

# EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FORUM III

## Final Report

25-27 May 2010  
Montreux - Switzerland



United Nations  
Geneva, 2010

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)  
Emergency Services Branch (ESB)  
Emergency Preparedness Section (EPS)

## Table of Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>EPF II Recommendations Follow-Up</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Session 1 : Big Picture - Respective Roles in the Preparedness Landscape</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1	Setting the Scene	2
3.2	Policy Instruction on OCHA Role in Preparedness	2
3.3	IASC Sub-Working Group on Preparedness	3
3.4	CADRI (Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative)	3
<b>4.</b>	<b>Session 2 : Capacity Assessment &amp; Development - Role of OCHA ROs/COs vis-à-vis Governments &amp; Regional Organisations</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	The Strategic Partnership for Preparedness (SPP) Project	5
4.2	Economic Commission for West African States (ECOWAS): Promoting Preparedness in a Poverty-Stricken and Disaster-Prone Environment	5
4.3	Working with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)	5
4.4	African Union (AU) Convention for the Protection & Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention)	6
4.5	Role of Regional/Country Office in Capacity Assessment and Development vis-à-vis Governments: Zimbabwe	6
<b>5.</b>	<b>Session 3 : Supporting Government Response Capacity – Role of the RO/OCHA in Haiti Response &amp; Lessons for ROs</b>	<b>8</b>
5.1	Haiti: Perspectives on effective preparedness for response before and after the earthquake of 12 January 2010	8
5.2	Role of the Regional Office (ROLAC) in Haiti Earthquake Response	10
<b>6.</b>	<b>Session 4 : Role of ROs in Strengthening Response Capacity of OCHA &amp; RCs/HCs/HCTs</b>	<b>13</b>
6.1	ROMENACA (Regional Office for Middle East, North Africa & Central Asia)	13
6.2	ROWCA (Regional Office for West & Central Africa)	13
6.3	ROAP (Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific)	13
6.4	ROSEA-SRO-EA (Regional Office for South & East Africa)	13
6.5	Regional Structure: REACT – ROMENACA SRO in Almaty for Central Asia	15
6.6	Integrating Pandemic Preparedness into Wider Emergency Preparedness	15
6.7	Extra Session on OCHA Policy Instruction - OCHA’s Role in Preparedness	15
6.8	Parking Lot - Risk Management Indicators (RMI)	16
<b>7.</b>	<b>Session 5 : Linking Humanitarian Action (Preparedness) with Development Actors/Policy Frameworks</b>	<b>17</b>
7.1	IASC Early Recovery & Crisis Preparedness (UNDP)	17
7.2	Incorporating DRR into CCA/UNDAF (ROAP)	17
7.3	On-Going CADRI Programmes Linking Preparedness & DRR (CADRI)	18
7.4	Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium (OCHA Nepal)	18
7.5	Questions & Answers	18
<b>8.</b>	<b>Session 6 : Climate Change Adaptation &amp; Preparedness</b>	<b>20</b>
8.1	Global Climate Change Negotiations & Regional/National Level Action	20
8.2	Humanitarian Impact of Climate Change	20
8.3	Adaptation Funding Landscape	20
8.4	Advancing Climate-Informed Preparedness Planning in East Africa	20
8.5	SARCOF Forum & SADC Preparedness Workshop	21
8.6	Reflections from Zimbabwe	21
<b>9.</b>	<b>EPF III Agenda</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>EPF III Contact List</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Annex I – Follow-Up on EPF II Recommendations (May 2009)</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Annex II – EPF III Evaluation Feedback</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Annex III – Questionnaire – Future Format of the EPF</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Annex IV - Discussion Notes</b>	<b>31</b>

## 1. Introduction

The third annual Emergency Preparedness Forum (EPF III) was organised by the Emergency Preparedness Section (EPS) of the Emergency Services Branch (ESB), to bring together OCHA colleagues dealing with preparedness in the field and headquarters. The positive feedback in continuing this annual event being expressed in the added-value of networking with colleagues and exchange of lessons learned from the different regions. For instance, stemming from the deliberations of the second edition, tangible outcomes have been achieved by ROMENACA and ROLAC in the form of 'Government Guides' in response to a recommendation made at EPF II.

Essentially, *la raison d'être* behind the Emergency Preparedness Forum is to:

- exchange hands-on preparedness experiences (good practices/lessons learned) amongst OCHA field colleagues at the working-level, in particular, Regional Disaster Response Advisors (RDRAs), National Disaster Response Advisors (NDRAs) and other OCHA staff dealing with preparedness;
- discuss prevailing and effective practices in emergency preparedness activities;
- share information on existing internal expertise;
- agree on OCHA's added-value in preparedness (including next steps); and
- identify focus areas where tangible outputs can be achieved after the Forum.

In 2010, the Forum was expanded to encompass preparedness partners, including a Civil Protection Directorate official from Haiti, donors at the technical level from Swedish MSB and Swiss SDC, along with UNDP, UNICEF, CADRI, WorldVision, and IFRC - a positive step forward that will undoubtedly lead to closer and better collaboration.

As well as the challenges faced in response to the earthquake in Haiti as a 'corporate' emergency, OCHA is at a crossroads - the emerging prominence of preparedness after several reviews and our collective effort to draft an OCHA Policy Instruction on OCHA's Role in Preparedness, coupled with changes in the OCHA Senior Management Team will all play a crucial part in its future direction.

This year discussions were organised into six sessions, where each one was linked to OCHA Strategic Framework objectives related to preparedness with a view to identifying 'actionable outcomes' or tangible results. 'Capacity Assessment and Development' was selected as the main theme to underscore the importance of this cross-cutting topic that touches upon many different preparedness issues. It is also one of the five Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) priority areas for 2010, led by the IASC Sub-Working Group on Preparedness. However, as the approach to capacity assessment and development varies from region to region, the discussions were not as focused as one might expect under a single theme; despite all facets of this key issue being aired.

Along with other changes taking place within OCHA, the future of the annual Emergency Preparedness Forum also hangs in the balance. To map out the future direction for the Forum, a questionnaire was distributed to solicit ideas for possible formats, including level of participation, venue and discussion topics (see Annex III).

Before final closure of EPF III participants agreed on the following statement:

***"Building a resilient society through coherent preparedness actions."***

Masayo Kondo, Ousmane Watt, Anton Santanen, Karolyn Heneghan, Johanna Medina-Poudou  
Forum Navigation Team  
Emergency Preparedness Section, Emergency Services Branch, OCHA

## 2. EPF II Recommendations Follow-Up

In Session 2, the status of the EPF II Recommendations Follow-Up (23 in total) was briefly presented in plenary (Annex I), where among them three salient points were highlighted:

- ROMENACA (Regional Office for Middle East, North Africa & Central Asia) developed the Government Guide for govts as responders (not recipients), whereas ROLAC (Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean) produced a 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the Government Guide on available international assistance. (EPF Recommendation 17).
- The Facilitator's Guide for Simulation Exercises developed by ROWCA was used in southern Africa. ROMENACA also developed and made use of the Guide in their Simulation Exercises. (EPF II Recommendations 10 & 11).
- Stemming from the engaging discussions on the UN Disaster Assessment & Coordination (UNDAC) Disaster Response Preparedness (DRP) missions, a new pilot project entitled, 'Strategic Partnership for Preparedness (SPP)' was launched by ESB/EPS. (EPF II Recommendation 1-4).

## 3. Session 1: Big Picture – Respective Roles in the Preparedness Landscape

This session examined the respective roles of OCHA, IASC SWG on Preparedness and Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) on on-going preparedness actions, including views on partners' roles in preparedness.

### 3.1 Setting the Scene

OCHA must recognise the changing humanitarian context in which preparedness work is situated. Following a recent study commissioned by the Emergency Services Branch critical shifts in the international arena highlight the need for OCHA to:

- provide conceptual and managerial prominence,
- capitalise on the fact that preparedness impinges on almost every core function of the institution (response, protection, etc.); and
- break out of previous hesitation through effective action.

ESB has been engaged in addressing the challenge through various activities:

- IASC Framework Project;
- Emergency Preparedness Survey;
- IASC WG Workshop on Preparedness;
- Emergency Preparedness Forums; and
- Promoting Funding for Preparedness.

Another initiative is the Strategic Partnership for Preparedness (SPP), a pilot project that builds on the strengths and the approach of the UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness missions.

### 3.2 Policy Instruction on OCHA's Role in Preparedness

The latest draft of the PI on OCHA's Role in Preparedness was briefly presented to further discuss elements of preparedness. Principles, the rationale, and the definition/role of OCHA in preparedness were all elaborated. The boundaries denoting OCHA preparedness actions vis-à-vis support to govts is still to be determined in collaboration with partners.

It was further acknowledged that OCHA engages in two types of preparedness actions - preparedness for institutional strengthening and preparedness for specific or imminent emergencies (e.g. contingency planning), where targets are defined in three areas:

- internal response capacity;
- international stakeholders at all levels; and
- capacities of national authorities and regional organisations.

In a later session, it was discussed and decided to accept additional input from participants so that their concerns could be incorporated in the final draft to be presented to the OCHA SMT in July.

Once the Policy Instruction is approved by the USG, the next step could be to develop OCHA Guidelines, where further details on courses of action, recommendations, and principles on how to deal with an area of activity can be further defined. These often help interpret policies when clarification is needed.

### 3.3 IASC Sub-Working Group on Preparedness

Founded in 2002, the main activities of the IASC SWG on Preparedness include the drafting of the Early Warning Early Action (EWEA) Reports initiated in 2004 and the development and review of IASC Guidelines (e.g. Inter-Agency Contingency Planning for Humanitarian Assistance).

Regular members include: WFP, UNICEF, OCHA, UNHCR, WHO, UNDP, OHCHR, UNRWA, WorldVision, CARE, Oxfam, Save the Children, Islamic Relief, IFRC, ICRC, ISDR, IOM, etc. Extended participation from NGOs is also being encouraged, to widen the pool of those working on the ground.

For the up-coming IASC WG meeting in July, the SWG was asked to define preparedness and national capacity development (NCD), to map elements of preparedness and to identify challenges and gaps. Many organisations have different definitions for preparedness - 'preparedness for whom?' and 'how to situate preparedness within the disaster risk reduction realm?' are all vital elements in determining the allocation of diminishing resources and also support an evidence-based decision-making approach.

### 3.4 CADRI (Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative)

Launched in 2007, CADRI is an inter-agency programme implemented by UNDP/BCPR, UNISDR and OCHA. CADRI supports the three organisations to respond to the UN general commitment to 'deliver as One,' focusing on capacity development for disaster risk reduction.

CADRI services include capacity development advisory services, training and facilitation services, tools, materials development and adaptation (not reinventing the wheel, adapting existing materials to specific needs and purposes); and knowledge exchange and networking.

The entry points for capacity development are enabling environment (rules, laws, policies, power relations and social norms that govern civic engagement), organisational level (internal structure, policies and procedures that determine an organisation's effectiveness); and individual level (skills, knowledge, experience that allow each person to perform). Feedback from participants on partners at various levels was as follows:

#### Regional Level

Regional organisations can support governments in preparedness. However, when there is a shift in political leadership, different kinds of support may be requested by the new government, hence there is no continuity in supporting actions.

#### National Level

Need to engage donors: Comoros CT is trying to 'deliver as One', but it appears that donors are not fully on board in funding various efforts.

Dissemination of EWEA Reports can be problematic as they are sent to the UN RC/HC in the first instance, running the risk of ending up with donors and/or host governments. As a result, the language needs to be desensitised. Hence there is the need to find a balance between sensitive and more forthright language.

Governments in jeopardy (invasion, coup, etc.) are even more difficult to work with.

There is a need to capitalise an asset in capacity development, namely, national technical institutes. What capacities exist already within countries? How familiar is field staff with these institutions?

IASC WG is trying to understand issues of concern better in a bid to find solutions/options. How can IASC achieve better predictability? We need to decipher which agencies have the comparative advantage to work with govts, so that we can coordinate and make a difference. There is a lack of predictability among national institutions.

International Search & Rescue Advisory Group (INSARAG) experiences may be useful when assessing what works at country level. Reflection on on-going development work on the ground also should be examined in detail.

Intl consultancies are not always useful. We need to invest more in better relationships with govts.

#### Community Level

Need to strengthen preparedness at the NGO level. As the first line of response lies amongst communities and families, we must think about bottom-up processes and perspectives as well as top-down methods. OCHA does not necessarily see threats the same way as communities do. OCHA tends to work with international responders, but how does it work at the community level and with NGOs? For instance, in Nepal, DIPECHO works almost solely with NGOs. OCHA should concentrate in coordination and catalysing action and send forward implementation of nascent projects to UNDP and other partners. Action at the community-level offers the best capacity development opportunity for institutional memory and effective action. To ensure the community-level perspective is well covered, it is envisaged that IFRC staff will join CADRI.

Session	Actionable Outcome
<b>1</b>	
Group Discussion	
<p>Development of an <u>OCHA Guideline for Preparedness Actions</u> at national, regional and global levels, once the Policy Instruction on OCHA Role in Preparedness is approved.</p> <p><b>Tangible preparedness activities and elements that should be included in <u>OCHA Guideline for Preparedness Actions</u>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ guidelines for regional CP;</li> <li>■ regional simulation exercises, rosters and tools, adapted to different contexts;</li> <li>■ OCHA package of tools and services for governments;</li> <li>■ defined added-value of ROs where surrounding countries have HCs (possible role includes, monitoring of potential issues and a Training-of-Trainers (ToT));</li> <li>■ information dissemination for trans-boundary disasters (other governments affected floods downstream countries may have no info to activate evacuation plans); and</li> <li>■ collaboration with regional actors: different levels of engagement/highly politicised environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Requiring innovative ideas to respond to gaps and challenges in preparedness activities in the field:</b></p> <p><u>Tools</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ how to measure effectiveness of preparedness activities;</li> <li>■ standardised assessment tools;</li> <li>■ basic equipment for EWEA for government counterparts;</li> <li>■ cross-border issues and protection in contingency planning; and</li> <li>■ advocacy for funding preparedness.</li> </ul> <p><u>Coordination</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ filling the gap between military actors (as 1<sup>st</sup> responders) and international humanitarian community;</li> <li>■ ensuring communication;</li> <li>■ coordinating gaps at national and sub-national levels;</li> <li>■ lack of capacity of government counterparts;</li> <li>■ engaging with the formulation of national disaster management legislation; and</li> <li>■ formulating inclusive coordination mechanisms (Inter-Agency Contingency Planning is centric).</li> </ul> <p><u>Complex Emergencies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ contingency planning for complex emergency scenarios with the involvement of governments;</li> <li>■ CAP and good coordination in countries at armed conflict situations;</li> <li>■ strengthening clusters in complex emergencies; and</li> <li>■ linking protection mandate with counterparts that are part of the conflict in a way that would not be perceived as taking sides.</li> </ul>	

This session introduced the role of OCHA Regional and Country Offices towards government and regional organisations in capacity assessment.

### 4.1 The Strategic Partnership for Preparedness (SPP) Project

The objective of SPP is to further define the roles and responsibilities amongst key stakeholders in emergency preparedness and response, to contribute to the development and the methodology for assessing national response capacity, taking into account existing resources such as HFA Priority 5 Guidance & Indicator Package, in addition to carrying out a comprehensive capacity assessment linked to capacity development response in a pilot country.

SPP stemmed in part from a review of the UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness (DRP) missions with the aim of improving DRP missions through wider stakeholder engagement at national, regional and global levels in the process before, during and after the capacity assessment mission. The strength and added-value of the SPP is that it engages stakeholders throughout including follow-up thus promoting sustainability. The SPP is anchored in the OCHA Strategic Framework Objective 1.3, with the ultimate aim of including all relevant partners and stakeholders. A pilot project in West Africa is currently in the process of engaging stakeholders at global, regional and national level. The national capacity assessment mission will take place in October.

The process leading up to the assessment mission in October included a regional stakeholder workshop in Dakar, where the objectives were explained to regional stakeholders and partners. The workshop also provided the unique setting to define the selection criteria for a pilot country through: national ownership and buy-in from main stakeholders/national counterparts. According to the criteria outlined above, Ghana was selected as the pilot country. The regional participants were from WFP, UNICEF, FAO, UNHCR, IFRC, Oxfam, ACF, WorldVision, USAID/OFDA. Once assessments are conducted by one entity, they are often discarded by others. The idea is to bring all partners on board at the onset of the process, so that they have ownership of the results and thus would be more inclined to use results in their work plans.

### 4.2 Economic Commission for West African States (ECOWAS): Promoting Preparedness in a Poverty-Stricken and Disaster-Prone Environment

In West Africa, the Millennium Development Goals will not be reached by 2015. Poverty is an overarching issue and many disasters hamper progress in the region. Twenty-million people are currently affected by food shortages and access to water is another important issue that needs to be taken into account as well as demographic context (youth majority/ unemployment), poor governance, insufficient development assistance, drugs and terrorism.

As one of the ROs' core functions is preparedness, the Regional Office for West and Central Africa (ROWCA) is supporting ECOWAS in their preparedness efforts through awareness and advocacy work, with several suggestions for a roadmap:

- 1) using disasters to promote preparedness;
- 2) genuinely assess capacity;
- 3) placing ownership as the primary goal;
- 4) investing time to foster partnership; and
- 5) valuing institutional and retrospective analyses.

The three-year strategic partnership action plan with ECOWAS is now being replicated with the Economic Commission for Central African States (ECCAS), covering preparedness, response and risk reduction. ROWCA will establish an INSARAG Secretariat. This regional approach, working with ECOWAS through a strategic partnership in preparedness and response transcending borders, is a key to peace and stability in the region.

### 4.3 Working with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

ASEAN has been an important partner for Myanmar since the passage of Cyclone Nargis in May 2008 through the Myanmar Humanitarian Task Force (HTF), which ultimately led to the creation of a strategic core group consisting of the UN, ASEAN and the Government.

The strategic core group is co-located along with OCHA in the six sub-offices set up after the cyclone, facilitating workshops on disaster management, strengthening relations between local authorities and humanitarian partners in addition to promoting recovery in the Post-Nargis Periodic Reviews.

The mandate of the HTF is coming to a close along with the strategic core group. Further involvement will depend on the Government. This is dealt with by the ASEAN Secretariat in Jakarta through the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance & Disaster Management (AHA Centre).

In July 2005, ASEAN's collective commitment and joint efforts in responding to disaster in the region and in reducing disaster risks more effectively, the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) for 2010-2015 was endorsed and came into force on 24 December 2009. The Work Programme is to attain the vision of disaster resilient nations and safer communities within the region, in accordance with the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA). ASEAN is forging a stronger partnership with its partners, including the United Nations, multilateral organisations, civil society and other stakeholders.

OCHA has worked with ASEAN since 2003. The Association is very active in the region and possesses many collaborative instruments. OCHA supports ASEAN nationals through INSARAG, UNDAC training, and peer learning of emergency expert on a number of training on tools.

The MOU between OCHA and ASEAN was designed after the OCHA/MIC-EU Agreement and the two organisations are formulating SOPs with UNDAC and the ASEAN ERAT (Emergency Rapid Assessment Team). Eleven ERAT members attended the last UNDAC Induction Course in Singapore.

#### **4.4 African Union Convention for the Protection & Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention)**

The Kampala Convention was adopted on 23 October 2009 and entered into force within 30 days of ratification by fifteen AU member States - the first such regional legal framework specifically dealing with IDPs.

The Convention emphasises on prevention by eliminating root causes, details obligations for States, including obligation to ensure rapid and unimpeded access for humanitarian organisations and relief, and to facilitate needs assessment. The convention will provide a way for durable solutions and national implementations, and is a benchmark in IDP and protection issues.

Some OCHA preparedness activities can make use of this Convention through advocacy for the inclusion of State Parties' obligations in national disaster management strategies and planning, promote measures in disaster context to prevent/mitigate internal displacement, including early warning, disaster risk reduction strategies, emergency preparedness, integrating risks of displacement in contingency planning scenarios. The Convention can also be used in developing technical guidance on specific issues such as evacuations, relocations and replacement of ID documents. The Convention is an important tool for humanitarian operations in Africa.

#### **4.5 Role of Regional/Country Office in Capacity Assessment & Development vis-à-vis Governments - Zimbabwe**

OCHA Zimbabwe is currently conducting assessments to support in strengthening the response capacity of the Government, but needs to exercise due caution with the language used, for example, "humanitarian" issues or "Internal displacement" are taboo. All OCHA partners in Zimbabwe (UNDP, UNICEF and NGOs) involved in capacity-building activities with the National Civil Protection Agency are obliged to use terms and creative terminology to overcome dangerous semantic nuances such as recovery and disaster risk reduction.

Zimbabwe has one government structure that is highly politicised. Thus, the first challenge is to find ways to work within this structure. OCHA has identified gaps and provided training to Government staff as well as guidance on preparedness and contingency planning. There is currently Government's buy-in for some pilot testing. After disasters occur, there is generally a good opportunity for advocating preparedness. OCHA should also use this as an opportunity to conduct a joint assessment. After having built trust with the Government, we can task the Government to refine existing tools. This takes a lot of work and time.

OCHA receives requests for assistance at all levels: national, provincial and local. At national level, governments ask OCHA for assistance in all issues related to capacity development, preparedness and response. OCHA has taken the lead in disaster preparedness and response, in spite of the existing needs for training OCHA staff itself.



<b>Session</b>	<b>Actionable Outcome</b>
<b>2</b>	
<b>Group Discussion</b>	
<p>Role of specific regional organisations in collaboration with OCHA, to be included in <a href="#">OCHA Guideline for Preparedness Actions</a>.</p> <p><b>Good Practices in Working with Regional Organisations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Participation of regional organisations in UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness missions.</li> <li>■ Use regional entities as an entry point for wider preparedness engagement and longer-term commitment.</li> <li>■ Information management tools and services.</li> <li>■ Coordination of regional and national entities (transferring skills and know-how).</li> <li>■ OCHA role as a catalyst and as a process facilitator for regional organisations (process-owners), who in turn are process-facilitators for national entities.</li> </ul> <p><b>How OCHA could refine its current approach with Regional Organisations:</b></p> <p><b>Approaches:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Take comprehensive approach: First assess the capacity of governments, and assist full range of preparedness actions, not only what is requested by RC (e.g. SimEx).</li> <li>■ Standardisation of MOUs/SOPs with Regional Organisations.</li> <li>■ Provide guidance on how to engage with regional organisations and governments with strong response capacities.</li> <li>■ Customise OCHA strategy according to country context.</li> <li>■ Engage governments more systematically in preparedness activities through advocacy.</li> </ul> <p><b>OCHA Role &amp; Capacity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Decision on OCHA role: to <u>provide</u> capacity building to government or <u>facilitate</u> the provision of capacity building.</li> <li>■ Strengthen required OCHA internal capacity in providing support to regional organisations.</li> </ul>	

This Session provided insights from the Government of Haiti (Directorate for Civil Protection Directorate/DCP) with respect to effective preparedness for response in the pre- and post-earthquake phases of the Haiti disaster of 12 January 2010. The roles played by OCHA ROLAC, and the IASC CP support mission in March 2010 are also reflected.

### 5.1 Haiti: Perspectives on effective preparedness for response before and after the earthquake of 12 January 2010

National perspectives through the National System of Risk and Disaster Management (SNGRD) were presented and provided participants with insight from Haiti before and after the catastrophic earthquake of 12 January 2010.

Prior to the earthquake, SNGRD was working towards decentralisation (geographical coverage of communal and local committees). The response plan was reviewed and validated in November 2009 taking into account the new approach including current needs - on-going training sessions, reinforcement of the central level, mobilisation of resources at local level, continuing efforts to raise communities' awareness, improvement of early warning systems and evacuation plans, and planning of 2010 hurricane season contingency plan initiated.

The international support group was led by UNDP, and on a daily basis, OCHA played an interlocutor/facilitator role between national and international bodies. The UN system and MINUSTAH were fully integrated into departmental (and sometimes communal) committees. National simulation exercises were conducted jointly until 2007. In October 2009, based on lessons learned, it was decided to have one contingency plan for the hurricane season - the national contingency plan.

Since the earthquake, the following actions have been taken by SNGRD:

- overall coordination of earthquake response;
- evaluation - resource mobilisation - response to the earthquake needs;
- public information and awareness/advocacy;
- preparation for the rainy/hurricane season;
- development of norms and risk factor studies; and
- review of the organisation of the national system and development thereof.

UN System/OCHA led the following:

- support to coordination of the international earthquake response;
- resource mobilisation – management of the Emergency Relief Response Fund for Haiti, on behalf of the Humanitarian Coordinator;
- information management, needs assessments, donor relations and reporting;
- mobile EOC; and
- support to system development and activities including development of scientific entities.

#### Joint Action:

- formulation of a national contingency plan.

In the meantime, some areas of weakness have been identified so far:

#### National System (SNGRD):

- low functioning Emergency Operation Centre (EOC);
- lack of material resources/infrastructures and qualified human resources;
- absence of new communal committees – no committees in some communes;
- delay in disseminating appropriate information for actions; and
- lack of scientific knowledge of events.

## UNDP/OCHA:

- lack of human and material resources;
- difficulties working with national counterparts (leadership);
- problems coordinating international response (many actors – many clusters);
- difficulties obtaining and sharing reliable information; and
- problems mobilising badly needed resources, including entry into country.

Efforts are underway in the following areas where the international community must support:

- strengthening the civil protection structures at all levels: Emergency Operations Centre, training, staffing and extension of early warning systems;
- revision of strategies taking into account the multiple hazards;
- follow-up of risk factors - reinforcements of National Meteorological Centre;
- constitution and management of data base – quality control of information;
- increased capacity of having geological and seismic information and studies aimed at implementing scientific entities;
- development of normative tools such as building codes; and
- enhancing education and public awareness.

Along with some challenges ahead:

- developing a legal framework for disaster risk management;
- change focus from hydro-meteorological risks to a multi-risk approach;
- strengthening human capital with technical and strategic expertise in reduction of disasters risks – graduate and post-graduate studies, tutorials and transfer of knowledge;
- appropriation of management of the risk of disasters by line ministries;
- increase the capacity to develop tools for detection of all kinds of risk;
- operation of a permanent network monitoring tools and information;
- stimulation of research; and
- coordination among various actors and the required leadership role.

From the viewpoint of building resilience, the following actions are necessary:

- better governance – reinforcement/adaptation of the national system of disaster and risk management to the needs (include the relationship with the politics and international counterparts);
- reinforcement of local capacities to increase effectiveness of response;
- reinforcement/organisation of line ministries to integrate disaster and risk management on a daily basis;
- protection of the economy, investments in the case of materialisation of hazards - transferring risk through promising financial mechanisms;
- putting in place and support the functioning of national scientific institutions - relocating institutions heavily damaged by the earthquake; and
- increase public awareness.

Finally, Haiti must make “vulnerability reduction the base of economical development” of the country. (Prime Minister Jean-Max Bellerive, May 2009).

## 5.2 Role of the Regional Office (ROLAC) in Haiti Earthquake Response

After showing the OCHA video on Haiti response, 'Coordinating the Response' ([www.nicespots.com/shortURL.php?id=229600](http://www.nicespots.com/shortURL.php?id=229600)), the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC) presented general views on the role of the Regional Office in Haiti response in SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis as follows:

<b>STRENGTHS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ availability of staff;</li> <li>▪ knowledge of Haiti;</li> <li>▪ first wave of emergency response;</li> <li>▪ presence of the NDRA in the Dominican Republic; and</li> <li>▪ regional inter-agency support (REDLAC).</li> </ul>	<b>WEAKNESSES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ information sharing within the office;</li> <li>▪ communications with the staff deployed;</li> <li>▪ internal administrative training (use of petty cash); and</li> <li>▪ IT equipment (available for only one emergency).</li> </ul>
<b>OPPORTUNITIES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ good support from UNRC in disaster response;</li> <li>▪ regional inter-agency support (REDLAC);</li> <li>▪ good surge capacity from OCHA; and</li> <li>▪ two emergencies tested internal procedures.</li> </ul>	<b>THREATS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MINUSTAH taking the lead;</li> <li>▪ support to the ERC rather than the UNRC;</li> <li>▪ IT limitations (BB, Lotus, cells) &amp; losses;</li> <li>▪ lack of admin support in Haiti;</li> <li>▪ interaction with OCHA-Haiti &amp; OCHA-Dominican Republic;</li> <li>▪ corporate means global not regional; and</li> <li>▪ no use of the regional (REDLAC) Rapid Needs Assessment method.</li> </ul>

In addition, there were some lessons learned:

- humanitarian leadership needs to be improved;
- Humanitarian Country Team needs to be operational;
- inter-cluster coordination capacity should be enhanced;
- national actors should be included;
- difficult coordination with myriad of actors on the ground;
- military assets should be absorbed by international community;
- adapt to challenges of working in urban environment;
- enhance adequate needs assessments with better planning;
- working conditions needs to be improved; and
- better understanding of the socio-economical environment and community is required.

An earthquake hit the region again, in Chile, on 27 February 2010. The response capacity of ROLAC was tested under the strenuous situation of having to deal with major, dual emergencies in the region. Along with Head, Deputy Head of ROLAC and other ROLAC staff members in Panama, four NDRAs based in Nicaragua, Peru, Mexico and the Dominican Republic were deployed. The following issues were identified for specific ROLAC preparedness:

### Preparedness for ROLAC:

- good preparedness since the initial event;
- good knowledge of Haiti;
- constant monitoring (mission was planned for 20 January for CERF);
- all ROLAC staff were ready to be deployed at the time of the earthquake, but there is a need to review ROLAC internal SOPs; and
- extra working hours need to be registered.

### Preparedness in Countries:

- monitor progress on contingency planning process in Haiti;
- Humanitarian Assistance of 2007, including the cluster approach;
- lack of coordination between UNETE (UN Emergency Technical Teams) & external actors (national NGOs);
- ensure available preparedness tools in one place (CP, 3Ws, etc.); and
- monitor progress of the contingency planning process.

## Contingency Plans (CP):

- CP revision was on-going in Haiti, but the document was not immediately available;
- CP was not consulted and followed in Chile;
- train and carry out simulations and ensure minimum actions are learned;
- simple CP works better;
- when the CP exists, make use of it (Chile and the role of UNRC); and
- update and link contingency plans with the ROLAC Emergency Response Plan in accordance with the IASC Contingency Planning Guidelines for Humanitarian Assistance.

Through these valuable experiences, ROLAC promoted the idea of identifying minimum preparedness tools or processes at national and regional levels (See Group Discussions).

## IASC Contingency Planning Support Mission to Haiti

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Contingency Planning Support Mission was fielded on 8-12 March 2010 with the objective to support the Humanitarian Country Team in developing a 'light' operational contingency plan for the next six months in respect of sharply increased vulnerability arising from the earthquake of 12 January and hazards including, but not limited to flooding, storm and landslide.

The recommendations were made by the IASC mission with regard to Inter-Agency Contingency Planning, with the following objectives to strengthen the:

- effectiveness of the emergency response of the humanitarian community during the upcoming rainy and hurricane season; and
- capacity of governments at national and sub-national levels to prepare and respond in case of emergencies during the rainy and hurricane season.

Other recommendations on coordination, information management and capacity were also formulated. As a result of these proposals, the inter-cluster coordination (UNICEF) is now led by a DFID Stand-By Partner Programme (SBPP) staff. At the time of the Forum a revised national contingency plan was with the Minister of Interior, for signature.

## Protection Cluster Leadership in Disaster Response

The main tool used in this cluster is the *Operational Guidelines and Field Manual on Human Rights Protection in Situations of Natural Disaster* (revised in 2010). People affected by natural disasters are often at increased risk of *harm*. This may take the form of not only physical or gender-based violence, but also destruction of property, separation of families, etc. They may be *denied access* to humanitarian assistance (food, water and sanitation, shelter, health services, education, livelihoods, etc.) or such assistance is provided in a discriminatory manner.

The IASC Guidance of November 2006 states, '*UNHCR is the lead of the Global Protection Cluster. At country level in disaster situations (...). The three core protection-mandated agencies (UNHCR, UNICEF and OHCHR) will consult closely and, under the overall leadership of the HC/RC, agree which of the three will assume the role of Lead for protection.*'

During the IASC Principals Meeting in April 2009, participants noted a gap in defining the lead agency on protection in natural disasters; requested the Protection Cluster Working Group to develop SOPs for designation of protection cluster lead.

Prior to the earthquake, human rights concerns included widespread poverty and inequality, discrimination, sexual abuse of women and girls, human trafficking, impunity, and generally weak rule of law. OHCHR (MINUSTAH Human Rights Section) and UNICEF were present, but UNHCR had no presence in Haiti.

In line with IASC Guidance, OHCHR, UNHCR and UNICEF agreed at global level that in Haiti OHCHR would lead the protection cluster with support from UNHCR, while in the Dominican Republic UNHCR would lead the cluster.

Other issues raised regarding protection were as follows:

- discrimination in assistance provision
- generalised violence in shelters (1,300 sites) under-reported;
- cross-border child trafficking (mainly to the Dominican Republic);
- CP with protection sector would be needed; and
- no mechanisms for dealing with instances of abuse.

<b>Session</b>	<b>Actionable Outcome</b>
<b>3</b>	
<b>Group Discussion</b>	

Adapted minimum preparedness tools/packages (e.g. CP for floods, SimEx, MPA for ROs to support govts in case of a “corporate” emergency agreed and included in OCHA Guideline for Preparedness Actions).

Product or Process	Resource Implications	Responsible	Timeframe
<b>Inter-Agency Contingency Plans (IACP)</b>	Travel Facilitation Training package Venue	RC/HC HCT Government	Triggers Deteriorating situation Key staff turn-over Update agencies in the HCT
<b>Simulations</b>	Travel Facilitation team Time of staff Venue	RC/HC Government HCT Gap – unclear mechanism	Every year
<b>EOC (link between Govt and HCTs)</b>	Dedicated staff Venue SOP/procedures	RC/HC OCHA (in-country)	As necessary
<b>Coordination CMCOORD Clusters</b>	Dedicated staff	CMCOORD RO Clusters RC/HC, Heads of agencies, HCT	Link to CP Ongoing process

- prioritisation on preparedness actions: what needs to be done and delivered;
- concentrate on what OCHA is good at (e.g. not always ICT);
- in-country and regional resources and stockpiles;
- assessment methodology adapted by Humanitarian Country Teams;
- business continuity plans (BCP): e.g. ROAP dealt with 7 emergencies in 5 weeks;
- RC/HC training that included familiarisation in OCHA role and support;
- IDP policy at country level;
- annual preparedness consultations with regional organisations;
- communication strategy; and
- targeted training for RC/HC and Handbook for RC/HC.

## Session 4: Role of ROs in Strengthening Regional Response Capacity of OCHA & UN RC-HC/Humanitarian Country Teams

Along with ROLAC, other Regional Offices and County Offices made efforts in terms of strengthening OCHA internal capacity as presented in Session 4.

### 6.1 ROMENACA (Regional Office for Middle East, North Africa & Central Asia)

At the Regional Planning Meeting in Cairo in February, which comprised of 25 internal participants, the following three issues were discussed under the heading of preparedness:

- **Bi-Annual Meetings with RC/HC** - To promote one common UN approach, enhance coordination of regional humanitarian issues and linkages to development topics, such as early recovery and serve as a forum to discuss emerging key concerns, including climate change and funding for preparedness.
- **Regional Surge Capacity** - Support in emergencies (surge) of RO staff is currently performed on an ad-hoc basis and therefore, a quick mechanism to deploy staff within the region is needed. The advantage of using staff from the region means that important criteria such as knowledge of the regional context, culture, language and the proximity to the crisis are instantly met. The formation of regional surge capacities would also complement the global Emergency Response Roster (ERR), the UNDAC system and the Stand-By Partnership Programme (SBPP).
- **Regional Emergency Response Funds (ERF)** – Regional Emergency Response Funds would allow rapid disbursement for minor and medium emergencies within the region. In addition, it would encourage regional stakeholders to come together to provide more knowledge on the region, hazards and emergencies. However, it is not clear who would be responsible for the distribution of funds: RC/HC, Advisory Group, etc. Guidance and coordination must be obtained from the Funding Coordination Section.

### 6.2 ROWCA (Regional Office for West & Central Africa)

ROWCA supports its staff in the following learning initiatives:

- formal training (e.g. WEM-UNHCR) including General Service staff;
- on-site mentoring, e.g. a national staff joining an international staff on mission (there is also an inter-agency responsibility for national staff);
- complementarity of skills and expertise promoted amongst RDRAs and Humanitarian Affairs Officers (HAOs). There is no divide between complex emergencies and disasters; and
- need for close interaction/partnership with governments' NDMOs by sharing experiences. There is something to learn from governments' perspectives and experiences.

The general trend of budget reduction will affect the recruitment process of national officers in RC Offices. The presence of a national staff in RC Office is essential in communicating with RC and will foster the next generation of HAOs. Some RCs are considering cost-sharing.

### 6.3 ROAP (Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific)

ROAP also provides in-house training to its staff as well as the Sub-Regional Office (SRO) in Fiji and Humanitarian Support Unit (HSU) in Papua New Guinea for general OCHA/humanitarian issues, first aid, information management and communications. Additional training is provided by OCHA HQ.

### 6.4 ROSEA-SRO-EA (Regional Office for South & East Africa) - Strengthening Humanitarian Country Teams (HCTs) & Regional Actors The Case of Scenario Building on Sudan +4

How to bring inter-agency stakeholders together for scenario building?

Key milestones in Southern Sudan 2010-2011:

- moving beyond limited UNHCR/WFP joint planning;
- showing added-value of regional approach to HCTs and RC/HCs;
- set-up of a Regional Humanitarian Partnership Team (IASC Eastern & Central Africa) initiative - not OCHA-led, but facilitated by OCHA;
- buy-in from RCs/HCs and OCHA Country Offices; and
- co-chairing between HCR-OCHA.

Objectives of the Sudan +4 meeting were to enable country teams from Southern Sudan, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda; and regional actors to:

- share information on organisational planning for possible increased humanitarian needs in southern Sudan, in particular cross-border implications in the coming months and beyond;
- facilitate the development of common sub-regional scenarios on the basis of which national level contingency plans can be fine tuned; and
- identify gaps in information sharing/channels or response capacity that should be supported and/or complemented by regional actors.

Sudan +4 was not intended to:

- produce a regional contingency plan, but rather it would assist countries in revising and/or updating their own national plans based on a better understanding of possible scenarios;
- cover the whole of Sudan, as most Nairobi-based organisations are primarily focused on the possible impacts on countries south and east of Sudan; and
- pass judgment on the prospects for peace or the various political processes underway, but rather focus on practical humanitarian concerns.

Sudan+ participants (64 persons from more than 20 organisations) constituted:

- 3-4 HCTs members per country (DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda);
- Regional Humanitarian Partnership Team (RHPT) members (IASC regional body);
- Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD);
- guest speakers (ICG Africa Director, Refugee International, UNMIS by phone);
- donors (follow-up meeting with donors 2 weeks later).

Key follow-up actions include:

- information sharing and scenario analysis (common scenario for CAP MYR);
- resource mobilisation;
- surge support to operations in southern Sudan (mapping of needs, profiles);
- regional coordination (logistics, stocks, etc.); and
- country-level preparedness and response (IACP and shared scenarios).

Discussion Points:

- in the absence of formal regional IASC bodies (regional HCT), how do we improve inter-agency preparedness and common risks analysis? Should IASC Principals formally establish such mechanisms?
- added-value of regional office support to country offices?
- moving beyond classical UNHCR-WFP joint planning on scenarios on cross-border population movements; and
- donors and regional bodies (in this case IGAD) involvement in such planning meetings?

The following issues were raised by the participants:

- for the purpose of info sharing and identifying gaps in response capacity, this type of common risk analysis would be a good opportunity to detect gaps in coordination, logistics sharing, stockpiling;
- common or most probable scenario paragraph can be incorporated in CAP;
- ROWCA/regional CAP including activation of clusters; and
- agree on figures and hotspots in bordering areas.



## 6.5 Regional Structure: REACT – ROMENACA SRO in Almaty for Central Asia

In Central Asia, the Rapid Emergency Assessment and Coordination Team (REACT) is the equivalent to the IASC-like structure in Central Asia. Membership includes UN agencies, NGOs and donor governments. REACT is part of national disaster management structure and is co-chaired by the Government. The Resident Coordinator's Office acts as Secretariat.

REACT has been successful in dealing with small- and medium-size emergencies. It has also been a partner in implementing OCHA core functions, with institutional memory in disaster management. Where appropriate REACT can also serve as an entry point for capacity building initiatives.

However, there are certain issues to be raised: blurred identity of the Secretariat, sometimes presents conflicts of interest in inter-agency coordination and project implementation. It seems that UNDP/BCPR regards REACT as project implementers. Therefore there is a need to clearly separate coordination and project implementation functions. More than twenty-one projects were added and requests are increasingly made to OCHA. There is also a need to separate roles of coordination and project implementation. REACT seems to be a parallel structure when clusters are not in accordance with global cluster guidance.

## 6.6 Integrating Pandemic Preparedness into Wider Emergency Preparedness

Regional Offices have been in the frontline of pandemic preparedness. As the PIC (Pandemic Influenza Contingency) office will close at end-2010, some key issues on mainstreaming this into preparedness were raised below:

### **Pandemic Preparedness**

- large global emergency preparedness initiative;
- faster detection and response;
- coordinated action;
- cross-sectoral involvement;
- new emerging viruses; and
- continued threat of H5N1

### **Opportunities & Threats**

- similar to preparedness for other disasters;
- positive spin-offs;
- tools, protocols, trainings, lessons, partnerships;
- opportunity to strengthen preparedness; and
- create parallel structures and mechanisms.

### **Integration & Mainstreaming into Existing Organisations/Programmes**

- UNDP/BCPR, ISDR, IASC-SWG and Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA);
- National Disaster Management Organisations;
- IASC CT - contingency plans, UNDAF;
- clusters;
- national strategies for disaster reduction; and
- global risk assessment, HFA Mid-Term Review, ISDR Global Platform.

The following questions were put to the floor for further consideration:

- Is it realistic to include pandemic readiness in the wider emergency preparedness agenda?
- How best to move this forward?

## 6.7 Extra Session on OCHA Policy Instruction on OCHA's Role in Preparedness

After a brief presentation of the then draft, participants:

- proposed change on national/inter-agency contingency planning be provided.;
- suggested the concept of partnerships be core to the guideline;
- enquired as to the level of detail needed for the guideline; and
- recommended OCHA provide governments with expertise in disaster management, engaging where necessary relevant partners to work with them in capacity development (Red Cross movement, UNDP, etc).

The Policy Instruction was approved by the USG on 20 August 2010.

***Nota Bene: No actionable outcome from Session 4 was elaborated as participants agreed to use the time allotted to engage in more in-depth discussions on the draft Policy Instruction on OCHA's Role in Preparedness.***

## 6.8 Parking Lot (Extra space for Specific Issues) Risk Management Indicators (RMI)

As a potentially useful tool, Risk Management Indicators were developed by the Inter-American Development Bank. This tool was introduced to the participants with a view to developing and elaborating possible 'preparedness' indicators.

Risk Management Index brings together a group of indicators related to the risk management performance of the country. These reflect the capacity and institutional action taken to reduce vulnerability and losses, to prepare for crises and efficiently recover. Main objectives are to:

- assess, analyse and measure risk management performance;
- measure and evaluate progress in implementation of RM activities;
- use it as a decision-making tool; and
- form an outline of DRR menu.

Formulation of RMI takes into account four public policies:

- 1) risk identification (RI);
- 2) risk reduction (RR, involving prevention and mitigation);
- 3) disaster management (DM, comprising response and recovery); and
- 4) governance and financial protection, (FP, related to institutionalisation & risk transfer).

The details of the four indicators are as below:

### Risk Identification (RI):

- systematic disaster and loss inventory;
- hazard monitoring and forecasting;
- hazard evaluation and mapping;
- vulnerability and risk assessment;
- public information and community participation; and
- training and education on risk management.

### Indicators of Risk Reduction (RR):

- risk consideration in land use and urban planning;
- hydrographic basin intervention and environmental protection;
- implementation of hazard-event control and protection techniques;
- housing improvement and human settlement relocation from prone-areas;
- updating and enforcement of safety standards and construction codes; and
- reinforcement and retrofitting of public and private assets.

### Indicators of Disaster Management (DM):

- organisation and coordination of emergency operations;
- emergency response planning and implementation of warning systems;
- supply of equipments, tools and infrastructure;
- simulation, updating and testing of inter-institutional response capability;
- community preparedness and training; and
- rehabilitation and reconstruction planning.

### Indicators of Financial Protection (FP):

- decentralised organisational units, inter-institutional and multi-sector coordination;
- availability of resources for institutional strengthening;
- budget allocation and mobilisation;
- existence of social safety nets and funds;
- insurance coverage and loss transfer strategies of public assets; and
- housing and private sector insurance and reinsurance coverage.

In addition, there are other risk management indicator initiatives as follows:

- HFA monitoring tool for 5 priorities;
- DARA – focus on HFA priorities 1-4;
- ECHO Disaster Risk Index; and

## Session 5: Linking Humanitarian Action (Preparedness) with Development Actors/Policy Framework

This Session focused on the role of OCHA and UNDP in terms of linking humanitarian action/preparedness with early action/recovery, as well as multi-lateral collaboration with development actors, targeted at disaster risk reduction (DRR) programmes in Nepal.

### 7.1 IASC Early Recovery & Crisis Preparedness (UNDP)

In short:

- early recovery (ER) is an approach, and the responsibility of all clusters;
- gap identified between 'humanitarian (relief)' and 'recovery (development)' phase;
- new focus was placed on inter-linking phase – ER; (continuity, resilience, etc.) to enhance 'crisis' preparedness, smarten crisis response and sharpen development schemes;
- ER integrated into strategic and inter-cluster frameworks etc. (ER advisors to RC/HC); and
- various entry points discussed.

### 7.2 Incorporating DRR into CCA/UNDAF (ROAP)

- ROAP participated in a ToT (Training-of-Trainers) session conducted by the UN System Staff College (UNSSC) in November 2009 on integrating disaster risk reduction (DRR) into CCA/UNDAF.
- In 1997, CCA/UNDAF was adopted as a strategic planning tool to better support national development efforts within the context of MDGs.
- The process of development itself has a huge impact, both positive and negative, on disaster risk. The varying impact depends on the kind of development choices they have made. The solution to this challenge is to make a concerted effort towards integrating DRR interventions into broader development approaches. An important step towards this is for the UNCT to integrate DRR as part of the CCA/UNDAF.
- DRR aims to minimise risks and related vulnerabilities (efforts to prevent disaster risk and to limit the adverse impact of hazards when they occur, through disaster mitigation, preparedness and response). "Mainstreaming" DRR includes a key risk reduction message to be advocated in all relevant sectors.
- CCA is a UN reading of key challenges in a country.
- UNDAF is not solely a UN document as it is also countersigned by the respective Government.
- UNDAF Action Plan is signed by the Government. For UN Funds & Programmes (UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA), UNDAF is a tool to obtain funds from the Board. If a particular activity is not included in UNDAF, the Agency will not get funds. This creates competition for inclusion of activities in UNDAF.
- UNDOCO (Development Operations Coordination Office) and UNSSC are supporting preparations of UNDAF roll-outs in 2010 in 45 countries.
- The Turin ToT focuses on adding trainers to the DOCO-UNSSC Roster of Experts who will help UNSSC support the roll-out of UNDAF and help UNCTs during their planning retreats. UNSSC has over 200 experts covering UNDAF support. The ToT has also added to this pool, additional UN professionals (experts on DRR) from various organisations.
- In November 2009, the undg endorsed a '*Guidance Note on UNDAF*', aimed at aligning UNDAF with government fiscal process and spending considerably less time on planning. Peer Support Groups (PSG) are set-up annually and change within regions. These groups are responsible for quality assurance for UNDAF. (See [www.undg.org/drr](http://www.undg.org/drr), [www.unssc.org/teamres](http://www.unssc.org/teamres)).
- Examples of DRR Integration into national priorities: **India** - The Planning Commission requires all development projects to conduct disaster risk assessment before approval. **Malawi** - Climate change and DRR are considered as one. **Fiji** - Completed a regional UNDAF (when Richard Dictus was RC). **Zimbabwe** - DRR was integrated into development planning in the context of enhanced sustainable livelihoods through employment opportunities and community recovery projects.
- A major challenge for OCHA is to increase a pool of trained UNDAF Process Supporters.
- OCHA usually does not participate in the CCA at country-level, but rather enters later, if at all to join the UNDAF, missing the opportunity to participate in the common understanding and analysis of country-level issues and challenges.

### 7.3 On-Going CADRI Programmes Linking Preparedness & DRR (CADRI)

- CADRI together with UNDP in the process of developing guidelines on how to mainstream DRR into UNDAF.
- Feedback from the UN System Staff College (UNSSC) training was that only a handful of participants were qualified as trainers and therefore, as a matter of urgency further technical capacity be developed.
- National development plans are being developed, but currently countries are looking at disaster preparedness for response with short term vision! *Challenge:* Utilise short-term vision for the bigger picture of disaster risk reduction, and change at the political level. UNISDR are working at political level. There is a definite need to start the local discussions.
- From the SPP bi-lateral meetings with organisations based in Dakar, it appeared that little knowledge was known about DRR in the long-term.

### 7.4 Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium (OCHA Nepal)

- Film on Nepal - Buildings as a Weapon of Mass Destruction.
- Transition on many fronts in Nepal, problem of ethnic federalism.
- Implemented the cluster approach that followed instructions from IASC as HC in place.
- Major food crisis due to drought, landslides, floods – impact communities.
- The Koshi floods have been caused by infrastructure failure (and sedimentation).
- Ongoing advocacy on earthquake risk, especially for Kathmandu valley.
- INSARAG is concerned about equipment and response in small alleys.
- The international community needed to make progress despite lag in national implementation (The National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management passed).
- Five flagship programmes formulated - 1) School and hospital safety, 2) Emergency preparedness, 3) Flood management in the Koshi river basin, 4) integrated community-based disaster risk reduction/management and 5) Policy/Institutional support for disaster risk management.
- Disaster risk reduction to be streamlined in all development areas involving IFIs.
- *Challenges:* few consultations with NGOs, no climate change adaptation links, little momentum from the government and dedicated coordinators.
- Strong institutional frameworks are needed.
- Communications systems should be operational.

### 7.5 Questions & Answers

#### **Clarifying Preparedness for Response and Preparedness for Recovery?**

*It is about enhancing crisis response. The point is sustainability. ER is an approach, so if you focus on capacity development you are doing preparedness. Challenge: “gaps” were addressed at the Copenhagen climate change conference, meaning ER was seen as a responsibility to fill these gaps – then there needs to be resources pulled towards this.*

#### **Recovery seems to lack a driver to be incorporated into clusters? (related to other cross-cutting issues needed to be mainstreamed by OCHA)**

*One aspect of recovery that remains unsolved is the issue of political environment. Political sanctions in a country make recovery programmes stand still, e.g. in Niger there is a food crisis, but they cannot scale-up the response. Challenge: Donors are restricted – thus it is recommended that political actors be brought into the discussion. Not participating in the CCA, which determines the shape of the UNDAF. Little input and understanding of the CCA - our responsibility is to underscore chronic vulnerabilities that can become acute vulnerabilities into the CCA, followed by the UNDAF process.*

#### **Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA)?**

*There are three main actors involved: European Union, United Nations and World Bank – the EU being the main donor to the process.*

#### **OCHA’s role in relation to preparedness and response, versus UNDP?**

*UNDAF is very UN focused. Risk Reduction Consortium looks at the national strategy. OCHA is trying to situate itself within this framework.*

<b>Session</b>	<b>Actionable Outcome</b>
<b>5</b>	
<b>Group Discussion</b>	
<p>Current Practices in collaboration with UNDP and Other Development Actors - strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and gaps:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Institutional memory (UNDP)</li> <li>■ Coordination mechanisms already exist and allow to bring partners together</li> <li>■ Technical expertise of development partners</li> <li>■ HFA 'belongs (ownership)' to governments</li> <li>■ OCHA-coordinating role</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Lack of dissemination of used concepts and terminology (e. g. "cluster approach")</li> <li>■ Priorities and focus differ</li> <li>■ Lack of coordination between agencies (BCPR/ISDR/OCHA)</li> <li>■ OCHA has no clear vision/structure on DRR</li> <li>■ Lack of independent assessment of performance of ISDR National Platforms for DRR</li> </ul> <p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Wide presence (UNDP membership in IASC – benefits link between humanitarian &amp; development issues)</li> <li>■ Funding is available (DFID, UNDP, etc.)</li> <li>■ Integration of DRR in UNDAF and developing coherent projects from CCA by promoting preparedness</li> <li>■ ISDR National Platforms for DRR do not work well. ISDR and partners should use what exists already and adapt it, rather than creating something new</li> <li>■ Nepal Consortium is an excellent example</li> </ul> <p><b>Gaps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Written agreement on roles and responsibilities (MOU?) at global level</li> <li>■ No linkage between UNDG (DOCO) – IASC – ISDR National Platforms</li> <li>■ Key messages to be developed by UNDP/ISDR/OCHA together</li> <li>■ Joint prioritisation of countries for activities</li> <li>■ Clarify OCHA role in HFA 5</li> <li>■ OCHA role/position/clarity (e. g. CCA)</li> <li>■ OCHA is not an implementing agency in UNDAF</li> <li>■ Is OCHA the voice of the IASC in the field? ISDR? Confusion created by UN Reform in 1997</li> <li>■ Discrepancy in understanding between field and HQ</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges:</b> Donors' behaviour (going directly to the field, and also implement activities).</p> <p><b>Questions:</b> What is OCHA position towards capacity development of governments and recovery?</p>	

## **8. Session 6: Climate Risk Adaption & Preparedness**

### **8.1 Global Climate Change Negotiations & Regional/National Level Action**

The Copenhagen climate conference (COP-15) was regarded as a disappointment as it did not deliver a strong enough legally-binding agreement. Nevertheless, humanitarian impacts and the urgency of climate change adaptation (CCA) are broadly recognised in the negotiations and the outcome document. COP-15 pledged \$30 bn a year in 2010-2012 as fast-track funding for mitigation and adaptation, but identifying and channelling actual funds will be a huge challenge. Another challenge is the “competition for attention” between mitigation and adaptation. CCA is humanitarian core business, thus it is unnecessary to create new mandates. The process is driven by needs as CC is a risk multiplier and natural disasters are predicted to become more frequent and intense. Thus climate risk assessments, early warning systems and national capacity building are the key tools in protecting vulnerable communities. Action is necessary at regional and national level in order to strengthen the capacity of humanitarian actors and vulnerable communities to engage in policy processes, access climate funding and forge new partnerships with environmental actors and climate scientists. Humanitarian actors need to find proper entry points (NAPA PRSP and UNDAF), as well as with government counterparts. IASC agencies need to mainstream CCA policies and scale-up programming, and continue to offer guidance and tools as well as CC experts. OCHA has a constructive and important role to play in this sphere.

### **8.2 The Humanitarian Impact of Climate Change**

OCHA is interested in CCA simply because of the events that will impact on vulnerable populations. Disaster risk management is recognised as a crucial element of adaptation, and adaptation funding is beginning to flow, but so far humanitarian actors have remained shy about accessing it.

The key issue is to identify what opportunities for action and programmes there are in the field and how we can and should seize them. Predictability on where climate change will tangibly impact humanitarian needs and exacerbate displacement and migration will be increasingly important in the future. Therefore humanitarian actors need to improve their analysis and use of climate information as well as link up with development and adaptation processes to ensure that humanitarian issues figure prominently therein.

### **8.3 Adaptation Funding Landscape – How Humanitarian Actors Can Seize the Opportunity**

Strong humanitarian leadership is required in order to access the increasing amounts of adaptation funding for preparedness activities, also to fill the long-standing preparedness funding gap and to strengthen collaboration with non-humanitarian stakeholders. It is important to continue to demystify adaptation funding sources which are quite simple and flexible in terms of access, and humanitarian actors actually have the power to shape the nascent funding practices and profiles of these sources which are trying to establish foothold in the adaptation framework.

It is proposed that OCHA’s role vis-à-vis adaptation funding should remain a non-operational catalyst for inter-agency and government action. OCHA should not assume new roles, but rather strengthen action, based on core functions without bloating cost-plans. The need is even greater due to expectations from bilateral donors and the IASC Principals meeting in February 2010, who called upon agencies to develop CCA project proposals that would benefit from adaptation funding. Against this backdrop, OCHA should monitor and share information on adaptation funding sources, work with partners to catalyse funding proposals and scale up preparedness, advocate for preparedness, and ensure that preparedness and early recovery activities address future climate risks and contribute to longer-term DRR and development.

### **8.4 Advancing Climate-Informed Preparedness Planning in East Africa**

Humanitarian actors in East Africa are looking for better ways to respond to climate risks, but currently lack effective means to access, analyse and operationalise appropriate climate information. Climate info currently remains too technical or lacks the context necessary for use in preparedness and contingency planning. For instance, it is difficult to access and interpret inconsistent and technical forecasts which lack geographic and temporal specificity and climatological context that would enable users to estimate probable impacts and establish thresholds to trigger specific operational action.

A recent OCHA-IRI (International Research Institute for Climate & Society) workshop helped bridge the divide between humanitarian practitioners and climate experts, and initiated a process of tailoring forecasts and other climate information products to humanitarian purposes that will subsequently help reinforce planning. The workshop recommended strengthening of inter-agency cooperation mechanisms for using climate information in preparedness and response, and developing a “one-stop-shop” DRM and climate information platform (map room, better packaging of existing data) designed to aid in the systematic interpretation of forecasts that will enhance decision-making across timescales.

## 8.5 The Case of Southern Africa Regional Climate Outlook Forum & Southern African Development Community Preparedness Workshop

ROSEA has collaborated with SARCOF (Southern Africa Regional Climate Outlook Forum) and SADC (Southern African Development Community) to improve climate-informed preparedness planning. After initial resource mobilisation, SARCOF will produce a regional forecast that will also be used for country level forecasts. ROSEA together with SADC then organises regional preparedness workshop where humanitarians and meteorologists analyse and use forecasts for contingency planning (for instance by assessing how and where farming sectors would be affected and in prioritising regions in contingency planning). The regional forecast is then presented at the SADC annual consultative workshop where countries and sectors requiring support for contingency planning, simulation exercises and resource mobilisation are prioritised while participants agree on support arrangements. RIACSO (Regional Inter-Agency Coordination Support Office) then works on an implementation plan while priority countries organise planning workshops and meetings. OCHA normally leads the team that offers support to contingency planning. ROSEA continues to monitor weather forecasts from other sources and provides updates to regional partners and HCTs for reviewing scenarios depending on changes in the forecast. SARCOF also provides monthly updates that are shared with partners and countries also produce ten-day forecasts.

Regional lessons learned will be collected and regional simulation exercises will be organised in the near future. Stakeholders will also consider longer-term risk reduction strategies as part of preparedness plans.

## 8.6 Reflections from Zimbabwe: OCHA, Climate Information and Contingency Planning

According to the experience of OCHA-Zimbabwe, the use of climate information in contingency planning and public awareness campaigns should be part-and-parcel of contingency plans, as they help increase knowledge on specific climate risks, improve local early warning systems, and identify safe havens for possible evacuations. These community-level campaigns should benefit from hydro-meteorological information/ forecasts, and be conducted prior to the rainy season by joint teams that include government counterparts. This engagement will also help humanitarian actors learn from communities themselves about their own strategies. Additionally, monthly national civil protection meetings give alerts based on 10-day weather forecasts on risks that are likely to occur help with preparedness planning. Operational challenges are caused by the disassociation between climate specialists and the end-user as well as the lack of government/partner capacity. It is important to tap into local community knowledge to overcome technical gaps in research and forecasts

### Plenary Discussion and Key Recommendations

- coherent efforts are needed for all hazards/risks;
- humanitarian actors need to be more strategic as governments want to see concrete best practices on preparedness;
- important that there is openness for CCA and that preparedness activities can be linked to this to secure adaptation funding;
- build on the common ground between CCA & DRR – HFA already exists as a framework for action;
- ensure CCA and DRR are both part of national development plans;
- regions should cross-pollinate and share their mechanisms, tools and information;
- further clarity and policy guidance on OCHA's role in CCA is needed;
- a policy instruction on promoting resilience might be needed and discussed at SMT;
- OCHA should concentrate on information for extreme weather events and ensure its proper tailoring and dissemination;
- a sense of urgency is required in the way we communicate to governments and actors on the ground. CC information can be used as an advocacy tool, but it still needs to be packaged properly;
- CCA and DDR is 90% overlapping – humanitarian actors should not be over-analytical as it is difficult to separate preparedness from response;
- humanitarian projects that have received adaptation funding should be used as best practices and encouragement for scaled-up action; and
- OCHA should engage with partners to catalyse funding for National Adaptation Programmes for Action (NAPA).



Session	Actionable Outcome
<b>6</b>	
Group Discussion	
<p>Development of a toolkit for climate information and preparedness planning; and development of a new version of the adaptation funding guidance document.</p> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ OCHA engagement in climate adaptation funding should be <i>catalytic</i> (e.g. helping partners access funding) and not involve OCHA getting money for itself or assume leadership and ownership of projects.</li> <li>■ Confusion between the different practice areas of climate change adaptation, DRR and humanitarian affairs can be avoided by considering that all of these practice areas support the same goal, namely increasing resilience and reducing vulnerability.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome Area 1 : Use Urgency of CCA to drive Additional Preparedness Activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ OCHA should facilitate the cross-feeding climate risk information and experience across different regions in Africa and request the African Union to convene a dialogue to this end.</li> <li>■ OCHA (potentially PDSB &amp; EPS) needs to develop a Policy Instruction for SMT approval on a coherent organisational approach to the promotion of increased resilience. This will help avoid piecemeal approaches.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome Area 2 : Better Use of Climate Risk Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ OCHA should catalyse better, more calibrated use of climate risk information to assist governments in scenario building, and in contingency planning. This could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) having the IRI climate risk information workshops in more regions; and</li> <li>ii) having OCHA ROs, with support from HQ, catalyse concrete action based on the outcomes of the IRI workshops including playing a role in creating interagency platforms for rapid onset events and developing a DRM information platform.</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ OCHA should enhance advocacy efforts by better integrating climate risk information into advocacy work. This could increase the sense of urgency of the need for preparedness. The example of OCHA-Zimbabwe could serve as a basis for replication. OCHA should then develop a response proposal based on the advocacy work.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome Area 3 : Financing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Climate risk financing discussions should be integrated into the working stream of Humanitarian Financing Group and IASC SWG on Preparedness.</li> <li>■ OCHA should catalyse new funding for partners within its existing coordination and resource mobilisation mandate.</li> <li>■ OCHA HQ should share info on potential funding sources and samples of good proposals.</li> <li>■ OCHA must catalyse resources to meet existing urgent needs described in NAPAs (National Adaptation Programmes for Action) and elsewhere.</li> </ul>	



## EPF III AGENDA

TUESDAY – 25 MAY	
10:15-11:30	<b>Introduction &amp; Overview/Recommendations from EPF II</b>
11:30-14:30	<b>Session 1 - Big picture: <u>Respective Roles</u> in the Preparedness Landscape</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Policy Instruction on OCHA Role in Preparedness &amp; OCHA Guidelines</li> <li>■ IASC Role in CD for Govts &amp; Emergency Preparedness Framework Project/Mapping of IASC Preparedness Work</li> <li>■ CADRI Approach to Capacity Assessment &amp; Development Strategy for DRR</li> </ul>
14:30-17:00	<b>Session 2 - Capacity Assessment &amp; Development: <u>Role of OCHA ROs/COs vis-à-vis Governments &amp; Regional Organisations</u></b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ SPP for National Response Capacity Assessment - UNDAC DR Preparedness Mission 'Plus'</li> <li>■ Role of ROs/COs in Capacity Assessment &amp; Development vis-à-vis Regional Organisations</li> <li>■ Role of ROs/COs in Capacity Development vis-à-vis Governments</li> </ul>
WEDNESDAY – 26 MAY	
08:30 - 09:00	Reflections from Day 1
09:00 - 12:00	<b>Session 3 - Supporting <u>Government Response Capacity</u>: Role of the Regional Office and OCHA in Haiti Response and Lessons for ROs</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Experiences from Haiti Earthquake &amp; the disaster risk management system's perspective</li> <li>■ Role of the RO in Haiti response: Inter-cluster coordination, IM (Needs Assessment), USAR, CMCoord</li> <li>■ Recommendations of the IASC Contingency Planning Support Mission</li> <li>■ Protection cluster leadership in disaster response</li> </ul>
13:00 – 16:00	<b>Session 4 - Role of <u>ROs</u> in Strengthening Response Capacity of OCHA &amp; RC/HC/HCT</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Cairo Regional Workshop recommendations to strengthen regional capacity</li> <li>■ Role of Regional Offices in Capacity Development for OCHA staff</li> <li>■ Strengthening HCTs and regional actors through IASC sub-regional scenarios in complex emergencies</li> <li>■ Supporting IASC-like structures in Central Asia: lessons learned</li> <li>■ Integrating pandemic preparedness into wider emergency preparedness</li> </ul>
THURSDAY – 27 MAY	
08:30 - 09:00	Reflections from Day 2
09:00 - 12:00	<b>Session 5 - Linking Humanitarian Action (Preparedness) with Development Actors/ Policy Frameworks</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Linking preparedness/humanitarian action with early recovery (post-disaster/post-conflict)</li> <li>■ Preparedness indicators as components of Risk Reduction Index</li> <li>■ Integrating DRR into CCA/UNDAF (Peer Support Group)</li> <li>■ On-going CADRI programmes linking preparedness and DRR</li> <li>■ Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium</li> </ul>
13:00 – 16:00	<b>Session 6 - Climate Change Adaptation &amp; Preparedness</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ IASC and climate change: update and perspectives</li> <li>■ Experiences from the IRI initiative: success stories, gaps and future improvement</li> <li>■ Adaptation funding landscape: how humanitarian actors can seize the opportunity</li> <li>■ Advancing climate-informed preparedness planning in East Africa</li> <li>■ The case of SARCOF and SADC preparedness workshop</li> <li>■ Reflections from Zimbabwe: OCHA, climate information and contingency planning</li> </ul>
16:00-16:30	Reflections from Day 3 Recommendations & Actions / Future Format of EP Forums Closing Remarks

EPF III CONTACT LIST				
Regional Offices	ROAP	GENGAJE, Rajan	<a href="mailto:gengaje@un.org">gengaje@un.org</a>	00-66-2288-2572
	ROLAC	BONNEL, Max	<a href="mailto:bonnel@un.org">bonnel@un.org</a>	00-507-317-1748
	ROMENACA	BUZURUKOV, Ali	<a href="mailto:buzurukov@un.org">buzurukov@un.org</a>	00-7-727-2528-643
	ROMENACA	HESSE, Fernando	<a href="mailto:hessef@un.org">hessef@un.org</a>	00-20-2-2751-5016/17
	ROSEA	BULTEN, Odile	<a href="mailto:bulten@un.org">bulten@un.org</a>	00-27-11-517-1595
	ROSEA	DUFOUR, Laurent	<a href="mailto:dufour@un.org">dufour@un.org</a>	00-254-20-762-1006
	ROSEA	MABASO, Elias	<a href="mailto:mabasoe@un.org">mabasoe@un.org</a>	00-27-11-517-1661
	ROWCA	LUDOVIC DE LYS, Hervé	<a href="mailto:delys1@un.org">delys1@un.org</a>	00-221-33-869-8500
	ROWCA	GONZALEZ, Manuela	<a href="mailto:gonzalez8@un.org">gonzalez8@un.org</a>	00-221-33-869-8532
Country Offices	Dominican Rep	ACOSTA, Martin	<a href="mailto:acostam@un.org">acostam@un.org</a>	00-809-537-0909 Ext 317
	Mexico	O'FARRILL, Juan Pablo	<a href="mailto:ofarrill@un.org">ofarrill@un.org</a>	00-51-1-55-346-67459
	Myanmar	TONDHLANA, Edmore	<a href="mailto:tondhlan@un.org">tondhlan@un.org</a>	00-95-1-544-500 Ext 811
	Nepal	CUE, Wendy	<a href="mailto:cue@un.org">cue@un.org</a>	00-977-1-554-8553 Ext 2012
	Philippines	PALACIO, Agnes	<a href="mailto:palacio@un.org">palacio@un.org</a>	00-632-845-4997
	Zimbabwe	NCUBE, Pios	<a href="mailto:ncube2@un.org">ncube2@un.org</a>	00-263-4-792-681/6/704866
Resource Persons	Haiti	VAVAL SURENA, Yolene	<a href="mailto:yvsurena@gmail.com">yvsurena@gmail.com</a>	00-509-3550-2999 (Cell)
	CADRI	BADJI, Hachim	<a href="mailto:badjih@un.org">badjih@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-8923
	CMCS	REARIO, Ronaldo	<a href="mailto:rearior@un.org">rearior@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1884
	DPSS	LINDE, Anne-Marie	<a href="mailto:lindea@un.org">lindea@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1604
	DVPS	KIRSCH-WOOD, Jenty	<a href="mailto:kirsch-wood@un.org">kirsch-wood@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1277
	EEU	TVEITE, Ingwill	<a href="mailto:tveite@un.org">tveite@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-5833
	EWCP (NY)	CARDEN, David	<a href="mailto:carden@un.org">carden@un.org</a>	00-1-212-963-5699
	FCSS	SCHMACHTEL, Christophe	<a href="mailto:schmachtel@un.org">schmachtel@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1694
	GCMS	MUNAVVAROV, Anvar	<a href="mailto:munavvarov@un.org">munavvarov@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1489
	HCSS	O'KEEFFE, Aoibheann	<a href="mailto:okeeffe@un.org">okeeffe@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-4329
	IASC secretariat	LAWRY-WHITE, Simon	<a href="mailto:lawrywhite@un.org">lawrywhite@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-3194
	ISDR secretariat	DOLCEMASCOLO, Glenn	<a href="mailto:dolcemascosolo@un.org">dolcemascosolo@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-8905
	PIC	MOSEL MANS, Michael	<a href="mailto:mosselmans@un.org">mosselmans@un.org</a>	00-41-22-910-2778
	SCS	FREIJSEN, Ivo	<a href="mailto:freijsen@un.org">freijsen@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1233
	SCS	HANDLEY, Paul	<a href="mailto:handleyp@un.org">handleyp@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1979
	UNDP	BESSUGES, Pierre	<a href="mailto:pierre.bessuges@undp.org">pierre.bessuges@undp.org</a>	00-41-22-917-8251
	UNICEF	SPIELBERG, Fred	<a href="mailto:fspielberg@unicef.org">fspielberg@unicef.org</a>	00-41-22-909-5627
	UNICEF	LE PECHOUX, Michel	<a href="mailto:mlepechoux@unicef.org">mlepechoux@unicef.org</a>	00-41-22-909-5610
	IFRC	MICHELSSEN, Jette	<a href="mailto:jette.michelsen@ifrc.org">jette.michelsen@ifrc.org</a>	00-41-22-730-4650
	WorldVision	GUIITON, Philippe	<a href="mailto:philippe_guiton@wvi.org">philippe_guiton@wvi.org</a>	00-41-22-798-4183
SDC (Switzerland)	VON DÄNIKEN, Beat	<a href="mailto:beat.vondaeniken@deza.admin.ch">beat.vondaeniken@deza.admin.ch</a>	00-41-31-322-3556	
MSB (Sweden)	HAGELSTEEN, Magnus	<a href="mailto:magnus.hagelsteen@msb.se">magnus.hagelsteen@msb.se</a>	00-46-70-383-5585 (Cell)	
EPS Support Team	Chief	SAKHAROV, Vladimir	<a href="mailto:sakharov@un.org">sakharov@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1142
	Deputy Chief	ZUPKA, Dusan	<a href="mailto:zupka@un.org">zupka@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1645
	EPF Focal Point	KONDO, Masayo	<a href="mailto:kondo@un.org">kondo@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1997
	CADRI Focal Point	TOLL, Katarina	<a href="mailto:tolik@un.org">tolik@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1107
	CCA Focal Point	BROOKE, Roy	<a href="mailto:brooker@un.org">brooker@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1661
	Africa Focal Point	WATT, Ousmane	<a href="mailto:watto@un.org">watto@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-2240
	ROMENACA	BENEDEK, Charlotta	<a href="mailto:benedek@un.org">benedek@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1205
	CADRI/CCA	MEIER, Michael	<a href="mailto:meierm@un.org">meierm@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1159
	Africa	MIKALA, Marcel	<a href="mailto:mikala@un.org">mikala@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1915
	CCA	SANTANEN, Anton	<a href="mailto:santanen@un.org">santanen@un.org</a>	00-41-22-917-1817

**Annex I**  
**Follow-Up on EPF II Recommendations**  
**(May 2009)**

#	Topic	Action	Follow-Up Status
1	<b>UNDAC DRP Missions:</b> Participation in future missions is expanded as standard practice to relevant partners as associated members, such as disaster response managers with in-country experience, colleagues from the Red Cross movement, especially IFRC legal experts.	FCSS/ROs	Most elements described here (except 6) have been incorporated into a new initiative to expand and build on the existing UNDAC DRP missions approach to the assessment process of response capacity for governments.
2	Pre-mission studies be systematically conducted to identify priority areas for the DRP mission to focus on (i.e. to be included in UNDAC Handbook Chapter I).	ROs/FOS	A pilot project entitled SPP (Strategic Partnership for Preparedness) was initiated in 2010 to build a process to engage stakeholders at global, regional and national level that will start in due time before the assessment mission and conclude at a suitable juncture in line with the recommendations to ensure thorough follow-up/engagement of stakeholders and partners. The 1 <sup>st</sup> Regional Stakeholder Workshop was held in Senegal for Western Africa region in April 2010. Subsequently, a National Stakeholder Workshop is planned for July in a pilot country (Ghana, Burkina Faso or Mali). A capacity assessment mission is also planned for September. Buy-in and long-term engagement of partners will be ensured by all stakeholders, including OCHA ROWCA.
3	Buy-in, ownership and capacity of IASC-CTs and national authorities are key for effective follow-up of UNDAC recommendations. The UNDAC system should define criteria for assessing these in advance of the mission.	FCSS	
4	Country selection process should target soliciting requests from priority nations.	ROs	
5	Upon completion of the mission, debriefing of Regional Director Teams/ Regional IASC Members, Permanent Missions and Donors is recommended.	FCSS/UNDAC DRP Team/ ROs/EPs	
6	Lessons learned exercise among UNDAC DRP mission members be organised at the global level in order to standardise methodology and tools.	ROs/FCSS/ EPs/UNDAC members	To be considered in the future.
7	<b>Comprehensive Training Package:</b> EPS to brief Training Providers Forum (TPF) on outcome of the discussions (especially mapping of training initiatives). Participants recommend that a learning roadmap be defined, including identifying responsible party to follow-up and to manage a common space on <a href="http://ochanet.unocha.org">ochanet.unocha.org</a> for uploading and sharing of training/reference material.	EPS/TPF	OCHA's Training Matrix was elaborated in October 2009 and uploaded on OCHANet, Training Provider's Site (OCHA-TF-TPTeam Site) for further discussion amongst the Group.  EO also produced an OCHA Training Matrix in June 2009.

#	Topic	Action	Follow-Up Status
8	<p><b>Preparedness Practices &amp; OCHA Role:</b> Participants expressed overall support/agreement with the recommendations as they are set out in the discussion paper for SMT on OCHA's Role in Preparedness. It was suggested to add concrete examples on what is being done in OCHA at various levels.</p>	Participants to share comments by 22 May 2009 (Received)	<p>During the period August '09 to March '10, intensive discussions and face-to-face meetings with field and HQ colleagues took place to develop an OCHA Policy Instruction on OCHA's Role in Preparedness. The PI was approved by USG on 20 August 2010.</p> <p>Regional modalities for surge: SCS has further integrated overall surge planning &amp; management with ROs in new emergencies, as was illustrated in the response to the Haiti crisis, where the regularly updated GANTT charts kept track of which staff (in which profiles) were being deployed; enabling good in-country handovers. Work to develop the Associates Surge Pool has progressed since the last EPF, with the approval of the ASG. The launch expected in early June will include invitations for the nomination of prospective members by ROs (experts with language skills/experience relevant to their regions).</p> <p>- See 17 below - Government Guide - OCHA Training Matrix elaborated</p>
9	<p>Additional recommendations to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ explore modalities for creating regional surge capacity (preparedness &amp; response);</li> <li>▪ make immediate allocation of emergency funds while awaiting completion of formal CERF application;</li> <li>▪ develop standard handbook on preparedness and response (update last version); and</li> <li>▪ global level should focus on best practices/training packages from regions.</li> </ul>		
10	<p><b>Simulation Exercises:</b> ROWA Facilitators' Guide available on <a href="http://ochaonline.un.org">http://ochaonline.un.org</a> should be studied by other offices for comments and feedback.</p>	Feedback to EPS by 30 June	OCHA ROWCA requested ESB (EPS) & CRD (EWCPS) to share the simulation toolkit globally and encourage RCs & OCHA offices to use it. EPS has sent a message to all OCHA offices introducing the package. EWCPS shared the simulation kit with IASC SWG on Preparedness & CP for comments.
11	<p>More effort should be devoted to the organisation/facilitation of simulation exercises as well as to the sharing of experiences among offices.</p>	ROs/FOs ESB	<p>Most of IASC SWG did not need to share it globally with RCs as many countries are using it already. The tool is available online at the ROWCA website.</p>
12	<p><b>DRP Toolkit:</b> Toolkit should serve as an on-line library on preparedness with IASC partners as the main audience. It is suggested that the tool be adapted to this group and that more effort be put into its dissemination.</p>	EPS	<p>ReliefWeb may be able to house this tool on their new platform. However, the modalities of who will maintain this still needs to be ironed out.</p>

#	Topic	Action	Follow-Up Status	
13	<p><b>Climate Change:</b> A guide on the role of OCHA be produced in order to identify appropriate resources. The handbook should particularly focus on the need to develop partnerships and define boundaries.</p>	PDSB/DVPS	<p>Drafted guidance on accessing adaptation funding for preparedness activities. Additional activities are envisaged to deepen OCHA and partners' understanding of new adaptation funding sources.</p> <p>Initial discussions, including consultations with ROs, ongoing on the role of OCHA in the adaptation landscape, including how to respond to IASC Principals request for agencies to come forward with funding proposals. An SMT discussion and corporate decision on possible OCHA roles may be proposed.</p> <p>Work is at an initial conceptualization stage for a toolkit to assist OCHA ROs/COs to better integrate CC in disaster preparedness activities.</p> <p>DRR and preparedness activities are increasingly integrated in the adaptation context, most visibly exemplified by the central ref thereof as constituting a crucial part of adaptation action in the Copenhagen Accord, and the increased acknowledgement of the importance of DRR and preparedness by Member States in the climate negotiations.</p>	
14	<p>Suggest DVPS look into modalities and provide advice on the use of the climate change adaptation fund for preparedness.</p>			
15	<p>OCHA frame its risk reduction and preparedness activities within the global context of climate change adaptation.</p>			
16	<p><b>Protection:</b> OCHA should promote inclusion of protection issues in preparedness planning processes for natural disasters and advocate for better implementation of the IASC Operational Guidelines on Human Rights &amp; Natural Disasters.</p>	ROs/FOs with DPSS support	<p>Input provided into revision of Policy Instruction on OCHA Role in Preparedness to ensure inclusion of rights-based approach.</p> <p>Mainstreaming of protection and displacement issues into contingency planning included in PCWG 2010 Work Plan.</p>	
17	<p><b>Government Guide:</b> should be developed from existing material and initiatives. The Guide should focus on what Governments can expect when there is a need for international assistance. Areas to be covered include coordination mechanisms; resource mobilisation and financial tracking; standards &amp; humanitarian principles; assessments; who's who and who does what; IM products; information on donors and principles of GHD; EW&amp;CP; thematic issues such as environmental emergencies, gender, civil-military coordination; legal instruments and institutional frameworks. The guide created by ROMENACA could serve as a basis for the development of this instruction. Next WebEx in June will discuss modalities of development.</p>	ROLAC/ ROMENACA/ ROAP with support from EPS	<p><b>(ROMENACA)</b> - Completed the Guide for governments who would act as responders (not as recipients). OCFA (the UAE Office for Coordination of Foreign Assistance) agreed to print them in Arabic and English.</p> <p><b>(ROLAC)</b> - A first draft of the Government Guide was produced. REDLAC decided to dedicate some time and resources (Inter-Agency WG) in the next two weeks to review and finalize it before the III Regional Humanitarian Conference in Buenos Aires (mid-June 2010).</p>	

#	Topic	Action	Follow-Up Status
18	<b>Regional Organisations:</b> should continue promoting multilateral collaboration with regional orgs in disaster preparedness and response. It was further suggested that current working modalities by ROs with respective regional organisations be mapped and analysed.	EPS with RO support	See Actionable Outcomes from EPF III Session 2.
19	<b>Disaster Preparedness Survey:</b> The on-going pilot be suspended until further analysis is completed on audience, use, follow-up mechanisms, how to respond to expectations and link to other tools.	EPS in consultation with ROs/FOs	ISDR produced HFA progress reports that assess national strategic priorities in the implementation of DRR actions and establishes baselines on levels of progress achieved in implementing the HFA five priorities for action. The analysis includes the HFA Priority 5, preparedness for effective response: <a href="http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/priority5/?pid:222">www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/priority5/?pid:222</a>
20	<b>Coordination Structures:</b> Recommend a Guidance Note is developed on how to support Country Teams with only a RC (development-oriented) office and no OCHA presence.	HCSS	The issue of support to RCs was tabled by OCHA at the April 2010 IASC WG (OCHA Heads of ROs were asked for inputs in this respect). The WG "Requested the HC Group to develop concrete proposals for improving support to RC/HCs & RCs in disaster-prone countries, taking into account the WG discussion, by the Nov 2010 WG". OCHA will spearhead the development of such proposals, in consultation with OCHA Heads of ROs and other relevant OCHA colleagues. Overall, it is felt that RCs/UNCTs don't need further guidance, but rather greater support.
21	It was recognised that the expanded UNETT coordination model for preparedness is considered as good practice, especially in countries with limited or no OCHA presence.		
22	<b>Surge Capacity:</b> Professional diversification of ERR and SBPP be improved (i.e. public information, civil-military coordination, administration, legal expertise, language skills), that requesting modalities be further harmonised, and that improvements be made in the provision of an integrated and 'client-friendly' overview of surge deployment options. It was recognised that surge availability is still weak during the second part of the surge phase (i.e. approximately between week 6 and month four), and that a new surge modality to meet these needs should be further explored, in conjunction with further improvements to AO's Roster Programme.	SCS	Diversification of ERR & SBPP has continued and allowed for regular successful deployments of IMOs, CMCOs, PIOs, Admin Officers, ICT Officers & generalist HAOs (P2/P5). Work continues - including with specialised HQ sections - to strengthen OCHA/partner capacities in these domains, with the availability of high-level Admin surge remaining the greatest area of concern. The SMT approved the creation of 2 new surge mechanisms to bridge the gap between first-wave surge and the arrival of regular staff. Recruitment for 2 Roaming Emergency Surge Officers (RESOs) is underway and calls for expressions of interest to join the Associates Surge Pool will be launched in early June. SCS has been a driving force behind new regular staff planning telecons with CRD & AO - to seek to improve seamless transitions in new crisis contexts. The past year has also seen an increasing role for SCS in coordinating and sourcing alternative interim staffing solutions for critical positions, including I-A loan (UNHCR).
23	<b>Legal Preparedness:</b> OCHA & IFRC consider formalising collaboration arrangements on legal preparedness and IDRL.	DVPS with EPS	No follow-up so far.

## Annex II

### EPF III Evaluation Feedback\*

#### Good Practices to be Retained:

##### Organisation:

- knowledge exchange – good opportunity to learn from others’ experiences
- panel presentation
- good facilitators and discussion topics
- participation of partners and governments (especially Haiti) to share experiences
- very nice venue/location - good food, service, logistics, accommodation and internet connection, good prior information on the venue

##### Participants/Representation:

- sizable number of OCHA participants and wide representation from the field
- good mix of people with good field experiences to share
- participation of govt reps helps gain better understanding of OCHA mechanisms
- IASC colleagues and donors should continue to be invited
- country/regional presentations allow us to keep abreast of what goes on in other parts of the world – encourage regions to talk/exchange more outside of the Forum

#### Lessons Learned and/or Suggestions for Improvement:

##### Organisation:

- apply ‘1/3 - 2/3’ rule: 1/3 for presentations & 2/3 for brainstorming/plenary discussions
- group discussions should find solutions, not just reiterate problems already acknowledged
- consider fewer presentations/sessions as time management is always a challenge
- more time to discuss achievements/challenges to meeting targets of agreed recommendations
- PowerPoint presentations should be limited to 5 slides (10 minutes)
- share presentations in advance in order to digest the content more thoroughly
- allow more time for topics of relevance – either reduce topics or extend Forum
- avoid acronyms as they cause difficulties for non-UN participants
- dedicate more time to improving emergency preparedness tools and practices
- the themes were all useful, but it is difficult to extract ‘solutions to problems’ from the group discussions. Next time we could set up working groups in advance for each topic so that group discussions produce more tangible results
- too little time for discussions: could have 1-2 sessions on ‘what did not work’
- be more specific on session output
- some group discussions became repetitive - more attention should have been given to the draft Policy instruction

##### Participants/Representation:

- ensure all ROs/COs send a representative, invite high-level OCHA management and encourage more CRD staff to participate
- invite donors and government representatives to next EPF to facilitate funding for preparedness
- invite actors such as UNHCR, WFP, EU Civil Protection next time

*\*Evaluation Feedback from 14 Participants.*



## Annex III

### Questionnaire - Future Format of the Emergency Preparedness Forum

<b>1. Future Direction of the EPF</b>	YES	NO
<i>Assuming the EPF is maintained, would changes to the current objectives/purpose of the Forum be necessary (i.e. exchange of good practices, networking, innovative approaches in preparedness)?</i>	9	11
<p>Suggestions for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reducing the number of sessions/speakers on a few chosen topics would allow for more in-depth discussions that would generate a “final” product.</li> <li>▪ Not only the sharing of initiative approaches in preparedness, but more on sharing on activities and programmes that have been implemented to include setbacks.</li> <li>▪ Serve as a platform to innovate approaches in preparedness.</li> <li>▪ If the PI on Preparedness is approved, sessions could be based on its implementation: resources, staffing etc.</li> </ul>		
<b>2. Contents &amp; Purpose of the EPF</b>	YES	NO
<i>Would EPF need a strengthened emphasis on soliciting &amp; providing inputs to HQ processes?</i>	13	4
<i>Would you prefer a specific overall theme, (e.g. 2010's 'Capacity Assessment &amp; Development') as opposed to a more general/'all-around' focus on various elements of preparedness?</i>	13	6
<p>Possible suggestions for an overall theme in 2011:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Policy/guidelines implementation and evaluation. Capacity assessment and development translated into policy/policies.</li> <li>▪ Capacity assessment for preparedness is still a valid topic – how to do it and with what tools? So far, the focus has not entirely been on capacity assessment and development for preparedness.</li> </ul>		
<i>Should shared 'good practices &amp; lessons learned' be translated into tangible products/ outcomes?</i>	22	2
<p>Suggestions on future content of the EPF (format of sessions, specific issues, etc.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tangible products &amp; outcomes should be prioritised to highlight what needs immediate implementation &amp; feedback.</li> <li>▪ Universalise individual experiences.</li> </ul>		
<b>3. EPF Actionable Outcomes (Recommendations)</b>	YES	NO
<i>Should EPF outcomes increasingly influence field activities?</i>	18	2
<i>Should EPF identify new field-based preparedness initiatives to focus on between EPFs?</i>	19	3
<i>Should actionable outcomes mostly pertain to HQ-led follow-up actions?</i>	6	12
<p>How would you recommend improving the type and quality of actionable outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EPF should remain as a platform for information exchange among ROs/COs. Field activities will be driven by needs. Perhaps EPF can do a global survey of the greatest and most common preparedness needs and look at how these issues could be approached coherently. HQ needs to focus on how and what kind of support it could offer ROs/COs.</li> <li>▪ By having groups working in between EPF by using web conferencing, ad hoc forums, OCHAnet etc.</li> <li>▪ Think before next EPF what exactly you wish to achieve. Perhaps 3 main objectives could be identified. If approved these could be taken from the PI on Preparedness.</li> </ul>		
<b>4. Venue of Next EPF</b>		
<p>Possible hosts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ West Africa – to be held back-to-back (ahead/after) the annual regional preparedness w/shop for govt DM agencies.</li> <li>▪ MSB - has also indicated a possible interest in hosting this event subject to formal discussions at MSB HQ.</li> <li>▪ Should be combined with another activity in the region.</li> </ul>		
<b>5. Future EPF Participants &amp; Audience</b>	YES	NO
<i>Did the expanded audience in EPF III (Member States, IASC partners, Heads of ROs/COs) significantly add value?</i>	18	1
<p><i>What would be their added value?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EU civil protection and other regional or sub-regional organisations would be valuable participants and would ensure that we do not work “in isolation”.</li> <li>▪ It has added value in learning the different perspectives of other IASC members.</li> <li>▪ It is an opportunity to gain insights from donors on what programmes they are most likely to fund and obtain information on how OCHA programmes will sustain funding against other competing actors.</li> <li>▪ Inviting donors affords us the chance to show them how we are moving ahead in some topics that may be interest to them. They can bring in their perspectives and contribute to discussion on how to move forward on specific topics.</li> </ul>		

*The information above has been extracted to give a synopsis of the 22 questionnaires received.*



## Annex IV DISCUSSION NOTES

### Session 1 – Respective Roles in the Preparedness Landscape

Facilitator: Dusan Zupka (EPS)  
Panelists: EPS, ROAP, UNICEF, WV, CADRI  
Note: Anton Santanen (EPS)  
Strategic Framework: Objective 1.3

In this Session, the respective roles of OCHA, IASC Sub-Working Group (SWG) on Preparedness and Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) in on-going preparedness actions will be discussed. After the panelists' presentation, participants will be able to focus different actors' points of view to reach common ground in relation to respective role in preparedness.

#### 1. Identification of Issues

- **Policy Instruction on OCHA's Role in Preparedness and OCHA Guidelines** - This session will present a brief overview of the draft Policy Instruction and OCHA Guidelines as the next level of OCHA guidance documents.
- **IASC Role in Capacity Development for Governments (IASC July WG Theme) & IASC Emergency Preparedness Framework Project/Mapping of IASC Preparedness Work** - This session will introduce on-going efforts made by the IASC SWG on Preparedness in view of the July meeting of the IASC Working Group, and makes a case for strong agency inputs to this process.
- **CADRI Approach to Capacity Assessment & Development for DRR** - This session will introduce CADRI basic criteria for initiating a capacity development programme, and practical steps for implementing such a capacity development programme.

#### 2. Discussion Points

Group Discussion - Select Facilitator/Rapporteur for each group. Topic: Elements for OCHA Guideline for Preparedness Actions vis-à-vis Partners.

#### 3. Background & Other Necessary Information

- OCHA Policy Instruction on OCHA Role in Preparedness (draft)
- OCHA SOP on Guidance, PDSB

#### 4. Actionable Outcome (Recommendation, Next Steps, Action Points)

Development of OCHA Guideline for Preparedness Actions at national, regional and global levels by mid-2011.

## Session 2 – Capacity Assessment & Development: Role of OCHA Regional/Country Offices vis-à-vis Regional Organizations and Governments

Facilitator:	Edmore Tondhlana (Myanmar)
Panelists:	EPS, ROWCA, DPPS, Zimbabwe
Note:	Charlotta Benedek (EPS)
Strategic Framework:	Objective 1.2

In this Session, the role of OCHA Regional and Country Offices toward Governments and Regional Organizations in capacity assessment and development will be introduced, with a focus on regional organizations. Participants will be able to further discuss good practices in collaboration with other regional organizations and governments.

### 1. Identification of Issues

- **Strategic Partnership for Preparedness (SPP: UNDAC DRP Mission ‘Plus’)** - This presentation will present SPP, an on-going pilot project in West Africa and explains the key role played by the Regional Office and regional stakeholders. The linkage with UNDAC DRP missions will also be covered.
- **Role of RO/CO in Capacity Assessment & Development vis-à-vis Regional Organizations (ECOWAS, ASEAN, AU-Kampala Convention)** - The following examples will showcase OCHA role in supporting regional organizations’ efforts in supporting an affected state:

**ECOWAS:** Annual preparedness workshop in Cape Verde.

**ASEAN:** ASEAN Humanitarian Task Force/AHTF – and future work with ASEAN Secretariat and in the context of AADMER work plan launched in May 2010, with Myanmar’s specific role; progress on draft MoU between OCHA and ASEAN.

**AU:** African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention) and how OCHA can support AU/governments in the implementation of the Convention?

- **Role of RO/CO in Capacity Assessment & Development vis-à-vis Govts (Zimbabwe)** - This session presents experiences on how capacity development can be challenging when working with a government that is on denial in terms of DRM issues, and will show how the CO-Zimbabwe worked with ROSEA to address the challenge.

### 2. Discussion Points

Group Discussion - Select Facilitator/Rapporteur for each group. Topic: Good Practices & Lessons Learned in Collaboration with Regional Organizations & Governments.

### 3. Background & Other Necessary Information

- SPP Process & Methodology Paper and SPP One Pager; and
- OCHA draft Summary Note: “AU Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa”, December 2009.

### 4. Actionable Outcome (Recommendation, Next Steps, Action Points)

Role of specific regional organizations (ECOWAS, ASEAN, AU, etc.) presented in OCHAnet (EP Forum Corner/EPS), OCHA booklets or included in the [OCHA Guideline for Preparedness Actions](#).

## Session 3 - Strengthening Government Response Capacity: Role of the Regional Offices & OCHA in Haiti and Beyond

Facilitator:	Max Bonnel (ROLAC)
Panelists:	Haiti/DCP, UNICEF, CMCS, EWCPs, DPSS
Note:	Michael Meier (EPS)
Strategic Framework:	Objective 1.2 & 2.3

In this Session, the Government of Haiti will present its perspective on effective preparedness for response pre- and post- earthquake of 12 January 2010. The role of OCHA ROLAC and how their experiences can be reflected in other regions will be discussed alongside next steps in supporting Haiti on the eve of annual rainy and hurricane season and other disasters in the near future, using the recommendations made by the IASC CP Support mission in March 2010.

Participants can also discuss other experiences in responding to disasters and agree on adapted tools and packages in response to 'corporate' emergencies like the Haiti earthquake. DPSS will introduce the experience with the protection cluster in Haiti, drawing global lessons for the cluster leadership.

### 1. Identification of Issues

- **Experience from Haiti Earthquake of 12 January 2010 and the Disaster Risk Management System's Perspective & Requirements for the Next Hurricane Season and Other Disasters** - This presentation will outline the Government's perspective and requirements for the next hurricane season.
- **Role of the Regional Office in Haiti Earthquake Response: Inter-Cluster Coordination, IM (Needs Assessment), USAR** - This presentation will discuss experiences and lessons learned from ROLAC Haiti response that can be incorporated by other Regional Offices in 'corporate' emergencies.
- **Recommendations of the IASC Contingency Planning Support Mission** - The added value and outcomes of recent IASC CP Support mission will be discussed: UNICEF (Michel, Fred)/ROLAC (Max)/EWCPs (David).
- **Protection Cluster Leadership in Disaster Response** - How protection cluster benefited from the SOPs developed by the global protection cluster, how OCHA can promote and support the implementation of SOPs and ensure that protection concerns are integrated into contingency planning.

### 2. Discussion Points

Group Discussion - Select Facilitator/Rapporteur for each group. Topic: Possible Applications/Tools (e.g. updating CP, SimEx, MPA, etc.) as preparedness measures for 'Corporate' Emergencies in each region, taking into account recent ROLAC and other experiences.

### 3. Background & Other Necessary Information

- IASC CP Support Mission Report, March 2010; and
- SOPs on Designating a Protection Sector/Cluster Lead Agency in the Event of a Natural Disaster at Country Level.

### 4. Actionable Outcome (Recommendation, Next Steps, Action Points)

Adapted minimum preparedness tools/packages (e.g. CP for floods, Simulation exercises, MPA) for ROs to support governments in case of a 'corporate' emergency, agreed and included in OCHA Guideline for Preparedness Actions.

## Session 4 – Role of Regional Offices in Strengthening Response Capacity of OCHA & RC/HC/HCT

Facilitator:	Ivo Freijsen (SCS)
Panelists:	ROMENACA, ROWCA, ROAP, SRO-EA, SRO-CA
Note:	Michael Meier (EPS)
Strategic Framework:	Objective 3.3 & 2.1

In this Session, the role of OCHA Regional/Country Offices in strengthening response capacity internal and RC/HC/HCT in terms of response capacity strengthening will be discussed. Unique in-house training sessions and other initiatives will be presented by ROs alongside experiences in strengthening country-level and sub-regional coordination structures.

Participants will be able to further discuss good practices in capacity strengthening for OCHA staff and HCT in the break-out session.

### 1. Identification of Issues

- **Cairo Regional Workshop Recommendations to Strengthen Regional Capacity** - The Presentation will highlight how to strengthen regional response capacity through regional RC/HC meetings, surge capacity and ERF.
- **Role of Regional Offices in Capacity Development for OCHA Staff** - The presentation will outline current internal capacity development practices by ROWCA as well as ROAP in-house training provision.
- **Strengthening HCTs & Regional Actors through IASC Sub-Regional Scenarios in Complex Emergencies** - The presentation will highlight the case of Sudan+4 IASC sub-regional scenario building meeting, and gives an example of how to engage with HCTs and HCs to reinforce regional preparedness for and tackle cross-border impacts of complex emergencies.
- **Supporting IASC-like Structures in Central Asia: Lessons Learned** - The presentation will show how SRO-CA engaged with coordination structures in countries with no OCHA presence, debates the key components and main principles on which such structures should be based, and highlights associated risks and advantages.
- **Integrating Pandemic Preparedness into Wider Emergency Preparedness** - PIC perspective and future collaboration.

### 2. Discussion Points

Group Discussion - Select Facilitator/Rapporteur for each group. Topic: Elements for tangible activities of RO/CO in strengthening response capacity of OCHA and RC/HC/HCT.

### 3. Background & Other Necessary Information

- Cairo Regional Workshop Report, ROMENACA, February 2010.

### 4. Actionable Outcome (Recommendation, Next Steps, Action Points)

Role of RO in strengthening response capacity of OCHA and RC/HC/HCT defined in [OCHA Guidelines for Preparedness Actions](#).

## Session 5 – Linking Humanitarian Action (Preparedness) with Development Actors/Policy Frameworks

Facilitator: Rajan Gengaje (ROAP) & Masayo Kondo (EPS)  
Panelists: EPS, UNDP/BCPR, ROAP, CADRI, Nepal  
Note: Ingvill Tveite (EPS/EEU)  
Strategic Framework: Objective 3.3 & 2.1

This Session will focus on the role of OCHA and UNDP in current practices in terms of linking humanitarian action/preparedness with early recovery and beyond. Early recovery activities were named differently, for example in Pakistan it was 'community restoration' and in Uganda 'governance, infrastructure and livelihood'. Tools to link humanitarian and development aspects will be presented through Risk Reduction Index and mainstreaming DRR into CCA/UNDAF.

Participants will be able to further compare wider policy framework of CCA/UNDAF and other structures such as the Risk Reduction Consortium in Nepal (OCHA, UNDP, ISDR, World Bank and Asian Development Bank).

### 1. Identification of Issues

- **Linking Preparedness/Humanitarian Action with Early Recovery (Post-Disaster/Post-Conflict)** - UNDP/BCPR will present the concept and mechanisms of early recovery in the aftermath of disasters and conflicts (including Early Recovery Advisors supporting RC/HC) and the role of in-country partners in transition.
- **Risk Reduction Index** - EPS will introduce the issue of preparedness indicators in the context of Risk Reduction Index by highlighting the importance of RRI as a priority-setting and decision-making tool, while acknowledging the relative weakness of preparedness therein.
- **Integrating DRR into CCA/UNDAF (Peer Support Group)** - ROAP will outline the integration DRR into CCA/UNDAF by elaborating on the methodology and mechanics of supporting and feeding into country-level activities, including UNDG and UNDOCO plans for UNDAF roll-out in 2010, setting up and functioning of Peer Support Group, in-country UNDAF environment and the mechanics of integrating DRR into CCA/UNDAF, with examples.
- **On-going CADRI Programmes Linking Preparedness & DRR** - CADRI will present examples of its programmatic approach in linking preparedness and DRR.
- **Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium** – OCHA-Nepal will outline the Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium initiative and its impact.

### 2. Discussion Points

Group Discussion - Select Facilitator/Rapporteur for each group. Topic: Current practices in collaboration with UNDP and other development actors - strengths & weaknesses and opportunities & gaps.

### 3. Background & Other Necessary Information

- IADB Risk Reduction Index and (Disaster Management Index); and
- Integrating DRR into the CCA/UNDAF, UNDG, 2009.

### 4. Actionable Outcome (Recommendation, Next Steps, Action Points)

Actions/Role for OCHA in CCA/UNDAF, linkage to early recovery and DRR defined with further discussions with UNDP by 31 December 2010.

## Session 6 – Climate Change Adaptation & Preparedness

Facilitator:	Roy Brooke (EPS)
Panelists:	DVPS, ROSEA/SRO-EA, ROSEA, CO Zimbabwe, EPS, IASC TF on CC.
Note:	Karolyn Heneghan (EPS)
Strategic Framework:	Objective 2.3

This session will discuss recent experiences (best practices, gaps, needs for improvement) in using climate information to enhance preparedness efforts and proposes next steps to strengthen OCHA climate risk management and adaptation funding activities.

### 1. Identification of Issues

- **IASC and climate change: update and perspectives** - How global climate change negotiations affect regional and national level action.
- **Adaptation funding landscape: how humanitarian actors can seize the opportunity** - How new adaptation funding sources could ensure funding for preparedness, and how humanitarian actors should approach these.
- **Experiences from the IRI Initiative: Success Stories, Gaps & Needs for Future Improvement** - Experiences in strengthening disaster risk management with improved technical CC information in the recent IRI humanitarian climate risk management workshops.
- **Tackling Climate Risks in East Africa** - How El Niño preparedness planning was conducted in 2009-2010. How OCHA and the Regional Inter-Agency Working Group for Preparedness are strengthening climate-informed preparedness in the aftermath of the IRI humanitarian climate risk management workshop.
- **The Case of Southern Africa Regional Climate Outlook Forum (SARCOF) & SADC Preparedness Workshop** - How climate information providers and end-users interact to enhance climate risk preparedness in Southern Africa.
- **Reflections from Zimbabwe: OCHA, climate information and contingency planning** - How OCHA facilitation and involvement in the national planning activities helped influence climate-informed contingency planning in a challenging operating environment.

### 2. Discussion Points

The availability of climate information is increasing in quantity, quality and accuracy, but does this improve preparedness activities? How is this information currently being used and does it correspond with humanitarian needs? What are the gaps and challenges, and how could these be overcome? How can we make the best use of climate information in preparedness activities? Significant amount of climate change adaptation funding are becoming available and could help overcome the traditional lack of preparedness funding – is this indeed the case or are there still some field realities that hinder the achievement thereof? How should OCHA position to ensure funding for preparedness? What needs to be done at HQ and field level?

### 3. Background & Other Necessary Information

- IRI Humanitarian Climate Risk Management Workshop report (summary & full minutes);
- IRI El Niño Mapping Workshop report; and
- Potential new CCA funding sources for disaster preparedness activities.

### 4. Actionable Outcome (Recommendation, Next Steps, Action Points)

- Development of a toolkit for climate information and preparedness planning; and
- Development of a new version of the adaptation funding guidance document.

## **GROUP PHOTOS**

(to be included in published document)