



European Commission
DIRECTORATE GENERAL HUMANITARIAN AID
AND CIVIL PROTECTION
ECHO

Annex 1 to Humanitarian Implementation Plan Caribbean / DIPECHO
ECHO/DIP/BUD/2013/94000 and to the global decision

Operational Recommendations
for DG ECHO partners wishing to submit proposals for the

The 2013- 2014 DIPECHO ACTION PLAN FOR THE CARIBBEAN

Anguilla (OT), Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba (OT), Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, British Virgin Islands (OT), Cayman Islands (OT), Cuba, Curacao (OT), Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat (OT), Saint Barthelemy (OT), Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia , St Marteen (OT) , Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos (OT).

Deadline for submitting proposals: 31 January 2013

Table of contents

Background	3
1. OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS	
1.1. Operational imperatives	4
1.2. General Recommendations	6
1.3. Priorities in terms of geographical areas, hazards and sectors	7
1.4. Recommendations in terms of contributions for the Region.	11
2. MAIN SELECTION CRITERIA	13
3. FINANCIAL QUESTIONS	14
4. TENTATIVE CALENDAR FOR THE ACTION PLAN	15
ANNEX 1. SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL TO DG ECHO	16
ANNEX 2: COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY	18
ANNEX 3: USEFUL LINKS FOR APPLICANTS	20
ANNEX 4: EXAMPLES OF SMART DP INDICATORS	21
ANNEX 5: MATRIX - SELECTED OF FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIES	24

Background

This document has been prepared to complement the Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) with specific recommendations and rules to be followed by the applicants to the DIPECHO Action Plan in the Caribbean.

These recommendations reflect the outcomes, in terms of geographical and thematic priorities, of consultations with various stakeholders undertaken in the Caribbean region during 2011 and 2012. They also integrate the outcomes of the regional events “ Seismic Risk Reduction in the Caribbean“ held on August 2012 and CDEMA’s 7th Caribbean Conference on Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM) carried out in December 2012, which included presentations from partners, experts, national emergency management organizations and other stakeholders in the region. A special session was held during the CDM conference to present the final outputs of the consultation process lead by UNISDR, to identify DRR contribution that can be undertaken in the forthcoming DIPECHO action plan. The process included the reviewing of existing strategies, action plans and other related documents, and an active participation of the National Disaster Management offices (NDMO) of Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Grenada, Dominican Republic and St Vincent & the Grenadines. A matrix was developed to incorporate the various areas of focus of the DIPECHO programme for the Caribbean, cross cutting themes from various DRR programmes undertaken by organizations (OFDA, PAHO, IFRC, UNICEF, CDEMA and FAO), CDEMA’s CDM Strategy and sectoral involvement. It has to be mentioned that the matrix complements the priorities identified during the process of the elaboration of the countries risk profiles (country document).

The final version of the matrix has been validated during the CDM conference, where more than 40 persons from the NDMOs and DIPECHO regional/ national partners were able to participate and provide additional recommendations.

Previous experience and lessons learned, current perspectives of EU co-operation in the field of Disaster Risk Reduction and evaluation of remaining needs in the field of Disaster Preparedness in the region have also been taken into account in setting the priorities for the 2013-2014 DIPECHO Action Plan in terms of risk areas and objectives, taking into account the specific humanitarian mandate established by the Humanitarian Aid Regulation, that focuses on preparedness activities, and DG ECHO 2012 operational strategy in this field

The forthcoming Action Plan also takes account of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters and reconfirms the commitment to regional initiatives to contribute to make schools and hospitals safer and cities resilient in disaster prone areas.

Links to all relevant documents and tools developed to help in the application process can be found at the end of these guidelines.

1. OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.1. Operational imperatives

A series of programme planning and implementation priorities **must be considered by all projects** submitted under the 2013-2014 DIPECHO Action Plan for the Caribbean to be considered eligible for funding.

Principles

1. The DIPECHO Programme contributes to the implementation of the ***Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA)***. This is the reason why all proposed disaster preparedness actions should look at supporting the on-going implementation measures of the HFA in the region.
2. A key element in DIPECHO is the development of ***Key contributions in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) so as to identify successful models for replication*** elsewhere by national/sub-national authorities or other funding instruments of the European Commission, other donors. This approach should remain at the centre of any DIPECHO intervention.
3. The ***starting point for the intervention logic of any DIPECHO supported project must be the hazard itself***, and not a problem that is essentially structural in nature, de-linked from a disaster event. This entails a ***thorough analysis of the natural disaster context*** (at the appropriate scale) that generates the following:
 - A typology of hazards in evidence,
 - The determination of the disaster risk by analysing the negative consequences and frequency of these hazards and a prioritisation of those considered most important by the population(s) at risk;
 - A breakdown of the needs ensuing from these hazards and the identification of those which can most appropriately be addressed by DIPECHO. (The breakdown can be structured as follow State, Impact, Pressure, Response capacities).
4. Operations proposed should be focused in areas with clear vulnerabilities and high exposure to natural hazards but also where there are opportunities for sustainability and scaling up of the experiences (e.g. political openness and commitment of local authorities, ease of dissemination, presence of development programmes to establish linkages, etc.)
5. The ***partner must demonstrate a clearly defined overall intervention strategy at the time of proposal submission*** that will ***ultimately conclude with phase-out and or handover***, either to the target community/institution, the appropriate authorities, or an appropriate longer-term funding instrument, such that ***sustainability and replicability*** of actions undertaken is maximised. In this sense partners should
 - Ensure the participation of communities and concerned authorities from the formulation of the proposal to the implementation, monitoring and evaluation phases.
 - Provide evidence that political commitment and institutional engagements allow the continuity or scaling up of the operations beyond the project proposed.
 - Orientate local stakeholders on existing mechanisms to access public funds for DRR beyond the duration of the project proposed.
 - Advocate for the establishment of political and technical mechanisms to ensure the continuity of the efforts, regardless of changes in municipal and national government.

6. The strategic dialogue that results in the conception and design of DIPECHO funded DP projects will have to ***successfully merge technical-scientific knowledge with local knowledge*** in a socio-culturally appropriate manner, thereby assuring an acceptable, effective system that capitalises knowledge and capacities and consequently maximises ownership and access to proper information.
7. As per DG ECHO's priorities, an active effort to ensure ***involvement of women, children, the elderly, ethnic minorities, vulnerable groups such as disabled*** is strongly encouraged.

Complementarity and coordination

8. Many countries have developed ***National Disaster Management Legislation, Policies and Plans*** to which preparedness and mitigation (and prevention) strategies contribute. All proposed actions should be aligned with them and should contribute to their implementation and consolidation, in particular at the appropriate sub-national and local levels.
9. A key interface in the development of DP strategies is the ***National Disaster Management institutions***, which in many countries are responsible for the articulation of a national risk reduction policy. However, this does not preclude a ***multi-ministerial*** planning/programming dialogue.
10. ***In the same sense***, all submitted projects must be developed with ***cognisance of*** and ideally contribute to the strategic objective of ***all on-going and planned instruments of donor cooperation*** in the third country, including DG ECHO or other EU initiatives, where relevant.
11. Even where a DIPECHO strategy is introduced as an exit vehicle for the phase-out of a DG ECHO strategy, thereby facilitating the linking of a humanitarian relief intervention with rehabilitation, recovery and development (LRRD), long term development perspectives must be considered.
12. Applicants should provide details of the ***coordination mechanisms*** existing both ***at local, sub-national and national levels*** taking into account linkages with other on-going initiatives.

Joint initiatives between partners

13. Activities to be carried out at national level (communication strategies, national campaigns and events, consultative processes, advocacy to national institutions, dissemination of the DRR Country Document, etc.) should be carried out jointly or at least fully coordinated by all DIPECHO partners in a country in order to gain efficiency and impact. Partners should integrate in proposals and budgets their participation in these joint activities with other DRR stakeholders and DIPECHO partners.
14. Taking into consideration that consultative process and updating of DRR Country Documents have evolved to be open and not necessarily specific to DIPECHO, they will not necessarily be performed in a systematic and similar way in all countries. In each country, this process will be defined based on the requirements established to that effect by the National Disaster Management offices (NDMO). In this sense, the budget considered in the proposals to this effect should be adapted to requirements expressed by each NDMO.

Miscellaneous

15. It is imperative that strategies ***encompass low cost solutions and technical assistance designs*** that accurately reflect the degree of sustained budgetary commitment that can ***realistically*** be expected from national, sub-national and/or local budgets.

16. Development and improvement of specific tools is highly recommended but only if dissemination and follow up strategies are integrated as part the Tools. Nevertheless, before producing new tools, the use of existing material should be prioritised. Development of new documents should be limited to the cases when there are no similar tools or when no experiences have been already systematised.
17. Small-scale mitigation works and infrastructure are to remain **complementary** (both in terms of contingency plan priority and resource allocation). Proposals that seek merely to address structural issues, for example, of food insecurity or inadequate delivery of basic services, **will not be considered eligible**. Actions of this type will need to clearly demonstrate logic within the development of a DRR strategy that is both complementary and enhances sustainability.
18. **Climate change adaptation** cannot be the sole focus of a specific and ad hoc DIPECHO project. However, projects can integrate it in risk analysis when relevant and look at links between DRR activities and institutions in charge of the monitoring climate change (CC).
19. Considering the demonstrative value of DIPECHO projects, DG ECHO promotes the development of communication strategies for dissemination of products including the presentation of DIPECHO experiences in other DRR fora.
20. Surveys at the beginning and at the end of the project at community and institutional level should be carried out in order to measure achievements and to track changes in practices.
21. It is encourage to capture evidence of success (could be in the past or throughout the project).
22. Taking into account DIPECHO is a programme rather than a collection of projects, collaborative strategic formulation and planning between potential DIPECHO partners that promote mutual complementarity is strongly encouraged. This can take the form of joint projects (consortia) or joint initiatives implemented through several projects (alliances). In this sense, partners are encouraged to coordinate from the identification and formulation phase. Consortia or multi country operations with a clear added value will be given advantage compared to isolated operations.

1.2. General Recommendations

The following are non-sector recommendations for the applicants and not conditions that have to be necessarily fulfilled.

1. In order to avoid unnecessary time constraints and activities being carried out without a proper hand-over process, it is strongly recommended that the results and timeframe of projects are realistic and not overambitious. Considering the demonstrative objective of the DIPECHO programme, quality should prevail over quantity. In this sense, foreseeable administrative, logistical and operational constraints as well as constraints linked to change of authorities involved in the project or time needed for institutional agreements should be integrated into the proposal timeframe.
2. Applicants should consider one or more of the proposed sub-sectors, based on their experience, mandate and specific skill. ECHO encourages specialization of partners rather than systematically cover all sub-sectors in a proposal.
3. Partners are encouraged to consider Sphere minimum standards, indicators and guidance notes so as to ensure the quality of the DRR actions proposed.
4. Synergy with supranational and global DRR strategies such as the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) is encouraged mainly in the case of regional projects. In this sense, proposals including activities contributing to the ISDR campaigns (Resilient Cities, Safe Hospitals and Schools) will be welcomed.

5. Priority to institutional linkages and advocacy: the small scale and pilot actions at community level will reach a maximum effectiveness if the outputs and outcomes feed the development and implementation of DRR policies and strategies. Priority should be given to this aspect; to create a link between the findings of community-based operations and existing development policies and strategies. Consortia of different partners or projects oriented to work on this specific aspect are welcome.
6. Recognising that in some cases there is a need for an additional effort to achieve sustainable results or scaling up, DIPECHO can consider proposals for DRR strategies that are multi-phased in nature (i.e. entail a series of phases financed over ≥ 1 Action Plan), to provide consolidation, proper hand over or promotion scaling up of certain experiences or products previously developed. For this to be possible operational imperative 5 mentioned above has to be specially taken into consideration in this cases an evaluation of previous phase is recommended in order to adapt the second phase to the findings.
7. It is recommended that recruitment processes, institutional agreements and other preparatory activities start as soon as the partner receives the communication that the proposal has been accepted in order to gain implementation time. Partners are encouraged to annex Terms of Reference of project Coordinators and Memorandums of Understanding between the members of Consortia to the proposal.
8. Partners should provide enough resources for a proper monitoring and evaluation of the operations. External evaluations are not supposed to be systematically included, but only when there is a justification due to the strategic momentum, size of the operation, or particular issues which need to be evaluated. Innovative approaches, such as carrying out an evaluation of several projects, will be welcomed. In cases where an external evaluation is planned, Terms of Reference must be submitted to DG ECHO for approval before the study is launched, in order for the cost to be considered eligible.
9. Integration of technical and scientific institutions as well as Universities in projects' activities is encouraged.

1.3. Priorities in terms of geographical areas, hazards and sectors.

The Caribbean region regularly experiences natural disasters, particularly the hurricane season that lasts for six months (i.e. from June to November), with tropical storms often taking the form of a hurricane. The region is also prone to floods, flash floods, tsunamis, landslides and mudslides. Some islands experience earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. The physical risk is combined with socioeconomic factors, such as high population density, fast demographic growth, inequality and great poverty; it is the combination of these factors which affect vulnerable communities with limited coping capacity in the event of a disaster.

Four thematic considerations will be prioritized:

1. Floods and hurricanes (all regions)
2. Exposure of densely populated urban areas with vulnerable communities (Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Jamaica)
3. Earthquakes & Tsunamis (Dominican Republic, Cuba, Jamaica, Haiti & Eastern Caribbean)
4. Drought (Haiti, Eastern Caribbean & Cuba)

Caribbean DIPECHO programme should prioritize the implementation at country level of UN strategies such as Caribbean Resilient Cities (Urban DRR), Safe Hospitals, Safe Schools as well as the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (particularly the monitoring part). Climate Change Adaptation strategies will also be explored.

In context of the development of the matrix of focus areas based on a consultation process and the reviewing of key DRR strategic documents and country documents find below some indicative recommendation for a country DP approach integrating the regional partners and National Disaster Management offices deem as priority activities/ most relevant focus areas.

A total of six (6) regional agencies and eight (8) countries were contacted. The countries were selected based on the fact that they are currently in the process of preparing their country documents for DRR. The following recommendations of the 5 countries below can be considered as references of DRR priority areas at national level for the region.

The countries involved in the process are Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, and St Vincent and the Grenadines.

The top priorities for countries are:

Dominican Republic:

1. Local Disaster Management
2. Hazard Mapping Analyses and Assessments
3. Early Warning Systems
4. Institutional Linkages and Advocacy
5. Information Education and Communication
6. Small Scale Infrastructure Projects and Services

In the case of the Dominican Republic, the well-defined priorities listed in the country document which was already approved by the National Platform, have been referred.

The Local Disaster Management element is a mixture of training and local capacity building as well as the development of emergency plans and procurement of equipment. They generally aim at strengthening local committees, and the self-management at the community level.

The plans for hazard mapping include the design and implementation of a National Land management plan that includes a comprehensive risk management approach.

In the Early Warning sphere, they refer to the total encompassing range of activities that would be involved. Their focus is on investing in technology, ensuring that there is adequate coverage and sees to the maintainability and sustainability of existing networks and systems. They seek to promote and support the operations of EWS through the development of protocols and procedures socialization and dissemination within the DRM National system.

Dominican Republic will be working towards the creation of a National Platform for Disaster Risk management. This effort will be led by the Technical National Committee.

Information Education and Communication relates to awareness raising among the general public. The country will be engaging the mass media as well as designing and producing training material for the general population and pupils, and training the teachers and pupils. They will also be seeking to implement the National Risk Management Communication Strategy, especially in seismic and tsunami prone areas.

Under the Small Scale Infrastructure and services section, the DR will be focussing on structural works on existing public buildings to increase their resilience to disasters. They will

also be establishing and implementing the necessary measures via the Ministry of Public Works, for an effective implementation of the new seismic building code.

Jamaica:

1. Small Scale Infrastructure and Services
2. Local Disaster Management
3. Baseline Data development especially continuing existing community hazard profiling exercises
4. Gender/ Youth/ Special Populations

Jamaica's choices reflect their state of preparedness, and current programming. Their strength and focus is currently on community programmes and the four choices clearly reflect this direction. The country has a well-established Parish Disaster mechanism, hence the local disaster management choice. Their system is well integrated with other sectors at the local government level, as well as within the communities in the parishes. They continuously seek to build their local disaster management framework.

Small scale infrastructure and services is an on-going component of their community programmes. These mitigation activities strengthen a variety of infrastructural elements and pull on community personnel to assist. Tied into this activity is the need for accurate information on each community, thus they are seeking to improve baseline data collection to enhance further programme development. The office has in place a very competent GIS department and equipment and can accommodate the baseline data.

Saint Lucia:

1. Institutional Capacity Strengthening
2. Early Warning Systems
3. Small Scale Infrastructure and Services
4. Map Making and computerisation of data
5. Research and Dissemination

The Saint Lucia situation in summary speaks to a strengthening of the national office in order **to further build on works that already started** and to implement current plans and programmes. In the context of a DIPECHO project the institutional strengthening is summarised in providing contributions that aims to facilitate linkage between institutions and to promote coordination process. However we acknowledge the NEMOs needs in term of permanent staff and technical assistance support.

The Early Warning System (EWS), in particular for flash flooding is a key area. Currently one exists in Corinth and they want to replicate the system in other watersheds. The focus is on a community EWS, where the community will receive warnings via text, and they need to be taught how to handle messages and evacuation plan.

Small Scale Mitigation works will be led from the National Mitigation Plan and Policy. There is an action plan in place and that needs support.

Map making is critical to their evacuation plans. They need the map making capabilities to do inundation maps for tsunamis, flood zones and others. They particularly need persons with GIS capabilities, as well as the necessary hardware.

Research and dissemination of information was seen as an area that is in need of improvement not only in Saint Lucia but across the Caribbean. Technical support is needed to provide sustainable support to the district DRM committees as well as to mainstream DRR in key sector.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines:

1. Local Disaster Management
2. Stock building of Emergency relief Items
3. Capacity Strengthening
4. Information Education and Communication
5. Small scale Infrastructure and Services
6. Early Warning Systems

Local Disaster management was the top of the list along with Small scale Infrastructure and Services. Activities under these areas included EWS for tsunamis storm surge and flash floods. NEMO already identified coastal communities as well as those in land to install the systems.

The stockpiling of emergency supplies was highlighted as another major point as NEMO is currently on the process of building 4 new warehouses, and assistance is required for purchasing stocks for the 4 locations. Capacity strengthening of communities in all areas was also highlighted. This included acquisition of radios (VHF radios) and training in Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) management, First Aid and CPR, supplies management, relief management. NEMO plans to train ambulance and fire service personnel as EMTs.

In the area of telecommunications, NEMO plans to install a nationwide National Emergency Communication System. This will allow all agencies to be in touch as well as communicate island wide. Capacity Strengthening should also spread across sectors especially ministries to enable them to meet the requirements of the national plans and projects.

Grenada

1. Local Disaster Management
2. Stock Building of Emergency Relief Supplies
3. Baseline Data Development
4. Hazard mapping Analyses and Assessments
5. Capacity strengthening

Cuba

Based on hurricane Sandy lessons learnt priorities of DIPECHO contribution should contemplate the Stock Building of Emergency Relief Supplies.

The partner will have to demonstrate a clearly defined integrated intervention coordinated with other DRR actions undertaken by authorities, and will have to make evident its capacity to ensure an appropriate timely implementation of the operation.

Haiti

Additional recommendations based on national consultative meetings through the Forum de Gestion des Risques:

- Strengthen National capacities in order to deal with tsunami risk, with priority given to the communities of the Port-au-Prince metropolitan zone

- Reinforcement of the health sector in disaster preparedness through pilot and limited experiences with the aim to obtain an integration strategy proposal within SNGRD
- Advocacy towards an urban strategy for DRR (towards EU Delegation and development actors in general, DRR in the national housing and neighborhood reconstruction policy)
- Advocacy to promote replication/scaling up of good practices/methodologies through coordinated actions with national stakeholders (DPC, Haitian Red Cross, UNDP)

1.4 Recommendations in terms of contributions for the Region.

These contributions should not be necessarily implemented by regional projects, all projects can take into account the following points and should highlight when appropriate, the project components that potentially can address a regional recommendation.

The following DRR Recommendations are the main results of the consultation process undertaken to identify DRR priorities in the region with participation of the National Disaster Management offices (NDMO) and regional DIPECHO partners, validated during CDEMA's 7th Caribbean Conference on Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM). Additionally, some outputs from the Seismic Risk Reduction regional seminar, held in Santo Domingo on August 8 to 10, 2012 will complement, when appropriate, the following recommendations.

The top 3 focus areas based on this study and prior consultations are: i) Capacity-Strengthening, ii) Small-Scale Infrastructure projects and iii) Early Warning Systems (EWS). In second place, these are followed by: iv) Local Disaster Management, v) Information, Education and Communications and by vi) Hazard Mapping Analyses and Assessments/ Vulnerability Assessments.

1) Small Scale Infrastructure and Services:

- Safer building techniques and training at the community level (with contractors, masons, etc.) and the design (seismic resistant but also multi-hazard) – the example was mentioned of PAHO's work surrounding Safer Hospitals
- Suggestion to add consideration of the integration of climate change adaptation in the build back better approach

2) Capacity building (including Stock building emergency relief items)

- Need to establish competency standards; define competencies by sector and then training manuals can be produced,
- Need to expand the section on equipment procurement. It was suggested that a comprehensive list be made and that Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) equipment be included on the listing.
- Training needs defined for the community should / will need to be supported by practical elements. To include risk perception surveys: they were found to be useful in work done in Guyana.

3) Early Warning Systems

- High priority and should be a multi Hazard system
- All systems should have the capability to be integrated into the Common Alerting Protocols (CAP) with appropriate software and proper components to ensure adequate functioning.

- The systems should benefit the community more so than national systems but should interface with the national authorities
- Projects should also look at component parts of the EWS as well.

4) Local Disaster Management

- To highlight the cross cutting themes, and highlight the connections between this area and hazard mapping, climate change, gender, special populations, resilient cities campaign, communications networks.
- Integrating mapping and Geographic Information Systems (GIS), with a focus on smaller or local scale, within local planning processes, plans and decision-making

5) Information/ Education/ Communication

- Recommended that baseline data be created so as to be able to measure gains over time
- Measuring progress through survey as well as documenting and disseminating good practices and significant experiences for promoting multiplication (i.e. replicability) and to support communication activities.
- Need for evidence of success was further noted.
- Seeking out best / good practices that can be replicated
- Need to identify the specific communication networks to transmit the information over including translation in Caribbean languages.

6) Hazard Mapping

- Develop community profiles from the hazard maps
- Promote a top-down as well as a bottom - up approach
- The mapping to be done on a participatory basis with community members creating the base maps then the higher level scientific evidence fine tunes. To encourage the community to take ownership and to clearly define how the maps will be used to help it.
- Link hazard maps to spatial planning at the local level.
- Bring info down to the community level
- Seek to ensure that the hazard maps bring about changes
- To ensure local or smaller scale mapping when required and to link local mapping with the national level. Therefore the use of GIS and risk mapping (hazard, vulnerabilities and capacities and resources) for appropriate and relevant data to inform planning, zoning and decision-making at the local and community level.

Additional recommendations:

- The National authorities will work with the non-state actors in setting up a coordination mechanism to bring all the project players to the table on a regular basis. The annual DIPECHO meeting could be moved to coincide with the annual CDM conference. These efforts are to bring about a greater harmony and synergy amongst all the players and government / national authorities.
- Two broad areas were identified: 1) the national processes led by the National Disaster Offices (NDOs) bringing together partners and 2) the regional process with the annual meeting being held within the framework of the annual CDM Conferences.

- The issue of greater articulation, collaboration and coordination between NDOs and authorities in-country with DIPECHO partners working in closer relation was reiterated with the NDOs acting as a facilitator. Noted was the idea of greater convergence and the framework for greater national resilience.
- Mapping of actors and initiatives was raised, something that has often proven difficult but is nonetheless of great importance for increasing collaboration and coordination between State and non-State actors. This initiative could also facilitate a sense of ownership of related processes as well as for identifying opportunities for promoting greater synergies as well as for identifying gaps
- The application of good practices and significant experiences so as to not reinvent and therefore maximize efforts by expanding or adapting to other contexts and other countries, while mindful of those countries beyond the focus or pilot countries.
- Stress was again placed on the importance of increasing coordination and collaboration between national actors and non-state, while examples were given of how in some cases this is currently being done through DIPECHO, such as the case with the 2011-2012 Country Documents, which enable greater communication and dissemination of what is being done and therefore enables greater coordination.

2. MAIN SELECTION CRITERIA

1. Relevance

- 1.1 How relevant is the proposal to the **objectives** and one or more of the **priorities** of the call for proposals.
- 1.2 How relevant to the particular **needs and constraints** of the target populations and country/countries or region(s) is the proposal.
- 1.3 Has the proposal been **discussed** and agreed with the local authorities responsible for risk management?
- 1.4 Is this project proposal part of the applicant's **strategy** in the country and does it contribute to an on-going **strategy** of engagement in the target area?
- 1.5 Does the project target the **most vulnerable populations** and regions?
- 1.6 Are there real opportunities for the proposed actions to be sustained or scaled up by local and national institutions or other actors?
- 1.7 Does the action fit within the established **DRR legal, policy and planning frameworks** and contribute to their implementation and consolidation, in particular at local level? Does the proposal refer to the **HFA**, its priorities and if possible its core indicators? Does the project take into account: **gender, children, elderly people, environmental, cultural issues and disabilities**?
- 1.8 Does the project take into account (when relevant) the **security** and/or **access context**? What are the contingency plans?

2. Methodology

- 2.1. How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (intermediaries, final beneficiaries, **target groups**)? Have the **needs** of the **target groups** proposed and the final beneficiaries been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately? To what

degree have the target beneficiaries been involved in project conception, design and development, from the moment of problem identification?

Are the **target groups' and final beneficiaries' level of involvement and participation in the operation** satisfactory.

- 2.2. How coherent is the overall design of the operation (**logical framework**)? Are the **activities** proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the local constraints, the objectives and expected results? Is the **Action Plan** clear and feasible? Are the technical **human resources** allocated to the operation adequate? Is the presence of **experienced** coordinator and administrative staff ensured in order to provide with a proper follow-up of the action?
- 2.3. Does the proposal contain **objectively verifiable indicators** for the outcome of the operation?
- 2.4 Does the proposal include a clear monitoring and evaluation system that will allow the applicant(s) to measure the benefits of the action and to track success and changes in practices?

3. Sustainability

- 3.1 Are the expected results of the proposed operation **sustainable**: Financially, Institutionally, Locally and at policy level.
- 3.2 Is the proposal likely to have **multiplier effects**?
- 3.3 Is the operation likely to have a tangible **impact** on its target groups?

4. Budget and cost-effectiveness

- 4.1. Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?
- 4.2. Is the proposed expenditure **necessary** for the implementation of the operation?
- 4.3. Are **material** resources and **services needed properly described**?
- 4.4. Are Means and Costs related to results and activities sufficiently explained?
- 4.5. Are local or national **institutions contributing** to the project **budget**?

3. FINANCIAL QUESTIONS

- There is no specific pre-allocation per country. However, some general orientations will be taken into consideration when approving an action in each country (see above in point 4 and information sessions) to ensure the achievement of DG ECHO's strategic priorities both at country and regional levels.
- As a general policy priority will be given to co-financed projects, in order to maintain the perspective of contributing to a strategy elaborated by a partner. DG **ECHO's contribution will not exceed 85% of the total eligible costs of the action**. It is expected that the balance of at least 15% of the total eligible costs will be financed from the partners' own resources, or from sources other than the European Community budget. This priority will be applied in the overall appraisal of submitted proposals.
- The proposal, both in the narrative and financial documents, should reflect the full amount proposed (i.e. the co-financing and the contribution requested to DG ECHO, without separate earmarking).
- ECHO does not advise carrying out internal audits in the framework of DIPECHO projects.

4. CALENDAR OF THE ACTION PLAN

- November 2012: Publication of HIP
- December: Publication Operational Orientations
- 1 January 2013: Starting date of the Global DIPECHO Funding Decision and start date for eligibility of expenses
- 31 January 2013: Tentative deadline for submitting proposals
- February – March 2013: Selection of proposals
- 1 March 2013: Projects can start from that date
- 13 October 2013: International Disaster Risk Reduction Day
- 31 December 2014: End date of the DIPECHO Global Funding Decision

Annex 1: Submitting a proposal to DG ECHO.

To allow a swift processing of project proposals, the following recommendations should be taken into account when designing and submitting a project.

In non emergency situation and to avoid a gap between the eligibility date of the activities and the signature of the grant agreement, partners should expect a period no less than 45 days between the initial discussions and their finalization, to allow sufficient time for the field discussion and review and HQ appraisal process.

Proposals should be submitted using the Single Form at the latest 31 January 2013. Proposed starting date of the projects is 1 March 2013.

The Single Forms must be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL with copy to Bernard.Boigelot@ec.europa.eu (Desk Officer for the Caribbean, and to Sandra.Descroix@ec.europa.eu (Desk Officer for HAITI) and to echo.santodomingo@echofield.eu (ECHO Field Office for the Caribbean)

All partners are requested to read and make use of the **DG ECHO Single Form guidelines**, available at http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm.

In the context of DG ECHO's mandate, the actions supported will have a **short-term nature (up to 18 months implementation period)**. For this reason DG ECHO partners should design their actions in order to ensure that the proposed objective can be **achieved** and **measured** by "SMART" indicators in this timeframe.

The **logframe and the intervention logic** (section 4.3.2 of the Single Form) are of upmost importance in the appraisal of project proposals. DG ECHO partners are then requested to pay careful attention to **DG ECHO guidelines on the Single Form**, p 10 to 15.

Linked to their presentation, DG ECHO partners are strongly encouraged to define already clearly at proposal stage which **contingency measures/activities** are foreseen in case of materialisation of a pre-identified risk. DG ECHO partners should define at proposal stage the circumstances in which contingency measures would be implemented (which data would be used to launch the contingency measures); and what would be the actions planned under these circumstances (see section #8.1 of the Single Form).

The **costs** of the project submitted to DG ECHO are presented in the Single Form in:

- The description of the results
- The section 4.2.3.4 of the Single Form (table "Other costs).
- The section 11 of the Single Form (Financial Overview)

It is important to recall that:

Sufficient information has to be provided in the description of the results (description of activities and related means) so that the costs allocated to the result can be understood. All costs related to a particular result have to be included (ie. logistics, monitoring, supervision, etc..)

The table "**Other Costs**" under section 4.2.3.4 of the Single Form should only include costs that cannot be allocated to or dispatched between the results. Ex: visibility, office costs in the capital, evaluation etc...

The financial overview will comprise annex II to the grant agreement. However, its design regarding the selection of headings to the different lines of the table is left to the choice of the partners as long as:

- The same table is used throughout the project (proposal and reporting stages)
- DG ECHO can identify clearly what is being spent in terms of personnel costs and visibility.

DG ECHO partners are strongly encouraged to include the required technical expertise in each of the sectors concerned and DG ECHO will pay particular attention to this aspect regarding the feasibility of the proposed operation.

As a general policy, DG ECHO gives **priority to co-financing**, compared to 100% financing. This priority will be applied in the overall appraisal of the proposals submitted to DG ECHO in the framework of this funding decision. In order to maintain DG ECHO's perspective of contributing to a strategy elaborated by a partner, the co-financing expected from the partner should be at least 15% of the total costs of the operation.

Proposals should include provisions for actions aiming at **documenting, disseminating and replicating lessons learned and good practices; as well as integrating them** in strategies beyond the project perspective, at country and regional levels. This implies participating to and/or supporting the organisation of *ad hoc* events or processes within the implementation period of the projects.

Annex 2: Communication and visibility

The Single Form contains three sections to develop the communication and visibility plan of a DG ECHO funded project. It is recalled that under Article 6.1 of the General Conditions, “The humanitarian organization shall contribute to the visibility of the humanitarian operations financed by the European Community, provided that this does not harm the organization's mandate or the safety of its staff.”

The need for effective communication is also linked to a number of specific factors:

- ⇒ *The obligation to be transparent.* DG ECHO manages public funds and has a duty to inform EU citizens about how the money is spent. Few EU citizens are aware that the Commission is one of the world’s largest humanitarian donors.
- ⇒ *“Getting closer to the citizen”.* This is a Commission commitment that entails pro-active communication efforts. Most EU Member State citizens support the idea of aiding the world’s most vulnerable people through relief assistance. They should be informed that this support is carried out in the work of DG ECHO and its implementing partners.
- ⇒ *Underlining European solidarity.* People living in countries affected by crises (victims, host populations and opinion leaders) should be aware of the EU’s solidarity expressed in concrete terms through humanitarian aid. Messages such as the impartiality of aid, the fact that it is needs-based, and its non-discriminatory nature are particularly significant.
- ⇒ *Highlighting a ‘badge of quality’:* Given the stringent criteria for acceding to the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA), partner organizations can benefit from publicizing their quality relationship with DG ECHO.

Visibility represents the mandatory display of the visual identity of the European Commission Humanitarian Aid department, wherever the partner’s own logo is being displayed, in the field or elsewhere; this includes on its website and equipment, (in cases where equipment or vehicles and major supplies have been purchased using funds provided by the Commission), publications about the project financed by the Commission, etc.). The visibility should appear, but only provided that this does not harm the organization's mandate or the safety of its staff, (Art 6.3 general conditions). The size of the visual identity will depend on the context and the space available.

It is to be noted that DG ECHO visibility items are to be budgeted within programme budgets and the DG ECHO field offices do not provide those items, unless in exceptional circumstances.

The decision to avoid visibility for security reason is to be discussed on a *case-by-case* basis with DG ECHO and requires approval by ECHO HQ. There are no automatic waivers.

Basic visibility also entails highlighting or at least, acknowledging, the European Commission as the donor in media interviews, press releases, or any other situation where the partner communicates about a funded project.

However, partners should exercise caution and ensure that **visibility actions do not undermine the project’s ownership in the community**. As much as possible, the community’s role in the implementation of the project should be acknowledged in the visual displays.

Communication represents a proactive dissemination of data and key messages to identified target audiences. Communication plans and budgets are welcome and should be discussed with DG ECHO at the proposal level, to define where ECHO can assist at best.

Since the principle of effectiveness applies as much to communication as to any other element of the project, pro-active information and communication activities are optional.

Changes in visibility, information and communication funding

The European Commission Humanitarian Aid department has set a limit to funding that partners can allocate to visibility, information and communication in humanitarian operational agreements. This is now pegged at 0.5% of the direct eligible costs with a maximum of EUR 8,000. However, exceptions may be allowed in the following circumstances:

- the partner has communication experience and expertise, and is keen to exploit the benefits of joint actions and visibility;
- the partner wishes to propose an impact oriented communication activity that would need a larger budget.

The partners should contact the relevant Regional Information Officer when designing such activity.

Reporting on visibility, information and communication has also changed. Partners should now include, with the final reports supporting documents such as photos of stickers on vehicles or supplies and of signboards, photos of ‘branded’ visibility items (tee-shirts, caps etc.), copies of press releases and press cuttings, etc.

Annex 3: Useful links for applicants

- 📖 Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) for NGOs and International Organisations
http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm
 - Application form (Single Form)
 - GUIDELINES FOR SINGLE FORM AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION
 - FPA FACTSHEETS, FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS, INTERACTIVE TRAINING AND HELP-DESK
 - FPA REGULATIONS AND DOCUMENTS; GENERAL CONDITIONS
 - [COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY TOOLKIT](#)
 - 📖 Guidelines for the submission of e-single form with APPEL
http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/etools_en.htm
 - 📖 2011-2012 DIPECHO Action Plan for the Caribbean (UNISDR website)
<http://eird.org/dipecho-action-plan-caribbean/index.html>
DRR Country Documents and reports of the region will be available at this website
 - 📖 [DG ECHO's Policies and Evaluations](#)
[DG ECHO's review on Water and Sanitation in 2005](#)
 - 📖 [Council Regulation No 1605/2002 of 25/06/2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Union](#) (OJ L 248, 16/09/2002) and Commission Regulation No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation No 1605/2002
- OTHER INFORMATION**
- 📖 GENERAL INFORMATION ON [DISASTER RISK REDUCTION IN DG ECHO](#)
 - 📖 [EU Strategy on supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in developing countries](#)
 - 📖 EU Regional Programming Document for Latin America and the Caribbean [LAC RPD](#)
European Union External Action Services Country Index [EU per Country](#)
 - 📖 http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/evaluation/thematic_en.htm
 - 📖 [International Strategy for Disaster Reduction](#), Hyogo Framework for Action
UN ISDR [2010-2011 World Disaster Reduction Campaign](#)
World Campaign on [Safe Hospitals](#)
World Campaign on [Disaster risk reduction begins at school](#)
World Campaign on resilient cities [My city is getting ready](#)

Annex 4: Examples of SMART DP indicators

Towards better indicators: Examples of good indicators for the DRR sector in LAC

- Please note that the below-mentioned indicators are RESULTS' INDICATORS only. Although working on this type of indicators is essential, we also want to recall that a lot of work has been done on developing other types of indicators (context, impact, indicators to measure response capacities to face an event at local and municipal levels and how to mainstream DRR in the response) in the region, which is very important to consider before/during/after project implementation. Discussions are still on-going on these types of indicators inside the region and inside the DRR working group.

- In the Caribbean, there has been a practice to include in all DIPECHO projects a common indicator in order to be able to compare and strengthen the impact of the projects. This has been reviewed in the last regional consultative meeting and improved for the 7th Action Plan. See below for more information.

- The results' indicators presented in this document have been grouped into five major components (which correspond to the DIPECHO main chapters) and imperatively need to be SMART. The indicators should also mainstream to the extent possible issues such as gender, participation of vulnerable groups and environmental aspects. In the Caribbean region, partners do not necessarily use this system in the DIPECHO Action Plans but rather merge the main chapters within two to three results.

- The first step of producing good results' indicators is to master the Project Cycle Management (especially the LFA). Those who write the proposals should be properly trained on this matter. This is one key recommendation for partners.

DISCLAIMER

These indicators are for reference purpose only; they need to be adapted to each specific context.

1. Local Disaster Management Components

1.1 #2 of local committees (*and/or brigades, according to the context*) have been established, trained, equipped, are functioning and recognized by the rest of the community (*or by the Municipality if required by law*).

SOV: simulation exercise evaluation, training curricula, KAP study, minutes of local committee meetings, list of equipment distribution

1.2. At least # communities have developed contingency plans that are validated.

SOV: Final contingency plans, risk maps, simulation exercise evaluation

1.3 At the end of the project, an EWS is functioning, appropriate and managed by the community and/or municipality

SOV: Communication protocols, monitoring protocols, evacuation protocols, recognition acts by the National System, simulation exercise evaluation

1.4 At least X% of the beneficiaries know and are able to identify the EWS alarm and alert signals and can provide and receive information in an understandable and timely way.

SOV: simulation exercise evaluation, communication protocols, monitoring protocols, evacuation protocols

2. Institutional linkages and advocacy

2.1 After X months of the project, # municipal committees established, trained, equipped and operational.

SOV: list of participants, training curricula, list of equipment distribution, simulation exercise evaluation

2.2 Municipal Committees developed contingency plans that are validated

SOV: list of participants, training curricula, simulation exercise evaluation, municipal emergency plan

2.3 The participating Municipalities have assigned % of their next budget year planning for Disaster Preparedness activities (*please note that this indicator is possible only in certain contexts*)

SOV: minutes from municipal meetings, next budget year planning, list of identified activities.

2.4 The EOC in # municipalities has been created, equipped and become operational with each one of the participating members knowing their role and responsibilities.

SOV: municipal simulation exercise evaluation, pictures, act of handing over the material for the EOC, final survey

2.5 There is at least 1 coordination and communication formal protocol between regional, municipal and communal commissions before the end of the project

SOV: *minutes of inter institutional meetings, communication protocol signed by the different levels of the System, lists of participants to the meetings organized between the different levels.*

3. Information, Education, Communication

3.1 At the end of the project, at least X people (*or % of the beneficiaries*) (adults and children) of the target communities know the risks of the hazard (*mention it*) and know the contingency measures to adopt in case of disaster.

SOV: final KAP study, list of participants, curricula of the trainings, simulation exercise evaluation

3.2 % of indirect beneficiaries knowledgeable about community contingency plans

SOV: simulation exercise evaluation, KAP study

3.3 % of schools of the intervention have school emergency plans (*please specify the local language when needed*) and these have been validated by the parents, teachers, children and the rest of the community.

SOV: school emergency plans, list of people taking part to the school brigades, DRR training curricula for schools, list of participants during the validation process, community emergency plan, and simulation exercise

3.4 Best practices, tools and experience on DRR in this project are identified, systematized and disseminated through X (*please specify one common channel*).

SOV: format of the used methodology, list of systematized experiences, web site of X, rating of website visits, list of participants to the NCM

Take into account that reports and attendance lists are not a sufficient way of verifying that the participants have acquired relevant knowledge from training.

4. Small Scale Infrastructure and Service

4.1 At mid-term of the project, at least X% of the beneficiary communities have identified community infrastructures to be improved and/or constructed to be used during emergencies and this has been agreed with the Municipality.

SOV: list of participants, minutes of the community assemblies, community emergency plan, signed letter from the Municipality

4.2 # shelters have been improved, following internationally accepted standards, to receive # people.

SOV: list of work undergone by shelter, pictures, sphere norms and indicators taken into account.

5. Stock building of emergency and relief items

5.1 In the X Municipality, an emergency stock (*provide details on the specificities of the stocks*) is available to cover the immediate needs of at least # of people during and in the immediate aftermath an emergency following the Sphere standards

SOV: lists of material in the shelters, distribution protocols, list of sphere indicators taken into account

5.2 At the end of the project, each Municipality has at least 1 space refurbished and equipped for warehousing and knows how to manage it, and has the capacity to attend at least #% of the most vulnerable population identified.

SOV: Simulation exercise evaluation, distribution protocols established, detailed list of stocks, procedure manual for the shelter management

6. Livelihood and economic assets protection

6.1. % of the population applying resilient agricultural practices.

SOV: baseline and final survey

6.2. % of families who diversified their food production by including at least X new products

SOV: baseline and final survey

6.3. X communities have access to a well-stocked and maintained emergency seed bank

SOV: final survey

Annex 5: Matrix - Selected of Focus Areas and Priorities.

	SELECTED FOCUS AREA	EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES	PRIORITIES/ COMMENTS	Target Groups Active Participants
1	Small Scale Infrastructure and Services	Structural works on existing public buildings; training on action and maintenance systems, integration into local development plans, development of mitigation plans and policy, safe hospital surveys to continue, establishment of mitigation officers national level	At community level, infrastructure support and mitigation works, bottom up approach to be utilized. The works will be tied into national policies where possible, and the community must be involved in the selection of the projects.	The community will have safer and more resilient infrastructure and more able to with stand hazard impacts
2	Capacity Strengthening	Training and exercises in DRM and other areas, sector training as well so as to enable them to plan and respond, development of policies and procedures, equipment procurement	Critical for the sustainability of the programmes and activities developed. Capacity development is to be carefully assessed and implemented and to ensure that it meets the needs	national and community level DRM organizations to benefit, as well as sectoral partners.
3	Early Warning Systems	Community Systems for flash floods; analysis and hazard monitoring; survey of rivers; evacuation plans in response to alerts	EWS was mentioned by all and was recommended for flooding in particular, then for tsunamis. Agricultural use was also highlighted for droughts. The EWS was not only sirens etc but to include a full fledged programme including training and plans	The community members will be the significant beneficiaries inclusive of farmers and other sectors.
4	Local Disaster Management	Early Warning Systems, mapping and data computerization, local capacity building training, Training of Community Members, establishment of community committees, training of local authorities, development of community and district plans	Targeting local actors in disaster prone areas, strengthening the local government authorities and systems, and ensuring a link to the national systems and structures	local government authorities, municipal authorities, communities as well as CBOas, NGOs and other interest groups working at the community level.
5	Information , Education and Communication	Awareness raising among the general public, mass media communication, design and production of training materials for population and pupils, training of teacher and pupils as well as community members, safe hospitals campaigns, communication links between sectors	Targeting direct and indirect beneficiaries. This is a wide span activity, cross sectoral and not only for DRM.	The entire population in general, and depending on target sector, will benefit specific groups
6	Hazard Mapping Analyses and Assessments/ Vulnerability Assessments	Hazard mapping, VCA, Hazard analysis, risk assessments, Comprehensive baseline study on each community. KAP (Knowledge Attitudes and Practices) , hazard monitoring, GIS systems established, training in mapping and use of satellite imagery, data collection for risk mapping	Critical to establish the current levels of each so the programmes and projects accurately address the needs. Disaster preparedness interventions to be based on Hazard Vulnerability Capacity Assessment (HCVA) and rapid Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA). These activities will require collaboration between the scientists / academics and public institutions.	Main beneficiaries will be the DRM institutions, planning agencies, local government authorities.