**July 11, 2019**

**FY18 REACH and Impact PIIRS DATA: What can we learn on Resilience and Resilience Marker?**

1. Overall agreement that **the questions that are asked in the marker are the right ones**. They are accurate and cover the right elements to assess resilience.
2. **Appreciation of the vetting form from COs**: The vetting form allows for documenting discussions, deliberations and some actions to be taken based on the scoring in the marker
3. **Need to invest more on unpacking the data and discussing it with regions, countries and technical teams.** Examples
   1. What does it mean to see that economic shocks and social shocks are the most prominent ones?
   2. What are the connections of the resilience marker data with other markers?
4. **What advice the CCRP provides on making more structured follow-up to marker results every year** (what should countries/regions do in between two marker assessments?)

Some ideas

* 1. Focus on top 5 or top bottom projects/scores
  2. Focus on specific thematic areas (e.g. advocacy)
  3. Ask projects to summarize action points from the vetting forms and follow up on a number of them during the FY
  4. Present key “areas of attention” to regional teams, for them to follow up with countries during a FY

1. **Suggestion of adjustment to the marker:** Can the questions refer to “all relevant shocks and stresses” instead of “the top 3 shocks and stresses”? Having the questions referring to 3 shocks has been challenging for some teams, when they don’t have more than 2 shocks.
2. **Targets for the resilience marker?** Do we need to set up targets for the next FYs? Or define a marker score threshold for projects?