

IRDR Review Questions FINAL

Key Review Questions	Sub-questions
<p>1. To what extent does IRDR meet the need for, and fill gaps in integrated disaster risk research?</p>	<p>1.1 To what extent are the scope and foci of IRDR realistic and desirable within the emerging global context? Are there redundant or important gaps or missing elements? Are its “boundaries” (<i>i.e.</i>, scope reflected in its mandate and operations) clear enough?</p> <p>1.2 Does IRDR have explicit values and principles that underpin and guide its work (e.g. with respect to cultural responsiveness, the creation of dependency, or the extent of participation of disaster prone communities in research processes)? Is this important?</p> <p>1.3 To what extent has the implementation of the IRDR proceeded in line with its objectives and in a holistic manner, <i>i.e.</i>, balancing the various objectives and cross-cutting themes, and maximising synergies between components? If not, what were the reasons?</p> <p>1.4 How appropriate and effective are the prevailing mechanisms and modes of implementation of IRDR research (<i>i.e.</i>, networks, joint projects, ICoEs, etc.)? How far could and should implementation oriented (rescue, humanitarian, insurance, etc. entities and individuals) participate in the IRDR?</p> <p>1.5 Has sufficient attention been given during implementation to the intended multi-dimensional, integrated and inclusive nature of the IRDR, including in terms of disciplines, fields of science, hazards, scale, and geographical regions? Are systems (<i>i.e.</i>, coherent and coordinated processes and mechanisms) in place to help ensure this?</p> <p>1.6 To what extent are the IRDR activities and products opportunity based rather than the result of the systematic implementation of the programme of work?</p> <p>1.7 How is “quality” defined and encouraged in the IRDR? Are effective systems in place for this purpose? Are IRDR outputs considered to be of sufficient/high quality?</p> <p>1.8 What is known at this stage about the (i) relevance, (ii) accessibility, (iii) visibility, (iv) utility and (v) timeliness of IRDR’s research outputs? And of its other main contributions?</p> <p>1.9 What are the main scientific achievements of IRDR (<i>i.e.</i> i.t.o. integrated disaster risk research and related activities)? To what extent are they in line with the initial expectations? Make specific reference to (i) the characterisation of hazards, vulnerability and risk; (ii) understanding decision-making in complex and changing risk contexts; (iii) assessment, data management and the monitoring of hazards, risks and disasters; (iv) reducing risk and curbing losses through knowledge-based actions; (v) developing case studies and demonstration projects; (vi) developing capacities in this domain.</p> <p>1.10 To what extent has IRDR been successful in (i) sharing knowledge among researchers, and (ii) engaging and communicating with influential users?</p> <p>1.11 What difference has the IRDR made within the scientific arena, from global to regional and national levels – <i>i.e.</i>, has its work been used, or had influence or impact among scientists?</p> <p>1.12 What difference has the IRDR made outside the scientific arena, from global to regional and national levels – <i>i.e.</i>, has its work been used, or had influence or impact, especially among influential stakeholders?</p> <p>1.13 To what extent are the differences made in line with the expectations expressed in key IRDR documents? Were these expectations realistic, given what has transpired?</p> <p>1.14 Were there any unexpected positive or negative consequences or impacts as a result of the design and/or implementation of the IRDR? Do any of the negatives have the potential to neutralise positive outcomes?</p> <p>1.15 What internal and external influencing factors have (i) enabled and (ii) inhibited IRDR progress and performance? What is emerging as possible success factors?</p>

<p>2. To what extent are the governance structures and processes appropriate for the effective positioning and management of the IRDR?</p>	<p>2.1 Are effective governance frameworks - including institutional structures and operational systems - in place, with evidence that they appropriately and sufficiently guide programme strategy and operations?</p> <p>2.2 Is the Scientific Committee an effective, efficient and appropriate governance mechanism, including in terms of its composition, oversight functions and programme positioning?</p> <p>2.3 Are the governance processes sufficiently transparent and accountable?</p> <p>2.4 To what extent are the (i) Scientific Committee, (ii) Working Groups (Projects) and (iii) Consultative Forum (or relevant conferences) perceived to be effective, legitimate and credible structures and mechanisms in support of programme execution?</p> <p>2.5 How well is the potential of the (i) National and Regional Offices and Committees, and (ii) the ICoEs being used in support of program execution?</p>
<p>3. To what extent are the management structures, mechanisms and resources appropriate and adequate for the effective and efficient management of the IRDR?</p>	<p>3.1 How well is the International Program Office performing in terms of efficiency and effectiveness? How has high leadership and staff turnover affected capacities and performance?</p> <p>3.2 To what extent is there effective collaboration and synergy between the different program structures, including between the IPO and host organisations, and the IPO and the Scientific Committee?</p> <p>3.3 Have resources been sufficient, and financial flows adequate, to enable program objectives to be met? Has IRDR (centrally and jointly) adequately contributed to the resources supporting the programme?</p> <p>3.4 How are priorities determined and positions advanced, progress and potential risks monitored, and results evaluated? Have knowledge management systems, including M&E and communication, been effective in supporting programme objectives?</p> <p>3.5 To what extent has programme management been adaptive? In other words, were opportunities used, and important challenges timeously identified and effectively addressed, informed by evidence? Are systems in place to support an adaptive management approach?</p> <p>3.6 Is the organisational culture of the IRDR conducive to collaboration and high performance?</p> <p>3.7 What internal and external influencing factors have (i) enabled and (ii) inhibited the governance & management performance of the IRDR? What is emerging as possible success factors?</p>
<p>4. To what extent is the IRDR relevant and significant in the broader efforts of the global community to address major challenges in the DRR domain?</p>	<p>4.1 How effective has the programme design and implementation been in positioning the IRDR as a unique, special and/or significant actor in the international DRR domain? Does IRDR have a clear role, niche and comparative advantage?</p> <p>4.2 How well have the IRDR objectives and results been aligned with expectations in key global and international agreements and agendas?</p> <p>4.3 To what extent have the IRDR objectives remained relevant within new and evolving global and international initiatives and contexts such as the 2030 Agenda and Sendai Framework for DRR 2015-2030? What frameworks and trends should be considered in future?</p> <p>4.4 To what extent do influential stakeholders credit the IRDR with significant and original innovations and contributions to the international DRR domain?</p> <p>4.5 To what extent has IRDR been successful and timely in engaging with important and influential international stakeholders? What is its level of influence at important international events, or within important initiatives?</p> <p>4.6 How successful has IRDR been in getting influential international stakeholders to engage with its initiatives?</p>

<p>5. Given the IRDR objectives, to what extent are the linkages and relationships of IRDR with the DRR science community and non-academic stakeholders appropriate and effective?</p>	<p>5.1 Have sufficient and appropriate partnerships, coalitions, alliances and/or other collaborative or coordinating mechanisms been used or established to (i) build (self-sustaining) capacity, (ii) enable integration and reduce duplication, and/or (iii) maximise the effectiveness of generated knowledge and expertise?</p> <p>5.2 Does IRDR have sufficient and appropriate working linkages with other important programs/initiatives, including with other ICSU Interdisciplinary Bodies such as Future Earth, Urban Health and Wellbeing Programme, Global Climate Observing System) supported by the co-sponsors of IRDR? And with national risk reduction efforts?</p> <p>5.3 To what extent have these linkages and relationships contributed to actions and results, both within and outside the scientific community, that otherwise would not have been possible?</p> <p>5.4 Are disaster prone communities sufficiently and appropriately engaged in IRDR research and communication processes? Is this encouraged and documented, and can examples readily be found?</p> <p>5.5 Have there been unintended negative consequences or impacts as a result of positioning efforts by IRDR? If so, to what extent can this neutralise positive gains?</p> <p>5.6 What internal and external influencing factors have (i) enabled and (ii) inhibited the international positioning of IRDR? What is emerging as possible success factors?</p>
<p>6. What are the main lessons and recommendations from the Review that should inform the next five year phase of the IRDR?</p>	<p>6.1 To what extent can IRDR be regarded as a success at this stage of its lifetime and performance trajectory? What were the main drivers for, or impediments to success? What are the implications for a next phase?</p> <p>6.2 Is the IRDR change logic or “theory of change” of the IRDR holding up? If not, where has it broken down and why? What are the implications for the next phase?</p> <p>6.3 Is any major change in direction or strategy needed over the next five year phase in response to the changing global landscape and demand? What are the reasons? If so, what changes are needed in the governance, management and operational arrangements?</p> <p>6.4 What are the main forward-looking strategic and, if appropriate, operational lessons that can be learned from an integration of the Review findings - cognizant of evolving contexts and potential future challenges and opportunities?</p> <p>6.5 What are the main strategic and, if appropriate, operational recommendations most likely to help IRDR achieve its objectives (or new objectives) over the next five years? Why are these considered the most significant and useful for long-term success?</p>