Global Preparedness Partnership
Application Prioritisation Criteria – Finalised Oct 9, 2017

This document outlines the key aspects of the process for prioritising country applications, and offers recommendations for consideration by all partners to decide on the best approach.

Application Process

The country application form is for National Governments to apply for support to the Global Preparedness Partnership (GPP) which provides diagnostic and programmatic finance and capacity strengthening support for reaching a minimum level of preparedness to respond to crises. The Application Form includes considerations of: Main Hazard Concerns (Intensive and Extensive); Risk Information Sources; Emerging and Imminent Hazards; Existing, Intended or Updated Preparedness Planning; Existing preparedness assessments and diagnostics; Identified preparedness gaps; Ministries or Departments involved; other stakeholders already involved. These are in a 'checkbox' format with little required detail.

Finally, there are four 'narrative' format questions on: existing internal national response, recovery, coordination and preparedness mechanisms including associated financial mechanisms; existing external support resources already committed by other stakeholders; opportunities for Government to receive preparedness support; and the level of human and financial resources the national government is prepared to commit to the process of GPP support.

These options below are a set of suggestions to open discussions, members are encouraged to provide comments or any further ideas to the Subcommittee meeting chairs, or directly by comment to this paper and forwarded to - global@preparednesspartnership.org

Overview of Ranking Process

Already Agreed Parameters

The GPP Framework Document (FD) has already been developed and agreed by all partners including V20 Ministers of Finance. As described in the FD the following points do not need discussion.

"*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. 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. Extensive Risk versus Intensive Risk should be explicitly considered, given the high community costs of extensive risk."

There are some aspects of the FD that will require consideration and updating. *"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 already identify transformational change the governments' hope to generate, including consideration of the 'minimum benchmarks' for response and recovery readiness."*

Recommendation 1 – That the indicative budget and the plan for transformational change be developed as part of the Scoping Mission, rather than in the initial application.

Review of applications

Who, how and when?

The key questions for the review applications are ***who*** will review and prioritise them, what the ***criteria and process*** will be, and for ***how long and how often*** will the GPP be open for applications.

Who?

Already Agreed Parameters

From the Framework Document - *"Applications will be received and processed by the Secretariat, and be reviewed and decided on by the MPTF SC"*

Applications need to be compared not only to one another, but also against a set of criteria outlined below. The GPP Secretariat could collect and compare applications. The Secretariat could then rank the applications with comments and a set of recommendations regarding each application to allow the Steering committee to either accept or adapt these recommendations. The Secretariat could also provide guidance on realistic timeframes for scoping missions, including their sequencing.

The other possibilities are that a small technical working group examine the applications and provide recommendations as above, which would be more transparent and possibly more extensive, but cumbersome and time consuming. Another is that the Steering Committee themselves review applications, but their meetings are likely to be too infrequent and short to allow adequate discussion. A third is that a small technical working group would remain available to support the Secretariat in the event of many applications.

Recommendation 2 - The GPP Secretariat should do the initial review and prioritisation of country applications in consultation with core partners. The review should then be shared with the MPTF Steering Committee for a final decision and guidance on funding support.

Key point – The Steering Committee will need to ensure a transparent approval process is maintained, with regular information provided to all V20 members. Preparedness support will be based on an agreement of ***'mutual accountability'*** among the V20 countries and other participating

states. Steering Committee members need to show that funding decisions have been based on reviews of applications, considering needs and capacities; recipient countries must ultimately be able to show other V20 members that the investment has been fruitful, and paid dividends in enabling minimum preparedness levels.

How?

Already Agreed Parameters

From the Framework Document - "*The selection of countries for support will be on the following bases:*

1. ***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;*
2. ***high multi-hazard vulnerability*** *evidenced by the existence of compounding risks and vulnerabilities; and*
3. ***emerging or imminent hazards*** *where urgent sector specific and hazard specific preparedness measures need to be scaled up.*

The three key measures; political will, high multi-hazard vulnerability, and emerging or imminent hazards need to be measured, but also balanced and compared between separate applications. Political will shall be given greatest weight, followed by multiple hazards and lastly by emerging threats.

Political will – only the final question in the application form specifically includes this point. However, the checklists regarding Ministries or Departments and other stakeholders involved give an indication of the breadth of connection to the application process. Finally, the questions regarding internal and external preparedness mechanisms and resources provide a sense of the extent of political will. Ultimately the Scoping Mission (see below) will be the primary gauge of political will. **High multi-hazard vulnerability** – it is relatively easy to compare types of hazards between applications, using reference points such as INFORM, however more complex are the compounding risks and vulnerabilities such as areas of high poverty or conflict. External efforts such as UNDP's Human Development Index or the World Bank's World Development Indicators, could assist in this process. **Emerging or imminent hazards** – must be considered, but given the expected timelines of several years from application to completion of the preparedness programme, this factor should have less weight.

Those countries with stronger existing preparedness measures and governance structures will be more able to develop a compelling application. This may lead to countries in greater need missing out on support. Similarly, the provision of co-funding opportunities should preclude the inclusion of lower income countries which may have less financial capacity to co-finance. There needs to be consideration of current capacity deficiencies; including parameters in relation to absence or presence of current in-country preparedness capacities. This should include the UNCT & WB having willing and available capacities to engage and support. Existing DRR programmes or projects where GPP could be integrated should be favourably viewed ensure country office support in implementation, and likely longevity and renewal of activities over time.

The Secretariat should thus ensure a balanced approach to ranking applications is taken with respect to likely existing capacity in the application process, while also ensuring an even regional spread of support and predicting likely absorptive capacities. Alongside these key concerns are other considerations; future potential climate risk indicators, as well as issues of access, fragility and insecurity.

Recommendation 3 - The GPP Secretariat should prepare a table briefly outlining and comparing the applications considering the various concerns above.

When?

Already Agreed Parameters

From the Framework Document – *"Guidance on periodicity of the application process, … will be developed by the OWG. Further, the group will develop … a transparent review and feedback mechanism."*

Initially the take up of applications may be slow, as awareness of the GPP is low. A quarterly periodicity could be employed to allow for applications to be submitted regularly. For the first year, applications could be reviewed and approved/rejected quarterly. After the first year, this could be reduced to biannually to reduce the number of Steering Group meetings required. Review and feedback opportunities should be included in the timing, to allow for a transparent and equitable process.

Countries should be allowed a full month from the date of applications being shared to complete the application. Applications should be reviewed as quickly as possible and returned to countries with feedback by the Secretariat where required. As some countries will use the entire month to apply, a further fortnight may be required for feedback and adjustment. The GPP Secretariat can then review and provide recommendations to the Steering Committee two months after applications have been opened. An indicative schedule could be;

Applications open	Sept 2017	**Applications close**	Oct 2017	**Feedback and review complete**	Nov 2017	**Scoping Missions begin**	Dec 2017
	Dec 2017		Jan 2018		Feb 2018		Mar 2018
	Mar 2018		Apr 2018		May 2018		Jun 2018
	Jun 2018		Jul 2018		Aug 2018		Sep 2018
	Dec 2018		Jan 2019		Feb 2019		Mar 2019
	Jun 2018		Jul 2018		Aug 2018		Sep 2018

Recommendation 4 - The application, review and approval process should begin quarterly, reducing to biannually after one year.

Scoping Process

Although the Scoping Mission processes are outside the remit of this options note, what is likely to occur in the scoping mission impacts on the recommendations above.

Already Agreed Parameters

From the Framework Document – *"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."

Scoping missions will be undertaken by GPP multilateral partner staff, with clear TORs and mission timelines, preferably in country, in concert with national government staff, with support as required from regional preparedness experts. The scoping mission will report back to the Steering Committee, and be supported by the Secretariat. Scoping Missions will be self-funded from in country. Where dedicated staff are required (consultants etc) to manage the scoping process, these can be supported by the MPTF on a case by case basis on approval by the Steering Committee. Reporting from scoping missions will be monitored and followed up on by the Secretariat. Scoping Missions will develop a budget and plan for the Diagnostic Review.

There is a risk that governments see the GPP funds as a way to avoid their own fiscal responsibilities, and rely on the GPP totally, rather than as way to improve and augment their own efforts. There is a similar risk that UN agencies or governments proceed without coordinating with one another, and failing to integrate their efforts. The Scoping Mission should manage expectations, and inform the Diagnostic Review planning to avoid both risks. It is vital to ensure that the UN Country Team and designated government authorities are fully engaged in the whole scoping mission (before, during and after) to secure their support during the diagnostic review. The scoping process should take 4-6 weeks.

The Scoping Mission should ensure the Diagnostic Review is in alignment with, and supports, existing national policy, strategic or programmatic frameworks that include preparedness (i.e. National Policy, Strategy, Plan, etc.). The scoping mission will consider complementarity with existing or planned investment or budget allocation to DRM generally or for preparedness specifically; and ongoing global initiatives such as the Capacity Development for Disaster Reductive Initiative (CADRI), the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), the Emergency Response Preparedness (ERP) approach, the Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems Initiative (CREWS), the Climate Resilience Initiative (A2R), the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS), or Getting Airports Ready for Disaster (GARD). The Scoping Mission will also assess which bodies have the stability and absorptive capacity to ensure the transformational change in their preparedness posture the GPP seeks to support. The scoping mission will make a final determination of which national entity or Government Ministry should be the focal point. The Scoping Mission should include private sector representatives, a specific plan for private sector engagement in the diagnostic review.

Scoping processes can empower and build capacities for national governments, by including a south-south peer-to-peer aspect. After the first round of scoping missions, an indicator of the political will of national governments to be eligible for access to GPP support could be to second national staff to participate in the scoping missions in other regional-based countries. This would serve to build the technical capacities of national staff as well as build a cadre of political champions for enhanced preparedness within the V20 plus countries.