

GLOBAL PREPAREDNESS PARTNERSHIP

A FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT¹



GOAL

The goal of the Global Preparedness Partnership (GPP) is for countries to reach a minimum level of preparedness² so that disaster events can be better managed locally with reduced need for international assistance. The GPP offers a strong partnership between affected governments, international resourcing partners and multilateral organisations which builds on existing international and national initiatives to make high-risk countries ready to respond to, and recover from, disasters resulting from natural hazards and climate-related risks. The GPP will support both preparedness for disaster response, and preparedness for disaster recovery³ The GPP is inspired by the Sendai Framework's Priority 4⁴, and was initiated at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016. Financed by a Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF), it will initially operate in 15 countries to ensure that they attain a minimum level of readiness by 2020, substantially meeting the call of the UN Secretary-General to enhance the emergency response capacity of the 20 highest risk countries by 2020. While other countries may apply for support, V20 members will be given priority

RESULTS

Effective implementation of the GPP will achieve an increase in readiness at agreed levels above the baseline determined as part of a diagnostic review. A program of action will be supported that leads to countries having arrangements in place to achieve a minimum level of readiness, including minimum and advance preparedness activities. This increase in readiness will be achieved through:

1. an improved **understanding of risks, vulnerabilities and capacities**, based on a variety of national and local risk and capacity assessment mechanisms as well as through modelling and simulations;
2. the demonstrated capacity to **coordinate and manage relevant stakeholders** prior to and during a crisis; based on contingency, response and recovery plans that have clear roles and responsibilities related to actions for all stakeholders, including an increased ability of at-risk communities to access and act on disaster information and early warnings, and engage in disaster preparedness planning that includes decision making mechanisms and procedures, and includes clear, specific triggers that ensure early action;
3. that **operational capabilities and systems** are identified and available prior to a shock to allow rapid provision of assistance when required, including physical assets such as procedures, key response support equipment, trained individuals and teams familiar with their roles and responsibilities, and systems such as communications and information processes;
4. improved **financial planning** as an essential part of preparedness planning, so that a set of financial instruments are in place for response and recovery financing, including establishing or expanding social safety nets.

¹ This Framework Document was endorsed by the V20 Ministerial Meeting on 23 April, 2017 in Washington DC.

² The GPP uses the [IASC Common Framework for Preparedness](#) as a foundational document, and follows its definitions and descriptions of preparedness

³ Preparedness activities will vary according to context, but common preparedness components as described by the IASC can be found in an annex.

⁴ **Priority 4:** Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to "Build Back Better" in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction.



SCOPE

The GPP will be successful in its ability to mobilize adequate investment by all participants, will depend on a number of factors, but particularly relevant will be maintenance of a tight focus on preparedness for response and preparedness for recovery. This will mean that some capacity building support will be outside the scope of the GPP, with support being available through other initiatives. For example: clarity, ideally through legislation, of the national lead(s) for managing preparedness and response will be a requirement for application; generic early warning systems development will be outside the scope of GPP, although the ability to analyse risks and to turn early warning into action will be included; financing relief supplies themselves will be outside the scope, although key support equipment and emergency response infrastructure will be included with regional pooling of equipment and capability considered. The GPP will concentrate efforts toward ensuring transformational change in preparedness capacity. Efforts toward resilience building, disaster prevention or mitigation and adaptation will be outside the scope of the GPP.

GOVERNANCE

The GPP will be led by a **Steering Committee (SC)** which provides transparent and accountable decision-making and is responsible for setting the priorities and the strategic direction of the partnership. The SC will be co-chaired by one V20 representative and one government donor representative. Members will include two additional representatives of the V20, two additional donors, and four core partner representatives (on a rotational basis), making a total of ten members of the SC. Donor representation will be the three highest donor contributors, and the MPTF administrative agent will be an ex-officio member of the SC. The SC may invite relevant observers to participate, e.g. representatives from implementing partners and civil society

The SC will: provide general oversight and accountability of the MPTF; approve the strategic direction of the Fund and its results framework; review and approve a risk management strategy for the Fund and review risk monitoring regularly; approve guidelines, selection criteria and an annual work plan; approve proposals submitted for funding and decide the allocation of funds; advocate for and supervise resource mobilization for the Fund; commission mid-term and final independent evaluations on the overall performance of the Fund; approve a Fund risk management strategy, monitor risks and advise on appropriate mitigation actions when necessary. Ordinary meetings of the Steering Committee shall be held quarterly. The quorum shall be set at six Steering Committee members. The Steering Committee shall make its decisions by consensus.

The SC will be supported by a Secretariat. The Secretariat provides direct support on general partnership operations, SC meetings, communications, fundraising, grant processing, and coordinating of reporting processes. The Secretariat reviews proposals submitted for funding. The Secretariat shall record and publish the reports of meetings of the Steering Committee. The Secretariat will be hosted by the V20 secretariat within UNDP Geneva.

During the GPP development phase, an **Operational Working Group (OWG)** made up of partner organisations will be responsible for proposing the operational principles and associated manual, templates and tools for SC review and approval. The Secretariat will continue to refine and adapt the standard operating guidelines and principles of the GPP once fully operational.



PARTNERSHIPS

The GPP enables partners to align objectives and resources, and agree on preparedness interventions to achieve more together than they would have been able to achieve individually and to provide a coherent approach to national readiness. It is expected that partners; are leaders in response and recovery preparedness or have strong links to it, endorse the vision and approach of the GPP, be committed to collective action including supporting other organisations at country level, be able to 'value add' – to bring something new, or additional to the Partnership and are prepared to actively contribute to the success of the GPP through; Knowledge, Operational Capacity, Personnel and Advocacy Contributions.

Donor Partners provide funds to the MPTF. Donor partners contributing above a minimum threshold, e.g. USD 25 million, hold seats on the SC on a rotational basis. The donor providing the largest contribution holds the co-chair position on the SC.

Country Partners currently are the V20 members, but can be expanded to others in future. Country partners applying for GPP support will meet entry requirements to receive funding, e.g. clarity on national institutional lead for overall management of emergency preparedness and response, and will also invest financial and human resources to the review, programme and follow up phases. Country partners can also provide technical advice and knowledge sharing with one another

Core Partners are currently six: the V20 group of countries, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank / Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (WB/GFDRR), and the World Food Programme (WFP). Core partnership requires a USD 50,000 annual input to the GPP funds for 2017 to establish the secretariat. Core partners hold seats on the MPTF SC on a rotational basis and have standing MOUs with the MPTF for receiving funds and can also contribute by aligning their related capabilities and initiatives, such as 5-10-50, with the GPP.

Functional Partners bring skills to the OWG at global level. Functional Partners can be organisations, but also initiatives. Functional Partnership does not incur a financial cost. Functional partners currently include; Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI), the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR), the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS).

Implementing Partners are funded contributors to capacity building at country level. There are many possibilities for implementing partners; other governments, private sector, academia, INGOs, NNGOs, UN agencies, National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, etc. Donor, country, core and functional partners can also implement at country level.

FINANCING

Financing is managed by a MPTF established to support the GPP. The MPTF delivers grants based on instructions from the SC and its Secretariat. Donor contributions are pooled into a single account managed by the UN MPTF Office, and core partner agencies receive funds based on instructions from the SC. Core partners



then disperse funds to implementing partners through budget transfer. Additional core partner agencies can be added at a later date if they meet the fiduciary and management standards required. UN and other core partners assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to them by the administrative agent. Indirect costs of the core partners are recovered through programme support costs set at 7%. National Governments may participate in and receive funding from the Fund. For direct access, the national government signs its own Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the MPTF. This MOA should include that all funding for preparedness proposals will be approved by the Steering Committee after being developed jointly with GPP core partners (including national institutions) using GPP approved methodologies and standards. The core partner agencies would be directly accountable to the SC for the use of transferred resources.

The initial phase of the GPP, covering 15 countries over a 2 to 3 year period, is estimated to cost \$100 - 130 million. A longer-term program of five further years, covering 50 vulnerable nations, would involve \$250 - \$330 million. Given the highly contextual nature of the planning, it is difficult to provide specific budget figures, and an 'indicative' budget is included as an annex to this framework document. In addition to resourcing through the MPTF, partners can contribute by aligning their separately funded related capabilities and initiatives with the GPP.

PRINCIPLES

National Ownership. The investment needed for real transformational change in preparedness capacities must be first and foremost mobilised nationally.

Joint Planning and Coordination. Under the leadership of national governments, GPP Partners will jointly plan specific action and investments required to strengthen national and sub-national preparedness, recognizing the comparative advantage of each organisation to support government.

Context Specific. Supporting national and local capacities for preparedness should be context specific and should recognise and build on country and regional initiatives.

Catalytic Approach. The GPP will take a catalytic approach that is an integral part of wider national and regional disaster risk reduction and risk management policies and frameworks.

The selection by the SC of countries for support will be on the following bases: **political will** based on the country's written commitment to provide financial and human resources to meet the objectives of the partnership, and clear evidence of relevant ministerial and relevant national agency engagement, including clarity, ideally through legislation, of national lead for disaster preparedness and response; high **multi-hazard vulnerability** evidenced by the existence of compounding risks and vulnerabilities; and **emerging or imminent hazards** where urgent preparedness measures need to be scaled up.

PROCESS

The GPP will leverage international technical and operational capacity through links to existing organisations and initiatives. The GPP country support follows four key steps;



OCHA



GFDRI
Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery



1. **Government application** for support followed by a partner scoping mission.
2. A government led **Diagnostic Review** or self-assessment of country-level preparedness, identifying priority gaps in response and recovery capacities and creating a starting baseline to measure results, and recommendations for a **Capacity Building Proposal**.
3. A government led **Targeted Preparedness Programme** including national integrated and coordinated capacity building programmes, directly addressing needs identified in the diagnostic review. For UN system partners this will also be harmonised with relevant country level development frameworks.
4. Follow up programme including, **Knowledge Management** with sharing between vulnerable countries, including through use of regional entities, structures and institutions, **Quality Assurance** and evaluating progress in readiness.

Government application

National Governments, with technical advice from GPP partners in country, apply to the GPP for financial and technical support. It will be a whole-of-government application, with a lead Ministry identified and other stakeholders advising; including civil society, the UN and national societies of the Red Cross/Red Crescent. Applications will explicitly link to existing preparedness planning and highlight already identified gaps that require support. Applications will be received and processed by the Secretariat, and be reviewed and decided on by the MPTF SC. Guidance on periodicity of the application process, who is to undertake review and prioritisation, and how to balance variations in scale of applications will be developed by the OWG. Further, the group will develop a template for applications, as well as a transparent review and feedback mechanism.

The application for support will clearly demonstrate via an indicative budget the financial and human resources required for the assessment phase. This will include the level of human and financial resources the national government is prepared to commit to the process, and therefore the percentage of support the GPP is expected to provide. The application should be based upon risk context information drawn from the national government's own research, academic research, and/or global risk analysis platforms and processes. If available, existing assessments and diagnostics should be referred to in the application. The application should already identify transformational change the governments' hope to generate, including consideration of the 'minimum benchmarks' for response and recovery readiness. Extensive Risk versus Intensive Risk should be explicitly considered, given the high community costs of extensive risk⁵. A scoping mission will be undertaken between a successful application and the full diagnostic review. This mission would examine and manage, where necessary, the country expectations and the planned diagnostic process. The scoping mission will provide feedback to the government and the SC on the application and draft diagnostic plan, and draft terms of reference for the diagnostic review.

Diagnostic Review and Capacity Building Proposal

The diagnostic review will include a country-led self-assessment of country-level readiness and will identify priority gaps in preparedness for both response and recovery. This would include assessing the current national and partner programs supporting preparedness, and improving the alignment of these to one another. The design of the review will be defined by the national government, with certain minimum inclusions, and in

⁵ Extensive risk is used to describe the risk associated with low-severity, high-frequency events, mainly but not exclusively associated with highly localized hazards. Intensive risk is used to describe the risk associated to high-severity, mid to low-frequency events, mainly associated with major hazards.



consultation with the GPP partners in country. The review will include a number of recommendations for strengthening national preparedness, consider the most vulnerable communities and locations and identify key partners and initiatives to assist the national government by recommending areas for capacity building. Diagnostic reviews should also include: an existing preparedness and capacity mapping and stakeholder assessment including resource constraints; local successes in preparedness; all sectors and detailed sub-sector priority gaps. As part of this process a starting baseline capability will be discerned in order to measure results, and regional entities, structures and institutions invited to provide knowledge gained from the region.

Reviews will be carried out by a government led nationally and internationally sourced assessment team, inclusive of representatives from whole of society, including the private sector, relevant regional entities, structures and institutions, National Red Cross or Red Crescent Societies, national NGOs and international partners. An output of the review should be the preparing or updating of a national preparedness action plan. Action plans should leverage existing funding and initiatives, including where appropriate regional emergency capability arrangements, and include scenario planning to establish response and recovery needs. It is likely to be a lengthy process (from 3-12 months) dependent on the context. The CADRI Partnership tools, and capacity development joint approach, for facilitating national diagnosis of capacity gaps at national and local level and the design of multi-sectoral action plans will be employed in this phase.

The final part of the diagnostic would be a 'Capacity Building Proposal' (CBP) developed based on the overall action plan. The CBP should be designed by an inclusive and participatory country team, with technical support from GPP partners, and approved by the MPTF steering committee. It should be prioritised, costed, output-based and include national government and other partners' contributions. The absorptive capacity of government agencies and the delivery capacity of partners will be reviewed and be a criterion for support. Engagement at the subnational and local community levels will be considered as part of a 'minimum standard' of preparedness as well as capacity that may be pooled on a regional basis. Templates and tools required for the review and proposal process will be developed by the operational working group, founded on existing tools such as the CADRI Capacity Development and planning tool, use the approach foreseen in the IASC/UNDG/UNISDR Common Framework for Preparedness as well as tools developed as part of the "Words into Action" set of guidelines developed post-Sendai. Other tools such as the IASC Emergency Response Preparedness process could also be adapted to suit government ministries and departments.

Targeted Preparedness Capacity Building Programme

A multi-level and multi-stakeholder approach is required in the capacity building programme as there are different people and different processes occurring at different levels of response and recovery. The mapping of expertise against capacity gap categories will be linked to a list of lead agencies and contributing organisations. It will be made clear who will be the actual responding or recovering entity in each sector or activity. To avoid replacing existing structures or processes, links must be established to existing capacity building projects, including those developed by relevant regional entities, structures and institutions. For newly established GPP capacity building, there will be a clear allocation of roles and responsibilities, including between the local and national level. The national government, in dialogue with the GPP partners in country, are to decide who has the **comparative advantage** in each country to provide capacity support. Comparative advantage will be based not only on technical or sectoral area, but also on geographic and physical presence.

The capacity building proposal will be tailored to each national context. However, there are some likely



common components within the following categories: risk analysis; linking early warning to action; (including linking national to local/community level); resource allocation and funding (including all levels from national to local); operational response coordination, including information management and communication; contingency planning; training exercises and community/public awareness; key support equipment and disaster management infrastructure. A set of guiding operational principles on what constitutes minimum levels of preparedness will be developed by the OWG. The group will also develop a list of concrete examples defining what is 'outside the scope' of the GPP. Some examples of what could be within or outside the scope of the GPP are included in the following table.

Risk Context and Component	Example within the GPP scope	Outside of the GPP scope
Flood – Emergency Rescues	Training emergency staff, establishing emergency communications systems Provision of rescue material – boats, motors, lifejackets, ropes etc	Emergency Staff Wages
Earthquake – Emergency supply prepositioning	Stock management software and guidance Establishing logistics hubs	Ongoing warehouse costs
Cyclone – Recovery shelter programme via cash distribution	Establishing guidance, rostering and training relevant staff, e.g. engineers, cash transfer managers Developing technology and mechanisms for cash transfers	Providing funds for cash transfers for shelter reconstruction

Follow up programme – knowledge management and quality assurance

Before, during and after the capacity building programme, the GPP will promote and facilitate knowledge sharing between V20 countries. This may include an exchange program to observe each other's response and recovery systems preparedness and how they are financed. The GPP will employ relevant technology to ensure that all partners and countries are keeping updated on preparedness measures, e.g. a single online platform such as ALERT or Prevention Web. Countries seeking GPP support would commit to peer to peer learning, employing multiple avenues and methods, and sharing knowledge with regional preparedness and disaster reduction entities, structures and institutions. One focus of knowledge management is directed to the GPP itself, with each capacity building process to inform the next. This will ensure that the GPP adapts and develops guidance and SOPs useful to V20 members.

Countries will also be instrumental in generating evidence on the value for money of preparedness investments. Monitoring will be based on an agreement of 'mutual accountability' among the V20 countries and other participating states. Recipient countries must be able to show other V20 members that the investment has been fruitful. This mutual accountability should also be a driver of learning with regional government bodies leveraged as avenues of shared learning. The monitoring framework will be a government responsibility, and follow a process of Activity > Outcome > Impact > Value for money, with value for money a key focus. The monitoring framework should measure transformational change to national preparedness structures and processes as well as impacts on links between international and national actors. Best practice should be fed back into the GPP. In recurring crises, it may be possible to evaluate the improvement in lives, finance and time saved through effective preparedness. Trend analysis and lessons learnt based on evaluations will inform future operations and GPP allocation decisions. The OWG will develop a template for monitoring, including guidance on minimum standards for preparedness and defining value for money and transformational change.



Annex A – Proposed MPTF budget – Indicative only

GPP Indicative Budget Outlay (2017-2021)				
Program components	Activities/deliverables	Cost estimate per country	Phase I (2017-2018) 15 target countries	Phase II (2019-2021) 35 target countries
1. Country diagnostic for preparedness and recovery capacities	Country preparedness diagnostic report with key recommendations	\$200,000	\$3,000,000	\$7,000,000
2. (a) Targeted preparedness capacity building programmes	Tailored technical assistance programs that builds on the existing preparedness initiatives and focuses on: developing institutional and legislative frameworks; strengthening national institutions for better preparedness; leveraging larger investments programs; and conducting trainings and drills/simulations.	\$1,850,000	\$27,750,000	\$64,750,000
2. (b) Rapid preparedness activities for emerging and imminent events	Strengthening early warning and IM systems; enhancing emergency services; improving contingency planning and financing; implementing standby arrangements and prepositioning of emergency resources;	\$4,000,000	\$60,000,000	\$140,000,000
3. Capacity building, documentation and knowledge sharing	Best practice notes and other knowledge products; Regional and national capacity building workshops; Experts training and knowledge exchange visits;	\$200,000	\$3,000,000	\$7,000,000
4. Program management and monitoring & evaluation	Program administration and secretariat services; annual reports; audits; independent impact assessments at mid-term and end-of-program.	\$150,000	\$2,250,000	\$5,250,000
			\$96,000,000	\$224,000,000
Total program outlay			\$320,000,000	
Notes:				
1. The cost estimates per country are average; actual cost per country will depend on the country context and agreed plan of action				
2. The program budget estimates are inclusive of the operating expenses of national and international partner agencies				
3. Component 2(b) includes the possibility of rapid deployment and preparedness building support to additional countries on-demand basis.				



Annex B – IASC Common Components of Emergency Preparedness

Hazard / risk analysis and early warning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Risk assessments: Hazard / Vulnerability/ Capacity – Early warning and alert systems (local, national, regional and international)
Institutional and legislative frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Multisector and sectoral Institutional and Legislative Frameworks, – Resource Allocation and Funding Mechanisms – National Plan of Action, National Platform, National Disaster Management Authority – Regional agreements
Resource allocation and funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Core country emergency program budgets (internal) – National and regional risk pooling mechanisms – International agency emergency funding arrangements – including risk pooling mechanisms (external)
Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Government Coordination mechanisms – National / sub-national/ local leadership structures – Multisector and sectoral inter-agency coordination – national, sub-national and local – Sector/cluster standards – Arrangements for coordinating and undertaking needs assessments (multi-sectoral, sectoral, recovery) – Coordination mechanisms for Govt / RCRCM / UN / NGO joint operations
Information management and communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Information Management systems – national, regional and international – Communication systems – Sector/cluster information management systems – GIS, 3/4 W's – Baseline data management – Data sharing systems
Preparedness and contingency / response planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community preparedness – Preparedness programmes for all sectors – Contingency/Response Planning
Training and exercises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Simulations, drills – with the presence of local, national and / or international actors – Accredited training packages and opportunities – Specific country context training opportunities
Emergency services / standby arrangements and prepositioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Stockpiling – national, regional and international – Civil Protection, Emergency Services, Search and Rescue, Mass Casualty Management – Contingency partnership resource and supply agreements – national, regional and international – Standards, guidelines and standard operating procedures for sectoral emergency response