

**INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP
54TH MEETING**

17-18 SEPTEMBER 2003

UNFPA HEADQUARTERS, RAFAEL SALAS (19TH FLOOR)

CAP: Directors of Emergency Review of Two 2004 CAPS-Proposal

Circulated: 3 September 2003

Background:

Following the Directors' review of the 2002 Burundi CAP, the IASC endorsed a recommendation to institutionalise such meetings annually (Recommendation 5 of the *IASC Plan of Action to Strengthen the CAP*). In October, 2002, the Directors reviewed the 2003 CAPs for Sierra Leone and Indonesia. The event was attended in Geneva by senior-level Directors from UN agencies, the Red Cross and IOM. In the field, discussions were led by the respective Humanitarian Coordinators from each country, accompanied by country heads of agencies/NGOs and senior programme officers. The field welcomed the discussions and appreciated the opportunity to share lessons learned and air concerns with headquarters at a senior level.

Objectives:

- 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 IASC Country Teams in order to better understand how strategy is formulated at field level and to strengthen headquarters support to the field.
- To identify lessons in strategic coordination, formulating strategy, and resource mobilisation at the field level.

Proposal

Directors will review TWO CAPs. The focus of the review is the strategic planning PROCESS. Directors are also expected to make substantive comments on the effectiveness of the document as an advocacy tool. **Two options** are proposed for the Review:

- 1) To review the CAPs in **January 2004** allowing for a complete analysis of the entire CAP cycle, from monitoring the previous year's CHAP to completing the planning process for the 2004 CHAP to document production to the launch of the document. This option has the benefit of allowing adequate time for reflection on the part of the Country Team, especially in light of donor reactions at the Launch of the 2004 Appeal. It also has the benefit of taking place outside of the CAP finalisation period in October, during which many key agencies and OCHA are fully engaged to meet tight CAP production deadlines.
- 2) To continue, as in previous years, to review the CAPs in **mid October** (13 or 14 October proposed). This option has the benefit of allowing Directors to review the documents and provide valuable feedback to the field before the document is finalized. One disadvantage is that time may be insufficient to address Directors' concerns in the document due to production deadlines.

Method: Each CAP is allotted 1 hour for discussion, which will take place primarily in tele-conference or video conference between the Directors and the respective Humanitarian Coordinator and key IASC Country Team members (including the Red Cross, IOM and NGOs). Directors will have reviewed and prepared feedback and questions for each CAP, using the attached matrix as a guide. The 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 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.

Proposed CAPs for review:

- Somalia: The Humanitarian Coordinator has taken extensive measures to engage NGOs in the CAP for 2004. In addition, during the CAP workshop for Somalia, participants agreed to a vetting mechanism for projects that could be useful in other contexts. Somalia was one of the case studies reviewed in the recent Overseas Development Institute (ODI) report, "According to Need?" which was part of the Humanitarian Financing Studies. Subsequently, the issue of needs assessment was discussed extensively at the CAP workshop. It would therefore be useful to discuss different approaches to assessing needs in Somalia, some of which are currently in the preliminary stages of development.
- Liberia: The changing situation in Liberia has renewed donor interest in this previously forgotten emergency. The discussion could focus on how the Country Team responded to the new situation, in terms of planning and advocacy to donors. In particular, discussion could revolve around the extent to which the Country Team was able to use the CAP to clearly send a message to donors regarding humanitarian and protection priorities. What were the challenges to doing this and what were the opportunities?
- Tajikistan: The Country Team has decided to produce a "transition" appeal, based on guidance provided by the UNDG/ECHA Working Group on Transition. Focus would be on the process of coordinating such a strategy, and inclusion of key stakeholders such as the government, donors and NGOs.

CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW OF 2004 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> : From the text, do you understand 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?	
<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 interventions 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?	

First background document of the agenda item on the CAP

Expected Decisions/Action Points by the IASC-WG:

To review the proposal for the Directors' Review of two 2004 CAPs and agree on the date of the review and method.