



Introductory Notes for Thematic Contributors of Resilience Focus: Issue 2

Theme 1: Alignment, Coordination and Partnerships

Contact Persons: animesh.kumar@unisdr.unon.org and giulia.polidori@wfp.org

Given the momentum generated by the 'Ending Drought Emergencies' through the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) the level of investment and number of actors in the IGAD region has increased in the last couple of years. This calls for ensuring effective coordination and partnerships among a wide range of actors and stakeholders, leveraging the potential of each and aligning contributions to enhance efficiency and effectiveness. This will ensure translating a common vision – disaster resilience in the drylands of the IGAD region – into action resulting in higher accountability, and paving way for coherent policies to guide implementation.

Key thematic areas of focus:

1. Resilience in the region is still seen from the humanitarian lens, while it is a result of long-term development processes. How can resilience become a common binder to bring humanitarian and development actors together? How can the efficiency of development investments be enhanced?
2. Year 2015-16 is significant in that will be it marked by the adoption of four different, but mutually complementary global frameworks and strategies – the Post-2015 Development Agenda, the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the International Climate Change Agreement, and the World Humanitarian Summit (2016). Can resilience act as a common integrative framework that embraces the outcomes of these processes, particularly in the IGAD region?
3. The IDDRSI strategy as well as Country Programming Paper underscore the importance of evidence-based approaches to addressing development challenges in the IGAD region, e.g. natural resource management, livestock markets and trade, conflict reduction, and increasing access to basic services, etc. How far is the evidence informing the policies? What are the constraints to turning policy into action, and vice versa?
4. The Country Programming Papers are expected to guide actions at national and sub-national levels to enhance resilience. How are countries' institutional frameworks for policy change adapting to the particular context of the drylands? Are the existing and new institutions in countries coordinating enough to implement programmes?
5. There is an increase in the availability of multi-year funding, and growing evidence of and awareness of the need for more effective linkages between development and humanitarian branches of some donors. Also, creating flexible funding for Early Action still presents a number of challenges. Donors are holding multiple contingency funds, raising questions on the best process for risk management and accountability. Innovations is encouraged, but also evidences and proven approaches are championed. What have been the successful efforts to date? How can further progress be achieved?



Theme 2: Resilience Programming

Contact Persons: Massawe, Stella (ILRI) (S.MASSAWE@cgiar.org)
and Olesambu, Emmanuella (FAO) (Emmanuella.Olesambu@fao.org)

Quality of design and implementation of resilience enhancing interventions (policies, strategies, projects and programmes) in the drylands of Africa is an important determinant of their effectiveness. Use of evidence plays a critical role in guiding decision-making for high quality design and implementation of interventions.

Key thematic areas of focus:

- Information on outcomes of interventions that have been implemented to address development challenges of the drylands of Africa (e.g. food insecurity, low agriculture productivity, limited access to output markets, limited access to agriculture services such as extension and credit, among others) to inform planning, programming, M&E as well as advocacy and policy making; and
- Link between programmes and resilience building informed by the drivers of resilience, demonstrated by case studies, so to provide practical examples of approaches used in programming to build resilience – this might should include sectoral and multisectoral approaches.

Theme 3: Resilience Measurement

Contact Persons: Tesfaye.Asfaw@fao.org and Laura Mattioli, (ESA) laura.mattioli@fao.org

Resilience has become a dominant discourse in both humanitarian, research and development policies. However, there are still a number of grey areas that needs empirical evidences and collective understanding. Therefore, the purpose of this thematic area is to attract experience from resilience research and field practice at households, community, district and national levels, including rigorous reviews of methodology and lessons learned from around the world, with special focus on Africa.

This theme attempts to shed light on the following key issues:

- Identify key resilience drivers or dimensions of resilience with specific indicators. This goes beyond the three capacities of resilience (absorptive, adaptive, and transformative) without rich operational indicators. Thus, there is a need to identify of measureable indicators within the respective capacities and other relevant indicators that may influence resilience under different context.
- Resilience measurement at scale, from household to sub-national level (country, watershed, district, etc.,) to national levels. Note that this addresses resilience for different units of analysis.
- Linking resilience with specific or multiple shocks in a systematic way – resilience of **what to what and how?**
- Provide answers to all or some of the following conceptual inconsistencies and gaps in resilience discourse using your case studies:
 - Is resilience measureable or not? If measureable, is it a process or an outcome?
 - Does resilience of different systems require the same capacities or pattern of responses? For instance, household systems, ecological systems, social systems, coupled systems (e.g., socio-ecological system), etc.,



- Provide evidences of where resilience may not be desirable. (Compare with resilience of what to what? Resilience for who, with temporal and special dimensions).
- What are the possible scenarios of resilience? (c.f resist, absorb, bouncing back, adapt, transform) and substantiate the principle of multiple equilibria over time.
- Do we have to wait for a major shock to occur to measure resilience or there is a window of opportunity to measure it progressively? If so how?
- Does improving intermediate outcome areas such food security at household level or access to basic social services guarantee resilience at household level?
- What is the time dimension to realize resilience at scale (household, sub-national to national level) and explain the nature of changes overtime (linear vs non-linear).
- What is the relationship between vulnerability and resilience?