



**European Commission  
DIRECTORATE GENERAL HUMANITARIAN AID  
AND CIVIL PROTECTION  
DG ECHO**

**Annex 1 to Humanitarian Action Plan South America .....**

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

**ACTION PLAN FOR SOUTH AMERICA 2013/14  
Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru,  
Uruguay and Venezuela**

**Deadline for submitting proposals: 21 January 2013**

## Table of contents

<b>Background</b>	3
<b>1. OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	
1.1. Programming Imperatives	4
1.2. General Recommendations	6
1.3. Priorities in terms of geographical areas, hazards and sectors	8
<b>2. MAIN SELECTION CRITERIA</b>	18
<b>3. FINANCIAL QUESTIONS</b>	19
<b>4. TENTATIVE CALENDAR FOR THE ACTION PLAN</b>	19
<b>ANNEX 1. SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL TO DG ECHO</b>	20
<b>ANNEX 2: COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY</b>	23
<b>ANNEX 3: EXAMPLES OF DP INDICATORS PER SUBSECTOR</b>	25
<b>ANNEX 3: USEFUL LINKS FOR APPLICANTS</b>	28

## **Background**

This document has been prepared to complement the Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) with more specific recommendations and rules to be followed by the applicants to the DIPECHO Action Plan in South America 2013-2014.

These recommendations reflect the outcomes, in terms of geographical and thematic priorities, of consultations with various stakeholders undertaken in the South American region during 2011 and 2012. They also integrate the outcomes of the national and regional consultative meetings held in September and October 2012. Besides offering to the main stakeholders the possibility for a disaster preparedness dialogue, this consultation process allowed concrete priorities to be drawn up for the countries targeted by this Action Plan. These recommendations include a synthesis of the Country Documents prepared in the framework of this consultative process. The Country Documents, with detailed information about the situation in terms of risks related to natural hazards as well as the priorities for each country, can be consulted on the same webpage as these recommendations.

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

The Action Plan 2013/14 also takes account of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: *Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters* and aims at facilitating the implementation of the Andean Strategy for Disaster Prevention and Management.

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

# 1. OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

## 1.1. Operational imperatives

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

### Principles

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

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

#### Complementarity and coordination

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

#### Joint initiatives between partners

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

## Miscellaneous

15. It is imperative that strategies **encompass low cost solutions and technical assistance designs** that accurately reflect the degree of sustained budgetary commitment that can *realistically* be expected from national, sub-national and/or local budgets.
16. Small-scale mitigation works and infrastructure are to remain **complementary and secondary** (both in terms of contingency plan priority and resource allocation). Proposals that seek merely to address structural issues, for example, of food insecurity or inadequate delivery of basic services, **will not be considered eligible**. Actions of this type will need to clearly demonstrate logic within the development of a DRR strategy that is both complementary and enhances sustainability.
17. **Climate change adaptation** cannot be the sole focus of a specific and ad hoc DIPECHO project. However, projects can integrate it in risk analysis when relevant and look at links between DRR and climate change (CC) initiatives, considering CC influence on the intensity and occurrence of extreme natural events.
18. Considering the demonstrative value of DIPECHO projects, DG ECHO promotes the development of communication strategies for dissemination of products including the presentation of DIPECHO experiences in other DRR fora.
19. Indicators for specific objectives and results must be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely adequate (SMART). Baseline surveys should be carried out at the beginning and at the end of the project at community and institutional level in order to measure indicators (e.g. KAP surveys). See annex 3 for a non-exhaustive list of examples of DP indicators.

## **1.2. General Recommendations**

The following are non sectoral recommendations for applicants, not conditions that have necessarily to be fulfilled.

1. In order to promote DIPECHO as a programme rather than a collection of projects, collaborative strategic formulation and planning between potential DIPECHO partners that promote mutual complementarity is strongly encouraged. This can take the form of joint projects (consortia) or joint initiatives implemented through several projects (alliances). In this sense, partners are encouraged to coordinate from the identification and formulation phase. Consortia or multi country operations should demonstrate a clear added value.
2. In order to avoid unnecessary time constraints and activities being carried out without a proper hand-over process, it is strongly recommended that the results and timeframe of projects are realistic and not overambitious. Considering the demonstrative objective of the DIPECHO programme, quality should prevail over quantity. In this sense, foreseeable administrative, logistical and operational constraints as well as constraints linked to change of authorities involved in the project or time needed for institutional agreements should be integrated into the proposal timeframe.
3. Applicants should consider one or more of the proposed sub-sectors, based on their experience, mandates and specific skills. ECHO encourages specialisation of partners rather than systematically covering all subsectors in a proposal.

4. Partners are encouraged to consider Sphere minimum standards, indicators and guidance notes so as to ensure the quality of the DRR actions proposed.
5. Synergy with supranational and global DRR strategies such as the Andean Strategy for Disaster Prevention and Management and the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) is encouraged mainly in the case of regional projects. In this sense, proposals including activities contributing to the ISDR campaigns (Resilient Cities, Safe Hospitals and Schools) will be welcomed.
6. Priority to institutional linkages and advocacy: the small scale and pilot actions at community level will reach a maximum effectiveness if the outputs and outcomes feed the development and implementation of existing DRR policies and strategies. Priority should be given to this aspect, to create a link between the findings of community-based operations and existing development policies and strategies. Consortia of different partners or projects oriented to work on this specific aspect are welcome.
7. Recognising that in some cases there is a need for an additional effort after a project to achieve sustainable results or scaling up, DIPECHO can consider proposals that are *multi-phased in nature* (i.e. entail a series of phases financed over  $\geq 1$  Action Plan) to provide consolidation, proper hand over or promotion of scaling up of certain experiences or products previously developed. For this to be possible, operational imperative no 5 mentioned above has to be specially taken into consideration. In these cases, an evaluation of the previous phase is recommended in order to adapt the second phase to the findings.
8. It is expected that projects carrying out innovative experiences systematise them and develop tools which can be used by others allowing the replication of good practices. In this case, a dissemination and communication plan for the elaborated material will be required and consequently considered in the timeframe of the action.
9. Nevertheless, before producing new tools, the use of existing material should be prioritised. Development of new documents should be limited to the cases when there are no similar tools or when no experiences have been already systematised.
10. It is recommended that recruitment processes, institutional agreements and other preparatory activities start as soon as the partner receives the communication that the proposal has been accepted in order to gain implementation time. Experience shows that one of the main time constraints in the implementation of projects is the delay in the recruitment of Coordinators. In this sense, the eligibility date in the Single Form can be fixed before the start date of implementation. Partners are encouraged to annex Terms of Reference of project Coordinators and Memorandums of Understanding between the members of Consortia to the proposal.
11. Partners should provide enough resources for a proper monitoring and evaluation of the operations. External evaluations are not supposed to be systematically included, but only when there is a justification due to the strategic momentum, size of the operation, or particular issues which need to be evaluated. Innovative approaches, such as carrying out an evaluation of several projects, will be welcomed. In cases where an external evaluation is planned, Terms of Reference must be submitted to DG ECHO for approval before the study is launched, in order for the cost to be considered eligible.
12. Integration of technical and scientific institutions as well as South American Universities in project activities is encouraged.

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

- The priorities and strategic lines at national and regional level are defined in the various DRR country and regional documents respectively, which have been developed in a consultative process with the participation of multiple DRR stakeholders in the region, with the support of ECHO and its partners and in most of the cases under the leadership of the NSDRMs; All of these documents have been uploaded on the Web. Operations proposed should respond to the context identified in those documents.
- There are no fixed amounts of funds foreseen for each country, and allocations will depend on the quality of proposals received as well as on the strategic value of the operations proposed. Exposure and vulnerability to natural hazards, together with gaps in terms of capacity and the opportunities for impact will be considered when selecting the actions to be funded per country.
- Here there is synthesis of main priorities defined. More detailed information is available in the country documents<sup>1</sup>.

### **REGIONAL LEVEL**

Regional priorities are considered as those going beyond the limits of individual countries. They can be considered through various approaches:

- Regional or multi country projects with a clear added value beyond the results achieved in each of the countries of implementation. These projects should be defined taking into consideration existing regional or global initiatives and involving national and concerned local stakeholders in the identification and formulation of the operations. It is expected that regional initiatives support articulation with local and national ones, promoting exchange of experiences and coordination.
- Components of national or local projects going beyond the country limits (e.g. leadership of thematic working groups to facilitate technical exchange at regional level).
- Common approaches taken by different local or national projects (e.g. use of a specific set of indicators to facilitate analysis at regional level).

Since the first DIPECHO Action Plan in South America, regional initiatives have provided an international dimension to the programme by promoting exchange of experiences and facilitating cooperation between countries. Today, DIPECHO is the only DRR platform for all the main DRR stakeholders of this sub-region. Common methodologies and tools such as the Safe Schools or Safe Hospitals strategies, the contribution to Resilient Cities Initiatives or the elaboration of an International Communication Protocol for a Tsunami Early Warning System in the South East Pacific are examples of initiatives that have been instrumental in connecting the community to the international level. Nevertheless, the current lack of an institution or body to articulate efforts of all South American DRM national systems is a constraint as regards optimising the sustainability and relevance of these efforts.

During the DIPECHO regional meeting held in Buenos Aires from 25-27 October 2012 some ideas were collected to orient priorities:

- National DRM Systems: Bi-national initiatives in border areas, comparative studies of national normative frameworks, promote exchange of experiences.
- Standardisation of DRR indicators at local level.

---

<sup>1</sup> Country documents available at: <http://www.desaprender.org/blogs/dipecho-america-del-sur-2011-2012--2/posts/documentos-pais-dipecho-2011-2012-america-del-sur>



- Livelihood protection: Compilation and systematisation of the knowledge acquired and tools developed on livelihood protection.
- Urban context: Elaboration of communication strategies, promote exchange of experience and reinforce DIPECHO partners' capacities to implement DRR in this particular context.
- Education: Reinforce teachers' capacities through the elaboration of specific training modules; support national working groups on DRR in Education.
- Health: Establish international medical assistance and cooperation mechanisms; operationalize international DRM health agreements in South America.
- Community and citizens' participation: Innovate through the use of technologies to increase peoples' participation, creation of a Latin American network of community DRR groups.
- Climate Change: Elaboration of processes and strategies to link DRR and CC.
- Communication: Develop a communication model for DRR, generate baselines to create communication strategies based on evidence.
- Knowledge management: Reinforce regional knowledge management created by DIPECHO through the improvement of web platforms with powerful research engines, use of social IT networks. Strengthen links with Central America and the Caribbean in order to harmonise communication and systematisation processes.

## **ARGENTINA**

Community DRR models tested through previous DIPECHO action plans have evolved and are already being up scaled by provincial governments and local actors such as Argentinian Red Cross. Advocacy and replication tools such as the Country Document are fully led by the National Directorate of Civil Protection (DNPC) or the Federal Council of Civil Protection with the participation of most of the provinces, creating a favourable context for an appropriate **exit strategy** with the institutionalisation of the tools and practices developed. The level of coordination achieved through an alliance between ECHO partners and DNPC should be used and promoted to achieve this goal.

### **Geographic priorities and hazards:**

- Seismic – volcanic regions, specifically provinces located in the western part of the country that are located in the Andes Mountain Range (Cordillera de los Andes): San Juan, Mendoza and Neuquén).

### **General recommendations for interventions in Argentina:**

#### **1. DIPECHO Exit Strategy**

- Support institutional capacity strengthening to consolidate a "phase out" process led by the National Civil Protection (DNPC).
- Development of tools for follow up and strengthening of the experiences of the process.
- Systematization of DIPECHO working experiences for application at provincial levels.
- Implementation of ex- post evaluation of projects to identify opportunities for replication and sustainability.
- Support the development of tools for the follow up of implemented processes and for strengthening previous DIPECHO experiences.
- Transform the DIPECHO process into a lively and dynamic tool through the identification of dynamics of participation, cooperation and exchange.
- Establishment of a DIPECHO platform as a referent for consultation and support to new local and national DRR initiatives.
- Support the elaboration of Civil Protection rules and regulations.
- Support the elaboration of an outline for consultation processes for a new Civil Protection regulatory framework proposal with a DRR approach.

<p><b>2. Consolidation of the Civil Protection Federal Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop and establish a strategic agenda for 3 years.</li> <li>- Support the inclusion of new actors.</li> <li>- Support the validation different processes at federal level.</li> <li>- Support the consolidation of its rules and regulations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Institutional Strengthening in terms of DRR at provincial level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inclusion of risk management approach in provincial agendas.</li> <li>- Promote the development of risk management processes and their institutionalization.</li> <li>- Support the follow up, commitment, and appropriation of DIPECHO processes.</li> <li>- Support capacity building processes at provincial level.</li> <li>- Support the development of a database for emergencies and disasters.</li> <li>- Development of risk maps at provincial level.</li> <li>- Support the elaboration or update of risk management, contingency and emergency plans (consider multi risk planning: early warning for storms and landslides).</li> <li>- Support and encourage the participation of civil society in the process and private sector.</li> <li>- Support local planning processes to include a DRR approach.</li> <li>- Capacity building/strengthening at local level.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Inclusion of Indigenous population</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include indigenous communities in territorial management and DRR processes.</li> <li>- Develop a methodological approach for working with indigenous populations.</li> <li>- Strengthen collaboration with the National Authority for Indigenous populations in the development of tools with a DRR approach.</li> <li>- Work on Ancestral knowledge with indigenous communities (e.g. Mapuche communities).</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Country Document</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the institutionalization of the consultative process and widen its scope.</li> <li>- Include a trans-border dimension.</li> <li>- Support its extensive dissemination and visibility as a planning and reference tool.</li> <li>- Develop a protocol for the consultative process and National Workshop.</li> <li>- Support the process for the elaboration of Province Documents through the identification of pilot provinces.</li> <li>- Adaptation of guides and protocols.</li> <li>- Consultative process at provincial levels.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Regional integration: Chile-Argentina</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the inclusion of risk management in the Austral Integration Committees (economic, social and cultural agreements among bordering Argentinean provinces and Chilean regions).</li> <li>- Trans- national cooperation among partners: information, strengthening capacities, communication.</li> <li>- Inclusion of trans-border risks in the Country Document.</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Development of extensive communication tools</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the development of a strategic policy for the dissemination of the DIPECHO processes.</li> <li>- Coordinate actions and communication products as a validation mechanism.</li> <li>- Development of TV and radio spots.</li> <li>- Development of an institutional image of the process as well as a visibility and communication protocol for participating partners.</li> </ul>

## **BOLIVIA**

After several action plans, much experience has been developed at community and local level, and in some cases sound DRM models have been developed at Departmental level which should be taken into consideration for dissemination and potential replication in other parts of the country. Incidence of DIPECHO projects at national level is still considered weak. Significant advances have been achieved in DRR in urban contexts and in protection of livelihoods in slow onset disasters that should be systematized and promoted in order to facilitate advocacy for replication.

Links between the National System for Risk Reduction and Disaster and Emergency Response (SISRADE) and the local level should be reinforced in order to increase the advocacy capacities of the projects. There is also a need to reinforce technically and operationally the municipal and

departmental risk management units, coordination mechanisms, early warning systems and emergency centres as well as the development of risk informed planning.

It has to be considered that drought risks in the Chaco region will be tackled by ECHO through the Drought Management Initiative and thus this problematic will not be considered under the DIPECHO programme.

Geographical areas prioritised (1 highest priority, 5 lowest priority):

1	Norte Integrado, Santa Cruz
1	Chaco, Santa Cruz
1	Zona del Trópico Cochabamba
1	La Paz metropolitana
1	Santa Cruz metropolitana
1	Cochabamba Metropolitana
2	Zona Andina, Cochabamba
3	Trinidad, Riberalta, Reyes, Rurrenabaque, Santa Ana, San Ignacio, Beni
4	Cuenca del Desaguadero, Oruro
4	Cobija, Bolpebra, Pando
4	Padcaya, Bermejo, Rural Cercado, Tarija
4	Montegudo, Huacareta, Villa Vaca Guzmán, Huacaya y Machareti en Chuquisaca

The main strategic axes considered with some illustrative examples are in the table below.

Strategic lines	Capacity building	Studies, Tools, documents	Events, campaigns sensitisation
1. Education	Training of teachers in DRR, use of communication kit, etc.	Adaptation/Implementation of the School Safety Index (already developed by UNICEF for South America)	Communication kit: adaptation, validation, dissemination.
2. Advocacy	Promotion of networks and advocacy strategies.	Systematisation and exchanges on DRR legislation in different countries of the region.	Dissemination and outreach of public policies.
3. Urban context	Exchange of existing tools, experiences and methodologies.		Use the experience gained with citizen's culture campaigns already implemented by DIPECHO.
4. Climate Change Adaptation	Strengthen local capacities, exchange of methodologies and techniques	Educational material, investigation on CC and livelihoods, etc.	Organisation of national events and campaigns related to CC
5. Childhood	Training integrating factors such as age, gender, ethnic, capacities, etc.	Differential approach in the elaboration of materials	Participation of children in national events.
6. Livelihood protection	Creation of a virtual working group to promote the exchange of experiences and methodologies		Promote spaces to exchange on good practices.
7. Information and Communication	Capacity building on advocacy and communication strategies.	Reinforcement of DRR websites and platforms.	DRR should be relevant to mass media. Resilient cities campaigns.
8. Ancestral knowledge	Systematisation and transmission of local traditional knowledge for reducing risks to livelihoods.		Promotion of experiences already tested previously.

## CHILE

Valuable experience has been gained in terms of inclusion of DRR in planning and reconstruction processes, as well as with development of DRM plans at community/neighbourhood, municipal, and regional level. In some regions targeted under previous action plans, specific tools have already been incorporated into institutional processes. Incidence at national level has been achieved well only through the Ministry of Education, which has extensively replicated educational tools developed in previous action plans. In order to allow a proper **hand over** of good practice and experience gained during the two last action plans, ways should be found to disseminate these tools countrywide.

### **Geographic priorities and hazards:**

- Due to its geographical location the country is exposed to several type of hazards: earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions (volcanic zones: central, southern and austral), forest fires, floods and drought.

### **Recommendations of the Country Document:**

#### **GENERAL**

- Support and reinforce knowledge and vulnerability analysis for risk management.
- Support the creation of permanent and formal spaces for coordination, dialogue and exchange of DRR experiences.
- Support the implementation of DRR actions in development processes.
- Support the articulation of different initiatives in order to avoid overlapping and maximize the efficient use of available resources by strengthening and integrating existing initiatives.
- Support the creation/establishment of an information system or platform at national level aiming to incorporate existing information and facilitating its exchange, as well as the dissemination of tools and resources available in the country.
- Promote and reinforce the inclusion of vulnerable communities in DRR activities and decision making.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE HFA**

**Priority 1:** *Ensure that disaster risk reduction (DRR) is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation*

##### A. DRR National Policy

- Support and encourage the active participation of regional governments, local authorities, International Humanitarian Networks, National Humanitarian Networks, as well as other actors.
- Support the process for inter- institutional coordination in the framework of the elaboration of the policy which will be the basis for the establishment of a DRR national platform.
- Support the creation of a DRR National Platform with a multi-sector approach, and support the elaboration of the national DRR policy through this platform.
- Dissemination of the national policy through training programmes at national, regional and local levels.

##### B. Allocate resources for the development and the implementation of disaster risk management policies.

- Support the dissemination of information on access to economic resources for planning and implementation of risk management actions (risk studies, training, mitigation works, etc.) at national, regional and local levels.

##### C. Decentralization and community participation.

- In the framework of the new law, support and promote the participation of the Chilean Municipality Association as a member of the National Civil Protection Council, and ensure the participation of municipality representatives in the Regional Civil Protection Committees.
- Support and promote the integration of Risk Management in municipal development plans.
- Systematization of good practices and lessons learnt of community participation programmes with a risk management approach to promote and strengthen risk management at community level.

##### D. National DRR Platforms

- Support the implementation and establishment of Civil Protection Committees at regional and local levels.
- Support the dissemination of actions considered in the National Policy of Safe Schools.

<p><b>Priority 2: <i>Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. National, regional and local risk assessments.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthen capacities for the elaboration of risk evaluation studies at regional and local levels.</li> <li>- Support and encourage the use of existing information (risk and hazard maps) for decision-making in terms of DRR.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>B. Capacity to systematize and disseminate hazards and vulnerability information.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the creation of a National Information System for Risk Management.</li> <li>- Strengthen capacities to properly transfer and disseminate comprehensible technical information for decision-making.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Priority 3: <i>Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. Information management and exchange</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the dissemination of information from the Early Warning Centre and ensure that local and sector authorities, and the population can easily access this information.</li> <li>- Support communication strategies for the dissemination of technical information related to early warnings.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>B. Knowledge, dissemination and replication of good practices.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the exchange of experiences and good practices among the institutions of the National Civil Protection System.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>C. Education.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the inclusion of Risk Management in education.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>D. Develop improved methods for predictive multi-risk assessments and socioeconomic cost–benefit analysis of risk reduction actions at all levels.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the integration of DRR in the National Public Investment System.</li> <li>- Support the active participation of the Treasury Department in the elaboration of the DRR National Policy in developing mechanisms to quantify the economic cost of disasters and in promoting DRR cost-benefit initiatives at sectoral, regional and local levels.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Priority 4: <i>Reduce the underlying risk factors.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. Environmental and natural resource management.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthen and reinforce capacities at regional and local levels for the inclusion of Risk Management in regional and local development plans.</li> <li>- Promote risk management research with social approaches.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>B. Territorial Planning.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inclusion of hazards in Regulatory Plans (volcanic activity, earthquakes, etc.).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Priority 5: <i>Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. Preparedness and contingency plans.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the revision and updating of the National and Regional Emergency plans incorporating DRR.</li> <li>- Support the revision and updating of existing contingency and emergency plans at local level.</li> <li>- Support capacity strengthening through training for emergency response.</li> </ul>

## **COLOMBIA**

In the Country Document, “Líneas estratégicas y avances en priorización de zonas de intervención”, the National authorities prioritise three natural phenomenon and some areas of intervention, as follows:

<p><b>Areas and scenarios prioritised</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Floods Magdalena Medio</li> <li>•Depresión Momposina</li> <li>•La Mojana</li> <li>•Atrato Alto, medio y bajo, in Chocó department</li> <li>•Cauca department</li> <li>•Landslides North of Santander</li> <li>•Hurricanes San Andres</li> <li>•Providencia</li> <li>•Alta Guajira</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strategic lines</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Risk knowledge</li> <li>•Risk dissemination</li> <li>•Early warning systems</li> <li>•Strength capacity of the regional and local authorities</li> </ul>

Interventions should be developed mainly in rural and remote areas.

Actions in order to prepare communities with regard to tsunamis, volcanos, earthquakes and other kinds of natural disasters would be taken into account for DIPECHO funds in the country.

## **ECUADOR**

Much valuable experience has been gained in Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) in the framework of previous action plans but this experience is not yet being adequately replicated. In the framework of the decentralisation process, experience with municipalities is being developed, with several of them having solid Risk Management Units and significant progress in DRR planning. Impact at national level has been achieved through support for the national policy on DRM in education and the drafting of a national protocol on communication for the Tsunami Early Warning System, which has potential to be used as a model for other kinds of hazards. The consultative process has served to interconnect different institutions concerned by DRM and the resulting document, Bases for DRM Planning (*Bases para la Planificación en gestión de Riesgos*), is a potential tool to achieve impact at national level for the institutionalisation of accumulated knowledge. Actions supported will be planned, launched and followed in close coordination between ECHO and the SNGR. Actions proposed should be in line with the orientations given by the SNGR and support the application of the new DRM Law.

Main points raised in the *Bases para la Planificación en gestión de Riesgos* are:

- The National Risk Management Secretariat (SNGR), as the leading institution of the National Risk Management Decentralized System, requires support for an appropriate risk management decentralization process at regional, provincial, municipal and local levels, but also through appropriate institutional coordination mechanisms. To accompany and support this process through the elaboration and dissemination of clear standardized rules and protocols both at institutional and local level is essential.
- Conform and strengthen the Risk Management Committees/Units in Autonomous Decentralised Governments (GADs) is necessary to support an appropriate decentralization process of risk management at local level, mainly in rural and marginal urban territories. The inclusion of defined operational protocols and financial tools for the functioning of these structures through normative and regulations is required.
- Apply an appropriate legal and normative framework in order to include DRR within the development processes of the Autonomous Decentralized Governments (GAD). Local governments should be provided with financial tools and regulatory frameworks in order to reach an effective integration of Risk Management in local development plans and territorial planning. Permanent coordination with SENPLADES (Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo), AME (Asociación de Municipalidades Ecuatorianas) and CONGOPE (Confederación de Gobiernos Autónomos Provinciales del Ecuador) is crucial.
- Constituting and strengthening Disaster Risk Reduction institutional coordination mechanisms and technical scientific platforms at national level is needed to influence the different structures which compose the National Risk Management Decentralized System.
- Identify adequate mechanisms to support DRR public policy and capacity building in the national institutional structures which compose the National Risk Management Decentralized System, including contingency plans and the creation of Risk Management Units. Active participation of Coordinator Ministries, Sectorial Ministries, technical scientific institutions, Universities, private sector, and civil society through national platforms is strongly encouraged.
- Continue supporting the application of the Risk Management Policy in the Education Sector and its endorsement at national level.
- Collect and systematize existing DRR tools and best practices/experiences at national level is key to supporting efficient and appropriate information management in the national DM institution and other actors in the National Risk Management Decentralized System, through the National Information System (SNI). Develop a national database of human resources specialized in different domains related to risk management and emergency response.
- Develop risk management/DRR communication instruments to increase awareness and disseminate key messages in order to modify behaviour and habits for enhanced risk perception. Optimization of media sources, training of media, TICs, and social networks could efficiently contribute to the dissemination of disaster preparedness messages, and also to communicate and inform in the aftermath of a disaster.
- Adapt a National Integrated Early Warning and Monitoring System validated by scientific-technical institutions, including clear protocols and procedures in order to connect national efforts with already constituted EWS at local level, which still lack sustainability. For the EWS related to floods, river basin approach is encouraged.
- Boost plans to support post emergency recovery, especially in the agricultural productive sector, in coordination with technical and scientific institutions to this area at national level.

## **PARAGUAY**

As much of DIPECHO work in Paraguay has been related to drought in the Chaco area, experience gained in other hazards is still limited and needs to be consolidated to achieve sustainability and obtain a replicable product. Other hazard risks such as flooding risk in urban contexts is considerable but has not yet been tackled. Impact at national level has already been reached through the support to the regulation of the DRM law, and consolidation of this new regulation is needed through dissemination, outreach and effective application in the framework of this action plan.

The themes prioritized in the country document, which are further developed in the country documents are:

- Strengthening the National System of Risk Management from the community to the national level.
- Education
- Risks in urban context: flooding in vulnerable areas of Asuncion.
- Livelihood protection
- Knowledge management

Drought risks in the Chaco region will be tackled by ECHO through the Drought Management Initiative and thus this problematic will not be considered under the DIPECHO programme in this action plan.

## **PERU**

Community DRM models developed in DIPECHO projects in the country have been successful, but have not yet obtained the expected sustained impact yet, generally remaining as good examples in a country where local capacities needs to be further developed. Nevertheless, at sub-national level, certain departments such as Cusco and in cities such as Lima, the level of impact has been substantial, with emergency and DRM plans institutionalised and certain ideas being considered and replicated in many districts. The new national DRM Law and a consequent increase of public funds available for the thematic in the local levels offer a good opportunity to have a much higher opportunity for replication than in the previous action plans.

Some of the scenarios and priorities identified in the country document have already been tackled by DIPECHO projects in the past. Proposed operations should build on what has already been developed in those geographic or thematic areas and should support consolidation, dissemination and advocacy for replication.

The country document identifies 10 risk scenarios as the most important to be considered when identifying priority actions:

1. Earthquake in high density cities with high impact on the national economy, such as Metropolitan Lima, Callao and neighbouring provinces, Cusco (as it is a tourist centre).
2. Earthquake in the southwest region of the country that affects a wide territory with high affectation of urban and rural population (cities with high population density).
3. El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) – affectation mainly in the northern coastal regions.
4. Floods in flood-prone areas of the highlands such as the Vilcanota Valley and Titicaca Lake (and its affluent) where hazards such as rivers overflowing, landslides, mudslides and huaycos could affect population and productive activities.
5. Floods in the Amazonian region (jungle) mainly in the northeast of the country (regions of San Martín, Loreto and Ucayali) and in a minor level in Madre de Dios. Floods in this area cover a wide part of the territory and last for months affecting populations living along the river banks and destroying livelihoods (crops, housing, water, sanitation and hygiene).
6. Landslides and floods in Rimac River basin, where huaycos block the main access to Lima and the central highlands. In the past, huaycos have swept away urban neighbourhoods causing significant losses.
7. Landslides, mudslides and floods in the Callejón de Huaylas due to the glacier range and its lakes. These events have occurred in the past and might occur suddenly due to the accelerated melting process of glaciers.
8. Extreme weather events such as extreme cold and frost in the Andean highlands (Cusco, Puno, Apurímac) that severely affect health and livelihoods of rural populations living in poverty conditions.
9. Drought mainly in the southern Andean highlands (Cusco, Puno, Arequipa, Moquegua, Tacna, and Apurímac) where agriculture might be severely affected.
10. Volcanic eruption in the south of the country. Monitored volcanoes are Ubinas, Misti, Sabancaya and Ticsani. Affectation due to ashes might cause a large affectation of the territory.



In terms of strategic priorities, and based on the HFA priorities, the Country Document establishes the following:

<p><b>Priority 1: <i>Ensure that disaster risk reduction (DRR) is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. <i>Strengthening of national integrated disaster risk reduction mechanisms with designated responsibilities and decentralized capacities.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support SINAGRED from the local to the national level.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>B. <i>Allocate resources for the development and the implementation of disaster risk management policies.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support and strengthen programmes for stimulation of investment of DRR resources such as the Programme for the reduction of vulnerabilities and emergency response and the Incentive Programme, which is included in the Municipality Modernization.</li> <li>- Strengthen dissemination programmes of existing financing mechanisms addressed to authorities and public servants.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>C. <i>Decentralization and community participation.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support and strengthen local capacities at regional and local levels: training, risk estimation, information and data management, technical inspections, and logistics in emergencies (warehouses).</li> <li>- Strengthen citizen participation in DRR at national, regional and local levels.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Priority 2: <i>Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. <i>National, regional and local risk assessments.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthen capacities for carrying out risk evaluation studies at regional and local levels.</li> <li>- Support and encourage the use of existing information (risk maps) for decision-making in terms of DRR.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>B. <i>Capacity to systematize and disseminate hazards and vulnerability information.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the creation of a National Information System for Risk Management.</li> <li>- Strengthen capacities to properly transfer and disseminate comprehensible technical information for decision making.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>C. <i>Existing Early Warning Systems (EWS) that are properly working with community linkages</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the maintenance of existing EWS through the investment of local economic resources and encourage community participation.</li> <li>- Reinforce and strengthen SENAMHI capacities for the monitoring of events and issuing of alerts.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Priority 3: <i>Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. <i>Inclusion of Risk Management in relevant sections of school curricula and training programmes.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support and promote the formal and definitive inclusion of Risk Management in education.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Priority 4: <i>Reduce the underlying risk factors.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. <i>Risk Management included in development planning, territory and natural resources management.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthen and reinforce capacities at regional and local levels for the inclusion of Risk Management in regional/local development plans and territorial planning.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Priority 5: <i>Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>A. <i>Preparedness and contingency plans.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promote and support the elaboration of emergency plans at municipal level.</li> <li>- Support the revision and update of existing contingency and emergency plans.</li> <li>- Support the elaboration of contingency and emergency plans for hydro meteorological and seismic hazards.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>B. <i>Resources for responding to disasters.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reinforce information mechanisms and access to contingency reserves. Promote trainings on the use of emergency resources.</li> <li>- Support the revision and adjustment of existing insurance mechanisms (Agrarian Insurance, etc.) and its proper use.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>C. <i>Implementation and operative capacity.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support and strengthen the full operational capacity of Emergency Operations Centres (EOC) at national, regional and local levels (infrastructure, equipment, capacity, trained human resources).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>D. <i>Training, Sensitization and simulation drills.</i></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthen and reinforce training on disaster preparedness at national, regional and local levels.</li> <li>- Support the promotion of a culture of prevention in the general public.</li> </ul>

## **VENEZUELA**

The communal spirit of Venezuelan people and a community-oriented administration have facilitated the development of CBDRM models which have been already consolidated at urban and rural level and which in some cases have been scaled up once the projects have concluded. Nevertheless, there is still work to be done with municipalities and sub-national and national levels in order to increase the impact and move forward in the institutionalization of processes. A good example has been the articulation with the Venezuelan Meteorological Institute (INAMEH) in the installation of a household based early warning system, which INAMEH intends to replicate nationwide.

Prioritized locations are:

- Metropolitan area of Caracas (Capital District and Miranda);
- Andean region: States of Tachira, Merida, Trujillo, Carabobo, Falcón and Zulia.

Hazards prioritised: hydro meteorological

General recommendations of the Country Document:

- ✓ Urban risk (local planning, vulnerable urban settlements, promoting safer building, etc.)
- ✓ Adaptation and promotion of DRR training programmes for vulnerable populations: children, adolescents and disabled people.
- ✓ Implementation of EWS in coordination with the community and the national level.
- ✓ Strengthen the national hydro-meteorological network
- ✓ Improve and strengthen institutional linkages and inclusion of new actors (grassroots organizations, universities, NGOs, and private sector) which are involved with DRR.
- ✓ Include anthropic hazards in risk analysis and definition of DRR programmes.
- ✓ Strengthening of the education system focused on DRR and resilience.

## **BRAZIL**

Following previous DIPECHO implementation focused on installing capacities and elaborating an appropriate methodology to implement Community Based Disaster Risk Management, the next phase should focus on dissemination and consolidation of the good practices and methodologies developed at community level during the previous DIPECHO action plan, engaging Civil Defence at state level to promote and scale up Community Based DRM through the recently elaborated NUDEC manual.

- Main hazards to be considered: floods and landslides
- Reinforce the links between the Civil Defence at different levels and the communities, increasing the efficiency of preparedness and response measures at grass root level.
- Strengthen and reinforce training on disaster preparedness at local levels.
- Support the promotion of a culture of prevention in schools and to general public.
- Boost awareness among the population through disaster preparedness key messages and active involvement of journalists and media, putting an emphasis on how to communicate about disasters.

## 2. MAIN SELECTION CRITERIA

### 1. Relevance

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

### 2. Methodology

- 2.1. How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (intermediaries, final beneficiaries, **target groups**)? Have the **needs** of the **target groups** proposed and the final beneficiaries been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately? To what degree have the target beneficiaries been involved in project conception, design and development, from the moment of problem identification?  
Are the **target groups' and final beneficiaries' level of involvement and participation in the operation** satisfactory.
- 2.2. How coherent is the overall design of the operation (**logical framework**)? Are the **activities** proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the local constraints, the objectives and expected results? Is the **Action Plan** clear and feasible? Are the technical **human resources** allocated to the operation adequate? Is the presence of an **appropriately experienced** coordinator and administrative staff ensured in order to provide proper follow-up and support to the action?
- 2.3. Does the proposal contain **objectively verifiable indicators** for the outcome of the operation?
- 2.4. Does the proposal include a clear monitoring and evaluation system that will allow the applicant(s) to measure the benefits of the action?

### 3. Sustainability & replicability

- 3.1 Are the expected results of the proposed operation **sustainable**: financially, institutionally, locally and at policy level.
- 3.2. Is the proposal likely to have **multiplier effects**? Does the partner provide a strategy to achieve this?
- 3.3. Is the operation likely to have a tangible **impact** on its target groups?

### 4. Budget and cost-effectiveness

- 4.1. Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?
- 4.2. Is the proposed expenditure **necessary** for the implementation of the operation?
- 4.3. Are **material** resources and **services needed properly described**?

4.4. Are Means and Costs related to results and activities sufficiently explained?

4.5. Are local or national institutions contributing to the project budget?

### 3. FINANCIAL QUESTIONS

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

### 4. CALENDAR OF THE ACTION PLAN

- **November 2012:** publication of HIP, Operational Orientations and Country Documents.
- **1 January 2013:** Starting date of the Global DIPECHO Funding Decision
- **21 January 2013:** Tentative deadline for submitting proposals
- **January- February 2013:** Selection of proposals
- **1 March 2013:** Start date for eligibility of expenses.
- **15 April 2013:** Tentative start date for projects.
- **13 October 2013:** International Disaster Risk Reduction Day
- **31 December 2012:** End date of the DIPECHO Global Funding Decision.

## Annex 1: Submitting a proposal to DG ECHO.

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

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

Proposals should be submitted using the Single Form at the latest 17 January 2011. Proposed starting date of the projects is 1 April 2011.

The Single Forms must be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL with copy to [dorothy.morrissey@ec.europa.eu](mailto:dorothy.morrissey@ec.europa.eu) and to [echo-quito@ec.europa.eu](mailto:echo-quito@ec.europa.eu) and, for proposals for Colombia, to [pedro-luis.rojo@echofield.eu](mailto:pedro-luis.rojo@echofield.eu).

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is important to recall that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Annex 2: Communication and visibility

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### ***Changes in visibility, information and communication funding***

DG ECHO has set a limit to the funding that partners can allocate to visibility, information and communication in humanitarian operational agreements. This is now set at 0.5% of the direct eligible costs with a maximum of EUR8,000. However, exceptions may be allowed in the following circumstances:

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

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

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



## **Annex 3: Examples of SMART DP indicators**

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

- Please note that the below-mentioned indicators are RESULTS' INDICATORS only. Although working on this type of indicators is essential, we also want to recall that a lot of work has been done on developing other types of indicators (context, impact, indicators to measure response capacities to face an event at local and municipal levels and how to mainstream DRR in the response) in the region, which is very important to consider before/during/after project implementation. Discussions are still on-going on these types of indicators inside the region and inside the DRR working group.
- In the Caribbean, there has been a practice to include in all DIPECHO projects a common indicator in order to be able to compare and strengthen the impact of the projects. This has been reviewed in the last regional consultative meeting and improved for the 7<sup>th</sup> Action Plan. See below for more information.
- The results' indicators presented in this document have been grouped into five major components (which correspond to the DIPECHO main chapters) and imperatively need to be SMART. The indicators should also mainstream to the extent possible issues such as gender, participation of vulnerable groups and environmental aspects. In the Caribbean region, partners do not necessarily use this system in the DIPECHO Action Plans but rather merge the main chapters within two to three results.
- The first step of producing good results' indicators is to master the Project Cycle Management (especially the LFA). Those who write the proposals should be properly trained on this matter. This is one key recommendation for partners.

#### **DISCLAIMER**

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

### **1. Local Disaster Management Components**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>2</sup> Number to be determined according to the context

## **2. Institutional linkages and advocacy**

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

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

2.2 Municipal Committees developed contingency plans that are validated

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **3. Information, Education, Communication**

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

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

3.2 % of indirect beneficiaries knowledgeable about community contingency plans

SOV: simulation exercise evaluation, KAP study

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

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

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

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

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

#### **4. Small Scale Infrastructure and Service**

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

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

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

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

#### **5. Stock building of emergency and relief items**

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

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

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

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

#### **6. Livelihood and economic assets protection**

6.1. % of the population applying resilient agricultural practices.

SOV: baseline and final survey


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


SOV: baseline and final survey


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

SOV: final survey

## Annex 4: Useful links for applicants


-  Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) for NGOs and International Organisations  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/humanitarian\\_aid/fpa\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/humanitarian_aid/fpa_en.htm)
- Application form (Single Form)
  - GUIDELINES FOR SINGLE FORM AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION
  - FPA FACTSHEETS, FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS, INTERACTIVE TRAINING AND HELP-DESK
  - FPA REGULATIONS AND DOCUMENTS; GENERAL CONDITIONS
  - COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY TOOLKIT
- [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/humanitarian\\_aid/visibility\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/humanitarian_aid/visibility_en.htm)


-  Guidelines for the submission of e-single form with APPEL  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/humanitarian\\_aid/etools\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/partners/humanitarian_aid/etools_en.htm)

-  Country Documents including national priorities (Spanish)  
<http://www.desaprender.org/blogs/dipecho-america-del-sur-2011-2012--2/posts/documentos-pais-dipecho-2011-2012-america-del-sur>

Report of the DIPECHO Regional Seminar of the VI Action Plan

<http://www.desaprender.org/tools/sistematizacion-taller-regional-dipecho-vi-america-del-sur>


-  [DG ECHO's Policies and Evaluations](#)


-  [Council Regulation No 1605/2002 of 25/06/2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Union](#) (OJ L 248, 16/09/2002) and Commission Regulation No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation No 1605/2002

### **OTHER INFORMATION**


-  GENERAL INFORMATION ON DISASTER RISK REDUCTION IN DG ECHO  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/prevention\\_preparedness/dipecho\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/prevention_preparedness/dipecho_en.htm)

-  [EU Strategy on supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in developing countries](#)

-  EU Approach to Resilience: Learning from Food Security Crises  
[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/food-security/documents/20121003-comm\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/food-security/documents/20121003-comm_en.pdf)

-  EU Regional Programming Document for Latin America and the Caribbean [LAC RPD](#)  
EU Regional Strategy Paper for the Andean Community [RSP CAN](#)  
EU Regional Strategy Paper for MERCOSUR [RSP MERCOSUR](#)  
European Union External Action Services Country Index [EU per Country](#)

-  [CAPRADE](#)

-  [International Strategy for Disaster Reduction](#), Hyogo Framework for Action  
UN ISDR [2010-2011 World Disaster Reduction Campaign](#)  
World Campaign on [Safe Hospitals](#)  
World Campaign on [Disaster risk reduction begins at school](#)  
World Campaign on resilient cities [My city is getting ready](#)