

**INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE-WORKING GROUP
50th MEETING**

18-19 September 2002

Conference Room 9, United Nations Headquarters New York

CAP: Preparations for 2003 CAP

Circulated: 4 September 2002

Two issues are to be discussed under this agenda item: the status of CAP preparations and the proposed second annual Directors Review of select CAPs.

Item 1: The current status us CAP / CHAP preparations is the following:

	COUNTRIES	TYPE OF DOCUMENT	INCLUDED IN CAP LAUNCH?
	AFGHANISTAN	Transitional Assistance Programme for Afg (TAPA)	YES
	ANGOLA	CAP	YES
	BURUNDI	CAP	YES
	CÔTE D'IVOIRE	CAP	YES
	DPR OF KOREA	CAP	YES
	DR OF THE CONGO	CAP	YES
	ERITREA	CAP	YES
	ETHIOPIA	Strategy Paper	YES
	GREAT LAKES	CAP	YES
	GUINEA	CAP	YES
	INDONESIA	CAP	YES
	LIBERIA	CAP	YES
	NORTH CAUCASUS	CAP	YES
	REPUBLIC OF CONGO	UN PLAN	<i>tbd</i>
	SIERRA LEONE	CAP	YES
	SOMALIA	CAP	YES
	SOUTHERN AFRICA HUMANITARIAN CRISIS	Update (e.g. MYR format)	YES
	SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE	CHAP	<i>tbd</i>
	SUDAN	CAP	YES
	TAJIKISTAN	CAP	YES
	TANZANIA	<i>tbd</i>	<i>tbd</i>
	UGANDA	CAP	YES

In addition to the above are the following crises that have been discussed in previous IASC WG Meetings:

First background document: CAP

- ❖ occupied Palestinian territory: clarification is needed on the status of the Humanitarian Action Plan drafted for oPt, and whether or not this needs should be included in the CAP Launch.
- ❖ Colombia: A Humanitarian Action Plan is being developed. It will NOT be presented at the CAP Launch.
- ❖ Sri Lanka – Donor Alert launched on 10 July in Colombo. Joint appeal with Government of Sri Lanka. Possible HLWG presentation in Geneva. UNCT to manage response and tracking. NOT included in launch.

Proposed Actions/Decisions by the IASC-WG:

1. Agreement with the proposed table, discussion on *TBD* crises
2. For SEE: Proposal to include 2-page summary of CHAP in compendium of CAP crises at Launch (similar to Ethiopia)
3. For oPt: What type of document is to be prepared? Is this document to be included in the CAP Launch?
4. For Tanzania: CAP or chapter in GLR CAP?

Item 2: Directors Review of select CAPs:

Following the Directors' Review of the 2002 Burundi CAP last year, the IASC endorsed a recommendation to institutionalise such meetings annually (Recommendation 5 of the *IASC Plan of Action to Strengthen the CAP*)

Objectives of the Review:

- To strengthen senior level involvement in the CAP, in line with the IASC Plan of Action.
- To review and provide constructive feedback to country teams and IASC members on early drafts of the CAP document.
- To discuss the CA Process with country teams in order to strengthen headquarters support to the field, understand how strategy is formulated at field level.
- To identify lessons in strategic coordination, formulating strategy, and resource mobilisation at field level.

Proposal:

Directors will review TWO CAPs. The focus of the review is the strategic planning PROCESS, not the appeal document, although Directors are also expected to make substantive comments on the effectiveness of the document as an advocacy tool.

Date: 10 October 2003, from 09:30 – 13:00. All draft CAP documents are due 1 October. As per usual practice, the documents will be circulated to IASC SWG members for comment. In addition, agencies should use the attached matrix to evaluate each of the CAPs that will be the focus of the Directors' Review.

Method: Each CAP is allotted 1.5 hours for discussion, which will take place primarily in tele-conference between the Directors and the respective Humanitarian Coordinator and key CAP Country Team members. Directors will have reviewed and

First background document: CAP

prepared feedback and questions for each CAP. The CTs will be expected to brief on the coordination process behind the document, flagging both successes and areas for improvement. Emphasis should be on identifying lessons that may be replicated in other contexts. The meeting will wrap up with Directors summarising key country specific and global recommendations and lessons identified.

CAPs to be reviewed: The following proposed CAPs were selected based on the following criteria:

- The Humanitarian Coordinator has initiated an innovative new coordination model or approach to CAP that could be replicated in other countries.
- A final field draft of the document is expected to be completed by 1 October.

Two of the following three CAPs are to be selected for the Review:

Burundi: The CAP for Burundi was the subject of the first Directors' Review in October 2001. The Directors gave substantial feedback on the process. The purpose of focusing again on Burundi would be to see if lessons identified last year have been applied. Also, Burundi has been the subject of one of the SCHR reviews of NGO participation in the CAP, so there may be useful analysis from this exercise.

Indonesia: The HC has initiated an IASC Country Team structure for coordination, including working groups to focus on issues, such as CAP. It may be useful to consider whether or not this structure helped to facilitate the process, and encourage inclusion in the CAP of IASC members/invitees (including NGOs and the Red Cross). The CAP strategy has both emergency and transitional elements.

Sierra Leone: The HC has initiated a "hybrid" appeal to include both humanitarian and transitional needs, linking to longer-term development initiatives. Focus would be on the process of coordinating such a strategy, and inclusion of key stakeholders such as the government, donors and NGOs.

Proposed Actions/Decisions by the IASC-WG:

- 1) Agreement on the date and concept of the Directors' review of the CAP
- 2) Selection of the two CAPs to be reviewed. Following SWG meeting 2 Sept, Note that IFRC, UNICEF, WFP suggested Indonesia and Sierra Leone. UNHCR did not indicate a preference. UNDP is interested in Burundi.

Checklist for Review of 2003 Consolidated Appeals	
Item for Review	Comment
<i>The “big picture”: Is it compelling? Is it internally consistent? Is there evidence of participation by a variety of stakeholders?</i>	
<u>Monitoring:</u> Is there an assessment of the impact of last year’s CAP programmes? Are the achievements and constraints of last year’s programme articulated?	
<u>Context:</u> Is there a compelling description of the humanitarian situation, its causes, and the effect on the vulnerable population?	
<u>Scenarios:</u> Does the most likely scenario seem plausible given the context?	
<u>Capacities and Vulnerabilities Analysis:</u> Is it clear who the most vulnerable people are in this context? Are the factors which contribute to vulnerability outlined? Is there a description of the capacities in the population to cope with disaster?	
<u>Complementarity:</u> Does the text clearly describe how the agencies in the CAP are complementing one another? Is there a clear description of the competencies and capacities of the respective agencies?	
<u>Strategic Goals:</u> Do the goals make sense given the context, the most likely scenario, the vulnerabilities and capacities of the population, and the capacities and competencies of the aid agencies?	
<u>Coordination:</u> Who participated in strategy setting? What kinds of coordination mechanisms exist and how are they functioning?	
<i>Sector Plans and Projects: Do they flow from the “big picture?” Is there sufficient level of detail? Are you convinced of the necessity of each sector plan and each project?</i>	
<u>Sector Plans:</u> Do they present a convincing argument for activities in each sector?	
<u>Sector Objectives:</u> Are the objectives S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timebound)? Do they relate directly to one or more of the strategic goals?	
<u>Sector indicators:</u> Does each objective include either qualitative or quantitative indicators to measure progress? Are these realistic?	
<u>Projects:</u> Do the projects help achieve one or more of the sector objectives? Is this explained clearly in the project summary?	