



Funded by
European Union
Civil Protection

Final Report of Uscore2 - Appendix 2: Presentation of the technical results and deliverables

City-to-city local level Peer Review on Disaster Risk Reduction

ECHO/SUB/2016/743543/PREV04

The European Commission contributed to the development of the Sendai Framework, emphasizing international cooperation and the importance of a multi-stakeholder approach. The upcoming European Commission action plan on its implementation will outline a cross-border, cross-institutional approach, with implications on local level implementation. Also, the 2013 EU Civil Protection legislation promotes international knowledge sharing.

Peer Reviews at national level help European Member States to improve DRR capabilities and foster multi-stakeholder dialogue. International city-to-city Peer Reviews can have similar benefits to cities and help disaster preparedness across Europe.

The overall purpose of Uscore2 was the development of a new tool for city to city Peer Reviews which will complement and build on the results of the EU national Peer Reviews. The aim was that the city Peer Reviews would strengthen DRR by enabling detailed knowledge exchanges between experts at a city level.

This appendix details the deliverables identified as essential to the success of the project, the purpose of the deliverable, the activities undertaken to facilitate this effectively, the method of evaluation and how value added practice has been identified and disseminated. Some evaluations were simple quantitative judgements, e.g. whether or not the proposed report/workshop/review was completed. Others necessitated a more qualitative judgement e.g. feedback from participants, evidence of change.

In line with the requirements of the grant funding, the project aimed to add value to the work already undertaken in this area by the EU. This appendix will identify where a deliverable has particularly added value.

The findings of the project have been disseminated on an ongoing basis through a well-regarded and visited Uscore2 website, which has been kept updated. Throughout the project the project team have facilitated Master Classes and provided regular face to face and remote support to partners and participants. On completion of the pilot reviews the Peer Review reports and tools created have been published in professionally designed formats, accessible to a variety of professional and non-professional users, along with summaries designed to enable marketing, particularly for commissioners to consider the appropriateness of future reviews.

WP1: Develop pilot Peer Review tool			
Action	Related Deliverable	Purpose of deliverable/activity	Description of the result / evaluation / value added
A1.1: Conduct Literature Review of city resilience Peer Review framework	D1.1: Literature Review on city Resilience Peer Review framework complete	A widespread academic review of the available literature referencing city resilience Peer Reviews, relevant theoretical models, case studies, findings, lessons identified and recommendations. This included a review of current academic literature, a review of government and NGO literatures e.g. journal articles, practitioner/consultant reports, national Peer Review guidelines, UNISDR publications, etc. The product of this work provided an evidence based framework for conducting Peer Reviews on DRR including an impact evaluation methodology.	<p>Evaluation: Quantitative: review completed on time.</p> <p>Qualitative: The search criteria to select documents for the literature review were agreed by all partners and the IAB to ensure a robust review.</p> <p>The review design was structured to align with the '10 essentials' of the UNISDR Making Cities Resilient Campaign to support wider project objectives.</p> <p>The review was completed by October 2017 and is recognized as a thorough, considered piece of research that has been an invaluable resource in the development and scrutiny of the Peer Review tools and IEM.</p> <p>Much of the design of the tools was based on this evidence.</p> <p>The review added to the body of knowledge available to EU and UN networks</p>

<p>A1.2: Agree objectives for city-to-city Peer Reviews</p>	<p>D1.2: Framework of objectives for conducting city-to-city Peer Reviews</p>	<p>Although Peer Reviewing is an established management and development tool, the application of Peer Reviews in DRR on a city-to-city basis is a largely untried concept. The Uscore project focused on self-assessment city resilience for DRR without any Peer Review involvement – complementary but different to Uscore2 which focused on a Peer Review process for developing city resilience. Learning from Uscore demonstrated that a successful self-assessment should be based on a common set of objectives that are incorporated into the assessment tool. Thus, when a Peer Review tool is applied to a city, there needs to be a set of overarching objectives that can be customised to the local context and the aims for each review. Using the results from the literature review, and the learning from Uscore and other sources, this action established a framework of objectives for conducting city-to-city Peer Reviews in DRR. This action also supported the development of local objectives.</p>	<p>Evaluation: Quantitative: framework completed on time.</p> <p>Qualitative: This action provides a framework of objectives for conducting city-to-city Peer Reviews which aid end-users to understand the potential value of applying the Uscore2 tool to their city. A set of objectives has been developed for city-to-city Peer Reviews on DRR. These effectively set out the multiple benefits cities might expect from conducting a Peer Review and will aid end-users to understand the potential value of applying the Peer Review tool to their city. As each city within the project pilots the Peer Review Tool it will set local objectives. This process was tested with the 3 pilot cities and evidenced the value of consistency in the high level objectives, with the ability to customise to local circumstances and priorities. The tool encourages each city to choose 3-5 modules to apply locally within their Peer Review.</p>
<p>A1.3: Design pilot Peer Review tool and methodology for its application</p>	<p>D1.3: Description of pilot Peer Review tool and the methodology to apply the tool</p>	<p>The Peer Review tool has been designed for a city-to-city level Peer Review. The tool includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • city-to-city Peer Review objectives from which a city could select the most relevant module and localise • data, information and evidence that is provided by the Host City prior and during the Peer Review to assist the Peer Review team • methods for gathering data • stakeholders that Peer Reviewers may find it useful to meet when conducting the review 	<p>Evaluation: Quantitative: review tool and methodology completed on time.</p> <p>Qualitative: This action was delivered both in advance of and during the project start-up workshop in Amadora and was prepared by reviewing: national DRR Peer Review guidelines; reports of findings/lessons learnt from a range of national Peer Reviews; the literature review (A1.1); final report from Uscore; MCR 10 Essentials; and Peer Reviews undertaken by project partners in other contexts.</p> <p>During the start-up workshop partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presented information from Uscore regarding use of data,

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recommended composition (experts, roles, etc.) of a city-to-city Peer Review team • guidelines and procedures for conducting the Peer Review <p>The design of the tool benefited from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • learning from Uscore including: data/information that helps to explain city resilience; which stakeholders to involve to describe city resilience; indicators to include for DRR city resilience; how to apply indicators to measure city resilience • new local indicators developed to aid the implementation of the Sendai Framework at local, national and international levels • national/international monitoring and reporting frameworks such as for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Paris Agreement, and the Sendai Framework • literature review of city resilience Peer Review framework (A1.1) • experience of national level DRR Peer Reviews (such as from Finland (in the IAB), Portugal (ANPC) and UNISDR) 	<p>stakeholders, indicators and processes that add value (Amadora and Salford)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - discussed the local indicators developed to aid implementation of the Sendai Framework (UNISDR) - presented findings from reviewing national level DRR Peer Reviews - agreed detailed content for the Peer Review tool. <p>After the workshop the project team further developed collated, circulated and agreed modules that would make up the Peer Review tool; circulated the draft Peer Review tool to the IAB; received IAB comments through teleconference / email; continued to refine the tool and engage other experts to input their views.</p> <p>The pilot tool was tested in the first pilot Peer Review in Viggiano.</p> <p>The Peer Review tool adds value and complements EU work on national Peer Reviews and the UNISDR Frameworks.</p>
A1.4: Design an impact evaluation	D1.4: Description of impact evaluation	To evaluate the Peer Review process and outcome, to agree evaluation criteria and methodology. These criteria and methodology have been developed from the literature reviews, Uscore learning and presented during and post the Amadora	<p>Evaluation: Quantitative: IEM completed on time.</p> <p>Qualitative: the impact evaluation methodology was established in order to assess the impact of the Peer Review tool on city resilience. It was conducted throughout the project</p>

<p>methodology which will assess the strengths/weaknesses of the Peer Review tool</p>	<p>methodology</p>	<p>workshop for comment. Following the workshop, they were revised and re-circulated to the consortium for final comment before being confirmed. They were then used in the first application of the Peer Review tool in Viggiano.</p> <p>The evaluation criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enable access to best practice (as mentioned in Form T1 Sections [S]1,2&4 of this proposal) and support knowledge exchanges between experts (S6&10) • encourage cities to strengthen their resilience and capacity to generate change (S1&8) • are practical and easy to use by cities at all levels of maturity in DRR planning (S1,2,3,4,5,8&10) and complement existing self-assessment tools (S4) • are applicable to cities with different risk profiles, sizes and governance arrangements (S4,8&10) and with different cultures (S8) • engage multiple stakeholders engaged in the city's DRR (S10) and reflect a comprehensive, all-of-society approach to DRR (S2) • incorporate learning from Uscore and findings from other EU-funded projects (S2&10) • recognise national/local DRR mechanisms (S4) and aligns with implementation of Sendai Framework and UNISDR MCR (S2,3&8) and with the EU Civil Protection Mechanism (S10) 	<p>and finalised at the conclusion of the testing phase.</p> <p>The University of Manchester have designed templates for capturing the outcomes and recommendations from the Peer Reviews. This will aid impact evaluation.</p> <p>The Peer Reviews in the three pilot cities supported the testing and development of the impact evaluation methodology.</p> <p>The IEM is a significant addition to the tools available to the EU to improve DRR.</p>
---	--------------------	---	---

		The methodology: evaluated the Peer Review tool; identified the most useful aspects of the Peer Review tool for cities; offered recommendations for improving the tool; assessed the impact of the Peer Review tool on city resilience).	
WP2: Apply pilot Peer Review to Viggiano			
A2.1: Agree objectives for Peer Review of Viggiano	D2.1: A set of objectives for the Peer Review in Viggiano	<p>Building on the overall framework of objectives for conducting city-to-city Peer Reviews developed in WP1 (D1.2) a set of local objectives for Viggiano was developed and agreed.</p> <p>This action was led by Viggiano and involved its local stakeholders reviewing the framework of objectives contained in the pilot Peer Review tool. Viggiano confirmed the areas of DRR it wished to review through discussions with city officials, APCGL and with the project team. The agreed city-level objectives were provided to Salford (as the Peer Review team) through a teleconference and then submitted in writing.</p> <p>The objectives were used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encourage buy-in to the Peer Review process by local multi-stakeholders • foster political ownership in Viggiano of the Peer Review process and its outcomes • ensure that the specific issues that Viggiano would like to be independently reviewed were given appropriate scrutiny during the Peer Review • enable the city Peer Review to reflect any specific governance arrangements 	<p>Evaluation: Quantitative: local objectives agreed and completed on time.</p> <p>Qualitative: the framework for the Peer Review for Viggiano (D2.1) included a detailed agenda and local level objectives, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the level of understanding, participation and coordination on DRR among the different stakeholders. • Spreading results among the population to improve not only understanding on DRR, but also the level of trust toward the institutions. <p>The following modules were chosen as the themes for the Peer Review:</p> <p>Module 2 - Identify, Understand and Use Current and Future Risk Scenarios</p> <p>Module 4 - Pursue Resilient Urban and DRR Development and Design</p> <p>Module 5 - Safeguard Natural Buffers to Enhance and DRR Ecosystems' Protective Functions</p> <p>Module 7a - Understand and Strengthen Societal Capacity for Resilience (Module 7a became Module 7 as Module7b Business</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agree the composition of the Salford team who will lead the Peer Review • provide context to all the partners in the consortium as each will send a representative to this first Peer Review so that they learn about the Peer Review tool • finalise arrangements for Viggiano Peer Review, including any additional information they should prepare for the review team 	<p>Continuity was incorporated within other modules as the project methodology evolved)</p> <p>Module 9 - Ensure Effective Disaster Response</p>
<p>A2.2: Identify expert Peer Review team for Viggiano</p>	<p>D2.2: List of expert reviewers for Viggiano Peer Review and their roles</p>	<p>Expert reviewers were enrolled to conduct the Peer Review using the using the objectives (D2.1) to ensure a sufficient coverage of skills was available. The Peer Review of Viggiano was led by Salford, but also involved non-Salford members of the project team to capitalise on the learning that came from this first test of the pilot Peer Review tool. These non-Salford members of the project team were expert reviewers and made valuable contributions to the Peer Review, hence they were included as part of the review team (rather than as only observers) so they could contribute their expertise to further strengthen the resilience of Viggiano.</p> <p>Salford led the review, identifying a suitable Peer Review team using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the recommendations and guidance available in the documented Peer Review tool (D1.3) • the local objectives for the city-level Peer Review (D2.1) • expertise available from other countries, on this occasion various roles needed in a team e.g. Chair, 	<p>Evaluation: Quantitative: expert team enrolled in the Peer Review team.</p> <p>Qualitative: thirteen Peer Reviewers undertook the review each drawn from a different background and including representation from international, national and city level DRR practitioners. The high number of reviewers reflected the fact that this review was the first to be held, had a high number of modules and was acting both as a test of the draft tool and as an opportunity for people to develop Peer Review skills. The list of experts is documented within the Peer Review report.</p> <p>The experience of piloting the Peer Review in Viggiano added to the knowledge of these EU contributors and raised the profile of the project. It also developed a cadre of Peer Reviewers who can support Peer Reviews in other EU countries.</p>

		Domain Experts.	
A2.3 Expert team of Peer Reviewers visit Viggiano and apply pilot Peer Review tool to conduct Peer Review	D2.3: Report on the findings from Viggiano city Peer Review	<p>An expert review team from Salford (from D2.2) and from other consortium partners visited Viggiano to apply the pilot Peer Review tool (from D1.3). The methodology included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • following the Peer Review objectives and the methodology agreed D1.3 • Viggiano submitting some information to the Peer Review team ahead of their visit which later helped informed the pilot Peer Review tool in specifying what sort of information should be submitted and in what format • Viggiano facilitating access for the Peer Review team to relevant data, information, experts, communities and sites (e.g. emergency control centre) – enabling an assessment of which sites might be specified in the review tool as important to visit, what sort of access may be required and how this should be facilitated • the Peer Review team following the pilot Peer Review tool to assess the city resilience of Viggiano – and thereby testing the usefulness of the pilot Peer Review tool during this experience • assessing the availability of data and demonstrating that commercial and security considerations to exchanging data may apply. The review tested the comprehensiveness of the data listed in the pilot Peer Review tool 	<p>Evaluation: Quantitative: expert team completed the Peer Review October 2017.</p> <p>Qualitative: Following the Peer Review objectives and the methodology agreed in D1.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viggiano provided information to the Peer Review team ahead of their visit following the guidelines in the draft Peer Review Tool. • A Peer Review team of experts assembled from all the cities participating in this project, having read the pre-visit information, visited Viggiano to apply the pilot Peer Review Tool. • Viggiano facilitated access for the Peer Review team to relevant data, information, experts, communities and arranged for site visits including visits to emergency control centres and areas of particular interest to DRR e.g. Oil pre-processing plant. • The pilot Peer Review was used to assess the availability, comprehensiveness and usefulness of the data listed in the pilot Peer Review tool. • The Peer Review team presented some initial headline findings to Viggiano officials and the local community at a public meeting towards the end of the Peer Review visit. • A report on the findings from Viggiano Peer Review was

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Peer Review team presenting some headline findings to Viggiano officials at the end of their visit enabling the pilot Peer Review tool to consider how best to deliver feedback the Peer Review team writing a report of their findings for Viggiano enabling the pilot Peer Review tool to suggest a template for that report <p>Following the Peer Review, the Peer Review team and Viggiano's host team captured their views of using the pilot Peer Review tool and discussed these in the mid-term workshop which was held in early 2018.</p>	<p>produced and presented to the Commune of Viggiano in a mutually agreed format as indicated in the pilot Peer Review tool.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the Peer Review, the Peer Review team had captured their views of using the pilot Peer Review tool and presented them at the mid-term workshop held in Salford, UK. The Host team from Viggiano also presented their views of experiencing the pilot Peer Review tool. Viggiano arranged an open public meeting in Viggiano in October 2018 for representatives from Salford to feed back the final conclusions and recommendations from Viggiano's Peer Review.
<p>A2.4: Evaluate the application of the Peer Review tool to Viggiano</p>	<p>D2.4: Impact evaluation report on the Peer Review of Viggiano</p>	<p>To assess the value gained from undertaking the Peer Review process an impact evaluation methodology was designed (D1.4) and trialled in Viggiano. The impact evaluation methodology explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> whether there is a value for the reviewed city using the pilot Peer Review tool and how it can be measured how cities can maximise their value from the Peer Review tool and the impact evaluation methodology what conditions need to be present in the reviewed/reviewer cities for the tool to have maximum value 	<p>Evaluation. Qualitative: The pilot IEM enabled an effective evaluation of the impact of the Peer Review of Viggiano, identifying the areas in which the review had made a difference to DRR and also offering insights to strengthen the future development of the IEM.</p>

		<p>Telephone interviews were conducted with the Viggiano Host team to understand the impact that the application of the tool on their city and what they saw as the strengths/weaknesses of the pilot Peer Review tool. Telephone interviews with the Salford (and wider) Peer Review team also helped to understand the impact the review had on DRR in their city as well as the strengths/weaknesses of the Peer Review tool. These insights were used to further improve the Peer Review tool, and the impact evaluation methodology.</p> <p>This pilot was conducted in Year 1, enabling the DRR activities in Viggiano to be monitored to understand the impact of the Peer Review up until the end of the project. To facilitate insights of longer-term benefits of applying the Peer Review tool, the impact evaluation methodology was applied in Viggiano again near the end of Year 2, using telephone interviews.</p>	
WP3: Develop final Peer Review tool			
<p>A3.1: Revise and update pilot Peer Review tool using the experience of Peer Reviewing Viggiano and the findings from the</p>	<p>D3.1: Final Peer Review tool report</p>	<p>The lessons identified from applying the pilot Peer Review tool in Viggiano were built into a revised Peer Review tool that was tested in Salford and Amadora. Learning and subsequent updating of the tool continued throughout the project.</p> <p>At the midterm workshop in Salford the project team considered written submissions (D2.3, D2.4); heard presentations from the Peer Review team, from Viggiano, from UoM and agreed the changes needed. This was followed by revising the Peer Review tool and through bi-lateral discussions and multi-lateral teleconferences agreement to the revisions</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative: revised Peer Review tool prepared and agreed.</p> <p>The next version of the Peer Review tool (D3.1) was updated to reflect the submissions and recommendations provided by the Host and Peer Review teams that were involved in the Viggiano Peer Review. The findings from the application of the IEM were also factored into the redraft of the tool. Drawing on the reflections of the cities, other Peer Reviewers and academic partners, the Peer Review tool was updated to then be trialled in the Salford and Amadora Peer Reviews. Reflections from the first Peer Review were shared with the IAB for their</p>

impact evaluation		was confirmed.	observations and input.
A3.2: Revise and update impact evaluation methodology using the experience from applying it in Viggiano	D3.2: Final impact evaluation methodology	This activity ensured the lessons identified from applying the IEM in Viggiano were discussed in the midterm workshop and built into a revised impact evaluation methodology that was applied and tested in Salford and Amadora.	Evaluation. Quantitative. Revised IEM prepared and agreed. The revised impact evaluation methodology (D3.2) was updated to reflect the submissions and recommendations provided by the Host and Peer Review teams that were involved in the Viggiano Peer Review and input from the wider project partners.
WP4: Apply final Peer Review tool to Salford and Amadora			
A4.1: Agree objectives for Peer Review of Salford (building on A4.8)	D4.1: Framework of Peer Review for Salford	A set of local objectives were agreed for the Peer Review of Salford prior to the Peer Review This action was led by Salford to ensure it aligned with the needs of its local stakeholders. This involved reviewing the objective setting content within the Peer Review tool as a focus for local discussions in Salford. The agreed city-level objectives were provided to Amadora, the Peer Review team, through a teleconference and then submitted in writing.	Evaluation. Quantitative: Local objectives identified and agreed through local consultation. Qualitative: The framework for the Peer Review of Salford (D4.1) was created by identifying and agreeing the agenda and aims and objectives of the Salford Peer Review prior to it taking place. The objectives enabled an appropriate choice of optional Modules to form the basis of the Peer Review Module 8a: Recognising the complex interdependencies between different infrastructure types in a large urban context, to explore the resilience to disaster risks of infrastructure providing essential services to the city region. Module 10: Understanding that the city region has, in the last

			three years, used its recovery plans after several emergencies, to seek an independent perspective on the recovery processes to validate current planning and to inform their future development.
A4.2: Identify expert Peer Review team for Salford	D4.2: List of expert reviewers for Salford Peer Review and their roles	<p>The Peer Review of Salford was undertaken on a city-to-city level, with just two cities engaged in the review, the Peer Review City, Amadora, and the Host City, Salford. A suitable Peer Review team was identified recognising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommendations and guidance available in the documented Peer Review tool (D3.1) • The local objectives for the city-level Peer Review (D4.1) • The requirement that as this will be a true city-to-city Peer Review, all Peer Review experts will need to be drawn from one city, in this case Amadora • The recommendations for the composition of a Peer Review team, from the Peer Review tool, were applied to select the Peer Review team. Local discussions in Amadora and Salford aided this process. MHCLG input UK national considerations. Amadora identified the individuals from within their city to undertake the Peer Review. 	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative. Expert recruiters from Amadora recruited</p> <p>The list of experts is documented within the Salford Peer Review report.</p>
A4.3: Expert team of Peer Reviewers visit Salford and	D4.3: Report on the findings from Salford city Peer	<p>An expert review team from Amadora (D4.2) visited Salford to apply the Peer Review tool agreed in WP3 as deliverable D3.1. This was a true city-to-city level Peer Review, albeit the regional stakeholder nature of DRR in Greater Manchester means some of Salford's DRR stakeholders cover a wider geographical area</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative: Report on the findings from Salford city Peer Review (D4.7) completed.</p> <p>Qualitative: Following the Peer Review objectives and the methodology agreed (D3.1):</p>

<p>apply pilot Peer Review tool to conduct Peer Review</p>	<p>Review</p>	<p>than just Salford. Salford facilitated access for the Peer Review team to relevant data, information, experts, communities and, where relevant, sites (e.g. utility provider’s infrastructure). Some data was submitted in advance of the visit from Amadora. After the visit and analysis of information, the Peer Review team from Amadora produced a written report detailing their findings and recommendations for Salford, again in line with the Peer Review tool.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salford provided information to the Peer Review team ahead of their visit. • The pilot Peer Review tool indicated what sort of information was submitted and in what format. • A Peer Review team of experts assembled from Amadora and visited Salford to apply the pilot Peer Review tool. • Salford facilitated access for the Peer Review team to relevant data, information, experts, communities and arranged for site visits including visits to local electricity / water infrastructure facilities to view DRR procedures and improvements that have been implemented from lessons learnt from previous incidents. The Peer Review Team also visited highways and local public transport infrastructure facilities and observed contingency planning for transport disruption and planning for emergency scenarios. • The Peer Review team followed the pilot Peer Review tool to assess the city resilience of Salford and tested the usefulness of the pilot Peer Review tool during this experience • The pilot Peer Review was used to assess the availability of data and tested the comprehensiveness of the data listed in the pilot Peer Review tool. • The Peer Review team shared some headline findings to Salford Host team at the end of their visit.
--	---------------	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report on the findings from Salford Peer Review has been produced and presented to the City of Salford in a mutually agreed format as indicated in the pilot Peer Review tool. <p>Following the Peer Review, the Peer Review team captured their views of using the pilot Peer Review tool and these views fed into the further evolution of the Peer Review tool.</p> <p>The final report was disseminated through EU and UNSIDR networks through, workshops, presentation at conferences and the Uscore2 website, adding to the body of work available to EU partners.</p> <p>On 12th December 2018 members of the Peer Review Team returned to Salford and provided the completed Peer Review report and verbal updates at meetings and to local officials regarding the findings of the Peer Review.</p>
A4.4: Evaluate the application of the Peer Review tool to Salford (building on A4.8)	D4.4: Impact evaluation report on the Peer Review of Salford	<p>To evaluate if there was any value in Salford applying the peer-review tool, there was a need to formally assess the Peer Review. The impact evaluation methodology developed in A1.4.was used for this purpose. The impact evaluation methodology evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the impact the Peer Review tool had on resilience in Salford • the strengths and weaknesses of the Peer Review tool <p>The project team also reflected on the impact evaluation methodology to understand if it was fit-for-purpose and how it</p>	<p>Evaluation. Qualitative. The pilot IEM enabled an effective evaluation of the impact of the Peer Review of Salford, identifying the areas in which the review had made a difference to DRR. The impact evaluation report on the Peer Review of Salford (D4.4) has been completed and has been used to inform the final Impact evaluation report methodology- D5.3.</p>

		<p>could be improved.</p> <p>This was conducted through telephone interviews with the Salford Host City team to assess the impact that the application of the tool had on their city and the strengths/weaknesses of the Peer Review tool. Telephone interviews with the Amadora Peer Review team were undertaken to understand any impact the review had on their city as well as the strengths/weaknesses of the Peer Review tool. These insights were used to further improve the Peer Review tool, and the impact evaluation methodology.</p>	
<p>A4.5: Agree objectives for Peer Review of Amadora (building on A2.4)</p>	<p>D4.5: Framework of Peer Review for Amadora</p>	<p>Local objectives were agreed for the Peer Review of Amadora. This action was led by Amadora to ensure it aligned with the needs of its local stakeholders. This involved reviewing the objective setting content within the Peer Review tool as a focus for local discussions in Amadora. The agreed city-level objectives were provided to Viggiano, the Peer Review team, through a teleconference and then submitted in writing.</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative: Local objectives identified and agreed through local consultation.</p> <p>Qualitative: The framework for the Peer Review of Amadora (D4.5) was created by identifying and agreeing the agenda and aims and objectives of the Amadora Peer Review prior to it taking place.</p> <p>The objectives enabled an appropriate choice of optional Modules to form the basis of the Peer Review</p> <p>Module 1: If the work carried out by the municipality in terms of disaster risk reduction is perceptible to stakeholders; what are the direct and indirect contributions of stakeholders to the city's resilience; understand how the Disaster Resilience Scorecard contributed to the definition / implementation of a local strategy.</p> <p>Module 6: Networking from the point of view of institutional resilience; the importance of local government in supporting</p>

			the construction of a culture of security; efficiency and effectiveness of risk communication to entities and the population; which is lacking in order to have a local platform on resilience, with the contribution of local stakeholders.
A4.6: Identify expert Peer Review team for Amadora	D4.6: List of expert reviewers for Amadora Peer Review and their roles	<p>The Peer Review of Amadora involved mainly the Peer Reviewer City, Viggiano, and the Host City, Amadora. A suitable Peer Review team was identified recognising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guidance available in the Peer Review tool (D3.1) • The local objectives for the Peer Review (D4.5) • The requirement that all Peer Review experts will be drawn from Viggiano <p>The recommendations for the composition of a Peer Review team from the Peer Review tool were followed in the selection of the Peer Review team. Local discussions in Viggiano and with Amadora assisted this process. ANPC input considerations from the Portuguese national government. Viggiano identified the individuals from within their city to undertake the Peer Review.</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative: Expert reviewers recruited mainly from Amadora with some involvement of the project coordinator and project manager (Salford).</p> <p>The list of experts is documented within the Amadora Peer Review report.</p> <p>The experience of piloting the Peer Review in Viggiano and Salford added to the knowledge of these EU contributors and raised the profile of the project</p>
A4.7: Expert team of Peer Reviewers visit Amadora and apply pilot Peer Review tool to conduct Peer	D4.7: Report on the findings from Amadora city Peer Review	<p>The expert review team from Viggiano (D4.6) visited Amadora to apply the Peer Review tool agreed in WP3 as deliverable D3.1. Amadora facilitated access for the Peer Review team to relevant data, information, experts, communities and, where relevant, sites (e.g. fire station). Some data was submitted in advance of the visit from Viggiano. After the visit and analysis of information, the Peer Review team from Viggiano produced a written report detailing their findings and recommendations for Amadora, again in line with the Peer Review tool.</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative. Report on the findings from Amadora city Peer Review (D4.7) completed and presented.</p> <p>Qualitative: Following the Peer Review objectives and the methodology agreed (D1.3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amadora provided information to the Peer Review team ahead of their visit. • A Peer Review team of experts assembled mainly from Viggiano visited Amadora to apply the pilot Peer Review

Review			<p>tool.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amadora facilitated access for the Peer Review team to relevant data, information, experts, communities and arranged for site visits including visits to a local school to view emergency evacuation procedures and DRR education as well as observing an emergency scenario table top exercise with local stakeholders i.e. firefighters, police, civil protection officers. • The Peer Review team followed the pilot Peer Review tool to assess the city resilience of Amadora and tested the usefulness of the pilot Peer Review tool during this experience • The Peer Review team shared some headline findings to Amadora officials at the end of their visit. • A report on the findings from Amadora Peer Review has been produced and presented to the City of Amadora in a mutually agreed format as indicated in the pilot Peer Review tool. • Following the Peer Review, the Peer Review team had captured their views of using the pilot Peer Review tool and these views have been fed into the further evolution of the Peer Review tool. <p>The final report was disseminated through EU and UNSIDR networks through, workshops, presentation at conferences and the Uscore2 website, adding to the body of work available to EU partners.</p>
--------	--	--	--

			On 14th December 2018 members of the Peer Review Team returned to Amadora and presented the completed Peer Review report to local officials.
A4.8: Evaluate the application of the Peer Review tool to Amadora (building on A2.4)	D4.8: Impact evaluation report on the Peer Review of Amadora	<p>To assess any value for Amadora in applying the peer-review tool, there was a need to formally evaluate the Peer Review. This was done using the impact evaluation methodology developed in A3.2. The impact evaluation methodology evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the impact the Peer Review tool had on resilience in Amadora • the strengths and weaknesses of the Peer Review tool <p>The IEM was conducted via telephone interviews with the Amadora Host City team to understand the impact that the application of the tool has had on their city and the strengths/weaknesses of the Peer Review tool. Telephone interviews were also conducted with the Viggiano Peer Review team to understand any impact the review may have had on their city as well as the strengths/weaknesses of the Peer Review tool. These insights were used to further improve the Peer Review tool, and the impact evaluation methodology.</p>	<p>Evaluation. Qualitative: The pilot IEM enabled an effective evaluation of the impact of the Peer Review of Amadora, identifying the areas in which the review had made a difference to DRR</p> <p>Impact evaluation report on the Peer Review of Amadora (D4.8) was completed and was used to inform the final impact evaluation methodology- D5.3.</p>
WP5 Confirm project outcomes and final tool for publication			
A5.1: Final workshop to assess learning from	D5.1: Workshop report on learning amassed from	<p>This final project workshop brought together the entire Uscore2 consortium to review all available learning. This included reviewing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences of being Peer Reviewed (Viggiano, 	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative. The workshop report was completed and published</p> <p>The final project workshop took place at the UNISDR offices Brussels, Belgium, 27/28 Sept 2018.</p>

<p>all Peer Reviews and impact evaluations</p>	<p>Peer Reviews and impact evaluations</p>	<p>Amadora, Salford)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The influence of the Peer Review on subsequent city-level resilience activity, principally through Viggiano and, to a lesser extent because of their reviews had been undertaken so recently, Salford and Amadora • Experiences of applying the city-to-city Peer Review tool (All) • Findings from evaluating the impact of the Peer Reviews on cities (UoM) • How the experience from this project compares to national level DRR Peer Reviews (UNISDR) and recommendations/findings from the D1.1 literature review (UoM) <p>The final workshop captured all this learning and used it to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare a report summarising the project findings • Agree and make any final amendments to the city-to-city Peer Review tool • Agree and make any final amendments to the impact evaluation methodology • Confirm findings, conclusions and recommendations for dissemination (WP7) <p>The workshop was delivered by the project team in UNISDR offices in Geneva and considered written outcomes (D1.2, D2.3, D2.4, D3.1, D4.3, D4.4, D4.7, D4.8); presentations from the Peer</p>	<p>The final project workshop brought together the entire Uscore2 consortium to review all available learning.</p> <p>A report captured the learning from the workshop and summarised the projects findings. In addition, the workshop agreed and made final amendments to both the city-to-city Peer Review tool and the impact evaluation methodology ahead of final publication, and confirmed findings, conclusions and recommendations for the dissemination of the tools.</p> <p>It was not possible, during the Peer Reviews, to pilot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 3: Strengthen Financial Capacity for Resilience (including Business Continuity) <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 8b: Public Health & Disaster Risk Reduction <p>These Modules were tested and reviewed by conducting table top exercises during the workshop.</p>
--	--	--	---

		Review teams, from the cities that were Peer Reviewed, from the impact evaluation team, and from UNISDR.	
A5.2: Finalise the Peer Review tool	D5.2: Final Peer Review tool report	<p>The Peer Review tool has been piloted in Viggiano (WP2), revised to incorporate learning from its initial use and then re-tested in Amadora and Salford (WP4). The practical experience of applying the tool in 3 cities has been incorporated into the final Peer Review tool as well as contributing to the impact evaluation conducted by UoM following each Peer Review. As Viggiano's Peer Review was conducted in WP1, the opportunity to evaluate impact over a 12-month period was facilitated to add to the rich source of information and experience refining the Peer Review tool to ensure it meets the project objectives.</p> <p>At the final workshop in Geneva the consortium, partners scrutinised the tool to identify any final improvements. This included assessing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project objectives and impact evaluation criteria for the Peer Review tool • Experience of applying the tool as a Peer Reviewer and as a city being Peer Reviewed • The findings from evaluating the impact of the tool on city level DRR <p>Subsequent to the workshop, the final draft of the Peer Review tool was circulated for signoff by the consortium partners with a teleconference to discuss any outstanding issues, before being published.</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative: Final Peer Review tool report completed and published.</p> <p>Qualitative: The step by step document provides an overview of the Peer Review process, the Impact Evaluation Methodology (IEM) used to measure the impact of the Peer Review, and the 11 Modules for conducting city-to-city Peer Reviews for DRR.</p> <p>The procedures to conduct a Peer Review are contained within the step by step guide which is supplemented and used in conjunction with individual Modules that cover key areas of DRR.</p> <p>The tool is available on the Uscore2 website and UNSIDR networks and is also being disseminated through workshops, presentations at conferences and articles, adding to the body of work available to EU partners.</p>

<p>A5.3: Finalise impact evaluation methodology for assessing the usefulness of the tool and its impact on city resilience</p>	<p>D5.3: Final report on the impact evaluation methodology</p>	<p>The impact evaluation methodology has been piloted in Viggiano (WP2), revised to incorporate learning from its initial use, and re-tested in Salford and Amadora (WP4). Practical experience of applying the impact evaluation methodology to the 3 cities, and feedback from those cities on the effectiveness of the impact evaluation methodology in identifying improvements in DRR, was used to revise the tool. Viggiano was also able to provide additional insights/learning on how useful the impact evaluation methodology was in the 12 months since their Peer Review. This provided a rich set of experiences against which to review the impact evaluation methodology to ensure it meets the project objectives.</p> <p>At the final workshop in Geneva the full project team scrutinised the impact evaluation methodology to identify any final improvements.</p> <p>Subsequent to the workshop, the final draft of the impact evaluation methodology was circulated for signoff by the consortium partners with a teleconference to discuss any outstanding issues, before being published.</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative: Impact Evaluation Methodology final report completed and published.</p> <p>Qualitative: The final report championed IEM as a self-assessment tool, which has been designed and piloted with partners from Viggiano, Amadora and Salford.</p> <p>D5.3 reports on IEM developments throughout the project which have resulted in a self-assessment method of evaluating impact that Uscore2 partners have tested and found to be usable, useful, scalable, and robust.</p>
<p>WP6: Project management</p>			
<p>A6.1: Overall project coordination and management</p>		<p>Effective overall project management with rapid resolution of problems and early identification and mitigation of risks.</p> <p>Regular dialogue with the European Commission with all reporting obligations met.</p> <p>Comprehensive engagement of all project beneficiaries.</p> <p>High quality deliverables that build confidence in the rigour of</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative Project management has been conducted as per A6.1. There has been regular dialogue with the European Commission with all reporting obligations met and a mid-term amendment to the Grant Agreement.</p> <p>There has been comprehensive engagement of all project beneficiaries, with all beneficiaries taking an active role in the</p>

		<p>the Peer Review tool to encourage end-users to adopt it.</p> <p>Project oversight through IAB (A6.3).</p> <p>End of project report (D6.6).</p>	<p>project deliverables.</p> <p>All deliverables have been met. There is a detailed project plan available which provided details the evolution of the project and identifies where the respective project documents are located.</p> <p>Due to how the documentation for the project has evolved into a modular based tool there has been a slight revision regarding the design and printing of documents i.e. there is not one single Peer Review tool document but a series of documents. The design and print element of the budget is in line with the original bid document.</p> <p>The final Peer Review tools have been created and are available online in order to encourage end-users to adopt and utilise the tool.</p> <p>There have been a limited number of hard copies printed, the majority of which were distributed during the two Master Classes in Barcelona and Rome.</p> <p>Project oversight through IAB: See A6.3</p> <p>End of project report (D6.6): This document.</p> <p>The total amount of EU funding contribution allocated within the original Grant Agreement was €757,639, which was 75% of the projected total project cost of €1,010,186. The project has been delivered with the final request for an EU funding contribution of €655,290 based on a total project cost of €880,752.</p>
--	--	---	---

			(For full details see financial EU document Annex VI [USCORE2 CONSOLIDATED- Annex VI (6. Annex VI Financial statement EU FINAL v1.0 (formally DRAFT V0.2))]).
A6.2: Develop project handbook	D6.1: Produce project handbook	<p>The project handbook was designed to enable all members of the consortium to adopt a consistent and structured approach to issues such as: operational aspects of the project; details on project execution and management; background information on procedures to be followed; risk identification, management and mitigation procedures; and reporting obligations. It included some information on dissemination of project information (see D7.1).</p> <p>The Handbook was created by the Project Manager and included key information from the bid document and the project's contractual documentation. The identified Project Manager is PRINCE 2 trained and included appropriate aspects of this methodology into the handbook.</p> <p>The handbook was circulated to all members of the project team and IAB.</p>	Evaluation. Quantitative. A project handbook was produced and disseminated to all partners including the IAB during the first month of the project with the content covering all the topic areas listed within D6.1. The content was periodically updated to reflect changes in the contact details for staff involved in the project.
A6.3: Project oversight by International Advisory Board	D6.2, D6.3, D6.4, D6.5: Hold four IAB meetings / dialogue	<p>A range of experts from different countries agreed to form an International Advisory Board (IAB) for the project. They represented a variety of organisations and a diversity of stakeholders, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belgium: to represent local level emergency planners who have a major ongoing industrial (nuclear) threat • Finland: to represent a nation that has undergone a national-level DRR Peer Review by EU MSs, OECD, UN 	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative. The IAB met on 4 occasions.</p> <p>Qualitative: The IAB has operated as a challenging and supportive Steering Group of expert advisors. The steering group has performed a number of functions crucial to the project's successful progress and delivery.</p> <p>The IAB has met four times during the project by teleconference and has received advance copies of project material. The teleconferences have assisted in developing the Peer Review</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • France: to represent a region with recent experience of disaster and major loss of life (Storm Xynthia in 2010) • Iceland: to represent a country which is populated by multiple small, isolated and very exposed communities • South Africa: to represent developing countries and thereby ensure applicability to end-users globally • Sweden: to represent a nation that is expert in self-assessment as Uscore project coordinator <p>The IAB operated as a steering group, having oversight of the project; checking progress of the project, helping to ensure transferability of the Peer Review tool methodology and guidance to different countries across the EU and globally; acting as a sounding board for issues encountered during the project; and holding the EU's interests in mind. The IAB received advance copies of project material and were invited to participate in project events (at their own cost).</p> <p>The IAB met 4 times by teleconference during the project. These meetings were held at month 4, 9, 15 and 21. Written minutes of the IAB meeting were circulated to the IAB and the project team and agreed.</p>	<p>tool and IEM and the IAB's input and impact has been reflected in the high quality of the final project deliverables.</p> <p>In addition to the teleconferences regular contact was maintained throughout the project with the IAB via email and additional telephone conversations.</p>
<p>A6.4: End of Project Report</p>	<p>D6.6: Produce end of project report</p>	<p>The end of project report collates the project findings, presents recommendations emerging from the project, and gives financial information.</p> <p>The content of the end of project report was discussed at the Brussels final workshop (WP5). The draft was circulated to all</p>	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative: The end of project report was produced and submitted.</p>

		project participants for comments before submission.	
WP7: Dissemination			
A7.1: Dissemination handbook & materials	D7.1: A dissemination strategy which is supported by professional materials and which all partners apply to their communications	<p>The handbook includes all the information and materials needed to ensure the project can distribute its project results to relevant policymakers and partners at the local level, EU level (e.g. Resilience Forum, Open Days for Regions and Cities etc.) and global level (e.g. Global Platform for DRR) and is consistent in how it presents itself to these audiences.</p> <p>This information includes: procedures; dissemination plan & responsibilities; approvals procedure to ensure information is suitable for public dissemination; branding and logos; templates for documents and slides; website layout; etc. Dissemination materials include: printed information leaflets; pull-up banners; etc. The handbook was developed by the project team and issued to consortium partners for review and comment. A final version of the handbook and materials will be retained in each country to ensure it is closely followed. All countries have a pull-up banner for local/national events. The dissemination handbook forms part of the project handbook (D6.1).</p>	Evaluation. Quantitative: A dissemination handbook has been produce and circulated to all project partners.
A7.2: Regular update of website	D7.2: An informative website that encourages learning about Uscore2 and	A professional, high impact website was created to enable the effective dissemination of information from Uscore2. It is regularly updated with all Uscore2 public reports, major findings, progress of the project, news items, opinion pieces from consortium members, etc.	<p>Evaluation. Quantitative: As part of D7.2 a website has been developed which provides information about the project.</p> <p>The content of the website has been created by drawing together the collective thoughts of project partners and using information contained within documents produced as part of the project, such as the project objectives.</p>

	how it can make a difference to city resilience.		Content is regularly updated under the News section of the website which charted project milestones and developments. Additionally, and where relevant, photographs and video content related to the project have been incorporated into this section of the website to document key events and add points of interest.
A7.3: Hold two final Master Classes / workshops on what the Peer Review tool is and how to use it.	D7.3: Two well organised, well attended and interactive Master Classes during which the city-to-city Peer Review tool is presented with information about the impact evaluation methodology.	The Master Class workshops were open events to disseminate the Peer Review tool and IEM to a broad audience beyond the Uscore2 consortium. The Master Class described the background to the tool, its application in the three cities, and lessons about how to use the tool and advice on applying it in different cities.	Evaluation. Quantitative: Two Master Classes were held in the latter stages of the project with the aim of disseminating the project tools: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Barcelona, Spain: Smart City Expo World Congress 13th November 2018. 2. Rome, Italy: European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction on 21st November 2018. <p>The Master Classes were held in Spain and Rome as the two events allowed maximum exposure to and international DRR audience.</p>
A7.4: Produce six conference /newsletter/ journal articles to disseminate	D7.4: The creation of wide scale interest in practitioner and academic	Dissemination through a range of printed media to access different audiences including conference papers to disseminate findings; journal papers providing the most rigorously developed arguments underpinning the Uscore2 concept and newsletters predominantly for a practitioner audience, quickly providing brief accounts of the Uscore2 concept, its benefits, and what it	Evaluation. Quantitative: the list of articles to date are documented within the D7.4 dissemination document.

project outcomes	communities.	can do for other cities.	
A7.5: Write International Standard	D7.5: An International Standard available to 162 ISO member countries.	Develop the Peer Review tool and impact evaluation methodology into a widely applicable International Standard through ISO. This is being progressed through ISO WG5 Community Resilience, part of Technical Committee 292. The process for delivering this is following ISO protocols, that is: new work item proposal; committee draft standard; working draft; draft international standard; final draft; publication.	Evaluation. Quantitative. ISO22392 has been drafted and is in the ISO process to becoming an international standard. The latest version is available upon request as the process takes a considerable time beyond the end date of the project.