Emergency Preparedness Project development **Quality Checklist**



Purpose

This element of the toolkit provides a step-by-step quality checklist for emergency preparedness (EP) project proposal writing and project implementation.

It is intended to facilitate the development of EP project activities and proposals that are high quality in their design. Guidance provided in this document encompasses all Emergency Preparedness & Readiness components. EP activities and proposals should always be contextual as there is no single set of "agreed" EP activities, and most of EP prjects would have strong linkages with DR activities. The document gives general guidelines that should be considered across EP implementation and proposals with checklists pertaining to each of the 10 components of EP that are covered in this toolkit.

To note, not all elements of these checklist are expected to be applicable to each context.

General Guidelines

- Check that proper EP/DRR terminology and acronyms are used throughout the proposal.
- Avoid using the term "natural disaster" as it is no longer relevant. You may refer to natural hazards - (i.e., earthquake) but earthquakes only become a disaster when the impact exceeds local (human) capacity to cope with it.
- Check that you accurately and consistently use terminology associated with the proposed activities including preparedness, response, mitigation, prevention, and climate change. For IOM EP terminology, first check the <u>IOM Introduction to Emergency Preparedness</u> self-study available on iLearn. For other globally accepted DRR terminology, use the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction Terminology page.
- Project proposals/EP activities need to be developed with the most up to date available information and be evidence-based through risk analysis and monitoring and/or needs assessments.
- Project proposals/EP activities need to demonstrate knowledge of the context and awareness of potential overlaps and opportunities to collaborate with other actors including the interventions and areas of competence of other organizations (including humanitarian, development and peace actors, as applicable).
- IOM generally supports engagement with national coordination platforms for an efficient response and should be based on the country strategy (where applicable).
- Donor priorities should be considered and addressed in the proposal to the extent that is possible and consequent to IOM priorities and relevant to the context.
- Prioritize the use of donor indicators over custom indicators when applicable. Use the **IOM** indicator database as a guidance document to select the most relevant indicators for your project proposal.
- Proposed activities should be realistic in terms of timeframe and available resources, taking into consideration IOM/ Implementing Partner's (IP) capacity.

- Proposed approaches and technologies should be consistent with national standards and, where absent, cluster / sector or international standards e.g. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. This should be explicit in the proposal narrative and reflected in project activities.
- Cross cutting issues such as gender, gender-based violence (GBV), environmental sustainability, disability inclusion, etc. should be mainstreamed across all the entire proposal and should be taken into account in all phases of the project including measures planned to mitigate any potential negative impacts.
- Where applicable, an exit strategy should be well defined for all projects.

EP Project development | Quality Checklist

1. Risk Analysis (For easier perusal between CO, RO & HQ, most of the information below could be centralized in the <u>EP dashboard</u>)	YES	NO	N/A
Has your CO completed the EP dashboard, done a basic context analysis to identify the main risks in your country context? (see PRD EP Dashboard & available Risk Analysis/Monitoring Resources)?			
Does the analysis identify how likely the identified hazards/threats are to occur?			
Is there an analysis of the level of exposure people have to the identified hazards and threats?			
Are the different levels of vulnerabilities that people have to the identified hazards and risks identified?			
Are the coping capacities of the local authorities, civil society and community considered in the risk analysis?			
Has the risk seriousness for each hazard/threat been calculated to determine low, medium and high-level risks in your context?			
Have you completed the MPA Checklist for your Country Office?			
Based on your completed MPA checklist, have you identified gaps in preparedness and an action plan to address them (with assigned responsibilities and deadlines)?			
Have you established the country baseline situation for your context that includes historical IDP and refugee movement trends and patterns?			
Does the country baseline situation cover risks faced by different sub-groups of the population (e.g., migrants, women, disabled people, unaccompanied minors, mixed flow populations)?			
Does your CO have a risk monitoring plan and schedule with assigned responsibilities for different categories of risks in your context?			
Does the CO update the Emergency Preparedness Dashboard at least annually and more often for medium and high-level risks?			
Does the CO include risk analysis as a standing agenda item in the Senior Management Team (SMT) meetings?			
Is risk analysis information proactively communicated and shared with programmes/fundraising teams?			
Have you coordinated and shared your risk analysis with the security focal point, where applicable?			
Where applicable, does the CO participate in inter-agency coordination mechanisms for risk analysis by proactively sharing relevant information and actively participating in coordination meetings?			

2. Preparedness and Contingency/Response Planning	YES	NO	N/A
Does the CO have contingency plans, which document all response trigger mechanisms to be activated in the event of specified hazards (e.g., agreed			
response strategies, priority emergency services, coordination mechanisms, division of tasks and responsibilities)			
Are your contingency/response plans based on evidence-based findings from risk analysis and risk monitoring?			
Have you prepared multi-risk or specific contingency/response plans that cover all of the medium and high-level hazards/threats in your country			
context?			
Are contingency/response plans up to date (revised annually at least and every six months for medium and high-level risk)?			
Has the CO agreed with relevant stakeholders (inter-agency, government) early warning indicators and a schedule for monitoring them?			
Has the CO identified relevant EP activities/concepts to address the Gaps and Obstacles identified in the Contingency Plan template?			
Do project ideas address the preparedness needs of the intended beneficiaries?			
Do the project ideas fall in line with already identified donor priorities and funding mechanisms ?			
Do the project ideas take into account the priorities , strategies, and policies of key stakeholders ?			
Do the project ideas fall within IOM's capacities, mission and strategic focus?			
Have you prepared a concept note as a communication tool to share project ideas with management and internal team members, as well as DOE RTS?			
Have you engaged relevant potential stakeholders in the concept development stage to ensure buy-in and sustainability of EP activities?			
Where applicable, does the CO participate in inter-agency coordination mechanisms for contingency/response planning/readiness to respond by			
proactively sharing relevant information and actively participating in coordination meetings?			
3. Emergency Services/Response Mechanisms and Strategies	YES	NO	N/A
Do your planned emergency services/response mechanisms and strategies align to national disaster response strategies ?			
Have you gathered pre-existing risk specific joint contingency/response UN plans (HCT, UNCTs) to inform your emergency services/response			
mechanisms and strategies?		Ц	
Have you verified if and how planned emergency services/response mechanisms and identified where there are residual gaps in humanitarian response?			
Has your analysis of emergency response capacity considered existing assessments such as inter-agency/inter-sectoral assessments, cluster/sectoral			
assessments, agency-specific assessments and the Displacement Tracking Matrix, where available?		ш	ы
Have you analysed the government's and the partners' capacities and gaps in the current response?			
Have you determined the government's position with regards to support from partners at the national and subnational levels?			
Have you developed an IOM emergency response strategy and plans with overall objectives and priority actions that reflect existing resources and			
capacity of government and partners?			

4. Resource Allocation and Funding Mechanisms	YES	NO	N/A
Have you identified the main donors for emergency response in your country context?			
Have you identified donors that are known to provide funding for emergency preparedness, including bilateral donors?			
Does your analysis of the donor landscape include a description of IOM traditional donors and the type of activities they fund?			
Does your analysis of the donor landscape include an analysis of how donor relationships could be strengthened?			
Does your CO team effectively engage with external funding mechanisms including Central Emergency Response Fund, Country-based Pooled Funds, bilateral preparedness donors and/or Anticipatory Actions funding?			
Is your CO team familiar with Emergency fundraising tools including Flash Appeals and the Humanitarian Response Plan templates?			
Have you checked if and how any existing response funding and/or resources could be better used by reallocating them to emergency preparedness activities?			
Does your CO team effectively engage with internal funding mechanisms including the Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism?			
Is your project proposal reflected and/or aligned with overall fundraising tool, the Global Crisis Response Platform (GCRP) under DRR/EP activities?			
Do proposals from your CO effectively reference key global fundraising frameworks such as Good Humanitarian Donorship & The Grand Bargain?			
Has your CO developed/maintained an IOM agency-specific Crisis Response Plan (see <u>IOM Global Crisis Response Plans</u>) and (potential) Flash Appeal that align to country and global level plans including HRP and Flash Appeals?			
Have you analysed the CO's capacity for accessing funding and diversifying funding sources?			

5. Coordination	YES	NO	N/A
Does IOM senior management and programs staff in your CO have a good understanding of pre-crisis coordination and management arrangements, whether led by national/local authorities with or without the support of a Resident Coordinator or the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs?			
Does the CO have a good understanding of coordination management arrangements for disaster response and coordination in mixed situations and refugee response in the country context?			
Has the CO prepared and implemented a plan to strengthen coordination capacity?			
Has the CO analysed key stakeholders for disaster preparedness and response using the Participation Matrix (see component 5 of the toolkit)?			
Has the CO established relationships and engaged with stakeholders in preparedness and response according to the completed Participation Matrix?			
Has the CO analysed whether the planned post-crisis coordination arrangements are structured and functioning as planned before the disaster (considering plans may need to be adapted if those with roles and responsibilities were impacted by the crisis).			
Post-crisis: Has the CO established and maintained relationships with national, local and community-level authorities in the response?			
Post-crisis: Does the CO engage with inter-agency coordination platforms for the response (i.e., participating in meetings, joint needs assessments, joint situation reports and coordinated funding appeals)?			
Post-crisis: Does the CO actively engage with donors to share the identified needs and gaps in the response that can be addressed through IOM programming?			

6. Information Management and Communication	YES	NO	N/A
Has the CO established an IOM coordinated emergency information management system? (e.g. increasing readiness by having a prepared			
SharePoint internal page for IM/KM ready to activate during emergency)			
Have you established a clear picture of the likely CO's information needs in potential emergencies?			
Do you trainings in place or planned around data collection , to ensure consistency and trustworthy data?			
Does your CO apply data protection principles for balance between collecting/sharing information while protecting individuals against misuse of information? (See Principles for protecting individuals in data management in Component 3.06.)			
Is the analysis of data in your CO adequate for identifying minimal gaps and shortcomings in the planning and provision of services and assistance?			
Is data disaggregated by demographics, by sector and by implementing agency (for effective coordination)?			
Does the CO actively use cluster/sector analysis tools and templates for all stage of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle to ensure coordinated humanitarian services?			
Has the CO considered a communication strategy or conducted planning to think through your communication objectives, distinct audiences, messaging, and a schedule of activities for dissemination?			
Does the CO offer opportunities for two-way communication through participatory planning and engagement with actors at different levels (i.e., government and community) to ensure Accountability with Affected populations?			
<u> </u>			
7. Early Warning Systems (EWSs)	YES	NO	N/A
Does your EWS include activities which strengthen national/local capacities for response preparedness?			
Do EWS training and learning activities promote the inclusion of migrants in emergency preparedness?			
Does of the EWS account for the public's perceptions of warnings and their beliefs and attitudes regarding disasters?			
Does the EWS include activities which strengthen community response preparedness and DRR capacity?			
Do community response preparedness strengthening activities cover risks to the community, options for safe behaviour, available escape routes and how to best avoid damage to property?			
Do early warnings and evacuation planning reflect the community's language abilities , first-hand knowledge of migrant populations, and understanding of cultural norms?			
Do evacuation plans consider and address the different needs of people within the community (i.e., older people and persons with disabilities who need extra protection measures and physical support to move safely to a different location, and can understand the early warning message).			
Have the migrants themselves and civil society partners taken an active role in identifying people with vulnerabilities and special needs for early warning and evacuation?			
Have migrants themselves and civil society partners actively participated in identifying solutions to address any required special protection measures and needs for evacuation?			
Have emergency management plans been located in a place or communicated in a way that is easily accessible to stakeholders with roles and			
responsibilities leading up to and during a crisis?			
In EW communications, have you worked in close coordination with government and inter-agency actors to agree on consistent crisis and hazard-specific communications to people at risk of displacement?			
Do EW communications include a description of potential risks associated with a crisis, where and how to obtain assistance and how to inform stakeholders of their needs?			

Do IOM communications address language, cultural and other barriers (including impacts of crises such as power failures, loss of internet and satellite systems).			
Is the CO prepared to disseminate pre-event risk communications and early warnings in line with government and local authority's direction using multiple communication channels, as necessary?			
9 Community Based Dispeter Brangedness (CDDD) 9 Bandiness	VEC	NO	BI /A

8. Community-Based Disaster Preparedness (CBDP) & Readiness	YES	NO	N/A
Have you proactively engaged and sensitized local leaders and communities to the CBDP initiative before it starts?			
Do CBDP plans reflect local leaders' and community perceptions of risks , concerns and priorities for improving disaster and crisis preparedness?			
Has a Participation Matrix been completed defining how CBDP stakeholders will be engaged at each stage of the CBDP (i.e., during assessment, design, implementation, monitoring as well as linkages with Accountability of Affected Population (AAP) practices)?			
Have you/IOM partners conducted a participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment (VCA) exercise with relevant stakeholders in the community using a variety of tools that allow for triangulation of information?			
Has the community developed an action plan based on the results of the VCA that defines activities, timeframes, human resources and other resources available, resources needed and committee/people responsible?			
During the planning stage, have you set realistic expectations for IOM's involvement that promote a smooth handover and sustainability of the project?			
With IOM's support, has the community developed a disaster plan which describes the hazards, objectives and indicators for the success of the CBDP project?			
Has IOM supported the community to create a coordinated calendar of events for the entire project ensuring alignment to other local civil defence and/or civil society activities?			
Does the project plan include (at least) monthly status meetings for tasking, mobilising community resources, capacity building, monitoring and review, and making adjustments?			
Does the CBDP project plan include an implementation, monitoring and evaluation system that covers progress on activities, time frames, budget, indicators, outputs, objectives and the impact of the disaster preparedness measures?			
At the end of the project, has a participatory After-Action Review to evaluate the project and lessons learned been planned and implemented?			
Have the lessons learned during the After-Action Review been documented and disseminated to relevant stakeholders for improved disaster preparedness actions in the future?			
At the end of the project, has the project been handed over to relevant stakeholders/authorities in a way that promotes sustainability (as part of a clear exit strategy)?			

9. Capacity Development/Training and Exercises	YES	NO	N/A
Have you engaged relevant stakeholders in capacity development and gained their support for activities?			
Have you conducted a capacity development/learning needs analysis to identify preparedness/response learning needs in your CO context?			
Does your capacity analysis describe how equipped government/ partners are to meet humanitarian needs and the needs of migrants in emergency response?			
Have you determined what capacity development activities can best be delivered by IOM to contribute to humanitarian/ migrants' needs being met more effectively when a disaster strikes?			
Has your CO identified in what ways IOM can contribute to enhancing government/partners' capacity for emergency response preparedness?			
Have you defined intended participants for capacity development/learning activities and assessed their learning preferences and requirements?			
Have relevant stakeholders been actively involved in identifying capacity development / learning activity design?			
Have you defined objectives for your capacity development/training activities as a whole and for its component parts?			
Are any capacity development/learning materials being used contextualised to ensure they are appropriate for the country context?			
Have participants of capacity development/learning activities been supported throughout the activities to meet the objectives (i.e., with technical, logistical and practical issues that may prevent them from engaging)?			
Do capacity building/training activities draw on participants' knowledge and experience ?			
Have steps been taken to mitigate safety and security risks to participants?			
Has a monitoring and evaluation plan for the capacity development/training project been developed and implemented?			

10. Institutional and Legislative Frameworks	YES	NO	N/A
Has your CO engaged with the Global Crisis Response Platform (GCRP) and updated and shared your country's crisis plan so that the RO and HQ are informed of your strategies?			
Has your CO engaged with the Migrants in Countries in Crisis (MICIC) Initiative and can you articulate how your current preparedness activities relate to it?			
Is your CO part of inter-agency disaster preparedness frameworks including the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's (IASC's) Emergency Response Preparedness (ERP) & the Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Anticipatory Action approaches?			
Do you engage with inter-agency disaster risk reduction (DRR) frameworks that can inform EP work including the Sendai Framework for DRR and the Words into Action: Disaster Displacement: How to Reduce Risk, Address Impacts and Strengthen Resilience?			
Have you identified inter-agency frameworks that are being applied in your country context and mapped existing CO activities to them?			
Have you identified the existing national laws, policies and strategies in place for disaster risk management/ preparedness and the extent to which these are being implemented as planned at national/local levels?			
Have you identified the existing national laws, policies or strategies in place relating to displacement and/or its resolution and the extent to which these are being implemented as planned at national/local levels?			
Can you determine the relevant local or regional/international frameworks in place that are being actively engaged in the country?			
Have you identified ways in which IOM can advocate for migrants in EP and response?			