USAID/OFDA Prepare II Program

BASELINE REPORT

Submission Date: December 21, 2018

Number: 72OFDA18GR00052
Activity Start Date and End Date: April 19, 2018 – July 18, 2020
AOR: Malgorzata Nowakowski
OFDA/LAC Regional Advisor: Phil Gelman

Submitted by: Corey Michaud
Miyamoto International, Inc.

1440 G St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: +1 240-481-4004
Email: cmichaud@miyamotointernational.com

This document was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development's Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID/OFDA).

Acknowledgement

This document was prepared for USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) as part of contract No. 72OFDA18GR00052 – Development of a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Preparing to Reduce the Social and Economic Impact of Earthquakes (PREPARE II) program.

The USAID/OFDA PREPARE II program has been made possible thanks to the support and generosity of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and its Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA). Miyamoto International, Inc. administers and executes the resources of USAID and manages the implementation of the program in conjunction with the governments of Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Mexico.

The goal of the program is to strengthen risk management policy and practice of national and municipal Disaster Risk Reduction/Management (DRR/DRM) institutions for a reduction in internally displaced people (IDPs), lives lost, less people injured and less economic disruption in the selected PREPARE cities: Pasto, Colombia; San José, Costa Rica; San Salvador, El Salvador and Guadalajara/Zapopan, Mexico.

This report is the result of a multi-stakeholder engagement and consultation process which involved authorities from the national and municipal level governments, academic institutions, and private sector partners.

We hereby acknowledge the contributions of, and thank the agencies, institutions and partners, for their valuable time, guidance and support.

DISCLAIMER: This publication is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The opinions, findings and conclusions stated herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

AMSS	Área Metropolitana de San Salvador
ASIA	Asociación Salvadoreña de Ingenieros y Arquitectos
CENAPRED	Centro Nacional de Prevención de Desastres
CATBRU	Comité Técnico Asesor de Búsqueda y Rescate Urbano
CTSDB	Colegio Técnico Salesiano Don Bosco
CASALCO	Cámara Salvadoreña de la Construcción
DGPC	Dirección General de Protección Civil
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FOSALUD	Fondo Solidario para la Salud
GoES	Government of El Salvador
GOM	Government of Mexico
IEGG	Instituto de Información Estadística y Geográfica
OFDA	Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
OPAMSS	Oficina de Planificación del Área Metropolitana de San Salvador
MOP	Ministerio de Obras Publicas
MARN	Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
PC	Protección Civil
RDA	Rapid Damage Assessment
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USAR	Urban Search and Rescue
UAG	Universidad Autónoma de Guadalajara
UTEG	Universidad Tecnológica de Guadalajara
VMVDU	Vice Ministro de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano

1. INTRODUCTION

The original PREPARE Program, Preparing Rescue and Emergency Personnel to Ameliorate the Response to Earthquakes, started on November 1, 2015 (AID-OFDA-A-15-00035) with funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) through its Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA). Miyamoto International partnered with government and private-sector institutions to implement activities to strengthen earthquake preparedness and response capacity in San José, Costa Rica and Pasto, Colombia over an initial period of 18 months.

In 2017, the program expanded to San Salvador, El Salvador and Zapopan, Mexico and, in 2018, USAID/OFDA and Miyamoto signed a new grant agreement (72OFDA18GR00052) for PREPARE II, whose name had by then evolved to Preparing to Lessen the Social and Economic Impact of Earthquakes to better capture the broader scope of the program.

The goal of PREPARE II is to strengthen and institutionalize the risk management and response capacity of public disaster authorities and private-sector partners in earthquake-prone and highly vulnerable urban settings. PREPARE I and II support OFDA's mandate to save lives, alleviate suffering and reduce the social and economic impact of disasters, especially among the poorest and most vulnerable segments of the population.

The purpose of this performance data baseline study and report is (a) to assess the baseline capacity of institutions and individuals charged with overseeing earthquake preparedness and response, and (b) to generate a monitoring and evaluation plan to evaluate technical and PREPARE II capacity building assistance activities in San Salvador, El Salvador and Zapopan, Mexico.

The qualitative study was designed based on a review of program and USAID/OFDA documents and discussions with PREPARE II personnel. The field portion of the baseline study was undertaken between October 29 and November 8, 2018, with the first week in San Salvador and the second week in Zapopan. Key Informant Interview (KII) and Group Interview protocols were developed and finalized based on consultations with PREPARE personnel in Washington DC, San Salvador and Zapopan. The consultant conducted 28 KIIs and three Group Interviews and reviewed numerous supporting documents over five weeks.

2. METHODOLOGY

The baseline study was designed to address the following thematic areas:

1. Seismic Risk
2. Rapid Damage Assessments (RDA)
3. Debris Management
4. Urban Search and Rescue (USAR)

A set of evaluation questions guided the methodological design of the baseline data collection instruments. The same evaluation questions will form the basis for the end-line survey to be implemented during program close-out. The pre-post design will enable the measurement of changes in standard and custom indicators between the baseline and final evaluation, though it will not be possible to determine attribution or causation.

A mix of quantitative and qualitative methods was used to assess baseline capacity and conditions related to seismic risk. Methods and tools consisted of Key Informant Interviews, semi-structured group interviews (focus groups) and desk review of secondary sources. Data was triangulated as much as possible to optimize validity, reliability and completeness.

Field Work

Miyamoto personnel arranged interviews and focus groups prior to the consultant's arrival to each country. In San Salvador, a total of 13 organizations and 18 individuals participated in the study. In Zapopan, 12 organizations and 27 individuals participated. Field work took place over two weeks. In most instances, the PREPARE II Program Manager (PM) introduced the consultant to study participants, explaining the purpose of the meeting as well as program objectives, expected outcomes and how baseline recommendations will inform planning and implementation.

Study Limitations

Most of the information collected was self-reported, which has several limitations including the possibility of exaggeration or omission of information, inaccurate recollection of experiences or events, social-desirability bias or memory shortcomings. Aware of these shortcomings, the consultant triangulated the information to the degree possible via documents provided by local PREPARE II offices, stakeholders and via internet research.

Another limitation was the inability to meet with Civil Protection in San Salvador.

3. FIELD WORK

San Salvador, El Salvador

Despite recent progress by the Government of El Salvador (GoES) in assessing and addressing seismic risk, there remain significant gaps in seismic hazard and vulnerability data as well as institutional capacity to prepare for and respond to an earthquake event. For example, building codes and contingency plans must be updated and consistently enforced. Seismically resilient construction materials and techniques must be more broadly promoted and applied within the construction sector. Moreover, lessons learned from past earthquakes must inform ongoing development and land-use planning.

> *"Homes and buildings have been erected in the same location in areas where nothing should be built. It is like knowledge gained has been frozen in time, because there is no investment in good building practices using the knowledge gained from past experiences."*
>
> - **Universidad del El Salvador**

Since the 2001 earthquakes, there have been notable advances in construction regulations and municipal ordinances prohibiting construction in high-risk zones, but these regulations have not been widely enforced. High-risk areas throughout San Salvador have been repeatedly re-developed even after seismic events. In the Las Colinas neighborhood, for example, new urban developments have emerged despite suffering extensive structural damages during the 2001 earthquakes.[1] Similarly, in downtown San Salvador, people have opened businesses on the ground floors of buildings previously deemed unsafe.

A recurring theme among respondents during the study was the need to update building codes. Current building codes were last updated in 2003. Construction with steel, for example, has increased in recent decades, yet there is no national construction code that regulates steel-based construction. Moreover, there is no public or private institution formally assigned to monitor and implement findings and recommendations generated from structural assessments.

According to the Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (MARN), once the code is updated, the government must also enact legislation to support and enforce adherence to the code. Through the Reglamento para la Seguridad de la Construccion Estructural, GoES delineates minimum standards for the design, implementation and supervision of construction works. Its objective is to ensure structural integrity and resilience during an earthquake. These

[1] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=alNEHUpnCmM

rules are rarely enforced due to resource and capacity deficits, as well as political corruption and institutional bureaucracy.

> *"The written norms exist, but there is no authority for monitoring and enforcing compliance."*
>
> **- Association of San Salvador Municipalities (OPAMSS)**

In terms of public-sector DRR policy and planning efforts, Civil Protection, through its national emergency commission, oversees eight national-level technical commissions: Health, Security, Infrastructure and Basic Services, Shelters, Logistics, Emergency Services, Technology and Science, and International Humanitarian Assistance. Risk Atlases[2] from MARN are available to the public, though they need to be updated and made more easily accessible. MARN also produces daily and monthly seismic incident reports on their website and publishes annual risk and vulnerability reports. There remains a critical need for seismic microzonation data for updating building codes.

In terms of public financing for activities to reduce seismic risk and strengthen response capacity, the Fondo para La Prevencion de Desastres (FOPROMID)[3], a public entity, provides emergency funds for all disasters, and el Fondo para el Desarrollo Economico de los Municipios de El Salvador (FODES) empowers GoES to transfer 7% of the national budget to municipalities annually.

Rapid Damage Assessment – Though there have been several efforts since 2001 to develop and streamline an RDA tool at the operational level, none have been incorporated into the national emergency response plan or collectively applied during a response operation. There is no comprehensive RDA plan. The tools that do exist need to be complemented with operational protocols and user guides, both of which are currently in the initial stages of development by GoES and would benefit from PREPARE II support. Importantly, GoES has not yet assigned a lead agency to assess structural damages after a disaster.

[2] https://elsalvador.travel/es/nuestros-eventos/

[3] http://www.transparenciafiscal.gob.sv/downloads/pdf/DC4739_6_Instructivo_No_7011_Normas_especficas_para_el_manejo_del_FOPROMID.pdf

Respondents also noted that there is no master communications plan for first responders. Firefighters, the Red Cross and the Green Cross each have a communication plan but there is not a single, overarching communications framework or strategy that is uniformly applied during a disaster response situation.

> *"A geological map can determine layers and terrain characteristics. A geological engineer map can determine the mechanical properties of the terrain, and both can help to generate different seismic scenarios. A seismic map can establish possible scenarios. After every seismic event, it is very important to recalculate the information based on what was observed, so both maps need to be up-to-date to serve their purpose."*
>
> **- Universidad de El Salvador**

Debris Management – Respondents from MOP, MARN and PREPARE II stated that currently there are no policies, norms or standards specifically related to debris management after an earthquake. A legislative proposal currently pending approval on integrated waste management could eventually inform policies to address the management of construction-related debris. Although the proposal falls short on how to address the management of construction debris from collapsed buildings, it nonetheless represents a potential opportunity for PREPARE II to support GoES policy development in a critical area.

Urban Search and Rescue – Respondents note that since the 2001 earthquakes, San Salvador has made advances in preparing for and responding to earthquakes. Risk maps have been developed, regular evacuation drills take place in schools and public buildings, a National Earthquake Contingency Plan[4] has been developed, army barracks have been stocked with

> *"In Chirilagua we were disorganized…during the first two days there was no coordination at all – everyone was doing their own thing. For example, the Red Cross, Green Cross and firefighters were collecting information using different forms, as there was no standard form to capture building damage data. We need one standard form for homes and another standard form for larger buildings. The data on these forms is utilized for reconstruction and to distribute construction materials and to assign people to shelters."*
>
> ***- Ministerio de Obras Publicas***

[4] http://proteccioncivil.gob.sv/plan-nacional-de-terremotos/

water and non-perishable food, the fire department conducts regular building inspections and many buildings post evacuation routes. Another positive outcome of the enhanced DRR focus since 2001 has been the creation of a USAR group comprising 108 members. Currently the group is seeking GoES accreditation with capacity building support from USAID/OFDA through provision of training and equipment.

> *"Individuals who have been trained and are committed to participate in these activities have to look for a new job once a new government is elected to office."*
>
> **- Fire Department, San Salvador**

Despite these advances many gaps remain in first response capacity. For example, there is no master communication plan for USAR members, leading to inadequate coordination during emergencies. Moreover, the perception of most respondents was that coordination is too centralized and at times serves as an impediment to rapid and effective response. Frequent turnover of key government posts complicates matters. Response times for completing damage and needs assessments must be improved and there is need for enhanced coordination and logistical support from Civil Protection and other government institutions.

First responders emphasized that there is a great need for training on search and rescue techniques in collapsed structures, particularly instruction on tools and techniques for safe shoring. USAR respondents also stated there is urgent need for a firefighting academy and earthquake preparedness center serving the greater San Salvador Metropolitan Area. San Salvador would also benefit from professionalization of its fire department and the development of a career path for firefighters.

> *"Training in new technologies is needed; people are getting old and they are retiring and training plans need to be long-term and repetitive, and the training needs to include new technologies and training in the use of new equipment because equipment gets old pretty fast."*
>
> **- Fire Department, San Salvador**

Most respondents stated that there is little “seismic conscience” of the general population of San Salvador. Evacuation drills are facilitated for schools,[5] hospitals and public and private buildings, but little is done to educate the population at large about earthquake preparedness. One exception is the series of public service announcements titled “Aprendamos a Protegernos” produced by MARN and available on its website.[6]

> *“There is no formal, planned and consistent training. We have had some training and a Japanese consultant provided helped us put together a Guide to Earthquakes and Tsunamis. We have been given some forms and some workshops, but I must say that we never evaluated the quality of the workshop, nor do we follow up to see if knowledge has been retained.”*
>
> **- OPAMSS, San Salvador**

5 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lwokJgKVjZ4
6 http://www.marn.gob.sv/aprendamos-a-protegernos-terremotos

Zapopan, Mexico

Seismic Risk – High-risk zones in Zapopan are densely populated and, in many cases, overdeveloped. While there are established norms for land-use and development planning in Zapopan, enforcement of these norms is inadequate. Seismic risk atlases such as the Zonificación Sísmica de la Zona Metropolitana (microzonation maps) are not updated regularly. Building codes must also be updated to address the evolution of modern construction materials and techniques. Quality seismic-risk data is crucial to development of a legislative framework and public policy to strengthen earthquake preparedness and response capacity.

> *"We need to know where to shoot the marbles."*
>
> **- Instituto de Información Estadística y Geográfica (IEGG), Zapopan**

The National Center for the Prevention of Disasters (CENAPRED) has relatively little data on seismic vulnerability for Zapopan. Respondents echoed the need for expanded vulnerability assessments, such as the building surveys conducted by trained local engineers with PREPARE II support in late 2018. The University of Guadalajara cited the need for new seismic monitoring technologies, including high-precision geodesic GPSs, seismographs and accelerographs for high-rise buildings in the city center, as well as training in their use. Municipal authorities expressed the urgent need to incorporate vulnerability data into their land-use and development planning.[7] Similarly, USAR and other first responders underscored the need for data-driven seismic scenario planning to strengthen preparedness and response capacity.

A common sentiment among respondents was that the general population has little awareness or understanding of seismic risk and is not prepared for a major earthquake. The municipality has implemented campaigns to heighten public awareness of seismic risk (encouraging families to prepare go-bags with emergency items, for example) but with modest impact. Respondents from Civil Protection noted the need to strengthen public participation in national and municipal-level risk-reduction efforts for broader impact.

7 https://www.gob.mx/cenapred

Rapid Damage Assessment - While the municipality has emergency response plans and coordination protocols, a uniformly applied methodology or tool for conducting RDAs does not exist. USAR and other first responders also lack basic training in how to assess damaged or collapsed structures.

> *"Proteccion Civil is prepared, but the population at large is not; earthquake consciousness is mostly on first responders."*
>
> **- Instituto de Información Estadística y Geográfica (IEGG), Zapopan, Guadalajara**

Debris Management - There are no norms, guidelines or plans to manage debris from structural collapsed. Three debris deposit sites have been preliminarily identified but have not been incorporated into municipal risk atlases and there has been no effort to map and catalogue debris management resources. Some respondents stated that there are insufficient landfills to accommodate the amount of debris that would be generated by a large earthquake, citing the need for a debris management strategy with a focus on collection and disposal. Furthermore, existing legislation and norms related to building demolitions are lacking or inadequate and must be addressed in the context of a large-scale earthquake.

Urban Search and Rescue – Zapopan USAR is currently working toward national level accreditation by the Government of Mexico (GoM) despite existing resource and capacity gaps. Civil Protection expressed concern that the current composition of USAR teams in Zapopan was not adequate in terms of size or capacity to effectively respond to a major earthquake. Respondents also cited the need to standardize search and rescue procedures, particularly around structural damage assessments. As with USAR teams in San Salvador, training in collapsed structures was deemed crucial by almost all respondents.

Civil Protection noted the need for earthquake scenario planning so that USAR teams can better anticipate and prepare for the probable impact of a large earthquake. There is also recognition that emergency response agencies need to establish closer ties to the technical community in order to better understand and incorporate seismic risk data into emergency preparedness and response plans.

> *"A world apart. Before, it was romanticism, love, vocation and learning by doing. Now, there is more technical training, technical support and planning. Today, we have the same love, but now we are also methodical and professional."*
>
> ***- Civil Protection***

There is, nonetheless, a solid foundation and organizational culture on which to further strengthen USAR capacity in Zapopan. For

example, joint mobilization and coordination exercises have substantially enhanced collaboration among first responders. Staff from the Red Cross, Fire Department and Civil Protection have trained together extensively, including in OFDA-sponsored courses related to Incident Command Systems (known locally as SCI) and Risk Management Administrative Systems (BAGER). A strengthened Incident Command System has enabled USAR member institutions to act in a coordinated fashion in small-scale emergencies. Moreover, municipal authorities are fully engaged in emergency planning as well as knowledge sharing through its webpage.

4. PREPARE II PERFORMANCE BASELINE DATA INDICATORS AND TARGETS (SAN SALVADOR AND ZAPOPAN)

No.	Indicator	Detailed Definition	Unit of Measure	Data Sources	Frequency of Collection	Responsible	Target	Achieved
1.1	Number of hazard risk-reduction plans, strategies, policies, disaster, preparedness and contingency plans developed and in place	"Hazard risk-reduction plans, strategies, policies, disaster preparedness and contingency plans" refers to a broad range of documented policies, plans, strategies, tools and procedures related to preparedness for and response to earthquakes and related hazards, an individual policy, plan, strategy, tool or procedure (or significant component or element thereof) included once a stakeholder responsible for either its adoption or implementation begins the process of drafting a new (or modifying an existing) policy, plan, strategy, tool or procedure, after the project has provided technical assistance or facilitated discussion on that subject.	Number	National and municipal level partners	Quarterly	Miyamoto Program Manager	6	

No.	Indicator	Detailed Definition	Unit of Measure	Data Sources	Frequency of Collection	Responsible	Target	Achieved
1.2	Number of people participating in discussions regarding national risk-reduction	"People participating in discussions" includes all individuals attending meetings, conferences and other events supported by the project, which do not fall within the above definition of training. In other words, the focus is not on sharing technical information or skills, but rather on discussion or debate about new or existing risk-reduction strategies. "National risk-reduction strategies" refers to all measures (plans, policies, strategies, tools and procedures) related to preparedness for and response to earthquakes and other natural hazards in the targeted countries, including measures at municipal level. Representatives of the implementer and USAID are not counted. Individuals who participate in more than one event will be counted only once.	Number	Meeting records	Quarterly	Miyamoto Program Manager	80	

No.	Indicator	Detailed Definition	Unit of Measure	Data Sources	Frequency of Collection	Responsible	Target	Achieved
1.3	Number of communities and stakeholders involved in the development of plans, policies, and strategies	"Stakeholders involved in development of plans, policies and strategies" are defined as all entities that have sent a participant to at least one project-supported activity, where plans, policies, strategies, tools and procedures related to preparedness for and response to earthquakes and other natural hazards were discussed. The entities represented can be governmental (national, municipal or other level), academic (such as universities), commercial (businesses or corporations), professional (such as associations of engineers), or from first responders (such as the Red Cross). Stakeholders that participate in more than one activity will be counted only once.	Number	Project records of meetings and trainings	Quarterly	Miyamoto Program Manager	10	
1.4	National and local risk assessment, hazards data and vulnerability information is available within targeted areas (Y/N)	"Available" means that stakeholders working in the areas of risk assessment and management are aware of and able to access that information. The project aims to enhance quality and quantity of available information related to national and local risk assessments, hazards data and vulnerability. Assessments (new or updated) and other information products generated by the project will be listed under this indicator.	Y/N	Project reports, assessments and other documents	Annually	Miyamoto Program Manager	Y	

No.	Indicator	Detailed Definition	Unit of Measure	Data Sources	Frequency of Collection	Responsible	Target	Achieved
2.1	Number of people trained in disaster preparedness, mitigation and management disaggregated by sex	"People trained in disaster preparedness, mitigation and management" refers to all individuals attending activities where sharing of technical information and/or skills with participants is a significant element (including formal and informal training activities and other events that include one or more presentations of technical information), organized with project support, provided that the technical subject matter is related to disaster preparedness, mitigation and management. Representatives of the implementer and USAID are not counted. Individuals who participate in more than one activity will be counted only once.	Number	Project Training records	Quarterly	Miyamoto Program Manager	60	
2.2	Number of trainings conducted	"Trainings" refers to all activities organized with project support, where sharing of technical information and/or skills with participants is a significant element, including formal and informal training activities and other events that include one or more presentations of technical information. These are the same activities for which participants are counted for Indicator 3.1.	Number	Program records	Quarterly	Miyamoto Country Program Manager	6	

No.	Indicator	Detailed Definition	Unit of Measure	Data Sources	Frequency of Collection	Responsible	Target	Achieved
3.1	National and municipal risk management and response plans incorporating program best practices, strategies and tools	National and municipal risk management and response plans incorporating program best practices, strategies and tools.	Number	Program reports	Quarterly	Miyamoto Program Manager	3	
3.2	Public-private partnerships formalized through MOU, commitment letter or similar agreement mechanism.	Public-private partnerships formalized through MOU, commitment letter or similar agreement mechanism.	Number	Program reports	Quarterly	Miyamoto Program Manager	3	

ANNEX A

PREPARE II – Baseline – Group Interview Protocol

Ficha Tecnica

Country	**El Salvador**			
Date	10.29.2018			
Time	9:00 – 11:00AM			
Institution	Comité Asesor Técnico USAR (CATBRU)			
Sector	Publico		Privado	
Location	Ministerio de Gobernación			
Participant (s) name (s) and function	**Name**	**Function/Role**		
	Salvador Garcia	President		
	Mayor David Carpio	Team Leader USAR		

Interviewer & Interview Method	Carlos Torres – Group interview	
Comments	Complete attendance list with detail contact information and signatures – attached.	

INTRODUCTION

You have been selected to speak with me today because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about earthquake risk management and response capacity.

The primary goal of PREPARE II is to strengthen and institutionalize the risk management and response capacity of public disaster authorities and private-sector partners in earthquake-prone and highly vulnerable urban settings. In San Salvador (and Guadalajara) PREPARE II activities under the Capacity Building and Training Sector will be designed to strengthen the institutional capacities, resources and systems of government and private-sector partners for implementation of scalable RDA and DM systems, strategies and tools.

PURPOSE

The focus of this interview is on assessing the baseline conditions, so we can generate a monitoring and evaluation plan for technical and capacity building assistance here in San Salvador.

TIME

We have planned this interview to last no longer than ___ hour. During this time, we have several questions that I would like to cover.

INTERVIEWEE BACKGROUND QUESTION

Please tell me about CATBRU; purpose, functions, history	

PREGUNTAS – LINEA DE BASE

#	DIMENSION/PREGUNTAS EVALUATIVAS	Comentarios
	Manejo de riesgos de catástrofes y capacidad de respuesta del sector público y privado	
1	¿Cuáles han sido los avances para mejorar la recuperación y respuesta ante un desastre?	

	Capacitación	
2	¿Qué entrenamientos se han llevado a cabo a nivel nacional o municipal para promover mejores políticas y planes para la recuperación de desastres?	
3	¿Cuáles han sido esos entrenamientos?	
4	¿Cuáles instituciones u organizaciones están participando e invirtiendo en estas actividades?	
5	¿Cuáles son los obstáculos para atraer más instituciones a participar en estas actividades?	

	Apoyo económico	
6	¿Existe presupuesto para estas actividades?	
7	¿Es el presupuesto adecuado para lograr los resultados esperados?	
	Coordinación	
8	¿Ha habido coordinación entre los diferentes organismos de recuperación de desastres?	
9	¿Como ha sido la coordinación entre las diferentes actividades de recuperación de desastres?	

10	¿Cuál ha sido el papel del sector público y privado en la función de coordinación?	
11	¿Como ha sido esa coordinación?	
12	¿Puedes dar ejemplos de coordinación?	
13	¿Cuáles han sido los problemas de coordinación?	

14	Hasta este momento, ¿Ha sido Miyamoto International efectivo en encontrar colaboración y apoyo en los sectores público y privado?	
	Resultados	
15	¿Qué actividades apoyadas por OFDA están generando resultados? Puedes dar ejemplos.	
16	¿Qué medidas se deben implementar para asegurar que los resultados son sostenibles?	
17	En su totalidad, ¿esas actividades han contribuido a fortalecer la preparación y capacidad de respuesta a un terremoto?	

18	¿Hay datos? ¿Qué datos se necesitan?	
19	¿Como se podrían medir los resultados y las relaciones en el futuro inmediato?	
20	¿Existen algunos ejercicios de evaluación que puedan demostrarlo?	

OTHER TOPICS DISCUSSED, IF ANY	
POST INTERVIEW COMMENTS OR LEADS	

DOCUMENTS OBTAINED, IF ANY	

ANNEX B

PREPARE II – Baseline KII

Ficha Técnica

Country	**El Salvador**			
Date	10.30.2018			
Time	02:00-3:00PM			
Institution	Alcaldía de San Salvador			
Location	Alcaldía			
Sector	Publico		Privado	
Participant (s) name (s) and function	**Name**		**Function/Role**	
	Alexander Zamora -		Jefe de Protección Civil Municipal	
Interviewer & Interview Methodology	Carlos Torres – Single Key Informant Interview			

Comments	Complete attendance list with detail contact information and signatures – attached.

INTRODUCTION

You have been selected to speak with me today because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about earthquake risk management and response capacity.

The primary goal of PREPARE II is to strengthen and institutionalize the risk management and response capacity of public disaster authorities and private-sector partners in earthquake-prone and highly vulnerable urban settings. In San Salvador (and Guadalajara) PREPARE II activities under the Capacity Building and Training Sector will be designed to strengthen the institutional capacities, resources and systems of government and private-sector partners for implementation of scalable RDA and DM systems, strategies and tools.

PURPOSE

The focus of this interview is on assessing the baseline conditions, so we can generate a monitoring and evaluation plan for technical and capacity building assistance here in San Salvador.

TIME

We have planned this interview to last no longer than ___ hour. During this time, we have several questions that I would like to cover.

#	DIMENSION/PREGUNTAS EVALUATIVAS	Comentarios
	Manejo de riesgos de catástrofes y capacidad de respuesta del sector público y privado	

1	¿Cuáles han sido los avances para mejorar la recuperación y respuesta ante un desastre?	
	Capacitación	
2	¿Qué entrenamientos se han llevado a cabo a nivel nacional o municipal para promover mejores políticas y planes para la recuperación de desastres?	
3	¿Cuáles han sido esos entrenamientos?	
4	¿Cuáles instituciones u organizaciones están participando e invirtiendo en estas actividades?	
5	¿Cuáles son los obstáculos para atraer más instituciones a participar en estas actividades?	
	Apoyo económico	
6	¿Existe presupuesto para estas actividades?	
7	¿Es el presupuesto adecuado para lograr los resultados esperados?	

	Coordinación	
8	¿Ha habido coordinación entre los diferentes organismos de recuperación de desastres?	
9	¿Como ha sido la coordinación entre las diferentes actividades de recuperación de desastres?	
10	¿Cuál ha sido el papel del sector público y privado en la función de coordinación?	
11	¿Como ha sido esa coordinación?	
12	¿Puedes dar ejemplos de coordinación?	
13	¿Cuáles han sido los problemas de coordinación?	
14	Hasta este momento, ¿Ha sido Miyamoto International efectivo en encontrar colaboración y apoyo en los sectores público y privado?	
	Resultados	
15	¿Qué actividades apoyadas por OFDA están generando resultados? Puedes dar ejemplos.	

16	¿Qué medidas se deben implementar para asegurar que los resultados son sostenibles?	
17	En su totalidad, ¿esas actividades han contribuido a fortalecer la preparación y capacidad de respuesta a un terremoto?	
18	¿Hay datos? ¿Qué datos se necesitan?	
19	¿Como se podrían medir los resultados y las relaciones en el futuro inmediato?	
20	¿Existen algunos ejercicios de evaluación que puedan demostrarlo?	

OTHER TOPICS DISCUSSED, IF ANY	
POST INTERVIEW COMMENTS OR LEADS	
DOCUMENTS OBTAINED, IF ANY	