<div style="border:1px solid;">

INTER–AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP
60th MEETING

21-22 March 2005
WFP Rome

CAP:
2005 Directors' Review of the Consolidated Appeal (CA) Côte d'Ivoire

Circulated: 11 March 2005

</div>

Background

Following the Directors' review of the 2002 Burundi CA, the IASC endorsed a recommendation to conduct such meetings annually (Recommendation 5 of the *IASC Plan of Action to Strengthen the CAP*). In 2002, the Directors reviewed the 2003 CAs for Sierra Leone and Indonesia. The event was attended by Directors from UN agencies, the Red Cross, and IOM. In the field, the respective Humanitarian Coordinators, accompanied by country representatives and senior programme officers of agencies and NGOs, led the discussion. The field welcomed the opportunity to share lessons and raise issues with senior officials in headquarters.

Objectives

- To listen to IASC country teams in order to better understand how strategy is formulated at the field level and to strengthen headquarters support to the field.

- To enhance directors' involvement in the CAP.

- To review and provide constructive feedback to IASC country teams on the Consolidated Appeal process and document.

- To identify lessons in coordination, strategy formulation, and resource mobilization as reflected by the CAP.

Method

Directors will review the Consolidated Appeal for Côte d'Ivoire. The focus of the review is the planning process and Directors are also expected to make substantive comments on the effectiveness of the document as an advocacy and fundraising tool.

The review will take place on Tuesday 22 March during the IASC Working Group Meeting in Rome. 75 minutes are allotted for discussion between Directors and the Humanitarian Coordinator and key IASC country team members (including the Red Cross, IOM, and NGOs). Directors will have reviewed and prepared feedback and questions on the Consolidated Appeal. (The attached matrix, or parts thereof, can be used as a guide.) The IASC country teams will be expected to brief on the coordination process behind the document, flagging both successes and areas for improvement. Emphasis should be on <u>identifying lessons that may be replicated in other contexts.</u>

Output

Lessons and recommendations will be summarised and disseminated.

CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW	
ITEM FOR REVIEW	**COMMENT**
2004 in Review	
<u>Monitoring:</u> Is there a convincing analysis of the impact of last year's programme? Are the achievements and constraints of last year's programme articulated and do they inform the 2005 programme?	
Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP)	
<u>Context:</u> Is there a compelling description of the overall situation, its causes, and the humanitarian consequences?	
<u>Scenarios:</u> Three scenarios were presented. Do scenarios include: core assumptions, potential triggers for future events, note who would be affected and how, note how this would impact humanitarian activities? How did the scenarios measure up to the evolving situation on the ground?	
<u>Strategic Priorities for Humanitarian Response:</u> Do the priorities make sense given the context and humanitarian consequences? To what extent do they articulate the following: results expected by the end of the appeal period; reinforcing links between different sectors; promotion of	

gender equality and address the needs of specific groups that have been determined to be at particular risk (such as women, people with HIV/AIDS, adolescent boys, etc.); addressing protection concerns; advocacy for humanitarian principles and human rights if needed; indicators to be used to measure the extent to which results have been achieved; ways in which the IASC CT's priorities complement those of other major aid initiatives in the country, such as CCA/UNDAF, World Bank Poverty Reduction Programmes, bilateral aid programmes, etc.	
Response Plans: To what extent do these outline: priority needs and response strategy in this sector, the implications if this response plan is not implemented, a list of the organisations participating in this sector strategy and a description of the complementarity between proposed activities, clear objectives, sector-wide indicators for measuring progress towards objectives, and a brief explanation of how the sector group will monitor the objectives.	

Monitoring, Prioritisation, and Strategic Framework

In terms of monitoring to what extent does the CAP answer the following questions: How will the IASC CT monitor the context? How will the IASC CT monitor protection and assistance needs throughout 2005, including those of specific groups deemed particularly vulnerable to a worsening of the situation (e.g. women, people with HIV/AIDS, the elderly)? How will the IASC CT monitor its planning scenarios, including their underlying assumptions and triggers for improvement and deterioration of the situation? How often will the IASC CT meet to discuss and agree on the need for major shifts in strategy and how will these be reported? Who will be involved in these discussions?	
Where clear criteria for prioritisation of projects selected and to what extent where they applied?	
How did the CT apply a strategic framework (sometimes referred to as a logical framework) to gauge the link between needs, strategic priorities, response plan objectives, and projects?	

Projects	
Projects: Do the projects address strategic priorities and help achieve one or more of the sector objectives? Are the main activities and expected outcomes clear and convincing? Were projects 'vetted'?	
Overall Issues	
Integrate gender analysis throughout the CHAP? Inclusion of projects that respond to different needs of men and women, girls and boys? Disaggregated data by sex and age? Inclusion of protection and human rights in your analysis and response? Discussion of impact of HIV/AIDS on the crisis and ensure that the response is appropriate? Explanation of implications of access and security on assessment of need and proposed response?	

Proposed Actions by the IASC WG members:

- Support the implementation of the lessons and recommendations of the Review