



## Humanitarian Aid Decision

23 02 02

Title: Third DIPECHO Action Plan for Central Asia

Location of operation: Central Asia (Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan)

Amount of decision: EUR 3,500,000

Decision reference number: ECHO/DIP/BUD/2005/01000

---

### **Explanatory Memorandum**

#### **1 - Rationale, needs and target population:**

##### **1.1. - Rationale:**

In 1996 the European Commission, through DG ECHO, created its disaster preparedness programme, DIPECHO, to address Article 2F of Council Regulation 1257/96<sup>1</sup> concerning the need to ensure preparedness for risks of natural disasters in humanitarian aid operations. At the 2005 World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR)<sup>2</sup>, the international community developed the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015<sup>3</sup>. Building on the lessons learned and gaps identified by the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World<sup>4</sup>, the WCDR adopted five priority points for action - making disaster risk reduction a national and local priority; identifying, assessing and monitoring disaster risks and enhancing early warning; building a culture of safety and resilience through using knowledge, innovation and education; reducing underlying risk factors; and strengthening disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels. The DIPECHO programme continues to contribute to these five priority areas.

The Central Asia region<sup>5</sup> is particularly vulnerable to natural disasters, the main hazards being floods, earthquakes, landslides, avalanches and drought. As such, ECHO has been contributing to disaster preparedness and prevention activities in the region since 1995 through the mainstreaming of disaster preparedness into relief operations, and more recently through the First<sup>6</sup> (2003) and Second<sup>7</sup> (2004) DIPECHO Action Plans for Central Asia. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1257/96 of 20 June 1996 concerning humanitarian aid. OJ L 163 , 02/07/1999 P. 0001 - 0006

<sup>2</sup> WCDR – held in Kobe, Japan from 18 – 22 January 2005, was facilitated by the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR).

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.unisdr.org/wcdr/official-doc/L-docs/OUTCOME-FINAL-as-separate-non-official-document.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about\\_isdr/bd-yokohama-strat-eng.htm](http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about_isdr/bd-yokohama-strat-eng.htm)

<sup>5</sup> Consisting of the Republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan

<sup>6</sup> Humanitarian Aid Decision ECHO/TPS/219/2003/01000 : First DIPECHO Action Plan for Central Asia for EUR 3,000,000

objectives of these Action Plans were to strengthen the capacity of local actors to predict, respond to and cope with disasters and to protect vulnerable groups from likely natural disasters through small scale infrastructure works. 10 projects were completed under the First Action Plan, and a further 10 are ongoing under the Second Action Plan, sharing the same objectives and building on the achievements of the first. These two Action Plans have been particularly successful in reducing the risk to human life and capital from natural disasters in Central Asia. They are also economical in terms of the number of beneficiaries that participate in, or benefit indirectly from, disaster prevention and preparedness activities<sup>8</sup>.

In 2003, ECHO commissioned an “Overall Evaluation of ECHO’s Strategic Orientation to Disaster Reduction<sup>9</sup>”. This report produced a global model of Disaster Risk Indicators (DRI), which identified Tajikistan as being of high priority, Uzbekistan as being medium priority and Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan as being of low priority. On a sub-national scale, however, ECHO has found that priorities in southern Kyrgyzstan are similar to those of Uzbekistan, which has been acknowledged in previous funding decisions. Furthermore, the Ferghana Valley, a region which stretches across Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, shares a common disaster risk configuration.

ECHO humanitarian operations in Central Asia have been primarily focused on Tajikistan where, following civil war and drought, it has been continuously active since 1992. As the general situation has improved in Tajikistan, ECHO has commenced a 3-year phasing out of operations, fully in line with the Commission’s strategy to link rehabilitation to longer term relief and development (LRRD). However, despite the improvements in the political and economic situation in Tajikistan, the country remains particularly vulnerable due to its high exposure to natural disasters and poor coping capacity. This was evident in July 2004 when heavy flooding and mudslides north of the capital, Dushanbe, resulted in damage to infrastructure and the contamination of much of the city’s drinking water supply<sup>10</sup>. More recently, in February 2005 heavy snowfalls and avalanches across both Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan contributed to loss of life and damage to buildings as local emergency services struggled to cope.

Disaster Reduction therefore has a role to play in the LRRD process as Tajikistan, and Central Asia more widely, moves from a humanitarian to a development setting. The 2003 Overall Evaluation of ECHO’s Strategic Orientation to Disaster Reduction notes that ‘...as long as it is not acknowledged that Disaster Reduction is also a strategic sectoral variable in the development processes, such as for rural development or poverty alleviation, LRRD will not be fully achieved<sup>11</sup>’.

---

<sup>7</sup> Humanitarian Aid Decision ECHO/DIP/BUD/2004/01000 : Second DIPECHO Action Plan for Central Asia for EUR 2,500,000

<sup>8</sup> Over the first and second Action Plans there has been an estimated 2.4 million beneficiaries (EUR 2.30 per beneficiary)

<sup>9</sup> ‘Overall Evaluation of ECHO’s Strategic Orientation to Disaster Reduction’, Consultants Transtec, SHER, IDRM, theNRgroup, December 2003

<sup>10</sup> ECHO responded with Emergency Humanitarian Aid Decision ECHO/TJK/BUD/2004/02000 for EUR 350,000 : Humanitarian Aid in favour of the population of Tajikistan affected by floods and landslides

<sup>11</sup> Page 5, Executive Summary

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/pdf\\_files/evaluation/2003/disaster\\_exec\\_summary.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/pdf_files/evaluation/2003/disaster_exec_summary.pdf)

## 1.2. - Identified needs:

Between 1992 and 2005 some 2,600 people were killed, 130,000 made homeless, and a further 5.5 million (9.5% of the total population) affected by natural disasters in Central Asia<sup>12</sup>.

**Tajikistan** is the most affected country in Central Asia in terms of the number of disasters, level of damage and loss of life. From 1992 to 2005, there have been 2003 deaths, 71,137 made homeless and 3,426,539 people affected by natural disasters<sup>13</sup>. The country has been identified in the 2003 ECHO evaluation's DRI as being of High priority. 2001 saw the worst drought in 75 years, and the country depends on import of food for sufficiency, despite improved harvests in more recent years. Floods have been more devastating in terms of lives lost, particularly in valleys in the mountainous parts of the country. Flash flood risks exist in the upper reaches of some valleys. The most frequent causes of localized damage are mud and landslides, where over 170 dangerous sites have been identified. The government has adopted a policy of resettlement of people exposed to such hazards, but few families have moved. Tajikistan is permanently threatened by several potential large-scale natural disasters such as flooding from Lake Sarez<sup>14</sup> or extensive damage to the capital Dushanbe by an earthquake. Earthquake represents a substantial, ever-present threat in many parts of the country and to a high proportion of the population. Seismic studies and monitoring have been partly disrupted since independence.

Tajikistan is also regularly affected by epidemic outbreaks of infectious diseases (203 deaths and 19,574 people affected by epidemic between 1992 and 2005). Epidemics can be brought about by other natural disasters, such as flooding and mudslides which can pollute drinking water supply. Although health is not always an obvious component of disaster preparedness, in Tajikistan the total absence of co-ordination mechanisms, analysis and prevention, combined with high effects of recurrent small scale disasters within communities, place this dilapidated sector at the core of many interventions.

Since gaining independence in 1991, Tajikistan has suffered economic collapse (83% of the population currently live below the poverty line), drought and civil war. These factors combined with systemic weaknesses in government structures have left most of the country without appropriate disaster preparedness and response mechanisms. Existing legislation envisages a response at village, district or regional level for all but the biggest disasters. In reality however, the response structures at all three levels lack the necessary equipment and skills. Many communities either ignore or are unaware of the threats facing them. In addition, 93% of Tajik territory is mountainous, making communication and access an ongoing problem.

**Uzbekistan** was given a Medium priority by the 2003 ECHO evaluation's DRI due to its high earthquake risk and high level of vulnerability. Uzbekistan experiences significant seismic activity that dominates much of the country. In 1966, a large earthquake destroyed large parts of the capital Tashkent, the largest city in Central Asia with a population of some 2.2 million. In 2002 the Ferghana region also suffered significant earthquake and flood damage. Drought also affected the county's northwest in 2001 and 2002.

---

<sup>12</sup> Source : EM-DAT The OFDA/CRED International Disaster Database <http://www.em-dat.net/>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.em-dat.net/disasters/Visualisation/profiles/natural-table-emdat.php?country=Tajikistan&Submit=Display+Country+Profile>

<sup>14</sup> Should the natural dam which forms the lake burst, the flood generated could affect up to 5 million people living along the rivers which traverse Tajikistan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan.

The Aral Sea in the Karakalpakstan region remains the biggest natural disaster in Uzbekistan since 1990<sup>15</sup>. Soviet era irrigation for growing rice and cotton led to a drop of more than 90% of the natural flow of water into the Aral Sea. This has resulted in about a 60% reduction in water volume, leading to desertification, air pollution, rising salinity and a total collapse in the fishing industry. Should a drought occur, the impact would be exacerbated by the Aral Sea crisis.

**Kyrgyzstan** was identified by the 2003 ECHO evaluation's DRI as having low priority, but earthquake exposure is particularly high. This is another poor and highly mountainous country, characterised by frequent small or mid-scale disasters, low levels of awareness and preparedness and inadequate response capacity, in particular in southern parts of the country. Between 1992 and 2004 there were 341 deaths, 54,451 people made homeless, and a further 205,911 affected by natural disasters. Kyrgyzstan is exposed to a range of potential disasters including earthquakes, landslides, mudflows, floods, avalanches, snowfalls, spring frosts, caused by complex geo-climatic conditions and is vulnerable due to its economic difficulties. Furthermore, Kyrgyzstan is exposed to technological hazards brought about by uranium tailings lying in areas at high risk from natural hazards<sup>16</sup>.

**Turkmenistan** and **Kazakhstan** both have a low DRI under the 2003 ECHO evaluation. Of the five Central Asian countries, these are considered best placed to respond to a natural disaster without the need for external assistance. Earthquake threat to the 1.5 million inhabitants of Almaty, Kazakhstan, does, however, remain ever-present.

Some co-operation mechanisms at regional level exist, with regional plans, exercises and programmes, and there is also a regional platform being set up with the support of UN ISDR. However, there is tremendous scope for improvement of regional co-operation.

### 1.3. - Target population and regions concerned:

The Third DIPECHO Action Plan will focus on local communities that are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of natural disasters in the following regions:

Tajikistan: Rayons of Republican Subordination, Sughd, Gorno Badakshan Autonomous Oblast, Khatlon.

Kyrgyzstan: Osh, Djalal-Abad, Batken, Issyk-Kul.

Uzbekistan: Andijan, Ferghana, Kashkadarya, Khorzem, Namangan, Navoi, Samarkand, Surkhandarya, Tashkent.

It is estimated that there will be some 1.7 million beneficiaries from this Action Plan.

### 1.4. - Risk assessment and possible constraints:

A major natural disaster or renewed armed conflict in the region might necessitate the diversion of resources to the delivery of emergency humanitarian assistance and/or the suspension of DIPECHO projects. Renewed conflict appears unlikely, but political tensions could resurface anytime and anywhere throughout the region. In March 2005, protests following the Kyrgyzstan elections culminated in violent clashes and the ousting of the incumbent President. It is possible that such tensions could occur in neighbouring Central Asian countries. Recent developments in Uzbekistan have confirmed these risks. The violent clashes in Andijan and other parts of the Ferghana Valley on 13 May 2005 have shown that the domestic situation in Uzbekistan is far from stable and that instability might increase and

---

<sup>15</sup> Kazakhstan also experiences similar problems relating to the shrinking of the Aral Sea.

<sup>16</sup> Mailuu-Suu area, southern Kyrgyzstan.

spill over into neighbouring republics. Epidemic outbreaks of infectious diseases could also call for a diversion of resources or deprive certain operations of key personnel<sup>17</sup>.

All operations will depend on some degree of cooperation with local communities, local authorities and/or other international actors. Relations between Tajik, Uzbek and Kyrgyz communities living in the Ferghana Valley remain strained and there are many problems at borders, or with border policy, that frequently lead to closures as a consequence. This may hinder the trans-border aspect of the planned operations in that region.

Most of the prospective partners have been working in the target areas for many years and have therefore developed constructive working relationships with the local communities. Most partners envisage making DP work an integral part of their broader community development, thus encouraging more sustainable outcomes.

## **2- Objectives and components of the humanitarian intervention proposed<sup>18</sup>:**

### **2.1. – Objectives:**

Principal objective :

To improve living conditions and save and preserve lives in Central Asia by reducing the impact of natural disasters.

Specific objectives :

To strengthen the capacity of local communities to predict, provide early warning, respond to and cope with disasters and to protect vulnerable groups from likely natural disasters through small scale infrastructure works.

### **2.2. - Components:**

#### **2.2.1.Strengthening local predictive, response and coping capacities**

- Draw up local disaster management plans that include a hazard and vulnerability assessment, preventive and response measures and the identification of roles and responsibilities of key actors;

---

<sup>17</sup> Malaria is now thought to be endemic in large areas of Tajikistan and new epidemics are taking place in low-lying areas, particularly in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz border regions of the Ferghana Valley.

<sup>18</sup> Grants for the implementation of humanitarian aid within the meaning of Council Regulation (EC) No.1257/96 of 20 June 1996 concerning humanitarian aid are awarded in accordance with the Financial Regulation, in particular Article 110 thereof, and its Implementing Rules in particular Article 168 thereof (Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002 of 25 June 2002, OJ L248 of 16/09/2002 and No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002, OJ L 357 of 31/12/2002).

Rate of financing: In accordance with Article 169 of the Financial Regulation, grants for the implementation of this Decision may finance 100% of the costs of an action.

Humanitarian aid operations funded by the Commission are implemented by NGOs and the Red Cross organisations on the basis of Framework Partnership Agreements (FPA) (in conformity with Article 163 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation) and by United Nations agencies based on the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA). The standards and criteria established in Echo's standard Framework Partnership Agreement to which NGO's and International organisations have to adhere and the procedures and criteria needed to become a partner may be found at

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/partners/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/partners/index_en.htm)

- Establish early warning systems;
- Train and equip rapid response, search and rescue and medical teams;
- Trainer programmes to promote sustainability of disaster management capacities;
- Develop curricula on safe construction practices and train communities in these practices;
- Conduct simulation exercises;
- Improve radio communication systems in remote areas;
- Coordinate disaster planning with relevant regional and national authorities and establish clear channels of communication with them;
- Develop database tools and systems and train the relevant persons and institutions in these tools;
- Conduct public awareness campaigns using leaflets, brochures, workshops and radio and television programmes;
- Share key lessons learned between districts, regions and countries;
- Ensure broad participation of target groups in project conception and implementation of activities relating to 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.

#### 2.2.2. Protecting vulnerable groups

- Construct anti-avalanche, anti-rockfall, anti-mudslide and anti-flood protection barriers;
- Clean and rehabilitate mudslide and flood channels;
- Reinforce landslide-prone slopes through tree planting;
- Strengthen beds and banks of flood-prone rivers;
- Implement structural mitigation (anti-earthquake) demonstration projects;
- Develop and encourage the use of safe and low-cost construction practices.

The proposed activities of most potential partners will contribute to both specific objectives. In Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, the National Red Crescent Societies and the Ministries of Emergency Situations will be highly involved in the operations. A series of local institutes, government structures and NGOs will also be co-implementing partners or direct recipients of the projects.

### **3 - Duration foreseen for actions within the framework of the proposed decision:**

Taking into account the fact that winters in Tajikistan are usually very harsh and often interfere with the planned implementation of humanitarian operations, operations may start at different moments in time. Moreover, some partners operating in remote areas may require additional time to complete their work. The period for the execution of this decision will therefore be 18 months. Humanitarian operations funded by this decision must be implemented within this period.

Expenditure under this Decision shall be eligible from 01/08/2005. This start date has been selected to ensure a level of continuity between the second and third Central Asia Action Plans.

If the implementation of the actions envisaged in this Decision is suspended due to *force majeure* or any comparable circumstance, the period of suspension will not be taken into account for the calculation of the duration of the decision.

Depending on the evolution of the situation in the field, the Commission reserves the right to terminate the agreements signed with the implementing humanitarian organisations where the suspension of activities is for a period of more than one third of the total planned duration of



the action. In this respect, the procedures established in the general conditions of the specific agreement will be applied.

#### 4 –Previous interventions/Decisions of the Commission within the context of the crisis concerned herewith

List of previous DIPECHO operations in CENTRAL ASIA				
Decision number	Decision type	2003 EUR	2004 EUR	2005 EUR
ECHO/DIP/BUD/2004/01000	Ad Hoc		2,500,000	
ECHO/TPS/219/2003/01000	Ad Hoc	3,000,000		
Subtotal		3,000,000	2,500,000	0
Total (2003)+(2004)+(2005)				5,500,000

Dated : 18/05/2005  
Source : HOPE

## 5 - Other donors and donor co-ordination mechanisms

### 5.1. Other Commission instruments

In line with ECHO's strategy of mainstreaming Disaster Preparedness (DP) activities wherever possible, some operations under the current 2004-2005 Decision and the proposed 2005-2006 Decision for Tajikistan contain DP elements (food-for-work, cash-for-work and income-generation activities, education schemes, surveillance systems). There will be no overlap with these actions and partners are encouraged through DIPECHO to complement their mainstreaming activities wherever possible.

The 2005-2006 TACIS Indicative Programme for Central Asia does not envisage any direct DP activities. ECHO shares information about its DP work with RELEX and AIDCO and will continue to explore ways in which future EC assistance might address DP needs, for instance through complementarity of interventions within the Poverty Alleviation component of the TACIS programme, currently piloted in the Ferghana valley (Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and northern Tajikistan) and the Khatlon region in Tajikistan. The NGO component of the Food Security Programme also indirectly addresses DP issues, through encouragement to better use land, avoid degradation and erosion schemes, or through sustainable rehabilitation of irrigation systems. Since some of the agencies funded or potentially funded through both TACIS and the FSP work directly with ECHO or in close contact with ECHO partners, there is good ground for synergies.

A TACIS project under the Policy Advice Programme is being considered in Kyrgyzstan, in order to complement large scale World Bank and ADB projects on disaster impact reduction in the Mailuu-Suu area, where uranium tailings located in landslip zones close to important waterways are putting at risk populations along the Ferghana Valley in Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan.<sup>19</sup> The TACIS project, if approved, would support the Kyrgyz Ministry of Ecology and Emergency Situations with training of technical specialists.

## **5.2. Member States**

The Federal Republic of Germany has been funding some activities in DP, in particular in the Sughd region, and has been supporting a DIPECHO partner in the Rasht valley with food-for-work. Luxembourg has also recently started funding flood prevention work in Tajikistan.

## **5.3 Other DP actors in the region**

Tajikistan has a Rapid Emergency Assessment and Coordination Team (REACT) chaired by the Ministry of Emergency Situations and supported by the UN Disaster Management unit. It involves key international, government and non-state organisations dealing with disaster preparedness and response. REACT's primary task is to ensure the rapid deployment of a joint assessment team to the site of natural or man-made disasters, although the group was expanded to DIPECHO partners and other agencies in order to address disaster reduction issues. A regional REACT team also came into existence in 2004 to co-ordinate rapid reaction in the Rasht Valley. Several REACT members are among the potential partners listed in this text. ECHO is in regular contact with the UN Disaster Management Unit and the ISDR representative, other donors (German Embassy, SDC, CIDA, USAID, Asian Development Bank, Japanese Government) and other key government (Ministries of Emergency Situations, Ministry of Health) and international and non-government actors (National Red Crescent Societies, UN Agencies) about DP issues.

In particular, the Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation (SDC) has produced a 2004-2008 Disaster Reduction Strategy for Central Asia<sup>20</sup>, also focusing on Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. The annual budget over the 5 year period is around USD 1.1 million. Around 50% of this amount will be allocated to capacity building, 20% for disaster awareness-raising and 30% for risk assessment and risk reduction. USAID is funding the three-year initiative Central Asia Region – Earthquake Safety Initiative (CAR-ESI) in Almaty, Tashkent and Dushanbe, due to finish in September 2005. All DIPECHO partners and the ECHO Dushanbe office work closely with these initiatives to avoid duplication and promote synergies wherever possible.

In Kyrgyzstan, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank have developed programmes on Disaster Hazard Mitigation and Reducing Vulnerability of the Poor to Disasters.

---

<sup>19</sup> Reducing Vulnerability of the Poor to Natural Disasters in Kyrgyz Republic, grant from the Japan Fund for Poverty reduction, Asian Development Bank, September 2004  
<http://www.adb.org/Documents/JFPRs/KGZ/jfpr-KGZ-38047.pdf>  
Disaster Hazard Mitigation Project, World Bank.  
<http://web.worldbank.org/external/projects/main?pagePK=104231&piPK=73230&theSitePK=40941&menuPK=228424&Projectid=P083235>  
<http://inweb18.worldbank.org/ECA/ECSSD.nsf/ExtECADocbyUnid/2F4DD0088206262A85256DF60080C4FB?Opendocument>

<sup>20</sup> [http://www.deza.ch/ressources/product\\_40\\_en\\_1278.pdf](http://www.deza.ch/ressources/product_40_en_1278.pdf)



Donors in the last 12 months					
1. EU Members States (*)		2. European Commission		3. Others	
	EUR		EUR		EUR
Austria	0	ECHO	0	SDC**	1100000
Belgium	0	Other services			
Denmark	0				
Finland	0				
France	0				
Germany	176615				
Greece	0				
Ireland	0				
Italy	0				
Luxembourg	155550				
Netherlands	0				
Portugal	0				
Spain	0				
Sweden	0				
United Kingdom	0				
Subtotal	332165	Subtotal	0	Subtotal	1100000
		Grand total	1432165		

Dated : 18/05/2005

(\*) Source : ECHO 14 Points reporting for Members States. <https://hac.cec.eu.int>  
Empty cells means either no information is available or no contribution.

\*\* Swiss agency for Development and Co-operation

## 6 –Amount of decision and distribution by specific objectives:

6.1. - Total amount of the decision: EUR 3,500,000

## 6.2. - Budget breakdown by specific objectives

<b>Principal objective:</b> <i>To reduce the impact of natural disasters by strengthening the relevant local physical and human resources in high-risk areas</i>				
<b>Specific objectives</b>	<b>Allocated amount by specific objective (EUR)</b>	<b>Possible geographical area of operation</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Potential partners<sup>21</sup></b>
Specific objective 1: To strengthen the capacity of local communities to predict, provide early warning, respond to and cope with disasters and to protect vulnerable groups from likely natural disasters through small scale infrastructure works.	3,500,000	Tajikistan (all districts), Uzbekistan (9 districts), Kyrgyzstan (4 districts)	Local capacity-building and training; advocacy and public awareness-raising; small-scale mitigation works; mapping, data computerisation and information management; education activities aiming at creating a “culture of prevention”; early-warning systems; institutional strengthening; research and dissemination; facilitation of co-ordination; development of disaster management infrastructure.	- ACTED - AGA KHAN - CARE NEDERLAND - CHRISTIAN AID – UK - CROIX-- ROUGE - DNK - CROIX-ROUGE - NLD - GERMAN AGRO ACTION - HILFSWERK AUSTRIA - IOM - MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND - MERLIN - MISSION OST - DNK - OXFAM - UK - UN - UNDP - BEL - UN - UNOCHA - WHO - OMS
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,500,000</b>			

<sup>21</sup> AGA KHAN FOUNDATION (United Kingdom), AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR), CHRISTIAN AID (GBR), DANSK RODE KORS, (DNK), DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU), HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS (NLD), HILFSWERK AUSTRIA, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT), MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR), MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND (GBR), OXFAM (GB), Stichting CARE Nederland, UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS, UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME, WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE

## 7 –Evaluation

Under article 18 of Council Regulation (EC) No.1257/96 of 20 June 1996 concerning humanitarian aid the Commission is required to "regularly assess humanitarian aid operations financed by the Community in order to establish whether they have achieved their objectives and to produce guidelines for improving the effectiveness of subsequent operations." These evaluations are structured and organised in overarching and cross cutting issues forming part of ECHO's Annual Strategy such as child-related issues, the security of relief workers, respect for human rights, gender. Each year, an indicative Evaluation Programme is established after a consultative process. This programme is flexible and can be adapted to include evaluations not foreseen in the initial programme, in response to particular events or changing circumstances. More information can be obtained at:

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/evaluation/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/evaluation/index_en.htm).

## 8 –Budget Impact article 23 02 02

	CE (in EUR)
Initial Available Appropriations for 2005	12.500.000
Supplementary Budgets	
Transfers	3.500.000
<b>Total Available Credits</b>	<b>16.000.000</b>
Total executed to date (by 01/06/2005)	0
Available remaining	<b>16.000.000</b>
<b>Total amount of the Decision</b>	<b>3,500,000</b>

## COMMISSION DECISION

of

**on the financing of humanitarian operations from the general budget of the European Union in  
Central Asia (DIPECHO)**

### THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,  
Having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No.1257/96 of 20 June 1996 concerning humanitarian aid<sup>22</sup>, and in particular Article 15(2) thereof,

Whereas:

- (1) Central Asia regularly experiences a wide range of natural disasters and in particular landslides, mudslides, floods and earthquakes,
- (2) Disaster Preparedness in Central Asia, and Tajikistan in particular, is complementary to the process of linking relief to rehabilitation and development (LRRD).
- (3) In Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan in particular, vulnerable communities and the local, regional and national authorities are ill-prepared and ill-equipped to cope with these disasters,
- (4) These countries largely rely on international assistance rather than promote preparedness activities,
- (5) An assessment of the humanitarian situation leads to the conclusion that humanitarian aid operations should be financed by the Community for a period of 18 months.
- (6) It is estimated that an amount of EUR 3,500,000 from budget line 23 02 02 of the 2005 general budget of the European Union is necessary to provide humanitarian assistance for the vulnerable populations of Central Asia, taking into account the available budget, other donors' interventions and other factors.
- (7) In accordance with Article 17 (3) of Regulation (EC) No.1257/96 the Humanitarian Aid Committee gave a favourable opinion on **14 July 2005**.

HAS DECIDED AS FOLLOWS:

#### *Article 1*

1. In accordance with the objectives and general principles of humanitarian aid, the Commission hereby approves a total amount of EUR 3,500,000 for humanitarian aid operations under the Third DIPECHO Action Plan for Central Asia by using line 23 02 02 of the 2005 general budget of the European Union.

---

<sup>22</sup> OJ L 163, 2.7.1996, p. 1-6

2. In accordance with Article 2(f) of Regulation (EC) No.1257/96, the humanitarian operations shall be implemented in the pursuance of the following specific objectives:
  - To strengthen the capacity of local communities to predict, provide early warning, respond to and cope with disasters and to protect vulnerable groups from likely natural disasters through small scale infrastructure works.

#### *Article 2*

1. The duration for the implementation of this Decision shall be for a maximum period of 18 months, starting on 1 August 2005.
2. Expenditure under this Decision shall be eligible from 1 August 2005.
3. If the operations envisaged in this Decision are suspended owing to *force majeure* or comparable circumstances, the period of suspension shall not be taken into account for the calculation of the duration of the implementation of this Decision

#### *Article 3*

This Decision shall take effect on the date of its adoption.

Done at Brussels,

*For the Commission*

*Member of the Commission*