

Evaluation of the  
Climate Lighthouse Process  
of Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe  
February – June 2018

---

**Anonymous summary**



Authors:

Dirk Hoffmann

Alfons Üllenberg

November 2018

# **Anonymous summary**

## **1. Background**

In 2008, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and Bread for the World developed what they called a climate lighthouse concept as a result of the internal discussion on climate change, the global threatening situation it has created and the related challenges posed for development cooperation and humanitarian aid. Lighthouse projects were since developed in close cooperation with their respective partners, in which the goal “of reducing the risks of climate change to particularly vulnerable target groups and of offering them sustainable development prospects” was pursued in a unified and systematic way.

Considering that the 10-year timeframe which was planned for the lighthouse process was coming to an end, Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe decided to carry out an evaluation of the climate lighthouse process in cooperation with the implementation partners.

## **2. Aims and methodology of the evaluation**

This evaluation was carried out to assess the Climate Lighthouse Process (LHPP) of Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and to learn from the experiences made. The evaluation dealt with the following aspects:

- An assessment of the applicability of the methodical approach of the lighthouse concept for climate adaptation projects.
- An evaluation of the results of the lighthouse process as a mutual North-South and South-South learning process so that they can be used for similar learning processes in future.
- The identification of the impact of the lighthouse process on other climate-related working areas and projects of Bread for the World, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and the partner organizations.
- An elaboration of the learning experiences from the cooperation between different working areas of Bread for the World and the formulation of recommendations for further cooperation.

In order to obtain a global view of the climate LHPP, the evaluation took place in three geographical regions: Berlin (Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe); Bangladesh (exchange and assessment workshop and field visits to a project region in southern Bangladesh); and Indonesia (field visits to a project region in West and Central Java). Secondary sources provided the basis for the assessment of experiences from lighthouse projects (LHP) in Sulawesi/Indonesia, Ethiopia, and Guatemala.

Looking at the technical and methodological standards and considering the ToRs, qualitative and quantitative data were collected in the three geographic regions mentioned above. Main data sources were the review of documents, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions with beneficiaries, project officers and staff of partner organisations, the participation at the international exchange and assessment workshop, as well as field visits to the project regions.

Triangulation was carried out to achieve high validity of results.

## **3. Conclusions based on OECD/DAC criteria**

The following information summarizes the results of the evaluation under consideration of the OECD/DAC criteria according to the framework of the ToR.

### *Relevance*

With its comprehensive and systematic approach, the climate LHPP enabled assessments and adaptation activities of adequate standard and with the involvement of all relevant stakeholders. In particular, the stakeholders of the LHP partners visited during this evaluation, were actively engaged in all relevant processes. Furthermore, the approach is in line with international strategies and the global policy dialogue in the area of climate change and offered projects the opportunity to develop climate and disaster resilience strategies. The relevance of the approach for the partner organizations became visible in the good results presented by project partners who participated in the Bangladesh international exchange workshop and by their support for the overall process.

In terms of an assessment of how the approach weighs climate change adaptation, climate change mitigation and disaster risk reduction it needs to be mentioned that the lighthouse concept (LHC) does not provide clear guidance on whether climate change mitigation (CCM) should be an integral component of the light house approach. As a result, CCM was only, if at all, considered during project interventions in terms of their contributions to greenhouse gas emissions rather than considering the more comprehensive CCM.

Gender aspects were not systematically incorporated in the projects in the different countries right from the beginning due to the fact that gender was not highlighted as an integral project component at project start. Gender received a more prominent role in the second project phase since 2014 and was more systematically included in the Indonesian projects.

### *Effectiveness*

The approach of the climate LHPP and in particular the risk assessment (RA) has proven to be successful in many ways. The RA was effective in providing detailed base line data on vulnerable people in the local project area. This allowed for monitoring of risk scores of target households and the creation of a number of innovative interventions to reduce the vulnerability. However, a number of difficulties were experienced in the application of the RA (e.g. lack of time, insufficient training of interviewers). By introducing the RA approach to all relevant stakeholders, effective relationships were established in particular with local governments, universities and research institutions. These relationships supported the progress of projects, whereas the lack of resources at local government level negatively influenced projects. Work with highly qualified and dedicated external consultants has shown to be a crucial factor for successful implementation of the LHPP. The specific project approach was very challenging for the partners at the beginning, but proved very effective at later stages. The lack of a well-functioning knowledge management system with accepted communication and learning strategies reduced the effectiveness of the climate LHPP.

### *Efficiency*

The efficiency of the LHPP was assessed by investigating the efficiency of the RA. The RA tool was not entirely replicated and used in other project activities of partner organizations. However, some key elements of the lighthouse approach, such as the combined focus on DRR and CCA, were adopted and used by other partners. As limiting factors for using the full-fledged lighthouse approach, high investment in time, human resources and external expert input were mentioned. These findings indicate that the application of the comprehensive light house approach as such has not been efficient.

### *Impact*

With its long-term perspective, there is a high probability that project outcomes will cause sustainable impacts. As already mentioned the lighthouse approach included the implementation of a risk assessment as its core tool and thereby helped to promote awareness about the impact of climate change and the social dimension of climate related risks. Thus, it created motivation and

ownership among project staff for being involved in activities reducing climate change related risks and provided relevant data. Furthermore, one project partner supported the mainstreaming of some methods from the lighthouse approach like a Climate Field School (CFS) into other projects of the organization. Through the advocacy work of Bread for the World, results of the lighthouse projects were presented at global level climate change negotiations, where the victims of climate change were given a voice at various high-level side events. The lighthouse projects also served as concrete examples of successful climate projects (best practice) for Public Relations work of Bread for the World. The lack of a centralized and adequately resourced coordination unit has, first and foremost, hindered the establishment of learning structures. The lack of a learning strategy – alongside the absence of a functioning knowledge management system – was a central factor in limiting the overall impact of the LHPP.

### *Sustainability*

The combination of DRR and CCA in the lighthouse concept is considered sustainable. The combined approach has not only led to conceptual discussions with and amongst the partner organizations, but also to the introduction of this approach in other partner organisations. The development of a Climate Technology Center by one partner organization constitutes the most ambitious initiative towards sustainability with respect to an exchange of experiences and learning from the LHPP.

Two of the other main factors of success of the LHPP are not considered sustainable: 1) the complex RA process itself, and 2) the high external expert input used to guide it. Despite a considerable motivation to further propagate the approach, it is not possible to replicate the RA without substantial external input. The experience of lighthouse project partners to participate in relevant meetings at global level was also an important learning mechanism, which offers sustainability through its potential for the inclusion of advocacy work in other climate related projects (advocacy work, sensitization).

## **4. Main recommendations**

As the evaluation is focused on the climate LHPP, not on individual projects, the recommendations also focus on processes rather than on the level of individual projects or measures. In general, the LHPP needs to be seen in the wider context of how climate change is tackled within Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and how its scope for mainstreaming can be broadened beyond the lighthouse concept. The development of a policy paper on climate change for Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe presently under way could be an excellent opportunity for taking on the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations for the RA**

A risk analysis as the core element of projects on DRR and CCA should be applied, but in a more flexible way and should be independently offered to projects according to their needs and opportunities. As minimum requirements a climate risk analysis needs to a) include the community level, as the increase of household resilience is often subject to collective action of the wider community; and b) incorporate climate change as a dynamic reality, preferably by the application of climate scenarios. Furthermore, discussions of a future RA tool should be expanded beyond the LHPPs.

## **Starting a catch-up learning process**

The most urgent task ahead is the creation of necessary conditions for a catch-up learning process. This process should be based on an in-depth assessment of each of the four remaining LHP and focus on project level strategies for replication and upscaling (within the organization, within the country, and in the wider region). This would ideally be done by four coordinated individual evaluations on project level, guided by common ToR.

Mainstreaming of best practices of the LHP (e.g. floating rice paddies, Climate Field Schools, Community Climate Resilience Centers) should be further pursued and documented. In order to produce high quality documents, it is recommended to develop a comprehensive strategy for the collection, dissemination and upscaling of best practices and lessons learnt. LHP partners should continue their learning activities and documentation of best practices.

Furthermore, it is recommended to integrate the documents of the climate LHPP into a functioning knowledge management system to enable an exchange of experiences within the organizations and with all relevant partners.

## **Implementation of the LHPP**

Mainstreaming within the partner organizations of the LHPs should be further supported, but at the same time, it should go beyond the lighthouse partners.

To increase the institutional capacity of Bread for the World, a second BAZ CCA would be a measure of high priority.

The gender perspective should be actively promoted in a systematic way not only in the RA, but also integrated into other components of DRR-CCA projects.

A regional focus (or cluster) of projects is recommended for effective mainstreaming, as more similar project environments are better suited to support project learning across countries.

We recommend the continued use of external expert consultants as a tool for climate change related project work.

To establish relationship with research institutions could provide more professional support to projects and help explore innovations focusing on CCA.

## **Institutional aspects**

In order to better assist LHPs – and other projects on DRR and CCA – Bread for the World's operative capacities should be increased.

Additionally, to offer better guidance to projects based on their needs it is recommended to develop a communication and learning strategy together with the partner organizations and relevant stakeholders. We recommend carrying out a comprehensive institutional analysis on learning and knowledge management as a starting point in order to identify its key elements.

Strategies of Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe to deal with climate-related disasters (short and long term) should be harmonized. It is therefore recommended to develop a mechanism of cooperation and communication in the area of DRR and CCA between Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and Bread for the World, starting from the beginning of an intervention, for which rules and procedures need to be developed and institutionalized. A starting point could be to jointly analyze the test run of the RA developed by Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe.

Recommendations from this evaluation should be included into the development of the climate change policy presently being developed. Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe need to further develop a common understanding of the relevance of climate change as the main

threat to development. Considering the future challenges of climate change, we recommend both brands to continue exploring new and innovative forms of cooperation, globally, as well as locally. To guarantee the effective implementation of the recommendations of this evaluation, Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe should assess the feasibility of the establishment of a technical working group on DRR and CCA projects.