



European Commission

Instructions and Guidelines
for DG ECHO potential partners wishing to submit proposals for a

**SIXTH DIPECHO ACTION PLAN IN CENTRAL AMERICA
COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, NICARAGUA, PANAMA**

Budget article 23 02 02

Deadline for submitting proposals: 30 April 2008

Table of contents

BACKGROUND.....	3
1. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME AND PRIORITY ISSUES FOR THE 6TH ACTION PLAN FOR CENTRAL AMERICA	6
1.1 Principal objective	5
1.2 Specific objective	5
1.3 Strategic programming imperatives (sine qua non).....	6
1.4 Type of activities	8
1.5 Priorities in terms of geographical areas, hazards and sectors	11
1.6 Visibility and Communication requirements.....	16
2. FINANCIAL ALLOCATION PROVIDED	18
3. RULES OF THIS EXPRESSION OF INTEREST	19
3.1 Eligibility criteria.....	19
3.1.1 Eligibility of applicants: who may apply.....	19
3.1.2 Eligible operations: operations for which an application may be made.....	19
3.1.3 Eligibility of costs: costs which may be taken into consideration for the grant.....	20
3.2 How to apply and the procedures to follow.....	21
3.2.1 Application form and supporting documents	21
3.2.2 Where and how to send the applications	22
3.2.3 Deadline for receipt of applications.....	22
3.2.4 Further information	22
3.2.5 Acknowledgement of receipt.....	22
3.3 Evaluation and selection of applications.....	23
3.4 Notification of the European Community's decision.....	26
4. CHECK LIST	27
GLOSSARY	28

BACKGROUND

According to Article 2(f) of Humanitarian Aid Regulation (EC) of 20 June 1996¹, DG ECHO's activities in the field of Disaster Preparedness shall be "to ensure preparedness for risks of natural disasters or comparable 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 to improve the capacities of communities at risk to better prepare and protect themselves from natural disasters. Initially the DIPECHO programme focused on three regions: Central America, South-East Asia (including Bangladesh) and the Caribbean. In 1998, the DIPECHO Programme was expanded to include two further regions that are highly exposed to natural disasters, namely South Asia and the Andean Community. In 2003, following the recommendations of a specific evaluation, Central Asia became the sixth DIPECHO region. While DG ECHO provides humanitarian aid for all kinds of disasters, in the field of disaster preparedness, DG ECHO focuses on extreme natural events of hydro-meteorological or geological origin.

At the end of the 1997, a diagnostic study was carried out to identify the risks, to evaluate the socio-economic vulnerability of communities and the risk to properties, and to determine what local, national and regional response capacity and what external support were under way in the Central American Region. In 1998, on the basis of the recommendations and conclusions of this diagnostic study, DG ECHO launched a First DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America, which included 6 projects for a total amount of EUR 2.1 million. In 2000, a Second DIPECHO Action Plan was launched for Central America with 10 projects for a total amount of EUR 3.5 million.

In 2003 DG ECHO launched a study on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)² where Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala were ranked at a very high level of disaster risk and Costa Rica and Panama at a medium level of disaster risk, compared to other regions.

Based on the DRR study and on the disasters that affected this region at that time³, DG ECHO launched the Third DIPECHO Action Plan in 2003 for an amount of EUR 3.1 million, and included 12 projects. A regional seminar was held in April 2004 in Guatemala with the local authorities and stakeholders involved in preparedness and prevention, to take stock of the lessons learned from such projects. The main conclusions of this seminar served as a basis for designing the Fourth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America.

The Fourth DIPECHO Action Plan was launched in 2004 for an amount of EUR 6.0 million, and included 18 projects. These projects came to an end in March-April 2006. In order to take stock of the lessons learned from those projects, a wide dissemination process was undertaken from March to April 2006, involving DIPECHO partners, relevant authorities, scientists, local and international organisations. This dissemination effort was accompanied by an extensive consultation process at national and regional levels which helped to prepare the ground for the Fifth DIPECHO Action Plan.

The Fifth DIPECHO Action Plan was launched in 2006 for an initial amount of EUR 6.0 million, with an additional EUR 1.5 million added in 2007, and supports 23 projects aiming at reducing risk through the level of preparedness of the vulnerable populations in the areas most exposed to recurrent natural threats. For the first time ever, regional projects account for a significant share of total funding. The projects will come to an end between May and October 2008.

¹ EC Regulation N°1257/96 of 20 June 1996, OL L163 of 02.07.1996

² December 2003, Evaluation of DG ECHO's strategic orientation to disaster reduction available on DG ECHO's website: http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/pdf_files/evaluation/2003/disaster_report.pdf

³ To name a few: Hurricane Mitch in 1998, earthquakes in El Salvador in 2001, drought in 2001-2003.

In order to prepare the ground for the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan, an extensive consultation process was undertaken in November 2007: National Consultative Meetings (NCMs) were held in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, and one Regional Consultative Meeting (RCM) was held in Guatemala. More than 400 DP experts participated in this process, including DIPECHO partners, relevant authorities (local, national and regional), scientists, local and international organisations. Notably, four national consultative meetings, as well as one regional seminar, were held

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.

An external evaluation of the DIPECHO programme in Central America was carried out in 2007. According to the final evaluation report, *"support for community based Disaster Preparedness in Central America has been and remains very relevant in the national and regional contexts. The programme's overriding objective of reducing risk by better preparing vulnerable populations in the most disaster prone areas maintains a high level of pertinence. Disaster preparedness remains a key factor to saving lives and ensuring an appropriate response in disaster prone Central America. The programme continues to fill a gap taken up on by very few other agencies or programmes. DIPECHO programmes and objectives are generally well understood by beneficiaries. The DRR initiatives of other EC services, national and regional efforts, and of bilateral cooperation agencies are meagre and do not provide a basis for phasing out DIPECHO in the short or even medium term"*. This Call takes into consideration several recommendations included in the final evaluation report.

An amount of EUR 20 million was approved by EC/RELEX for Central America for a regional programme on disaster prevention (PREVDA) that was officially launched in 2007. This programme should contribute to a reduction of the vulnerability of the region and an improvement of the environmental situation by reinforcing the regional and national capacities in terms of planning, prevention and information management. PREVDA aims to promote the harmonisation of legal frameworks and capacities. It also envisages actions at the local level in strategic main river basins. A regional food security programme – PRESANCA- of EUR 15.0 million was launched by Commission services to, *inter alia*, address the need for rapid reaction and early warning in terms of food insecurity in the region.

These studies and experiences, 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 been taken into account in setting the priorities for the Sixth 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.

The Priorities for Action of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)⁴ 2005–2015: *"Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters"*⁵ provide the strategic logic underlying the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America, as well as CEPREDENAC's regional plan for disaster reduction (PRRD) for 2006-2015.

These Guidelines set out the rules for the submission, selection and implementation of project proposals financed under the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America, in conformity with the provisions of DG ECHO's Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) and the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Community.

⁴ <http://www.unisdr.org>

⁵ The five 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.

On 10 March 2008 the European Commission adopted the Humanitarian Aid Decision ECHO/DIP/BUD/2008/03000, which is the legal basis for this Call for Proposals. These Guidelines complement the Decision by providing additional practical information to interested applicants.

Links to all relevant documents and tools developed to help in the application process are included in this document.

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME AND PRIORITY ISSUES FOR THE SIXTH ACTION PLAN FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

1.1. Principal objective

The overriding objective of this DIPECHO Action Plan is to reduce risk by better preparing the vulnerable populations in the areas most prone to natural disasters in Central America.

The programme aims to do this primarily by:

- targeting the most vulnerable communities and categories of population using bottom-up participatory methods and relevant local materials/resources that can be easily replicated;
- focusing on the areas most exposed to natural hazards and with lower coping capacities;
- fostering appropriate and sustainable innovative preparedness activities that are co-ordinated with local, national and regional public institutions and that can be easily replicated in other parts of the region and beyond;
- Small-scale mitigation activities which have a demonstrative, complementary purpose, proven impact and can be easily replicated in other parts of the region and beyond;
- Reinforcing local first response capacity: stock building of emergency and relief items close to isolated vulnerable communities and training of communities and local emergency response institutions in the management of these stocks during emergencies.

1.2. Specific objective

Please note that for the purpose of this expression of interest, DG ECHO understands:

- Coping capacity as the level of resources and the manner in which people or organisations use these resources and abilities to face the adverse consequences of a disaster.
- Resilience as the capacity of an ecosystem, society or community to assimilate a negative impact and to recuperate once it has been affected by a dangerous physical phenomenon.
- Preparedness refers to measures used to organize and facilitate operations for the effective and opportune warning, rescue and rehabilitation of populations and economies in case of disaster. Preparedness is undertaken by means of the organization and planning of warnings, evacuation, search and rescue, help and assistance that are required during an emergency and should guarantee that the systems, procedures, and resources required to face up to an emergency or disaster are available in order to offer opportune help to the affected, using where possible, existing mechanisms (training, sensitization, emergency plans, early warning systems). Preparation also involves activities that increase the options for the population to use local resources to deal with rehabilitation and recuperation (damage assessment, project formulation training, knowledge of construction techniques etc).
- Local level refers to community and municipal levels.
- Sub-national level refers to departmental or any other (below national) level (according to the political-administrative division of the country).
- National level refers to country level.
- Regional level refers to the Central American⁶ regional level.

Projects submitted should target the following **objective, address the points raised in 1.3, include one or more activities listed below in section 1.4, and target one of the geographical areas included in section 1.5:**

⁶ For the purpose of this Call Central America encompasses the following countries: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama.

Specific objective:

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.

DG ECHO will take into account, when evaluating the proposals, the overall consistency and synergy among selected proposals and with other ongoing interventions in the field of Disaster Risk Reduction in the countries/region and which are in line themselves with the Disaster Reduction Strategic Framework for Central America and the Disaster Reduction Regional Plan for 2006-2015⁷ and with the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015.

1.3. Strategic Programming Imperatives (*sine qua non*)

A series of programme planning and implementation priorities **must be considered by all projects** submitted under the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America to be considered eligible for funding.

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 ongoing implementation measures of the HFA in the region.
2. The ***starting point for the intervention logic of any DIPECHO supported project must be the hazard(s) itself and the inadequacy of the emergency response capacity***, 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:
 - i. a typology of hazards in evidence,
 - ii. the determination of the range of negative consequences of these hazards (some of which can be termed disasters),
 - iii. an analysis of these negative consequences and a prioritisation of those considered most important by the population(s) at risk,
 - iv. a breakdown of the needs in terms of disaster preparedness ensuing from these hazards and the identification (prioritisation) of those which can most appropriately be addressed by DIPECHO.
3. For a ***disaster preparedness strategy*** (particularly at community level) to have relevance from the perspective of the end-user, it should ***address the most pressing concerns of the community***, even individual households. Without an appropriate profundity of analysis through Hazard Vulnerability Capacity Assessment (HVCA)/rapid Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) for example, this can easily be overlooked by external actors when formulating an appropriate intervention strategy.
4. In recognition of the complementary nature of DP programming and its contribution to protecting cumulative development gains accrued thus far, all community-based DIPECHO strategies are to be ***developed within the context of an ongoing, established development strategy*** with the target community.
DIPECHO support should not be solicited for projects at the community level where a minimum development interface does not already exist⁸ – it is ***not to be seen as a start-up fund***. The only exception for considering ad hoc, focused or stand-alone disaster preparedness activities, would be when applicants apply an ***innovative approach***.

⁷ <http://www.cepredenac.org>

⁸ The introduction of a DIPECHO project should at the very least have been preceded by a substantial social-anthropological economic study and PRA so as to ensure that the basic community dynamics, governance and decision making systems are adequately understood.

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.

5. **Complementarity with other cooperation instruments of the EUROPEAN COMMISSION.** All submitted projects must be developed with *cognisance of* (and ideally contribute to the strategic objective of) **all ongoing and planned instruments of EC cooperation** in the country/region of operation, including those of DG ECHO, where relevant.
6. **Strategic planning and programming should be undertaken in a fully inclusive manner** so as to ensure harmony and promote synergy with other disaster risk reduction strategies in targeted areas of operation (sponsored by other funding sources and executed by other implementing agencies). **Collaborative strategic formulation and planning between prospective DIPECHO partners** in a country (zone) of operation that promotes mutual complementarity is positively encouraged.
7. Small-scale mitigation activities are to remain **secondary and complementary** (both in terms of strategic priority and resource allocation) to **DP programming**. The resources available under a DIPECHO Action Plan **are not to be considered an alternative funding source** for actions that are included under other medium to long term funding instruments of the EUROPEAN COMMISSION (e.g. PREVDA, Food Security budget line) or other multi-lateral or bi-lateral sources. 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 ilk will need to clearly demonstrate a logic within the development of a disaster risk reduction strategy that is both complementary and enhances sustainability. Only those small-scale mitigation activities that have been defined in function of the broader disaster risk management planning process at the local level will be considered eligible.
8. The implementation of a successful DP strategy is dependent upon the sustained investment of all stakeholders at multiple levels before, during and upon completion of the project cycle, the omission of which, be it of the direct involvement of target beneficiaries in the community or the participation of the local authorities or others, **will result in project failure**. This entails as complete an involvement of communities and relevant authorities as is feasible throughout the entire project cycle, from problem/hazard/risk identification, to project conception and design through implementation to evaluation and long-term hazard monitoring and management. Without an appropriate emphasis on community members' participation, **the system will fail**, as many have before that were effectively born of the attitudes, evaluations and strategic parameters of external actors. Likewise, **relevant public entities, officials and stakeholders at the appropriate levels must be consulted and involved at all stages** of the action (design, preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, follow-up and hand-over where feasible).
9. The strategic dialogue that results in the conception and design of DIPECHO funded DP projects will have to **successfully merge technical knowledge with indigenous knowledge** in a socio-culturally appropriate manner, thereby assuring an acceptable, effective system that capitalises on existing knowledge and capacities and consequently maximises the longevity of ownership and sustainability.
10. At the core of DIPECHO's conception was the philosophy of chaperoning **pilot projects in DP so as to identify successful models for replication** elsewhere by other funding instruments of the European Commission, other donors or national governments.
11. Although disaster preparedness as a national policy is commonly in its infancy, many countries have developed **National Disaster Management Legislation, Policies and Plans** to which preparedness and mitigation (and prevention) strategies contribute. The knowledge of, and contribution to these, are considered imperative in the preparation of a project strategy to be submitted to DIPECHO.

12. The operation and maintenance of a DP mechanism and its interrelated components, is often a bottleneck for sustainability. It is therefore 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.
13. The key components of a system that require maintenance by the community or nominated individuals must have a general relevance to the lives of community members. As per DG ECHO's priorities, an increased **involvement of women, children, the elderly, ethnic minorities, vulnerable groups such as disabled** is strongly encouraged.
 - *Non exhaustive examples: training of relevant personnel of implementing agencies, community facilitators, decision-makers on inclusion of gender and in particular women's involvement, consultation and participation in projects development of training materials in local languages, hiring bi-lingual staff, child-focus and disability issues in programming; awareness raising measures; measures promoting increased participation of the above-mentioned groups in leadership and implementation; development and dissemination of tools and materials.*
14. **Climate change adaptation** cannot be the sole focus of a specific and ad hoc DIPECHO project. However, projects can integrate components reflecting the necessity to raise awareness of evolving trends and looking at links between DRR and climate change (CC), always **in a natural disaster context**.
 - *Non exhaustive examples: where scientific data confirmed the impact of CC on natural disaster trends, increased awareness raising on integration of CC adaptation into programming and planning (ad hoc target groups), reinforced vulnerability and risk assessments, early warning systems, land-use planning and building codes, institutional and legal capacities, development of guidelines and tools on how to better communicate CC in a DRR context, improving and adapting practices/behaviours affecting environment and livelihoods (in a DRR context).*
15. Partners are encouraged to consider Sphere minimum standards, indicators and guidance notes so as to ensure the quality of the DP actions proposed.

Strategic planning and programme design **should** also consider the following:

16. Recognising that the process of raising risk awareness, risk identification, strengthening capacities, increasing resilience, installing sustainable planning and management systems, etc. at community level is a process that can only be achieved over the long term, DIPECHO will not ignore proposals for DP strategies that are **multi-phased in nature** (i.e. can entail a series of phases financed over ≥ 1 Action Plan)⁹. This might entail for example the following programming phases: inception; consolidation; phase-out and evaluation. For this to be possible the **partner must demonstrate a clearly defined overall intervention strategy at the time of submission** that will **ultimately conclude with phase-out and handover**, either to the target community/institution, the appropriate authorities, or an appropriate longer term funding instrument, such that **sustainability** of actions undertaken is maximised.

⁹ **N.B.** Although willing to accept 15 month proposals that comprise a component part of a multi-phased strategy of engagement, DIPECHO financing is subject to the same financial regulations that govern DG ECHO funding. Consequently, **DIPECHO can offer no guarantee** that funding will be made available for subsequent phases of the strategy. The decision to provide funds or not under subsequent Action Plans will be made on a case-by-case basis following the publication of the guidelines for that Action Plan and will for example be contingent upon availability of funds, partner's prior performance, retention of key project / programme personnel, as well as all other criteria detailed in this document.

A project proposal of this nature is subject to the same terms and conditions as single-phased interventions i.e. must be justified by clear objectives, results, indicators... This strategy can however be set in the context of a longer term strategy, wherein the outputs of the current phase contribute to the attainment of a broader objective(s) / result(s).

17. A key interface in the development of DP strategies is the *National Disaster Management institutions*, which in many countries bear the responsibility for the articulation of a national risk reduction policy. However, this does not preclude a *multi-ministerial* planning/programming dialogue.
18. The development of all programme strategies to be submitted to DIPECHO must assimilate the *lessons learned* accumulated from past DP programming in each respective country and incorporate these in current strategic deliberations. These are to be found in the country papers produced at the National and Regional Consultative Meetings which will be circulated simultaneously with the publication of the Guidelines for the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America.
19. Applicants should consider one or more of the proposed eligible activities, based on their experience, mandates and specialisations. The proposed interventions should be *realistically integrated into and balanced within the short timeframe* of the DIPECHO Programme.
20. Applicants must systematically consider, preferably in a coordinated manner, the *compilation, dissemination* and in particular *integration of lessons learned* into their own programmes and strategies, those of their partners, as well as more widely to relevant stakeholders in the country and when relevant region. *Documentation of lessons learned and their dissemination should be explicitly envisaged under the activities and in the work plan of each proposal.*
21. *Collaborative strategic formulation and planning* among potential DIPECHO partners, but also jointly with other interested DRR agencies, in a country or region of operation is positively encouraged. This can take the form of joint projects (consortia) or joint initiatives implemented through a series of projects.
22. Applicants should provide details on the *coordination mechanisms* existing both *at local, sub-national and national levels* taking into account linkages with other ongoing initiatives funded by other donors and the proposed modalities they intend to/can join such fora.
23. All proposed actions should fit within the *established legal, policy and planning DRR frameworks* and should contribute to their implementation and consolidation, in particular at the appropriate sub-national and local levels. When those frameworks do not exist or should be updated, adequate supporting actions should be considered.
24. *Capacity-building of local organisations and institutions*, as well as mandated agencies (such as the Red Cross Societies) is a crucial component of any DIPECHO action. Where capacities and mandates exist, applicants should work through identified relevant local actors.

1.4 Type of Activities

What follows is a general description of type of **activities that are eligible and can be implemented in a project**¹⁰, apart from the support activities (administrative expenses, logistics, audit, evaluation...). The examples cited are non-exhaustive.

1. LOCAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT COMPONENTS, addressing local actors in disaster prone areas:

Early warning systems (EWS)

All activities and the provision of equipment related to the setting up of an EWS¹¹.

¹⁰ Please refer to point 19 in section 1.3.

¹¹ An EWS has four components: risk analysis, hazard monitoring, alert mechanism and local preparedness.

Examples:

- Technical studies conducted specifically to set up an EWS
- Studies carried out to collect traditional local knowledge specifically to set up an EWS
- Recovery/strengthening of traditional local EWS
- Installation of radio networks and training beneficiaries on their use
- Installation of hazard monitoring equipment (e.g. rain gauges and hydrometric scales) and training of beneficiaries on their use
- Development/installation of alternative alert equipments
- Exchanges between scientists and communities
- Simulation drills
- Information campaigns

Research, mapping and data computerization

Research, mapping and data computerization linked with the study of hazards, vulnerabilities, coping capacities and the elaboration of emergency plans.

Examples:

- Data collection for risk mapping purposes (scientific maps)
- Feasibility studies (Baseline, other research studies)
- Technical studies aimed at increasing knowledge about risk and preparedness issues
- Development of mapping software and training on its use; GIS
- Printing and dissemination of risk maps and other collected data.

The provision for baseline studies in the projects will facilitate future evaluation of impact; therefore, the realisation of baseline studies before and after the intervention is compulsory. Preference will be given to proposals based on baseline studies carried out during the design phase, and not those realised after the project's start date. In these baseline studies, consideration should be given to categorising levels of community resilience before and after DIPECHO interventions¹².

Partners are also expected to collaborate with ongoing initiatives aimed at the compilation of disaster risk indicators (e.g. World Bank's CAPRA study). Sharing information collected at local level with these initiatives will certainly contribute to a better understanding of the risk conditions at the local level and to a proper targeting of DRR resources in the future.

Local Capacity Building/Training

Capacity building/Training for natural disaster preparedness conducted at local level, with a direct involvement of the beneficiary communities.

Examples:

- Support in the organisation and training of local emergency committees
- Workshops conducted at community level for the development and management of community emergency plans
- Simulations conducted at community level, e.g. evacuations
- Training of community facilitators
- Training of community emergency brigades
- Community risk mapping

2. INSTITUTIONAL LINKAGES AND ADVOCACY, addressing institutions involved in disaster management/disaster risk reduction, in particular at regional, national and sub-national levels:

¹² See, for instance, John Twigg for the DFID Disaster Risk Reduction Interagency Coordination Group, **A Guidance Note, Characteristics of a Disaster Resilient Community**, version 1 June 2007.

Advocacy

One-way communication activities aimed at raising awareness on disaster risk reduction issues among decision-makers.

DIPECHO actively encourages coordinated and collaborative national programming for disaster risk reduction, particularly amongst DIPECHO partners. In this regard it should be noted that proposals for multi-agency advocacy and awareness-raising in any given context (at national or sub-national level) are welcome. Joint strategy formulation and programming, with one identified lead agency (with accompanying prior written MOU¹³ between participating agencies), is therefore considered relevant.

Networking at inter-municipal level (through national associations of municipalities and FEMICA¹⁴) needs to be further encouraged in order to advocate for effective DRR at municipal and national levels. The creation and strengthening of municipal platforms integrated by municipalities where DIPECHO projects are (or have been) implemented could serve as a basis for the participation of municipalities in the DRR national platforms encouraged by ISDR.

Facilitation of co-ordination

Support initiatives to facilitate co-ordination among institutions working on disaster preparedness, prevention and response.

Examples:

- Inter-institutional meetings
- Interactive products
- Work with sectoral line ministries for coordination purposes (health, education, public works, agriculture, etc)
- Creation/strengthening of national and regional networks on DP.
- Support to regional cooperation initiatives
- Standardisation of materials (e.g. SUMA, Sphere, EDAN, etc)
- Exchanges between projects inter-acting in the same geographical area (beneficiaries and staff)

N.B. **all proposals should include as an activity** (reflected in the budget and logical framework) the following:

1. Co-organization and Participation in a *National Consultative Meeting* in the country of the project's implementation.
2. Participation in a *Regional Consultative Meeting* with the participation of national decision makers, other donors, EU services and major stakeholders (5 days per meeting; tentative venue: Honduras).

Therefore, activities related to this result need to be envisaged in the proposal and duly budgeted.

Institutional strengthening

Services and equipment delivered to strengthen institutional capacities on risk reduction.

Examples:

- Training of decision makers at different levels (local, sub-national, national) on DP
- Training of, among others, Civil Protection, Red Cross, Fire brigades in search and rescue, emergency communications, first aid, EDAN, etc.
- Training of health staff on humanitarian supplies management tools.
- Simulation drills.

¹³ Memorandum of Understanding

¹⁴ Federación de Municipios del Istmo Centroamericano.

3. INFORMATION, EDUCATION, COMMUNICATION, addressing direct and indirect beneficiaries:

Public awareness raising

One-way communication activities aimed at raising awareness on disaster risk reduction issues among the local population.

Examples:

- Radio spots/radio communication in communities
- TV broadcasts
- Media interaction: newspapers, journals, magazines, etc.
- IEC15 materials: leaflets, posters, billboards, brochures etc.
- Conferences, symposia, seminars, workshops, peer-to-peer awareness initiatives
- Awareness campaigns: street drama, theatre, songs...
- Training for the media.

Education

Activities aimed at creating a “culture of prevention” within the formal education system pursuing a change of attitude and practice.

Examples:

- Design and production of training materials for pupils
- Training of teachers and pupils
- Elaboration of emergency plans for schools
- Simulations conducted at school level

Dissemination

Workshops, studies, surveys, and other initiatives conducted in order to increase knowledge about preparedness issues and dissemination of its results.

Examples:

- Organisation of workshops/seminars aimed at dissemination of project results
- Compilation and dissemination of DP best practices and lessons learned
- Production of dissemination materials (catalogues, brochures, etc)
- Support to national and regional information management centres
- Workshops on common topics (e.g. EWS tools, approaches to urban risk, etc) to stimulate inter-project discussion during implementation

N.B. **all proposals should include as an activity** (reflected in the budget and logical framework) the following:

1. Co-organization and Participation in a *National Dissemination Workshop* in the country (duration: 3 days).
2. Participation in a *Regional Dissemination Workshop* with the participation of national decision makers, other donors, EU services and major stakeholders (duration: 5 days; tentative venue: Honduras)

In these workshops, partners are expected to share the tools developed and, in general, the lessons learned in the implementation of their respective projects. Therefore, compilation, systematisation and dissemination activities related to this result need to be envisaged in the proposal and duly budgeted.

3. Final systematization of the lessons learned and the main tools developed by the project.

4. SMALL SCALE INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES, at community level:

¹⁵ Information Education Communication - IEC

Infrastructure support

Goods and services aimed at providing support to basic infrastructure within emergency plans.

Examples of activities:

- Construction and/or improvement of public temporary shelters
- Upgrading/refurbishment of storage facilities
- Rehabilitation of evacuation routes, facilitation of access to emergency shelters, etc. (including small bridges)
- Refurbishment of health care posts, temporary shelters for evacuated population, etc
- Sign-posting of evacuation routes
- Non-structural rectification/improvement
- Construction of basic services for emergency response (water and sanitation, etc.)
- Works associated with safeguarding livelihoods (e.g. shelters for domestic animals)

This component is expected to receive special attention from partners submitting proposals in isolated areas of the Caribbean coast of Honduras and Nicaragua, where the lack of appropriate shelters remains an urgent need.

Small-scale mitigation works

Small-scale infrastructure works aimed at reducing the physical vulnerability of the beneficiaries, which serve to complement the preparedness component of the project strategy. These activities shall protect life and/or basic resources. Can include training of beneficiaries during the implementation of these mitigation works in order to operate/maintain or replicate them in the future. Expenses related to this sort of training would be included in this sub sector.

Examples:

- 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

As a general rule, it is more important to give attention to emergency infrastructure than to mitigation works. However, when considered, small-scale mitigation measures are for demonstrative purposes and should complement other components (in particular capacity-building and training). They must be linked to a natural hazard and be identified and designed as a result of appropriate methods (e.g. HVCA-like process). They should take account of affordable and easily replicable models in neighbouring areas and when relevant in the country/region.

5. 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:

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

An adequate level of transparency and accountability needs to be ensured for this component (details must be provided in the proposal). Replenishment of existing stocks cannot be supported.

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

Community-based projects aim at reinforcing the coping capacity at local level integrating and coordinating activities at local, sub-national, national and regional levels and contributing to the identification of best practices and standardisation of preparedness programmes through the implementation of pilot activities of a demonstrative nature.

Community-based projects must take place in one or more of the following countries: COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, NICARAGUA, and PANAMA.

For projects with similar evaluation scores, priority will be given to projects in any of the following countries¹⁶: *El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Nicaragua*. Projects in *Costa Rica and Panama* may be selected based on their special innovativeness and their potential for replication in other countries of the region.

The following section summarise the priorities per country in terms of geographical areas and hazards for the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for the four priority Central American countries (Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala). These priorities are the result of the national consultative meetings organised in November 2007¹⁷. However, other interventions including a different type of hazard are possible in the framework of a multi-hazard approach.

Although DIPECHO projects usually target rural areas, projects targeting vulnerable urban-marginal and semi-urban areas are also priorities in this Call.

DIPECHO projects usually adopt an integral approach¹⁸ and are implemented at local level (community, municipality). In this sense, participants at the National Consultative Meetings (NCM's) made an attempt to prioritise intervention sectors per scenario (geographical area, hazard). DG ECHO recommends partners interested in this Sixth Call to consult the Country Documents prepared at the NCMs for further details in this respect. Such prioritisation is purely indicative and any proposal should be based *on a proper field assessment and the overall coherence of the proposal has to be preserved*.

Regional projects aim at contributing to the compilation of disaster preparedness indicators and tools, advocacy and awareness raising on relevant topics (support to national and regional DRR networks, participation in global campaigns, etc), dissemination of lessons learned on disaster preparedness and to the exchange of experiences at national and regional levels in cooperation with national disaster preparedness systems and CEPREDENAC, respectively.

Regional projects **must have a direct link to the community level**.

Preferably, for regional projects to be considered for financing, the whole Central American region has to be involved.

The Regional Consultative Meeting organised in November 2007 had the objective of identifying regional priorities that could complement the national priorities identified in the NCMs for the Sixth Action Plan. Complementarities between DIPECHO and HFA¹⁹, CEPREDENAC's PRRD and PREVDA (among others) were identified by participants in this regional workshop. It is important for regional proposals to highlight their **complementarities with HFA 2005-2015, CEPREDENAC's PRRD 2006-2015 and PREVDA**.

¹⁶ N.B. Listed in alphabetical order.

¹⁷ For further details regarding these priorities, please refer to the country documents. They are downloadable on the same webpage of this Call.

¹⁸ Integral projects: those covering several intervention sectors.

¹⁹ Hyogo Framework for Action

Priority will be given to projects targeting any of the following geographical areas and hazards:

- **Atlantic region:** hurricanes, floods and forest fires.

Municipalities: Waspam, Puerto Cabezas, Prinzapolka, La Cruz de Rio Grande, Desembocadura de Rio Grande, Tortuguero, Laguna de Perlas, Kukra Hill, El Rama, Bluefields, Corn Island, Siuna, Rosita and Bonanza.

River basins: Coco/Segovia, Wawa, Kukalaya, Ulang, Bambana, Prinzapolka, Grande, Kukawas, Escondido.

Priority sectors²⁰: Considering the lack of up-to-date information about vast areas of this isolated region, the realisation of **baseline studies and mapping** activities are the basis for any successful intervention in the Atlantic coast communities. **Local capacity building** is extremely important in areas with low institutional presence. The special **cultural** features of this area need to be taken into account when drafting the proposal (bilingual staff and training materials, respect for local practices, etc). Local institutions are very weak in this region in terms of DP; therefore institutional strengthening is also a priority, both at **municipal and departmental levels**. Education activities must consider the cultural specificities of the region. **EWS and emergency infrastructures** are especially relevant in isolated communities. The risk of **forest fires** has increased exponentially in RAAN after hurricane Felix. Projects located in this region are expected to take this situation into account.

- **North-Centre region:** Landslides, flash floods, forest fires and drought.

Municipalities: Condega and La Trinidad (Esteli Dept.), San Ramon, Muy Muy, San Isidro and Matagalpa (Matagalpa Dept.) Jalapa, El Jicaro and Murra (Nueva Segovia Dept.), El Cua and Santa Maria de Pantasma (Jinotega Dept.), Palacagüina, Telpaneca, San Juan and the other municipalities located in the upper basin of River Coco (Madriz Dept.)

River basins: Esteli, Pantasma-El Cua, Grande, Jicaro, Coco and Bocay.

Priority Sectors: Please refer to the Country Document for details.

Proposals need to take into account the lessons learned by the numerous **DIPECHO projects previously implemented** in this region.

Proposals with a component of EWS for landslides must consider the **pilot work developed by INETER** in this area.

Partners need to take advantage of the continuity of the COMUPRED members (as compared to other regions of the country). In some departments like Nueva Segovia, departmental authorities have shown interest in DP topics. In this sense, opportunities for coordination with **departmental authorities** need to be further explored.

- **Pacific volcanic strip.** The areas surrounding the following volcanoes are prioritised:

- Concepcion volcano
- Masaya volcano
- Momotombo volcano

Projects targeting any of these areas should take into account the impact of other hazards like earthquakes, floods, tsunamis (Ometepe) and forest fires.

Priority Sectors: The inclusion of an **EWS component** is mandatory in this scenario. Please refer to the Country Document for details.

²⁰ Please refer to the Country Document for further details.

Proposals need to take into account the lessons learned in the **previous DIPECHO projects** implemented in the areas near volcanoes San Cristobal, Cerro Negro and Telica.

Special consideration will be given to proposals that include the joint implementation of activities with **COSUDE**.

Participation of **INETER** and the **Civil Defence** in the implementation of the project activities is advisable.

➤ **Pacific coast:** Tsunamis

Municipalities: Corinto and Puerto Morazan (Chinandega); Puerto Sandino and El Transito (Leon); San Juan del Sur and Tola (Rivas); Masachapa and Pochomil (Managua).

Priority Sectors: The inclusion of an **EWS component** is mandatory in this scenario. Please refer to the Country Document for details.

Proposals need to take into account the lessons learned in previous projects funded by **ECHO, COSUDE** and **JICA**.

Special consideration will be given to proposals that are able to involve the **private sector** in the project's activities.

Participation of **INETER** in the implementation of the EWS is advisable.

➤ **Urban areas in the Pacific strip:** earthquakes.

Municipalities: Managua, Chinandega, El Viejo, Chichigalpa, Leon, Ciudad Sandino, Masaya, Granada and Rivas.

Priority Sectors: Please refer to the Country Document for details.

Proposals need to take into account the existing risk maps and seismic vulnerability studies.

Collaboration of relevant research and scientific institutions like **INETER, CIGEO/UNAN, UNI, UNAN-Leon, etc** in the project is advisable.

- Where relevant, **special consideration** will be given to proposals that include some sort of collaboration with **PREVDA** (e.g. joint trainings, exchange of information, workshops, etc).
- The World Bank has selected Nicaragua to pilot its **CAPRA study**. In this sense, it is important that partners envisage in their DIPECHO proposals information-sharing activities and mechanisms with this initiative.
- Risk mapping: Maps are to be elaborated according to national standards, using conventional symbols, and at a relevant scale for contingency and territorial planning at local level.
- Education: Promote the use of guidelines and educative materials already developed by the Ministry of Education. Coordination between local, sub-national and national levels is strongly recommended in order to foster sustainable and replicable processes.
- Early Warning Systems: Compilation of best practices and exchange of lessons learned is encouraged. Community EWS must be connected to the EWS national network.
- Institutional strengthening: these activities must respect the existing legal framework and municipal planning. Partners should advocate for the inclusion of DP activities in municipal plans. Promote a participatory approach among government staff in order to reinforce the links between the communities and the public institutions. *Joint* monitoring missions with national government staff during the project's implementation are encouraged. Institutional strengthening at sub-national level could be envisaged

only as *complementary* to the institutional strengthening component of a project mainly addressed to the local level.

- Activities at local level (community, municipality) are prioritised. Joint activities with associations of municipalities (*mancomunidades*) will be considered as a plus.

HONDURAS

Priority will be given to projects targeting any of the following geographical areas and hazards:

- For **floods**, the following river basins have been prioritised:
 - Ulua and Chamelecon
 - Mezapa-Lislis
 - Aguan
 - Choluteca
 - River basins of Iriona and Moskitia: i.e. Sico-Paulaya, Platano, Patuca, Kruta, Coco-Segovia.

Vulnerable communities located in the middle and lower basins are prioritised.

Risk mapping and EWS have been developed in most of the prioritised river basins (with the exception of some rivers in the macro-basin of Mezapa-Lislis). Therefore, any proposal working in those components must complement the existing initiatives.

Local capacity building, advocacy, awareness raising and dissemination are prioritised.

- For **Hurricanes**, the following municipalities have been prioritised:
 - In Colon Dept.: Balfate, Santa Fe, Trujillo, Santa Rosa de Aguan, Limon and Iriona.
 - In Gracias a Dios Dept.: Juan Francisco Bulnes, Ahuas, Puerto Lempira, Brus Laguna, Ramón Villeda Morales.

Training of local emergency brigades (and provision of rescue equipment) is a priority.

CODEL's and CODEM's do exist but sustainable solutions need to be found for the continuity of CODEM structures after the change of local authorities following local elections.

EWS is also a priority, but these systems need to be adapted to the special characteristics of this area.

The installation of radio communication equipment powered by alternative energy sources (e.g. solar panels) is indispensable in remote communities.

The lack of emergency infrastructure (e.g. shelters) is critical in isolated communities. The construction of shelters or the refurbishment of public buildings which serve for this purpose (e.g. schools, community centres) is also a priority.

- Given the topography of the country, **landslides** (often associated with heavy rains) are recurrent in many Honduran municipalities. According to the experts who participated in the National Consultative Meeting organised in Tegucigalpa in November 2007, most municipalities are prone to this kind of hazard. Besides, since this is a topic which has been targeted very little by previous DP projects in Honduras, any intervention related to this topic would have a demonstrative added value. Partners are advised to check the list of geographical priorities in the corresponding Country Document.

There is a strong need to know more about this kind of hazard (underlying causes, vulnerable areas, triggering events, etc). Therefore, research and mapping are two key elements for any intervention in this topic. Considering the limited experience in the country in this hazard, all intervention sectors (see section 1.4 of this Call) are a priority. COPECO is currently compiling information about the few EWS developed in

the country for landslides. Any proposal targeting this hazard must take into consideration the existing information in this respect.

➤ For **Earthquakes**, the priority areas are the following:

Area #1: Yoro and Fco. Morazan Depts.:

- Dept. Yoro: Municipalities of Yoro and Yorito.
- Dept. Francisco Morazan: Marale.

Area #2: Western departments.

- Dept. Ocotepeque: Ocotepeque, Mercedes, Santa Fe, Concepcion, Dolores Merendon, San Jorge and San Fernando.
- Dept. Lempira: Cololaca, Guarita, San Juan Guarita, Valladolid, La Virtud, Mapulaca, Virginia and Piraera.
- Dept. Copan: Florida, El Paraíso, Copan Ruinas.
- Dept. Intibuca: San Antonio, Santa Lucia, Magdalena, Colomocagua.
- Dept. La Paz: Santa Elena La Paz, Yarula, Marcala, Cabañas, Santa Ana, Opatoro, Mercedes de Oriente, San Antonio del Norte.

Area #3: Southern Departments

- Dept. Valle: San Lorenzo, Nacaome, Amapala, Guascorán, Caridad, Aramecina and Alianza.
- Dept. Choluteca: El Triunfo, Concepción de María, Namasigüe, Choluteca and Marcovia.

Area #4: North.

- Dept. Cortes: Omoa and Puerto Cortes.

Area #5: Bay Islands

- Guanaja

Similar to landslides, earthquakes have been scarcely targeted by previous DP projects in Honduras; therefore any intervention related to this topic would have a demonstrative added value. There is a strong need to know more about this kind of hazard. Therefore, research and mapping are two key elements for any intervention in this topic. Considering the limited experience in the country in this hazard, all intervention sectors with the only exception of EWS (see section 1.4 of this Call) are a priority. The construction and/or refurbishment of shelters resistant to earthquakes must be included in any related proposal. Pilot construction of seism-resistant houses for demonstrative purposes and reforestation activities aimed at slope stabilisation to avoid landslides will also be considered.

➤ Projects targeting areas prone to **Droughts** will be considered only in those cases where DP activities are complementary to ongoing long term structural programmes. For this hazard, the priority areas are as follows²¹:

- Reitoca and Verdugo river basins (Fco. Morazan, Choluteca, El Paraiso, Valle and La Paz)
- Cajon basin (Fco. Morazan, Comayagua and Yoro)
- Lempa river basin (South of Lempira Dept.)

Local capacity building, institutional strengthening, education and awareness raising components are the priority sectors, together with infrastructure works.

²¹ See Country Document for the list of municipalities targeted in each basin.

- Although DIPECHO projects usually target rural areas, projects addressing landslides and floods in **urban marginal areas of Tegucigalpa** are also a priority in this Call.
- **Special consideration** will be given to proposals that include the implementation of joint activities with **PREVDA** (e.g. in the Choluteca river basin) and **COSUDE**.

EL SALVADOR

Priority will be given to projects targeting any of the following geographical areas and hazards:

- For **Floods**, the following municipalities will be prioritised:

Ahuachapan Dept.: San Francisco Menendez, Jujutla, San Lorenzo and San Pedro Puxtla.

Cabañas: Jujutla and Dolores.

Chalatenango: Nueva Concepción, tejuela, El Paraíso, San Rafael, Chalatenango, Cancasque, Potonico, San Antonio de la Cruz, San Antonio Los Ranchos, San Miguel de Mercedes, San Luis del carmen, San Francisco Lempa and Azucualpa.

Cuscatlan: El Carmen.

La Libertad: Southern area of the department (coastal zone), Ciudad Arce and San Juan Opico.

La Paz: Zacatecoluca, San Pedro Nonualco, Santiago Nonualco and San Luis Talpa.

San Miguel: El Tránsito and Chirilagua (Olmeqa).

San Salvador: Districts 4, 5 and 6, Mejicanos (Las Mercedes, Ibiza, Enero 16, Montreal, Zacamil, san Roque, San Ramón), Soyapango, San Martin (Santa Gertrudis, Com. Autopista), Ilopango (Santa Lucia, Matazano, Lago de Apulo).

San Vicente: San Ildefonso and Teoluca.

Santa Ana: El Congo (lake de Coatepeque), Santa Ana (urban area, *lagunetas* and El Apoyo), Chalchuapa (urban rea), Masahuat (Lempa), Texistepeque (Lempa), Metapan (Lake Guija).

Sonsonate: Acajutla, Sonsonate and Santa Isabel Ishuatan.

Usulután: Berlin, Mercedes Umaña, Jiquilisco, Puerto El Triunfo, Usulután, San Dionisio, Concepcion Batres and Jucuaran.

La Unión: Pasaquina, La Union, Conchagua and San Alejo.

- For **Earthquakes**, the following municipalities will be prioritised:

Ahuachapan Dept.: San Francisco Menendez, Jujutla, San Lorenzo and San Pedro Puxtla.

Cuscatlan: Candelaria, Santa Cruz, Analquito, San Ramon, Cojutepeque, San Cristobal and San Rafael Cedros.

La Libertad: Central area of the department and municipalities located in the Balsamo mountain strip.

La Paz: Northern area of the department.

Morazan: San Francisco Gotera, El Divisadero, San Carlos, Yamabal and Guatajiagua.

San Miguel: Nuevo Eden de San Juan, San Gerardo, San Luis La Reyna, Carolina, San Antonio del Mosco and Ciudad Barrios..

San Salvador: All the municipalities.

San Vicente: San Vicente, Teoluca, Guadalupe, Tepetitán and Verapaz.

Santa Ana: El Congo, Santa Ana, Chalchuapa and Coatepeque.

Usulután: Berlin, Alegria, Mercedes Umaña, Santiago de Maria, California, Tecapan, Jucuapa, Santa Elena, San Francisco Javier and San Agustin.

- For **Landslides**, the following municipalities will be prioritised:

Ahuachapan Dept.: Atiquizaya, Apaneca, Tacuba, San Francisco Menéndez, Jujutla, Concepción de Ataco, San Lorenzo, Ahuachapan.

Cabañas: All municipalities except Ilobasco and Guacotecti.

Chalatenango: Citalá, San Ignacio, La Palma, La Reina, San Fernando, Dulce Nombre de María, El Carrizal, La Laguna, Comalapa, Concepción Quezaltepeque, Las Vueltas, Chalatenango, Las Flores, Ojos de Agua, Cancasque, Potonico, Nombre de Jesús, Arcatao.

Cuscatlan: Santa Cruz Analquito, Candelaria, San Ramón, Cojutepeque y San Cristóbal

La Libertad: Municipalities located in the Balsamo mountain strip.

La Paz: Olocuilta, Tapalhuaca, San Francisco Chinameca, San Juan Tepezontes, San Emigdio, San Pedro Nonualco, Santa Maria Ostuma and Jerusalén.

Morazan: Divisadero and Jocoro

San Miguel: All the municipalities.

San Salvador: Districts 2, 3, 5 and 6, Soyapango, Ciudad Delgado (river Acelhuate, area bordering Cuscatancingo).

San Vicente: Guadalupe, Tepetitán and San Cayetano Itstepeque

Santa Ana: El Congo, Coatepeque, Santa Ana, Chalchuapa, Metapán, San Antonio Pajonal, Santiago de la Frontera, Candelaria de la Frontera.

Sonsonate: Juayua, Salcoatitán, Santa Catarina Masahuat, Izalco, Nahuizalco, San Julián, Santa Isabel Ishuatán, Santo Domingo de Guzmán, San Antonio del Monte.

Usulután: Jucuarán, Berlín, Alegría, Santiago de María, Jucuapa, San Francisco Javier, Tecapán.

La Unión: Anamorós, El Sauce, Santa Rosa de Lima, Pasaquina, San Alejo, Bolívar, Yucuaquín, Yayantique, San José, El Carmen.

➤ For **volcanic eruptions**, the areas surrounding the following volcanoes are prioritised²²:

- Santa Ana/Illamatepec volcano
- San Salvador/Quezaltepec volcano
- Caldera/Ilopango volcano
- San Miguel/Chaparrastique volcano

➤ **Special consideration** will be given to proposals that include the implementation of joint activities with **PREVDA**.

➤ Joint activities with **associations of municipalities** (*mancomunidades*) will be considered as a plus.

➤ Specific recommendations regarding **intervention sectors and activities** are provided for each department in the Country Document.

GUATEMALA

Priority will be given to projects targeting any of the following geographical areas and hazards:

➤ **Floods**: five floodable regions have been identified:

- Pacific coast
- Motagua-Polochic-Chixoy river basins
- North-Western region
- North strip
- Petén

The list of the 41 municipalities prioritised is included in Guatemala's Country Document (pages 20-21).

²² See Country Document for the municipalities prioritised for each volcano.

- **Landslides:** The area usually affected by these hazards is the high plateau. Most of the municipalities prioritised were affected by landslides triggered by torrential rains associated with Tropical Storm STAN. Nevertheless, several municipalities located in the metropolitan area of Guatemala and other parts of the country that have suffered landslides in recent years have also been prioritised. In total, 159 municipalities have been prioritised. The list is included in the Country Document (pages 24-30).
- **Earthquakes:** Geographical prioritisation is difficult in a country like Guatemala that is so prone to earthquakes. The 1976 earthquake is a benchmark in Guatemala's disaster history. Unfortunately, this hazard has not been worked with in this country as much as in others in terms of DP. Participants at the NCMs made an attempt to prioritise municipalities and a general list can be found in the Country Document (pages 34-40). Although 276 municipalities are included in that list, there are 45 municipalities which, according to experts, have the highest risk indicator. These municipalities are the following:
 Petapa, San Antonio Aguas Calientes, Chimaltenango, Yepocaca, Nueva Concepción, Santa Maria Ixhuan, Santa Catarina Ixtahuacan, Panajachel, San Pablo La Laguna, Santiago Atitlan, San Andres Xecul, San Martin Sacatepequez, Almolonga, Colomba, El Palmar, Genova, Flores Costa Cuca, Mazatenango, Cuyotenango, San Francisco Zapotitlan, san Bernardino, Santo Domingo Suchitepequez, Samayac, San Pablo Jocopilas, San Antonio Suchitepequez, San Miguel Panan, San Gabriel, Chicacao, Santa Barbara, Santo Tomas La Union, Zunilito, Pueblo Nuevo, San Sebastián, San Martin Zapotitlan, San Felipe Retalhuleu, Nuevo San Carlos, El Asintal, Nuevo Progreso, El Tumbador, Catarina, Ocos, El Quetzal, La Reforma, Pajapita, Conguaco.
- **Forest fires:** A list of 67 priority municipalities mainly located in the high plateau and Petén can be found in the Country Document. The highest risk indicator corresponds to the following 14 municipalities:
 Nahuala, Totonicapan, San Francisco El Alto, Santa Maria Chiquimula, Comitancillo, Tacana, Tajumulco, Malacatancito, Chiche, Cunen, San Juan Cotzal, Nebaj, Uspantan and San Cristobal Verapaz.
- **Special consideration** will be given to proposals that include the implementation of joint activities with **PREVDA** (e.g. in the Samala river basin).
- Activities at local level (community, municipality) are prioritised. Joint activities with associations of municipalities (*mancomunidades*) will be considered as a plus. DIPECHO partners are expected to coordinate with other EC programmes in the target areas, such as the **Municipal Strengthening Programme**²³ and the projects of the **Decentralised Cooperation Budget Line** (21.02.13).
- Institutional strengthening at sub-national level could be envisaged only as *complementary* to the institutional strengthening component of a project mainly addressed to the municipal level.

REGIONAL

The following priorities were identified at regional level:

- **Compilation, systematisation and dissemination of DP tools, best practices and lessons learned** are key issues at regional level. Activities which represent an added value at regional level will be

²³ Programa de Descentralización y Fortalecimiento Municipal ALA/2000/3061 DTA GUA/B7-310/00/0020

taken into account (including the promotion of networks to exchange experiences, production of new dissemination tools, etc...).

- Initiatives focusing on **advocacy** and **awareness raising**, such as setting up and strengthening national and regional DRR networks (*plataformas nacionales y regionales*), support to global DRR campaigns (e.g. 2008-2009 Global Campaign "Hospitals Safe From Disasters"), promotion of CEPREDENAC's PRRD main action lines in DP, and dissemination and training on regional DP tools which are in line with PRRD's priorities (e.g. Web-COE, SCI, management of emergency storage facilities, etc).
- **Design/Compilation of disaster risk and coping capacity indicators** will be considered when they contribute to:
 - (i) National and regional DRR platforms with inputs for advocacy and awareness raising purposes and
 - (ii) Local stakeholders and other actors (e.g. donors) with relevant information for proper decision making.

Regional projects **must have a direct link to the community level** and, at the same time, **contribute to the strengthening of Central American integration**.

Applicants should ensure and respect a particularly close coordination with **SE/CEPREDENAC**, **ISDR** and **PREVDA**, as well as with **national authorities** to facilitate the implementation of project initiatives.

1.6. Visibility and communication requirements

Why Communicate?

The European Commission's DG ECHO is increasingly emphasising the need for visibility and communication[†] in the context of funded projects. Such visibility and communication activities contribute to fulfilling an important part of the DG's mandate which is *not only the funding of disaster risk reduction measures (and humanitarian aid), but also to raise awareness of the principles and values of this aid*. It is also an excellent way of informing European citizens about the European Commission's activities and thus of being transparent about and accountable for the use of EU funds.

DG ECHO would like to involve implementing partners as much as possible in this communication effort thereby facilitating mutually beneficial synergies and enhancing complementarities. DG ECHO and its implementing partners address similar target groups: the beneficiaries, general public and opinion multipliers in the countries of operation and in Europe. Both highlight the impact of the projects implemented, formulate similar messages on values/principles and achievements but use different channels to do so. DG ECHO consequently encourages the use of project funds budgeted under the visibility line to implement communication activities that meet the DG's requirements whilst also being in line with the communication strategy of its partners.

What to Communicate?

In general the objective of communication activities is to raise awareness for the specific DIPECHO-funded project and its aims, and/or the role of the European Commission and the partner.

[†] By 'visibility' we understand measures that allow the EC's Humanitarian Aid Directorate General (DG ECHO) to be identified as a donor (e.g. stickers, sign boards, banners etc) and by 'communication' we refer to activities/tools explaining the mandate and roles of the partner and the EC, the principles and values of humanitarian aid, in short the reason for our being there and doing what we do.

DG ECHO considers that activities to be funded under Budget Line Visibility (02.08.) will have the specific objective of communicating and raising awareness of the DIPECHO funded project, its aims and the roles (and aims) of the partner and the European Commission. A corollary of this might also be the promotion of disaster risk reduction (and the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015).

This is distinct from activities considered eligible under Budget Line Advocacy and Public Awareness-raising (01.02.08.), where the specific objective will favour the promotion of DRR and the HFA, within which reference must be made to DIPECHO support, and the role of the partner and the European Commission.

How and to Whom to Communicate?

Communication activities implemented in the context of a DIPECHO-funded project should be a *part of a partner's overall communications strategy*, targeting their direct beneficiaries, local and international stakeholders, other opinion multipliers in the country of operation or in Europe, and should use the most appropriate channels/tools depending on the target. .

We very much encourage activities involving or even targeting local media, such as press trips to projects or opening events which are part of project implementation to the media. Such events might be organised in the broader context of sports or cultural events to raise awareness/inform the wider public (and inviting the media). We would like partners to schedule one such event every October, so as to benefit from the increased attention for the subject of disaster risk reduction generated by the International Day for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR). Of course if there are equivalent national commemorative days that do not coincide with the IDNDR, then these should also be considered an opportunity.

Whilst the involvement of the European (or other international) media is of course considered desirable, it is recognised that generating necessary levels of interest can prove challenging. Nevertheless, DG ECHO encourages partners to develop communication activities in the EU, especially in the country where they have their headquarters, to inform the public in Europe about their DIPECHO-funded projects and support received from the European Commission.

The minimum activities expected are:

- i. a press release at contract signature or the project start,
- ii. a press release or event at the closing or important achievement/milestone of the project, and
- iii. an article in the partner's newsletter/website if they publish one.

Despite the increased emphasis on communication, 'traditional' visibility activities allowing donor identification such as the setting up of signboards, stickers etc. **remain obligatory**, unless they entail security risks for the partner's staff.

How to Meet the Requirements?

A visibility plan detailing the kind of activities planned, their objective, target group, timing and expected impact as well as impact indicators (this one specifically for communication activities) **and a budget** is to be included under section 9 of the Single Form. It should clearly separate the two categories of activities:

- i. Basic visibility for donor identification, e.g. stickers, sign boards and
- ii. Communication activities e.g. photo exhibitions, visits by journalists, advertorials.

For complete information refer to the Visibility guidelines for partners 'A partnership for communication' (http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/index_en.htm).

ECHO logo samples and specifications are available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/echo/information/identity/index_en.htm

The budget required to implement the visibility plan can be foreseen in the Budget Breakdown of the Grant Agreement, line 02 08. It is recommended to limit the visibility budget to 5% of project budget, with a maximum of €50,000.

Please note that activities which are part of the operational content of the project itself and which, by definition, require the use of communication tools **may not be funded under the visibility budget, but under the title 1 – goods and services**. For example: training manuals, advocacy campaigns, etc. These should nevertheless feature the visual identity like all supplies and equipment funded by the European Commission.

For further questions please feel free to contact the Regional Information Officer, François Duboc: francois.duboc@ec.europa.eu

2. FINANCIAL ALLOCATION PROVIDED

The overall indicative amount made available for the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan is EUR 10,000,000.

The EUROPEAN COMMUNITY reserves the right not to award all available funds.

There is no specific pre-allocation per country. However, some general orientations will be taken into consideration when approving a project in each country to ensure the achievement of DG ECHO's strategic priorities both at country and regional levels (see section 1.5).

Size of grants

Any grant awarded under this programme should fall between the following minimum and maximum amounts:

- minimum amount: EUR 200,000
- maximum amount: EUR 600,000

Any request for an amount below the minimum or above the maximum stated should be duly justified.

There is no upper limit to the co-financing share, and as a consequence, to the total amount of the operation.

In addition, **no grant may exceed 85% of the total eligible costs of the operation**. The balance must be financed from the applicant's or partners' own resources, or from sources other than the EUROPEAN COMMUNITY budget. Level of co-financing will be taken into account as selection criteria.

3. RULES OF THIS EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

These guidelines set out the rules for the submission, selection and implementation of projects financed under the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America in conformity with the provisions of DG ECHO's Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) and the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Community's Council Regulation N° 1605/2002 and its implementing rules (Commission Regulation N° 2342/2002).

3.1 ELEGIBILITY CRITERIA

There are three sets of eligibility criteria, relating to:

- organisations which may request a grant,
- operations for which a grant may be awarded,
- types of cost which may be taken into account in setting the amount of the grant.

3.1.1 *Eligibility of applicants: who may apply*

In order to be eligible for a DIPECHO grant for the Central America, applicants must:

- be in one of the following categories :
 - A **non-governmental organisation** signatory of the Framework Partnership Agreement with the Humanitarian Aid Directorate-General (DG ECHO) or in a position to become a signatory of the FPA in accordance with the procedures in place at the moment of the signature of the Grant Agreement.
 - An **international organisation**, i.e. organisations set up by international agreement and specialised agencies set up by such organisations, signatories of the Financial and Administrative framework Agreement (FAFA) between the EC and the UN or of a Framework Partnership Agreement with DG ECHO, or in a position to become a signatory.
 - A **specialised agency of an EU Member State**.
 - A **consortium of the above**. In case of consortia, the application should be made by a lead agency. The lead agency will be responsible for all administrative and financial matters vis-à-vis the Commission.
- be directly responsible for the preparation and management of the operation, not acting as an intermediary.
- Potential applicants may not participate in calls for proposals or be awarded grants if, in accordance with article 114 of the new Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Community's Council Regulation N° 1605/2002, they are in one of the situations referred to in Articles 93 and 94 of the same Regulation. This Regulation is available in ECHO's web page: http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/partners/selection_en.htm.

It should be noted that the list of potential partners inserted in point 6.2 of the Financing Decision ECHO/DIP/BUD/2008/03000 is not exhaustive and definitive. This list will be updated as per the final selection of eligible applicants following the evaluation process.

3.1.2 *Eligible operations: operations for which an application may be made*

Size

- Amount: there are no restrictions on the total cost of the operation. However, the Community grant applied for should fall within the minimum and maximum amounts set out in section 2 above.
- Duration: The duration of an operation should be of maximum 15 months.

Location

Actions must take place in one or more of the following countries: COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, NICARAGUA, AND PANAMA.

See Section 1.5 for more details.

Type of actions covered:

A grant may be awarded for an action which has already begun only where the applicant can demonstrate the need to start the action before the agreement is signed. In such cases, expenditure eligible for financing may not have been incurred prior to the date of submission of the grant application. No grant may be awarded retrospectively for actions already completed.

The following types of action are also ineligible:

- Individual sponsorships for participation in workshops, seminars, conferences, congresses;
- Individual scholarships for studies or training courses.

Number of proposals and grants per applicant

An applicant may submit more than one proposal.

An applicant may be awarded more than one grant under this Action Plan.

3.1.3 Eligibility of costs: costs which may be taken into consideration for the grant

Only “eligible costs” can be taken into account for a DIPECHO grant. These are detailed in the General Conditions of the new Framework Partnership Agreement²⁴ or for international organisations in the Framework agreements (FAFA for example).

Please note that the eligible direct costs (title 1 and 2 of budget breakdown) must be based on real costs.

A lump sum not exceeding 7% of the direct eligible costs of the Action may be claimed as indirect costs to cover the administrative overheads incurred for the Action.

Indirect costs are eligible provided they do not include costs assigned to another heading of the agreement budget.

No contingency reserves will be allowed.

Any contributions in kind made by the Humanitarian Organisation or the Organisation’s partners, which must be listed in point 11 of the Single Form, do not represent actual expenditure and are not eligible costs. They cannot be treated as co-financing by the organisation but will be taken into account in the evaluation of proposals.

²⁴ Article 15 of the General Conditions

The rules of the new FPA, or when applicable the FAFA or similar agreement, will be entirely applicable for these grants (http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/partners/index_en.htm)

3.2 HOW TO APPLY AND THE PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW

3.2.1 *Application form and supporting documents*

Applications must be submitted on the Single Form (Annex I to the Framework Partnership Agreement with ECHO).

The application form is available on the ECHO web site at:

http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/partners/fpa_ngos_en.htm (English version), or

http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/partners/fpa_ngos_fr.htm (French version).

International Organisations must download the appropriate Single Form and Budget Breakdown from DG ECHO's web site at: http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/partners/fpa_int_en.htm.

The complete application must include:

- i. **the Single Form,**
- ii. **the Activity Schedule,**
- iii. **the Logical Framework**
- iv. **the Budget Breakdown, and**
- v. **a signed cover letter.**

Applicants must apply in either **English or French**²⁵.

Handwritten applications will not be accepted.

International organisation will use the specific forms foreseen in their respective Framework Agreements. Applicants should keep strictly to the format of the application and fill in the pages in order.

Please complete the application forms carefully and **as clearly as possible** so that we can assess them properly. Be **precise and provide enough detail** to ensure the application **is clear**, particularly as to how the aims of the operation will be achieved, the benefits that will flow from it and the way in which it is relevant to the programme's objectives.

The maximum length of the proposal (single form) is 25 pages. Complementary relevant information could be attached to the single form (as annexes).

Supporting documents

Applications must be accompanied by the following supporting documents:

1. Correspondence from other bodies (for example governments) on whose participation in whatever way the success or viability of the project may depend;
2. Particulars of current or earlier participation in operations financed by the European Commission;
3. Correspondence from other co-financing entities regarding their contribution to the project.
4. Curriculum vitae of the main personnel responsible for performing work in connection with the project, and when available, a list of staff connected to the project, and a statement on what proportion of their time will be dedicated to the project.

²⁵ At application stage, some supporting documents can be provided in Spanish.

5. Map of exact location of the proposed operation;

3.2.2 *Where and how to send the applications*

Applications must be received at the address below in **one original, paper copy**:

Postal address:

DG ECHO– Unit A3
Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America
To the attention of the Head of Unit, Mr Esko KENTRSCHYNSKYJ
AN 88, 06/12
European Commission
B-1049 Brussels

Address for hand delivery or delivery by private courier:

DG ECHO-Unit A3
Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America
To the attention of the Head of Unit, Mr Esko KENTRSCHYNSKYJ
Avenue du Bourget,1 (Courrier central)
B-1140 Brussels

In addition, an **electronic copy of the full application must be sent to the following three addresses:**
echo-central-mailbox@ec.europa.eu

dorothy.morrissey@ec.europa.eu and echo-nicaragua@ec.europa.eu

If the full application is too large to be sent by email, the supporting documents can be sent on a CD separately.

Applicants should verify that their application is complete by comparing it with the checklist included at the end of these guidelines.

3.2.3 *Deadline for receipt of applications*

The deadline for the receipt of applications is **30 April 2008**. Any application received after the deadline is not guaranteed to be taken into consideration even if the postmark indicates a date preceding the deadline or if the delay is due to the private courier service.

3.2.4 *Further information*

Questions may be sent by e-mail or by fax to:

DG ECHO Brussels:
Dorothy Morrissey
E-mail address: dorothy.morrissey@ec.europa.eu
Fax: 32.2.2954571

or

DG ECHO Nicaragua:
Sergio Lacambra
E-Mail address: sergio.lacambra@ec.europa.eu
Fax: 505.2706201

Questions that may be relevant to other applicants, together with the answers, will be published on the internet: http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/index_en.htm

3.2.5 *Acknowledgement of receipt*

Following the proposal receipt, DG ECHO will send an acknowledgement of receipt to all applicants, indicating the date of receipt and informing them of the reference number they have been allocated.

3.3 EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF APPLICATIONS

Applications will be examined and evaluated by DG ECHO Brussels and DG ECHO Nicaragua with the possible assistance of assessors from other services of the Commission involved in co-operation programmes in the region. All operations submitted by applicants will be assessed according to the following criteria:

(1) Administrative compliance

- Verification that the application is complete in accordance with instructions in point 3.2 above.

DG ECHO reserves the right to reject the applications that fail to fulfil these criteria and not to consider them for funding.

(2) Eligibility of the applicants, partners and operations

- Verification that the applicant and the operation are eligible according to the criteria set out in section 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3.

Applications failing to fulfil any of these criteria will be immediately rejected and will not be considered for funding.

(3) Evaluation of the quality of the proposals and financial evaluation

3.1 DG ECHO will first proceed with a preliminary evaluation of the applicants' **operational capacity** to ensure that they have the professional competencies and qualifications required to successfully complete the proposed action. This also applies to any partners of the applicant. The two key questions will be:

- Does the applicant, in **particular its project co-ordinator, project management team and those of its local partner(s)**, have adequate experience of project management in the countries where the project is presented?
- Does the applicant, in **particular its project co-ordinator, project management team and those of its local partner(s)**, have sufficient technical expertise in terms of disaster preparedness project management **in the country and/or region** where the project is presented?

Applicants which have an insufficient financial and operational capacity will not have their proposals further evaluated.

Proposals submitted that do not allocate the *necessary human resources with appropriate levels of DP experience and expertise to senior levels of project management* (country director, programme coordinator, project manager, or equivalent) *will not be considered eligible.*

3.2 As a second step, an evaluation of the **relevance** of the proposal will be made on the basis of the following 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 (points 1.1, 1.2 and 1.5 of this Call; 4.3.1, 4.3.2 of the Single Form, Log-Frame)
<p>1.2 How relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target populations and country/countries or region(s) is the proposal (including avoidance of duplication and synergy with other initiatives, in particular EU co-operation initiatives targeting for example institutional strengthening at municipal level or environmental objectives)? (points 2 and 4.2 of the Single Form) Has the proposal been discussed and agreed with the local authorities responsible for risk management? (point 2, 4.2 and 6 of the Single Form). Is this project proposal part of the applicant's strategy in the country (point 3 of the Single Form) and does it contribute to an ongoing strategy of engagement in the target area? (points 3.2 and 3.3 the Single Form) Does the project target the most vulnerable populations and regions? (points 2, 4.1 and 4.2 of the Single Form)</p> <p>Does the project take into account: gender (in particular women's involvement, consultation and participation in projects), children, elderly people, environmental and cultural issues and disabilities (points 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 of the Single Form)?</p> <p>Does the project take into account (when relevant) the problem of security and/or access?</p> <p>What are the contingency plans? (point 8 of the Single Form)</p>

Please note that those proposals evaluated not to have a good level of relevance (criteria 1.1 and 1.2) will not be evaluated further.

3.3 As a third step, an evaluation of the **quality of proposals**, including the proposed budget, will be carried out in accordance with the relevance criteria above and the evaluation criteria hereunder to finally select actions which maximise the overall effectiveness of the Action Plan:

2. Methodology
<p>2.1. How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (intermediaries, final beneficiaries, target groups)? (point 4.2 of the Single Form) Have the needs of the target groups proposed and the final beneficiaries been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately? (points 2, 4.2, 4.3 and 5 of the Single Form) To what degree have the target beneficiaries been involved in project conception, design and development, from the moment of problem identification (points 4.2.5 and 4.3)? Are the target groups' and final beneficiaries' level of involvement and participation in the operation satisfactory? (points 2 and 4.2 of the Single Form).</p>
<p>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? (point 4.3 of the Single Form) Is the Action Plan clear and feasible (point 4.4 of the Single Form and Activity Schedule); in particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and anticipate an evaluation? (Points 2, 4 and 8 of the Single Form). Are the technical human resources allocated to the operation adequate? (Point 10 of the Single Form). Is the presence of experienced coordinator and administrative staff ensured in order to ensure notably a proper follow-up of DG ECHO procedural rules?</p>
<p>2.3. Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the operation? (points 4.3, 4.5 and 5 of the Single Form and Logical Framework)</p>
3. Sustainability
<p>3.1 Are the expected results of the proposed operation sustainable: (Points 4.2, 4.5, 5, 6, 7 of the Single Form)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financially (<i>how will the activities be financed after the EC funding ends?</i>) - Institutionally (<i>will structures allowing the activities to continue be in place at the end of the operation? Will there be local "ownership" of the results of the operation?</i>) - Locally (<i>what are the links and coordination with the relevant authorities?</i>) - At policy level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the operation — e.g. will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc?</i>)? - Is the operation likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups - Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects? (Including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the operation and dissemination of information.)
4. Budget and cost-effectiveness
<p>4.1. Is the ratio between the estimated costs for the EU and the expected results satisfactory (taking into account in particular the level of co-financing)?</p>
<p>4.2. Is the proposed expenditure necessary for the implementation of the operation (adequacy of the budget with the proposed activities)? (Point 11 of the Single Form)</p>
<p>4.3. Are material resources and procurement procedures described? (points 4.3, and 11 of the Single Form) In case of service contracts (audit, evaluation, consultants in the project...) are the services and procurement procedures described? (Points 4.3, 4.5 and 10 of the Single form)</p>

3.4 NOTIFICATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY'S DECISION

Applicants will be informed in writing of the European Community's decision concerning their application.

Justifications will be provided to the applicant concerning any decision to reject its application.

The European Commission's decision to reject an application or not to award a grant is final.

Given the deadline of **30 April 2008** for presenting applications, DG ECHO intends to make a first analysis of the proposals during the months of May and June 2008. Pre-selected proposals may be negotiated during the course of July-August. Therefore, operations must start between September and October 2008. These dates are indicative only.

The selected applicant will be offered a grant based on the European Community's standard grant agreement for humanitarian operations annexed to the new Framework Partnership Agreement (2008). If the successful applicant is an international organisation, the model Contribution Agreement with an international organisation for humanitarian actions will be used instead of the standard grant agreement

Therefore it is recommended that projects do not have a starting date prior to September 1, 2008.

The Single Form for Humanitarian Aid operations in Annex 1 will also be the format for the interim and final reports.

4.CHECK LIST

Before dispatching your application, please check that it is complete and specifically that:

The application forms

- the dossier is complete and complies with the application form requirements;
- one original and 1 copy of all documents are annexed;
- an electronic copy of the file has been sent;
- the dossier is in English or French;
- the budget and the expected sources of funding are presented in the format of the appropriate application form , completed and drawn up in Euro;
- in the budget the European Commission's contribution is identified and is a maximum of 85% of the total eligible costs of the operation;
- in the budget, overheads do not exceed 7% of direct eligible costs;
- the logical framework and action plan for the operation have been completed.

Supporting documents

For all the applicants:

- Correspondence from other bodies (for example governments) on whose participation in whatever way the success or viability of the project may depend;
- Particulars of current or earlier participation in operations financed by the European Commission;
- Correspondence from other co-financing entities regarding their contribution to the project;
- Curriculum vitae of the main personnel responsible for performing work in connection with the project, and , if available, a list of staff connected to the project, and a statement on what proportion of their time will be dedicated the project;
- Map of exact location of the operation.

GLOSSARY

CAPRA: Central American Probabilistic Risk Analysis

CC: Climate Change

CEPREDENAC: Centro de Coordinación para la Prevención de los Desastres Naturales en América Central

COSUDE: Swiss Agency for Cooperation

DG ECHO: Directorate General of Humanitarian Aid

DIPECHO: Disaster Preparedness Programme of ECHO

DP: Disaster Preparedness

DRR: Disaster Risk Reduction

EDAN: Damage Evaluation and Needs Assessment

EWS: Early Warning System

HVCA: Hazard Vulnerability Capacity Analysis

HFA: Hyogo Framework for Action

ISDR: International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

JICA: Japanese International Cooperation Agency

LRRD: Linking Relief, Rehabilitation, Recovery and Development.

NCM: National Consultative Meeting

PRA: Participatory Rural Appraisal

PREVDA: Vulnerability and Environmental Degradation Reduction Regional Programme

PRRD: Regional Plan for Disaster Reduction

SUMA: Humanitarian Supplies Management Programme