

COMMISSION DECISION  
of  
on the financing of humanitarian operations from the general budget of the European  
Communities in  
Central America<sup>1</sup> (Dipecho)<sup>2</sup>

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>3</sup>, and in particular Articles 2(f) and 15(2) thereof:

Whereas:

- (1) Central America is one of the most disaster prone regions in the world, in terms of recurrence of hazards and their severity and scope, particularly floods, flash floods, cyclones, landslides, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, droughts and forest fires.
- (2) Local communities are particularly vulnerable to all these disasters, and the losses they cause are significant both in social and economic terms.
- (3) The capacities of Central American countries to cope with the disasters are insufficient considering the great impact of disaster events on the population and international interventions are needed to support preparedness and small-scale mitigation actions.
- (4) These countries currently rely on international assistance to promote disaster risk reduction, risk management and preparedness activities;
- (5) Experience from the previous five DIPECHO Action Plans implemented in the region as well as from national and regional consultations lead to the conclusion that the type of activities financed by DIPECHO are more effective when implemented within a period of 18 months.
- (6) It is estimated that an amount of EUR 10,000,000 from budget line 23 02 03 of the 2008 general budget of the European Communities is necessary to provide disaster preparedness activities (including public awareness measures) taking into account the available budget, other donors' interventions and other factors.
- (7) Notwithstanding the implementation period laid down in Article 3, and the conditionality of this Decision upon the availability of funds laid down in Article 4, it is necessary to adopt it without delay with a view to launch the calls for proposals required for its implementation;
- (8) The present Decision constitutes a financing Decision within the meaning of Article 75 of the Financial Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002<sup>4</sup>, Article 90 of the detailed rules for the implementation of the Financial Regulation determined by

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this Decision the Central America countries involved are: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama.

<sup>2</sup> "Disaster Preparedness ECHO"; the European Commission's disaster preparedness programme in the framework of humanitarian aid, implemented by the Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid- ECHO

<sup>3</sup> OJ L 163, 2.7.1996, p. 1-6

<sup>4</sup> OJ L 248, 16.9.2002, p.1. Regulation as last amended by Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1995/2006, OJ L 390, 30.12.2006, p.1

Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 2342/2002<sup>5</sup>, and Article 15 of the internal rules on the implementation of the general budget of the European Communities<sup>6</sup>.

- (9) In accordance with Article 17(3) of Regulation (EC) No. 1257/96, the HAC gave a favourable opinion on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2008.

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 10,000,000 for humanitarian aid operations undertaken in the framework of the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America by using line 23 02 03 of the 2008 general budget of the European Communities.
2. In accordance with Article 2(f) of Council Regulation No.1257/96, the humanitarian operations shall be implemented in the pursuance of the following specific objective:

To support strategies that enable local communities and institutions to better prepare for, mitigate and respond adequately to natural disasters by enhancing their capacities to cope and respond, thereby increasing resilience and reducing vulnerability.

The total amount of this Decision is allocated to this objective.

*Article 2*

1. The duration for the implementation of this Decision shall be for a maximum period of 18 months, starting on 1 September 2008.
2. Expenditure under this Decision shall be eligible from 1 September 2008.
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*

1. The Commission shall implement the budget by direct centralised management or by joint management with international organisations.
2. The actions supported by this Decision will be implemented by:
  - Non-profit-making organisations which fulfil the eligibility and suitability criteria established in Article 7 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1257/96; and
  - International organisations and agencies
3. Taking account of the specificities of humanitarian aid, the nature of the activities to be undertaken, the specific location constraints and the level of urgency, the activities

---

<sup>5</sup> OJ L 357, 31.12.2002, , p.1 Regulation as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC Euratom) No. 478/2007, OJ L 111 of 28.4.2007, P. 13

<sup>6</sup> Commission Decision of 21.2.2007, C/2007/513

covered by this Decision may be financed in full in accordance with Article 253 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation.

*Article 4*

1. The implementation of this financing Decision shall be conditional upon the necessary funds being available under the 2008 general budget of the European Communities.
2. The amount of EUR 10,000,000 shall be conditional upon the adoption of the amendment tabled by the European Parliament in order to increase article 23 02 03 in the 2008 General Budget of the European Communities. Should this amendment be rejected, the Commission will adapt the amount accordingly.
3. This Decision will take effect on the date of its adoption.

Done at Brussels,

For the Commission

Member of the Commission



Humanitarian Aid Decision

23 02 03

Title: Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America

Location of operation: Central America (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama)

Amount of Decision: EUR 10,000,000

Decision reference number: ECHO/DIP/BUD/2008/03000

---

**Explanatory Memorandum**

**1 - Rationale needs and target population.**

**1.1 Rationale:**

According to Article 2(f) of Humanitarian Aid Regulation (EC) of 20 June 1996<sup>7</sup>, DG ECHO's<sup>8</sup> activities in the field of Disaster Preparedness shall be "*to ensure preparedness for risks of natural disasters or comparable exceptional circumstances and use a suitable rapid early-warning and intervention system*". DIPECHO (which stands for Disaster Preparedness ECHO) is a programme set up by DG ECHO in 1996 to improve the capacities of communities at risk to better prepare and protect themselves. In 2003, a global evaluation on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)<sup>9</sup> was carried out in several regions to identify the risks, evaluate the socio-economic vulnerability of the people and determine what local, national and regional response capability and external support was already in place. Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala were ranked at a very high level of disaster risk. Certain regions of Costa Rica and of Panama can also be included in this category. Based on the DRR study and on the recent disasters that affected the region<sup>10</sup>, as well as on a consultation process and identification of needs, DG ECHO has decided to launch a Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan.

---

<sup>7</sup> EC Regulation N°1257/96 of 20 June 1996, OL L163 of 2 July 1996.

<sup>8</sup> Directorate-General for humanitarian aid – ECHO.

<sup>9</sup> December 2003, Evaluation of DG ECHO's strategic orientation to disaster reduction available on DG ECHO's Web site: [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/pdf\\_files/evaluation/2003/disaster\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/pdf_files/evaluation/2003/disaster_report.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> To name a few: Hurricane Mitch in 1998, earthquakes in El Salvador in 2001, drought in 2001-2003, Hurricane Stan in 2005 and Hurricane Felix in 2007.

Central America, which has been a DIPECHO target region since the creation of the programme, is considered one of the most disaster prone regions in the world, in terms of recurrence of hazards, their severity and scope and the significant potential for major disasters. The region is particularly exposed to natural disasters such as volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, hurricanes, tropical storms, tsunamis, landslides, droughts, and forest fires. Additional threats such as global warming, environmental degradation, improper land planning, inadequate agricultural practices, uncontrolled exploitation of natural resources and rapid urbanisation added to a lack of awareness, knowledge, expertise, resources in the communities and local institutions continue to make thousands of people more vulnerable to these hazards.

Hydro-meteorological events have been predominant over the last 15 years and have been on the rise in Central America, where 61 floods have affected more than 1.8 million people since 1990. Over the same period, more than 5 million Central Americans have been hit by windstorms, most notoriously by Hurricanes Mitch<sup>11</sup>, Stan<sup>12</sup> and Felix in 1998, 2005 and 2007 respectively. In fact, 2005 was a record cyclonic season in the Atlantic in terms of tropical storms and hurricanes<sup>13</sup>. The month of September 2007 was a record cyclonic month in terms of tropical storms. Hydro-meteorological events are the cause of more than 93% of human lives lost over the period 1990-2007<sup>14</sup>. The number of droughts, a slow-onset disaster, has been on the rise, affecting over 2 million people in Central America alone in the past fifteen years<sup>15</sup>.

Geological events and more specifically earthquakes generate the most significant economic losses. For example, the two earthquakes which hit El Salvador in 2001 affected a total of 1.5 million people<sup>16</sup>.

Finally, deforestation is a frequent problem in poor countries, and events such as the El Niño phenomenon aggravate its consequences. The drought induced by the El Niño phenomenon in 1997-1998 caused losses of forests (due to fires) corresponding to four years of deforestation<sup>17</sup>.

The recurring nature of disasters is a very important element to be taken into account in the analysis of threats and therefore of risks.

The losses and the destruction that result from these disasters are significant from a social and economic point of view and reduce the development potential of the region. Recent studies have shown that despite the many efforts made in the region, disasters have increased gradually over the last thirty years and affect 5% of annual GDP<sup>18</sup>.

Central America also experiences frequent small-scale disasters<sup>19</sup> affecting relatively few communities, where donors are unlikely to intervene due to the limited scale of the events, but which recurrently undermine the fragile livelihoods of those affected. According to CRED,

---

<sup>11</sup> Hurricane Mitch is a benchmark in Central America's recent disaster history. Its impact was so severe in this region that, for example, 7 years later the PRRAC – The Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Plan for Central America- funded by the EC (EUR 250,000,000 approx.) is still being implemented.

<sup>12</sup> In Guatemala alone, Hurricane Stan caused damage of over EUR 800,000,000 (equivalent to more than 3% of GDP) and affected to 0.5 million people (4% of the population).

<sup>13</sup> Registration started by the mid-1850's

<sup>14</sup> Source: CRED (Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disaster)

<sup>15</sup> DG ECHO responded to the drought of 2001-2002 through 4 decisions which amounted to EUR 6,820,000.

<sup>16</sup> DG ECHO responded to these earthquakes through 3 decisions which amounted to EUR 10,500,000.

<sup>17</sup> According to CCAD (Comisión Centroamericana para el Ambiente y el Desarrollo), the losses of forests in Central America during 1997-1998 amount to 1.5 million hectares.

<sup>18</sup> CIESA, conclusions of the Mitch + 5 Forum (November 2003).

<sup>19</sup> A disaster is considered of small-scale when it affects less than 20,000 people.

over 80% of the population affected by disasters in Central America during 1990-2007 was affected by small-scale events.

The vulnerability indicators<sup>20</sup> of Central American countries, such as the human development index, are the lowest for all Latin America. In particular, Guatemala is positioned 118<sup>th</sup>, Honduras 115<sup>th</sup>, Nicaragua 110<sup>th</sup>, and El Salvador 103<sup>th</sup>, according to UNDP's 2007 report. Additionally, in Latin America, the within-country vulnerability disparity levels are extremely high: even in relatively favoured countries such as Costa Rica, Panama and El Salvador.

The vulnerability profile is also evolving with migrations to urban centres, erosion of traditional coping mechanisms, and the fragility of resistance to potential pandemics. Even when national governments have disaster response capacities, preparedness measures often remain weak, or strongly infrastructure-oriented. Moreover, at local levels, populations are often ill-prepared or in too fragile a situation to cope with recurrent and frequent small to medium scale disasters.

Even though the countries in the region have at their disposal national legislations that are incorporating Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) concerns, the full implementation of these legislations is still lacking due not only to financial constraints but also to the lack of clear prioritisation of these concerns by the national authorities and other development stakeholders.

Consequently the ability of these countries to cope with disasters is most of the time extremely weak, particularly at local level where many communities and local institutions lack awareness, knowledge, expertise, resources and formal mandate. In such a scenario, the lack of resilience of populations, institutions, basic services (commonly ruptured during natural disasters) and other infrastructure result in vulnerabilities and losses (both in lives and assets lost) that in many instances could be mitigated or avoided. The resulting erosion of the coping capacities of people and institutions and the additional resources that are subsequently required contribute to undoing much of the accrued recovery and development gains made in recent decades. The socio-economic impact of natural disasters is considerable, in particular for the poorest and most isolated populations. In many instances, such losses could be largely mitigated or avoided, with many lives and properties saved by simple preventive measures. In the very first hours and days of a disaster, the population at risks are the best placed and the only ones to be able to respond and save their lives and properties. It may take days and even weeks before national or international aid is provided in situ in all the affected places notably to the most remote and difficult to access areas (as was the case for the 2005 Hurricane Stan and the September 2007 Hurricane Felix) or when the aid takes time to reach the most vulnerable and poor. By helping people to help themselves, disaster preparedness should be seen as the first response instrument. All recent disasters should be used as opportunities to raise the awareness of all the relevant stakeholders to the importance of improving their DRR policies.

The experience gained during the implementation of the five Action Plans for Central America (1998-2007) is very significant and diversified. For example, in the September 2007 Hurricane Felix made land in Sandy Bay, Nicaragua, where a DIPECHO project was being implemented. Community emergency committees had been formed and trained in emergency procedures, and had received communication equipment. Moreover, community brigades had been formed, trained and equipped. This enabled the community to respond, and no lives were lost in the community despite the severity of the material damage caused by the

---

<sup>20</sup> The vulnerability indicators comprise the physical, social, cultural, economic and environmental factors, which increase the probability of a community suffering a negative impact due to a threat.  
ECHO/DIP/BUD/2008/03000

hurricane, the most severe ever experienced in this region. Similar examples occurred during Hurricane Stan in 2005, in San Marcos (Guatemala) and the Jiboa river basin (El Salvador). The Early Warning System developed in Nicaragua under several Action Plans in response to volcanic risk has been adopted as a model by the Civil Defence. The urban risk projects being implemented under the Fifth Action Plan are developing innovative intervention models which are inciting interest from other urban communities not covered by the current projects. A key element of DIPECHO Action Plans has been the consistent support to the national Red Cross societies, as key actors of the national emergency response systems. DIPECHO support has enabled them to exchange methodologies, thus strengthening their institutional capacity in the region. Furthermore, there has been a consistent effort to systematise and disseminate best practices, through the organisation of dissemination workshops and implementation of regional projects.

A major strength of the DIPECHO programme in Central America is the constant building of a partnership relationship in order to strengthen partners' project implementation capacity, improve the quality of the programme and capitalize on the DIPECHO experiences in the region. The DIPECHO programme is currently entering a consolidation phase in Central America.

DG ECHO promotes through its DIPECHO programme the scaling-up of pilot projects through fostering the participation of local authorities and national emergency systems in the implementation of the projects. DG ECHO expects that this joint implementation will contribute to the mobilization of these public actors to support DRR initiatives at various levels. On the one hand, partners implementing community-based projects will work in close coordination with municipal authorities. Advocacy actions at local level will be carried out to sensitise the authorities and other stakeholders. Also, national emergency response agencies like Civil Defence are local implementing partners in several components of the projects (e.g. creation of local emergency committees, training of brigades, etc). National bodies responsible for hazard monitoring implement several activities related to the installation of early warning systems. These joint ventures allow the national systems and municipal authorities to improve their knowledge and skills regarding disaster preparedness.

The consultative process initiated with the Fifth Action Plan will be consolidated. Public institutions, local NGO's, UN agencies and other international organisations will participate in the dissemination of best practices and in the prioritisation of geographical areas and topics for future action plans. By exchanging information, these actors will build a closer relationship and possibilities of further cooperation will be explored, thus promoting the scaling-up of DIPECHO initiatives.

An external evaluation of the DIPECHO Central America programme was launched in September 2007, to review the period 1998-2006, i.e. the first five Action Plans. The final report was not yet available at the time of drafting this decision, but the Intermediate Draft Report submitted on 13 October 2007 mentions among its conclusions that *"In general, the outcomes of the majority of projects undertaken by partners in the five DIPECHO Action Plans have contributed to increased disaster preparedness, reduced vulnerability for inhabitants in many municipalities of Central America who have benefited from the programme and its approach."* Furthermore, it notes that *"In addition, there has been a demonstrated increase in the capacity of local institutions, mandated with protecting vulnerable populations (including Civil Defence, municipal councils, disaster management committees at different levels in project areas and implementing partners themselves"*. The recommendations of the final evaluation will be integrated into the Sixth Action Plan.

The Priorities for Action of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)<sup>21</sup> 2005–2015: "*Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*"<sup>22</sup> provide the strategic logic underlying the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America.

In April 2005 the European Commission, in its Communication "*Reinforcing EU Disaster and Crisis Response in third countries*",<sup>23</sup> addressed the issue of enhancing preparedness and response to disasters. The document also considers the Hyogo Framework for Action as the starting point of its strategy<sup>24</sup>.

The European Commission in its Communication on "*Towards a European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid*"<sup>25</sup> also expressed its commitment to further promote disaster preparedness by:

- promoting international efforts within the Hyogo Framework for Action to increase coping capacities at local, regional and national level through strategic planning and action;
- mainstream disaster risk reduction in humanitarian and development operations and ensure that adequate EU funding is made available for disaster preparedness and risk reduction activities;
- establish an overall EU policy approach to support action in this area.

A European Commission Communication on DRR is being prepared and is expected to be adopted in 2008.

## **1.2. – Identified needs:**

The needs identified by DG ECHO in Central America in the field of preparedness and in particular in terms of early warning mechanisms and intervention systems arise from the conviction that response to disasters is a mainly temporary action with high costs in human and socio-economic terms, whereas the reduction of risks in the domain of natural disasters can reduce the probability of losses before the risks turn into a tragedy.

If one refers to the "formula" " $\text{risk} = (\text{threat} \times \text{vulnerability})/\text{capacity}$ ", which is commonly accepted within the international community dealing with risk reduction, risk can be reduced by any action aiming to reduce the intensity of the threat, to reduce vulnerability, or to improve the agents' capacity to respond in a situation of risk.

The high risk levels in certain countries and regions of Central America arise for a great part from the exposure to natural threats and from the vulnerabilities connected with all types of factors: economic, social, cultural, environmental, etc. The risk level in this region also arises from significant weaknesses in the response capacity, defined as the level of resources, the way in which the communities use these resources, and the capacity of these communities to

---

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.unisdr.org>

<sup>22</sup> The 5 priorities for action are: 1. Ensure that DRR is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation; 2. Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning; 3. Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels; 4. Reduce the underlying risk factors; 5. Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

<sup>23</sup> COM (2005) 153, 20 April 2005.

<sup>24</sup> Such as integrating disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and into programmes in countries that have been affected by disaster; strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels that can build resilience to hazards and disaster preparedness both inside and outside the EU; development of people-centred early warning, better management and exchange of information on risks and protection, education and training; identifying, assessing and monitoring disaster risks, enhancing early warning; reducing the underlying risk factors.

<sup>25</sup> COM(2007)317



cope with the unfavourable consequences of a disaster. A diagnosis carried out by CEPREDENAC<sup>26</sup> under a DIPECHO project in 2003-2004 confirmed that the national response and prevention systems of the six Central American countries have become structured, in particular since hurricane Mitch in 1998, and dispose, in varying degrees of clear and agreed emergency plans. But it also shows that in all cases they are short of financial means<sup>27</sup> and trained human resources, which prevents them from being effective in terms of preparedness, prevention and response outside of the capital cities and in the most isolated areas.

Even though there is a large presence of donor institutions in Central America, few support DRR strategies by directly financing community-based activities; more attention is paid to support for national/sub-national institutions and large-scale infrastructure projects or structural programming that embraces national priorities, but there is a tendency to neglect local vulnerabilities. Equally, such engagement strategies do little to address critical weaknesses in coordination and advocacy at national and regional levels

After five DIPECHO Action Plans covering the region and in order to take stock of the lessons learned from previous projects, an extensive consultation process was undertaken in November 2007 in Central America, involving over 400 DRR experts representing DIPECHO partners, relevant national authorities, scientific community, other EC services and local and international organisations. Notably, four national consultative meetings, as well as one regional seminar, were held to prepare the ground for the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan. Besides offering to the main stakeholders the possibility for a disaster preparedness dialogue that in many countries had hitherto been lacking, this consultation process allowed concrete priorities to be drawn up for the countries targeted by this action plan. The results of these consultative exercises confirm the analysis outlined above of the risk level in the region. These exercises also identify, with regard to the response capacities and notwithstanding the five previous Action Plans, a need to continue the preparedness work with the communities, given the extent of the risk, in order to extend or consolidate the few local initiatives already launched.

The analysis confirms that disaster preparedness capacities at community level are generally weak or non-existent, except in those areas targeted by previous DIPECHO action plans and by the few similar initiatives sponsored by NGO private funds. As mentioned above, few donors are supporting DRR community-based initiatives. DIPECHO has been one of the few programmes to focus on community interventions and has covered approximately 10% of the Central American municipalities through the five previous action plans; a total of 68 projects have been implemented in 100 municipalities (approximately 2,500 communities). This means that there are still around 1,000 Central American municipalities remaining which have received little (if any) support from either public or private institutions. In practical terms, this means that the majority of the Central American local emergency committees lack the infrastructure and equipment required to manage disaster response in their respective jurisdictions. Within the existing local emergency committees, technical capacities related to specific areas of disaster preparedness remain weak, such as management of emergency aid, damage and needs assessment and shelter management. These committees require further strengthening. Essential information (alerts, damage and needs assessments) does not flow between all actors at all levels. Coordination among governmental levels (municipal, departmental, national) remains weak. Confusion and misinformation persists in the

---

<sup>26</sup> CEPREDENAC is the Coordination Centre for Disaster Prevention and Response in Central America, an intergovernmental body.

<sup>27</sup> For example, SINAPRED (the Nicaraguan National System for Prevention, Mitigation and Attention. in Nicaragua) had, in 2003, less than EUR 500,000 per year for its operation.  
ECHO/DIP/BUD/2008/03000

vulnerable population in terms of what to do in case of disaster. In the few cases where mitigation works exist, they are extremely weak and are not receiving adequate maintenance by the municipal authorities. The same applies to the early warning systems: critical information is not being effectively and efficiently communicated to municipal authorities and communities in the few minor river basins and volcanoes where some hazard monitoring equipment exists. Although the communities and municipalities which benefited from previous DIPECHO action plans are better off, these results require consolidation. As stated above, there is still room for the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan to target areas previously uncovered by former DIPECHO programmes, where DP capacities are non-existent while strengthening the advocacy towards the national and local authorities and other development stakeholders to integrate DRR components in all their programmes and policies (the so-called mainstreaming)

Finally, all the assessments confirm the need to work harder on the standardisation, compilation and distribution of best practices at national and regional levels, since numerous good practices of previous experiences have never been replicated in other locations facing similar problems.

Based on the results of these national and regional consultative meetings, and taking into account the recommendations of the external evaluation, DG ECHO will draw up a comprehensive regional and per country strategy with precise identification of needs according to areas and activities.

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

The Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan will target the most vulnerable local communities and their institutions involved in risk reduction in El Salvador, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama. Furthermore, regional programming could take into account the whole of Central America.

It is estimated that approximately 1,000,000 people will benefit directly from the Sixth Action Plan.

In all countries and in relevant projects, multi-hazard approaches will be encouraged. DG ECHO will continue to promote the joint initiatives of its partners in each country. Enhanced and timely emergency response capacity of local organisations and Red Cross volunteers can also be supported wherever the conditions of accountability in stock management are appropriate and ensured.

Partners will be encouraged to build synergies with development programmes funded by the EC and other donors which target the same geographical areas.

The hazards prioritised by this action plan were identified during the consultative process organised in the region during November 2007 and are as follows:

El Salvador: Priority will be given to the following hazards: *floods, landslides, volcanic eruptions and earthquakes*. Areas at risk of *drought* may also be targeted, especially in eastern departments, and in general, multi-hazard approaches will be encouraged. DIPECHO will look both at consolidation of previous actions, in particular in relation to floods and landslides and to scale up on *urban risk reduction* actions. DG ECHO will seek to fund a pilot project on preparedness to volcanic eruptions.

Guatemala: Priority will be given to the following hazards: *earthquakes, forest fires, floods and landslides*. Areas affected by Hurricane Stan (2005) will be a priority. DG ECHO expects to consolidate the work done on *urban risk reduction*. Areas at risk of *volcanic eruptions* may also be targeted but taking special care to avoid overlapping with other donors' initiatives such as JICA's. DG ECHO intends to scale up its interventions in this country, which so far have been limited in number.

Honduras: Priority will be given to hydro-meteorological hazards such as *floods, hurricanes and droughts*. *Landslides* triggered by torrential rains will also be prioritised. A recent *earthquake* that took place in the heart of the country justifies also the prioritisation of this unknown hazard in Honduras. Considering the high vulnerability of the metropolitan area of Tegucigalpa, special consideration will be given to projects targeting *urban risk reduction* as done in the last DIPECHO Action Plan.

Nicaragua: Priority will be given to hydro-meteorological events such as *hurricanes and floods*. In this sense, areas affected by hurricanes Mitch (1998) and Felix (2007) will be a priority. *Landslides*, whether triggered by torrential rains or by seismic activity, will also be prioritised. Areas at risk of *drought and tsunamis* may also be targeted through pilot projects. DG ECHO would like to extend the coverage of the EWS model for *volcanic eruptions* already in place in Cerro Negro and Telica to other active volcanoes. *Earthquake* scenarios in *urban areas* may also be taken into consideration. Due to the exposure of Nicaragua to all kinds of natural threats, in general, multi-hazard approaches will be encouraged.

Costa Rica and Panama: Priority will be given to hydro-meteorological events such as *hurricanes, floods and landslides* triggered by torrential rains. Although Costa Rica and Panama are not as vulnerable as Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras or Nicaragua in general terms, DG ECHO may fund operations in these two countries as long as they are innovative and have the potential to be replicated in the four top-priority countries. Furthermore, as members of Central America Centre for Disaster Prevention (CEPRENAC), Costa Rica and Panama could be usefully included in any programme having a regional dimension.

Regional actions, covering the six Central American countries will be considered. Regional components will, however, concentrate on networking, information management, training, communication and awareness raising as well as compilation and dissemination of lessons learned, and harmonisation of approaches. Regional projects will have to propose specific actions linking regional and local (community) levels and thus ensuring feedback between the two. Furthermore, these initiatives should closely link with the CEPREDENAC's Disaster Risk Reduction Regional Plan for 2006-2015 and HFA 2005-2015.

In addition to the target populations in local communities mentioned above, the Sixth Action Plan will also seek to specifically target the following groups:

- Children, youth volunteers and students
- Women's groups
- Disabled
- Ethnic minorities
- Teachers
- Trainers
- Government officials at all levels
- Local disaster management committees
- Red Cross and Red Crescent members and volunteers
- Local non-government organisations, civil society associations, private sector.
- Representatives of media
- General public: several million persons will be addressed through public campaigns

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

As the majority of the proposed activities have a community orientation, their success depends on the desire for cooperation of the identified communities. Moreover, the disaster preparedness projects depend on the link that the partners establish with the competent local authorities, which have to be involved in the project from the beginning, in order to make sure that the objectives are achieved and the results are sustainable. Such dependence on support and collaboration with local institutional structures carries the risk that anticipated cooperation/support/political commitment fails to meet expectations. However, in terms of long-term sustainability, this link is crucial.

In order to maximise the possibility of success in achieving the project objectives, DG ECHO will take account, in the selection, both of prospective partners' experience in disaster preparedness programmes and their operational presence in the target location (thereby providing a pre-existing working relationship with local communities and local authorities).

In addition, as a region with frequent natural hazards, the likelihood that disasters will occur during the Sixth Action Plan is high, as experienced during previous Action Plans. Such events could cause delays in implementation as DIPECHO projects under implementation could be de-prioritised in favour of emergency/humanitarian actions that may also impose a considerable workload on partners' human resources not only on the spot but also in the region. Furthermore, the disaster itself may prevent access to target beneficiaries and/or locations. Apart from potential large disasters, the frequency and scale of recurrent small and medium natural disasters may strain the capacities of local communities, authorities and government.

It has been noted that DIPECHO partners are often in a better position to intervene in the case of small or medium scale disasters, but also that communities prepared under DIPECHO projects can better cope with those events, sometimes also supporting neighbouring communities to respond. The programme should therefore remain flexible to the needs of disaster response after such localised events.

In all countries, electoral calendars have often slowed down the implementation during the electoral campaigns. Once new administrations are in place, they require renewed training and awareness raising measures for newly appointed counterparts. Disrupted linkages between authority levels, but also ongoing decentralisation processes, can also create challenges for capacity-building and scaling up measures.

While the region has a comprehensive pool of DRR expertise, it is often difficult to find a sufficient number of specialists, especially in the present context where demand has considerably increased for such knowledge. A substantial amount of effort and time is therefore often invested by the partners to train their personnel or the personnel of their co-implementing agencies.

The current political situation in Central America is stable. However, any breakdown in political stability in any of the six countries concerned could affect the implementation of operations financed under this Decision.

## **2 - Objectives and components of the humanitarian intervention proposed:**

### **2.1. - Objectives:**

Principal objective:

To reduce risk by better preparing the vulnerable populations in the areas most prone to natural disasters in Central America.

Specific objectives:

To support strategies that enable local communities and institutions to better prepare for, mitigate and respond to natural disasters by enhancing their capacities to cope and respond, thereby increasing resilience and reducing vulnerability.

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

Programme strategies which receive DIPECHO support will be developed in the context of existing relevant legislation and decrees and will contribute to existing/planned National Disaster Management Plans and Policies (including the implementation of the HFA 2005-2015 and the CEPREDENAC). They will also be implemented in conjunction with the appropriate institutions of national governments at all relevant levels (local, sub-national, national); sectoral line ministries, finance or planning ministries, the National Disaster Management Office of each country, or others.

Municipal authorities and national emergency response agencies (such as the Civil Defence) are often implementing partners of DIPECHO operations. Other national institutions, such as the agencies responsible for hazard monitoring, are involved in the installation of Early Warning Systems. The Ministries of Education are involved in the activities linked to education on DRR. Coordination is established with the national systems from the design phase in order to ensure their empowerment.

Within the projects to be supported, DG ECHO will pay particular attention to cross cutting issues: involvement of women, children, vulnerable groups such as disabled people, ethnic minorities; environment protection, etc.

Sectors and sub-sectors of intervention

- a) Local disaster management components, targeting local actors in disaster prone areas: early warning systems, mapping and data computerisation, local capacity-building, training.

Examples of possible eligible activities:

- Development and setting up of early warning systems through local structures, adapting or developing user-friendly and locally-appropriate systems; training of the beneficiaries through simulation exercises, mock drills, dry-run rehearsals etc.
- Mapping and data computerisation through local actors, linked with the study of hazards and vulnerabilities and the establishment of emergency plans.
- Capacity building and training of natural disaster management committees (including preparedness and response) at local level, with direct involvement of the beneficiary communities; development and management of community disaster preparedness action plans; integration of such plans into economic plans at the proper administrative level; simulation and evacuation exercises; training of trainers, community facilitators, fire brigades and other response groups.

- b) Institutional linkages, targeting institutions involved in disaster management/ disaster risk reduction, in particular at regional, national and sub-national levels: advocacy, facilitation of coordination, institutional strengthening

Examples of possible eligible activities:

- Communication activities aimed at raising awareness on DRR.
- Coordinated and collaborative national programming for disaster risk reduction, particularly amongst DRR fora.
- Joint strategy formulation and programming, through joint project proposals, establishment of common indicators and measurement systems, joint identification of categories of beneficiaries, joint events and activities.
- Technical studies, workshops and surveys to increase knowledge about preparedness issues and dissemination of results.
- Facilitating co-ordination; support of existing networks, institutions working on DRR and notably preparedness and response.
- Strengthening of institutional capacities on DRR; training of decision-makers on the HFA.

- c) Information, Education, Communication, targeting direct and indirect beneficiaries: awareness raising among the general public, education and dissemination

Examples of possible eligible activities:

- Radio spots, radio communication actions at various levels; TV broadcasts; media interaction with newspapers, journals, magazines; training of journalists and media students.
- Production of joint innovative Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials; dissemination of good existing IEC materials.
- Conferences, symposia, seminars, workshops, peer-to-peer awareness initiatives.
- Awareness campaigns among the general public as well as targeted groups, simulation exercises and mock drills.
- Activities aimed at creating a “culture of prevention” within the formal education system pursuing a change of attitude and practice; design, production or update of training materials for pupils; dissemination of good existing materials; training of teachers and pupils, and parents; simulations conducted at school level, school competitions.

- d) Small scale infrastructure and services, at community level: infrastructure support and mitigation works, reinforcing critical infrastructure, operation and maintenance systems; non structural mitigation activities

Examples of possible eligible activities:

- Provision of equipment and reinforcement of infrastructure to support disaster preparedness plans; scientific equipment; rehabilitation of evacuation routes; refurbishment of health posts; temporary shelter for evacuated populations and sign-posting of evacuation routes.
- Small-scale infrastructure works aimed at reducing the physical vulnerability of the beneficiaries, complementing the preparedness component of the project strategy; training on operation and maintenance systems; provision of knowledge and tools for replication of measures in neighbouring communities or for integration into local development plans.
- Protection walls along river banks; structural works on existing public buildings to increase their resistance to disasters; identification and reinforcement of safe places; reforestation/plantation; small-scale drainage; and irrigation works.
- Non structural mitigation measures.

- e) Stock-building of emergency and relief items: targeting the reinforcement of the response capacity of local actors and institutions in disaster-prone areas in view of contributing to ensuring an adequate response to natural disaster by strengthening the response capacity in the early hours and days of a disaster.

Examples of possible eligible activities:

- Provision of basic equipment such as rescue kits and first aid kits complemented by training activities
- Stockpiling of response items at local level through mandated actors or entities and through well established systems

### **3 - Duration expected for actions in the proposed Decision:**

The duration for the implementation of this Decision shall be 18 months. Humanitarian operations funded by this Decision must be implemented within this period.

The 18 month duration for this Decision is necessary because the nature of the activities proposed requires sustained engagement and establishment of optimal working relationships with both the target beneficiaries and public personnel. This requires time, even if the partner is already present in the project location. Moreover, partners are encouraged to develop medium term strategies for DRR to which DIPECHO can contribute through focused or phased actions. Finally, it is necessary to foresee a margin of at least one month in case certain operations are delayed at start-up or because of unforeseen events such as natural disasters.

Expenditure under this Decision shall be eligible from 1 September 2008.

Start Date: 1 September 2008.

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 humanitarian aid operations.

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 procedure established in the general conditions of the specific agreement will be applied.





## 5 - Overview of donors' contributions

### Donors in Costa rica/Guatemala/Honduras/Nicaragua/Panama/El Salvador in last 12 months

1. EU Members States (*)		2. European Commission		3. Others	
	EUR		EUR		EUR
Austria		DG ECHO	8,000,000		
Belgium		Other services			
Bulgaria					
Cyprus					
Czech republic					
Denmark					
Estonia					
Finland	200,000				
France	50,000				
Germany	391,060				
Greece	150,000				
Hungary					
Ireland					
Italy	907,922				
Latvia					
Lithuania					
Luxemburg					
Malta					
Netherlands	200,000				
Poland					
Portugal					
Romania					
Slovakia					
Slovenie					
Spain	2,200,000				
Sweden	1,344,889				
United kingdom					
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>5,443,871</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6,500,000</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>
		<b>Grand total</b>	<b>11,943,871</b>		

Dated : 30 November 2007

(\*) Source: DG ECHO 14 Points reporting for Members States. <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/hac>

Empty cells means either no information is available or no contribution.

### **5.1. Coordination with other Commission departments:**

Since September 2001, coordination on DRR has been ongoing with the Directorate-General for External Relations (DG RELEX) and the EuropeAid Cooperation Office (DG AIDCO) in order to encourage an increased involvement of these services in this field. Similar efforts have been made by the Directorate-General for Development (DG DEV). DG ECHO has stressed the importance of including DRR as a cross-cutting issue in country/regional strategy papers.

Moreover, since the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan (January 2005), significant progress has been made in promoting DRR dialogue within the European Commission.

At the field level, DG ECHO launched a dialogue with some of the Delegations in the region to explore the possibilities for the incorporation of disaster risk management components in programmes supported under the Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) for 2007-2013. At headquarters level, the same effort is made in terms of information sharing to better link DIPECHO-interventions with the potential mainstreaming of DRR components in the sustainable development programming of DG RELEX and DG AIDCO.

Recommendations of the ongoing external evaluation of the DIPECHO Central America Action Plans will be taken into account in the drafting of the Call for Expressions of Interest and in project selection.

A Disaster Risk Reduction Group has been created in 2006 by DG ECHO and the Regional Delegation in Managua to discuss DRR issues and to ensure proper coordination between all disaster preparedness, mitigation and prevention programmes financed by the EC in Central America.

EUR 20,000,000 was earmarked in the EU regional strategic paper for Central America for a regional programme on disaster prevention (PREVDA) that was launched in 2006. This programme should contribute to a reduction of the vulnerability of the region and the improvement of the environmental situation by reinforcing regional and national capacities in terms of planning, prevention and information management. Under PREVDA, harmonisation of legal frameworks and capacities will be promoted. It also envisages prevention and mitigation actions in strategic main river basins. Contacts have already been established in Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala and at a regional level with the PREVDA coordinators who participated in the National and Regional DIPECHO Consultative Meetings. The Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan, in focusing on preparedness at local level, should be complemented by this regional programme.

EUR 20,000,000 has been approved for a municipal strengthening programme in Guatemala. No infrastructure works are envisaged and technical assistance (including risk management) to municipalities plays a key role in this programme. Its geographical focus is on the Western high plateau, the Verapaces, Zacapa and Chiquimula. Coordination opportunities between this programme and the Fifth DIPECHO Action Plan arose in the western department of San Marcos with a DIPECHO partner. If DIPECHO community-based projects are selected in this region, efforts will be made to ensure complementarity.

EUR 12,000,000 has been approved for a regional food security programme in Central America (PRESANCA). This programme has prioritised 25 border municipalities and foresees a food security fund which, *inter alia*, has a municipal institutional strengthening component (including risk management). DG ECHO will share information through the DRR Group about target municipalities under the Sixth DIPECHO action plan so as to ensure coordination between this action plan and PRESANCA.

In 2006 EU-ACP Natural Disaster Facility was established. In its current phase, the facility strengthens the capacity of six ACP regional organisations in the area of disaster risk reduction. Under the current Decision, scientific/meteorological cooperation with the Caribbean region could be envisaged.

## **5.2. - Member States:**

In a note dated 29 October 2007 (D13562) DG ECHO requested Humanitarian Aid Committee (HAC) members to provide information about projects they are supporting in the area of disaster preparedness and prevention. At the time of drafting this Decision only Spain had replied. Nevertheless, actions under this Decision will be implemented in full coordination and complementarity with other activities supported by Member States in the region.

### Spain

Spanish Cooperation has been working on the basis of a regional approach, supporting the Central America Integration System (SICA) and specially the CEPREDENAC and its National Commissions.

Spanish Cooperation is due to publish The Action Plan for Disaster Prevention, focused in four main field areas:

- 1) Institutional strengthening
- 2) Capacity building
- 3) Knowledge management
- 4) Coordination between emergencies and reconstruction

It is also based on the main Spanish Cooperation priorities, such as: gender empowerment, sustainable development, fight against poverty and respect for cultural diversity.

In a few months the Spanish hangar for emergencies in Panama will be inaugurated. This will allow Spanish Cooperation, to be more efficient in emergency responses, reconstruction and risk prevention.

Furthermore in order to fulfil the Paris Conference principles, Spain has created with the Central America Regional Integration System, a Spanish-SICA Fund. Through it resources are allocated in the Specialised Organisms of SICA, such as CEPREDENAC

### **5.3 - Other Donors:**

Every effort will be made to coordinate and ensure complementarity with other ongoing or planned DRR operations in the geographical areas concerned.

Most of the programmes financed by other international donors in Central America have focused on disaster prevention and mitigation rather than on preparedness. Regional, national and to a lesser extent municipal levels have been prioritized by those programmes. Community-based projects have been rare. Some complementarity, though, has been achieved by previous DIPECHO action plans with those few municipal and community-based projects funded by other donors in the same geographical areas.

By participating in the Regional Consultative Meeting organised in Guatemala and in other meetings organised by DG ECHO, other donors' agencies [such as JICA (Japanese Agency), COSUDE (Swiss Agency), USAID (American Agency), CIDA (Canadian Agency), the World Bank (WB) and the IDB] have been sharing with DG ECHO their plans for DRR in the region.

### **Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (COSUDE)**

COSUDE has been financing risk management initiatives in the entire region:

In Nicaragua (2005-2008):

- Integral Risk Management in Esteli and Nueva Segovia (EUR 663,000)
- Tsunami Awareness Raising (2006) (EUR 110,000)

- Human Resources Training for SINAPRED, the Nicaraguan National System for Prevention, Mitigation and Attention. (2003-2004) (EUR 120,000).

In El Salvador (2005-2008): Integral Risk Management in Sonsonate (EUR 480,000).

In Honduras (2006-2008): Risk Management in Colon with COPECO, the Honduran Permanent Contingency Commission (EUR 314,000).

Although these initiatives have mainly focused on disaster prevention rather than on preparedness, several of the projects coincided in geographical terms with previous DIPECHO projects. In those cases, complementarity between COSUDE and DIPECHO projects was achieved as DG ECHO partners took stock of the technical information produced by those projects.

COSUDE is currently drafting their five-year Action Plan 2008-2012, and participated in the Regional Consultative Meeting in order to establish synergies with the 6<sup>th</sup> DIPECHO Action Plan.

### **Norway**

In Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua, Norway will finance through CEPREDENAC a Seismic Risk Reduction Project. (2007-2011) (EUR 1,800,000)

### **Japanese Cooperation (JICA)**

JICA finances two projects in Nicaragua (in the towns of Leon and Chinandega) in vulnerability reduction amounting to EUR 3,000,000 (2006-2011). Also, the National Institute of Territorial Studies (INETER) recently implemented a Risk Mapping project in some Pacific Region areas financed by JICA (EUR 4,000,000).

### **The World Bank (WB)**

The WB implemented (April 2001-September 2006) an institutional strengthening project in Nicaragua entitled "Natural Disaster Vulnerability Reduction" which amounts to EUR 11,100,000. This project had a wide geographical coverage and strengthened the national and municipal levels through training and equipment provision. In some geographical areas, previous DIPECHO projects have complemented this WB project at the community level.

In Honduras, the WB implemented (2000-2007) a mitigation project amounting to EUR 8,900,000 which focuses on risk mapping. Some previous DIPECHO projects used some data generated by this WB project when drafting municipal and community emergency plans. In June 2006, the World Bank's Board of Directors endorsed establishment of the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), a longer term partnership under the ISDR system to reduce disaster losses by mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in development, particularly upstream country strategies and processes, towards fulfilment of principal goals of the Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA).

### **Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)**

IDB launched an EUR 8,000,000 disaster prevention fund for Latin America and the Caribbean (2006).

IDB also launched an action plan (2005-2008) for improving disaster risk management at a regional level (LAC) in cooperation with the Japanese government (EUR 600,000)

**6 - Amount of Decision and distribution by specific objectives:**

6.1. - Total amount of the Decision: EUR 10,000,000

## 6.2. - Budget breakdown by specific objectives

Principal objective: <i>To reduce risk by better preparing the vulnerable populations in the areas most prone to natural disasters in Central America</i>				
Specific objective 1:	Allocated amount by specific objective (EUR):	Geographical area of operation:	Activities:	Potential partners <sup>28</sup>
Specific objective 1: To support strategies that enable local communities and institutions to better prepare for, mitigate and respond to natural disasters by enhancing their capacities to cope and respond, thereby increasing resilience and reducing vulnerability	10,000,000	Costa Rica El Salvador Guatemala Honduras Nicaragua Panama	Local disaster management components Institutional linkages and advocacy Information, education, communication. Small scale infrastructure and services. Stock-building of emergency and relief items	- ACH – ACPP - ACSUR Las Segovias - ACTED – ACTIONAID – - ADRA Deutschland – ADRA Denmark - AYUDA EN ACCIÓN- ASB e.V. CAFOD - CARE – FR - CARE – UK - CARE NL - CA –AUT – DCV - CESP – SECOURS CATHOLOIQUE - CEPREDENAC - CHRISTIAN AID – UK - CISP - CISV - CONCERN UNIVERSAL- CONCERN WORLDWIDE - COOPI – CORDAID – COSPE - CRIC - CR-E - CR – FIN - CRF- ITRC - CR – NLD - CR – NOR - HI – HIB – ICCO – ICU - IFRC-FICR – IO - FKN / DCA – DIAKONIE – FAO - GERMAN AGRO ACTION - GOAL - MdM E - MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND - MME, - MPDL, - Novib, - UNOCHA – OIKOS-OXFAMSOL, - OXFAM GB - PAHO, - Plan Germany, - Plan UK - PTM, - SCNL, -SC(UK), - SPF, - SI - STCH, - TDH IT, - TROCAIRE - TSF, - UNCHS – HABITAT - UNDP-PNUD, - UNICEF, - WFP-PAM - WVUK, - WVD, - WVN
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,000,000</b>			

<sup>28</sup> ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP), ACTIONAID (GBR), ADVENTIST DEVELOPMENT AND RELIEF AGENCY - DENMARK, AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR), ARBEITER-SAMARITER-BUND DEUTSCHLAND e.V., ASAMBLEA DE COOPERACION POR LA PAZ, (E), Adventistische Entwicklungs- und Katastrophenhilfe e.V., Asociación para la Cooperación con el Sur "LAS SEGOVIAS", Ayuda en Acción (E); CARE FRANCE, (FR), CARE INTERNATIONAL UK, CARITAS AUSTRIA, (AUT), CARITAS ESPANOLA, (E), CARITAS FRANCE - SECOURS CATHOLIQUE, (FR), CATHOLIC AGENCY FOR OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT (GBR), CATHOLIC ORGANISATION FOR RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT AID (NLD), CENTRO COORDINACION PREVENCION DESASTRES AMERICA CENTRAL, CENTRO REGIONALE D INTERVENTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE (ITA), CHRISTIAN AID (GBR), COMITATO INTERNAZIONALE PER LO SVILUPPO DEI POPOLI (ITA), COMUNITA'IMPEGNO SERVIZIO VOLONTARIATO, CONCERN UNIVERSAL (GBR), CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL), COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA), COOPERAZIONE PER LO SVILUPPO DEI PAESI EMERGENTI (ITA), CROCE ROSSA ITALIANA (ITA), CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE, CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E), DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU), DEUTSCHER CARITASVERBAND e.V. (DEU), DIAKONISCHES WERK der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (DEU), FEDERACION DE ASOCIACIONES MEDICUS MUNDI ESPANA, (E), FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE, FOLKEKIRKENS NODHJAEPL, (DNK), FONDAZIONE TERRE DES HOMMES ITALIA ONLUS, Fundación Save The Children, GOAL, (IRL), HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (BEL), HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR), HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS (NLD), INTERMON OXFAM, (E), ISTITUTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE UNIVERSITARIA - ONLUS (ITA), Interkerkelijke Organisatie voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking, MEDICOS DEL MUNDO ESPAÑA, MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND (GBR); MOVIMIENTO POR LA PAZ, EL DESARME Y LA LIBERTAD, (E), NORGES RODE KORS (NORWEGIAN RED CROSS), Nederlandse Organisatie voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking, OIKOS - COOPERAÇÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO, OXFAM (GB), OXFAM-Solidarité BE, (BEL), PLAN INTERNATIONAL (UK), PTM-mundubat, (E), Plan International Deutschland e.V., SAVE THE CHILDREN (NLD), SECOURS POPULAIRE FRANCAIS, (FR), SOLIDARIDAD INTERNACIONAL, (E), SUOMEN PUNAINEN RISTI (CROIX ROUGE FINLANDE), Stichting CARE Nederland, Stichting World Vision Nederland, TELECOMS SANS FRONTIERES, THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR), Trocaire, (IRL), UNICEF, UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION, UNITED NATIONS - PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION, UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME, UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS, United Nations Human Settlements Programme, WORLD FOOD PROGRAM, WORLD VISION - UK, WORLD VISION, (DEU)

## 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 DG 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://ec.europa.eu/echo/evaluation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/evaluation/index_en.htm).

## 8 - Budget Impact article 23 02 03

-	EC (EUR)
Initial Available Appropriations for 2008	32,325,000
Supplementary Budgets	
Transfers	
Total Available Credits	32,325,000
Total executed to date (by 01/01/2008)	0
Available remaining	32,325,000
Total amount of the Decision	10,000,000

### Estimated payments schedule:

2008	2009	2010	TOTAL
EUR 5,700,000	EUR 2,300,000	EUR 2,000,000	EUR 10,000,000

## 9. Management Issues

Humanitarian aid actions funded by the Commission are implemented by NGOs, Specialised Agencies of the Member States, and the Red Cross organisations on the basis of Framework Partnership Agreements (FPA) and by United Nations agencies based on the EC/UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) in conformity with Article 163 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation. These Framework agreements define the criteria for attributing grant agreements and financing agreements in accordance with Article 90 of the Implementing Rules and may be found at:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/index_en.htm).

Individual grants are awarded on the basis of the criteria enumerated in Article 7.2 of the Humanitarian Aid Regulation, such as the technical and financial capacity, readiness and experience, and results of previous interventions.