



**Humanitarian/DRR Integration Consultancy**  
*Inception Report*

October 18, 2019

Prepared by: Jessica Alexander

## Contents

<b>I. Introduction</b> .....	3
1.1 Background .....	3
1.2 Humanitarian Development Nexus (HDN).....	3
1.3 Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction within the Humanitarian Development Nexus.....	5
<b>II. Purpose of consultancy</b> .....	7
2.1 Specific Objectives .....	7
2.2 Audience .....	7
2.3 Scope of work.....	7
<b>III. Specific Deliverables and Methods</b> .....	7
3.1 Background Paper .....	7
3.2 Regional Workshop.....	9
3.3 Global Validation Workshop .....	9
3.4 Final Guidance Note and Dissemination Strategy .....	10
<b>IV. Timeline</b> .....	10

## I. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) is the designated focal point in the United Nations system for coordinating efforts to reduce disasters and ensure synergies among disaster reduction activities of the United Nations and regional organizations in both developed and less developed countries. It provides policy and normative expertise and plays a convening role to integrate disaster risk reduction into humanitarian action, to address root causes of humanitarian crises and to reduce humanitarian needs. This includes engagement in strategic partnerships on displacement, risk financing and social protection, as well as overarching advocacy and knowledge management across the humanitarian/development nexus. Through its guiding role in Sendai Framework implementation, UNDRR also contributes to enhanced risk and vulnerability information for better humanitarian planning and response.

As part of its commitment to integrate DRR across the UN system and strengthen coherence between the humanitarian and development communities, UNDRR has engaged a consultant to provide strategic and technical expertise on the integration of DRR in humanitarian planning and programming, at a global and regional policy level.

### 1.2 Humanitarian Development Nexus (HDN)

In many crisis settings, emergency responses have been seen to be in a holding pattern, responding year-on-year to the same needs without promoting lasting positive change in people's lives. As these protracted and cyclical crises persist<sup>1</sup> and further strain limited resources, the divides which have long existed between humanitarian and development intervention – in terms of assessment, planning, coordination, financing and implementation – have been made more apparent, and the need to tackle them even more urgent. Poverty is predicted to increasingly be concentrated in contexts of fragility, environmental insecurity and protracted crises, further reinforcing the case for a joined-up approach to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building.<sup>2</sup>

Consultations leading up to the World Humanitarian Summit,<sup>3</sup> the UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Financing,<sup>4</sup> and the Secretary General's Report "One Humanity: Shared Responsibility" called for shift from delivering aid to ending need. They acknowledged that short-term results which do not address underlying vulnerabilities are insufficient to lay the foundation for sustainable development. These commitments promote new ways of working that strengthen the linkage between humanitarian and development aid, prioritizing the needs and vulnerabilities of those who have been left furthest behind by development progress.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, *The Secretary-General's Report for the World Humanitarian Summit, 2016; Review by the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, 2015.*

<sup>2</sup> [Global Humanitarian Assistance Report, 2019](#)

<sup>3</sup> *Restoring humanity, global voices calling for action: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit.* September 2015.

<sup>4</sup> *High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing Report to the Secretary-General: Too important to fail - addressing the humanitarian financing gap.* January 2016.

Recognizing that neither humanitarian nor development interventions alone will address the range of needs facing people in these fragile settings, greater coherence and alignment between these sectors is required. Identifying a 'nexus' in which humanitarian and development planning and delivery<sup>5</sup> is aligned has garnered significant momentum, backed by policy shifts and institutional reform processes including the New Way of Working and the Grand Bargain. At the country and regional levels, UN agencies, NGOs, and donors have also operationalized these new approaches, through Multi-year humanitarian planning and the development of collective outcomes.<sup>6</sup>

Multi-year humanitarian planning is a recognition of the need to address protracted and recurrent crises differently. The preparation of an MYP can result in identifying collective outcomes --- measurable results that humanitarian and development (and sometimes peace-building) actors commit to working together to reduce needs, risks and vulnerabilities and increase resilience within a period of 3-5 years.<sup>7</sup> As advised by OCHA, collective outcomes must focus on reducing need, risk and vulnerability of targeted populations (not just meeting needs) and change the status quo.<sup>8</sup>

A number of missions have been deployed within the UN system to support Resident / Humanitarian Coordinators and UNCT/HCTs to plan and program in a manner that brings together humanitarian and development actors and their respective tools to achieve measurable progress.<sup>9</sup> Although progress has been made with regards to joint planning,<sup>10</sup> a number of challenges have already been identified. Among these has been a recognition that development assistance has remained inadequate to address chronic or structural factors or reducing needs, risks and vulnerabilities, nor has it increased the capacities and coping mechanisms of the most vulnerable people.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> For some, the nexus is a "triple nexus" in which planning and delivery should align humanitarian and development programming as well as peacebuilding. Most agree that early investment in institutions and social services reinforces and contributes to "sustaining peace." (See, for example, Security Council Resolution 2282 (2016) on post-conflict peacebuilding; Mahmoud and Súilleabháin, *With New Resolutions, Sustaining Peace Sits at Heart of UN Architecture*. IPI, April 2016.) However, some, particularly in the humanitarian community, are wary of encouraging humanitarians to be aligned with peacebuilding, which is inherently political in nature and may reinforce existing patterns of exclusion, undermining the guiding principle of needs-based delivery. While the debate continues at a policy level, in practical terms, each context is likely to interpret this nexus somewhat differently in light of factors such as the role of government, the inclusivity of national plans, and the extent to which independent humanitarian action is still respected and upheld.

<sup>6</sup> For a mapping illustrating the range of related initiatives within the UN system, see: [https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/humanitarian-development\\_nexus\\_mapping\\_2017.pdf](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/humanitarian-development_nexus_mapping_2017.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> [Evaluation of Multi Year Planning, OCHA 2017.](#)

<sup>8</sup> [Collective Outcomes, Operationalizing the New Way of Working](#). OCHA, April 2018.

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, background documents from the IASC TT on Humanitarian-Development Nexus (<https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/iasc-task-team-strengthening-humanitariananddevelopment-nexus-focus-protracted-contexts/documents>); workshop reports from OCHA-UNDP *West and Central Africa Regional Policy Dialogue, The New Way of Working*. January 2017; and OCHA-UNDP *WHS High-level Anniversary event: Advancing the New Way of Working*, May 2017.

<sup>10</sup> In 2017, seven countries put in place a multiyear humanitarian response plan (MYHRP) or strategy (MYHS). These are Cameroon 2017-2020, Chad 2017- 2019, CAR 2017-2019, DRC 2017-2019, Somalia 2016-2018, Haiti 2017-2018, and Sudan 2017-2019.

<sup>11</sup> Humanitarian Program Cycle: Multi-year Humanitarian Planning. [Tip Sheet for OCHA Country/Regional Offices](#) 20 September 2017

### 1.3 Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction within the Humanitarian Development Nexus

The increasing frequency and intensity of climate related disasters is threatening development gains and undermining progress towards meeting the SDGs.<sup>12</sup> Poor and extremely poor people are more vulnerable to shocks, and there is gross inequality of burden sharing between the richest and poorest nations on earth, with lowest income countries shouldering the greatest human cost of disasters.<sup>13</sup> A recent IFRC report estimates that some 200 million people will need humanitarian aid by 2050 due to climate linked disasters, with a corresponding price tag of \$20 billion per year to respond to these emergencies.<sup>14</sup>

Historically, DRR has tended to fall in the gap between humanitarian and development assistance, with some elements fitting more naturally into one sphere or another. Disaster preparedness, for example, is closely linked to emergency response, whereas longer-term mitigation and risk reduction approaches tend to fall within development program processes.<sup>15</sup> Yet as the humanitarian and development communities move to closing these gaps through the nexus, there is an opportunity to more coherently and systematically address DRR across sectors. Furthermore, the prevention agenda advanced by United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres transcends these divides and calls for all United Nations agencies, funds and programs to strengthen humanitarian and development linkages as a means of ending need by reducing long-term risks and vulnerability, preventing future crises and building more resilient societies.

Contexts in which humanitarians respond vary considerably, but are typically distinguished between protracted conflict settings and recurrent sudden onset settings. As highlighted in the latest Global Humanitarian Assistance (GHA) report, 27 countries had more than 5 consecutive years of UN-coordinated appeals between 2000 and 2017. The report also relays the disproportionate burden of these recurrent crises on people in poverty, as a third of the global population living in extreme poverty (on less than \$1.90 per day) are in countries with UN-coordinated appeals in 2018 and for at least on preceding year.<sup>16</sup> At the same time, crises are often protracted, with the GHA reporting that nine of the ten countries with the largest populations in need, faced conflict and forced displacement in 2018. But many countries which experience crises for multiple years often experience combination of conflict, forced displacement and/or disasters associated with natural hazards.<sup>17</sup>

Recognizing not only the prevalence but also the different characteristics stemming from these different contexts, it will be important to examine the different nature of risk and vulnerability in these settings. Already a body of literature exists about the importance of reducing risk and vulnerability in conflict settings.<sup>18</sup> Identifying the various ways that risk is or is not integrated into response tools in these settings will also be an important contribution.

---

<sup>12</sup> See the UN's "Sustainable Development Goals Report 2019" which suggests that even as extreme poverty is declining, climate change is exacerbating the increase in inequality and hunger. See also the IPCC's 2019 special reports on climate change and land/ocean and cryosphere, which forecast increasing frequency and severity of disasters.

<sup>13</sup> [Economic Losses, Poverty & Disasters, 1998-2017](#). Center for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters, UNISDR

<sup>14</sup> [The Cost of Doing Nothing](#), IFRC. September 2019.

<sup>15</sup> Twigg, John. [Disaster Risk Reduction: Mitigation and preparedness in development and emergency programming](#). HPN Good Practice Review. March 2004.

<sup>16</sup> [Global Humanitarian Assistance Report](#), 2019.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> See for example: Peters, Katie. [The next frontier for disaster risk reduction Tackling disasters in fragile and conflict-affected contexts](#), ODI; Peters, Katie. [Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia](#), ODI. Peters Katie. [Out of Touch? Why Disaster Risk Reduction can no longer ignore conflict](#), Blog ODI.

Global instruments such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, emphasize the role of humanitarian action with reference to preparedness, early warning, recovery and building back better. Including and strengthening DRR outcomes within the humanitarian program cycle, especially in recurrent and protracted crisis settings, is an important contribution to the global effort to “leave no-one behind”.

Humanitarians are already employing various instruments, to address climate related risks and shocks. These include the application of risk indices (such as INFORM) which can help identify risks and vulnerabilities in humanitarian and disaster settings, and promote resilience building; pre-financed emergency preparedness plans; forecast- based financing mechanisms, with predefined actions initiated on the basis of agreed triggers; early action/anticipatory funding schemes; crisis modifiers, which enable early action in combination with longer-term vulnerability reduction; shock responsive programming, resilience-building, cash transfer programming and insurance.<sup>19</sup>

In addition, humanitarian and development leaders in a number of contexts have already identified Collective Outcomes that include risk. These include<sup>20</sup>:

- Burkina Faso: By 2020, reduce by at least 1% the number of households vulnerable to climate shocks and increase by 50% the number of institutions with DRR
- Sudan: By 2022, the population has increased access to energy and the risk for disasters is reduced, through more effective management of natural resources and environmental and climate change by national institutions DRAFT and communities.
- Somalia: Risk and vulnerability reduced and resilience of internally displaced persons, refugee returnees and host communities strengthened in order to reach durable solutions for 100,000 displaced households by 2022.

While these collective outcomes clearly articulate how risk is being incorporated (at least rhetorically) into joint action, other contexts, such as those in Asia Pacific, which may not have developed collective outcomes per se, but are nonetheless aligning efforts between humanitarian action in these development contexts.

These trends and operational shifts, point to greater inclusion of risk reduction, as part of a broader agenda spanning humanitarian, development, climate and security actors.<sup>21</sup> As the impact of the nexus on the broader set of tools, services, leadership and coordination fora for humanitarian and development stakeholders (namely UNCTs/HCTs; UNDAFs/HRPs; RC/HCs) continues to be realized, there is an opportunity to better understand how DRR has been integrated into this nexus, and to further embed risk considerations into the context analysis, planning, and monitoring of joint humanitarian and development action.

---

<sup>19</sup> [Double vulnerability The humanitarian implications of intersecting climate and conflict risk](#). ICRC, ODI March 2019.

<sup>20</sup> Not comprehensive. From data presented at the IASC Humanitarian Development Nexus Task Team: [https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/activity\\_1.5\\_iasc\\_hdn\\_ttt\\_collective\\_outcome\\_mapping\\_v2.pdf](https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/activity_1.5_iasc_hdn_ttt_collective_outcome_mapping_v2.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> [Ibid.](#)

## **II. Purpose of consultancy**

### **2.1 Specific Objectives**

This specific objectives of this consultancy, are to:

- 1) Take stock of the extent to which DRR considerations have been integrated into humanitarian-development nexus contexts through instruments, such as multi-year plans and the humanitarian program cycle, for both sudden onset and complex emergency settings. This will be carried out through the drafting of a Background Paper (3.1 below).
- 2) Provide policy and technical advice to UNDRR and other DRR colleagues on ways to integrate DRR into the humanitarian program cycle including preparedness, coordinated needs/risk assessments and analysis, strategic planning, implementation and monitoring, resource mobilization, and cross-cutting issues such as gender. This will be delivered through a guidance note or tool (3.2-3.4 below), which can also be used by humanitarians to more clearly identify ways that they can include DRR actions in their work.
- 3) Identify means for UNDRR to strengthen its strategic engagement at global and regional levels – (including for example the Grand Bargain, the IASC and the UN Joint Steering Committee to Advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration) to contribute to the integration of DRR into humanitarian action, with a focus on humanitarian/development nexus contexts. This will be included in the guidance note or tool (3.4 below).

### **2.2 Audience**

The primary audience of these products will be DRR practitioners who would like to get more involved in the humanitarian-development planning processes, as well as humanitarian and development actors (HC/RCs and UNCT members) who would like guidance on how to better engage DRR colleagues and integrate it into their work. Ultimately, the products are intended to provide direction for these stakeholders to enhance coordination on integrating DRR into joint humanitarian and development planning processes.

### **2.3 Scope of work**

The analysis will focus on humanitarian-development nexus countries that are scaling up disaster risk reduction to reduce humanitarian needs and achieve development outcomes. The guidance or tool should be applicable to both sudden onset contexts and complex emergencies. Phase 1 of the project will focus on countries in Asia Pacific, namely Indonesia, Philippines, Afghanistan, Bangladesh and those in the Pacific. Phase 2 will broaden the scope to include protracted crisis settings, namely select countries in Africa and Arab States, where collective outcomes are being used.

## **III. Specific Deliverables and Methods**

### **3.1 Background Paper (10-15 pages plus Annexes): Current state of integration of DRR into the Humanitarian-Development Nexus**

The purpose of the background paper is to outline the extent to which DRR has been integrated within the HDN contexts through planning processes and tools, highlighting specific examples of where and how

it has been incorporated, and what have been the results. The paper will also uncover challenges for integration and the obstacles that exist.

The drafting of this paper will be iterative. Phase 1 will focus on how DRR has been integrated into humanitarian-development planning within Asia Pacific focusing specifically on development contexts with recurrent natural hazards such as Indonesia, the Philippines and those in the Pacific. In these contexts, collective outcomes may not have been articulated, but other ways of aligning humanitarian and development actions, such as through preparedness actions, have been taken. This phase will also include countries in the region such as Afghanistan and Bangladesh (Rohingya crisis) to include protracted settings. This will be used to inform the Regional consultation, which will draw upon experts and practitioners in Asia Pacific.

The next phase of drafting will widen the scope to include other protracted crisis contexts, including those with collective outcomes and which are working jointly on risk mitigation. Additional interviews and desk review will be conducted focusing on select Arab States and those in Africa, prioritizing those with collective outcomes which include risk elements (as highlighted above).

The final outcome will be a background paper and guidance note that applies to both recurrent and protracted crisis settings.

Specific issues to be covered in the paper are:

#### **Extent to which DRR is integrated within the Nexus**

- What is the current state of integration of DRR within humanitarian-development analysis, planning tools, plans and processes? Country examples and descriptions including sudden onset and complex emergencies.
- What are the main differences in terms of integration between protracted and recurrent contexts?

#### **Success factors with regards to integration**

- What are considered best practices in terms of DRR integration? Have any innovative models (coordination mechanisms, partnership frameworks, SOPs) emerged which have promoted DRR integration?
- Where integration was most effective, which enabling factors underpinned successful integration? Are these specific to context or can any be transferred elsewhere?

#### **Existing obstacles to integration**

- Are there factors which have hindered integration of DRR into humanitarian-development planning?
- What challenges do DRR professionals encounter in including DRR into humanitarian-development planning? What challenges do humanitarian/development practitioners encounter when trying to incorporate DRR elements into their planning?
- What are the broader political/financial/planning obstacles that exist to integrating DRR? Are these specific to protracted or recurrent crisis contexts?

#### **Further opportunities for greater engagement**

- What are the opportunities and implications for better engagement of DRR in humanitarian planning processes, entry points to more systematically engage both at country and global levels?

The paper's methodology will be based on desk review and individual interviews as elaborated below.

### 3.1.1 Desk Review

The desk review will be comprised of relevant program, planning and monitoring documents such as:

- Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs) and Common Country Analysis (CCAs) focusing on examples where risk analysis has been integrated
- United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs)/ Multi Year Humanitarian Response Plans (MYHRPs),<sup>22</sup> targeting countries where DRR outcomes have been incorporated into these planning processes (DRC and Somalia for example)
- Relevant documents including from: UNDRR, United Nations Joint Steering Committee to Advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration, IASC Task Team on Strengthening the Humanitarian-Development Nexus, IASC Reference Group on Risk, Early Warning and Preparedness (REAP), IFRC and NGO partner reports on integration of DRR into the humanitarian-development Nexus
- Phase 1 will focus on documents from Asia Pacific, where as Phase 2 will incorporate protracted crisis settings.

### 3.1.2 Key Informant Interviews

Consultation with relevant stakeholders, including: RC/HCs, Heads of OCHA Country Offices, regional and headquarters colleagues within OCHA, UNDRR, UNDP, World Bank, IFRC and relevant NGOs will also be conducted to better understand the extent to which DRR is being integrated into the HDN and the current obstacles that exist.

A draft guidance note (see 3.4 below) will be prepared at the end of this phase, informed by the background paper which will be used as the basis for discussion at the Regional Workshop.

## 3.2 Regional Workshop

A one-day regional workshop in Bangkok will be held with colleagues from at least two countries where Phase 1 of the background paper and draft guidance note will be shared and discussed. The purpose of the meeting will be as follows:

- To solicit specific input into the draft guidance note
- Seek advice on the dissemination strategy of the guidance note
- Identify areas for greater engagement between DRR and humanitarian-development practitioners
- Discuss any overlap between issues found in this context with other crisis contexts, specifically protracted settings

The consultant will facilitate this meeting and provide additional preparatory materials such as an agenda, presentations and group exercises. A write-up of the meeting will be drafted by the consultant and shared with participants. The draft guidance note will be revised based on the inputs from this meeting.

## 3.3 Global Validation Workshop

---

<sup>22</sup> It may also include Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF) and the World Bank Group's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and Country Partnership Frameworks (CPF)

Following the regional workshop, a 1 day global workshop in Geneva will be held with HQ colleagues as well as those working in protracted crisis settings. This will serve to solicit further input and substantiation of the guidance note, as well as inputs on protracted crisis settings. It will also provide another opportunity to identify areas for DRR actors to best engage and disseminate the guidance note. The consultant will facilitate this meeting and provide additional preparatory materials such as agenda and presentations. A write-up of the meeting will be drafted by the consultant and shared with participants. The draft guidance note will be revised based on the inputs from this meeting.

### 3.4 Final Guidance Note and Dissemination Strategy (5-10 pages)

The guidance note will be structured around the stages of the Humanitarian Program Cycle (HPC) and will identify opportunities and entry points within the humanitarian-development nexus for DRR collaboration and integration. It will provide recommendations on scaling up disaster risk reduction in contexts where strong linkages between humanitarian and development action are being sought to reduce humanitarian needs while also achieving development outcomes. As noted above, the guidance note will address both recurrent and protracted crisis settings.

A dissemination strategy will accompany the guidance note, which will provide recommendations for how best it can be used and implemented in the field. In addition, the guidance note will include advice on ways that DRR colleagues can engage more systematically with the humanitarian - development communities both at global and regional levels.

## IV. **Timeline**

The main deliverables will be phased as represented in Table 1. Key dates are highlighted below.

4.1 Inception Phase: Inception report finalized and expectations agreed by **Tuesday October 15**. A tentative call is scheduled for **Monday October 14** to review the inception report and agree to/clarify the following:

- 1) Background Paper: UNDRR vision of what successful DRR integration looks like, expectations on length, contents, scope and structure of paper; Identify initial documents for review; initial set of names of persons to consult (with contact details) shared with consultant
- 2) Guidance Note: Discussion of current UNDRR Issues Brief and how final guidance note will build on this.
- 3) Dissemination Strategy: Expectations of contents and scope

4.2 Phase 1 Background Paper and Draft Guidance Note:

- Draft report and Guidance Note – for Asia Pacific region - shared with UNDRR by **November 20**
- Comments from UNDRR back to consultant by **November 27**
- Drafts finalized (for purpose of Regional Workshop) by **December 3**

4.3 Regional Workshop, Bangkok: December 12

- Background Paper and Draft Guidance Note (V2) shared with participants: **December 3**
- Workshop summary note finalized and shared with participants by **December 20**

4.4 Research and drafting of Phase 2 Background Paper and Draft Guidance Note:

- Updated Background Paper and Draft Guidance (V3) note to include protracted settings shared with UNDRR: **January 20**
- Comments from UNDRR back to consultant by **January 27**
- Drafts finalized by **February 3**

#### 4.5 Global Validation Workshop, Geneva: Friday February 28

- Background Paper and Draft Guidance Note (V4) shared with participants by **February 14**
- Workshop summary note shared with participants by **March 6**

#### 4.6 Finalization of Guidance Note and dissemination strategy

- Draft Guidance (V5) and dissemination strategy shared with UNDRR by **March 17**
- Comments from UNDRR back to consultant by **March 24**
- Final Guidance Note (V6) and dissemination strategy delivered by **March 31**

Tasks and Milestones		Responsible C=Consultant	Oct-19	Nov-19	Dec-19	Jan-20	Feb-20	Mar-20
<b>1</b>	<b>Inception Phase ( 4 days)</b>							
1.1	Drafting of Inception Report	C						
1.2	Inception Report submitted to UNDRR	C	10					
1.3	Feedback from UNDRR and inception meeting for further clarification	UNDRR	14					
1.4	Finalization of Inception Report	C	15					
<b>2</b>	<b>Phase 1 Background Report and Draft Guidance ( 30 days)</b>							
2.1	Introductory emails to interviewees sent	UNDRR						
2.2	Initial documents for review identified and shared	UNDRR						
2.3	Desk Review	C						
2.4	Individual Consultations	C						
2.5	Draft Background Report and Guidance Note Draft shared with UNDRR	C		20				
2.6	Feedback on first drafts from UNDRR to consultant	UNDRR		27				
2.7	Background Report and Draft Guidance Note finalized and shared with workshop participants	C			3			
<b>3</b>	<b>Regional Workshop in Bangkok (10 days)</b>							
3.1	Participants Identified and invitations sent	UNDRR						
3.2	Logistics Prepared	UNDRR						
3.4	Regional Workshop	C/UNDRR			12			
3.5	Workshop summary note finalized and sent to participants	C			20			
3.6	Revision of Guidance Note based on outcomes of Regional Consultation	C						
<b>4</b>	<b>Phase 2 Background Report and Guidance (10 days)</b>							
4.1	Interviews and desk review from protracted context countries	C						
4.2	Updating of Background Note and Guidance to include these contexts	C						
4.3	Updated drafts shared with UNDRR	C				20		
4.4	Feedback from UNDRR shared with consultant	UNDRR				27		
<b>4</b>	<b>Global Validation Workshop, Geneva (7 days)</b>							
4.1	Participants Identified and invitations sent	UNDRR						
4.2	Logistics Prepared	UNDRR						
4.3	Background Report and Draft Guidance Note shared with Global Validation Workshop participants	C					14	
4.4	Global Validation Workshop	C/UNDRR					28	
4.5	Workshop summary note finalized and sent to participants	C						6
<b>5</b>	<b>Finalization of Guidance Note and dissemination strategy (15 days)</b>							
5.1	Revision of Guidance Note based on feedback from Global Validation Workshop	C						
5.2	Guidance Note Draft shared with UNDRR	C						17
5.3	Feedback on Drafts from UNDRR	UNDRR						24
5.4	Guidance Note and dissemination strategy finalized	C						31

