risk to develop a greater understanding of DRR laws.<sup>38</sup></li> </ul> <p>Improve existing tools to better target advocacy for the socially marginalized and excluded groups.<sup>39</sup></p> <p>Move away from solely being ‘service providers’ to being ‘enablers’. This was a recommendation emerging from the Nairobi Urban Resilience Programme in Kenya - i.e. linking people to other service providers for a more sustainable approach.<sup>40</sup></p>
<p><b>Examples</b></p>	<p>The <b>SURE programme (Nepal)</b> will work in seven municipalities from 2016-202 to improve urban disaster resilience of municipal governments, the Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) and citizens. SURE will use multi-hazard and informal network approaches to understand and build the disaster resilience of municipalities. SURE works with 4 target vulnerable groups in each municipality with each group nominating 30 champions with whom NRCS will build the ability to advocate for disaster priorities. This programme includes new innovative processes such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participatory Campaign Planning that engages citizen voices in creating DM messaging.</li> <li>• Capacity building of government staff and elected officials and preparedness.</li> <li>• Linking citizens with local Government - linking target group champions with government forums, planning and budgeting processes.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, strengthen functional capacity and leadership of NRCS in quality programming and preparedness /response.<sup>41</sup></p> <p><b>Haiti post-quake</b> – urban resilience: The HRC created new strategies for addressing the many needs of the population. DRR was not a priority for those affected, and tools like VCA had to be adapted so that they incorporated a more holistic approach for improving people’s living conditions, as well as preventing false expectations (e.g. distribution of food or other items). The HRC could not attend or respond to all the needs, nonetheless, it</p>

<sup>36</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop Report 2014

<sup>37</sup> Building urban resilience. ANNEX 4 - The Road to Urban Resilience: The IFRC’s Perspective, 2017

<sup>38</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>39</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>40</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>41</sup> SURE Assessment Guidelines, 2017

	<p>established itself as a reference system, seeking solutions to specific problems and acting as a “bridge” with the responsible government institution.<sup>42</sup></p> <p><b>Resilience in the Americas (RITA)</b> – ARC pilot project in 10 countries and 86 communities. Case example - Costa Rica. Priority topic areas include: access to employment &amp; livelihoods, public health (dengue fever) and transportation issues. The project involved working with communities to identify resilience priorities and developed new brokering approaches to help communities address needs that fall outside of the RC/RC own direct services.<sup>43</sup></p>
<p><b>Survey quotes</b></p>	<p><i>“We need to understand where we can add value and facilitate better responses in urban environments - how we can be facilitators rather than deliverers (working with municipal governments, local stakeholders, other partners to broker and influence etc)”</i></p> <p><i>“Pick some cases and tell the story. Floods in Jakarta, slums in Dhaka, vaccination in Karachi, earthquake in Bakhtapur, etc... we need more stories and publications with a deliberate urban twist”</i></p>

## Broader approach to partnerships

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnerships to increase evidence base/research/technical knowledge</li> <li>• Partnerships including private sector</li> <li>• Coalitions for urban risk reduction and contingency planning</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strategic direction</b></p>	<p>We need to <b>proactively establish multi-stakeholder partnerships</b> in urban contexts in preparedness, response and recovery to include an exchange of new ideas, expertise and knowledge. Multi-partner approach is a crucial link in scaling up capacities and resourcing.<sup>44</sup></p> <p>Create multi-stakeholder urban coalitions for safety and resilience, particularly at city-level.<sup>45</sup></p> <p><b>Coalition building model anchored around three core types of stakeholder partners:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) business community,</li> <li>2) foundations/govt and international orgs/research institutions,</li> <li>3) RCRC and NGOs (GDPC Scaling Urban Resilience scoping study).<sup>46</sup></li> </ol> <p>Define RCRC role in Urban Risk Reduction based on country contexts and NS structure and solidify partnerships/coordination with urban stakeholders.</p> <p>Leverage working partnerships with national and local disaster management authorities for greater access to decision-making processes for vulnerable populations.</p> <p>Corporate / private sector can be rich sources of social capital, technical knowledge, and other resources.<sup>47</sup></p> <p>Through CSR initiatives, partner with corporate entities in all aspects of Disaster management, while serving as a conduit to communities and schools. Capitalize on the opportunity to promote corporate and institutional volunteer services.<sup>48</sup></p>

<sup>42</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, South America workshop

<sup>43</sup> GDPC Scaling urban resilience scoping study 2014

<sup>44</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>45</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>46</sup> Scaling Urban Resilience – GDPC scoping study, 2014

<sup>47</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia Workshop, 2013

<sup>48</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

	<p>Generating evidence through scientific information facilitates changes in mass perceptions. To do this, RCRC needs to build collaborative partnerships with professionals, universities, research institutions and the private sector.<sup>49</sup></p> <p>Recognise roles of non-traditional partners (foundations, private companies, universities, etc.) in building expertise in a range of RC/RC work areas (including risk analysis, protection of livelihoods, market research).<sup>50</sup></p>
<b>Lessons identified</b>	<p>Urban environment: A major challenge is involvement and coordination of multiple stakeholders with different mandates and approaches.<sup>51</sup></p> <p>To vastly increase community action there is a need to consistently provide two inputs that are largely missing in existing programs: i) strong local coalitions and ii) effective scaling and connecting mechanisms. New approaches are needed to expand beyond the current set of resilience champions and enable a wider set of RC/RC branch and other community partners.<sup>52</sup></p> <p>There is a need to gain the confidence, skills, and access to catalyst technical resources and financing to implement these models in their own communities.<sup>53</sup></p> <p>National Societies require more experience in working with local authorities, professional organisations, private sector, academia, and other local urban actors. They are also not integrated and active in global urban DRR/CCA initiatives.<sup>54</sup></p> <p>A multi-partner approach is a crucial link in scaling up capacities and resourcing, which has in the past been a limiting factor for the expansion of resilience programs within the RC/RC.<sup>55</sup></p> <p><b>Uganda elections 2011</b> – There were challenges in ensuring effective multi-agency planning due to a lack of pre-crisis agreements on engagement with other agencies duplicating RC efforts.<sup>56</sup></p>
<b>Key points from non-RCRC actors</b>	<p>Achieving resilience objectives requires the cooperation of all actors that make a city function on a daily basis. This can be the key to the effectiveness and sustainability of a city's resilience plans, and can often stimulate progress despite limited resources.<sup>57</sup></p> <p>The private sector is the major engine of job and livelihood creation and is therefore key to resilience. The private sector is also responsible for a large share of infrastructure implementation and operation.<sup>58 59</sup></p>
<b>RCRC role</b>	Using our convening power to form the network and then 'getting out of the way' so that the RC/RC isn't automatically the lead partner. <sup>60</sup>
<b>IFRC role</b>	The Federation can support the membership to build in-country capacities, adapt the tools, and facilitate alliances with key national institutions that can accompany them in this process. <sup>61</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>50</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Americas workshop, 2013

<sup>51</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience Workshops, 2013

<sup>52</sup> Scaling Urban Resilience – GDPC scoping study, 2014

<sup>53</sup> Scaling Urban Resilience – GDPC scoping study, 2014

<sup>54</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>55</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>56</sup> BRRC, Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>57</sup> Making Cities Resilient: Summary for Policymakers (UNISDR) 2013

<sup>58</sup> Making Cities Resilient: Summary for Policymakers (UNISDR) 2013

<sup>59</sup> Developing city resilience strategies: lessons from the ICLEI-ACCCRN process, 2017

<sup>60</sup> GDPC Scaling up urban resilience workshop 2014

<sup>61</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012



	<p>The IFRC Secretariat should be supporting National Societies to identify their unique role in urban resilience and their added value in being actively engaged in similar events, including through the promotion of partnerships with the private sector, academics and CSO's to improve our operational capacity in urban context.<sup>62</sup></p> <p>Develop tools and pilot projects that assist the National Society in understanding and establishing collaborations with local authorities, service providers, private sector, academia and other major actors in cities. Develop regional and global advocacy campaigns. Support National Societies in upgrading their negotiation, communication and marketing skills to increase their effectiveness in establishing and maintaining partnerships.<sup>63</sup></p>
<p><b>Actions/ideas</b></p>	<p>Determine what working partnerships already exist between the National Societies and local disaster management authorities. Focus could be in 1) preparedness and contingency planning (emergency management, search and rescue, local action response teams); and 2) health promotion (dengue program, avian influenza, and others).<sup>64</sup></p> <p>Contingency plans with multiple stakeholders. Develop integrated <b>urban risk reduction plans in collaboration</b> with other entities.<sup>65</sup></p> <p>Potential areas that National Societies could collaborate with local governments to improve <b>safety of the built environment</b>: community based non-structural mitigation education (esp. construction practitioners); DRR education and awareness rising in informal settlements; advocating for policy changes regarding safe construction practices, enforcement of building codes, and retrofitting existing public buildings. <b>Urban infrastructure</b>: areas that National Societies could collaborate with local governments include education, advocacy, improving/building.<sup>66</sup></p> <p>Through Community Safety and Resilience initiatives, partner with corporate entities in all aspects of disaster management, while serving as a conduit to communities and schools. Capitalize on the opportunity to promote corporate and institutional volunteer services.<sup>67</sup></p> <p>National Societies can optimise resources and increase their impact in urban areas by forging partnerships with technical agencies especially on multi-hazard risk assessment to inform their emergency response and preparedness planning.<sup>68</sup></p> <p>Scaling Urban Resilience proposal (GDPC): The proposed initiative would combine i) global and regional partnering and awareness raising with ii) a set of local action campaigns to promote and enable community safety and resilience to disasters and climate change challenges. Anchored through the RC/RC network but designed and organized as a multi-partner initiative. Locally the focus of the initiative will be on the creation or strengthening of coalitions of partners at the city or civic level to support community level action on resilience. Local coalitions will also have access to a set of grants for catalyzing community resilience activities to address the impacts of climate risks. RC/RC has working models for local coalitions and the challenge is to more consistently put these models into action at larger scales. New approaches are needed to expand beyond the current set of resilience champions and enable a wider set of RC/RC branch and other community partners to gain the confidence, skills, and access to catalyst technical resources and financing to implement these models in their own communities.</p>

<sup>62</sup> RCRC engagement in the 9<sup>th</sup> session of the World Urban Forum, 2018

<sup>63</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>64</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>65</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>66</sup> American Red Cross Guidance for Urban Resilience Programming, 2015

<sup>67</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>68</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

	<p>Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resilience visioning workshops (scenario-based analysis of individual city's needs and opportunities)</li> <li>• Urban assessment workshops with city-specific partners (American Red Cross methodology)</li> <li>• Create DIY toolkit or campaign-in-a-box for community organizations that are interested to lead their own coalition-building process</li> <li>• Community grants: core grants for catalyst activities by coalitions and supplementary grants for projects</li> <li>• Cross-learning: create a platform for peer sharing between coalitions (offshoot of preparecentre.org) and a Solutions Lab grant pool for addressing issues raised among city coalitions</li> <li>• Technology platforms: use RCRC apps and games. Support development of new tools to support engagement and crowd sourcing of assessment data and open data store for integrating data sources.<sup>69</sup></li> </ul> <p>RCRC could potentially link microinsurance schemes with Forecast-Based Financing mechanisms. Micro-insurance schemes may strengthen the resilience of people and households towards shocks and stressors, but it is difficult to find private companies that are willing to establish small-scale and affordable insurance schemes for the poorest as it is not considered to be sufficiently profitable. Other common challenges include a lack of awareness about the benefits of insurances, as well as religious barriers.<sup>70</sup></p>
<b>Examples</b>	<p><b>Iranian Red Crescent</b> - 6.5 magnitude earthquake contingency plan for Tehran. RCS with its national partners have developed a contingency plan comprised of nineteen specialised partnership committees. The IRCS heads the emergency nutrition and shelter, and search and rescue committees.<sup>71</sup></p> <p><b>Indonesia Red Cross (PMI)</b> - collaboration with government health departments in activities to control the spread of dengue, including fogging activities and hygiene promotion, had enabled PMI to extend the reach and sustainability of its resilience programs.<sup>72</sup></p> <p><b>Egyptian Red Crescent</b> – informal settlement development involving a partnership to provide services, facilities, awareness re risks, mediation between dwellers and authorities. Critical community development strategies focused on literacy programmes, vocational training, women's clubs, youth activities and educational opportunities.<sup>73</sup></p> <p>The <b>Netherlands Red Cross, the Red Cross Climate Centre, CARE Netherlands, Cordaid and Wetlands International</b> established <b>Partners for Resilience (PFR)</b> to increase the resilience of citizens against natural disasters, climate change and the deterioration of ecosystems. PFR have started CBDRR programmes in informal settlement areas in Jakarta, Indonesia and Manila, Philippines<sup>74</sup></p>
<b>Key questions</b>	How can National Societies be supported to change from a culture of protecting independence to a collaborative approach?
<b>Survey quotes</b>	<i>"Urban environments require a very complex set of partnerships and coordination to ensure coherence and impact of interventions, to address scale of interventions, to embrace technology and to be able to engage effectively with vulnerable urban residents as well as complex municipal government structures and actors."</i>

<sup>69</sup> Scaling Urban Resilience – GDPC scoping study, 2014

<sup>70</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>71</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, MENA workshop 2013

<sup>72</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop 2013

<sup>73</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, MENA workshop, 2013

<sup>74</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the AP, 2012

*“The coordination mechanisms are mostly sectoral/cluster based. Different type of ‘area-based’ coordination is needed”.*

## Understanding urban context, identifying vulnerability, inclusive programming

<b>Strategic direction</b>	<p>National Societies will need to <b>overcome the knowledge gap that currently exists with regard to city-level hazards, vulnerability and risk</b>, and institute a systemic and systematic process of gathering and integrating information to feed into tailor-made and context-appropriate programmes and policies (identified as one of the key challenges faced by the Movement).<sup>75</sup></p> <p>Policy development and action plans must be inclusive of rural-urban linkages as the urban environment does not function in isolation to rural settings.<sup>76</sup></p>
<b>Lessons identified</b>	<p>Working with a heterogeneous community, <b>identifying the ‘community’</b>. Entry points for policy and advocacy in urban settings are both more numerous and varied.<sup>77</sup></p> <p>Complexity of communities - identifying community leaders may be problematic.<sup>78</sup></p> <p>Urban <b>residents may be difficult to categorise</b> – overlapping identities, live and work in different neighbourhoods, recently migrated from rural areas etc.<sup>79</sup></p> <p>Some National Societies are inadequately equipped with knowledge and resources to identify, connect with and maintain relations with urban communities and urban actors. The urban communities were often described as “difficult to identify”, “not homogeneous and stable” and “lacking social support”. Most NS in the region implement programmes in urban areas but require the skills to document their experiences and translate such experiences into tools and guidelines that capture and replicate good practices.<sup>80</sup></p> <p><b>Nepal programmes:</b> Earthquake Preparedness for Safer Communities (EPS) and Organizational Preparedness for an Earthquake in Kathmandu Valleys – <b>challenges included limited time commitments from community members; growing prevalence of unplanned settlements; and a large mobile population working in the informal sector</b> – resulting in challenges in <b>targeting the most vulnerable</b>.<sup>81</sup> The 9M Review showed importance of understanding urban networks (informal and formal) as people organise around these post-disaster, not DM Committees. Community committees also tend to replicate power structures so the vulnerable can be excluded, therefore the SURE programme seeks a better understanding of networks through the social and institutional network analysis tool.<sup>82</sup></p> <p><b>Problems with geographical classification of communities:</b> Learning from EPS and rural CBDRM interventions both in Nepal and regionally highlights that the geographical classification of communities is deeply problematic, especially in the urban context due to increased heterogeneity of areas, lack of social cohesion and difficulties in engaging with “community” members.<sup>83</sup></p>

<sup>75</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>76</sup> RCRC engagement in the 9<sup>th</sup> session of the World Urban Forum, 2018

<sup>77</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience Workshops, 2013

<sup>78</sup> BRR, Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>79</sup> BRR, Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>80</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>81</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>82</sup> SURE Urban Assessment Guidelines 2017

<sup>83</sup> SURE Urban Assessment Guidelines, Nepal 2017

	<p><b>Nepal SURE project challenges:</b> A constantly evolving landscape of actors and actions (requiring an iterative and documented approach to management, decisions and relationships); and the need for a targeted approach to identify and engage with ‘hard to reach’ vulnerable groups in urban areas.<sup>84</sup></p> <p><b>British RC recovery programme Haiti:</b> highlighted the <b>challenge of engaging and communicating with complex communities in urban areas</b> – e.g. high proportion of renters and their propensity to move from different parts of the city due to work, labour and family connections.<sup>85</sup></p> <p><b>V2R Bangladesh</b> - The programme should ensure that <b>participation in the CDMCs and their consultation processes engage a wider spectrum of community members</b>, in particular people with limited education, from ultra-poor households and people with disabilities. The VCA identified a number of other highly vulnerable groups whose needs were not addressed as part of the programme. These included: people living in kancha housing; land occupiers without any kind of formal tenure and; house renters without formal lease arrangements.<sup>86</sup></p> <p><b>V2R Bangladesh, Barisal:</b> A number of the interventions largely mirrored the previous coastal V2R programme which were not always appropriate and <b>did not take into consideration the complexities and greater inter-connectedness of the urban environment</b>. A comprehensive analysis using a <b>“settlements” approach</b> is required, including the analysis of formal and informal power structures, housing, land and property rights and identifying a full range of entry points for programme interventions beyond the more “traditional” RCRC programming.<sup>87</sup></p> <p>National Societies need to better understand and increase our focus, <b>on social issues within urban areas</b>. Social isolation is a growing issue. Community bonds are more limited when coping with the impacts of an urban disaster; especially if geographic communities have been resettled.<sup>88</sup></p> <p><b>Consider livelihoods needs:</b> V2R – Bangladesh: the absence of a livelihood component, which was included in other V2R programmes, is a significant limitation of the Barisal programme’s relevance to communities and to addressing their overall resilience. This is a significant barrier to addressing many of the underlying challenges facing women and girls.<sup>89</sup></p> <p>It is clear that cash and markets are essential to urban livelihoods, the real challenge is in ensuring that assessment measures identify areas of critical need and do not miss vulnerable groups who may be less visible.<sup>90</sup></p>
<p><b>Key points from non-RCRC actors</b></p>	<p>To achieve high levels of engagement and inclusion, resilience initiatives need to consider specific needs of stakeholders – moving beyond generalised assumptions about informal settlement dwellers or street vendors to overcome structural barriers to inclusion. The inclusion of community groups in the early stages of resilience planning, as well as implementation phases, is critical if initiatives are to be successfully put into action and sustained.<sup>91</sup></p>

<sup>84</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>85</sup> BRRC – Learning from the City 2012

<sup>86</sup> Mid-Term Review V2R Programme Bangladesh -Barisal, 2017

<sup>87</sup> Mid-Term Review V2R Programme Bangladesh - Barisal, 2017

<sup>88</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>89</sup> Mid-Term Review V2R Programme Bangladesh -Barisal, 2017

<sup>90</sup> BRRC – Learning from the City 2012

<sup>91</sup> Developing city resilience strategies: lessons from the ICLEI–ACCCRN process, 2017

	<p>Gorakhpur Environmental Action Group and ISET flood management approach: Communities responses indicate the greatest benefit of the program was awareness, empowerment, leadership, and hope as a result of developing a greater understanding of how, by working together, they can influence decision-makers to act on their behalf.<sup>92</sup></p>
<b>RCRC role</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RCRC Movement’s ability to include youth in decision-making processes for the development of urban settings was also acknowledged (PASSA and VCA).</li> <li>• The international community has acknowledged the RCRC Movement’s unique ability to conduct a community based and integrated neighbourhood approach to urban challenges, promoting the active role that city residents can take to reduce risks related to their built environment.<sup>93</sup></li> </ul>
<b>Actions/ ideas</b>	<p>National Societies will need to proactively enhance their existing knowledge base on urban risks, vulnerabilities, hazards, and the composition and dynamics of urban communities. There is a need for National Societies to focus on three sets of activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To gain an enhanced understanding of urban settings and communities (by defining urban areas and urban communities and gaining an understanding of community perceptions of risk);</li> <li>• To develop and strengthen coordination and collaboration with the range of actors present in urban settings (by increasing knowledge and relationships with multiple stakeholders across a range of sectors); and</li> <li>• To adapt programming to the urban context.<sup>94</sup></li> </ul> <p>Recommendations from the review of EPS (Earthquake Preparedness for Safer Communities) and DFID DRM programmes in Nepal highlight the <b>need for more explicit social inclusion strategies</b> in future urban CBDRM programming.<sup>95</sup></p> <p><b>Using systems thinking</b> to analyse vulnerability and develop solutions means developing a structured way of looking at the factors contributing to vulnerability and where the entry points are to shift those factors.<sup>96</sup></p> <p>Existing guidelines, tools and training materials for disaster preparedness and response, which have been firmly embedded within the rural experience, will need to be retrofitted and adapted to the needs of urban contexts.<sup>97</sup></p>
<b>Examples</b>	<p>British RC recovery programme in Haiti overcame the challenge of engaging and communicating with complex communities through more structured communications using a ‘community mobilisation unit’, which was responsible for all community liaisons, across all sectors, as well as data management.<sup>98</sup></p> <p>The V2R model (Bangladesh) establishes community-based, independent Community Disaster Management Committees (CDMCs) to provide the community management and leadership needs of the community and then empowers the CDMC to implement the programme and (to some extent) manage funds. Anecdotally it was felt by some Movement partners that the application of the V2R approach was best practice in this regard. One of the biggest success stories of the V2R programme is the establishment of the CDMCs which filled an important gap in community decision-making and representation, are widely accepted by the community and are included as part of the Ward Disaster Management Committee (WDMC) structure. They have also played a particularly important role in encouraging women’s empowerment. The CDRTs have been effective in disseminating key</p>

<sup>92</sup> Beyond Resilience: Case Studies (ISET)

<sup>93</sup> RCRC engagement in the 9<sup>th</sup> session of the World Urban Forum, 2018

<sup>94</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>95</sup> SURE Programme Nepal, Urban Assessment Guidelines 2017

<sup>96</sup> American Red Cross, Guidance for Urban Resilience Programming, 2015

<sup>97</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>98</sup> BRRC – Learning from the City 2012

	<p>information about disaster preparedness and response and were activated during Cyclone Mora to conduct community preparedness and response activities.<sup>99</sup></p> <p>The Nepal Red Cross highlighted activities to reach people through their workplaces and private sector affiliations. Recognizing the responsibilities of people in their different stakeholder roles in varied contexts throughout the day can be a powerful way to leverage engagement in the over-lapping circles of community that typify urban environments.<sup>100</sup></p>
<b>Key questions</b>	How can National Societies be supported to move from a rural focus to an urban focus for programming?
<b>Survey quotes</b>	<p><i>"We are still looking at cities as geographic areas instead of a multitude of networks."</i></p> <p><i>"livelihood programmes keep being very focused on rural livelihood ... and much less on creating entrepreneurship, start-up ideas, providing financial literacy and an enabling environment to generate income in new ways."</i></p>

## RCRC reach and relevance in cities

<b>Strategic direction</b>	<p>Work in partnership with communities and external entities to <b>identify needs based on capacities, address vulnerabilities &amp; advocate</b> with and for the most vulnerable urban groups.<sup>101</sup></p> <p>National Societies should aim to localize DM systems in cities through strengthening local (district/neighbourhood) preparedness and emergency response capacities; increasing community engagement and participatory approaches; maximizing local resources.<sup>102</sup></p> <p>Integrated and inclusive urban programming.<sup>103</sup></p>
<b>Lessons identified</b>	<p>A number of prominent (external) initiatives have been launched in recent years to promote resilience but have primarily targeted local government and governance processes. The RC/RC has long worked at community level to galvanize action but is not achieving the scale necessary to make every community safe and resilient. The RC/RC has the network to make this scale possible, but only through concerted effort in coalition with other partners.<sup>104</sup></p> <p>The impact of humanitarian efforts may not be so visible or comprehensive in urban as in rural areas. For, in a city, agencies will only be able to focus on a certain area or sector. This requires prioritisation - essential to understand how humanitarian assistance is relevant and connected to other urban groups and processes.<sup>105</sup></p> <p>National Society capacity in urban resilience should be strengthened through an urban profiling process: Concept of resilience and working in urban settings is relatively new to the VNRC. An urban profiling process is an opportunity to increase the knowledge and technical skills of the branches and communities in urban disaster risk reduction and resilience building as well as forming and working with city wide coalitions. The follow up workshops on urban resilience and community risk assessment helped integration of the profiling study findings into the project implementation.<sup>106</sup></p>

<sup>99</sup> Mid-Term Reviews V2R Programme Bangladesh - Barisal 2017

<sup>100</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop 2013

<sup>101</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>102</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>103</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>104</sup> GDPC Scaling urban resilience scoping study 2014

<sup>105</sup> BRRC, Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>106</sup> Urban Profiling in Vietnam, 2015

<b>Actions/ ideas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work closely and proactively through grass roots entities and local institutions – including work places, schools and community groups.</li> <li>• Set up services in the most vulnerable communities to increase reach, build trust and strengthen local capacities.</li> <li>• Build branch skills in assessment, in influencing decision makers, mobilizing resources, and promoting local partnerships in supporting vulnerable urban groups.<sup>107</sup></li> </ul> <p>Further develop Community-Based Action Teams. Link these with the Disaster Preparedness programme of the local government to ensure sustainability. Focus training activities on strength areas such as emergency management and build partnerships for undertaking drills for highly vulnerable urban communities.<sup>108</sup></p> <p>Other entry points include small health initiatives such as TB care and prevention. RCRC health services directly benefit the population, establish trust and facilitate expansion of urban DRR work.<sup>109</sup></p> <p>Developing an individual entry point (e.g. volunteer) may help to push a campaign around connectedness at an individual level. E.g. Everyone knows a Red Cross volunteer or has a connection to the Red Cross. This is a simple approach that eventually builds in size to serve as a platform to support existing campaigns. Rely on the “forgotten” Red Cross base, which is our volunteer base; a “human face”. Volunteers as a tangible expression of connection to the community.<sup>110</sup></p>
<b>RCRC role</b>	<p>The capacity to encourage and facilitate active participation of people and communities in urban DRR and DM, and to connect them to other risk management actors, responders and service providers.<sup>111</sup></p>
<b>Examples</b>	<p>The <b>Philippines Red Cross</b> – A Community volunteering program called 143 seeks to establish a volunteer leader and core set of volunteers in each barangay district in the Philippines. This program is very successful in matching the existing organizing structure of communities and uses a wide pool of community volunteers to establish a Red Cross presence and engagement in the community.<sup>112</sup></p> <p><b>Uganda elections 2011</b> – Following hostilities towards Uganda Red Cross during 2009 riots, the Uganda Red Cross Society focussed its activities on 35 ‘hotspots’ where political activity could potentially turn violent – successfully increasing communication regarding the Red Cross role e.g. fundamental principles, auxiliary role to government.<sup>113</sup></p> <p><b>Bangladesh</b> - The V2R programme has been effective in boosting the public profile of BDRCS in Barisal.<sup>114</sup></p>
<b>Key questions</b>	<p>The Strategy 2020 strategic aims already define the scope of responsibilities for the IFRC and anchor RCRC decisions in actions that serve the well-being and safety of the most vulnerable in any geographical setting. Therefore, <b>the key question is not what the RCRC should do in urban areas. It is— how can RCRC navigate more effectively and efficiently in complex and dynamic urban environments, and maximise its mass impact?</b> Scaling up NS programmes in urban areas requires building upon what they are good at.<sup>115</sup></p>

<sup>107</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>108</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>109</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>110</sup> GDPC Scaling up urban resilience workshop 2014

<sup>111</sup> Building urban resilience. ANNEX 4 - The Road to Urban Resilience: The IFRC’s Perspective, 2017

<sup>112</sup> GDPC Scaling urban resilience scoping study 2014

<sup>113</sup> BRRC, Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>114</sup> Mid-Term Review V2R Programme Bangladesh - Barisal, 2017

<sup>115</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012

<b>Survey quotes</b>	<i>"...We need to better understand what is our capacity in urban response, and how that can better complement other existing capacities. We need to better recognize our position in contexts with complex networks of actors and Influence"</i>
----------------------	---

## Leveraging volunteers

<b>Strategic direction</b>	Leveraging the added value of RCRC when extending into urban settings, including our network of volunteers, community presence and our outreach and access. <sup>116</sup>
<b>Lessons identified</b>	<p><b>Volunteer retention:</b> Volunteering has become event-based and people are not as dedicated as long-term volunteers. Create ways to keep people engaged.<sup>117</sup></p> <p>More time is needed for volunteer training for the new assessment tool - SURE Urban Assessment.<sup>118</sup></p> <p><b>Resilience in the Americas (RITA)</b> – ARC pilot project in 10 countries: Many volunteers want to focus on the response side of the Red Cross. There is a challenge in getting volunteers excited and passionate about preparedness programs.<sup>119</sup></p>
<b>RCRC role</b>	<p><b>Leverage the unique position and role of the RCRC National Societies before, during &amp; after times of conflict or violence</b> to promote humanitarian values and maintain our presence and commitment to our communities.<sup>120</sup></p> <p>Volunteers are well placed to undertake low-cost and low-tech activities in communities that support response, behavioural change activities, early warning early action and health surveillance activities. This is how Red Cross deepens its reach, connection and understanding of communities. It is a point of difference from other humanitarian actors.<sup>121</sup></p> <p><b>Indonesia Greater Jakarta project</b> - The value added of RCRC engagement was identified as the buy-in from local government, including recognition/trust and collaboration, and a role in knowledge generation.<sup>122</sup></p>
<b>Actions/ ideas</b>	<p>Recruitment of volunteers as active members of social change.<sup>123</sup></p> <p>Urban conflict: Actions needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protect our RCRC logos and emblems, especially in urban areas where monitoring the misuse or misrepresentation by unaffiliated entities can be harder to detect.</li> <li>• Increase the dissemination/visibility of RCRC National Societies highlighting our work as impartial, neutral actors, working through a united force of diversified volunteers.</li> <li>• Minimum care guidelines and training for support staff and volunteers when directly impacted by disasters (practice guidelines for safer access toolkit).</li> <li>• RCRC orientation for actors to conflict and authorities, regarding the role of the RCRC in remaining neutral, impartial and avoiding affiliation.<sup>124</sup></li> </ul> <p>Promoting volunteer retention, specialised training of staff and volunteers, more effective planning and developing a solid basis for resource mobilisation:</p>

<sup>116</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>117</sup> GDPC Scaling up urban resilience workshop 2014

<sup>118</sup> SURE Pilot Feedback and De-brief Report, 2017

<sup>119</sup> GDPC Scaling up urban resilience workshop 2014

<sup>120</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop Report 2014

<sup>121</sup> Resilience Planning in the Pacific, IFRC Pacific Office– DRAFT PAPER, 2017

<sup>122</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>123</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, Africa workshop 2013

<sup>124</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop Report 2014



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with National Government and authorities to promote volunteering.</li> <li>• Develop recognition systems for volunteering.</li> <li>• Develop funding plan/appeals for contingency planning in National Societies.<sup>125</sup></li> </ul> <p>Acknowledging high diversity in urban contexts, National Societies need to adapt to urban contexts, by <b>increasing volunteer diversity, providing flexibility with volunteer time commitments, and preparing for spontaneous volunteers</b> following urban disasters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invest more in building the capacities and ensuring the welfare, protection and recognition of urban volunteers and staff.</li> <li>• Ensure volunteer demographics is reflective of urban diversity.</li> <li>• flexible arrangements with volunteers - based on their personal situations.</li> <li>• contingency planning for how (if) spontaneous volunteers will be utilized and the requirements needed.<sup>126</sup></li> </ul>
Survey quotes	<p><i>"[There is a need for] professionalizing volunteers, and having recruiting systems where we can have skilled volunteers for some aspects of programming"</i></p> <p><i>"We have volunteer response teams that have been equipped with technology that enables them to fulfill their roles and responsibilities in responding to disasters. Private sector partnership (funding) has been an important component of resourcing."</i></p>

## Integrated approach

Strategic direction	<p>Siloed approaches will need to give way to approaches that encompass multi-stakeholder, multi-hazard and multi-sectoral practices addressing a wide array of interrelated issues such as resilience building, local socio-economic development, environment, climate change, legislation, migration, access to safe land, security of tenure and violence.<sup>127</sup></p> <p>It is time to reframe organisational and branch development as strengthening <b>'the largest local disaster and adaptation network in the Pacific'</b> and to offer partners a wider-longer term investment strategy in the sustainability and effectiveness of the network rather than investments in short-term projects which have limited reach or sustainability. This approach requires integrated program plans that enable partners to invest in the network at an outcome level. Communications will be crucial to the success of this approach. Strengthening the Red Cross network means strengthening branches, increasing investment. A resilience planning approach in Pacific National Societies, provides an opportunity for Partner National Societies to integrate program support in order to strengthen long-term resilience outcomes.<sup>128</sup></p>
Lessons identified	<p>It is a challenge to bring a multi-sectoral approach to national societies (SE Asia) that currently work primarily within specific departments (e.g. youth, DRR, health, etc.)<sup>129</sup></p> <p>Bangladesh: The V2R urban programme is broadly aligned with the mandate, Strategic Plan and Disaster Management Plan of BDRCS, however it <b>remains unclear how the CDMCs and CDRTs align with the specific institutional structures of BDRCS and does not yet reflect the full scope of the BDRCS "integrated resilience approach"</b>. While BDRCS has specific experience of urban programming further capacity building in this area is required, as well as alignment with the "integrated resilience approach"<sup>130</sup></p>

<sup>125</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop Report 2014

<sup>126</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop Report 2014

<sup>127</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>128</sup> Resilience Planning in the Pacific, IFRC Pacific Office– DRAFT PAPER, 2017

<sup>129</sup> GDPC Scaling up urban resilience workshop 2014

<sup>130</sup> Mid-Term Review V2R Programme Nepal -Barisal, 2017

	<p>The linkage between urban DRR &amp; DM and other sectors and issues such as climate change, urban development, health, education, legal systems, technology, etc. should be better understood and included in the relevant programmes.<sup>131</sup></p> <p>Integrated approaches are needed across sectors to reduce duplication, maximize efficiencies, and benefit from community synergies that strengthen resilience.<sup>132</sup></p> <p>A good understanding of the complexity of urban settings is essential but often difficult to master and not easily gained from silo-ised sector-based analysis.<sup>133</sup></p> <p>In linking different types of programming to build resilience, participants highlighted the relevance of existing RCRC services in urban areas related to community health and first aid, livelihoods, and reduction in domestic and social violence. These services provide natural links to resilience and an entry point for expanding work with communities.<sup>134</sup></p> <p>There is the need to ensure awareness and coverage of multi-sector needs (e.g., housing, communications, water and sanitation, education, healthcare and relief)<sup>135</sup></p> <p>Bangladesh: It is difficult to coordinate all the different programmes that exist. The urban resilience programme must be integrated into an already existing system.<sup>136</sup></p> <p>We are still missing a strong commitment and a holistic approach when it comes to urban programming within the RCRC Movement. The urban context requires connecting with all the sectors and cross-cutting area.<sup>137</sup></p>
<p><b>Actions / ideas</b></p>	<p>Resilience planning moves a National Society from a project-based approach to a programmatic integrated approach. Resilience Planning: The six landmarks of the plan are that it is inclusive, demand driven, people-centred, holistic, prevents suffering and is risk informed. It requires that a National Society develop a strategic plan and integrate program design and delivery across various sectors.<sup>138</sup></p> <p><b>Mainstreaming risk reduction across all urban initiatives:</b> National Societies need to consider and apply risk reduction measures in all aspects of urban preparedness, response and recovery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the Formulation of guidelines, SOPs and standard models to follow</li> <li>• Capturing and sharing of good practices and lessons learnt from other National Societies, NGOs and Governments' experiences.<sup>139</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Examples</b></p>	<p>The <b>Nairobi Urban Resilience Programme</b> aims to strengthen community resilience in informal settlements of Nairobi through a multisectoral approach. The project follows a community participatory implementation strategy, with a particular emphasis on youth engagement. KRCS is also increasingly focusing on innovation and finding new ways of engaging with the private sector, while stressing the importance of user-centric designs and including beneficiaries as active participants in the innovation process, to avoid doing more harm than good by introducing inappropriate or unsustainable solutions to societal problems.<sup>140</sup></p>

<sup>131</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, MENA workshop, 2013

<sup>132</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, Africa workshop, 2013

<sup>133</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, MENA workshop, 2013

<sup>134</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop, 2013

<sup>135</sup> GDPC Scaling up urban resilience workshop 2014

<sup>136</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop, 2013

<sup>137</sup> RCRC engagement in the 9<sup>th</sup> session of the World Urban Forum, 2018

<sup>138</sup> Resilience Planning in the Pacific, IFRC Pacific Office– DRAFT PAPER, 2017

<sup>139</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop Report 2014

<sup>140</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

	<p><b>Haiti 2011 Integrated Neighbourhood Approach:</b> French Red Cross (FRC) and the IFRC, implemented an ‘Integrated Neighbourhood Approach’ (INA) to introduce a development-oriented, multi-sectorial angle. A “community platform” was created and designed to be representative of the neighbourhood and act as the entry point for dealing with the authorities and programme partners. The approach was successful in enhancing social cohesion.<sup>141</sup></p> <p><b>British Red Cross recovery programme Haiti</b> – using the <b>integrated neighbourhood approach</b>. Initially this was a recovery programme with cash grants. Since April 2012, and with the results of the PASSA assessments, the programme was reoriented to become an urban regeneration and reconstruction programme, incorporating efforts to reduce the risk of disasters, improve community health and shelter, and support livelihoods. This development has resulted from improved communication with community members and local authorities. It is envisaged that around 4,000 households will benefit from different packages of shelter solutions, and improved security and public health. In this way, the programme highlights the potential of urban recovery operations to improve community resilience.<sup>142</sup></p>
<p><b>Key questions</b></p>	<p>How to move from ad-hoc projects to a programmatic approach with resilience as the outcome? To be joined up on the outside, a national society needs to be joined up on the inside. Practically this means disrupting silos and running assessments together, planning together and learning together as one team.</p> <p>How do donor requirements (compliance costs, reporting requirements, donor-led projects) impact upon National Society ability to improve organisational capacity and integrate resilience across programming?</p>
<p><b>Survey quotes</b></p>	<p><i>“So much of our Movement work in the region is project focused and fragmented. Bringing greater coherence to and shared learning of the vast array of good work and existing tools available in urban programming would be highly beneficial.”</i></p> <p><i>“We need to be changing our focus and potentially un silo-ing to ensure we can adopt more settlements based approaches”</i></p>

## Resourcing: Using the right tools for the job, approach, knowledge base

<p><b>Strategic direction</b></p>	<p>Upgrade and/or develop appropriate and relevant methodologies, tools and standards for urban contexts.<sup>143</sup></p> <p>Improve understanding of urban context and assessment of urban risk.<sup>144</sup></p> <p>National Societies must acquire the knowledge on how urban development programmes are set up, funded, managed and evaluated. Invest in researching the development processes of cities, the budgetary allocations, and the key programmes for poverty reduction, informal settlement rehabilitation, sanitation improvements, educational access etc. RCRC can be members of stakeholders’ committees and/or public hearings committees and work with local and district authorities to participate in the planning and review processes.<sup>145</sup></p>
-----------------------------------	--

<sup>141</sup> Habitat III - Humanitarian crises and the city. RCRC engagement

<sup>142</sup> BRRC – Learning from the City 2012

<sup>143</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>144</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>145</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

	Focus on adapting tools that have applications for Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships, Institutional Capacity and Emergency Response and Preparedness. <sup>146</sup>
<b>Areas of debate</b>	<p>Using <b>systems thinking</b> to analyse vulnerability<sup>147</sup>, versus <b>area-based approaches</b> (e.g. integrated neighbourhood approach).<sup>148</sup></p> <p>A great deal of attention and discussion about urban humanitarian response has focused on 'area-based approaches'. While geographically targeted approaches have benefits, including the potential for 'inclusive' programmes, there is also a risk of being disconnected from the dynamics and connections present across an urban space, not just in any one area. The urban system includes economics and livelihoods, politics and governance, society and culture, infrastructure and services, and finally space and settlements.<sup>149</sup></p>
<b>Examples – mapping tools</b>	<p><b>QGIS</b>: an innovative and participatory mapping methodology was developed and piloted in three countries (Cambodia, the Philippines and Viet Nam) to enable local government and communities to improve their preparedness and response plans. Multi-hazard maps were developed using (free) <b>Quantum Geographical Information System (QGIS)</b>.<sup>150</sup></p> <p>Building Urban Resilience programme SE Asia: <b>Innovative and participatory mapping methodology</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective QGIS mapping requires a longer timeframe to implement than traditional hand drawing mapping used in part of Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (VCA).</li> <li>• Expert technical support is required to enable the National Society and the local government to take full ownership of the methodology.</li> </ul> <p>Scaling up the implementation of this methodology will require allocation of significant - financial and human resources.<sup>151</sup></p>
<b>Examples – stakeholder mapping</b>	<p><b>Greater Jakarta DRR Project</b> (climate change). Comprehensive stakeholder mapping matrix – should be carried out as an essential program activity; while incorporating the strategy of identifying and using a research driven evidence-base is an element that needs to be considered to strengthen advocacy or other program-related efforts. The stakeholder mapping can be improved by conducting an in-depth, detailed organisational assessment prior to the multi-stakeholder workshop.<sup>152</sup></p>
<b>Examples - Assessment Tools</b>	<p><b>Building on the VCA</b></p> <p><b>SURE programme (Nepal) Urban Assessment Tool</b> adapts the VCA to better understand informal networks. The Urban Assessment uses 8 tools to analyse secondary information across a municipality then drill down to target populations for a detailed snapshot of hard to reach groups and overview of DM profile. In targeting "hard to reach" citizens and citizens in general in urban areas, the SURE programme will use six types of urban community instead of geographic: communities of place, interest, resistance, culture, practice and virtual / digitised.<sup>153</sup></p> <p>MRCS has developed the <b>Integrated Community Assessment for Building Resilience Process (ICABR)</b>. Builds on VCA process - enhances the usual community assessment</p>

<sup>146</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>147</sup> American Red Cross Urban Resilience Guidance, 2015

<sup>148</sup> BRRC – Learning from the City 2012

<sup>149</sup> Stepping back: Understanding cities and their systems (ALNAP) 2016

<sup>150</sup> Building Urban Resilience in South East Asia Case study: Innovative participatory mapping methodology for disaster preparedness and response, 2017

<sup>151</sup> Building Urban Resilience in South East Asia Case study: Innovative participatory mapping methodology for disaster preparedness and response, 20017

<sup>152</sup> Multi-stakeholder mapping using research and associated evidence-based for advocacy - Climate Vulnerability Mapping (Indonesia), American Red Cross 2016

<sup>153</sup> SURE Assessment Guidelines, Nepal, 2017

	<p>process by focusing more on community engagement and facilitation for ownership. Output is a community action proposal.<sup>154</sup></p> <p><b>V2R (Bangladesh)</b> – The V2R programme used a number of approaches to identify the priority needs in the community. This included reviews of census data, initial community visits and interviews with government, the conduct of VCAs in targeted communities and a livelihoods assessment. There was little evidence that these processes had any significant impact on the scope, scale and type of activities that had already been identified in the early stages of programme planning. It was recommended that participative workshops be conducted to explore the residual vulnerabilities and risks that will remain within the community. Include a further community-driven needs assessment process. Development phases of future projects should use a Theory of Change process and tools such as PASSA (implemented in a sector neutral way) and PHAST.<sup>155</sup></p> <p><b>Other tools</b></p> <p><b>GDPC city risk assessment and coalition building tools:</b> GDPC has developed tools for how to assess community resilience city wide and piloted them in Indonesia and Vanuatu (Coalition Building in Coastal Cities project). These tools will also build the skills of partners and a wide range of stakeholders.<sup>156</sup></p> <p><b>PASSA Youth:</b> A variation of the original Participatory Approach for Safe Shelter and Settlements Awareness (PASSA) tool, incorporating changes and additions to make it more suitable for young people between 13 and 17. Two successful pilots have been done in Manila and Costa Rica, now trying to scale up to 5 countries in Asia-Pacific and 5 in Latin America where 10,000 youth will be trained to be change makers and to implement micro-projects in their communities.<sup>157</sup></p> <p><b>PASSA:</b> Used successfully in Tacloban (to develop a 3-year community action plan) and Haiti urban recovery programmes, providing community participation, buy-in and accountability.<sup>158</sup></p> <p><b>American Red Cross’ Resilience in the Americas (RITA)</b> program assessment tool: four complementary assessment surveys: a questionnaire focusing on critical components of community resilience; and 2 sector-specific assessment tools (DRR and WATSAN – more to be developed)</p>
<p><b>Lessons identified</b></p>	<p>SURE project Nepal: There is a lack of urban knowledge and tested tools (requiring substantial investment and adaptation). During the earthquake review in 2015 it was found many urban citizens depend on informal networks and not formal stakeholders which are usually mapped as part of the VCA process (see <i>SURE guidelines feedback session 2017</i>).<sup>159</sup></p> <p>Based on learnings from other urban programmes in Nepal we know that rural-based <b>spatially-driven vulnerability and capacity assessment (VCA) tools are difficult to use in large urban centres</b>. These were originally designed to capture the vulnerabilities and capacities of villages or ‘communities’ that are easily geographically defined, largely homogenous and with members who work and reside in a single settlement. Time constraints, citizens residing in different areas from where they work, heterogeneous make-up of neighbourhoods, social isolation, and large contingents of migration are just some reasons why use of the rural-based VCA tools has not wielded a depth of understanding of disaster vulnerability and capacity issues. Initial parameters of the SURE proposal economic security/livelihoods and conflict analysis tools were not included in the Urban Assessment,</p>

<sup>154</sup> Integrated Community Assessment for Building Resilience Process (ICABR) – Guidance Document, 2015

<sup>155</sup> Mid-Term Review V2R Programme Bangladesh - Barisal, 2017

<sup>156</sup> (Coalition building toolkit and City-wide risk assessment on GDPC website)

<sup>157</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>158</sup> BRRCL Learning from the City; Case Study – Tacloban Recovery Programme, PASSA+ assessment, 2016

<sup>159</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

but a question about **livelihoods** was included in the semi-structured interview as this emerged as an **area warranting more focus than originally planned**.<sup>160</sup>

Most of the DRR programmes and approaches have been designed for rural communities or adapted from rural experiences. There is limited experience in establishing systematic processes that access, gather and integrate information on city-level hazard, vulnerability and risk into programmes and policy formulation. IFRC guidelines, training materials and manuals - National Societies face **difficulties in adapting them to their national/local contexts**.<sup>161</sup>

Nepal: Biggest challenges included Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) in urban areas. Africa: Participants recognised the need to better adapt VCA for use in urban settings. Asia: Need to review and **adapt traditional tools** to work with the communities (e.g. the VCA) as well as utilizing new and innovative tools for advocacy, which leverage the available technologies for greater dissemination and information sharing.<sup>162</sup>

American Red Cross: The VCA as the main assessment tool is not designed to generate information that would allow analysing city level systems and structures that have huge implications on the lives of vulnerable communities. The process should instead be based on a systematic risk and vulnerability analysis at different levels that would narrow down the assessment from city level to community level. City level engagement requires city risk analysis involving national, regional or provincial stakeholders and adopts a multi-hazard approach. Sub-city engagement requires developing “urban profiles” in partnership with district level stakeholders and can be designed to target specific hazard(s) or communities (geographical and/or communities of interest).<sup>163</sup>

Bangladesh: V2R - little evidence exists that participatory tools, such as the VCAs, influenced the final decision-making process as to the type and scale of the interventions required. Development of the livelihood component should include a comprehensive market assessment and consultation process with special consideration given to the needs of women and girls. Linkages with the programmes of government and other agencies would be essential, as well as considering options which could link in with other programme objectives such as the maintenance of WASH infrastructure for example.<sup>164</sup>

Urban risk assessment should identify the perceptions of risk and priorities of all urban vulnerable groups and communities:

- Combine and apply multi-sectoral VCAs with National Societies and other technological data collection methods.
- Partner with NGOs, Government authorities and academic institutions to analyse secondary data.<sup>165</sup>

The dense settlements and complexity of systems in urban areas can make historical needs assessment approaches difficult to apply. resources deployed up front on context analysis and high-quality assessments were vital in ensuring programmes were effective.<sup>166</sup>

American Red Cross and Vietnam Red Cross: Access to existing data and information on disaster risk, spatial structures and resources, and development plans proved to be critical and cost-effective for a city level analysis. (An important learning experience for VNRC, was

<sup>160</sup> SURE Programme Nepal, Urban Assessment Guidelines 2017

<sup>161</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>162</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, Asia workshop 2013; GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, Africa workshop 2013;

<sup>163</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, MENA workshop 2013

<sup>164</sup> Mid-Term Review V2R Programme Bangladesh - Barisal, 2017

<sup>165</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>166</sup> BRRRC Learning from the City, 2012

	<p>that with limited experience in urban risk, staff were not confident to approach local government's technical departments.)<sup>167</sup></p> <p>In urban areas people often have multiple livelihood strategies which means the use of assessment tools such as household economic security approach is challenging.<sup>168</sup></p>
<p><b>Key points from non RCRC actors</b></p>	<p>Findings re successful risk reduction: risk reduction priorities of local governments are context-specific, pointing to the fact that <b>resilience indicators must be locally developed</b>, based on the city's own risks and its current governance systems.<sup>169</sup></p> <p>AGORA initiative, two pilots (Haiti and Central African Republic): An area-based approach to assessments was an effective method to understand needs and capacities at the local level whilst capturing geographic, ethnic and other differences across a complex urban environment.<sup>170</sup></p> <p>Many projects in the Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network (ACCCRN) portfolio enable solutions to be implemented at a <b>household or community scale</b>, which tends to surface local solutions or technologies, which make them more affordable, and lend themselves to replication on a broad scale without necessarily depending upon a centralized mandate or decision by government.<sup>171</sup></p>
<p><b>Actions/ ideas</b></p>	<p>Partner with technical agencies and scientific organisations to transform scientific knowledge into simple planning and risk communication tools.<sup>172</sup></p> <p>The participants identified four new tools to develop collectively:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Urban System Analysis</li> <li>2. Collecting/compiling/utilisation and storage of secondary data and information.</li> <li>3. Guidance for using emerging technologies in urban assessment.</li> <li>4. Engaging in policy/advocacy with municipalities.<sup>173</sup></li> </ol> <p><b>Improve existing institutional knowledge and capabilities on risk profiling and risk mapping:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt simple self-assessment and indicator tools that can quickly build knowledge and skills in the urban context.</li> <li>• Establish linkage with global initiatives such as the Making Cities Resilient Campaign.</li> <li>• Build institutional capacities on risk profiling and mapping to link risk parameters to the conditions of vulnerable populations.</li> <li>• Partner with technical agencies and scientific organisations to transform scientific knowledge into simple planning and risk communication tools.<sup>174</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>QGIS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop an online training course to reach more NS and local government staff.</li> <li>• The mapping methodology could become part of the Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) practice.</li> <li>• Advocate for the allocation of additional resources to replicate the training with other National Societies and Branches.<sup>175</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>167</sup> Urban Profiling in Vietnam, American Red Cross and Vietnam Red Cross, 2015

<sup>168</sup> GDPC Scaling Urban Resilience scoping study, 2014

<sup>169</sup> Making Cities Resilient: Summary for Policymakers (UNISDR) 2013

<sup>170</sup> Cities in Crises: Promoting Settlement Approaches in Urban Areas – overview of lessons learnt

<sup>171</sup> Urban Climate Change Resilience in Action: Lessons from Projects in 10 ACCCRN Cities

<sup>172</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>173</sup> Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

<sup>174</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>175</sup> Building Urban Resilience in South East Asia Case study: Innovative participatory mapping methodology for disaster preparedness and response, 2017

<b>Survey quotes</b>	<p><i>“There are limited tools which have been properly adapted. Those that do exist are from specific programmes and are not taken to scale.”</i></p> <p><i>“All our training can be adjusted to context ...some of our training modules and approaches were initially developed in urban settings (YABC, FA, road safety, NCD, healthy aging..)”</i></p> <p><i>“We need to look at training paired with what Private Sector is doing [e.g.] business continuity”</i></p>
----------------------	--

## Resilient National Societies, branch structures – institutional and operational capacity

<b>Strategic direction</b>	<p>Collectively, we need to improve methodologies and standards for contingency planning through innovations and efficient use of modern technologies.<sup>176</sup></p> <p>The NS should acquire sufficient <b>organisational resilience</b> in order to be able to assist communities by ensuring <b>business continuity</b>, in particular in complex urban environments.<sup>177</sup></p>
<b>Lessons identified</b>	<p>V2R Bangladesh (Barisal): transition of the CDMCs into CBOs is a critical step towards the establishment of permanent representation and decision-making platforms/organisations at community level to engage in sustained advocacy and facilitate funding and technical assistance to bring lasting changes to the community. Future programmes should <b>consider a longer timeframe (5 years) for implementation and/or a commitment from BDRCS to support the continuation of core staff</b> to support the programme in the longer term.<sup>178</sup></p> <p>The V2R approach is described as “supportive, empowering and trusting” of the national society. However, the joint nature of the programme management system, the large BRC staffing structure and the <b>limited independent decision-making afforded to BDRCS</b> does not reflect this in practice. However, there were instances where greater technical oversight and improved monitoring were needed to ensure quality of the programme interventions.<sup>179</sup></p> <p><b>Staff safety and security</b> - urban violence raises additional challenges. Because of the dense populations in urban areas, rumours can spread quickly and the security situation can deteriorate rapidly. Risk assessments, therefore, need to be updated regularly. Uganda elections 2011 - important challenges include need for sensitivity to the security implications of urban violence for Red Cross staff, delegates and volunteers.<sup>180</sup></p> <p>The complexity of undertaking urban risk assessments due to a number of factors including <b>multiple and secondary hazards</b> such as big fires and interruption in life lines (scale and frequency).<sup>181</sup></p> <p>Construction standards in high density areas are often below standard and pose significant risk.<sup>182</sup></p>

<sup>176</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>177</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>178</sup> Mid-Term Reviews V2R Programme Bangladesh -Barisal, 2017

<sup>179</sup> Mid-Term Reviews V2R Programme Bangladesh -Barisal, 2017

<sup>180</sup> BRRC, Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>181</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>182</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014



<b>Key points from non-RR actors</b>	Regardless of location, the humanitarian system continues to respond to urban crises as though they were rural –not having yet developed the skills and experiences related to responding effectively in urban contexts. <sup>183</sup>
<b>Actions/ ideas</b>	<p>Appoint focal points for contingency planning to learn and develop/implement within each National Society.<sup>184</sup></p> <p>To improve technical and operational capacities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement a train-the-trainer program via webinars/online platforms &amp; resources</li> <li>• Utilise Resource Management systems (RMS)</li> <li>• Appoint focal points for contingency planning to learn and develop/implement within each National Society.<sup>185</sup></li> </ul> <p>The city level projects and regional workshops emphasised National Societies’ institutional and operational capacities need to be further enhanced and scaled up to address urban challenges. Main areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional structure (ensure that internal structures, divisions and set-up allow work in urban resilience building) (ensure that the qualities of resilient organisational systems are in place)</li> <li>• Human resources.</li> <li>• Institutional capacity development.</li> <li>• Urban volunteer management.</li> <li>• Operational capacity development.<sup>186</sup></li> </ul> <p>Building Urban Resilience in SE Asia Programme – Public Awareness and Public Education campaigns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More expert technical support is required to enable National Societies to take ownership of the public awareness and public education process.</li> <li>• Scaling up the impact will require more financial and human resources.</li> </ul> <p>More attention is needed on finding a balance between participatory approaches and bringing experts in.<sup>187</sup></p> <p>Other areas that need adapting to the urban context are the development of staff and volunteer skills in relation to urban risk reduction as well as relief and recovery activities. When operating in complex environments in densely populated centres with limited access to basic services, the Movement needs to broaden its expertise and knowledge of issues such as shelter/housing improvement and rehabilitation, urban and spatial planning, legal and policy frameworks, security of tenure, and water and sanitation.<sup>188</sup></p> <p>A strong understanding of markets is central to any assessment of vulnerability and resilience in urban areas. People in urban areas are more likely to be dependent on local markets.<sup>189</sup></p> <p>Work closely to strengthen our understanding and tools about the urban context and working with local governments (e.g. through the RCRC Urban Collaboration Platform).<sup>190</sup> There is a wealth of urban programming experience within the domestic section of NS in developed countries that should be shared with sister National Societies.</p>

<sup>183</sup> Stepping back: Understanding cities and their systems (ALNAP) 2016

<sup>184</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>185</sup> Manila Urban DM Workshop report, 2014

<sup>186</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>187</sup> Building Urban Resilience in South East Asia Case study: Innovative and tailored public awareness and public education, 2017

<sup>188</sup> Building urban resilience: A guide for RCRC engagement and contribution, 2017

<sup>189</sup> BRRC Learning from the City, 2012

<sup>190</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

	<p>Improve existing institutional knowledge and capabilities on risk profiling and risk mapping. Adopt simple self-assessment and indicator tools that can quickly build knowledge and skills in the urban context. Establish linkage with global initiatives such as the Making Cities Resilient Campaign.<sup>191</sup></p>
<b>Examples</b>	<p><b>National society capacity in urban resilience should be strengthened through urban profiling process:</b> The concept of resilience and working in urban settings is relatively new to the VNRC and the process is an opportunity to increase the knowledge and technical skills of the branches and communities in urban disaster risk reduction and resilience building as well as forming and working with city wide coalitions. The follow up workshops on urban resilience and community risk assessment helped the integration of the findings of the profiling study into the project implementation.<sup>192</sup></p> <p>V2R Programme – Bangladesh: The capacity building component allows BDRCS Units to determine what they need to become more sustainable and better recognised within their area. This component is usually attached to the Branch Organizational Capacity Assessment (BOCA). This often includes infrastructure upgrades to Unit offices, and trainings in management.<sup>193</sup></p> <p>The V2R programme has been effective in supporting the capacity building of BDRCS through staff development, office refurbishment of the BDRCS Barisal Unit, improving connectivity with local government and communities and boosting the public profile of BDRCS in Barisal.<sup>194</sup></p>
<b>Key questions</b>	<p>How can the RCRC role model the behaviour they want to see in the urban environment? For example, ensuring that assets are functional after a large scale urban disaster, co-designing programmes with communities, ensuring buildings are disability-accessible.</p> <p>How can we learn and plan better? How can we ensure that we share and apply learnings from previous evaluations and reviews, experiences?</p> <p>How do we support National Societies to be competent and feel confident to work effectively in urban environments?</p>
<b>Survey quotes</b>	<p><i>“Our national society is doing preparedness activities with regards to urban context. However, we know that there still a lot more things needs to do like improving guidelines and SOP's, preparing the system (internal) and also improving our contingency plans and practicing it.”</i></p> <p><i>“We still rely too much on international donor money. Our systems are all needs based not assets based which would allow tapping local resources more effectively.”</i></p>

## Cross cutting issues

	<p>How can NSs strengthen their capacities for urban DRR/DM?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and engage with relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• Strengthen communication and documentation skills to better capture experiences</li> <li>• Regional information sharing of lessons learned and good practices - listening from others to promote active learning</li> <li>• Training and simulation exercises</li> <li>• Improve risk analysis skills and capacities</li> </ul>
--	---

<sup>191</sup> Programmatic directions for RCRC in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific, 2012, 2012

<sup>192</sup> Urban Profiling in Vietnam, American Red Cross and Vietnam Red Cross, 2015

<sup>193</sup> V2R Programme Model Overview – Bangladesh RC and British RC

<sup>194</sup> Mid-Term Reviews V2R Programme Bangladesh - Barisal, 2017

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve human-resource skills including the recruitment of educated/skilled volunteers</li> <li>• Increase fund-raising capabilities</li> <li>• Better understand the urban planning process and how to influence it <sup>195</sup></li> </ul>
	<p>Gaps in urban resilience work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding the complexity of urban settings</li> <li>• Partnerships with private sectors</li> <li>• Better use of social media</li> <li>• Ability to speak out on political issues</li> <li>• Poor social networking in urban areas</li> <li>• Existing DRR tools should be tested and adapted to an urban setting</li> <li>• Not many specific tools for the urban context<sup>196</sup></li> <li>• Lack of simulations to practice contingency planning</li> </ul>

---

<sup>195</sup> GDPC Urban Risk Dialogues, MENA workshop 2013

<sup>196</sup> GDPC Urban Resilience, Asia workshop 2013

## Appendix 1 – External literature review (non-Red Cross Red Crescent)

<i>Review of External Literature</i>	
Key points	Source
<p>There are two diverging trends relevant to strengthening urban resilience. The first is one in which competent, sufficiently resourced city and municipal governments work with citizens, businesses, and other stakeholders to reduce disaster risk. There are also notable successes in cities located in low- and middle-income countries, demonstrating that resilience is not exclusive to high-income nations.</p> <p>The second trend points to many cases in which national and local governments' attention to disaster risk reduction activities, or to the institutions, infrastructure and services that help build resilience, is failing to keep pace with the rapid rate of urbanization they are witnessing. There are also many cities and smaller urban centres where even the best-oriented disaster risk reduction policies have limited impact due to large deficits in critical social infrastructure and local investment capacity. Consequently, <b>one of the key issues for building urban resilience is how to support and learn from the innovators and leverage significant changes in city-level resilience, even where there are limited resources.</b></p> <p>Three notable findings re what interviewed city leaders consider as components of successful risk reduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is a heavy concentration of actions related to diverse aspects of Essential 1 of the Ten Essentials – the administrative and institutional framework for resilience – including the development of a dedicated body, and a political commitment to disaster risk reduction.</li> <li>2) Projects that address specific risks, including improving infrastructure to control floods, retrofitting buildings, or the construction of safe schools, were cited as the next most important component of resilience building, based on the specific risks facing the respondents' cities.</li> <li>3) The risk reduction priorities of local governments are <b>context-specific</b>, pointing to the fact that <b>resilience indicators must be locally developed</b>, based on the city's own risks and its current governance systems.</li> </ol> <p>These findings and trends hold many implications for policymakers.</p> <p>Achieving resilience objectives requires the <b>cooperation of all actors</b> (politicians, community and youth groups, civil society, academia, businesses, and others) that make a city function on a daily basis. This can prove to be the key to the effectiveness and sustainability of a city's resilience plans, and can often stimulate progress despite limited resources.</p> <p>Engaging with multiple stakeholders can also help local governments identify innovative solutions they might have otherwise overlooked. Innovation, whether locally generated or shared from afar, remains an essential instrument in overcoming the challenges to building and sustaining urban resilience. For example, citizens' groups in risk-prone areas may share 'homegrown' early-warning signs that were previously unknown or under-utilised and contribute to the assessment and documentation of the localized impacts of natural hazards, which will ultimately help governments at all levels make more informed decisions and investments.</p> <p><b>As the primary generator of wealth and the main employer in most cities, the private sector should be at the centre of the urban resilience agenda.</b> Earthquakes, floods, drought and other events can severely disrupt the critical systems, distribution networks and infrastructure that are vital to a company's operations, and which can cause significant, long-term financial and reputational impacts. Large-scale events can also interfere with shorter-term market</p>	<p><b>Making Cities Resilient: Summary for Policymakers (UNISDR)</b></p>

<b>Review of External Literature</b>	
<b>Key points</b>	<b>Source</b>
dynamics, artificially depressing or inflating stock prices and disrupting global supplying chains. The specialized knowledge offered by private enterprises can also offer local governments advice, expertise, and technical support. As the private sector is responsible for up to 85% of all global investments in new buildings, industry, and small to-medium sized enterprises, <b>private companies can help also help to ensure new urban housing and commercial developments are built to safer standards and reflect the needs of all citizens.</b>	
<p>Emerging lessons learnt from area-based approaches include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt an area-based approach selectively; compare the advantages and disadvantages with other methods of intervention before proceeding.</li> <li>• Clearly define and test the scope, outcomes and intended impacts of an area-based approach; communicate these to all stakeholders to manage expectations and to build trust.</li> <li>• Ensure the timeline matches the scope of the programme; do not underestimate the time required to build trust and bring together multiple stakeholders.</li> <li>• Link area-based planning approaches to wider city or regional plans and policies; vertical integration of plans or strategies at different levels can be a costly and lengthy process – allow sufficient time and resources.</li> <li>• Early and on-going engagement with local governments, civil society groups and other stakeholders.</li> <li>• Early and on-going engagement with residents.</li> <li>• Design programmes to be flexible; programmes that can adapt and adjust schedules, programme management practices, staff levels and funding allow for agencies to best respond to rapidly changing post-crises contexts.</li> <li>• Demonstrate results early to mobilise, motivate and build the trust of residents.</li> </ul>	<b>IIED - Humanitarian response to urban crises: a review of area-based approaches</b>
<p>Area-based approaches (ABAs) have gained traction in recent years among humanitarian aid agencies seeking to provide better responses in urban areas following a naturally-triggered disaster. This is in response to existing approaches that have struggled with the complexity of urban programming.</p> <p>This guidance note presents ten principles for enacting post-disaster urban ABAs. The principles are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Multi-agency, multi-sector participatory assessments</li> <li>2. Focus on location</li> <li>3. Realistic timeframes</li> <li>4. People-centred actions – whose reality counts?</li> <li>5. Work with existing structures</li> <li>6. Collaborating sectors and programmes</li> <li>7. Flexible programming: adaptive management</li> <li>8. Nimble internal systems</li> <li>9. Plan for scaling-up, and</li> <li>10. Measure contribution not attribution.</li> </ol>	<b>Urban area-based approaches in post-disaster contexts: Guidance Note for Humanitarian Practitioners</b>
One way to improve understanding the complexity of urban contexts is by using systems thinking. A systems approach focuses on the linkages, interconnections and interrelationships between different parts of a system. The urban system includes economics and livelihoods, politics and governance,	<b>Stepping back: Understanding</b>

<i>Review of External Literature</i>	
Key points	Source
<p>society and culture, infrastructure and services, and finally space and settlements. These aspects of the urban context are all interconnected, dynamic and changing.</p> <p>A systems approach to urban contexts can be broken down into seven principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledging cities as systems;</li> <li>2. Accepting uncertainty and complexity;</li> <li>3. Recognising how urban systems change and exhibit resilience;</li> <li>4. Looking at urban contexts across multiple scales;</li> <li>5. Focusing not just on the elements of urban areas but also the whole;</li> <li>6. Addressing the relationships and interconnections in cities;</li> <li>7. Being spatially focused but not geographically constrained.</li> </ol> <p>Recently, a great deal of attention and discussion about urban humanitarian response has focused on ‘area-based approaches’. While geographically targeted approaches have benefits, including the potential for ‘inclusive’ programmes that bring together entire populations in a given area, and therefore the potential to reduce tensions and conflict (Parker and Maynard, 2015), there is also a risk of being disconnected from the dynamics and connections present across an urban space, not just in any one area. As we have seen, it is likely near impossible to draw boundaries that capture one single community. (interconnectedness).</p> <p><b>Regardless of location, the humanitarian system continues to respond to urban crises as though they were rural</b> – so many individuals have not yet developed the skills and experiences related to responding effectively in urban contexts. When humanitarians are faced with the complexity of the city, we resort to our known mental models, which are unable to provide us with an understanding of the urban systems we are attempting to understand. Some organisations have taken steps to respond differently to urban crises, but in practice their efforts to address issues around systems and interconnectedness often mean focusing on geographically defined neighbourhoods, which does not include addressing broader, systemic issues, seen to be beyond their budgets. It also creates ‘small islands of excellence, while other equally or more vulnerable areas and populations are neglected, and the infrastructure and markets that links these neighbourhoods, and the wider city, are ignored’ (Earle, 2016: 5).</p> <p>Though more and more organisations are starting to re-examine the tools they use for relevance in urban crises, there also exists a degree of tool wariness – with many reluctant to take up new ones. Broadening the definition of ‘tool’ to something more like ‘anything that can be used to help you’ may help calm this tool-phobia.</p> <p>The depth and breadth of changes required mean that understanding urban contexts is an ‘adaptive challenge’ rather than a ‘technical problem’. Unlike technical problems, which may have quick and easy answers provided by an expert or generated from best practice, adaptive challenges require time in terms of identifying causes and dimensions; need a change in attitudes or approaches across numerous places and organisations; and often meet resistance. Additionally, we are limited by the nature of the other stakeholders in an urban environment, and the perceptions they may have of us.</p>	<p><b>cities and their systems</b></p>

<i>Review of External Literature</i>	
Key points	Source
<p>In many ways, humanitarians are failing to understand urban contexts at the moment – which raises the question of how we can address this gap. Thinking in terms of urban systems can help humanitarians grapple with the density, diversity and dynamics of the city. By emphasising the interconnectedness of urban environments, a systems approach provides a helpful framework to examine not only the pieces, but also the whole.</p>	
<p>IMPACT and partners have partnered in the framework of the AGORA initiative to implement a 2-year EU-funded program, supporting humanitarian actors in 5 cities. 2 pilots have been completed between September 2016 and August 2017 in Jeremie, Haiti, (cyclone Matthew) and Bangui, Central African Republic (displaced populations returning to Bangui). Multi sectoral assessment, informal working groups created, technical support for waste/water management.</p> <p><b>LESSONS LEARNED</b></p> <p><b>Benefits of area-based assessments:</b> The two pilots affirmed the <b>value of utilising an area-based approach to assessments</b>. The process provided an effective method to understand needs and capacities at the local level and was identified as a useful planning tool by humanitarian and local stakeholders (Mayors, local NGOs, INGOs, UN agencies, etc.), to understand community needs whilst capturing geographic, ethnic and other differences across a complex urban environment.</p> <p><b>Urban coordination mechanisms:</b> Creating coordination bodies involving local, city and international actors requires dedicated time and resources to develop modalities, ways of working and a sense of trust between members. Such bodies should be created as soon as possible following the onset of a crisis. When creating a specific city/municipal coordination body, lines of engagement must be established with existing coordination mechanisms. Municipal and city-level actors often have limited understanding of the complex international humanitarian coordination mechanisms. At the same time, international humanitarian actors often bring a very limited awareness of city-level governance mechanisms and ways of working. Greater efforts need to be directed towards supporting each stakeholder group to better understand and engage.</p>	<p><b>Cities in Crises: Promoting Settlement Approaches in Urban Areas – overview of lessons learnt</b></p>
<p><i>Key lessons from the development/implementation of City Resilience Strategies through the Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network (ACCCRN) initiative.</i></p> <p>City resilience strategies (CRS) across all four countries (Indonesia, India, Philippines, Bangladesh) generally linked vulnerabilities with strategic goals and actions, and according to the most vulnerable hotspots identified in the city. A diverse range of initiatives was identified across a multitude of sectors, integrating climate adaptation and mitigation measures. However, the four most common sectors for intervention were water, solid waste, public health and ecosystems, in line with fragile systems identified and sectors selected for their ability to respond to the types of vulnerability outlined.</p> <p>To achieve high levels of engagement and inclusion, the analysis suggests that <b>resilience initiatives need to take into account the specific needs of different stakeholders – moving beyond generalised assumptions about slum dwellers or street vendors – in order to overcome structural barriers to inclusion.</b></p> <p>A majority of the studied CRS processes included community and civil society groups as stakeholders, selected both in line with local hazards (e.g. communities susceptible to landslides) and forms of political organisation (e.g. trade unions). <b>The inclusion of community groups in the early stages of resilience planning, as well as during the implementation phases, is critical</b> if initiatives are to be successfully put into action and sustained.</p>	<p><b>Developing city resilience strategies: Lessons from the ICLEI–ACCCRN process</b></p>

<i>Review of External Literature</i>	
Key points	Source
<p><b>A further group whose voice is often underrepresented in resilience planning is that of the private sector</b>, given the vast range of private-sector actors present within the urban environment. The private sector is the major engine of job and livelihood creation and is therefore key to resilience. <b>It is also responsible for a large share of infrastructure implementation and operation</b>, particularly with respect to buildings, electricity generation and transport. The inclusion of private-sector organisations is particularly important in the contexts studied here, given the financial constraints faced by many city governments, and the potential for the co-funding of resilience initiatives. Certain groups of private-sector actors, such as the tourism industry in Gangtok and Patna, or the shoe-manufacturing industry in Santa Rosa, have much to gain from ensuring the city acts on resilience.</p> <p>There is a growing body of research demonstrating the value of the ‘co-production’ of urban services by community groups working in partnership with local government (Mitlin, 2008), which outlines a series of methods and tools that could help resilience strategies increase engagement and inclusion. For example, assessing vulnerabilities and planning for DRR (see Carcellar et al., 2011; Mitlin, 2012) to continually assess priorities and build a longer-term investment in terms of physical and social capital. A greater emphasis on the co-production of city resilience strategies, for example by ensuring climate core teams always include civil society representation would diversify responsibility from the city government to a broader range of actors from both the private sector and civil society, building consensus around common goals while ensuring the representation of vulnerable groups.</p> <p>The CRS have demonstrated how building resilience can be integrated with other city priorities: in fact, they have shown that doing so is the only way for them to be accepted and actioned.</p>	
<p>Many projects in the ACCRN portfolio enable solutions to be implemented at a <b>household or community scale</b>, which tends to build greater flexibility, modularity and redundancy into systems - key characteristics of resilience. They <b>also tend to surface local solutions or technologies, which make them more affordable</b>, particularly among poorer communities that are not served by core infrastructure. And although they are relatively small-scale individually, they lend themselves to replication on a broad scale without necessarily depending upon a centralized mandate or decision by government. These projects have demonstrated that modular solutions can be used to address a variety of critical UCCR action areas, including building more resilient housing, addressing water demand, strengthening urban ecosystems, and mitigating growing flood risks. And they can aggregate to have a city-wide impact. For example, the involvement of communities in the restoration of 15 urban lakes in Indore, India, will provide 1.2 million cubic meters of additional water storage available for emergency purposes (equivalent to approximately 3 days of demand for the city).</p>	<p><b>Urban Climate Change Resilience in Action: Lessons from Projects in 10 ACCRN Cities</b></p>
<p>This case study of resilience in Gorakhpur, India demonstrates how <b>many small actions at multiple levels—community, individual and governmental—across a city can lead to more rapid transformation and resilience</b>. The approach taken by the Gorakhpur Environmental Action Group (GEAG) and ISET-International takes into consideration ecosystem dynamics and the need to build social cohesion in the face of annual flooding and community fragmentation as increasing numbers of rural migrants flood the city.</p> <p>Waterlogged for months out of the year, Gorakhpur’s municipal government lacked the capacity and financial resources needed to effect local change. GEAG and ISET-International supported a series of small initiatives—actions such as supplying weather information to farmers, building flood resistant homes and schools, or paving roads in low-income wards—which are creating ripple effects throughout the city. Moreover, the increasing community engagement resulting from this work has effectively created political pressure on the state to replicate these projects in other wards within the city.</p>	<p><b>Beyond Resilience: Case Studies (ISET)</b></p>



<i>Review of External Literature</i>	
Key points	Source
<p>The Mahewa Ward is located on a former landfill in the urban area of Gorakhpur. The roads were once filled with litter, waste, and debris + lack of drainage. In addition to the community building, drainage and paving work in Mahewa, GEAG worked to implement awareness campaigns centred on informing the community about general health. GEAG and ISET-International facilitating shared learning activities in the community with the goal simply of forming connected community groups. These groups then identified critical issues, such as sanitation, drainage and the creation of all-weather roads, which were of high priority to them. In response to this community driven initiative, GEAG invested money and piloted a street-paving project with gutter systems to improve drainage and move wastewater away from homes, and a solid waste removal and composting project to assure that drains would remain clean and provide the co-benefit of compost for household gardens. These community efforts effectively shamed the local government into action.</p> <p>While GEAG provided support and training, the community members have provided the momentum. Communities responses indicate the greatest benefit of the program largely awareness, empowerment, leadership, and hope. Greater understanding of how, by working together, they can influence decision-makers to act on their behalf. Wellness practices, like hand washing and receiving vaccinations, are being adopted at increasing rates. Community members know which municipal corporations and government offices to go to for support.</p> <p>The Gorakhpur case <b>illustrates the role actions within communities, households and markets can play</b> as central parts of an urban water management system. While each action (such as improvements in drainage) may only represent “one percent” of the urban management equation, more <b>comprehensive approaches can be catalysed by recognising and facilitating action by different sets of actors.</b></p>	
<p><b>Risk information essential for building resilience.</b> Disaster loss data, risk assessments and climate change projections, for instance, are fundamental tools for guiding plans and investments and identifying opportunities for transformative action. Though recognised as a global priority, these are not yet universally available in all cities. In this context, knowledge and tools for building resilience to disasters are the most advanced. Greater investments in understanding the causes and consequences of other shocks and stressors, such as those related to environment and conflict, are urgently needed.</p> <p><b>Building resilience demands a whole-of-society approach,</b> especially in cities, where the key sectors of local government must be fully engaged and coordinated. Private sector, the scientific and technical community and community actors (including women, youth and persons living with disabilities among others) are increasingly involved in building urban resilience. Efforts to pro-actively engage expertise in issues of economics, environment, health and related areas will help to ensure that resilience building efforts are holistic.</p> <p>Key drivers for action: Developing mechanisms/instruments to promote coherence across systems, sectors and organizations related to their policies, plans, programs, processes and investments in urban resilience.</p>	<p><b>Habitat III Issue Paper – Urban Resilience</b></p>
<p><b>Inclusive and resilient urban development: Questions of good governance</b></p> <p>The Urban Community Resilience Assessment (UCRA) developed by the World Resources Institute aims to increase understanding of communities’ needs, resources, and capabilities in order to reduce their vulnerabilities and enhance their adaptive capacity. By incorporating individual and community capacities (social cohesion, familiarity with local climate risks, early warning systems, and disaster readiness) into broader urban resilience evaluations, it provides a snapshot of preparedness behaviours, risk perception, and the strength of local networks. The implementation of UCRA participatory and gender-responsive</p>	<p><b>Resilient Cities Report 2017: Tracking local progress on the resilience</b></p>

<b>Review of External Literature</b>	
<b>Key points</b>	<b>Source</b>
<p>methods in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Surat, India; and Semarang, Indonesia) demonstrates that community engagement in local evidence-based resilience planning is crucial for identifying context-specific adaptation actions.</p> <p>The municipality of Guiuan, Philippines, which suffered almost 100% damage to infrastructure from Typhoon Haiyan in 2013, is breaking the disaster cycle through resilient post-disaster recovery. During the recovery phase, the municipality has engaged the community in resilience planning to respond to climate and environmental risks in alignment with development planning. [SEE CORDAID, BELOW]</p> <p><b>City-to-city and multi-stakeholder partnerships</b>  Lessons learned:  (1) Building trust among partners requires time to understand shared problems and overcome differences in culture and terminology.  (2) All approaches - bilateral or network; multi-stakeholder or thematic; north-north, north-south, south-south – can succeed if they facilitate a reliable long-term collaboration.  (3) Disasters can spur collaborations, as there is an obvious common interest to reduce risk and costs.  (4) Partnerships, especially North-South, resemble less the “donor-recipient” model, with all parties contributing resources to achieve mutual benefits.  (5) City-to-city partnerships can open access to wider city networks and global stakeholders, toward SDG17</p> <p>Research for resilience: New tools, methods, and directions - With the wealth of information available, access to accurate and policy-relevant data, as well as capacity to absorb this information and translate it into action is challenging – especially for local governments with limited resources. To counter this, some public-private initiatives have coupled open data with user-friendly interfaces to support knowledge management in place of information overload. E.g. Edmonton’s extensive Open Data Catalogue provides freely available, easy to access, and user-friendly data. The City plans to utilize the Catalogue as it develops its Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience Strategy.</p>	<p><b>targets of SDG 11</b></p>
<p>Multi-stakeholder engagement for building sustainable livelihoods and environmental management and protection.  Resilient Community Action Plan (RCAP) • Local Government urban and coastal planning, including DRR, CCA and Environmental management</p> <p><b>Cordaid Resilient Recovery approach – Philippines</b>  Strengthening family and community resilience is supported through programs for livelihoods diversification and strengthening, environmental resilience, risk proofing, group business capacity strengthening; and in Guiuan proper modelling Urban Resilience, through hazard specific assessment, planning in close collaboration with the LGU, assisted by UN-Habitat and the Mayor’s office; linking community resilient recovery to a broader neighbourhood planning process covering housing, infrastructure, water and sanitation and drainage, safety, environmental planning. A unique and highly effective aspect of this program was that communities were given the financial means to build and develop safer housing, small business and livelihoods options to not only recover, but also to increase their resilience to the risk of future typhoon hazards.</p>	<p><b>Cordaid Programme Brief Guiuan</b></p>

<b>Review of External Literature</b>	
<b>Key points</b>	<b>Source</b>
<p>Between 2016 and 2020, Cordaid Philippines Resilient Recovery approach will be integrated within the “Partners for Resilience” 5-year strategy to empower local communities and local platforms to mainstream their resilience strengthening plans and ensure Integrated Risk Management is applied into local government development planning in high-risk zones. The strategy also aims to increase risk-proofed investment from government and private sector.</p>	
<p><b>City Resilience Profiling Programme</b></p> <p>The cornerstone of the CRPP is the City Resilience Profiling Tool (CRPT): a forward-looking multi-sectoral, multi-hazard and multi-stakeholder diagnostic instrument, designed to assess and measure the resilience of urban systems and to inform the preparation of a Resilience Action Plan (RAP).</p> <p>The city profiles produced by the CRPT identify UNHabitat entry points through 4 key dimensions of the urban system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Spatial vulnerabilities</i>: addressed through planning and design; policy and regulation; land readjustment; urban extensions; and capital investment/finance incentives;</li> <li>• <i>Physical vulnerabilities</i>: addressed through improving regulation, codes and standards; retrofitting/upgrading bulk and distributive infrastructure; densification; transport; public space;</li> <li>• <i>Functional vulnerabilities</i>: addressed through urban design; service, economic, commercial continuity; regulatory reform; municipal revenue/ finance; transport/energy/utility/communications upgrading;</li> <li>• <i>Organisational vulnerabilities</i>: addressed through urban regulation and legal frameworks; strengthening stakeholder engagements (public, private and civil society); social and economic programming; and jurisdictional mapping2.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of UN HABITAT programmes:</p> <p>Emergency Flood Response in Khartoum for Vulnerable Communities project, a community-based participatory approach was adopted, in order to minimise the impact of floods, and enhance the capacity to recover from it. Taking a community-based approach to those hazards, the project (April 2014 - March 2015) conducted a Flood Rapid Assessment Study (FRAS) to both map risk and vulnerable areas and deliver recommendations for permanent solutions.</p>	<p><b>Trends in Urban Resilience</b></p>
<p>This paper reviews what local governments in more than 50 cities are doing with regard to disaster risk reduction. It draws on the reports of their participation in the global Making Cities Resilient Campaign and its 10 “essential” components, and on interviews with city mayors or managers.</p> <p>Urban resilience is also related to additional qualities not associated with direct DRR activities. These are the product of accumulated resilience, which is the “built-in” resilience a city has accumulated through the processes of city-building, infrastructure investment and socioeconomic development.</p> <p>The campaign cities show a broad spectrum of experiences, with different balances of DRR and accumulated resilience characteristics making up the resilience “profile” for each city.</p> <p>Cities in high-income countries tend to have higher accumulated resilience, a result of the fulfilment of entitlements over decades of development. They also have more resources for implementing sophisticated disaster risk management systems.</p> <p>In many low-capacity contexts, improvements to basic infrastructure and other development activities are recognised by cities as part of resilience building.</p>	<p><b>Advocacy for urban resilience: UNISDR’s Making Cities Resilient Campaign</b></p>

<i>Review of External Literature</i>	
Key points	Source
<p>The emphasis by local governments on mainstreaming DRR into urban development is partly a response to the understanding that resilience is about achieving development objectives.</p> <p>Integrating development objectives and disaster resilience is seen as particularly important in Batticaloa, which has suffered from major infrastructural deficits and deepened poverty as a result of ethnic conflicts (the civil war ended in 2009) and the impact of the 2004 tsunami. Responding to these development challenges has been viewed as an opportunity to reduce disaster risk, alleviate poverty and empower communities simultaneously, and participation in the campaign is intended to help Batticaloa work towards sustainable development more broadly</p> <p>Cities are also engaging with a wide range of stakeholders beyond government departments, including multi-lateral and bi-lateral organizations offering technical support, universities and research organizations, the private sector, and NGOs and other civil society groups.</p> <p>Municipalities are also placing emphasis on the role of communities and households as partners in risk reduction. Communities are involved in different types of activities: participating in decision-making with municipalities through planning and policy-making; generating information about risk and communicating risk; and taking direct responsibility for DRR activities</p> <p>Municipalities are also engaging with communities to enhance information about risk (Table 4). Community involvement extends the capacity of municipalities to gather risk information and allows a better understanding of people’s perceptions of risk. In Albay and Makati, Philippines, communities are taking part in risk-mapping and communicating these findings to the municipalities.</p> <p>Many cities report on the inadequacy of data on hazards, vulnerabilities and risks and how this holds back their ability to implement risk reduction.</p> <p>Informal settlements. The major challenges for resilience lie in developing the necessary basic infrastructure for water, sanitation and drainage, improving roads and supporting housing improvements. Some of the cities are addressing these issues through upgrading projects and programmes (Table 6). In addition to improving health and residents’ quality of life, upgrading makes low-income settlements and cities more resilient to a range of natural hazards, including flooding and fires.</p> <p>Engaging in partnerships or learning exchanges with other cities has been instrumental in building momentum for DRR activities. The campaign organises regular city-to-city learning events, which have helped cities to share practices and look at ways to further enhance resilience activities.</p>	
<p><b>100 Resilient Cities initiative: Indonesia</b>  Mega-cities hold the spotlight, but the globe’s growing ‘secondary cities’ are where scalable urban resilience mainstreaming is needed most—and a prime testing ground. Within a decade, more than 500 cities will have populations exceeding one million, many along coastlines. All will be increasingly exposed to weather-related disasters and the risk of rising sea levels. A lethal combination of weak infrastructure, poor planning, rapid growth and overwhelming migration from rural areas means that these cities include vast numbers of vulnerable people.</p>	<p><b>BUILDING 100 RESILIENT CITIES: INDONESIA AS A LEARNING</b></p>

<i>Review of External Literature</i>	
Key points	Source
<p>Two pilot cities are using a ‘Resilient City’ process with support from Mercy Corps through the Rockefeller-funded Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network (ACCCRN). As the Indonesia country coordinator for ACCCRN, we’re facilitating an urban climate resilience building process owned by local government and citizens, which pays particular attention to the needs of poor and vulnerable communities.</p> <p>Ten additional cities have now expressed interest in replicating the process. Self-starting and self-financing expressions of interest are the strongest indications possible that replication and scaling are picking up momentum</p> <p>Mercy Corps has learned that a lack of technical capacity isn’t the main problem in mainstreaming climate resilience. Urban planning and climate change experts know how to read climate models and predict cycles and have plenty of experience building water treatment plants that can deal with flooding. <b>The most critical issue is governance. Prioritising long-term planning over short-term expediency</b> is necessary: Building strong relationships among local actors, developing commonly-defined goals, creating processes to work and share learning, and ensuring local program ownership is strong and the right people with complementary skills are on board.</p>	<p><b>LAB information sheet</b></p>
<p><b>STRESS assessment:</b> System mapping results in a visual representation of the dynamic relationships between people and the complex systems in which they exist. This workshop brings together local team members, technical advisers, partners and other key stakeholders – people who hold the critical knowledge of local context and relevant technical issues.</p> <p>The Inform phase is comprised of three types of information collection efforts that look across national, regional and local scales. Literature reviews and expert interviews provide the assessment with a baseline understanding of the issues. Secondary data provides quantitative evidence for analysis. Analysis culminates in an Analysis Workshop that brings together local team members, technical advisers, partners and other stakeholders with knowledge of the local context or relevant technical issues.</p> <p>In the Strategize phase, teams draft, refine and finalise their theories of change. Final outputs are then prepared to document the outcome and results of STRESS.</p> <p>Since our efforts in Myanmar, the STRESS process has been used to launch new initiatives in Nepal, Northern Uganda, Niger and Mongolia.</p>	<p><b>The STRESS Process at Mercy Corps</b></p>

## Appendix 2 – Documents Reviewed

RED CROSS/RED CRESCENT DOCUMENTATION		
Title	Author	Date
GDPC Urban Resilience Workshop Results, Bangkok <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/resources/building-urban-resilience-workshop-bangkok-thailand">https://www.preparecenter.org/resources/building-urban-resilience-workshop-bangkok-thailand</a>	Global Disaster Preparedness Centre	2013
GDPC Urban Resilience Workshop Report, Beirut <a href="https://www.unisdr.org/files/36460_36441beirutworkshoponurbandrreport.pdf">https://www.unisdr.org/files/36460_36441beirutworkshoponurbandrreport.pdf</a>	Global Disaster Preparedness Centre	2013
GDPC Urban Resilience Workshop Report, Arusha <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/resources/building-urban-resilience-workshop-arusha-tanzania">https://www.preparecenter.org/resources/building-urban-resilience-workshop-arusha-tanzania</a>	Global Disaster Preparedness Centre	2013
GDPC Urban Resilience Workshop Report, Panama <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/resources/building-urban-resilience-workshop-panama-city-panama">https://www.preparecenter.org/resources/building-urban-resilience-workshop-panama-city-panama</a>	Global Disaster Preparedness Centre	2013
Scaling urban community resilience: A scoping study for global action <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/scaling_community_resilience_-_gdpc_scoping_study_-_may_30_2014_final.pdf">https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/scaling_community_resilience_-_gdpc_scoping_study_-_may_30_2014_final.pdf</a>	Global Disaster Preparedness Center	2014
Scaling up urban resilience workshop report <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/resources/scaling-urban-community-resilience-scoping-study-global-action">https://www.preparecenter.org/resources/scaling-urban-community-resilience-scoping-study-global-action</a>	Global Disaster Preparedness Center	2014
Urban Disaster Management workshop report, Manila - <a href="http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/2014-08-21_Manila-Urban-DM-Workshop-Report.pdf">http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/2014-08-21_Manila-Urban-DM-Workshop-Report.pdf</a>	IFRC/Philippines Red Cross	2014
Building urban resilience: A guide for Red Cross and Red Crescent engagement and contribution <a href="http://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/12/1317300_GuidanceUrbanResilience_LR25b15d.pdf">http://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/12/1317300_GuidanceUrbanResilience_LR25b15d.pdf</a>	IFRC	2017
Programmatic directions for the Red Cross and Red Crescent in building urban community resilience in the Asia Pacific Region <a href="http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/document/programmatic-directions-for-the-red-cross-and-red-crescent-in-building-urban-community-resilience-in-the-asia-pacific-region/">http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/document/programmatic-directions-for-the-red-cross-and-red-crescent-in-building-urban-community-resilience-in-the-asia-pacific-region/</a>	EMI	2012
Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/revised_workshop_report_urban_assessment_tools_02_feb.2017.docx">https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/revised_workshop_report_urban_assessment_tools_02_feb.2017.docx</a>	IFRC/GDPC	2017
Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop Oslo - Urban Assessment Tools <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/revised_workshop_report_urban_assessment_tools_02_feb.2017.docx">https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/revised_workshop_report_urban_assessment_tools_02_feb.2017.docx</a>	IFRC/GDPC	2016
Habitat III - Humanitarian crises and the city (Engagement of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement) <a href="http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Photos/Secretariat/HIII-Movement-leaflet-EN-LR.pdf">http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Photos/Secretariat/HIII-Movement-leaflet-EN-LR.pdf</a>	IFRC	2016
Learning from the City: British Red Cross Urban Learning Project Scoping Study <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/learning_from_the_city_2012.pdf">https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/learning_from_the_city_2012.pdf</a>	British Red Cross	2012
Regional Resilience Initiative Lessons Learned Workshop Report – Bangkok <a href="http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/2018-03-05_RRI_LL-WS_Report.pdf">http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/2018-03-05_RRI_LL-WS_Report.pdf</a>	IFRC, Canadian Red Cross	2018

<b>RED CROSS/RED CRESCENT DOCUMENTATION</b>		
<b>Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Case Study: Building Urban Resilience in Southeast Asia: Innovative and tailored public awareness and public education</b> <a href="http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/BUR-case1-compressed.pdf">http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/BUR-case1-compressed.pdf</a>	IFRC	2017
<b>Case Study: Building Urban Resilience in Southeast Asia – Innovative participatory mapping methodology for disaster preparedness and response</b> <a href="http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/document/case-study-building-urban-resilience-in-southeast-asia-innovative-participatory-mapping-methodology-for-disaster-preparedness-and-response/">http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/document/case-study-building-urban-resilience-in-southeast-asia-innovative-participatory-mapping-methodology-for-disaster-preparedness-and-response/</a>	IFRC	2017
<b>Case Study: Building Urban Resilience in Southeast Asia – School Safety</b> - <a href="http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/document/case-study-building-urban-resilience-in-southeast-asia-school-safety/">http://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/document/case-study-building-urban-resilience-in-southeast-asia-school-safety/</a>	IFRC	2017
<b>The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement engagement in the 9th Session of the World Urban Forum. Kuala Lumpur, February 6th to February 13th, 2018</b>	RCRC Movement	2018
<b>Overview of the International Red Cross Red Crescent’s engagement in the WUF9</b>	RCRC Movement	2018
<b>IFRC: Sustainable Reconstruction in Urban Areas</b> <a href="http://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/95526/publications/Urban%20reconstruction%20Handbook%20IFRC-SKAT.pdf">http://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/95526/publications/Urban%20reconstruction%20Handbook%20IFRC-SKAT.pdf</a>	IFRC	2012
<b>Guidance for Urban Resilience Programming</b> <a href="https://www.alnap.org/help-library/guidance-for-urban-resilience-programming">https://www.alnap.org/help-library/guidance-for-urban-resilience-programming</a>	American Red Cross	2015
<b>Integrated Community Assessment for Building Resilience Process (ICABR) – Guidance Document (Introduction and Overview Module)</b>	Myanmar Red Cross	2015
<b>Coalition Building in Coastal Cities – Global Brief, 2016</b>	GDPC, ARC and IFRC	2016
<b>Mid-Term Review Vulnerability to Resilience (V2R) Barisal Programme, British Red Cross - Bangladesh</b>	Humanitarian Consulting	2017
<b>Urban V2R Programme Technical Backstopping Mission Report</b>	IFRC	2017
<b>Mid-Term Review Vulnerability to Resilience (V2R) Kurigraml Programme, British Red Cross - Bangladesh</b>	Humanitarian Consulting	2017
<b>V2R Programme Model Overview – One pager</b>	Bangladesh Red Crescent and British Red Cross	?
<b>SURE Pilot Feedback and De-brief</b>	Nepal RC and British RC	2017
<b>Strengthening Urban Resilience &amp; Engagement (SURE) programme (Nepal) - Urban Assessment (VCA) Guidelines</b>	Nepal RC and British RC	2017
<b>Urban profiling in Vietnam</b>	American RC and Vietnam RC	2015
<b>Case Study: Multi-stakeholder mapping using research and associated evidence-based for advocacy - Climate Vulnerability Mapping (Indonesia)</b>	Dino Argianto, American RC	2016

RED CROSS/RED CRESCENT DOCUMENTATION		
Title	Author	Date
Case Study: PASSA+, Tacloban Recovery Programme	Phillipines RC and American RC	2016

External documents (Non-RC/RC)		
Title	Author	Date
Summative Evaluation - Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network Initiative <a href="https://assets.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/20170215144848/ACCCRN-Final-Evaluation-Reissued-Dec-2016.pdf">https://assets.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/20170215144848/ACCCRN-Final-Evaluation-Reissued-Dec-2016.pdf</a>	The Rockefeller Foundation	2014
Trends in Urban Resilience 2017 <a href="https://unhabitat.org/books/trends-in-urban-resilience-2017/">https://unhabitat.org/books/trends-in-urban-resilience-2017/</a>	UNHABITAT	2017
Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management <a href="http://gsd.spc.int/frdp/assets/FRDP_2016_Resilient_Dev_pacific.pdf">http://gsd.spc.int/frdp/assets/FRDP_2016_Resilient_Dev_pacific.pdf</a>	Pacific Community (SPC) et al.	2016
Humanitarian response to urban crises: a review of area-based approaches <a href="https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/10742iied.pdf">https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/10742iied.pdf</a>	IIED	2015
Urban area-based approaches in post-disaster contexts: Guidance Note for Humanitarian Practitioners <a href="http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/10825IIED.pdf">http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/10825IIED.pdf</a>	Stronger Cities Consortium	2017
GLOBAL MIGRATION Resilient Cities at the Forefront: Strategic actions to adapt and transform our cities in an age of migration <a href="https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/global_migration_resilient_cities_at_the_forefront_digital_high_res.pdf">https://www.preparecenter.org/sites/default/files/global_migration_resilient_cities_at_the_forefront_digital_high_res.pdf</a>	Proceeding of the 100RC Network Exchange	2016
Stepping back: Understanding cities and their systems <a href="https://www.alnap.org/help-library/stepping-back-understanding-cities-and-their-systems">https://www.alnap.org/help-library/stepping-back-understanding-cities-and-their-systems</a>	ALNAP	2016
Cities in Crises: Promoting Settlement Approaches in Urban Areas – overview of lessons learnt	AGORA initiative	2017
Developing city resilience strategies: lessons from the ICLEI–ACCCRN process <a href="https://www.accrn.net/sites/default/files/publication/attach/10816iied.pdf">https://www.accrn.net/sites/default/files/publication/attach/10816iied.pdf</a>	Archer, Monteith, Scott and Gawler	2017
Urban Climate Change Resilience in Action: Lessons from Projects in 10 ACCRN Cities <a href="https://assets.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/20150201235447/ACCCRN_ProjectsInsightsPaper_single.pdf">https://assets.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/20150201235447/ACCCRN_ProjectsInsightsPaper_single.pdf</a>	ACCCRN	2015
Beyond Resilience: Case Studies <a href="http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/558f8a_6d54600a289c4072ba32fb5a7f7bb886.pdf">http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/558f8a_6d54600a289c4072ba32fb5a7f7bb886.pdf</a>	ISET	2015
Habitat III Issues Papers: 15 – Urban Resilience - <a href="https://www.alnap.org/help-library/habitat-iii-issue-papers-15-urban-resilience">https://www.alnap.org/help-library/habitat-iii-issue-papers-15-urban-resilience</a>	UN HABITAT	2016
Resilient Cities Report 2017: Tracking local progress on the resilience targets of SDG 11 <a href="https://resilientcities2018.iclei.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/RC2017_Report_Online_26102017_Final-compressed.pdf">https://resilientcities2018.iclei.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/RC2017_Report_Online_26102017_Final-compressed.pdf</a>	ICLEI	2017



External documents (Non-RC/RC)		
Title	Author	Date
Cordaid Programme Brief Buiuan – Resilient Recovery Programme - <a href="https://files.zenhub.io/56d67b605f52a31016484f64">https://files.zenhub.io/56d67b605f52a31016484f64</a>	Cordaid	2015
Advocacy for urban resilience: UNISDR's Making Cities Resilient Campaign <a href="http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1433986/1/Environment_and_Urbanization-2014-Johnson-29-52.pdf">http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1433986/1/Environment_and_Urbanization-2014-Johnson-29-52.pdf</a> (Environment and Urbanisation Journal, Vol 26 (1))	Cassidy Johnson and Sophie Blackburn	2014
Making Cities Resilient: Summary for Policymakers. A global snapshot of how local governments reduce disaster risk <a href="https://www.preventionweb.net/files/33059_33059finalprinterversionexecutivesu.pdf">https://www.preventionweb.net/files/33059_33059finalprinterversionexecutivesu.pdf</a>	UNISDR	2013
The STRESS process at Mercy Corps (info sheet) <a href="https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/STRESS_Doc_R7%20%281%29.pdf">https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/STRESS_Doc_R7%20%281%29.pdf</a>	Mercy Corps	
BUILDING 100 RESILIENT CITIES: INDONESIA AS A LEARNING LAB info sheet <a href="https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/Building%20100%20Resilient%20Cities.pdf">https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/Building%20100%20Resilient%20Cities.pdf</a>	Mercy Corps	