

Section 5: six months and beyond



eprhandbook.actionaid.org/section5

Section 05

KEY POINTS

- After six months, IHART co-ordinates and supports the planning process to **integrate plans with the longer term change process** based on the real time evaluation findings.
- IHART and International Fundraising support member/country programme to develop a **fundraising programme**.
- Manage the **phase-out in collaboration with the disaster-affected communities**.
Phase-out should not be treated as closure of activities, rather a change in leadership. The following aspects should be followed:
 - Building strong community institutions, particularly women's leadership and women's organisations that can carry forward work initiated by the Emergency Response and Resilience Programme.
 - Maintaining all staff details on file so that relevant skills can be redeployed in future, update of asset inventories.
 - Consultation of local/national labour laws and relevant employment legislation in case of termination of a large number of contracts.
 - Employment of extra security and protection measures to protect ActionAid assets.
- Notice provided well in advance for all other contracts such as lease contract, bank accounts and vehicle contracts.
- Submission of all project completion reports such as final report and audit reports well in advance of the programme phase-out/handover. Archive key programme, audit and financial documents for at least the next five years.
- All assets to be handed over to local organisations and/or authorities will be properly documented. The condition of the use of assets must be marked in the documentation. The MOU agreed with partners at the outset of the partnership should also clearly spell out how the organisations are going to handle ActionAid's liabilities, legal obligation and pending legal issues.
- **Evaluation to consolidate learning** from the programme.
- **Information sharing** at a local, national and global level.

About this section

This section describes the actions that should be taken as the disaster response moves from the immediate relief phase towards longer term recovery. It explains what the member/country programme should do around six months after the disaster, as well as the support that should be provided by other parts of the organisation. This section summarises the key information and actions that are required, and contains references to the annexes where relevant templates and detailed guidance on each activity can be found.

This section follows on from **Section 4**, which explains what should be done in the first month following a disaster. The activities started in the first month will be continued up to six months, according to the Emergency Response and Resilience Building Plan, and may also continue beyond six months.

This section sets out the specific activities that should be considered as the disaster response moves into a new phase. This section should be referred to when planning a disaster response, and also when a disaster-affected member/country programme is writing annual plans or country strategies.

Summary of key actions

The following table summarises the key actions that should be taken around six months after the disaster. A fuller description of each activity is included on the following pages.



Implementing disaster response

What the member/country programme does

- integrate ERRP with longer term programmes and strategies
- manage phase-out

What IHART does (ORANGE and RED alerts)

What other parts of the organisation do (ORANGE and RED alerts)



Information management

What the member/country programme does

- submit information update at key milestones of disaster

What IHART does (ORANGE and RED alerts)

- support information gathering for milestone reports

What other parts of the organisation do (ORANGE and RED alerts)

- ICT circulate milestone reports (e.g. reports one year after major disaster)



Management response

What the member/country programme does

- conduct evaluations of ERRP

What IHART does (ORANGE and RED alerts)

- provide ongoing advice and technical support to continuing response
- review ToR for evaluation and support in identifying appropriate consultants

What other parts of the organisation do (ORANGE and RED alerts)

- Oversight Group reviews evaluation



Fundraising

What the member/country programme does

- continue to seek in-country donor funding in line with funding requirements of ERRP

What IHART does (ORANGE and RED alerts)

- share fundraising gaps with federation and support funding proposals
- co-ordinate continuing fundraising efforts across the federation

What other parts of the organisation do (ORANGE and RED alerts)

- affiliates submit proposals to institutional donors, trusts, major donors



Communications

What the member/country programme does

- provide communications products in line with donor requirements
- develop communications products around emergency milestones (e.g. one year on)

What IHART does (ORANGE and RED alerts)

What other parts of the organisation do (ORANGE and RED alerts)

- ICT co-ordinate development and dissemination of communications products around emergency milestones (e.g. one year on)



Fundraising

Submit proposals to institutional donors, trusts and major donors

Who does this: member/country programme and fundraising affiliates, with support of International Fundraising and IHART

Depending on the scale of the emergency, continuing needs of those affected and the amount of funds we have been able to mobilise within the first six months, there may be a need for continued fundraising. At this stage, the most likely available sources of funding are institutional donors, trusts and major donors – the majority of which are accessed not directly by the disaster-affected country but through fundraising affiliates who ‘own’ the relationship with specific donors.

As at earlier stages in the response, fundraising activities will continue to be co-ordinated through IHART except in cases where specific information is needed for the application to the donor, when IHART will be informed. In the case of a large-scale emergency (e.g. a red alert level emergency)

IHART will continue to share regular updates on the disaster situation and ActionAid’s response with the wider federation (including situation reports, needs assessment reports, updated Emergency Response and Resilience Building Plan etc). If there is a continued need for further funding, fundraising affiliates will then be expected to submit proposals to appropriate donors within their countries, including institutional donors, trusts, foundations and major donors.

Fundraising affiliates should link with IHART in the first instance to share information on planned fundraising and to request additional information needed from the member/country programme. They should also ask IHART to review proposals before submitting, to check for technical accuracy and accordance with ActionAid’s human rights-based approach in emergencies.

The member/country programme is responsible for submitting proposals to multilateral donors, including the EU and UN agencies, with the support of International Fundraising. IHART should review proposals before submission to check for technical accuracy and accordance with ActionAid’s human rights-based approach in emergencies. IHART will liaise with the member/country programme on behalf of International Fundraising, and will facilitate direct contact where appropriate.

The decision on whether to apply for funding opportunities remains with the member/country programme. In some cases, the member/country programme may not wish to apply for smaller grants, which have a high burden of reporting requirements. In **ORANGE** and **RED** alert level disasters, the Oversight Group will provide advice and review decisions to decline funding.



Implementing disaster response

Integrate ERRP into longer term programmes and strategies

Who does this: member/country programme, with support from IHART.

Disasters are not one-off events, and ActionAid's disaster response should contribute to building community resilience to future disasters. To do this, it is important that the disaster response is integrated into the member/country programme's ongoing work. This can be done by:

- Integrating the Emergency Response and Resilience Programme into LRP strategies, the country strategy and annual plans. The box below summarises how this was done in the case of the East Africa drought in 2010-2011.
- Integrating outcomes from participatory analysis into long-term planning, and continuing building community preparedness and resilience to multiple risks as identified by community members themselves.
- Where relevant, continuing policy and advocacy work initiated by the Emergency Response and Resilience Programme as part of our ongoing policy and advocacy work at LRP and national levels, accompanied by media and communications strategies as necessary.
- Exploring possibilities for establishing new LRPs in response areas.
- If money had been raised through voluntary public fundraising appeals to ActionAid supporters and/or the general public, oversight of the ongoing emergency response moves to IHART when the Oversight Group is disbanded. IHART will support the country programme to establish a long-term fundraising strategy, including contract management, donor management and management and reporting on spending of appeal money.

You can find an article on ActionAid's approach to resilience building and the links to emergency response here:

<http://goo.gl/asTkFk>

Kenya drought response programme

In 2011 ActionAid Kenya responded to a drought in the Horn of Africa, considered to be the worst to afflict the country in over 60 years.

ActionAid Kenya responded to the drought by designing a comprehensive drought response programme that addressed the immediate needs linked to building long-term resilience amongst the communities to be better able to cope with future disasters.

Using the rights-based approach, the programme was designed in such a way as to recognise violation and denial of rights as key drivers of vulnerability. The design placed 'vulnerability' at the centre of all programme interventions. Using Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA), it was quite clear that the drought, like in all emergency situations, had reinforced inequality and impacted upon the most vulnerable members of the community, women in particular. The social drought research study that the programme commissioned during the first phase revealed the drought as cyclical, and showed how climate and political problems are shortening the

cycle and increasing the depth of the problem. Thus the programme was also designed, right from the beginning, to address the structural inequalities through advocacy and policy-making, rooted in the experience of disaster-affected communities.

The programme design took into account the traditional coping mechanisms of the communities.

Thus the drought response programme was particularly built around communities' already established livelihoods, enhancing their ability to improve on what they were already doing and have been doing for generations to cope. These included livestock restocking, food- and cash-for-work around water harvesting, soil and water conservation. The programme also integrated women's leadership in all activities, and accountability to disaster-affected communities through transparency boards, community reviews and social audits and complaint mechanisms.

The food- and cash-for-work programmes ensured that communities addressed their immediate food and other needs, yet building on the coping strategies they had been practising for generations to address longer term resilience to drought. The policy and advocacy efforts linked to the drought response and resilience building are having a significant impact, as evidenced by the signing of the Nairobi Declaration on Drought and the subsequent establishment of the National Drought Management Authority through an act of parliament. It is assumed that this Authority will enhance preparedness for future droughts and contribute to limiting the consequences of future crisis.

Manage phase-out

Who does this: member/country programme

ActionAid will start integrating phase-out plans from the beginning of the programme. For example, if the community is intended to take over leadership of the programme, this should be conceived at the beginning of the programme. The Emergency Response and Resilience Programme Managers in-country will liaise with donors to ensure that project closures, handover and phase-out are consistent with donor policies, and ActionAid meets all contractual obligations. The Emergency Response and Resilience Programme will clearly define the budget for handover and closures, as well the human resources necessary to carry out activities and handover of assets. The phase-out plan is developed in collaboration with the disaster-affected communities and should include the following key aspects:

- Building strong community institutions, particularly women's leadership and women's organisations, which can carry forward work initiated by the Emergency Response and Resilience Programme. Phase-out should not be treated as closure of activities, rather a change in leadership.
- Maintaining all staff details on file so that relevant skills can be redeployed in future.
- Consultation of local/national labour laws and relevant employment legislation in case of termination of a large number of contracts.
- Employment of extra security and protection measures (against theft, rodents and bad weather as relevant) to protect ActionAid assets.
- Update of asset inventories.
- Notice provided well in advance for all other contracts such as lease contract, bank accounts and vehicle contracts.
- Submission of all project completion reports such as final report and audit reports well in advance of the programme phase-out/handover. Archive key programme, audit and financial documents for at least the next five years. (Refer to **Section 5** for details of financial management practices).
- All assets to be handed over to local organisations and/or authorities will be properly documented. The condition of the use of assets must be marked in the documentation. The MOU agreed with partners at the outset of the partnership should also clearly spell out how the organisations are going to handle ActionAid's liabilities, legal obligation and pending legal issues. A sample partner MOU is currently being developed.



Evaluate Emergency Response and Resilience Programme

Who does this: member/country programme, with support from IHART

When the Emergency Response and Resilience Programme was developed at the start of the response, plans should have been included for monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring should have been ongoing throughout the programme, and a real time evaluation should have been conducted in the first three months.

At the end of the programme, or when it is integrated into longer term programmes or strategies, an end-of-programme evaluation should be conducted. The purpose of this is to consolidate learning from the programme, and would ideally be conducted by in-country staff, partners and community members.

<http://goo.gl/asTkFk>

contains a generic ToR for an end-of-programme evaluation which can be adapted for the specific context.

The member/country programme should ask IHART to review the ToR before engaging consultants to carry out the evaluation.

It is also useful to document lessons learned and prepare learning documents, case studies and stories of change. These should be shared with IHART and will be used to inform future emergency response programming, fundraising and profile building. Templates and guidance for developing effective case studies are available on the Hive:

<http://goo.gl/ENKGfe>

password: powerinpeople

Include an evaluation of the structure of the emergency team to ensure that it is still 'fit for purpose'. Review the roles in the team and ensure that you have the right skills and experience to match the next stage in the emergency response.

Discuss with the team the evaluation findings and outline what specific focus and direction is required for the next phase of the emergency response. Articulate key areas of focus and identify any areas of support required (capacity or competency) and integrate into the key deliverables into the planning.

Repeat at each phase in the process to ensure that the changing circumstances you experience match the team structure at each critical point of delivery.



Develop and share information updates at key milestones

Who does this: member/country programme, with support from IHART and International Communications

In advance of important milestones after major disasters (normally one year, but potentially also at the six month stage if a massive disaster with global significance), IHART will contact the member/country programme to request a summary information update of the activities conducted and the impact to date. This is used to communicate to the rest of the organisation and external audiences (donors, supporters, media) how ActionAid has contributed to the disaster response. A sample template for the report is included at

<http://goo.gl/asTkFk>

for information, but IHART will send a tailored template to the member/country programme at the appropriate time.

At the same time, the International Communications Team will link with ActionAid affiliates to assess the communications needs of the wider federation around the emergency milestone. If colleagues across the federation plan on using the milestone as a hook with which to feedback to supporters/engage in media or other communications work, the International Communications Team will work with the member/country programme to develop appropriate communications products (case studies, photos, blogs, digital content, film footage, Q&As, etc), and will co-ordinate dissemination of this material across the federation.

The International Communications Team is also responsible for supporting in-country activities around key milestones of the emergency response (e.g. national/regional policy/advocacy, report launches, media activity etc)

Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA) project in Italy – L'Aquila earthquake

Following the 2009 L'Aquila earthquake in Italy, which killed 308 people and displaced thousands for several months, there was much criticism about the government's broken promises in the reconstruction process.

In 2010 ActionAid Italy produced a documentary called 'L'Aquila a pezzi' (Broken L'Aquila) that called on the government to account for its actions, delays and lack of accountability: <http://video.corriere.it/aquila-pezzi-inchiesta-actionaid/d1be2f1e-40b5-11df-84ba-00144f02aabe>

This documentary was widely distributed online, in national newspapers and among independent media.

Two years after the earthquake the needs of the affected communities were still vast, with thousands of people displaced, an empty and unpopulated city centre and social services still not restored. In 2011, ActionAid Italy established its first domestic LRP and after first contact in town it designed a pilot programme for the Pettino borough of L'Aquila, one of the worst affected areas with 15,000 inhabitants. Many of the most active citizens had tried to participate in the reconstruction process since 2009, but the lack of information, transparency in tenders for reconstruction and bureaucratic delays had caused great frustration.

Using ActionAid's PVA technique, adapted for the Italian context, **affected communities in L'Aquila were supported to identify critical gaps in social and physical infrastructure and advocate for better disaster resilience measures.** Through the analysis, communities are able to speak out against factors that affect their wellbeing and advocate for early warning systems and risk mitigation measures. The pilot project has not yet shown its full potential in terms of the changes the community can bring to its territory, but has laid the basis for a broader and longer term project that can be developed in L'Aquila.

The community is now part of a network of actors including local organisations, the Italian Agency for Emergency Response (AGIRE) and academics. The network aims to develop a vulnerability toolkit that can also be used by other towns and cities that are affected by disasters.

ActionAid Italy established its own LRP in 2011 and is now active in nine towns. The main focus areas include women's rights, right to food and accountability. ActionAid Italy is now looking for funds to implement a longer-term PVA project in L'Aquila.

**FURTHER READING AND RESOURCES**

Templates and guidance for developing effective case studies:

<http://goo.gl/ENKGfe> password: powerinpeople

ActionAid's approach to resilience building and the links to emergency response, sample template for a key milestone report and a generic ToR for an end-of-programme evaluation can all be found at: **<http://goo.gl/asTKFk>**
