



**European Commission**

Instructions and Guidelines  
for DG ECHO potential partners wishing to submit proposals for the  
**SEVENTH DIPECHO ACTION PLAN IN CENTRAL AMERICA  
COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, NICARAGUA, PANAMA**

**Budget line 23 02 03**

**Deadline for submitting proposals: 31<sup>st</sup> of May 2010, 17.30 CET**

# Table of contents

<b>BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME AND PRIORITY ISSUES FOR THE 7TH ACTION PLAN FOR CENTRAL AMERICA .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Principal objective .....	5
1.2 Specific objective .....	5
1.3 Strategic programming imperatives (sine qua non).....	6
1.4 Type of activities .....	11
1.5 Priorities in terms of geographical areas, hazards and sectors .....	15
1.6 Visibility and Communication requirements.....	26
<b>2. FINANCIAL ALLOCATION PROVIDED .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3. RULES OF THIS EXPRESSION OF INTEREST .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.1 Eligibility criteria.....</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1.1 Eligibility of applicants: who may apply.....	29
3.1.2 Eligible operations: operations for which an application may be made.....	29
3.1.3 Eligibility of costs: costs which may be taken into consideration for the grant.....	30
<b>3.2 How to apply and the procedures to follow.....</b>	<b>31</b>
3.2.1 Application form and supporting documents .....	31
3.2.2 Where and how to send the applications .....	32
3.2.3 Deadline for receipt of applications.....	32
3.2.4 Further information .....	32
3.2.5 Acknowledgement of receipt.....	32
<b>3.3 Evaluation and selection of applications.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.4 Notification of the European Commission's decision.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>3.5 Useful links for applicants.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4. CHECK LIST .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>38</b>

## BACKGROUND

According to Article 2(f) of Humanitarian Aid Regulation (EC) of 20 June 1996<sup>1</sup>, 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 DG 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 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. In 2008, South East Africa became the seventh 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 for 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)<sup>2</sup> 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 recent disasters that affected this region<sup>3</sup>, DG ECHO launched the Third DIPECHO Action plan in 2002 for an amount of EUR 3.1 million, and included 13 projects. A regional seminar was held in April 2004 in Guatemala with the local authorities and parties 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 amount of EUR 7.5 million, and included 23 projects aiming at reducing the risk through the level of preparedness of the vulnerable population in the areas most exposed to recurrent natural threats. For the first time ever, regional projects accounted for a significant share of total funding.

---

<sup>1</sup> CE Regulation N°1257/96 of 20 June 1996, OL L163 of 02.07.1996

<sup>2</sup> December 2003, Evaluation of DG ECHO's strategic orientation to disaster reduction available on DG ECHO's Web site: [http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/pdf\\_files/evaluation/2003/disaster\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/pdf_files/evaluation/2003/disaster_report.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> To name a few: Hurricane Mitch in 1998, earthquakes in El Salvador in 2001, Drought in 2001-2003.

At the end of the Fifth DIPECHO Action Plan, more than 400 DP experts participated in an extensive consultation process that was undertaken in November 2007, involving DIPECHO partners, relevant authorities, and scientists, local and international organisations. Notably, four national consultative meetings, as well as one regional seminar, were held to prepare the ground for the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan.

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.

The Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan was launched in 2008 for an amount of EUR 10 million, and included 24 projects aiming at reducing the risk through increasing the level of preparedness of the vulnerable population in the areas most exposed to recurrent natural threats. Regional projects still accounted for a significant share of the total funding. Also, there was a balanced repartition of projects between the priority countries.

On 17 March 2010, the European Commission adopted the Financing Decision ECHO/DIP/BUD/2010/03000 "Seventh DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America", which is the legal basis for the present Call for Expression of Interest. The total amount of the Decision is EUR 10 million; covering the period 01/09/2010 – 28/02/2012.

At the end of the Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan, more than 600 DP experts participated in an extensive consultation and dissemination process that was undertaken in January and February 2010, involving DIPECHO partners, relevant authorities, scientists, universities, local and international organisations involved in DRR. Notably, four national consultative and dissemination meetings, as well as one regional seminar, were held to prepare the ground for the Seventh DIPECHO Action Plan.

The present guidelines set out additional information regarding the rules for the submission, selection and criteria for project proposals to be financed under the 7<sup>th</sup> DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America, in conformity with the provisions of DG ECHO's Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) and the Financial Regulations applicable to the General Budget of the European Union.

The document reflects the outcomes of the consultation processes at national and regional levels held at beginning of 2010. Previous experiences and lessons learned, current perspectives of the EU cooperation in the field of DRR and evaluation of remaining needs in the field of Disaster Preparedness in the region have also been taken into account in setting the priorities for the Seventh DIPECHO Action Plan in terms of risk areas and objectives, respecting the specific humanitarian mandate established by the Humanitarian Aid Regulation.

The Seventh Action Plan is also written in accordance with the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015: *Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters* and with CEPREDENAC's regional plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (PRRD) for 2006-2015 and aims at supporting the implementation of the Central American Policy for Integral Disaster Risk Management (PCGIR).

Links to all relevant documents and tools developed to help in the application process can be found in this document and in the country folders on our Website.

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

### 1.1. Principal objective

The overriding objective of this DIPECHO Action Plan is to reduce the vulnerability and increase the coping capacities of Central America populations living in areas most affected by natural hazards.

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; specific attention will be given to projects taking into account gender, children and disabled issues in line with DG ECHO's strategy on the most vulnerable populations;
- focusing on the areas most exposed to natural hazards and with lower coping capacities;
- fostering appropriate and sustainable 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 can complement the project if they have a demonstrative purpose, a proven impact and can be easily replicated;
- Reinforcing local response capacities and mechanisms.

### 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 population and economy 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). Preparedness also involves activities that increase the options for the population to use local resources to deal with rehabilitation and recovery (damage assessment, project formulation training, knowledge of construction techniques, etc.).
- Local level refers to community and municipal levels. For shared hazards, it could be envisaged to support trans-boundary local level projects.
- 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 American<sup>4</sup> regional level.

Projects submitted should target the following **specific operational 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:**

---

<sup>4</sup> For the purpose of this Call Central America encompasses the following countries: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama.

Specific objective:

To contribute to increasing resilience and contribute to reducing vulnerability of local communities and institutions through support to strategies that enable them to better prepare for, mitigate and respond to natural disasters.

This can be done primarily by:

- a. Reinforcing the coping capacity at local level integrating and coordinating activities at local, sub-national, national and regional levels and the execution of Disasters Preparedness programmes through the implementation of pilot activities of a demonstrative nature.
- b. Contributing to the identification, compilation and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned on Disaster Preparedness and to the exchange of experiences at national and regional levels.

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 Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015, with the CEPREDENAC's regional plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (PRRD) for 2006-2015 and with the Central American Policy for Integral Disaster Risk Management (PCGIR)<sup>5</sup>. For projects with a similar evaluation, priority will be given to projects under point (a).

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

Applicants are encouraged to consult the materials provided during and after the Consultative and Dissemination Meetings. These provide further details on priorities and orientations for DIPECHO in Central America for the concerned period. These documents are available at the ECHO Website.

A series of programme planning and implementation priorities **must be considered by all projects** submitted under the Seventh 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. Applicants are encouraged to refer to the HFA priorities and when possible to its main relevant indicators in their proposals.
2. The ***starting point for the intervention logic of any DIPECHO supported project must be the hazard itself***, and not a problem that is essentially structural in nature, de-linked from a disaster event. This entails a ***thorough analysis of the natural disaster context*** (at the appropriate scale) that generates the following:
  - 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.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.sica.int/ceprendenac>

3. For a **disaster preparedness intervention** (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. The chosen methodology should be clearly stated and detailed in the project proposal as well as an indication of how it will be implemented.

The provision for **baseline studies** in the projects will facilitate future evaluation of impact; therefore, the realisation of baseline studies is compulsory. This will help to ensure that the right interventions are being proposed for the right places with the right target population. 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 interventions<sup>6</sup>.

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 exist<sup>7</sup> – 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**.

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. **Complementarities with other cooperation instruments of the European Commission, Members States of the European Union, or any relevant initiatives in the field of disaster risk reduction.** All submitted projects must be developed with **cognisance of** (and ideally contribute to the strategic objective of) **all ongoing and planned instruments of EU cooperation** in the country/region, 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 complementarities is positively encouraged. Joint activities are also encouraged. DG ECHO will favour **complementary actions** in each country and regionally, as well as joint initiatives.

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.: 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

---

<sup>6</sup> 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. <http://www.phree-way.org/resources/documents/characteristics-resilient.doc>

<sup>7</sup> 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.

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. 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 local 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. This approach should remain at the centre of any DIPECHO intervention.
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** (as actors more than "recipients" or "vulnerable categories") **of women, children, elderly people, ethnic groups, and disabled** is strongly encouraged.
  - *Non exhaustive examples: training of relevant personnel of implementing agencies, community facilitators, decision-makers on inclusion of gender, 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**. Climate Change Adaptation components can be integrated in DRR measures, where relevant and as long as they are realistic in the timeframe of the project.
  - *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 (both through community based activities and public awareness campaigns), integration of CC concepts in trainings, reinforced vulnerability and risk assessments, studies on knowledge at local level on CC and DRR, 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 and a manual with easy proposals of adaptation measures, improving and adapting practices/behaviours affecting environment and livelihoods (in a DRR context) and exchange between partners, amongst others.*

15. Partners are strongly encouraged to consider **Sphere** minimum standards, indicators and guidance notes so as to ensure the quality of the DP actions proposed.
16. If applicants are willing to address the **drought** hazard, they should take into account that in drought preparedness actions, there should be a strong focus on documentation and promotional tools, training systems, research and increased involvement of the relevant institutions, local institutes, local NGOs and universities. Drought preparedness can be addressed as a complement to ongoing long term structural programmes and its components will be funded with a clear hand-over perspective.
  - *Non exhaustive examples: studies, research and documentation related to: key indicators, variability factors to define thresholds, stakeholder analysis, action planning for drought risk reduction measures, economic and social indicators related to drought impact and information systems, appropriate monitoring system for water availability, improved review and assessment of drought typologies and context, physical and sociological mapping of vulnerabilities and capacities and development of innovative and alternative approaches. Other activities can be oriented to strengthen capacities for drought monitoring, including, when relevant, a user friendly EWS or a rainfall data management system, data and information collection on existing drought preparedness, lessons learned and documentation on good practices, training and capacity building of local actors on issues related to drought preparedness EWS, development of guidelines to handle drought preparedness components, amongst others.*
17. 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  $\geq 1$  action plan)<sup>8</sup>. 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.
18. Applicants submitting proposals should include as an integral part of their project an ad-hoc **sustainability strategy**. The strategy, which shall be an identifiable part of the action work plan, shall aim at implementing feasible and relevant actions to sustain the results achieved by the project after its conclusion. The strategy should be developed beyond targeting the community itself to targeting municipal and national authorities and other donors including the EU.

---

<sup>8</sup> **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 of 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).

19. 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.
20. 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 Documents produced at the National and Regional Consultative Meetings which will be circulated simultaneously with the publication of these Guidelines for the Seventh DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America. This should be clearly stated in the proposal. On the same level, applicants are encouraged to analyze the existing *Disaster Preparedness tools* in the region in order to evaluate if they can be used, adapted or replicated in their project.
21. 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* (15 months projects) of the DIPECHO Programme. For this reason, applicants should design their action realistically (avoid ambitious proposals i.e. huge geographical coverage or too wide-ranging activities) in order to ensure that the proposed objective can be achieved and measured by "SMART" indicators in this timeframe – ensuring good quality and sustainable impacts as opposed to quantity coverage with no impact at the end of the project.
22. Applicants must systematically consider, preferably in a coordinated manner, the *compilation, systematization and dissemination of experiences and tools* 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 and Systematization of experiences/tools and their dissemination should be explicitly envisaged under the activities and in the work plan of each proposal.*
23. *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 (i.e.: on DRR communication, advocacy, awareness campaigns, visibility events, etc). Cross-visits, **exchange of experience** and similar promotional activities are encouraged within a country and when relevant within the region.
24. 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 their proposed modalities they intend to/can join such fora.
25. 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.
26. *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.
27. *National and regional platforms*: When relevant, applicants should support and participate in national mechanisms for coordination and policy guidance on disaster risk reduction that are multi-sectoral and inter-disciplinary in nature, with public, private and civil society participation involving all concerned entities within a country. The partner should explain which mechanisms are supported and why they intend to do so. DIPECHO projects should contribute to the international, regional and national DRR efforts and priorities identified by all the actors.

28. Inclusion of specific actions supporting the *International Day for Disaster Risk Reduction* (IDRR) should be clearly indicated in the project proposals. These actions (preferably carried out jointly by DIPECHO partners) should target the general public, national and local authorities, to promote and advocate good practice in community risk reduction. This should be clearly stated and detailed in the proposal.
29. DIPECHO strongly favours components or actions supporting the implementation at regional and country levels of the global *DRR campaigns* promoted through the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR): through the "Making Cities Resilient" campaign, hospitals and schools will be also addressed.
30. Proposals should include provisions for supporting and participating in any relevant DRR programming and *consultative process* (as referred in section 1.4).
31. Agencies should ensure that the *outputs of the projects will be made available* through appropriate distribution mechanisms including web-resources centres or other relevant information management systems.
32. Please note that during the former DIPECHO Action Plan (Sixth Action Plan), *matrix of indicators* to measure the emergency response capacities have been developed in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras and Nicaragua. These matrixes are available as an annex of this Call together with its explanatory file. Its use is not compulsory, but recommended. If applicants use it to realize part of the need's assessment, please join it to your proposal as an annex.
33. Public-private *partnerships* are encouraged. When possible, alliances should be made in order to combine resources and expertise to act jointly to execute preparedness activities.

#### 1.4 Type of Activities

What follows is a general description of the type of **activities that are eligible and can be implemented in a DIPECHO project**<sup>9</sup>, apart from the support activities (administrative expenses, logistics, audit, evaluation...). The examples cited are non-exhaustive and proposals should not necessarily attempt to cover all types of activities. On the contrary, the feasibility of the intervention scale will be particularly assessed when selecting a project.

**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 EWS<sup>10</sup>.

Examples:

- Technical studies conducted specifically to set up an EWS (e.g.: definition of thresholds)
- 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

<sup>9</sup> Please refer to point 21 in section 1.3.

<sup>10</sup> In an EWS the following four components have to be considered: risk knowledge/analysis, hazard monitoring, communication (alert mechanism) and local preparedness to adequately respond to the alert.

- Simulation drills

### **Studies, mapping and data computerization**

Studies, 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)
- Development of mapping software and training on its use; GIS
- Improvement of hazard monitoring

Also, it is important to share the information collected at local level with other DRR actors and initiatives as this 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, adapting or developing user-friendly and locally appropriated systems.

Examples:

- Support in the organisation and training of local emergency committees
- Development and management of community emergency plans
- Simulations conducted at community level
- Training of community facilitators
- Training and equipment 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:

#### **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 MOU<sup>11</sup> between participating agencies), is therefore considered relevant.

Networking at inter-municipal level (through national associations of municipalities and FEMICA<sup>12</sup>) needs to be further encouraged in order to advocate for an 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.

---

<sup>11</sup> Memorandum of Understanding

<sup>12</sup> Federación de Municipios del Istmo Centroamericano.

### **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.
- 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: contribution to the elaboration/update of the Country Document

### **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.

**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.
- Conferences, symposia, seminars, workshops, peer-to-peer awareness initiatives
- Awareness campaigns: street drama, theatre, songs, etc.

### **Education**

Activities aimed at creating a “culture of safety and resilience” 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
- Integration of DRR into school curricula
- Promotion of safe school building design and construction

### **Systematization and 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 systematized tools and experiences, lessons learned, etc
- Systematization of DP tools, experiences, best practices and lessons learned
- Production of dissemination materials (catalogues, brochures, etc.)
- Support to national and regional information management centres
- Contribution to virtual exchange platforms and or publication of a specific experience

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 DIPECHO Workshop* in the country of intervention
2. Participation (one person of the project and one institutional guest) in a *Regional DIPECHO 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 and its dissemination.

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

##### **Infrastructure support**

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

Examples:

- Improvement of basic services in an emergency situation (ex: access to safe water in secure areas)
- Construction and/or improvement of public temporary shelters
- Rehabilitation of evacuation routes and sign-posting, facilitation of access to emergency shelters, etc. (including small bridges)
- Refurbishment of health care posts, temporary shelters for evacuated population, etc
- Works associated with safe guarding 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 still 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.

Examples:

- Protection walls along river banks
- Structural works on existing public buildings to increase their resistance to disasters
- Reforestation / plantation for slope stabilisation

Although there are many arguments in favour of mitigation works, the investment in this component should be kept to a minimum. The previous component, i.e. DP assistance infrastructure (e.g. escape routes, multi purpose shelters, etc) should receive far more attention from partners than mitigation works. Activities under this sector will be supported only in complement with the other above listed components.

**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 ensuring an adequate response 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 emergency non-food items at local level through mandated actors, entities or local partners and through well established systems
- Training on stockpiling and warehouses management
- Establishment of distribution mechanism and links with suppliers

Activities under this sector will be supported only in complement with the other listed activities. An adequate level of transparency and accountability needs to be ensured for this component (details must be provided in the proposal). Replenishment of stocks already purchased cannot be supported.

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

**A. Community-based projects** aim at reinforcing the coping capacity at local level integrating and co-ordinating 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. The Seventh DIPECHO Action Plan will focus on the most vulnerable local communities in disaster prone areas and institutions involved in DRR.

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 countries<sup>13</sup>: *El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua*. Projects in *Costa Rica and Panama* may be selected based on their special innovativeness and their replication possibilities in other countries of the region.

The following section summarises the priorities per country in terms of geographical areas and hazards for the Seventh DIPECHO Action Plan for the four DIPECHO priority Central American countries (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua). These priorities are the result of the national consultative meetings organised in January and February 2010<sup>14</sup>.

General recommendations regarding the intervention sectors and activities for each one of the targeted areas can also be found in the Country Documents. Activities at local level (community, municipality) are prioritised. Joint activities with associations of municipalities (*mancomunidades*) will be considered as a plus. Special considerations will be given to proposals that include some sort of collaboration with EU programmes (e.g.: PREVDA) and other donors. 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. Finally, DG ECHO welcomes multi-hazards approaches.

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

---

<sup>13</sup> N.B. Listed in alphabetical order.

<sup>14</sup> For further details regarding these priorities, please refer to the country documents. They are downloadable in the same webpage of this Call.

Community based trans-boarders initiatives could be considered favourably in this Action Plan. This would allow cross border river basin issues to be tackled in Central American countries (e.g.: Coco, Lempa, Motagua, etc.) or shared hazards along borders (e.g.: floods, drought, etc.). These projects will have to show the added value of being implemented in several countries within one single project.

DIPECHO projects usually adopt an integral approach<sup>15</sup> and are implemented at local level. In this sense, participants at the National Consultative Meetings (NCMs) made an attempt to prioritise intervention sectors per scenario (geographical area, hazard). DG ECHO strongly recommends partners interested in this Seventh Call to consult the Country Documents prepared after the NCMs to get 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.*

## NICARAGUA

For more information about criteria categorisation, please refer to the Nicaragua Country Document (pages 123-136). These criteria will be taken into account when selecting the proposals.

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

- **Atlantic region:** Hurricanes, Floods, Earthquakes and Forest fires.

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

River basins: Río Coco, Río Wawa, Río Prinzapolka, Río San Juan and Río Grande de Matagalpa.

Priority sectors<sup>16</sup>: 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 (e.g.: bi-lingual staff and training materials, respect for local practices, etc.) and its activities. The applicants will also have to ensure that indigenous authorities and/or leaders are taken into account when strengthening the COMUPRED. Institutional strengthening is a priority, at **municipal, territorial and regional (i.e.: departmental) levels. EWS and emergency infrastructures** are especially relevant in isolated communities.

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

If applicants are interested to work in the RAAN, collaboration mechanism should be established with other on-going projects related to the rehabilitation post Felix through the Stability Instrument (EU).

- **North-Centre region:** Landslides, Flash floods, Forest fires, Earthquakes and Droughts.

Municipalities: Telpaneca, Wiwili de Jinotega, Yalagüina, San Dionisio, Ciudad Antigua, San Rafael del Norte, Río Blanco and to a lesser extend: La Trinidad, San Ramón, Muy Muy, San Isidro, El Jícaro, Murra, El Cua, Santa Maria de Pantasma and San Juan del Río Coco

River basins: Pantasma, Grande, Jícaro, Bocay and bi-national river basins: Coco and Choluteca

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 **work developed by INETER** in this area.

Opportunities for coordination with **departmental authorities** need to be further explored in this region.

---

<sup>15</sup> Integral projects: those covering several intervention sectors.

<sup>16</sup> Please, refer to the Country Document for more details.

**Drought:** If applicants are willing to address the drought hazard, please refer to the list of municipalities prioritized by SE-SINAPRED (page 135 of the Country Document). Applicants are encouraged to support the studies on this phenomenon and its consequences. Applicants should also refer to previous DIPECHO experience on this matter in Honduras and take into consideration what is stated in section 1.3 (point 16).

- **Pacific volcanic strip:** Volcanic activities, Earthquakes, Floods, Forest fires and Landslides.

Municipalities: Achuapa, El Jicaral, Moyogalpa, San Jorge, Diriomo, La Paz Centro, Masaya, Rivas, Managua, Granada and Ciudad Sandino.

Surrounding areas of the Masaya and Momotombo volcanoes will also be prioritised. Projects targeting any of these two areas should take into account the impact of other hazards like earthquakes, floods, landslides and forest fires.

Priority Sectors: The inclusion of an **EWS component** is mandatory in this scenario.

Proposals need to take into account the lessons learned in the **previous DIPECHO projects** implemented in the areas near volcanoes San Cristobal, Cerro Negro, Telica and Concepción. If applicants are addressing volcanic activities, they should establish some sort of collaboration with the upcoming EU project on strengthening the private sector in the volcanic route (2011).

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

- **Pacific coast:** Tsunamis and Earthquakes.

Municipalities: Nagarote, Santa Teresa, Puerto Morazán, Villa Carlos Fonseca, San Rafael del Sur, Diriamba, Jinotepe, Tola and San Juan del Sur

Priority Sectors: The inclusion of an **EWS component** is mandatory in this scenario.

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

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

- **Urban areas in the Pacific strip:** Earthquakes and Volcanic activity

Managua, Ciudad Sandino, Masaya, Granada, Rivas, Chichigalpa, El Viejo and to a lesser extend: León and Chinandega

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

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

Urban risks should be addressed by developing first the capacities and abilities to work in this context (e.g.: developing and dissemination of tools adapted to urban risks) and take the **lessons learned** from past experiences of Urban Risks in Nicaragua and the rest of the Central American region.

If applicants consider working in Managua, the operation should be focused on strengthening risk knowledge, risk mapping, strengthening CODEPRED, organisation and strengthening of local committees, strengthening of the response capacity in school centres and raising-awareness of the population in general.

- Where relevant, **special consideration** will be given to proposals that include some sort of collaboration with other EU programmes / projects and with other DRR initiatives in the same area to guarantee complementarities, continuity and consolidation of processes. It is strongly recommended to look for approaches and mechanisms at municipal level in order to build sustainable processes in a long term basis. Special attention will be paid to proposals that have a clear strategy on this point.

- **Local Disaster Management components:** Activities must take into account the conclusions of the National Consultative and Dissemination Meeting: consolidation of the existing Early Warning System Network, dissemination of the know-how on EWS and tools to the community (BRILOR, COLOPRED, COMUPRED, etc.), exchange of experiences, capitalization of the local risks' knowledge and promotion of the humanitarian values and principles. Also, jointly efforts have to be made by applicants to guarantee a major **institutionalization** of the EWS. All the projects should collaborate with the mapping of the EWS, jointly collaborate with the institutions to carry on their strategy and dissemination of methodologies and manuals for the implementation of EWS. In this sense, efforts have been realized in Nicaragua to gather information in a systematic way together with the national authorities; applicants that are interested in implementing an EWS are strongly encouraged to enclose a technical file to the proposal which format can be found in annex of the Nicaragua Country Document (*otros anexos: Ficha SAT modelo*). For the EWS related to the floods, river basin approach is encouraged. 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. Mapping of actors at local level is encouraged.
- **Institutional linkages:** these activities must respect the existing legal framework and municipal planning. Partners should advocate for the inclusion of DRR in municipal planning. Promote the participatory approach among governmental staff in order to reinforce the links between the communities and the public institutions. Promote the strengthening of the system from an inter-institutional approach (design, update of sectoral plans in an integrated manner, building synergies, etc.). During the National Consultative and Dissemination Meeting, there were also concrete recommendations to support the Safe Hospital Strategy at local level and promote the implementation of building codes. Joint monitoring missions with national government staff during the project's implementation are encouraged. Also, it is encouraged that all the proposals should foment the integration of civil society organizations and the private sector in the COMUPRED and work on strengthening the ties between them and the COLOPRED. At municipal level, it is important to optimize the impact of the project by looking for appropriate mechanisms to ensure sustainability. On advocacy, it is recommended to include the private sector actors in these exercises as they have means and capacity to contribute. The applicants are encouraged to realize some joint activities at national level.
- **Information, Education and Communication:** Support the optimization of the information management system; strengthen the DRR in the curricula and training to the media. 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. On Information Management: the applicants should work jointly on supporting the compromise of the public entities leading the information management to institutionalize the existing products.
- **Small-scale infrastructures:** low cost and replicability of mitigation works should be taken into account when writing a proposal.
- Special consideration will be given to proposals that are able to involve the **private sector** and **Universities** in the project's activities.
- Details on thematic priorities that were identified during the National Consultative and Dissemination Meeting can be found in the Country Document (pages 137-143). Please note that some of these recommendations should be taken into account when writing the proposal in concordance with what is explained in Section 1.3 of this Call.

## HONDURAS

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

- **Multi-hazards:** Santa Rita, San Antonio de Flores, Ilama, San Jerónimo (*Floods, Landslides and Earthquakes*), San Marcos de Colón, San José, Candelaria (*Floods, Landslides, Droughts and*

*Earthquakes*), Piraera, Gualcinco, San Sebastián (*Floods, Landslides, Droughts, Hurricanes and Earthquakes*), Santa Fe (*Floods, Landslides, Hurricanes, Earthquakes, Flood tides and Swells*), Omoa (*Floods, Landslides, Earthquakes and Flood tides and Swells*), Balfate (*Floods, Landslides, Hurricanes and Flood tides and Swells*), La Unión (*Floods, Landslides, Hurricanes and Earthquakes*), Bonito Oriental (*Floods, Landslides and Hurricanes*), Veracruz, San Marcos (*Landslides, Hurricanes and Earthquakes*), Camasca, Reitoca, San Miguelito, Erandique, La Igualá, Dolores Merendón, Curaren (*Droughts, Landslides and Earthquakes*), San Marcos de Sierra, Valladolid (*Landslides, Droughts, Hurricanes and Earthquakes*), Trujillo, Santa Rosa de Aguan, Juan Francisco Bulnes, Limón, Jose Santos Guardiola, Puerto Lempira, Brus Laguna (*Hurricanes and Flood tides and Swells*), Roatán (*Hurricanes, Earthquakes and Flood tides and Swells*), Marcovia (*Earthquakes and Flood tides and Swells*), San Lorenzo, Alianza (*Droughts, Earthquakes and Flood tides and Swells*) and to a lesser extend:

Choluteca (*Droughts and Flood tides and Swells*), La Ceiba (*Floods and Landslides*), Guata (*Floods, Droughts and Earthquakes*), Esquipulas del Norte, Concepción de María (*Floods and Earthquakes*), Vado Ancho (*Floods, Landslides and Earthquakes*), Santa Ana de Yusguare (*Floods and Droughts*), , Cabañas, Florida, San Manuel Colohete, Colomoncagua, Trinidad, Puerto Cortes, Yoro (*Landslides and Earthquakes*), San Francisco de Coray (*Landslides, Droughts, Hurricanes and Earthquakes*), Orocuina (*Landslides and Droughts*), El Triunfo (*Droughts, Earthquakes and Flood tides and Swells*), Mangulile, Mapulaca, Santa Elena, Caridad, Aramecina, Langué, Goascorán and Nacaome (*Droughts and Earthquakes*).

- For **Floods**: areas prioritised within multi-hazards scenario and to a lesser extend: Potrerillos and Distrito Central. Trans-national river basins such as the Motagua, Lempa, Coco, Negro and Goascaran can be prioritized. Other river basins such as the Ulua, Lislis, Aguan, Choluteca and river basins of the Atlantic coast can be prioritised as long as the applicants build their action on what already exists in the river basins and look for consolidation in terms of EWS. Applicants interested in working in the Patuca, Choluteca or Rio Negro river basins are encouraged to establish coordination mechanisms with the FORCUENCAS (UE) programme. Applicants who would like to work in the river basins of the Mesoamerican Biologic Corridor will have to establish coordination mechanisms with PROCORREDOR (UE) programme.
- For **Landslides**: areas prioritised within multi-hazards scenario and to a lesser extend: San José de Colinas, Chinda, Santa Cruz de Yojoa and San Manuel. Any proposal targeting this hazard must take into consideration the existing information in this respect.
- For **Hurricanes**: Sonaguera, Tocoa, Utila, Dulce Nombre de Culmi, Gualaco, San Estebán, Wampusirpe, areas prioritised within multi-hazards scenario and to a lesser extend: Saba.
- For **Earthquakes**: La Encarnación, Yorito, Marale, those prioritised within multi-hazards scenario and to a lesser extend: Choloma, Guanaja, El Corpus, Talgua, Las Flores and San Rafael.
- For **Droughts**: areas prioritised within multi-hazards scenario and to a lesser extend: La Virtud, Virginia, Alubaren, Apacilagua, Liure, Soledad, Texiguat, Duyure, El Paraíso and Jacaleapa. Any proposal targeting this hazard must take into consideration previous experiences on this matter in Honduras and take into consideration what is stated in section 1.3 (point 16).
- Although DIPECHO projects usually target rural areas, projects addressing earthquakes, landslides and/or floods hazards in **urban marginal areas of Tegucigalpa** are also a priority in this Call.
- Where relevant, **special consideration** will be given to proposals that include some sort of collaboration with other EU programmes / projects (e.g.: PREVDA) and with other DRR initiatives in the same area to guarantee complementarities, continuity and consolidation of processes and also with other donors (e.g.: COSUDE, OFDA, etc.). It is strongly recommended to look for approaches and mechanisms at municipal level in order to build sustainable processes in a long term basis. Special attention will be

paid to proposals that have a clear strategy on this point. Special attention will also be paid on what are the roles of sectoral entities, private sector and universities as key actors in the projects.

- **Local Disaster Management components:** Activities should take into account some of the conclusions of the National Consultative and Dissemination Meeting: **Local capacities strengthening:** design of multi hazards emergency plans, integration of the psycho-social component into trainings, integration of the disabled in the brigades, adoption of the Safe Hospitals Strategy, etc. **Studies and Mapping:** integrated risk mapping, strengthening the compilation of data at local level, mapping at municipal scale with appropriate data and methodologies. Participants mentioned also the strengthening of the knowledge on hazards such as tsunamis and earthquakes, as it has hardly been done previously. **EWS:** improve the definition and update on thresholds, research/studies on landslides and tsunami EWS and replicate successful experiences from the region. Strengthen and consolidate the existing EWS and improve sustainability mechanisms, amongst others.
- **Institutional linkages:** Improve coordination between partners on topics such as inclusion of disabled, integration of the private sector in the planning, strengthen the risk management round tables, organize field exchanges between partners and integration of early recovery approach in the projects **Advocacy:** disseminate the SINAGER law, improve sustainability of institutional capacities, strengthen the alliance between the national risk management system and strategic partners and Human Rights transversal approach, amongst others.
- **IEC:** Dissemination and raising awareness on SINAGER law and raising awareness programmes to the population in general on DRR. Disseminate good practices and successful tools, establish a culture of systematisation and support existing mechanisms for information management, amongst others.
- **Small-scale infrastructures:** Support the building practices respecting the existing dynamics of the community and using local materials, amongst others.
- **Stock building:** Improve accountability mechanisms for stock management, amongst others.

Please refer to pages 114-120 for more information on the thematic priorities participants' conclusions of the National meeting. Some of these recommendations should be taken into account when writing the proposal.

## EL SALVADOR

For more information about criteria categorisation, please refer to the El Salvador Country Document (pages 538-606). When selecting the proposals, priority will be given to the areas below mentioned (corresponding to the list of first priority of the Country Document (page 587). However, some areas are rated under the category 2 (page 590) and as long as it is well justified with a proper needs assessment, communities within these areas can also be taken into account when writing the proposal.

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

➤ **Multi-hazards:**

- Ahuachapán department: Apaneca and Atiquizaya (Earthquakes and Landslides)
- Sonsonate department: Sonzacate (Volcanic activity and Earthquakes), Salcoatitán (Earthquakes and Landslides), Sonsonate (Earthquakes and Floods) and San Antonio del Monte (Volcanic activity, Floods and Landslides)
- Chalatenango department: Chalatenango, San Antonio los Ranchos, San Isidro Labrador, San Rafael, Citala (Landslides and Floods) and Nueva Concepción (Earthquakes, Floods and Landslides)
- La Libertad department: Colón (Volcanic activity and Earthquakes), Nueva San Salvador (Volcanic activity, Landslides and Earthquakes), La Libertad (Landslides and Floods), Jayaque (Earthquakes, Floods and Landslides) and Quezaltepeque (mainly Volcanic activity)
- San Salvador department: Ilopango, San Martín, Santiago Texacuangos (Volcanic activity, Earthquakes and Landslides), San Salvador (Volcanic activity, Earthquakes and Floods), Apopa, Mejicanos, Panchilmaco, San Marcos, Santo Tomás, Tonacatepeque (Earthquakes and Landslides) and Guazapa (Floods and Landslides)
- Cuscatlán department: San Pedro Perulapán (Volcanic activity and Earthquakes), Cojutepeque (Volcanic activity and Landslides), Santa Cruz Michapa (Volcanic activity, Earthquakes and Landslides), Santa Cruz Analquito and San Ramón (Earthquakes and Landslides)
- La Paz department: San Emigdio, San Miguel Tepezontes (Volcanic activity and Earthquakes) and Santa María Ostuma, Zacatecoluca (Earthquakes and Floods), Olocuilta, San Rafael Obrajuelo, San Juan Talpa (Floods and Landslides), San Antonio Masahuat and Tapalhuaca (Earthquakes and Landslides)
- Santa Ana department: Candelaria de La Frontera (Floods and Landslides)
- San Vicente department: Guadalupe, San Cayetano Istepeque, Tepetitán, Verapaz (Earthquakes and Landslides) and San Vicente (Earthquakes and Floods)
- Usulután department: Jucuapa, Puerto El Triunfo (Earthquakes and Landslides), El Triunfo, Ereaguayquín (Floods and Landslides) and Santa María (Volcanic activity and Floods)
- San Miguel department: Nueva Guadalupe (Volcanic activity, Earthquakes, Floods and Landslides), San Miguel (Volcanic activity, Earthquakes and Floods), San Rafael Oriente (Volcanic activity and Landslides) and El Tránsito (Earthquakes and Floods)
- La Unión department: Conchagua (Earthquakes, Landslides and Floods)

➤ **Volcanic activity:**

Areas surrounding the following volcanoes are prioritised:

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

When addressing the volcanic hazard, collaboration with MARN/SNET is an obligation. Projects can also take the lessons learned of similar projects executed in Nicaragua in previous Action Plans.

- **Earthquakes:**
  - Ahuachapán department: Concepción de Ataco, El Refugio and Turín
  - Sonsonate department: San Julián
  - San Salvador department: Ayutuxtepeque, Cuscatancingo, Nejapa, Soyapango and Ciudad Delgado
  - La Paz department: Jerusalén, Mercedes de La Ceiba, Paraíso de Osorio and San Juan Tepezontes
  - Usulután department: Tecapán, California and Estanzuelas
  - San Miguel department: Lolotique
  
- **Landslides:**
  - Santa Ana department: Coatepeque, Chalchuapa, El Congo and Texistepeque
  - Sonsonate department: Santa Catarina Masahuat
  - Chalatenango department: Concepción Quezaltepeque, Dulce Nombre de María, El Carrizal, La Palma, Las Vueltas, San José las Flores, San Miguel de Mercedes, San Ignacio and San Francisco Lempa
  - La Libertad department: Huizucar, Tepecoyo and Talnique
  - La Paz department: Cuyultitán and San Juan Nonualco
  - San Salvador department: Rosario de Mora
  - Cabañas department: Sensuntepeque
  - San Vicente department: Santo Domingo and San Lorenzo
  - Usulután department: San Agustín and Santa Elena
  - Morazán department: San Francisco Gotera
  
- **Floods:**
  - Chalatenango department: Azacualpa, El Paraíso, Potonico, San Luis del Carmen and Tejutla
  - La Paz department: San Luis Talpa, San Pedro Masahuat, Santiago Nonualco, El Rosario and San Luis La Herradura
  - Cabañas department: Tejutepeque
  - San Salvador department: Aguilares and El Paisnal
  - San Vicente department: Tecoluca
  - Sonsonate department: Nahuilingo
  - Usulután department: Usulután, Ozatlán and Jiquilisco
  - La Unión department: La Unión, San Alejo and Pasaquina
  
- Where relevant, **special consideration** will be given to proposals that include some sort of collaboration with other EU programmes / projects (e.g.: PREVDA and the upcoming UE Urban and Rural Supportive Communities Program (2011) and with other DRR initiatives in the same area to guarantee complementarities, continuity and consolidation of processes. It is strongly recommended to look for approaches and mechanisms at municipal level in order to build sustainable processes in a long term basis. Special attention will be paid to proposals that have a clear strategy on this point.
- Applicants are encouraged to work with a **river basin approach**, and strengthening the consolidation of the EWS in the areas of intervention. Paz, Goascaran, Grande de San Miguel and Lempa river basins will be prioritized. Collaboration with MARN / SNET is required. When working on Rio Paz, Lempa and Goascoran River Basins, trans-boundaries projects can be submitted.
- Proposals targeting **urban risks** can also be submitted to DG ECHO. **Forest Fire** preparedness measures can also be implemented if necessary. For this case, it is recommended to take into account the PREVDA experience in the Shushula and Nunuapa sub-river basins and previous experience in Nicaragua on this issue.
- **Local Disaster Management components:** Activities must take into account the conclusions of the National Consultative and Dissemination Meeting: Integrated Risk Studies (Water, Environment, Risk Management) at municipal level. Organization of integrated simulation exercises with the participation of all sectors (reflect the applicability of the different plans, e.g.: local, municipal, education, health) in

order to raise awareness at every level. Training on Sphere standards. Incorporate the University in diagnostics and studies. EWS: strengthen and consolidate the existing EWS within the national network.

- **Institutional linkages:** Promote the exchange of experiences and lessons learned between municipalities. Support the creation of a Risk Management National Policy. Support the cross-sectoral coordination. Support the Safe Hospital Strategy.
- Details on thematic priorities that were identified during the National Consultative and Dissemination Meeting can be found in the Country Document for each one of the departments. Also, general recommendations regarding sustainability, advocacy, Climate Change adaptation and others can be found in the Country Document (pages 598-606). Please note that some of these recommendations should be taken into account when writing the proposal in concordance with what is explained in Section 1.3 of this Call.

## GUATEMALA

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

- **Floods:** The following floodable regions have been identified:
  - Pacific coast river basins
  - Motagua, Polochic and Chixoy river basins
  - Petén
  - Other areas (Alta Verapaz, Quetzaltenango, Guatemala)

The list of municipalities prioritised is included in Guatemala's Country Document (pages 37-38).

- **Landslides:** The area usually affected by these hazards is the occidental high plateau and around volcanic areas. However, other areas have been identified such as, for example, the metropolitan areas of Guatemala. The list of prioritised municipalities is included in the Guatemala's Country Document (pages 41-43).
- **Volcanic activity:** Surrounding areas of the Tacaná, Santiaguito, Fuego and Pacaya volcanoes will be prioritised. The list of prioritised municipalities is included in the Guatemala's Country Document (page 44). Applicants who would like to work on this hazard should take into account the lessons learned from **previous DIPECHO projects** implemented in Nicaragua and existing experiences in Guatemala. Participation of **INSIVUMEH** in the implementation of related projects is compulsory.
- **Earthquakes:** The following departments and municipalities were identified during the consultative process in Guatemala: Senahú, Panzós, Tukurú y Tamahú (Alta Verapaz department), Baja Verapaz department except for San Miguel Chica municipality, Chimaltenango department, El Progreso department except for Sanarate and Sansare municipalities, Escuintla department, Guatemala department, Tectitán (Huehuetenango department), Izabal department, Mataquesuintla and San Carlos Alzatate (Jalapa department), Quesada and San José Acatempa (Jutiapa department), Quetzaltenango department, Canillá, Zacualpa, San Antonio Ilostenango, Santa Cruz del Quiché, Joyabaj, Chinique, Chiché, Patzité, Chichicastenango and Pachalum municipalities (Quiché department), Retalhuleu department, Sacatepéquez department, San Marcos department, Santa Rosa department except for Chiquimulilla municipality, Sololá department, Suchitepéquez department, Totonicapán department except for Santa Lucía La Reforma municipality, Zacapa department except for La Unión and San Diego municipalities. The municipalities prioritised are included in the Country Document (pages 46 and 47).
- **Droughts:** Special attention should be paid to this hazard when working in Baja Verapaz, El Progreso, Zacapa, Jalapa, Chiquimula, Santa Rosa and Jutiapa, which are the identified

departments of the "dry corridor" most affected by food insecurity. Applicants who would like to work on this hazard should take into account the lessons learned from **previous DIPECHO projects** implemented in Honduras and existing experiences in Guatemala and take into consideration what is stated in section 1.3 (point 16). In any case, DP activities must be complementary to ongoing long term structural programmes.

- Where relevant, **special consideration** will be given to proposals that include some sort of collaboration with other EU programmes / projects (e.g.: PREVDA, Rural Development project in Huehuetenango, Institutional Strengthening of the Youth sector, Non-State actors programmes in rural areas, etc.) and with other DRR initiatives in the same area to guarantee complementarities, continuity and consolidation of processes. It is strongly recommended to look for approaches and mechanisms at municipal level in order to build sustainable processes in a long term basis. Special attention will be paid to proposals that have a clear strategy on this point.
- DG ECHO will consider conclusions of the participants during the National Consultative and Dissemination meeting who stressed out the importance to tackle geographical areas through a **multi-hazards approach**. They also stressed out the importance of considering **trans-boundary river basins**. Finally, participants stressed out the need to work on DP in an urban context (**urban risks**) due to the high concentration of population in growing cities such as: Guatemala City, Quetzaltenango, Cobán and Escuintla.
- Some recommendations on thematic priorities are reflected in the Country Document (e.g.: strengthening of inter-institutional coordination and strengthen the coordination between national, departmental and local levels, integration of DRR in municipal planning, support the optimization of an information management system, etc.). Details on thematic priorities' activities that were identified during the National Consultative and Dissemination Meeting can be found in the Country Document (pages 53-54). Please note that some of these recommendations should be taken into account when writing the proposal in concordance with what is explained in Section 1.3 of this Call.

**B. 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 e.g.: Making Resilient Cities, etc), networking, information management, trainings, compilation and dissemination of lessons learned on disaster preparedness and harmonisation of approaches (related to different issues e.g.: Urban Risks, EWS, National platforms, etc.) and to the exchange of experiences at national and regional levels. A regional project is not the sum of bilateral negotiations with each country belonging to the region; a real regional vision and negotiations at this level should exist in cooperation with national disaster preparedness systems and CEPREDENAC, respectively, contributing therefore to strengthen the Central American integration system.

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. Regional actions should look at the consolidation and up-scaling of experiences developed in the region during the past few years.

A Regional Consultative Meeting was organised in February 2010 in order to identify regional priorities that could complement the national priorities identified in the National Consultative Meetings for the DIPECHO Seventh Action Plan. Complementarities between DIPECHO and other initiatives were identified by participants in this regional workshop. As coordination is a key issue at regional level, applicants for regional proposals should ensure and highlight their **complementarities/linkages with national priorities, HFA 2005-2015, CEPREDENAC's PCGIR and PRRD and with other donors and existing global initiatives**. Applicants should respect a particularly close coordination with **SE/CEPREDENAC, ISDR and other EC funding programmes (e.g.: collaboration with PREVDA is encouraged)** as well as with **national authorities** to facilitate the implementation of projects.

Participants at the Regional Consultative Meetings (RCM) made an attempt to prioritise initiatives by intervention sectors. DG ECHO recommends applicants interested to submit a proposal for this Seventh Call<sup>17</sup> to consult the Regional Matrix prepared during the RCM to get further details in this respect. Such prioritisation is purely indicative and any proposal should be based **on a proper needs' assessment and the overall coherence of the proposal has to be preserved.**

## **REGIONAL**

The following priorities were identified at regional level:

- **Compilation, systematisation and dissemination of DP tools, best practices and lessons learned** are still key issues at regional level. Activities which represent an added value at regional level will be taken into account (including the promotion of existing networks to exchange experiences, production of new dissemination tools, improve the systematization and dissemination methodologies by for example including the private sector and universities at a regional level, 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.)).
- 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.: 2010-2011 Global Campaign "Making Cities Resilient" and provide continuity to the Safe Hospitals Strategy, as well as to the Safe Schools Strategy<sup>18</sup>), promotion and dissemination of CEPREDENAC's PCGIR main action lines. Also, facilitate a study on costs/benefits to promote tools to advocate for more DRR in the future from the national institutions. Special attention will be oriented in including Municipalities' associations (e.g.: FEMICA) in these initiatives to support and advocate for the decentralization in terms of Integral Risk Management to Municipal authorities.
- **Design/Compilation, studies at regional level on hazards, disaster risk and coping capacity indicators** (including the harmonization of risk mapping methodologies, data bases, early warning systems, cost-analysis, monitoring and evaluation standards, etc) may be considered when they feed:
  - (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.
- **Harmonization of EWS** at a Central American level, through the diffusion of protocols between technical and scientific institutions, harmonization of concepts, foment exchanges of experiences, awareness raising campaigns and strengthening of institutional capacities that will seek the improvement of sustainability.
- Analysis, harmonization, **standardisation of existing IEC** and training materials and tools. This can include compiling tools and materials and development of packages of consensually approved products.
- **Standardization of norms** for infrastructures' building, dissemination of successful mitigation works through popular guidelines, organization of workshops on Sphere, Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergency standards and Safety Hospital Index methodology.
- **Promote coordination between countries** e.g.: for the harmonization of legal frameworks, inter sectorial dialogue between climate change entities and risk management institution to promote joint action plans. Create mechanism to foment and **reinforce the coordination at a trans-boundary**

---

<sup>17</sup> All applicants are encouraged to consult the National **and** Regional priorities' documents to define their action.

<sup>18</sup> Recommendations on Health and Education were discussed during RCM sessions. These have to be taken into account by all partners.

**level** (e.g.: promote meetings between municipalities' associations and national systems, shared planning and mapping of existing capacities, discuss the custom process, mobility issues and strengthen the exchanges between emergency committees, etc.). Areas such as the Fonseca Gulf between Nicaragua, El Salvador and Honduras and the Coco River basin between Honduras and Nicaragua have been identified during the regional meeting.

- Improvement of **DRR inclusive approaches**, in particular involving the most vulnerable groups and properly addressing cross-cutting issues.

## 1.6. Visibility and communication requirements

### New approach

With a view of boosting the impact of the resources, both human and financial, that DG ECHO devotes to communicating about its humanitarian aid, a new approach has been adopted whose objective is to limit to the basics visibility and communication activities funded through agreements with the partners and develop communication activities managed directly by DG ECHO information unit.

**Therefore the funding that partners can normally allocate to institutional visibility/communication in humanitarian operational agreements is limited to a maximum of €8,000 or 0.5% of the direct eligible costs, whichever is smaller. No minimum figure is imposed.**

These amounts are sufficient for partners to meet the costs arising from basic visibility obligations in the FPA (stickers, posters, signboards, tee-shirts etc.) with a modest margin in larger financing agreements for pro-active communication work in line with Article 4.1 of the FPA General Conditions. In very limited circumstances, DG ECHO might consider specific proposals from experienced partners for larger amounts to be spent on communication actions but only on the basis of **convincing impact indicators** set out in the single form and following prior discussion with ECHO A6.

Please refer to the following link for detailed information:

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/about/actors/toolkit\\_for\\_partners\\_sept\\_09\\_en.pdf#page=3](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/about/actors/toolkit_for_partners_sept_09_en.pdf#page=3)

### Eligible activities

Activities funded under the Visibility Heading will have the following objectives:

1. Making visible the EC support to the project
2. Promoting the role and the mandate of DG ECHO, especially its principles of intervention: needs based operations implemented through non-governmental partners (European NGO's), International Organisations including United Nations (UN) agencies and Member States Specialised Agencies.
3. Promoting the humanitarian principles: humanity, impartiality, independence and neutrality.

This is distinct from activities considered eligible under Advocacy and Public Awareness-raising, where the objectives will favour promotion of DRR and the HFA for example, in which reference must be made to the EC support, the role of the partner and the EC, and visibility given to DG ECHO.

Basic 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.

In terms of communication activities, these could consist of (for example):

- 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/web site if they publish one, mentioning the EC role and support to the project, with display of ECHO logo and a link to DG ECHO website (<http://ec.europa.eu/echo>)

- iv. an article in any newspaper or media reporting on the project
- v. mentioning DG ECHO's funding in any interview, etc.

### **How to Meet the Requirements?**

The visibility and communication activities planned, their objective, target group, timing and expected impact as well as impact indicators (this one specifically for communication activities) and relevant costs (unit costs, quantities and distribution planned) is to be included under section 9 of the Single Form **and the related TOTAL amount under section 4.3.2.y (1<sup>st</sup> row of other costs table)**. Please see **Single Form guidelines**.

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.

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 heading**. For example: training manuals, advocacy campaigns, etc. These should nevertheless feature the visual identity, with a clear mention of DG ECHO's funding, like all supplies and equipment funded by the European Commission. If, in these productions space allows partner to present himself, same space should be allocated to present DG ECHO

### **Support available**

In 2009, a new visibility toolkit for partners has been produced to reflect DG ECHO's new approach on visibility and communication issues. Those guidance sheets are available on DG ECHO website: [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/visibility\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/visibility_en.htm)

For further questions please feel free to contact the Regional Information Officer in Managua, Juan Carlos Rincón: [juan-carlos.rincon-dominguez@ec.europa.eu](mailto:juan-carlos.rincon-dominguez@ec.europa.eu)

## 2. FINANCIAL ALLOCATION PROVIDED

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

The EUROPEAN COMMISSION 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

In addition, **DG ECHO's contribution may not exceed 85% of the total eligible costs of the operation.** The balance of at least 15 % must be financed from the applicant's or partners' own resources, or from sources other than the EUROPEAN UNION budget. Level of co-financing will be taken into account as selection criteria.

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

### 3. RULES OF THIS EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

These guidelines set out the rules for the submission, selection and implementation of projects financed under the Seventh 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 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.
- The list of potential partners in point 6.2 of the Financing Decision ECHO/DIP/BUD/2010/03000 is indicative only. It will be updated as per the final selection of eligible applicants following the proposals 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 EC grant applied for must fall within the minimum amount 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 and individual scholarships for studies or training courses.
- Actions that seek to address structural issues such as food insecurity.

#### 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.

<h3><i>3.1.3 Eligibility of costs: costs which may be taken into consideration for the grant</i></h3>
---

Only “eligible costs” can be taken into account for a DIPECHO grant. These are detailed in the General Conditions of the Framework Partnership Agreement<sup>19</sup> or for international organisations in the Framework Agreements (FPA/FAFA).

Please note that the eligible direct costs 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 that 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.

---

<sup>19</sup> Article 18 of the General Conditions (Annex III of the FPA with DG ECHO)

## 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 DG-ECHO, 2008).

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm) (FPA English version), or

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa\\_fr.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_fr.htm) (FPA French version).

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fafa\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fafa_en.htm) (FAFA)

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.

*The complete application must include:*

- i. **the Single Form,**
- ii. **a signed cover letter** and
- iii. **relevant supporting documents**

Applicants must apply in either **English or French**<sup>20</sup>. Handwritten applications will not be accepted.

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 Action Plan'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 should be accompanied by the following supporting documents:

1. Correspondence from any relevant entities such as local partners, authorities and institutions, upon whom the success or viability of the action may depend;
2. Brief description of current or earlier participation in Disaster Risk Reduction actions financed by the European Commission or other sources;
3. Correspondence from other co-financing entities regarding their contribution to the project;
4. Further information on the applicant's disaster risk reduction strategy, needs assessment, studies including reference to previous programmes and evaluations;
5. If already known, 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;
6. Any other annex considered important.

---

<sup>20</sup> At application stage, some supporting documents can be provided in Spanish.

### 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 A4  
Seventh DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America  
To the attention of the Head of Unit, Mr Esko KENTRSCHYNSKYJ  
AN 88, 06/012  
European Commission  
B-1049 Brussels

Address for hand delivery or delivery by private courier:

DG ECHO-Unit A4  
Seventh 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 THREE following addresses:**

Central HQ: [echo-central-mailbox@ec.europa.eu](mailto:echo-central-mailbox@ec.europa.eu)  
HQ - Mikel Usabiaga at : [mikel.usabiaga-flores@ec.europa.eu](mailto:mikel.usabiaga-flores@ec.europa.eu)  
Field - Virginie André at: [echo-nicaragua@ec.europa.eu](mailto: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. The annexes have to be submitted officially and timely as full part of the application.

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 **31 of May 2010, 17:30 CET**. 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:  
Mikel Usabiaga  
Central America Desk Officer  
E-mail address: [mikel.usabiaga-flores@ec.europa.eu](mailto:mikel.usabiaga-flores@ec.europa.eu)  
Fax: 32.2.2954571

With copy to:

DG ECHO Nicaragua:  
Virginie André  
Central America Technical Assistant  
E-Mail address: [virginie.andre@ec.europa.eu](mailto:virginie.andre@ec.europa.eu)  
Fax: 505.22706186

### 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/or 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/or those of its local partner(s)**, have sufficient technical expertise in terms of Disaster Preparedness, mitigation and prevention or Disaster Risk Reduction project management **in the country and/or region** where the project is presented?

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

3.2 As a second step, an evaluation of the **relevance** of the proposal will be done on the basis of the following criteria:

<b>1. Relevance</b>
1.1 How relevant is the proposal to the <b>objectives</b> and one or more of the <b>priorities</b> of the call for proposals (points 1.1, 1.2 and 1.5 of this call)?
1.2 How relevant to the particular <b>needs and constraints</b> of the target populations and country/countries or region(s) is the proposal (including avoidance of duplication and synergy with other DRR initiatives and strategies, in particular EU co-operation initiatives)? (points 2, 3 and 4.2 of the Single Form) Has the proposal been <b>discussed</b> 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 <b>strategy</b> in the country (point 3 of the Single form) and does it contribute to an ongoing <b>strategy</b> of engagement in the target area? (points 3.2 and 3.3 of the Single Form) Does the project target the <b>most vulnerable populations</b> and regions? (points 2, 4.1 and 4.2 of the Single form) Does the action fit within the established <b>DRR legal, policy and planning frameworks</b> and contribute to their implementation and consolidation, in particular at local level? (points 2.3, 4.3, 5, 6, 7 of the Single Form) Does the proposal refer to the <b>HFA</b> , its priorities and if possible its core indicators? (points 4.3 of the Single Form) Does the project take into account: <b>gender, children, elderly people, environmental, cultural issues and disabilities</b> (points 4.2, 4.3, 4.5 and 5.3 of the Single Form)? Does the project take into account (when relevant) the problem of <b>security</b> and/or <b>access</b> ? What are the contingency plans? (point 8 of the Single Form)

**Please note that those proposals evaluated not to have a good level of relevance (criteria 1.1 and 1.2) will also 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 above relevance criteria and the hereunder evaluation criteria to finally select actions which maximise the overall effectiveness of the Action Plan:

<b>2. Methodology</b>
2.1. How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (intermediaries, final beneficiaries, <b>target groups</b> )? (point 4.2 of the Single Form) Have the <b>needs</b> of the <b>target groups</b> 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 <b>target groups' and final beneficiaries' level of involvement and participation in the operation</b> satisfactory? (points 2 and 4.2 of the Single form).
2.2. How coherent is the overall design of the operation ( <b>logical framework</b> )? Are the <b>activities</b> proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the local constraints, the objectives and expected results? (point 4.3 of the Single Form) Is the <b>Action Plan</b> 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 <b>human resources</b> allocated to the operation adequate? (Point 10 of the Single Form). Is the presence of <b>experienced</b> coordinator and administrative staff ensured in order to provide with a proper follow-up of the action?
2.3. Does the proposal contain <b>objectively verifiable indicators</b> for the outcome of the operation? (points 4.3, 4.5 and 5 of the Single Form and Logical Framework)
<b>3. Sustainability</b>
3.1 Are the expected results of the proposed operation <b>sustainable</b> : (Points 4.2.5, 4.5, 5, 6, 7 of the Single Form)  - 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?</i> )

<p><i>Will there be local “ownership” of the results of the operation?)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Locally (<i>what are the links and coordination with the relevant authorities?</i>)</li> <li>- At policy level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the operation — e.g. will it <b>lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, good practices, etc.</b>?</i>)</li> <li>- Is the operation likely to have a tangible <b>impact</b> on its target groups</li> <li>- Is the proposal likely to have <b>multiplier effects</b>? (Including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the operation and dissemination of information.)</li> </ul>
<b>4. Budget and cost-effectiveness</b>
4.1. Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory (taking into account in particular the level of co-financing)? (Points 10, 11 of the Single Form)
4.2. Is the proposed expenditure <b>necessary</b> for the implementation of the operation (adequacy of the budget with the proposed activities)? (Points 4.3.2, 10, 11 of the Single Form)
4.3. Are <b>material</b> resources and <b>services needed properly described</b> ? (Points 4.3.2, 4.5, 11) <i>Both P and A partners should provide sufficient information in means and costs/other costs sections and where relevant. Only A-partners need to fill in Annex A.</i>
4.4. Are Means and Costs related to results and activities sufficiently explained? (Points 4.3.2)
<b>5. Other</b>
5.1 Have visibility measures been included (activities in point 9 with costs indicated in "other costs" of point 4.3.2)?

### 3.4 NOTIFICATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S DECISION

Applicants will be informed in writing of the European Commission'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 31 May 2010 for presenting applications, DG ECHO intends to make a first analysis of the proposals during the month of June 2010. Pre-selected proposals may be negotiated during the course of July-August. Therefore, operations must start between September and November 2010. These dates are indicative only.

The selected applicant will be offered a grant based on the European Union's standard grant agreement for humanitarian operations annexed to the Framework Partnership Agreement. 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.

**Bearing in mind that the funding decision has 1<sup>st</sup> of September 2010 as a start date, therefore the projects can have the earliest starting date as from September 1, 2010.**

### 3.5 USEFUL LINKS FOR APPLICANTS

- Financing Decision “DIPECHO Seventh Action Plan for Central America” ECHO/DIP/BUD/2010/3000:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding/decisions\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding/decisions_en.htm)

- All related Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) related documents for NGOs and International Organizations: [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm)

- External evaluation of the DIPECHO Central American Program:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/evaluation/2008/dipecho\\_central\\_america\\_final.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/evaluation/2008/dipecho_central_america_final.pdf)

- Council Regulation N°1605/2002 of 25/06/2002 on the **Financial Regulation** applicable to the General Budget of the European Union (OJ L 248, 16/09/2002) and Commission Regulation N° 2342/2002 of 23 of

December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation N° 1605/2002: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/documents/financial\\_regulation\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/documents/financial_regulation_en.htm)

- European Union Strategy on supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in developing countries: [http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/COMM\\_PDF\\_COM\\_2009\\_0084\\_F\\_EN\\_COMMUNICATION.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/COMM_PDF_COM_2009_0084_F_EN_COMMUNICATION.pdf)

- International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction, Hyogo Framework for Action and its indicators, World Campaigns on Safer Schools, Safer Hospitals and Making Cities Resilient: <http://www.unisdr.org>

## 4.CHECK LIST

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

### The application forms

- The application has been filled in on the proper form (Single Form);
- A signed cover letter is attached;
- One original hard copy with all supporting documents has been sent to the European Commission;
- An electronic copy of the file has been sent to the 1/ECHO Central Mailbox, 2/Mikel Usabiaga and 3/Virginie André;
- The application is typed in English or French;
- The application contains a financial overview of the total eligible costs (i.e. including both the contribution requested from the European Commission and the co-financing share) in Euro (Section 11 of the Single Form);
- In the budget the European Commission's contribution is identified and is a maximum of 85% of the total eligible costs of the operation;
- The total eligible costs include only eligible costs and no in-kind contribution;
- In the financial overview, the overheads do not exceed 7% of direct eligible costs;
- The contribution requested from the European Commission does not exceed 85% of the total eligible costs of the action.

### Supporting documents

For all the applicants:

- Correspondence from other entities (for example governments) on whose participation in whatever way the success or viability of the project may depend;
- All annexes have been attached to the original paper application sent to the European Commission;
- All annexes have been copied and sent by email to DG ECHO HQ and at Field level (or on CD if too large);
- Particulars of current or earlier participation in operations in Disaster Risk Reduction financed by the European Commission or by other sources;
- Correspondence from other co-financing entities regarding their contribution to the project;
- Curriculum Vitae of the main personnel responsible for implementing the activities of the action;

## **GLOSSARY**

CAPRA: Central American Probabilistic Risk Analysis

CC / CCA: Climate Change / Adaptation

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

COSUDE: Swiss Agency for Cooperation

DG ECHO: European Commission Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid

DIPECHO: Disaster Preparedness Programme of DG ECHO

DP: Disaster Preparedness

DRR: Disaster Risk Reduction

EDAN: Damage Evaluation and Needs Assessment

EWS: Early Warning System

FAFA: Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement

FPA: Framework Partnership Agreement

HFA: Hyogo Framework for Action

HVCA: Hazard Vulnerability Capacity Analysis

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 Program

PRRD: Regional Plan for Disaster Reduction

RCM: Regional Consultative Meeting

SUMA: Humanitarian Supplies Management Program