

PERIPERI U

Phase 2 Evaluation Report

Kathy Lewis, Patrick Spaven & Sharman Wickham

March 2011



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

LIST OF ANNEXES	4
LIST OF TABLES.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
GUIDE TO THE EVALUATION REPORT.....	12
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO PERIPERI U & THE EVALUATION. 13	
1.1 Introduction to Periperi U	13
1.2 Evaluation purpose and objectives	14
1.3 Programme overview	15
1.3.1 Origin.....	15
1.3.2 Phase 1	17
1.3.3 Phase 2	18
CHAPTER 2: EVALUATION FINDINGS	22
2.1 Introduction	22
2.2 The baseline: what was in place before Periperi U.....	22
2.3 Exchange.....	23
2.3.1 Introduction	23
2.3.2 Exchange activities 2008 – 2010	23
2.3.3 Network mechanisms, ethos and benefits.....	24
2.4 Research	27
2.4.1 Research output 2008 - 2010	28
2.4.2 The Risk Reduction Africa website	29
2.4.3 Value of research for partners	30
2.4.4 Challenges for research.....	31
2.5 Curriculum design and delivery	31
2.5.1 Short courses	32
2.5.2 Academic programmes.....	36
2.6 Consulting, policy and advocacy work	40
2.6.1 Relationship between consulting, policy and advocacy.....	40
2.6.2 Consultancy.....	41
2.6.3 Policy and advocacy.....	42
2.7 Professional development of teachers and researchers	43
2.8 Institutional development	43
2.9 Knowledge domain development.....	44
2.10 Evidence of societal impact.....	45
2.11 Support factors and processes.....	46
2.11.1 Home Institutions	46
2.11.2 Project and programme management and administration	47
2.11.3 Monitoring and evaluation	50
2.12 A Phase 3 for Periperi U.....	51
2.12.1 Partners’ ideas.....	51
2.12.2 Contemplating the future without Periperi U.....	53
2.13 Comparison between Periperi U and other African higher education networks	56

CHAPTER 3: CONCLUSIONS.....	58
3.1 Introduction to the conclusions	58
3.2 Focus Area 2	60
3.3 Focus Area 3	61
3.4 Focus Area 4	62
3.5 Focus Area 1	63
3.5.1 Teaching, training and research.....	64
3.5.2 Policy and advocacy.....	64
3.6 Outcomes.....	65
3.6.1 Consulting.....	65
3.6.2 Other outcomes in brief.....	66
3.7 Enabling processes.....	66
3.8 Two main obstacles	68
3.9 Sustainability.....	68
3.10 Phase 3	69
CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDATIONS.....	70
4.1 Sustainability over the next five years	70
4.2 Overall funding and financial management.....	70
4.2 Research funding.....	71
4.3 Short course development	72
4.4 Quality assurance	72
4.5 Knowledge domain and curriculum development.....	73
4.6 Support for student and graduate work experience	73
4.7 Promotional activities	74
4.8 Network expansion / extension	74
4.9 Data management	74
4.10 Student tracking and graduate tracer studies.....	75
4.11 Programme planning, monitoring and evaluation.....	75

LIST OF ANNEXES

1	Evaluation structure and methodology
2	Periperi U programme logic model
3	Phase 2 partner profiles
4	Bi- and multi-lateral exchange visits, 2008 - 2010
5	Research output
6	Short courses
7	Academic programmes
8	Note on the higher education context
9	Baseline for Phase 2
10	Phase 2 objectives, expected results and indicators
11	Research within Periperi U
12	Towards trans-disciplinarity
13	Views on the DRS knowledge domain
14	Suggested additional institutions
15	References and sources
16	Acknowledgements

LIST OF TABLES

1	Output/activity summary	Page 6
2	Phase 2 partners	Page 20
3	Core faculty and PG student research output 2008 - 2010	Page 28
4	Externally commissioned research output, 2008 - 2010	Page 29
5	Number of consulting projects 2008 - 2010	Page 41
6	Summary of bi-lateral meetings 2008 - 2010	Annex 4
7	Timing & purpose of bi-lateral visits	Annex 4
8	Summary of short courses offered 2008 - 2010	Annex 6
9	Overview of academic programmes at the end of 2010	Annex 7
10	Baseline summary	Annex 9

“[There] is evidence of increased trust in African institutions from the side of sponsors and donors in the developed world. The question now is: do African higher education leaders have enough confidence in themselves to take the lead in rebuilding higher education in Africa? And, will the likely public and private sector beneficiaries of such efforts entrust them with the necessary resources? If not, we Africans will hardly be able to stand as equals in international higher education partnerships and exchanges.”
Professor Johann Groenewald, projects coordinator, Graduate School and African Doctoral Academy, Stellenbosch University

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Periperi U

Periperi U is a partnership of African higher education institutions (HEI) supported by USAID since 2006 to develop sustainable capabilities in disaster risk related capacity building, specifically through formal education, short course training, research and policy advocacy.

Periperi U supports the development of a new, potentially trans-disciplinary, knowledge domain with a disaster risk focus in 10 African HEIs where academics have already orientated their specialist research and teaching towards the disaster agenda. A key feature of Periperi U is the diversity of the specialist disciplines of the academics involved in it, which tend to reflect the hazard profiles of the countries in which they are based.

The partnership is conceived as a peer network, and networking and collaboration – exchange – is at the heart of the programme.

The programme Secretariat and intellectual nerve centre is based in the Disaster Mitigation for Sustainable Livelihoods Programme (DiMP) based at the University of Cape Town, South Africa until the end of 2010, when it moved to Stellenbosch University.

The goal is to reduce disaster risks in Africa through improved national and local disaster risk policy, strategy and management, leveraged by the capacity developed in these institutions.

The evaluation

The evaluation focuses primarily on Periperi U Phase 2, which runs from 2008 to mid-2011. The purpose of the evaluation is twofold:

- To ensure accountability to USAID and other stakeholders, including the participating institutions.
- To contribute to understanding about the programme's value and the factors which influence its value creation, both positively and negatively.

The evaluation methodologies are mostly qualitative and rely heavily on locally facilitated self-assessments, augmented by facilitated group discussions with representatives of most of the institutions, and five site visits.

Findings and conclusions

Baselines

The majority of partners were active in disaster-related education or training before they joined Periperi U, but only DiMP and one other were running formal education programmes in the domain. Minorities had short course or disaster-related research experience. The degree of focus on disaster risk reduction was low at point of entry, except at DiMP.

Phase 2 main outputs and activities

Table 1 presents a summary of the programme outputs and activities during Phase 2.

Table 1: Phase 2 outputs and activities

	Intended result	2008	2009	2010	Total
Number of partners	10	5	9	10	10
Multi-lateral exchanges	4	1	1	2	4 (+ 1 in 2011)
Bi-lateral exchanges	"demonstrated evidence"	2	14	13	29
Number of short courses offered	22				31
Number of course sessions	At least 1 - 2 per partner per year				49
Number of short course participants	600				1472
Academic programmes offered	12				9: 2 UG & 7 PG (excl PhD) (+ 6 Masters still in development)
Graduates	No specific target				At least 217
Students still studying, Nov 2010	No specific target				At least 700
Research output	22 reports				47 by staff 60 by students 26 commissioned Total: 133
Website			Live in Oct		

Exchange

The partners are unanimous that the learning and collaborative activities made possible through exchanges – particularly face-to-face – are one of the main attractions and benefits of Periperi U. Other evidence in the evaluation supports this.

There were 29 bilateral face-to-face exchanges up to the end of 2010. The most common purpose was short course attendance – direct capacity building – but 10 were for fact-finding, ideas exchange and curriculum development. Over half of the visits were to partners other than DiMP, indicating that the network was beginning to develop multiple nodes.

The network activity has contributed to the development of teaching and training outputs, but more significantly to professional development and personal growth in the form of increased confidence. This is a significant and relatively unusual phenomenon, which has been driven partly by the flexibility of funding in the programme and explicit encouragement to use funds for networking and collaboration. Networking and collaboration has been encouraged by the ethos of Periperi U, and the quality of the participation which includes collegiality, innovation and commitment to pro-poor outcomes.

Short courses

Short courses – which are aimed mostly at professionals and decision-makers – are an important potential vehicle for both capacity development and policy advocacy.

A total of about 1472 people were trained across Africa in the partner institutions during Phase 2 of Periperi U, up to December 2010. This was over seven times as many as during Phase 1 and almost 2.5 times the Phase 2 target. Courses offered increased from 5 to 31, with 49 iterations. Every institution, including the newest, has run at least one course in the period.

In terms of concrete outputs – in numbers at least – training is the most visible indicator of the success of the programme. Where short courses were already established, Periperi U funding has enabled their expansion. New courses have been created. Short courses for some institutions – particularly the Francophone countries – were an innovation and their development has involved the breaking of moulds.

In terms of domain and theme, the majority of courses were aligned with the programme's intentions. Five of the courses were introductory in nature, nine focused on risk reduction and five on risk management.

It is less easy to gauge the extent to which the courses have reached their intended targets: development and disaster risk management practitioners. There were insufficient data available to the evaluation on participant profiles.

The quality of the short courses has also been difficult to assess. Feedback has been solicited from participants and, where examined, was generally positive. The few partners that have offered short courses repeatedly have observed sustained demand and repeat business, but it is probably too early to assess what these indicators tell us about quality. No courses are formally accredited by the institutions, and the evaluators could find no explicit standards or quality assurance frameworks.

Academic programmes

By the end of 2010 there were nine full academic programmes, five of which were already in place at the beginning of Phase 1. Six more postgraduate programmes were in various stages of development or awaiting approval prior to implementation. In addition to new programmes implemented, new disaster-related teaching input was being given on at least four undergraduate programmes in other disciplines.

The results for this programme output area were not fully in line with intended objectives, despite focused attention by many partners. This is because development time for academic programmes is much longer than for short courses and because academics reported being under-resourced for the work. Home institutions demonstrated different capacities to support changes related to the programme.

In terms of domain and theme, the courses in place and in development are broadly consistent with the focus on disaster risk and vulnerability. The principal exception is the Masters programme in the pipeline at Makerere where the main emphasis is on public health in disaster response.

It was difficult for the evaluators to reach any definitive assessment of the quality of academic programmes across the partnership. However, unlike short courses, they are formally accredited and this does offer some, although not sufficient, assurance. Several programmes, e.g. the South African ones, are subject to external review and the Secretariat emphasised that all Masters theses are externally examined, which is a common academic quality assurance mechanism. Evidence from student feedback suggests that they are relevant, exciting and positively challenging. To some extent this reflects the attitude of the students that are typically attracted to the courses – those with a sense of mission. This suggests that the curricula are a good fit with their markets.

Research

By the end of 2010, the partners reported that 99 pieces of faculty and student research had been completed or were underway. Although 43 of these were at DiMP, each institution reported at least two pieces of research. The majority of the research was by students. A further 26 pieces were commissioned by clients, mostly at Ardhi and UDM.

The production of research on this scale in this short period, exceeding expectations, is an objectively good result. The partners highlighted it as a clear benefit of the programme, in particular as something that would not have happened on this scale without the programme's funding.

Research was not as strongly influenced by the programme's networking as other elements such as short courses. Exchanges of ideas and themes influenced some partners to expand their research horizons, but beyond dataexchange, there was no inter-institutional research collaboration and the themes were mostly local.

We were not in a position to assess the quality of research. It is clear however that the experience of research was highly valued by students and faculty. There was a consensus among the partners that it was valuable as a source of intellectual capital for curriculum design and delivery, and that it was a useful tool for advocacy and reputation building. This is the area where partners would most like more funding.

Consultancy and policy advocacy

Consultancy by the partners is an emerging capacity, not explicitly mentioned in the programme objectives, but nevertheless an important potential contributor. It has taken the form of research, tailor-made training, and the design of disaster risk assessment and response instruments. The partners had undertaken about 45 pieces of consulting work in Phase 2, by the end of 2010. Most of this was accounted for by DiMP, UDM and Ardhi, where experienced players in the partner institutions were leading in this field.

Policy advocacy activity should be viewed primarily as an outcome – a result of increased capacity in the other areas of work, increased confidence of the partners to engage with disaster risk as a construct, raised profile for the partners' expertise resulting from short courses, and increased availability of completed research. The evidence confirms that active, direct policy advocacy work has been the exception and confined to a few experienced individuals. There is evidence of governments engaging actively with

partners for short course provision and research services, which indicates that the indirect approach to advocacy and influencing policy is bearing fruit.

Development of the partners' own capacity

The outputs in teaching, training and research and consultancy - unhesitatingly in terms of volume and somewhat more tentatively in quality - are indicators of the capacity of the partner institutions, much of which has clearly been nurtured within the Periperi U programme.

Other evidence indicates that that the partners have:

- Experienced synergies between research, teaching/training and consulting;
- In a small way begun the transition from multi-disciplinarity to inter- and trans-disciplinarity in the domain, although not without challenge;
- Gained respect for and interest in the domain from peers in their institutions and, in many cases, attracted colleagues from other departments to teach on their programmes.

All these - especially the last two - are work in progress and need to be further developed. Nevertheless, it is safe to conclude that capacity development in teaching, training and research in the partner institutions has generally been strong and is on the path to sustainability.

Organisational processes

The Secretariat at DiMP was generally seen as enabling - administratively, intellectually and collegially - despite the problems it was experiencing with its own institutional home.

With one exception, there has been adequate - and in some cases strong - support from the host institution for the programme and its objectives. This is a necessary condition for success. The exception is DiMP, which has had to move to another host to obtain the necessary supportive environment.

There was regular reporting of results at the activity and output levels, but little evidence of systematic evaluative activity until this summative study got under way in September 2010.

Most of the partners were initially challenged by the administration of Periperi U, especially in the timely transfer of funds. Occurrence of administrative problems had reduced significantly in the last year of the programme, except at UDM, where funds transfer remains a critical issue.

Language – for the Francophone and Lusophone partners – has inhibited interchange and product development. The programme’s translation facility has helped, but there are indications that language differences create significant challenges for partners that do not have English as an official language, and that these differences need to be catered for more effectively at the institutional level in future, especially in terms of funding and the time demand.

A further phase

There is a broad consensus among the partners about the scope and focus of a further phase.

- Higher profile for Periperi U and the partners to attract more interest in the disaster risk domain and their work, from a wide range of institutions in Africa and beyond.
- More funding for research. Consideration of collaborative research.
- A review of themes and areas of focus.
- Continued development and improvement of academic programmes.
- More pro-activity in placing graduates, including internships.
- The extension of the network through association – e.g. mentoring - rather than full membership.
- Development of capacity in project management and administration.

Periperi U is at a critical and delicate point in its life. Although the objectives it set for itself at the beginning of Phase 2 have mostly been achieved and exceeded and there are encouraging signs of growth in exchange and collaboration, the underlying structure is not yet robust enough to sustain current activities except, perhaps, for the academic programmes. Even these would be negatively affected if the programme were to cease in mid-2011.

The evaluation makes 27 recommendations for Phase 3 that address financial sustainability and management, research funding and design, short course funding and design, quality assurance, curriculum development, work experience for students and graduates, promotion and expansion of the consortium, data management, monitoring and evaluation, student and alumni tracking.

The key recommendation is that Periperi U be funded for a further five years to enable the partners, several of whom are relatively new, to consolidate and build on the foundation that has been laid to date and to enable DiMP to achieve stability within its new institutional home in order to sustain its critical programme facilitation role.

GUIDE TO THE EVALUATION REPORT

The report begins with a brief introduction to the Periperi U programme and to the evaluation. A fuller account of the evaluation methodology can be found in Annex 1.

The report continues with a more extensive overview of the programme: both Phase 2, which is the primary focus of the evaluation, and its antecedents. This was thought to be important for various stakeholders because no up-to-date overview exists.

The findings section is the largest part of the report. It begins with an analysis of networking and collaboration, which are at the heart of the programme. It then examines the three principal outputs: short courses, academic programmes and research. Illustrative material for these areas is found in the annexes.

The report moves on to look at results in areas that verge on early outcomes: consultancy, policy and other advocacy activity, development of the capacity and reputational assets of the partner institutions, and development of the DRR knowledge domain. The report concludes that it is too early to expect to find broader societal impact.

The next sub-section examines support factors and processes, including the role of the Secretariat at DiMP.

There follows a summary of what the partners believe is important to build into a Phase 3 of Periperi U; and what the future would look like without a funded Phase 3.

The final main sections are the evaluation conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO PERIPERI U AND THE EVALUATION

1.1 Introduction to Periperi U

Periperi U is a partnership of African higher education institutions (HEIs) focused on incrementally developing sustainable ‘multi-tasking’ capabilities in disaster risk and vulnerability reduction capacity building, specifically through formal education, short course training, local research and risk and vulnerability reduction policy advocacy. The programme provides an institutional framework for this development that includes academic institutions, and, as partners and clients, international NGOs (iNGOs) and agencies and research institutions, and was the first of its kind.

The concept is an African response to Africa’s complex risk profile, which includes slow- and sudden-onset disasters, complex emergencies, displacement of human populations and rapid urbanisation, all of which are expected to be exacerbated by increasingly severe hydro-meteorological risks associated with climate change.

The programme seeks to complement foreign bilateral and multilateral support to African governments, which encourages programmatic mainstreaming of risk management policies. It supports the nesting of a risk and vulnerability reduction focus in the core activities of a consortium of African universities. These universities have pre-existing formal education programmes designed and taught by academics who have orientated their specialist research and teaching towards the disaster risk agenda and are contributing to the development of a new, potentially trans-disciplinary, knowledge domain, which some people refer to as Disaster Risk Science. A key feature of Periperi U is the diversity of the specialist disciplines of the academics involved in it, which tend to reflect the hazard profiles of the countries in which they are based.

The programme recognises, leverages and seeks to further develop a widely diverse spectrum of existing academic expertise and capacity to support the process of embedding disaster risk reduction knowledge and expertise within and across the African countries in and through the consortium. It explicitly prioritises accumulation of a collective body of knowledge from historical disaster events across Africa and seeks to combine old wisdom and new science related to climate change and urbanisation.

The long-term goal of the programme is to reduce disaster risks in selected African countries through improved national and local disaster risk management due to enhanced strategic human capacity to integrate risk reduction into critical developmental sectors and programmes. Pursuit of the goal entails a specific focus on influencing policy makers at all levels of government.

The overarching objective of Periperi U Phase 2 is to develop sustainable 'multi-tasking' capabilities in disaster risk and vulnerability reduction capacity building in ten selected institutions of higher learning in Africa from 2008 to 2011, consistent with global disaster reduction priorities reflected in the Hyogo Framework of Action. To this end, it has four focus areas:

1. The institutional development/expansion of active teaching and training, research and policy advocacy capacity in Africa on context-specific disaster risk and vulnerability reduction, with particular emphasis on urban and hydro-meteorological risks.
2. The establishment and/or enhancement of sustainable capacity for each university unit/programme to provide at least one-two short courses annually in disaster risk management, community based disaster risk management, food/livelihood security.
3. The establishment and/or development within each unit/programme of either undergraduate and/or graduate modules related to reducing/managing the risk and vulnerability profile of the country concerned.
4. The generation of applied research outputs by each unit/programme related to the risks and vulnerabilities of the country concerned that increase local understanding and improve the management of those risks.

1.2 Evaluation purpose and objectives

In accordance with its contractual obligations under USAID Grant No DFD – G00 – 00097 – 00, in August 2010 the Disaster Mitigation for Sustainable Livelihoods Programme (DiMP), the South African partner in Periperi U that was based at the University of Cape Town (UCT) and serves as the Periperi U Secretariat, commissioned an independent summative evaluation of the second phase of Periperi U. The evaluation was undertaken by Ms Kathy Lewis of Perspic Learning (South Africa) as Lead Consultant, in association with Dr Patrick Spaven of Spaven Research and Evaluation (UK) and Dr Sharman Wickham of Research and Academic Development (South Africa). Mr Thomas King served as research assistant to Ms Lewis.

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold:

- To ensure accountability to USAID and other stakeholders - including the participating institutions - which have invested funds, time, and other resources in the programme.
- To contribute to understanding about the programme's value and the factors that influence its value creation, both positively and negatively. These factors include the intervention processes themselves, as well as wider institutional factors and economic, social and political environments.

One of the evaluation intentions is to inform possible future actions by USAID and programme partners and guide submissions for further funding. The evaluation will specifically assist in decision-making about how a third phase of Periperi U would add value to what has been achieved to date and how that phase might be designed and conducted. In this last sense, the evaluation is designed to be future-formative as well as retro-summative.

As the programme goal is long-term and beyond the scope of the evaluation, the central task of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the project's overarching objective has been achieved in terms of its four focus areas, the conditions and interventions that have helped and the factors that may have hindered a fuller achievement of the objective.

The evaluation also explores processes, outputs and outcomes, which were defined in a programme logic model (see section 1.3.3 "Periperi U Logic" below and Annex 2).

Finally, the evaluation seeks to identify unspecified, unplanned and unintended results and effects of the programme, both positive and negative, and to assess the factors that have contributed to them.

For the evaluation structure and methodology, see Annex 1.

1.3 Programme overview

1.3.1 Origin

Periperi U has had a lengthy gestation. It originated in the work of Dr Ailsa Holloway of DiMP, who is acknowledged by the partners and other stakeholders as the main driving force behind the initiative. Periperi U is an adaptation of a DiMP project, funded by ODA/DFID in 1998-2001, to strengthen disaster mitigation capacities in southern Africa. The project name was "Partners Enhancing Resilience to People Exposed to Risks, or

‘Periperi’¹. The first incarnation of Periperi worked mainly with local and international nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) in seven southern African countries to promote awareness of urban and rural risks. Its main focal areas included rainwater harvesting, urban vulnerability and drought-resilient livelihoods.

Lessons emerging from other regions on the contributions of teaching, learning and research institutions to disaster risk reduction advocacy, research and capacity development showed that educational institutions play a key role in building a strong local risk knowledge base that can inform policy and practice. In addition, international assistance partners often mobilise these institutions to research development and disaster-related challenges in Africa. It was thus a short and obvious step to add the ‘U’ when the academic partnership was conceptualised a few years later.

Periperi U has operated since mid-2006 and has had two funding terms. Phase 1 ran in 2006 – 2007 and Phase 2 in 2008 – 2010, with a no cost extension until June 2011. Both Phases were funded by USAID. The programme fits USAID’s strategy of funding existing and ongoing training programmes. Periperi U was the first project funded by the USAID Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) that involved a network of academic institutions. Importantly, it is an expression of a shift in USAID OFDA’s philosophy of funding disaster-related projects and programmes to include reduction and mitigation strategies alongside response and relief initiatives. Although different in nature, USAID’s experience of capacity building for disaster risk reduction in Latin America, which resulted in training of forty thousand people who then engaged in cross-continent collaboration in disaster risk, forms a background to the decision to fund Periperi U.

There are a number of internal factors that shape development and innovation in the higher education sector, some of which potentially pose challenges to the kind of initiative exemplified in Periperi U. [Annex 8](#) sets out some of these issues. Essentially DiMP and Periperi U are rooted in activism, which historically has been the province of the NGO sector. The transition to an academic enterprise has been a challenging strategic necessity to enable mainstreaming of sustainable disaster risk related capacity building that is embedded in African countries. The evaluation demonstrates that active acceptance and support within the institutional context is a critical success factor. One of the reasons for DiMP’s relocation to SU is that it was not able to fully shake off unhelpful aspects of being seen as “an NGO within a university” at UCT.

¹ The word ‘Periperi’ has layered meanings and the shape of the hot chili that is found all over Africa lent itself well to adaptation to the shape of the continent in order to create the programme’s logo.

1.3.2 Phase 1

Through the initiative of its Southern African Office, in 2006 - 2007 USAID OFDA funded the pilot phase of Periperi U. The initial sum of USD198,000 seeded an experiment in enabling like-minded academic champions from five African universities who were already working in the disaster risk and disaster management fields to establish contact with one another, to begin sharing their curricula for academic programmes and to develop and start to offer short courses. The institutions were the Universities of Cape Town (UCT) and the Witwatersrand (Wits) in South Africa, Ardhi University (Ardhi) in Tanzania, Bahir Dar University (BDU) in Ethiopia and the University of Science and Technology Houari Boumediene (USTHB) in Algeria.

The pilot delivered nine short courses in three countries that reached some 200 participants from 12 African countries. Technical development of curricula for four new short courses was completed. There were two consultative meetings that all the partners attended and bi-lateral exchange visits in which five staff members from two partners attended short courses in other countries. Ardhi and USTHB developed master's programmes and UCT redesigned two modules for credit-bearing integration into a postgraduate diploma in adult education. Three additional universities were successfully identified for inclusion at the start of Phase 2: the University of Ghana (UG), Makerere University in Uganda and the Technical University of Moçambique (UDM).

Several valuable lessons are reported to have emerged from Phase 1 (see Holloway 2007 and 2008). An important development - that was not explicit in the pilot plan - was the collegial support that operated through the network. Ongoing contact between partners provided support and encouragement that mitigated the potentially demoralising impact of navigating and overcoming the difficulties characteristic of conservative academic environments. Above all, Phase 1 demonstrated that the network was able to advance the implementation of a range of locally relevant disaster risk reduction-associated graduate programmes across the Africa.

The implication of Phase 1 was that if continued, Periperi U could shift the field of disaster management from an externally-provided relief model to an internally-generated and sustained pre-emptive risk reduction and mitigation strategy. The need for the programme was also substantiated by several other international and Africa-based disaster risk reduction and management initiatives that were unfolding at the time such as the UNDP/ISDR's Global Future Search Meeting on Disaster Risk Reduction (2006) and the subsequent establishment of the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI), Round III of ProVention's Research and Action Grants programme for young risk researchers, ProVention's African Urban Risk Analysis Network (AURAN) and the UNU ICT-enabled University Network for Disaster Risk Reduction

Education in Africa (UNEDRA). The International Council for Science's regional plan for natural and human-induced hazards and disasters in sub-Saharan Africa emphasised the need for capable research and training institutions and strengthened links between science and policy- and decision-making.

Although Phase 1 was not formally evaluated, it was seen by stakeholders to be sufficiently successful to attract a second round of funding from USAID OFDA of USD 3 million for a three-year programme for up to ten universities.

1.3.3 Phase 2

Objectives and structure

Specific expected results and process or outcome indicators were set for each of the four sub-objectives, or 'Focus Areas', outlined in section 1.1 above. Annex 10 contains a summary table. These were broken down for the three years of Phase 2 and for each of the partner universities. The evaluation findings address the results and outcomes broadly and a summary assessment of the programme's achievements in terms of the indicators is presented in the conclusions.

Phase 2 began with four of the original five institutions (Wits did not continue) and the three new partners identified during Phase 1. An additional three – Moi University in Kenya (Moi), the University of Gaston-Berger in Senegal (UGB) and the University of Antananarivo in Madagascar (Univ-Tanà) - were identified later and joined during Phase 2 to make up the target of 10 (see Table 2 and Annex 3 for profiles of the partner institutions).

Periperi U is conceptualised as a peer network. The partner universities fulfil the following initial selection criteria:

- Pre-existing activity broadly aligned with the field of disaster management and/or disaster risk reduction, built on the presence of an academic champion whose established track record of specialist teaching and research is orientated to disaster risk reduction. The champion has to have the intellectual capacity to grow the knowledge domain in his/her own country and on the continent and, if possible, the personal energy, gravitas and networks to influence decision-makers inside the home university and at the national level. The academic champions were chosen both for their professional standing and a particular personal quality of compassion and altruism.
- A sufficiently supportive institutional home environment to enable the initiation and development of the disaster risk related project.

The essential concept is a sufficiently robust microstructure within each institution, enabled by a continental network, populated with competent people, with broadly defined outputs that each partner interprets and enacts within its own context and risk profile. The whole is nourished by a flow of ideas and resources and is intended to function with a degree of self-organisation, facilitated by DiMP as the formal Secretariat and acknowledged first among equals.

Table 2: Phase 2 partners

Institution	Abbreviated name	Country
Université des Sciences et de la Technologie Houari Boumediene	USTHB	Algeria
Bahir Dar University	BDU	Ethiopia
University of Ghana	UG	Ghana
Moi University	Moi	Kenya
Université d'Antananarivo	Univ-Tanà	Madagascar
Universidade Técnica de Moçambique	UDM	Moçambique
Université Gaston-Berger	UGB	Senegal
University of Cape Town	UCT	South Africa
Ardhi University	Ardhi	Tanzania
Makerere University	Makerere	Uganda

In terms of Focus Area 1 (see section 1.1 above), each partner is required to implement its own dedicated administrative point for the project, if such a support point did not already exist. The Secretariat provides a central administrative infrastructure that ensures financial management at the partnership level and assists partners in resolving difficulties in local financial management. It seeks to function as a central distribution hub for information and knowledge created within the partnership. It is also a communication point with a wide range of stakeholders, mainly but not exclusively through Ailsa Holloway's networks of contacts. Although legally the Secretariat entered into the agreement with USAID and the partner institutions signed contracts with UCT, which was then home to the Secretariat, the network is explicitly not intended to be micro-managed from South Africa.

The multi-lateral face-to-face exchange aspect of the consortium is built on an annual programme of Consultative Meetings, of which three have occurred during Phase 2: Cape Town, South Africa in 2008, Kampala, Uganda in 2009 and St. Louis, Senegal in 2010.

A system of quarterly reporting is used to provide feedback on progress in terms of annual plans submitted by the partners, which are structured around the programme objectives and specific result indicators documented

for each focus area in the original project proposal (see Annex 10). The extent to which the objectives were achieved is discussed in the findings and conclusions of this report.

Periperi U Logic

A logic model for Periperi U (see Annex 2) was developed by the DiMP team, with facilitation from the evaluators, at the beginning of the evaluation process and provides one of the frameworks for reporting the evaluation findings.

The model identifies the main programme processes, outputs and outcomes. It illustrates the primacy of two fundamental factors:

- The process of collaboration and other exchanges, which develop the knowledge, skills and confidence required to pursue the core programme activities of curriculum design and delivery in the form of short courses and academic programmes, research, policy and advocacy work and consulting;
- The broadly conceptualised output of applied academic research, which informs curriculum design and delivery, policy and advocacy work and the production of knowledge artefacts such as teaching materials, policy documents, legislation, conference papers, public education materials, articles in popular media and peer reviewed journals, etc.

These two factors are the roots of the other programme outputs and outcomes. The intentions they serve are to produce:

- Competent professionals who are able to engage with disaster risk conceptually in their work and contribute to the ongoing evolution of the knowledge domain through their practice;
- Well-qualified graduates who find employment in jobs where they can leverage their knowledge and skills to shape and influence disaster risk policy and practice and continue to grow as professional practitioners through continuous professional development and to contribute to the ongoing evolution of the field;
- Governments that are able to engage with disaster risk conceptually, incorporate new ideas and practices in changed and evolving policy, laws and service delivery frameworks and systems and ensure appropriate investment in relevant resources;
- International aid that is focused on building sustained capacity for risk reduction in Africa through appropriate investment ;
- Mainstreaming of the a disaster risk focus in African HEIs' curricula;
- The evolution of a robust knowledge base of Africa's disaster risk profile;

- Recognition that African HEIs can help to reduce disaster risk through their experience and expertise.

The ultimate outcome of the collaboration and research that informs the other programme activities is to reduce the risk of disasters in Africa.

The evaluation demonstrates that, from the partners' perspective, facilitation of the two fundamental processes has been the most important benefit of the programme. There were also indications of a desire to merge them by collaborating in joint research projects within the partnership.

CHAPTER 2: EVALUATION FINDINGS

2.1 Introduction

The Periperi U programme's complexity becomes apparent when an attempt is made to separate the various strands in order to report on them. The reality is that Periperi U is a genuine web: each element is connected to everything else and the partnership functions as a plurality of cycles and exchanges at several levels.

The structure for reporting the evaluation findings is based mainly on the programme logic model developed at the start of the evaluation. There is a particular focus on exchange - networking and collaboration - which emerged during the evaluation as an especially important feature of the programme. A vital question in the evaluation is the degree to which exchange has acquired its own momentum and underpinnings. If this has occurred, we believe it would be a very significant outcome, bearing in mind past attempts to establish self-sustaining pan-African educational networks.

2.2 The baseline: what was in place before Periperi U

Baselines need to be researched to establish what has changed during the life of a programme, although not necessarily because of it. With Periperi U the baseline cannot be defined as a single point in time because the partners joined at different times. The picture presented in Annex 9 is of what was in place in each institution at the point of joining.

DiMP and BDU had master's level programmes in DRS and DRM respectively. BDU also had an undergraduate DRM programme. DiMP and Moi were contributing disaster-related teaching input to other undergraduate programmes in their home departments and Univ-Tanà and Ardhi were developing curricula for master's level programmes. Work done during Phase 1 by the partners who continued to Phase 2 is most evident in the four short courses offered by DiMP and Ardhi. UDM and Makerere also brought prior experience in short courses in disaster-related areas into the partnership.

The degree of focus on disaster risk was low at point of entry, except for DiMP. DiMP had been elaborating the disaster risk domain since before 1998 and by 2004 was offering postgraduate programmes in disaster risk at UCT. Its short course, Disasters and Development, was first offered in 2000 and Community Risk Assessment was added in 2004.

2.3 Exchange

2.3.1 Introduction

The partners are unanimous that exchange opportunities and the learning and collaborative activities made possible through exchanges are the one of the two main attractions and benefits of Periperi U². For the majority, the face-to-face interactions have been the most positive and impactful aspects of the programme that have enabled them to build on existing embedded intellectual capacity and experience.

The impact on the work of the academics in the partnership has been tangible and, in some cases, rapid: members were able to attend short courses that extended their own knowledge in different directions, to meet peers from other countries with other disciplinary foci, thus enriching their own knowledge of hazards and disaster risk and to build the shared knowledge base of the domain and capacity for education, training and research in Africa for Africa. Everyone has asked for more.

This section outlines the partners' exchange activities during Phase 2 and explores the network ethos and benefits.

2.3.2 Exchange activities 2008 – 2010

Focus area 1 (institutional development) aimed to produce the following results related to exchange:

- Four yearly consultative meetings of partner organisations, including an evaluation or consolidation meeting in the final year of the programme.
- Demonstrated evidence of greater collaboration, exchange and mutual support among the participating institutions in disaster risk and vulnerability reduction course design/ teaching/ training/ research.

During the period, 29 bilateral exchange visits were made between the partners: two in 2008, 14 in 2009, and 13 in 2010. Three of the planned multi-lateral annual consultative meetings took place (the fourth is scheduled for April 2011) and an additional multi-lateral meeting initiated by one of the partners took place.

The maps and tables in Annex 4 summarise the bi-lateral exchanges for Phase 2, illustrating the network in action.

² The other main benefit was funding for research, which drives curriculum development, policy advocacy and consulting – see section 2.4 below.

The purposes of the bi-lateral visits include attending short courses (the most common reason - 15 visits), exchanging ideas on curriculum development (10 visits) and, in three cases, teaching on each other's short courses and academic programmes. DiMP made two visits for administrative reasons.

DiMP is a primary node for cross-pollination through short course attendance and has seeded many courses across Africa, but there are other examples, e.g., people from UDM in Moçambique attended the short course on Public Health in Complex Emergencies at Makerere in Uganda and Prof Benouar from Algiers presented at conferences in Madagascar attended by scientists and government representatives as well as running a seminar for students on Univ-Tanà's postgraduate diploma.

Partners report sharing training resources, for example UGB shared its knowledge resources on food security, crop production and irrigation with UDM, DiMP's materials are shared across the entire consortium and USTHB had produced a manual that had been translated and distributed. The exact extent of sharing is unknown.

Four multi-lateral exchanges will have taken place by the end of Phase 2 in the form of annual Consultative Meetings initiated and arranged by the Secretariat. The main purpose of these visits is to compare and contrast experiences, welcome new partners, develop models for future collaboration, and resolve administrative issues.

An additional multi-lateral meeting, partially supported by Periperi U, was a conference on curriculum design, "*Risk Science Scholarship and Sustainable Development: Building Educator-Practitioner Network in Africa*". It was initiated and hosted in Ethiopia by BDU and the University of Arizona in January 2010 and the Periperi U partners were invited to participate.

2.3.3 Network mechanisms, ethos and benefits

Network facilitation

Although the network shows signs of self-organising capacity, the exchange could definitely not have gained momentum without a competent and dedicated central switching gear. DiMP's intellectual leadership and administrative strength are almost unanimously acknowledged as key to maintaining a creative intellectual exchange space. Several partners describe DiMP as a strong, enabling "parent" that fosters independence and autonomy.

DiMP's role as the conceptualiser, initiator and Secretariat could easily create an impression of dominance. The reality is that DiMP does occupy an inherently powerful position. The issue of power in the relationships is not so much that a hierarchy exists but rather how it is enacted through the behaviour of DiMP staff. DiMP team members spoke extensively of their awareness of needing not to dominate and to step back and respect their partners as colleagues and peers. The evidence suggests this strategy has worked.

It is too early to judge whether any of the other partners is capable of taking on the Secretariat role. DiMP believes that the complexity of the process and the experience they have accumulated from managing Periperi U and other multi-country projects equip them best for the job. They also point out that proposed new partnership-wide initiatives would generally fall into their lap, which makes them cautious about expanding activities. The experience of developing the Periperi U website is a case in point (see section 2.4.2 below).

The DiMP team does not feel that they have yet been able to leverage great intellectual value for themselves from the partnership, mainly because they have been preoccupied with setting up and maintaining the administrative infrastructure and dealing with the problems of finding a sustainable institutional home for themselves. Nevertheless, one of their external faculty members noted significant value in exchange activity for DiMP, its host university and the South Africans who met their African neighbours on its courses and programmes. It is noteworthy that, in opening its doors to DiMP, for Stellenbosch University access to African colleagues is a primary consideration.

A multi-hub peer network with a collegial ethos

The partners agree that Periperi U has created an embryo multi-hub network with a supportive collegial ethos. There is ample evidence that the partnership process is highly collaborative and open. There is also evidence of the network's emerging capacity to function as a self-organising system: DiMP was not involved in organising the curriculum development conference and several partners have made use of the opportunity to initiate bi-lateral exchanges that do not involve DiMP.

An important benefit of networking is moral support to pursue advocacy work inside and outside their institutions. Although many of the partners reported having strong support within their institutions, the work of convincing colleagues and senior institutional managers that the disaster risk domain is worthy of academic focus has not been easy. The life of an academic is typically somewhat isolated, particularly in pioneering curriculum development, and the project teams are small and stretched. Prof Djillali Benouar from USTHB summed up the psychological value of the

network as having given him the necessary support to push forward the institutionalisation of the disaster risk domain at USTHB and to persist in ongoing and, as yet unfinished, work to extend its influence in Algeria.

The psychosocial value of exchanges and collaboration is reflected in the experience of many of the academics, who report feeling part of a family. The make-up of the partnership in Phase 2 reinforces identities in positive and negative ways: the Francophone universities have been quick to collaborate, while the team from Moçambique feel isolated because of the absence of other Lusophone universities.

Diversity as strength and challenge

An important aspect of Periperi U's complexity lies in the diversity of the partners. There is no single, monolithic construct of the disaster risk domain; it is rather a theme that is applied within cross-disciplinary³ clusters that pivot in each institution on the underlying specialisation(s) of the core faculty and their collaborators. While core concepts and frameworks have been defined and shared, each university is free to focus on what it deems to be the priority disaster risk related project in its own context.

Disciplinary diversity is a conscious pursuit, driven by the Secretariat's belief that it defuses the potential for competition. Partners emphasise the benefit of each institution aiming to be the best in its context and specialist area and being role models for one another while being funded equally by Periperi U. Within the network it is possible to leverage the expertise of acknowledged leaders because there is no competition for resources.

Disciplinary diversity is also experienced as a limitation. Some partners feel they would derive benefit from having colleagues in the same discipline to exchange learning, teaching and research. Ardhi's DMTC sees limited scope for resource person exchange on its Masters programmes because of the diversity of partner foci. Makerere has limited its interaction to visiting Moi, which shares a Public Health focus.

Network benefits

One of the main areas of added value of the Periperi U model is intellectual enrichment and growth for academics through exchange and collaboration,

³ Disaster risk science – as an academic domain - aspires to be trans-disciplinary rather than inter- or multi-disciplinary. The distinctions between these concepts are often contested, and the location of the different partners' programmes on the spectrum is far from clear. In this report, to avoid difficulties of definition, we use the term "cross-disciplinary" to refer to the domain. See Annex 12 for short notes on multi-, inter- and trans-disciplinarity and Annex 13 for a note on the disaster risk knowledge domain.

which has influenced their core work. Personal contact facilitates ongoing email exchanges, for example a peer review mechanism for short course design and email contact during disaster events that enables partners to share and learn from real life as it unfolds.

The academics value the potential within the partnership to call on any of the partners whose disciplinary expertise is similar or complementary to their own. This is a powerful method of academic quality assurance that crosses national, regional, language and disciplinary boundaries. Academics in northern countries who have easy access to cheap and stable information and communications technology and more plentiful funding to travel to conferences are accustomed to this way of working, but many of the Periperi U academics are only able to access these resources through their membership of the network.

In addition, the core project teams draw colleagues from other faculties and departments in their universities to teach on disaster risk related programmes and short courses. The professional worldview of extended faculty is expanded and in the process, networks of very particular kinds of colleagues have been created. The country visits highlighted the typical profile of successful disaster risk teachers: they are youthful in outlook (and some in age), they are passionate about education and making a social contribution in their contexts, they enjoy being stretched and challenged to learn new things, are willing to invest time and effort in this and they value learning from their students as much as teaching.

2.4 Research

The evaluation has highlighted the value academics attach to the research opportunities Periperi U makes possible. This is the area they particularly feel needs expanding through higher levels of funding. Annex 11 contains more detail on research.

2.4.1 Research output 2008 - 2010

In terms of Focus Area 4 (Research) Periperi U aimed to produce at least 22 context-specific research reports focusing on hydro-meteorological and/or urban risks, an inventory of essential resource materials for studies related to the disaster risk field in English, French and Portuguese, and to disseminate research and other related information to relevant stakeholders by developing and maintaining a website for Periperi U that is actively used.

Total research output by students and academics, including externally commissioned research was 107 reports, almost five times the target. Use of the website has not yet reached the desired level – see section 2.4.2 below.

Table 3 illustrates that internal research (research produced by core faculty and postgraduate students) flourished during the Periperi U period.

Table 3: Core faculty and PG student research output 2008 - 2010

Country/Partner	Research produced by staff	Research produced by students	Total research output
Algeria: USTHB	4	5	9
Ethiopia: BDU	0	12	12
Ghana: UG	2	0	2
Kenya: Moi	5	0	5
Madagascar: Univ-Tanà	1	1	2
Moçambique: UDM	9	0	9
Senegal: UGB	8	0	8
South Africa: DiMP	9	34	43
Tanzania: Ardhi	1	4	5
Uganda: Makerere	8	4	12
TOTAL	47	60	99

Research topics are extremely broad and cover persistent disaster risk factors (overcrowding, poverty), episodic disasters (flooding, earthquakes), retrospective studies, fire safety, reproductive and women’s health, and management strategies at local and governmental level. A full list of research output is provided in Annex 5. Publications in which research appeared include several seismology, earthquake and disaster risk academic journals. Two items were published by Periperi Publications.

The relationship between academic programmes and research output is illustrated by these data, as is the effect of the long duration of academic programmes and the lead-time necessary to implement them. Most of the student research (77%) emanates from BDU and DiMP, both of which were offering academic programmes before Phase 1. By the end of 2010, the

output of the academic programmes implemented during Phase 2 consists of the four master’s theses from Ardhi, but this figure does not reflect the true research output of the Phase 2 because at least 37 master’s students at Univ-Tanà and USTHB are due to complete their theses by mid-2011.

External research, or research commissioned by clients exterior to the university (Table 4), overlaps with consultancy. Clients included UNICEF, local district authorities, USAID, national governments, INGOs such as ProVention, and organisations involved in disaster risk management and response. The research was largely to create risk profiles of specific areas and to analyse and develop capacity building for at-risk areas. Disaster tracking and analysis and policy documentation were other significant outcomes. Not all commissioned research was strictly related to disaster risk. The research at Makerere for example, was largely focused on the public health agenda in the context of the semi-permanent nature of Uganda’s IDP communities.

Table 4: Externally commissioned research output, 2008 – 2010

Country/Partner	Number of Research Projects
Algeria: USTHB	1
Ethiopia: BDU	0
Ghana: UG	0
Kenya: Moi	0
Madagascar: Univ-Tanà	0
Moçambique: UDM	9
South Africa: DiMP	0
Senegal: UGB	0
Tanzania: Ardhi	13
Uganda: Makerere	3
TOTAL	26

2.4.2 The Risk Reduction Africa website

Risk Reduction Africa, the partnership website, is both a resource and output of Phase 2 (<http://www.riskreductionafrica.org/>). It “aims at providing resources and links for practitioners, professionals and academics keen to incorporate risk reduction concepts and approaches into their formal and non-formal educational programmes [and] short courses for continuing professional development.” (Periperi U, 2009: 26). Research reports and thesis abstracts are published via the site and courses and job opportunities are advertised.

Responsibility for developing the website was initially accepted by Ardhi, which was also developing a website for AURAN. The developer relocated to the US to complete his PhD and, despite confidence that he could undertake the development remotely, by 2009 the task was taken over by DiMP and the

site became operational in October 2009. To some extent, this experience supports DiMP's perception that for a new initiative to succeed within the partnership, the Secretariat has to assume responsibility for most, if not all, administrative aspects, at least initially.

A review of the public area of the site in January 2011 revealed a bias towards South Africa, with most of the downloadable materials emanating from DiMP, which means that, in practice, the bulk of the site is in English.

Use of the website by other partners has been slow, not only because of the delay in setting it up. Slow and unreliable information and communications technology (ICT) hinders use and language is a challenge, in particular for UDM, where Portuguese-speaking faculty and students feel that their English is not good enough to contribute to the website. At Univ-Tanà the diversity of the website contributions is said to be a limiting factor because the information available for downloading is not deeply relevant to them.

2.4.3 Value of research for partners

The programme aims to fill a critical gap in research funding that traps African academics in a vicious cycle of obscurity and reduced capacity. They experience great difficulty in sourcing research funding because they are not well known internationally and they cannot become well known unless they publish research. Funding also serves to replenish and grow the knowledge domain by attracting students to do disaster risk related postgraduate research. Several partners reported that while they were designing new disaster risk programmes, they had been able to attract students registered for thesis-based masters and PhD studies to orientate their research to the domain. An observable consequence of this is professional development for academics: at UDM, BDU and Univ-Tanà young researchers have been cultivated to take on work doing teaching, supervision, materials development and administration in the Periperi U project units. Colleagues from other parts of several partner universities have focused their research on disaster risk.

Although each of the partner universities has a research agenda aligned to the specific academic interests of core faculty and the hazard profile of their countries, they believe the programme could create an integrated platform for collaborative research and serve as the impetus for a critically important virtuous cycle because research feeds all the other activities.

Comments made by students and graduates interviewed during the evaluation show that the opportunity to do research is the highlight of their studies.

2.4.4 Challenges for research

Despite the apparent success of this strand of the programme, there are some reservations. First it is important to note that research was being conducted by all the partners before they joined the network. In the case of Makerere and UG, the funding from Periperi U was very modest compared with funding they receive from other organisations.

Some partners reported that low funding levels in Periperi U prevent them from conducting research and/or from disseminating their research output effectively. This view may be shaped to some extent by a lack of clarity about resources. For example, while UGB perceived a lack of funding for student research, the Secretariat commented that that student research funding is available and being used by other partners such as Ardhi.

Time is also a major constraint. Phase 2 did not support collaboration in joint research projects, but rather the exchange of data for use in local research. Developing joint research projects requires time for conceptualisation, capacity building and data collection and management. DiMP believes that the urban risk material being compiled in several countries may be a starting point. Creating a special publication is also an option that will entail substantial time investment and leadership.

While the programme facilitates the creation of baseline data and impact assessments, the capacity to collect and manage data is said by Periperi U partners to be a challenge.

2.5 Curriculum design and delivery

The most visible output of the programme to date is in the curriculum area: new courses and programmes have been designed and some have been implemented; teaching materials are being shared and there have been examples of exchange teaching. It is difficult to say how much of the effort involved would have happened anyway, but the partners acknowledge the exchange platform the Periperi U created as an important contributing factor.

The core capacity building for Periperi U is manifested in the curricula designed and delivered by the partners. The curricula have taken two forms:

1. Short courses, also known as “training”.
2. Academic programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

2.5.1 Short courses

Short course output and numbers of people trained

In terms of Focus Area 2 (short courses) each partner was expected to generate one to two short course core training modules related to hydro-meteorological hazards and urban risks in Phase 2 and to deliver one or two short courses annually. The target number of short courses across the network for the period was at least 22 and the programme aimed to reach a minimum of 600 development and disaster risk management practitioners during 2008 – 2010.

During Phase 2, 26 new short courses were implemented, 49 course sessions were run and 1472 people were trained.

A summary of the short courses offered during Phase 2 and their intake per country is shown in the table in Annex 6, along with a detailed overview of short courses offered during Phase 2. Five of the courses were introductory in nature, nine focused on risk reduction and five on risk management.

The growth in short courses from five in Phase 1 to 31 is an important indicator of success at the output level for Phase 2. The 31 courses were offered a total of 49 times in the three years. Of the 31, 22 were run once and six twice. Measured in terms of the number of times they ran, the three most productive courses were at DiMP and Makerere – 15 iterations in total – but these courses were already in place before Phase 2.

A total of 1472 people were trained across Africa during Phase 2, just over seven times as many as during Phase 1 and almost 2.5 times the target. The number of participants on any single course ranged from as few as five (Ardhi's *Introduction to DDR and Emergency Planning*) to as many as 227 (Ardhi's *Introduction to DRM*). The latter course is long-established and reinforces the view that courses need time to develop a market.

Several partners, notably UDM, had many proposed short courses lined up for 2011.

Quality assurance and accreditation for short courses

Explicit standards for assuring the quality of short courses within the partnership did not emerge. Courses are evaluated through standard feedback forms for participants and facilitator feedback. All the partners visited said they hold some form of debriefing session after their courses. The facilitator of DiMP's *Community Risk Assessment* course returns to the

communities after each course to glean information used for course adaptation.

DiMP's experience is that demand is high when short courses are introduced and then stabilises once courses have been on the market for a few years. Nevertheless, the wide variation in numbers per course is cause for concern because large numbers of participants make it hard to deliver quality courses without correspondingly large numbers of facilitators. One of the ways Univ-Tana aims to ensure short course quality is to limit the number of participants. They received 80 applications for their first course, selected 35 people and offered the course again for another 24 people after adapting the curriculum to include an element of community risk assessment. The second iteration of the course still generated a small profit.

None of the partner institutions has detailed procedures for approving short courses, presumably because none of the short courses is credit bearing. Two institutions indicated that they had attempted unsuccessfully to gain formal accreditation. The majority simply say that skills development is the benefit participants receive from tuition.

Some of the partners reported that the desire for certificates is a factor when government officials decide whom to send on short courses. Senior officials may favour themselves and their senior colleagues at the expense of officials in lower level positions whose jobs entail delivery and whose need for skills and knowledge developed through training is said to be more urgent. In South Africa accredited short courses are in demand because of the government skills levy.

The issue of formally accredited training is an area for exploration. The benefit of credits has to be weighed against the accreditation requirements, which will extend the time needed for curriculum development. It also implies assessment, which influences acceptance criteria and places additional burdens on participants to prepare for assessment, faculty who have to conduct assessments and, in South Africa, external validation of assessments.

Course duration

Courses range between three and eight days. Finding the right duration for courses is a clear challenge across the network. Several participants and facilitators mentioned that courses are too short and that more time is needed for practical work and simulations. However, many said that courses are too long for working people.

Benefits of short course provision

New ground for capacity building:

For the Francophone universities in particular, short courses were not a regular aspect of the curriculum prior to joining Periperi U. At USTHB, there were seminars and conferences, but nothing like the highly participatory short courses delivered within Periperi U, some of which involve practical exercises and field trips. At UGB, UDM and Univ-Tana, respondents including university executive managers said that without Periperi U there would be no short courses at all.

Advocacy and influence:

Short courses have proved to be an important way to influence decision-makers, practitioners and communities in a relatively short time because they can be developed, implemented, evaluated and adapted relatively quickly. Local contexts inform curriculum foci in various ways: the nature of hazards and risks in each country and the availability of local experts capable of teaching are central drivers of design.

Professional development of Periperi U partners:

In Phase 2, academics were also a target market for the professional development application of short courses. Learning from one another by attending short courses at other institutions is one of the main exchange and collaboration activities. DiMP is the primary source of learning for short course development and several partners said they benefited from DiMP in multiple ways: absorbing content, experiencing practice in the field in South Africa, interacting with people from other African countries, learning how to take into account theories of adult learning and learning the logistics of managing short courses.

Participant profiles, funding and outcomes

Generally partners believe their courses are attracting the right profile of participants, namely policy and decision makers, government officials responsible for disaster risk management, practitioners from (i)NGOs and community members. However, there are concerns about participant profiles. UG is not entirely sure they are attracting the right people and feels the need to do more in terms of marketing and selection. DiMP reports having problems in the beginning when people with no direct decision-making responsibility were sent on courses to make up training requirements. They also report a persistence of stereotyping around disasters which causes people in areas such as social development and urban planning to question the relevance of courses in disaster risk reduction.

Political concerns are an enduring challenge for many African universities and affect course attendance. One partner's experience is the opposite of

DiMP's: senior people who are not responsible for service delivery take places on courses for themselves and "their cronies" in order to benefit from receiving certificates and the daily stipend paid to short course participants in line with norms in that country. This also has the effect of skewing the gender profile towards men.

Information on the ways in which participants' attendance is funded was mostly not provided. Where it was indicated, free tuition, government funding for state employees, Periperi U and participant self-funding were almost equally balanced. Many partners indicated that they would use Periperi U funding to provide for tuition expenses for planned future courses.

There was limited information on participant outcomes. There was some reporting that people have set up systems and programmes at work and are able to exert influence on professional service providers and government officials after attending courses. Also there is some evidence that knowledge and skills have been transferred to colleagues. In Moçambique, for example, the head of the Ministry of Health, who attended the *Public Health in Complex Emergencies* course at Makerere, trained people in her department and reported an increasing level of initiative in dealing with public health problems. Professionals commented on the value of expanding their networks of contacts. In Madagascar for example, short courses have spawned alumni networks initiated by the participants.

Challenges of short course provision

Duration:

The tension around course duration did not appear to have been resolved and is an area of research and development we recommend for inclusion in Phase 3.

Materials:

Producing training materials is a challenge because of time and funding constraints. Translation into French and Portuguese is a complicating issue, as is the reality that the three European languages of the partnership are a small segment of the total number of languages spoken by potential short course participants in the ten countries – see below for more details.

Funding:

Funding for participants is a challenge in some countries. Ardhi attracts fairly small numbers to its open-enrolment short courses and attributes this to the cost. Tailor-made short courses tend to be better attended in Tanzania, but they also tend to focus on disaster management. UDM thinks it may be able to charge INGOs but that the Moçambiquan government would not pay. Although the Secretariat disagrees and believes that organisations such as the UNDP would fund capacity building in Moçambique in terms of bi-lateral

agreements with the Moçambiquan government, UDM's view implies that their short courses could not happen without external funding.

Content updating:

Intellectually the domain is demanding because new lessons are constantly being learned. DiMP has offered the same two short courses for many years, adapting them in response to particular disaster events and participant feedback. They find the task of keeping up to date difficult because each new event gives rise to a large volume of mostly unpublished materials to draw on. In addition, the cross-disciplinary nature of the domain means that change can happen in many different disciplines simultaneously.

2.5.2 Academic programmes

Growth during Phase 2

Focus Area 3 (undergraduate and graduate programme expansion) set a target for introducing a minimum of seven formal academic programmes on DRR and the successful completion of the UCT masters programme by two students from Bahir Dar by December 2009. These two students were expected to lead the Bahir Dar programme.

Having started with five programmes (one fully-fledged undergraduate and four master's level programmes of which three were offered at UCT), by the end of 2010 a total of nine full DRR/M programmes were running. The growth consists of three master's level and one undergraduate programme.

The target of seven new programmes was thus not reached by the end of 2010, but six new postgraduate programmes are in various stages of development and approval prior to implementation and new teaching input is being given on at least four undergraduate programmes in other disciplines. Only Moi and UGB have no academic programme activity as yet, but both are developing postgraduate programmes.

Development time for academic programmes is much longer than for short courses because in addition to a larger design project, they entail institutional and sometimes national government approval. Conceptualisation and implementation involve multiple steps and can take two years or longer. It is thus not surprising that growth in academic programmes has been lower than for short courses over the three-year period.

Although no specific targets were set for student intake and graduate numbers, at least 217 graduates were produced during Phase 2 and at the end of 2010 there were some 700 students in the pipeline. Annex 7 contains

a table summarising the spread of academic curriculum development and delivery activity and lists details of academic programmes on offer or under development at each institution. There is a bias towards postgraduate programmes (eight of the 10), which can be attributed to the cross-disciplinary nature of the knowledge domain. Many students and academics commented on the value of building disaster risk knowledge on the base of sound learning in a related underlying discipline.

Students' experience

A key test of an academic programme's success is the number of graduates produced. The standard way of measuring what is called "throughput" is to track the progress of cohorts of students, i.e. groups that start their studies in a particular year. The minimum time to measure throughput for any cohort is the duration of the programme of studies. All but two of the partners – DiMP and BDU – started designing DRR/M programmes during Phase 2⁴. The three-year period is too short to assess Periperi U's throughput because students who began undergraduate and postgraduate programmes during Phase 2 were still studying at the time of the evaluation.

Despite initial lack of clarity of expectation among many undergraduates, all of the students report "getting hooked" by their studies, being very glad to have "stumbled" into the disaster risk field and optimistic about making careers in it. Postgraduate students are unsurprisingly clearer about what disaster risk studies mean in terms of their careers and generally envisage working in positions where they can influence people's thinking about disasters and change practice. In Madagascar, all the postgraduate students have personal experience of living through disasters that were not well managed, which shaped their career and study choice. They are all driven by a desire to help their fellow citizens and make a difference in their country. They all recognise that there are things they do not know and want to learn. They also recognise the value for their careers of being early entrants to a field where skills are scarce.

Across national boundaries, students talked about being forced out of their comfort zones by the programmes. They are attracted by the combination of hard and social sciences and enjoy the challenge of being required to think in a cross-disciplinary way. There is a very definite air of trail blazing and sense of mission among students that mirrors the pioneering spirit of the academics involved in initiating the disaster risk domain across the ten

⁴ The graduate production figure in the Annex 7 table reflects the output of institutions where programmes were in place before Phase 2 began. In fact, in all three cases, academic programmes were being offered before Phase 1. The 14 graduates from UDM were not products of the specialist DRM programme subsequently launched by that university.

countries. It is notable many people in Periperi U have a firm future focus and desire to build a legacy that supports profound and sustainable social change.

Almost all students had been involved in research. The research all seemed relevant to their countries and they enjoyed researching actual disasters and hazards. Zimbabweans studying at UCT could see how they might apply the knowledge gained from research in South Africa in their home country because they had learned to apply theory in different contexts and had acquired a systemic perspective.

Challenges in developing and implementing academic programmes

Three main challenges emerge in academic curriculum design and delivery: the time needed to develop curricula, the effect on students of the cross-disciplinary curriculum, and acceptance of the domain in the university.

A complex and time-consuming process

In addition to providing the intellectual impetus and marshalling intellectual resources, Periperi U funding made the work of designing academic curricula possible. Different approaches involve different time demands. Some partners, like Ardhi and Makerere, conducted needs analyses in different target groups including their own graduates to assess market requirements and review their academic curricula in the light of what they found. Others followed a more traditional, internally driven approach and did not include graduate perspectives in curriculum design. There is evidence of curriculum sharing within the partnership, which saves time and effort.

Most institutions that were able to launch new academic programmes from scratch had a head start: USTHB was a Phase 1 partner and Univ-Tanà and Ardhi were both already engaged in academic programme design when they joined Phase 2. UDM had also previously started orientating its BSc in Environmental Engineering towards disaster management by introducing an elective course in the final year for the cohort that graduated in 2009.

The challenges of cross-disciplinarity

A cross-disciplinary curriculum places heavy demands on designers, lecturers and students. The design complexity is two-fold: to decide on the relevant content and to develop an appropriate methodology. The variety of options within each programme is illustrated by the team of specialists assembled to work on the MSc at UGB, which included environmental law, anthropology, biostatistics, hydrology, sociology, agronomy, biomathematics, soil microbiology, phytopathology and agri-nutrition, among others. Cross-disciplinary programmes have many themes. Fieldwork is essential for

grounding learning and there is tension between achieving sufficient breadth and depth. Synthesising is crucial and a substantial challenge for people who have been educated to break problems down into their component parts rather than synthesising them by crossing sectoral and disciplinary boundaries.

Generally students entering these cross-disciplinary programmes, especially at postgraduate level, struggle with having to learn the basics of new elements of the curriculum and with different underlying methodologies, in particular differences between social and “hard” science methodologies. Even where the foundation disciplines build high levels of numerical competence, there are differences and difficulties, e.g. between engineering and architecture.

Academics who design and teach this kind of programme have to be able and willing to support students wrestling with the curriculum. Academics in the institutions visited demonstrated high levels of concern for their students’ success, devoting extraordinary amounts of time to student supervision and support.

Acceptance in the academy: questions of rigour and standards

New knowledge domains challenge orthodox views and traditional academic boundaries. They tend to provoke concerns about rigour and academic standards. The phenomenon can be observed in graduate schools of business, even though they have existed for more than five decades. DiMP’s experience of being unsuccessful in achieving traction within UCT was partly attributable to unwillingness on the part of the home department to accept that DRS was sufficiently rigorous. The DiMP team will be challenged by their new academic colleagues to prove their academic mettle by producing accredited research in order to achieve full integration and financial support from SU.

There are very different quality assurance practices across Periperi U, arising from institutional and national higher education system policies. South Africa has a comprehensive system of internal and external validation and approval for curricula and student assessments. South African universities and qualifications are subject to regular audits and approval to offer programmes is time-limited. Student assessments such as examinations, theses and dissertations are validated in a peer review system of external examination and moderation.

The East African institutions that inherited aspects of the British education system are accustomed to external review and validation. Academics in the former French and Portuguese colonies have to have approval from the national education authorities to offer academic programmes but are not required to conform to ongoing external validation processes.

It was important for the evaluation not to assume that the existence of national quality assurance systems automatically means the programmes are better quality or to try to enforce a particular approach. Peer review as a collegial practice aimed at improvement and capacity building is something the partners could consider, if they found it useful. We recommend this as an area to explore in Phase 3.

2.6 Consulting, policy and advocacy work

Consulting, policy and advocacy work are classified as “extension” work and form part of academics’ job requirements. Although, no targets were set for them in Focus Area 1, they form an important part of the programme logic and there has been activity in all three areas.

2.6.1 Relationship between consulting, policy and advocacy

The evaluation team define consulting as work done for a particular client organisation that could include commissioned research, in-house or tailored training and other advisory work. Policy work was defined as work done to develop government policy and legislation at any level of government and participation in activities that directly contributed to shaping government thinking about disasters. Policy work is different from advocacy in that it is usually invited or commissioned, while the initiative for advocacy comes from - in these cases - the academy.

In practice, the evaluation revealed rather blurred lines between these kinds of activities, which suggested the lived reality of the partners’ national and local contexts where governments are a primary target for Periperi U work as the key employer of graduates and practitioners and deliverer of services to communities. It also reflects the newness of the domain in its academic and practice forms.

This section attempts to identify consulting contributions. Policy and advocacy is dealt with in the next section.

2.6.2 Consultancy

Types of consultancy

Consultancy as reported by the partners is strongly distributed to the southern part of Africa, with only four of the eighteen consultancies occurring outside of that region. Table 5 shows the number of consulting projects undertaken by specific institutions.

Table 5: Number of consulting projects 2008 - 2010

Country (Partner)	Number of Consultancies
Algeria (USTHB)	1
Moçambique (UDM)	4
South Africa (DiMP)	10
Tanzania (Ardhi)	2
Uganda	1

External clients were interviewed in Moçambique, South Africa and Tanzania. In all three countries the clients were government departments or agencies, which illustrated the overlap between consulting and policy work. At Moi, the university itself was a client in that the Periperi U unit ran a fire prevention and risk assessment short course for the institution.

Influence on clients

The main avenues of client influence are training and research that shift mental models around disasters and influence policy. Consulting assignments are both an indication of the credibility of the partners as service providers in disaster-related areas and a vehicle for reinforcing and growing this credibility in a virtuous circle.

There is evidence in Moçambique and Tanzania of training being cascaded to district levels, and the employment of graduates and interns at provincial level in the Western Cape of South Africa. Training interventions are both direct to practitioners or via train-the-trainer programmes.

African universities have differing levels of support for consulting. Taken together these projects are an early sign of the disposition and ability of some of the partner institutions to contribute to disaster risk related capacity building in the continent. It is likely that they are substantially personality-

driven at this stage. DMTC at Ardhi has a structural relationship with the Tanzanian government. Individual project leaders in some partner institutions (e.g., Algeria, Moçambique and South Africa) have established track records in their fields. The lack of consultancies undertaken by other partners is partly attributable to the short duration of their membership and may be a reflection of the extent to which they were able to build their profiles nationally.

2.6.3 Policy and advocacy

The main means of policy and advocacy work in Periperi U is indirect, through short courses for professionals and potentially through the production of graduates able to take up jobs where they can influence policy and practice. The partners who took part in the focus group discussions said they had begun to transmit the thinking shift into the public domain in their countries, both through raising public awareness about the potential for disasters and in influencing decision-makers in their countries to focus on predicting potential disasters. The evaluation found examples of public education initiatives, via printed materials and training. However, the newness of the domain and Periperi U dictate that there is a small incidence of graduates finding employment in the public sector.

On the ground, policy and advocacy work was not evenly distributed across the consortium or indeed a major component of many of the partner's portfolios. Only the southern African bloc (South Africa, Madagascar and Moçambique) and Uganda reported that they had been approached to provide input to national policy. The other partners reported no policy and advocacy work. Direct influence – like consultancy – seems to be mainly personality-driven. Periperi U academics like Ailsa Holloway, Djillali Benouar, Rui da Maia and Chris Orach, have attained the stature and relationships needed to gain access to key decision makers in senior government positions and have worked directly in policy formation, drafting legislation or implementation frameworks. However, they all admit that their capacity to have direct influence on what their governments actually do is limited.

On a limited basis, Periperi U also supports access to international organisations outside Africa. One example is the invitation extended by the International Council for Science (ICSU) and UNISDR to Prof Benouar to serve on the scientific committee of their Integrated Research in Disaster Reduction (IRDR) project based in Beijing. ICSU and UN ISDR know about his membership of Periperi U and he plans to showcase the Periperi U capacity building model in this forum.

DiMP expressed reservations about how much they had really been able to influence national practice with regard to disaster management. While South Africa's policy is very enabling, risk management is a line responsibility of

several government departments. Working across different departments and spheres of government is difficult because they are said to operate in silos.

2.7 Professional development of teachers and researchers

The Periperi U partnership is home to 41 academics who regarded themselves as core to the teaching and research activities of the project units and a further 30 external faculty who worked as facilitators, lecturers and supervisors. External academics are largely drawn from government (38%) and academic institutions (48%). The remaining 14% come from the private sector. They are funded either on a commission basis, by their respective organisations, or work pro-bono.

The cross-disciplinary environment of Periperi U is a significant attractor for core academics engaged in this work, as is the potential social relevance of the work. Periperi U facilitates a wider perspective on issues that enrich their view of the domain and allows them to do research that is meaningful and beneficial to society.

Academics note that the sharing made possible by the programme improves their productivity. It makes them more viable by enabling them to address disaster risk issues in their own countries through sharing in the knowledge of the partners. The physical meetings, including attending each other's short courses, help significantly.

All the academics report that participation in Periperi U helped them integrate their knowledge with practice. There are examples of professional identities being reshaped. Dr Mateugue Djiack from UGB in Senegal and Prof Djillali Benouar from the USTHB in Algiers were both focused on laboratory-based research and seminars and conferences before joining Periperi U. Dr Djiack reported a shift in his focus from an approach in which research and teaching happened in relative isolation to a logically integrated model of applied scholarship in which teaching, research and "outreach" are linked for the creation and dissemination of knowledge that influences practice in the disaster risk field. Prof Benouar reported shifting his focus to being a specialist teacher and researcher in disaster risk who supervises masters and PhD level research.

2.8 Institutional development

Benefits to the institutions from the programme include enhanced profile and, in some cases, actual service provision and funding of infrastructure such as office upgrades and equipment purchases that support research and

teaching. In this regard, BDU reported that the allocation is rather small, but nevertheless useful. At Moi, where a short course on fire protection and risk assessment was run for the university, a DVC commented that disaster risk awareness has been created in the institution. He also observed relationships around disaster risk teaching and research growing across departments and schools, which strengthens the institution.

The degree to which the programme has been transformative or incremental in terms of professional development differs in each country. In Senegal, where the programme contributed the academic base for the national DM authority's work, the Periperi U-funded initiative is an innovation. UGB is the first institution in Senegal to offer disaster risk capacity building. They expect their leadership and early-entrant status to enhance their profile as the disaster risk work's profile grows in the country. For others, the conceptual shift around disasters has been a natural evolution that tracks similar developments in their specialist disciplines – e.g., the shift from a curative to a preventative frame in health care. In Ghana Periperi U reinforces existing initiatives in disaster-related research for AURAN.

There is evidence of the programme beginning to attract attention from beyond the network as centres of excellence in DRS. Moçambique's Eduardo Mondlane University sent people to Ardhi's DMTC and to DiMP to investigate master's curricula; Univ-Tanà was invited to run their short course at the University of Toamasina in Madagascar and Prof Benouar was invited to teach disaster risk reduction at the University of Mostaganem in Algeria after some Mostaganem students attended USTHB's short courses. He is supervising masters and PhD students at Mostaganem.

Discussions with the head of department at SU, which opened its doors to DiMP, indicated a clear perception of value to the university in enhancing its profile and extending its links in Africa, which is an important aspect of the institution's strategy.

2.9 Knowledge domain development

It is too early to determine exactly the extent and nature of Periperi U's contribution to developing the disaster risk knowledge domain in Africa to date. The partners all acknowledge that the consortium's teaching, training and research output, consulting and policy advocacy work has just started. It is also true that the development of the DRS knowledge domain is in the hands of many more stakeholders than the Periperi U members.

A wide range of underlying disciplines and a collective academic experience, rooted in specific geographic areas of practice are evident in the partnership. Periperi U has drawn in practitioner experience to help build the applied

science. In the process, research results have been disseminated and people in communities have learned.

Academics exposed to the emerging knowledge domain have raised awareness within their institutions and, in cases such as BDU and UGB, are influencing their institutions to move towards a greater integration of disaster risk into the curricula of other programmes. There are thus early signs of the potential of the programme to influence “mainstreaming” of disaster risk and to produce graduates across a wide spectrum of disciplines and professions who understand the domain and can apply its concepts and methods in the work in fields such as agriculture (Senegal), public and community health (Uganda and Kenya), development studies (Madagascar, Moçambique and Ethiopia) and environmental science (South Africa).

It is also clear that across Periperi U there are different views on the disaster risk domain and that the divergence has not yet been fully explored by the partners. The balance between disaster management and disaster risk reduction as focal areas for teaching and research varies among institutions. This is accepted within the partnership as long as programmes and courses are coherent and robust.

We recommend that discussions on the knowledge domain be pursued more explicitly in Phase 3 and that Periperi U contributes strongly to international debates on DRS as an academic domain, particularly because the partners all agree that they wish to see the programme continue so they may continue to build up the foundation they have been able to lay in the past four years.

2.10 Evidence of societal impact

The academics acknowledge that, as yet, there is no hard, measurable, impact in terms of reduction in the occurrence and impact of disasters in Africa. Four years is far too little time for the kind of broad capacity building inherent in the model to produce results of this kind. However, they are optimistic that their efforts will lead to such outcomes because the first steps “are well under way”.

At Moi University where university employees have been training in fire risk reduction, project staff are watching for a decrease in the incidence of small fires on campus. Although they have been active for a relatively short time, the Madagascan partner expects to see a change in the way risk is managed in their country because the heads of the two public agencies responsible for risk reduction have attended short courses and general feedback from short course participants indicates significant acquisition of essential new knowledge in managing disaster risk. In addition, Madagascan NGOs involved in disaster management participate in Round Table discussions at

the University of Antananarivo. This form of information dissemination is expected to influence practice.

Prof Djillali Benouar of USTHB summed up the overall conviction shared by the partners that the work they have begun will bring about change in their countries:

“I believe inside me that we need to train the next generation [in] a new vision of humanity for nature. This is very important because we had other preoccupations in the past, but today we know that ignorance and unconsciousness are very important [contributors] in all death and destruction. We need as humans to learn about a new vision for this world, about risk reduction – all risks. Even if today we are concentrating on some risks, with time, with education and with raising awareness, I am sure we will have a larger vision of risk that will prevent humanity from [suffering in] disasters. ... This will influence all [aspects of] life: political, economic, education.”

2.11 Support factors and processes

2.11.1 Home Institutions

Generally, the partners report that their home institutions are supportive despite challenges in convincing colleagues of the importance and legitimacy of the project and the disaster risk work, particularly in the beginning. DiMP's circumstances and its relocation to another university during the evaluation are exceptional, although a few other partners appear to be experiencing some significant challenges in securing acceptance and practical support in their universities. The process of weaving the projects into the institutions happen at multiple levels and the task of putting the projects “on the map” inside the institutions is time-consuming and requires significant effort.

All the partnership agreements were signed with senior institutional representatives and, for the most part, support at the top of the institutions is in place, although this translates into different degrees of action. In some cases very senior university executives are the project champions, e.g. the UGB rector, the UDM Academic Dean (second only to the rector), the Dean of the School of Environmental Sciences and Technology at Ardhi and the USTHB Vice Rector for Research and International Relations. In the case of UCT, there was an almost complete lack of support from people who could positively influence DiMP's position in the institution.

The determining factors for successful institutional integration seem to be a clear strategic alignment between the project goals and deliverables and university strategy, coupled with a senior or executive level champion who is actively engaged with the project.

Institutional support consists of facilitating administrative and infrastructural arrangements to allow the projects to function and the introduction of new academic programmes related to disaster risk through internal and external quality assurance mechanisms. Even UCT provided for these project elements. Institutional policies, systems and procedures affect the partners in different ways. They have to comply with or work around universities' priorities, policies, systems and decision-making methods. Some institutions manage the integration more easily than others. Univ-Tanà is a good example of streamlined integration and there are encouraging signs that SU sees attractive strategic fit with DiMP at the departmental and institutional levels. The project unit at UGB, however, has been prompted to look for an alternative home within the university because the management structures and procedures in its current department are reportedly rigid and not sufficiently sophisticated for the required project administration and academic activity. At UDM, although the University Rector is extremely supportive of the project, the UDM project unit had to make arrangements for its funds to be channelled and managed by a third party – see section 2.11.2 below for more details.

Senior management in some institutions (Moi, UG, UDM) said they would fund academic programmes and research if they could, but that short courses funded by Periperi U will cease if funding dries up. The UDM Rector indicated that he is unable to offer financial support to ensure sustainability for the project because the institution is private and his primary duty is to generate profit for the owners. Others, like Univ-Tanà and USTHB, are actively committed to making the disaster risk project sustainable. Univ-Tanà has plans to charge for short courses and academic programmes and build the project's capacity to sell consulting services by supporting networking and partnerships with other institutions inside and outside Periperi U and other organisations such as international agencies.

2.11.2 Project and programme management and administration

The role of the Secretariat

DiMP performs the role of programme management. It provides the central administrative point - a financial and communications switching gear - based in and drawing on the infrastructure, systems, processes and staff of its home institution. DiMP is mindful of the danger of being too directive and prefers to present itself as a "Secretariat" and not "programme manager",

operating in the service of the partners - a facilitator, conduit and problem-solver rather than a manager. This picture somewhat obscures the complexities of the programme management tasks that DiMP has had to perform, whatever its preferred stance. But the fact that it has performed these tasks without disturbing the picture speaks volumes about its competence in the programme management role.

With one exception (UG), the partners vocally appreciate the Secretariat's role as a central hub in the network. They value the absence of the kind of top-down communication structure experienced in other networks - Periperi U is characterised by a multi-directional flow of communication, enabled and stimulated by DiMP's facilitation.

UG's reservation concerns being consulted about the timing of the annual programme events so that they can attend. Coordination of events does appear to have been a challenge: overlap and contiguity of short courses in different countries has limited people's ability to travel and attend one another's courses. UG also expressed the desire for consensus on the programme's focus, support and collaboration. The desire to revisit these issues as part of Phase 3 is shared by other partners.

Generally, the partners believe that DiMP's efforts to ensure that all the partners are engaged, share one another's ideas and have the opportunity to give input and receive feedback is what makes Periperi U different. The sensitivity of boundaries in the domain is taken into account and the model explicitly enables navigation of multiple boundaries by decentralising decision-making. Academics acknowledged that an important aspect of what they are learning through participating in Periperi U is how to navigate complex and fluid boundaries and how to work with a variety of people.

There are two areas where DiMP is acknowledged to lead - and both are appreciated. First, DiMP is seen as a source and driver of innovation: its intellectual work is an inspiration and a resource for the partners. Second, it acts as a user-friendly interface with the funder, relieving the partners in particular of the responsibility for reporting. This does not absolve the partners from accountability, but relieves them of the task of operating the accountability mechanisms, which would have been extremely burdensome for these small units acting independently and probably impossible for the funder to sustain.

[Project management and administration at the partner level](#)

The partners were all required to establish administrative units as counterparts to the Secretariat to facilitate the interface and handle local project management and administration.

Challenges and hiccups emerged in relation to financial management for almost all the partners, even where adequate institutional systems and procedures and project unit financial management capacity are in place. Alongside difficulties in setting up workable systems to facilitate flows of money between South Africa and the partner countries, the spend-and-claim funding model presents the biggest headache for the partners and the Secretariat. International banking interface challenges were dealt with in all cases, with the Secretariat and each institution finding unique, creative and sustainable ways to make things work.

With the exception of UDM, the partners managed to establish viable ways to manage their internal finances and other administrative tasks. UDM entered into an agreement for financial management with the Moçambiquan Red Cross (CVM), because the university's financial management systems were deemed insufficiently developed. Despite intensive effort including a visit to Moçambique by DiMP's financial manager, at the time of the institutional visit a range of tensions and mutual misconceptions and suspicions between UDM and CVM were apparent and in need of urgent attention.

Problems in the timely transfer of funds were experienced at UG, Makerere, Univ-Tanà and UDM and are attributed to several factors:

- Delays in the transfer of funds by DiMP, reportedly because of the spend-and-claim model, which means that projects have to have bridging finance for cash flow management.
- Delays in moving funds across international banking boundaries and national foreign exchange policy environments.
- Internal delays in moving funds from institutional accounts to projects.

The main effect of problems in funds transfer, experienced by several institutions, is cancellation and postponement of planned work. At Univ-Tanà, the university funded the project for almost nine months while they waited for funding. At UDM substantial amounts of planned work were cancelled during 2010 and there was an exceptional delay in procurement of essential equipment reportedly because of funding delays. The UDM project leader had funded activities from his own pocket and CVM had also made available a small sum to assist cash flow. Funds were delayed because UDM's financial reports were late. There are differences of opinion in UDM and CVM around the reasons for the late reports.

Fortunately, UDM's situation is unique in the network, but several partners expressed concerns about the viability of the present model of funds management in a more ambitious future phase of the project.

In practice, support roles and responsibilities are defined differently and allocated rather fluidly across the partnership administrative teams and there is no common model. Support staff – who are funded by Periperi U - assist in office administration, student recruitment, short course administration and media engagement. At DiMP one member of the support staff is responsible for knowledge management within DiMP and to some extent for Periperi U. In many cases, people attached to other parts of the institutions are helping out.

The support teams are at different stages of development; some are still finding their feet, e.g., at UDM, where the project leader and two of his academic colleagues tried for two years to run the project themselves before appointing three support staff working part-time or on a project basis. At Ardhi, the project leader has an ambitious plan for expanding the DMTC to include a Board (not yet set up) two managers (one at the time of the visit), two operational officers (none at the time of the visit) and two admin/finance officers (one at the time of the visit).

The Secretariat and one of the partners highlighted the fact that managing a Periperi U project unit is very different from managing more conventional, single-institution academic projects. The accountability requirements demand adherence to the programme time cycle; plans have to be created, implemented and reported on; the financial accountability is more complex. Several partners evidently struggled with this and the evaluators observed impatience with structures and formalities in some institutions.

There are a few possible contributing factors. Several of the project leaders are social entrepreneurs as well as academics. The project units are, for the most part, in the start-up phase of their life cycle as organisations. Informality, fluidity and weakly developed systems, policies and procedures are characteristic of entrepreneurial orientations and early-stage organisations. Despite its flexibility, the complexity of the programme enforces formality, structure and adherence to procedures. This seems to sit uncomfortably with a few individuals in the network.

2.11.3 Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring of the programme has focused on the envisaged core activities and outputs: exchanges, short courses, academic programmes and research studies. These have been documented through regular reporting by the institutions. There has been very little shared reflection on achievement of these results and what may lie behind success and shortcomings. The programme was not evaluated after Phase 1 or midway through Phase 2, as had originally been proposed.

In evaluating their own performance, the partners made few references to M&E. Ardhi noted that they had been unable to conduct formal tracer studies to assess the value and impact of their short courses due to lack of funds.

Evidence from the self-assessments thus suggests that there is very little M&E capacity among the partners. This is a field that needs to be developed in Phase 3. The experience of the summative evaluation indicates that an evaluation framework needs to be developed for Phase 3, hand in hand with initial programme planning. Steps should be taken to build capacity of the partners to operate it.

2.12 A Phase 3 for Periperi U

2.12.1 Partners' ideas

The partners agree that Phase 2 has allowed them to build a sound foundation. They are unanimously committed to continuing the programme, subject to funding availability.

Their vision encompasses a range of interrelated areas of growth and development for Phase 3:

1. Promotion and expansion of the network in various quarters and ways -
 - Increase Periperi U's visibility. A key strategic issue that has to be addressed in the next phase of the partnership is its profile. Until now, Periperi U has consciously maintained a low profile in order to have the flexibility to experiment and go through the initial phases of birth and growth. While this has given the partnership substantial freedom to decide on its focus and activities, it is not as widely known or recognised as other initiatives, such as some in the climate change domain. The partners recognise that they have to decide how to position Periperi U as a player in the global risk reduction field in relation to other organisations and how to develop a stature and a voice that is representative of Africa and compelling for political leaders inside and outside Africa without losing the consortium's independence. Suggestions included a generic "corporate" presentation (e.g., a brochure and an updated website) that outlines Periperi U's achievements that all the partners can use.
 - Attract government agencies to work more with universities in the disaster risk arena in order to exert greater influence on practice. Academics would like to see their research translated into actionable and implemented policy. They would also like to arrive at a point where their governments recognise their expertise and come to them for assistance.

- Hold Periperi U conferences, seminars and workshops across Africa.
- Secure support to facilitate presenting papers at international conferences and other forums.

2. Strengthened research capacity and impact -

- Enhance the value of the research output by strengthening the interface between research and policy.
- The possibility was mooted of a multi-country research project. Although it might divert energy from the training and community responsiveness agendas, it would raise Periperi U's global profile as a centre of knowledge production in the domain and reflect well on the partners' capacity for collaborative research.
- Enhance funding for postgraduate research by reallocating funds from focus areas that have been adequately developed, e.g. short courses.
- Secure more funding for research, particularly for PhD students.

3. Additional and strengthened themes and focus areas -

- Widen the conceptual ambit to include climate change. Concerns about Periperi U's capacity to contribute in the climate change arena were raised. Other entities are far better established in that domain and the partners would be operating from a base of relative weakness. There are multiple agendas and the politics have to be clarified. This is evidently a topic for debate by the partners.
- Focus on rapid urbanisation and informality and locate livelihoods, disaster risk and resource management within that frame. This could be a fertile frame for all sorts of partnerships and generation of new knowledge.
- Focus on gender issues in disaster risk. Work more with local and national organisations in this field interested in risk reduction.
- Establish Periperi U field teams to report on disasters in Africa and publish the reports.

4. Growth of academic programmes -

Experience to date shows that it takes a long time to establish new academic programmes and that the process is far from complete in most partner institutions. Most of the programmes in the partnership are new and still in the pilot phase. Sustaining the partnership will enable the institutions to share learning that supports ongoing curriculum development and learning and sharing teaching resources, methods and subject expertise.

5. Internships and graduate placement -

The partners have already agreed to explore internship and graduate placement programmes. Creating opportunities for more field-based learning beyond the university is another area of interest. An experienced external faculty member suggested field learning that is carefully designed and practically orientated and takes people from different countries to a field with preparatory reading and facilitates a triangulated process around a theme, e.g., risk in informal settlements. People from different countries looking at the socio-economic and political settings that shape the environments would deepen their understanding about the relative complexity, roots and ways people have tried to engage with those issues in different contexts.

6. Expansion of the consortium -

Several partners raised the issue of expanding the Periperi U programme to other counties. USTHB would like to have partners in neighbouring Morocco, Tunisia, Libya and Mauritania and eventually the rest of Francophone Africa. The Francophone partners acknowledge the value of having a critical mass of partners who share their language for exchange and Moçambique currently experiences the same linguistic isolation Algeria had in the beginning. UDM would like partners in the rest of Lusophone Africa - Angola, Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Guinea - and is working on identifying possibilities.

Other partners advocate adding universities in disaster-prone countries that are not yet capacitated in disaster risk management. They identified other universities interested in joining (see Annex 14). One idea is for the new institutions to have a mentorship relationship with a current partner and share resources, but not actually be taken on as partners in Phase 3. Another is to assist partners in the same sub-region to collaborate on issues of common concern by sharing human, material and financial resources while remaining under the Secretariat's co-ordination. This would require additional funding.

7. Project management and administration capacity development -

Some partners acknowledge that the "academic ways of working" that they are used to are not well aligned with the demands of Periperi U as a project and they would like to improve their project management skills and practice.

2.12.2 Contemplating the future without Periperi U

There is no strong sense from the partners that their universities would be able to fund their activities fully in the short term, beyond what is already happening. Other than DiMP, which is fully funded by external donors, institutional funding is largely limited to salaries for core academics, access to facilities for teaching and research and office space. Periperi U has funded support posts and equipment.

The partners agree that if the formal, funded programme were to come to an end, the network would continue to function, but in a diminished way. They would each have to work at raising funds from external sources. The strength of the network effect for fundraising would cease to exist and the partners would become competitors for donor funds as opposed to collaborators. Individual partners would be affected differently by the drying up of funds. DiMP expressed confidence in its ability to attract funds but felt that loss of Periperi U would affect it by diminishing its perceived continental leadership role.

Relationships would continue and be facilitated by available, affordable means, such as email. However, Phase 2 demonstrated that technology-enabled methods of exchange were less effective than face-to-face meetings in the Periperi U context, mainly because of the importance of building strong personal relationships in a new and emerging field across the vast distances of Africa. Individuals also claim that technology is a challenge. The evaluation was affected negatively by slowness and non-delivery of email, but it is impossible to judge the true extent of technological barriers.

The core business of education (i.e., academic programmes) and research would continue, with some trimming. Teaching by external specialists funded by Periperi U would come to an end.

As research relies on funding, which is difficult to secure in Africa and complicated by the challenges of the cross-disciplinary disaster risk domain, there would be less research in most institutions. The biggest gap would be funding for postgraduate student research, which would undermine the quality of the academic programmes. In an applied knowledge domain, lack of opportunity for fieldwork would essentially eviscerate the academic programmes. A diminished supply of people with master's and PhD degrees in DRS would slow the development of the knowledge domain and undermine the longer-term tactic of influencing policy and practice through the production of highly educated professionals capable of taking on and shaping key roles in disaster management and risk reduction.

Loss of funding would, in cases like Moi, make it difficult to implement academic programmes that are still under development, e.g., programmes that require appointment of additional teaching staff whose salaries would have to be funded through Periperi U. As the newest member, Univ-Tanà

would be very challenged to find funding for the initiatives that Periperi U has seeded. They would continue, but on a scaled down basis, especially in the key area of research.

The two biggest casualties of the demise of Periperi U would be the programme of exchange visits and short courses. None of the partners would be able to sustain the programme of multi-lateral and bi-lateral visits at the level that was possible in Phase 2. The flow of ideas, knowledge, contacts and opportunity would be significantly diminished.

Short courses have been the first and most visible output of the partnership. Supported extensively by the physical exchanges the programme made possible, the training interventions that build capacity for government and civil society, often at no cost to participants or their employers, have seeded growth in awareness, understanding and, potentially, changes in policy and practice. The full benefit of what has begun is yet to be realised and for this to happen, the training effort has to continue and to increase. Growth in the training area is likely to be dependent mostly on external funding at present. There is a small incidence of participants or their employers paying to attend courses, but a large number of short course participants, especially government employees and community members, were paid for by Periperi U. Several partners said they would have to close their short course programmes if funding dried up.

Some institutions are thinking about how to raise funds from their core work to ensure sustainability and others already have a track record of securing research funding from other donors, but none of these efforts is yet mature enough to sustain the full functionality of any of the partner projects.

In wealthier countries like South Africa, the partner could market customised short courses to government and charge a more market-related fee, but as DiMP is under pressure from SU to establish its academic standing in order to qualify for full incorporation into the university in the future (which would seem to be DiMP's best chance for long-term sustainability), this would not be possible without significant growth in people qualified to teach and run short courses, and is thus an unlikely scenario.

UGB's comment sums up the general attitude to the possibility of no further funding: *"The UGB Periperi U project intends to open itself to other aspects of DRM in Senegal, in association with State structures responsible for these issues, i.e., the Directorate for Civil Protection (DPC). In the light of this challenge, it is not desirable that funding of the project should stop ..."*. In other words, the good work begun would be difficult to continue and develop. In sum, loss of the formal, funded network that Periperi U facilitates would be a major blow that would impoverish the domain and limit its further development.

2.13 Comparison between Periperi U and other African higher education networks

Mammo Muchie, Professor of Innovation Studies at the Institute for Economic Research on Innovation at Tshwane University of Technology in Pretoria, South Africa has highlighted the importance of collaborative networks for improving the state of African higher education. “If Africa is to join the global knowledge community as an equal partner,” he says, “it must revolutionize its research, education and training systems. This does not simply mean pumping money into individual institutions. This can help raise the profile of single universities or research institutes but will do little to improve the system as a whole. Rather, the key is to foster and sustain a network that circulates knowledge and encourages the creative learner, researcher and knowledge producer. The priority must be to promote networks for African researchers to engage with and learn from each other.” [17 March 2010 SciDev.net <http://www.scidev.net/en/opinions/african-networks-needed-to-improve-higher-education.html>]

The current reality is that Africa has far fewer functioning inter-institutional networks in higher education than other parts of the world, even from a proportional perspective. To some extent this is a by-product of Africa’s general legacy of fragmentation. Efforts are made and some networks are currently contributing to capacity development, research and institutional development, but apart from high-level, inter-governmental organisations like the Association of African Universities (AAU) and the Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA), they are almost exclusively driven by non-African or South Africa partners.

This is an evident gap for Africa because networks are needed at the practitioner level, as that is usually where innovation originates. Ownership by academics and higher education institutions rather than external agencies is also crucial for credibility and sustainability.

It was beyond the scope of this evaluation to conduct comprehensive research on other efforts to create collaborative networks in Africa, but two examples from the evaluators’ experience may help to illustrate the challenge and highlight Periperi U’s achievement.

The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) promotes the development of capacity in open and distance learning, at all levels in education. Collaborative networks are one of the principal vehicles it advocates for this. Outside South Africa, attempts to promote these networks in Africa have met with little

success, unlike other regions of the developing Commonwealth such as the Pacific (despite its logistical challenges).

A programme for developing capacity in the use of – and research in – educational technology for teaching and learning in a number of African universities has, two years into the programme, generated no significant inter-institutional networking and collaboration despite these being intended vehicles for the development of capacity.

Periperi U's early success in generating the type of peer practitioner networking and collaboration that seems capable of making a difference is an encouraging sign that it is possible to foster effective networking at the "chalk face" that is endorsed and, in many cases, actively supported by the higher education institutions which are home to the project partner units. In the evaluators' estimation, Periperi U has three primary distinguishing features: (1) the inclusion of networking and collaboration as an explicit priority activity, and output that is backed by funding, (2) the energy and passion of the individuals in the consortium and (3) the empowering, hands-off approach of the Secretariat.

The evaluation demonstrates that DiMP's facilitative and co-ordinating role is essential for the network's success and that its capacity to initiate and deliver results injects necessary energy and productivity into the partnership, but there are encouraging signs of other partners taking on this kind of leadership role as well. We wonder whether, if DiMP had been more hands-on and directive, the partners might have been more passive. A third phase that entails consolidation and growth would be an acid test of the sustainability of what seems to be a very special achievement.

CHAPTER 3: CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Introduction to the conclusions

The conclusions report the programme's achievements against two frames of reference. They also summarise the conditions and interventions that have helped and the factors that may have hindered greater achievement. Finally they look beyond the planned and anticipated results at the wider evaluation findings and their implications.

There are two principal frames of reference for the programme's achievements. The key elements of the programme plan contained in the November 2007 Periperi U proposal are the most important, in particular the long-term Goal, Principal Objective and four Focus Areas. The Focus Areas are expressed as expected results, principally at the output level. These were elaborated in a monitoring table of 'Objectives', 'Expected Results' and 'Process/Outcome indicators' (Annex 10).

A second frame of reference is the logic model (Annex 2), which was developed in November 2010 by the DiMP team with facilitation by the evaluators. As this was created retrospectively, and has not been explicitly agreed with the funder or the other partners, it does not carry the same formal weight as the first frame. However, it arises out of DiMP's experience of Periperi U, and up-to-date thinking about its potential value, and therefore can be seen as highly valid. It is the main source of thinking about medium and longer-term outcomes, which were generally not spelt out in the 2007 proposal.

The Goal of Periperi U was to:

"... reduce disaster risks in selected African countries through improved national and local disaster risk management due to enhanced strategic human capacity to integrate risk reduction into critical developmental sectors and programmes".

Significant reduction of disaster risks is clearly a long-term goal, and the changes that are intended to bring that about – improved risk management and enhanced strategic capacity to integrate risk reduction – are outcomes that, even if they are beginning to happen as a result of Periperi U, are beyond the scope of the evaluation to assess with confidence.

These envisaged changes would be in institutional and social environments beyond the boundaries of the partner universities and although the programme outputs – particularly short courses, commissioned research and

policy and advocacy activity – reach out to these environments, it is too early for the necessary critical mass to have developed. The evaluation therefore only looked at a few examples of early progress in these outcomes. These were not enough from which to draw firm conclusions. They are also not sufficient to address the counter proposition: that the universities’ activity is not having much effect.

All this is to be expected and the evaluation was never intended to explore this territory comprehensively. A deeper exploration of changes in the broader environment that may produce the long-term goal should, however, be within the scope of a Phase 3 evaluation in about 5 years’ time and this should be planned for at the outset, through, for example, a deeper understanding of baselines.

Periperi U’s Principal Objective was to

“... build sustainable ‘multi-tasking’ capabilities in disaster risk and vulnerability reduction capacity building in ten selected institutions of higher learning in Africa from 2008 to 2011, consistent with global disaster reduction priorities reflected in the Hyogo Framework of Action.”

Leaving aside the issue of sustainability – which it is too early to fully assess – it was accepted by the programme stakeholders that the objective should be interpreted through four ‘Focus Areas’:

1. The institutional development/expansion of active teaching and training, research and policy advocacy capacity in Africa on context-specific disaster risk and vulnerability reduction, with particular emphasis on urban and hydro meteorological risks.
2. The establishment and/or enhancement of sustainable capacity for each university unit/programme to provide at least one-two short courses annually in disaster risk management, community based disaster risk management, food/livelihood security.
3. The establishment and/or development within each unit/programme of either undergraduate and/or graduate modules related to reducing/managing the risk and vulnerability profile of the country concerned.
4. The generation of applied research outputs by each unit/programme related to the risks and vulnerabilities of the country concerned that increase local understanding and improve the management of those risks.

Focus Area 1 – the development or expansion of institutional capacity in this domain – is the most fundamental of the four focus areas. It is a pre-condition for, and encapsulates, the other three, which are about specific

outputs in teaching, training and research. The outputs reported under Focus Areas 2-4 are the proof of progress made in Focus Area 1 – the concrete expression of the institutional development or expansion of capacity. Therefore it makes sense to look at them first, before returning to conclusions about Focus Area 1. With each of the three outputs (Focus Areas 2, 3 and 4), the conclusions will look at volume, reach, domain/theme and quality. Outcomes will be addressed later.

3.2 Focus Area 2

The establishment and/or enhancement of sustainable capacity for each university unit to provide at least one-two short courses annually in disaster risk management, community based disaster risk management, food/livelihood security.

Focus Area 2 covers what is described as training in Focus Area 1. The expected results and indicators in the monitoring table specified that there would be at least 22 courses in total and that 600 ‘development and disaster risk management practitioners’ would be reached. The table specified that the short courses should be related to hydro-meteorological hazards and urban risks.

A total of about 1472 people were trained across Africa in the partner institutions during Phase 2 of Periperi U, up to December 2010. This was over seven times as many as during Phase 1, albeit with more institutions involved. Courses offered increased from five to 31, with 49 iterations. Every institution, including the newest, has run at least one course in the period.

In terms of concrete outputs – in numbers at least – training is the most visible indicator of the success of the programme. The numbers exceed expectations – in the case of course participants by a factor of 2.5. Where short courses were already established, Periperi U funding has enabled their expansion. New courses have been created. Short courses for some institutions – particularly the Francophone countries - were an innovation and their development has involved the breaking of moulds.

In terms of domain and theme, the majority of courses were aligned with the intentions in Focus Area 2. Focus Area 1 emphasises urban and hydro-meteorological risks. These themes were explored in a wide variety of contexts and from different angles, including food security, health, earthquakes and climate change. They were also not the only foci for short courses. Five courses were primarily in the disaster management domain. and several were not directly concerned with hydro-meteorological hazards and urban risks.

It is less easy to gauge the extent to which the courses have reached their intended targets: development and disaster risk management practitioners. There was insufficient data available to the evaluation on participant profiles. The partner institutions self-reported that they were generally satisfied they were reaching the right people, but there were reservations about this from at least three of the partners. We recommend that better data on participants is kept and reviewed for marketing purposes.

The quality of the short courses has been difficult to assess. One measure is sustained demand in maturing markets for repeated courses. It is too early to use this criterion. There is limited evidence of ongoing demand from stakeholders for courses offered by the two more “established” partners, DiMP and Makerere, who have been offering the same short courses for several years. The other courses were offered once or twice only. None of the courses are formally accredited by the institutions, and the evaluators could find no explicit standards or quality assurance frameworks.

Other evidence – e.g. from participant feedback and participant/trainer ratios – presents a picture which is generally encouraging but with some deficits and areas of opacity. An encouraging aspect is the universal practice among the partners of debriefing after courses, with a view to continuous improvement.

Quality is an important area for exploration in Phase 3. In particular it would be beneficial for the partners to collaboratively develop approaches and instruments for quality assurance and improvement.

3.3 Focus Area 3

The establishment and/or development within each unit of either undergraduate and/or graduate modules related to reducing/managing the risk and vulnerability profile of the country concerned.

By the end of 2010 there were nine full academic programmes, five of which were already in place at the beginning of Phase 1. The growth therefore consists of four: three Master’s and one undergraduate programme. Six more postgraduate programmes were in various stages of development or awaiting approval prior to implementation. In addition to new programmes implemented, new disaster-related teaching input was being given on at least four undergraduate programmes in other disciplines. Every institution, except UG had either completed a new full academic programme or had one in the pipeline, and UG had developed current disaster-related input to other courses.

The results for this Focus Area did not fully match the intended objectives by the end of 2010. This can be ascribed to at least two factors. First,

development time for academic programmes is much longer than for short courses and academics reported being under-resourced for the work, despite the valuable contribution Periperi U funding made to enabling the process. Second, institutional capacity and support for change varies across the consortium.

In terms of domain and theme, the courses in place and in development are broadly consistent with the original intentions of the programme – a focus on disaster risk and vulnerability. The principal exception is the Masters programme in the pipeline at Makerere where the main emphasis is on public health in disaster response.

During Phase 2 least 217 graduates were produced and at the end of 2010 there were some 700 students in the pipeline. This should expand rapidly once the six new programmes come on stream and the more mature ones develop further momentum.

The evidence from student feedback suggests that in certain respects at least, the academic programmes are well constructed. The consensus among existing students is that they are relevant, exciting and challenging (in a positive sense). To some extent this reflects the attitude of the students that are typically attracted to the courses – those with a sense of mission. This suggests that the curricula are a good fit with their markets.

Unlike short courses, the Periperi U academic programmes are subject to their local systems of accreditation. These vary from country to country and the evaluation does not assume that they are all a sufficient guarantee of quality or that the more elaborate ones automatically guarantee higher quality. Ongoing quality assurance also varies in type and in some cases does not appear to exist. The partners were not consistent in reporting on internal and external quality assurance processes. It is not clear from the data, for example, that all Masters theses are being subjected to external examination. General conclusions can thus not be made. Quality in new, cross-disciplinary domains is particularly difficult to define in detail and legislate for. As with short courses, we recommend that Phase 3 explore issues of quality and possible frameworks for assurance, such as peer review.

3.4 Focus Area 4

The generation of applied research outputs by each unit related to the risks and vulnerabilities of the country concerned that increase local understanding and improve the management of those risks.

The monitoring table expected at least 22 research reports, focusing on hydro-meteorological hazards and urban risks.

By the end of 2010, the partners reported that 99 pieces of faculty and student research had been completed or were underway. Although 43 of these were through DiMP's efforts, each institution reported at least two pieces of research. The majority of the research was by students.

A further 26 pieces were commissioned by clients, mostly at Ardhi and UDM. In the programme model, this is classed as consulting and is regarded as an outcome – a product of the capacity, outreach effort and reputation of the partner institution, which Periperi U sought to enhance.

The production of research on this scale in this short period, exceeding expectations, is an objectively good result. The partners highlighted it as a clear benefit of the programme, something that would not have happened on this scale without the programme's funding in particular.

Unlike other elements of the programme, such as short courses, the influence of the programme's network effect on research is less visible. There was no inter-institutional research collaboration and the themes were mostly local. However there was sharing of data and anecdotal evidence of cross-pollination of ideas and seeding of new areas of research through exposure to one another's work and collaboration. There is a growing expectation that collaborative research will feature in Phase 3. This is endorsed by this evaluation both for its intrinsic value and for its likely benefits to profile and professional development.

We were not in a position to assess the quality of research. It is clear however that the experience of research was highly valued by students and faculty. There were differing views among the partners about the standing of applied research, but there was a consensus that it was valuable as a source of intellectual capital for curriculum design and delivery and that it was a useful tool for advocacy and reputation building. This is the area where partners would most like more funding.

3.5 Focus Area 1

Having assessed the other three Focus Areas, we are in a position to draw conclusions about Focus Area 1. This was defined as:

The institutional development/expansion of active teaching and training, research and policy advocacy capacity in Africa on context-specific disaster risk and vulnerability reduction, with particular emphasis on urban and hydro meteorological risks.

3.5.1 Teaching, training and research

In teaching, training and research the expected results have been achieved and exceeded in the cases of training and research. Although we are not able to draw firm conclusions about quality, there is significant demand-side evidence that students and clients value the products. In terms of domain and theme, not all the outputs have been in the risk reduction and urban and hydro-meteorological fields, but we understand that the programme stakeholders have agreed a broadening of scope provided the risk reduction concept has been embraced alongside DM. Makerere is the only partner that has not made substantial progress in explicitly building risk reduction into its courses and research.

In developing their capacities in disaster-related work, the partners have

- Experienced synergies between research, teaching/training and consulting.
- In a small way begun the transition from multi-disciplinarity to inter- and trans-disciplinarity in the domain, although not without challenge.
- Gained respect for and interest in the domain from peers in their institutions.

All these – especially the last two – are work in progress and need to be further developed in Phase 3. Nevertheless, it is safe to conclude that capacity development in teaching, training and research in the partner institutions has generally been strong.

3.5.2 Policy and advocacy

The fourth area referenced in Focus Area 1 – policy and advocacy – was not defined by any indicators, and so achievement is less easy to measure directly. Although it was not specifically targeted by Periperi U interventions, policy and advocacy work has been pursued via core academic activities – teaching, training and research – and should be viewed more as an outcome or result of increased capacity in the other Focus Areas. Indeed, some partners see all the work they do as having an advocacy objective.

Governments' openness to influence is evident from their participation in public short courses, commissioning of tailored, in-house courses and commissioned research. This can be seen in Ethiopia, Madagascar, Moçambique, South Africa and Tanzania. As the confidence of the partners to engage with disaster risk as a construct grows and there is more completed research the suite of advocacy tools is likely to expand.

The evidence confirms that direct policy and advocacy work has been the exception and confined to a few experienced individuals. DiMP's advocacy had already produced significant changes in legislation related to disaster management before Periperi U was formed and, through its network exposure, USTHB has proposed the South African legislation as an exemplar for Algerian legal reform. As other partners mature and achieved higher national profiles, their direct policy and advocacy work may increase.

3.6 Outcomes

Apart from policy and advocacy, no expected outcomes were defined in the Periperi U Focus Areas or monitoring table. The logic model developed at the start of the evaluation (Annex 2) therefore serves as the best guide to expected outcomes. It is a guide to the intended long-term effects of the Periperi U intervention and assumes sustainability and continued momentum beyond Phase 2, and therefore it is too early to expect reliable evidence in most of the outcome areas. Nevertheless we can draw tentative conclusions about some from the evidence available.

3.6.1 Consulting

We define consulting as an outcome. It is market-led, and should stem from a belief by the client in the value and importance of a disaster risk reduction focus, and trust in the supplier institution.

Consulting has mainly taken the form of research, design of disaster risk assessment and response instruments, and tailor-made training. Including commissioned research, which has already been referenced, the partners undertook about 45 pieces of consulting work in Phase 2, by 2010. Most of this was accounted for by DiMP, UDM and Ardhi, where experienced players in the partner institutions were doing most of the work. In the case of Ardhi, the main client was responsible for establishing the unit in the first place. Nevertheless, it is encouraging that much of this work has been in disaster risk reduction and that a possible model for this type of outreach in the domain has been demonstrated.

In the logic model, the commissioning of the various types of consultancy is seen as a result of a mind shift by clients in some countries at least, and thus a recognition of local capacity to develop skills in and research disaster risk⁵.

⁵ In other contexts, South Africa for example, there is a legal requirement for risk and vulnerability assessments that creates consulting opportunities. There is a danger that such consultancy serves a compliance need rather than reflecting a genuinely different approach to practice.

The evidence suggests that in some quarters, this has begun to happen and that Periperi U has played a part.

The parent institutions, in recognising disaster-related teaching, training and research as valid, are no doubt looking for reputational benefits for the institution as a whole, which would in turn reinforce the standing of the disaster units. It would be surprising if the increasing outreach of some of the units were not beginning to set this virtuous cycle in motion. There was some evidence of this already, at UDM for example.

3.6.2 Other outcomes in brief

[African short course participants embrace the concept of risk and the possibility of its mitigation.](#)

From the participant feedback available it is clear that this process is underway. Although the partners provided anecdotal evidence of individual cases, the true extent to which the participants have been able to apply the new attitudes and knowledge is not known.

[Graduates from academic programmes get jobs that enable them to leverage their learning.](#)

Few students had graduated from the Phase 2 academic programmes, and evidence of their job destinations and leverage that resulted is too thin to be reliable. This, and the experience of short course participants, should be researched through tracer studies in Part 3.

[African universities embrace disaster risk in their academic disciplines.](#)

This is the mainstreaming effect – disaster risk infiltrating curricula beyond the academic programmes in the partner units. A small number of modules and topics have been produced for other academic programmes by 3-4 partner units, but it is too early to say that there is momentum in this outcome area.

[Increased confidence among African academics in their ability to engage with disaster risk. Periperi U partners present disaster risk related papers in international forums.](#)

These two outcomes would stem from the professional development and networking opportunities that Periperi U sought to promote, and there is no doubt that the partners have increased their grasp of the disaster risk domain and in most cases were confidently engaging with it. There were isolated examples, outside DiMP, of papers being presented in international forums. We recommend that this should be a feature of Phase 3.

3.7 Enabling processes

In the monitoring framework, success in Focus Area 1 was defined partly by the effectiveness of enabling processes namely

- Planning
- Evaluation
- Administrative and financial structures, procedures
- Networking and collaboration – both bi- and multi-lateral.

There seems not to have been a strong emphasis on planning and evaluation so far in Periperi U, at least not in the sense of centralised programme planning. The original proposal served as the overall programme plan. Work planning was devolved, which was part of the programme ethos. It is difficult to say what effect this has had, but there are risks in devolved planning where capacity is uncertain. A different model may be needed in Phase 3.

There was regular reporting of results at the activity and output levels, but little evidence of systematic evaluative activity until this summative study got under way in September 2010. Both planning and evaluation should be considered as integral to success in the Phase 3, especially if it is more complex and centrally directed. Capacity building in these areas is indicated.

Most of the partners were challenged by the administration of Periperi, especially in the timely transfer of funds. This led to cancellation and postponement of work by several partners. Occurrence of administrative problems had reduced significantly in the last year of the programme, except at UDM, where funds transfer remains a critical issue.

The Secretariat at DiMP was generally seen as enabling - administratively, intellectually and collegiately - despite the problems it was experiencing with its own institutional home.

The fourth enabling process – networking and collaboration – has been a clear success factor and driver of achievement. There were 28 bilateral face-to-face exchanges up to the end of 2010. The most common purpose was short course attendance – direct capacity building – but 10 were for fact-finding, idea exchange and curriculum development. Over half of the visits were to partners other than DiMP, indicating that the network was beginning to develop multiple nodes.

The network activity - the amount and quality of interaction, collaboration, and knowledge exchange between the members – has contributed not only to the development of the teaching and training outputs, but also to professional development, and personal growth in the form of increased confidence. This is a significant and relatively unusual phenomenon, which has been driven partly by the flexibility of funding in the programme, and explicit encouragement to use funds for networking and collaboration.

The Periperi U website has played a minor role in networking and collaboration, as well as performing usefully as a knowledge repository. If funds are available, these roles should be enhanced in Phase 3, and the site developed as a promotional instrument.

Networking and collaboration has also been encouraged by the ethos of Periperi U, which includes collegiality, innovation and commitment to pro-poor outcomes. Partners were carefully selected with this ethos in mind and there is a strong sense that a community of like-minded people has been developed. This in turn has proved to be fertile ground for inter-change and collaboration.

With one exception, there has been adequate – and in some cases strong – support from the host institution for the programme and its objectives. This is a necessary condition for success. The exception is DiMP, which has had to move to another host to obtain the necessary supportive environment.

3.8 Two main obstacles

There have also been barriers and inhibitors to progress. Problems with administration have been a brake on progress in several institutions. Limited evaluation activity may have led to missed opportunities for learning from success and difficulty.

Language – for the Francophone and Lusophone partners – has been an inhibitor to interchange and product development. The programme's translation facility has helped, but this is clearly an area for further development and funding and thus a sustainability factor for Phase 3. The existence of subgroups who share a common language other than English appears to be an influential factor. The Francophone partners have benefited from the expansion of their numbers to three. UDM would benefit from the inclusion in some capacity of at least one other Lusophone institution in Phase 3.

3.9 Sustainability

There was a strong sense among the partners that, without a Phase 3, the initiative would not collapse entirely. The academic programmes in particular would continue to be developed. However, some elements, particularly interchange, short courses and research, would be threatened through lack of funding.

Although agreement on a Phase 3 of Periperi U would make sustainability issues less imminent and critical, it would not be premature to address them in the planning of that Phase. Future funding models – especially for short

courses and research – are the most urgent issue. Marketing – including profile for the institutions and Periperi U - will play an important part.

3.10 Phase 3

There is a broad consensus among the partners about aspects of Phase 3.

- Higher profile for Periperi U and the partners to attract more interest in the disaster risk domain and their work, from a wide range of institutions in Africa and beyond.
- More funding for research. Consideration of collaborative research.
- A review of themes and areas of focus.
- Continued development and improvement of academic programmes.
- More pro-activity in placing graduates, including internships.
- The extension of the network through association – e.g. mentoring - rather than full membership.
- Development of capacity in project management and administration.

The overall conclusion of the evaluation is that the description of Periperi U as “a complex programme with modest requirements of the partners – simple tasks based on their core academic work” is a significant understatement. Even though many of the academics involved in the partnership are engaged in all the kinds of activities required by the programme as part of their normal jobs (teaching, training, research, consulting, policy advocacy), the demands of the programme have been very challenging for a whole variety of reasons described in the findings.

Periperi U is at a critical and delicate point in its life. Although the objectives set at the beginning of Phase 2 have mostly been achieved and exceeded and there are encouraging signs of growth in exchange and collaboration, the underlying structure is not yet robust enough to sustain current activities except, perhaps, for the academic programmes and even these would be negatively affected if the programme were to cease in mid-2011. Further funding to enable a Phase 3 is evidently needed to allow the consortium to capitalise on what has been achieved to date.

CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Sustainability over the next five years

1. In the light of the achievements to date and the potential reflected in the following 26 recommendations, we recommend that USAID fund Periperi U for a further five years. The five-year period is recommended for two reasons:
 - a. Although a further three years' funding would enable Periperi U to further consolidate the foundation created during Phase 2, academic institutions operate with long work cycles. In addition, the outcomes envisaged by the partnership require sustained effort over a lengthy period. Some of the members are new and most of the activities across the network are still in their infancy. Phase 2 and the experience of the longer-standing partners whose work predates Periperi U demonstrate that three years is not sufficient to develop robust research and academic programmes or to bed down short courses that have solid profiles and market penetration, all of which contribute to building the platform for advocacy.
 - b. DiMP needs time to take root at SU and prove its capacity to contribute to the university's core business in order to be incorporated into the University and receive institutional funding. This will entail higher levels of academically sanctioned research output than previously achieved by DiMP staff, along with teaching, short course design and delivery and ongoing policy advocacy, consulting and networking efforts. The Head of the Department of Geography at SU, Prof Hannes van der Merwe, has confirmed that, in his view, five years is an accurate timeframe for DiMP to reach this goal. DiMP devotes significant time and other resources to its Secretariat role, including fundraising. Its stability is also evidently essential to Periperi U's success. There are early signs that SU is a good fit for DiMP, but the relationship is still in the initial phase. It is advisable that DiMP be put in a position where it can focus on building its position in SU and serving the growth and development needs of the consortium for the next five years without having to worry unduly about the fundamental financial viability of the programme during that period.

4.2 Overall funding and financial management

2. Future funding models – especially for short courses and research – are the most urgent sustainability issues that need to be addressed in Phase

3. The first recommendation notwithstanding, it is important to recognising that Periperi U is a long-term venture by its nature: the overall goal will not be achieved even in the next five years. The donor base should thus be diversified to offset the risk of the current single donor withdrawing support and effort should be applied to this during Phase 3. The evaluation demonstrates that additional funding can be applied immediately to research and short course development/delivery.
3. The spend-and-claim model has caused delays and cancellation/postponement of planned work. A centralised mechanism for providing bridging finance in respect of guaranteed spend-and-claim funding tranches should be explored. Donor funds could be invested for this purpose, if donors willing to fund such an activity can be found. One avenue to explore is a foundation established by a very high net worth individual who would understand the concept of social venture capital investment. Alternatively, loan capital could be provided by the partner institutions. Either option would require a sound investment, management and repayment strategy.
 4. Phase 3 should include a requirement for the current partner institutions to demonstrate capacity to raise funds to supplement Periperi U funding. To start active pursuit of greater levels of self-sustainability, a modest amount could be set as a target to be achieved by the end of Phase 3. The partners should be given freedom to determine the method of raising such funds, within simple guidelines that would ensure the integrity of the programme and not undermine centralised fundraising.
 5. Improved marketing capacity – including profile for the institutions and Periperi U - should be leveraged to support income generation from donors and through “trading” that is rooted in core academic business (training, teaching and research).

4.2 Research funding

6. Funding for research should be increased, in particular through a scholarship fund for postgraduate, especially PhD, students. The feasibility of international fieldwork exposure for advanced postgraduate students and professionals should be explored.
7. There is a growing expectation that collaborative research will feature in Phase 3. This is endorsed by this evaluation both for its intrinsic value and for its likely benefits to profile and professional development.
8. Research funding should include funding the dissemination of research output in a variety of media. For example, there were isolated examples, outside DiMP, of papers being presented in international forums. This should be a bigger feature of Phase 3, along with other forms of research dissemination for promotion and advocacy.
9. If funds are available, the networking and knowledge repository roles of the Periperi U website should be enhanced in Phase 3.

4.3 Short course development

10. Diversion of funds away from short courses to research has been mooted. Care should be exercised in this regard. Although the Phase 2 targets were exceeded both in terms of the number of courses offered and the number of people trained, most short courses were offered once or twice only. Except for DiMP and Makerere, the experience base for running short courses is still fragile. In addition, the short courses on offer vary widely, indicating that the partners are still in an experimental phase, exploring their local markets and developing their capacities. The evaluators recommend continued funding for short courses, with some targets set for developing a foundation set of courses that can be run repeatedly within institutions and across the partnership, alongside the experimental space where new courses can be piloted. Some foundation courses would be similar across multiple delivery sites, with local adaptations, and some unique to particular sites. The overall aim should be to begin to create centres of excellence that become known and sought after internationally. This is an example of a tactic for raising profile that is rooted in core business, coordinated across the partnership and would provide the donor with a solid exemplar of capacity building and generate return on investment. It would also advance each partner along the experience curve and create internal return on invested time and expertise, as well as creating the potential to charge fees and generate financial profit.
11. The duration of short courses should be reviewed in the light of participants' feedback. Globally, graduate business schools, which offer extensive short course programmes, find that one to three days, with a maximum of four days, is what the market will bear. The evaluators are not competent to comment on the feasibility of this in terms of content, but shorter courses (possibly the current longer courses broken down into introductory, intermediate and advanced offerings) might attract more participants.

4.4 Quality assurance

12. We recommend that Phase 3 broadly explore issues of quality and possible frameworks for assurance, such as peer review, within the network.
13. In particular, the partners should collaboratively develop approaches and instruments for quality assurance in short courses. Factors to be considered include numbers of participants, facilitation methods and facilitator competencies.

4.5 Knowledge domain and curriculum development

14. In developing their capacities in disaster risk-related work, the partners have to a small extent begun the transition from multi-disciplinarity to inter- and trans-disciplinarity in the domain, although not without challenge. They have gained respect for and interest in the domain from peers in their institutions. This is work in progress and needs to be further developed in Phase 3.
15. To support development towards trans-disciplinarity, Phase 3 should include a focus on integration in curriculum design. For example, a conference on curriculum development for trans-disciplinary domains could be held and experts in adult learning and curriculum development invited to share their specialist knowledge.
16. The evaluation shows that postgraduate programmes are developing highly skilled people for management positions that require leadership competence. The partners should explore the possibility of defining a core set of themes / courses / modules for all masters programmes that deal with essential leadership competence development (e.g., interpersonal skills, conflict resolution, negotiating skills, community engagement/facilitation, etc.). The partners should consider designing masters level curricula in such a way that some of these skills are developed explicitly through the learning process, e.g., sustained learning groups with group assessments.

4.6 Support for student and graduate work experience

17. The evaluation revealed widespread support for a more active focus on internships, within countries and across national borders. As Periperi U is grooming people for a new profession, opportunities for young people to gain experience have obvious value and the evaluators endorse this initiative.
18. A more pro-active approach to placing graduates of the academic programmes was mooted. The feasibility and desirability of a graduate placement programme that goes much beyond the current practice of advertising jobs on the website could be explored, with the caveat that graduate placement is a time-consuming task and requires dedicated and funded expert capacity. The evaluation suggests that current students are in demand and mature enough to look for jobs on their own. Many of them have worked before in jobs related to the field. Given the early stage of the disaster risk field, this seems unlikely to change in the next 3 – 5 years.

4.7 Promotional activities

19. The partners agree that Periperi U's profile needs to be raised. There are different views on how much it should be raised and how it should be done. The evaluators have noted the Secretariat's concern about the possible negative effect on the partnership of a sudden substantially raised profile. There is a risk of growing too fast. Periperi U has grown purposively during Phase 2 through the addition of new partners and each partner's implementation of its own planned activities. It has also grown organically and incrementally through exchange and collaboration activities. The evaluators believe Periperi U is at a delicate moment in its life cycle. Few of the partners can be said to be fully stable. The Secretariat is challenged to establish itself in a new institution and the other partners' projects and project management teams are still new. Care needs to be exercised to ensure that the stability that is essential for ongoing mobility is reinforced rather than weakened by excessive demand. The network's profile should be raised steadily and consciously through growing and judiciously publicising its core activities. Promotional activities should be rooted as much as possible in core business.
20. Subject to availability of funds, the Periperi U website should be developed as promotional instrument.

4.8 Network expansion / extension

21. Some partners have expressed the desire for additional partners who share their discipline or language, i.e. growth through expansion. Other partners have proposed forming relationships with other institutions that are interested in and have some capacity related to disaster risk on the basis of mentoring, i.e., growth through extension. Bearing in mind the caution expressed in recommendation 19 above, provision should be made at least to fund relationship building between current partners and other institutions during Phase 3. Criteria for selecting "extension" institutions should be agreed and the current partners should have to motivate the strategic value of such relationship development initiatives, accompanied by an activity plan and budget.

4.9 Data management

22. Better data on short course participants should be kept and reviewed for marketing purposes.
23. Data gathering for the evaluation revealed a lack of a central data repository that is easy to search and that can be relied on for comparative analysis of partners' performance over time. The data seems to be scattered across multiple documents and is difficult to verify. At partner

level, there is evidence of a similar fragmentation. Reliability and completeness are thus in question. We recommend that Phase 3 make provision to fund the development of a web-based database that can be used by the partners to record key information for ongoing monitoring and record keeping in relation to the programme reporting cycles. Standard reports that meet donors' accountability requirements could be generated from the database, supplemented by narrative reporting. It would make sense for the developer and hosting agency to be based in South Africa, close to the Secretariat.

4.10 Student tracking and graduate tracer studies

24. The employment experience of graduates and short course participants should be researched through tracer studies in Part 3.
25. The database proposed in recommendation 23 should be designed to support tracking studies of student cohorts within and across the partner institutions.

4.11 Programme planning, monitoring and evaluation

26. As Periperi U looks set to mature as an organisation and to gain complexity during Phase 3, a more structured, possibly somewhat more centralised approach to planning and evaluation should be considered as integral to its success. Capacity building in these areas may be needed and provision should be made to fund this.
27. Evaluation of longer-term outcomes in the logic model, such as change in policy and increased resources for disaster risk reduction – should take place at the end of Phase 3 and should be planned for at the outset.