

# Global Log Frame

## Policy Makers and regulator's Logical Framework

Design Summary	Performance Targets – Tangible Results	Monitoring and Oversight	Risk	Contingencies
<b>Goal</b>				
Reduce the risk of and vulnerability of lives and livelihoods from disasters	Percentage reduction of lives lost and impact on livelihoods	Reporting by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Governments</li> <li>○ Civil society</li> <li>○ International community</li> </ul>	Lack of ownership and engagement of stakeholders at all levels (national, local, community)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Raising awareness</li> <li>○ Closer engagement</li> </ul>
<b>Objectives</b>				
Increased and more Effective Use of ICT for Disaster Management	Uninterrupted ICT Services during the life cycle of the disaster, measured as a percentage of downtime.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Country and Regional Reports</li> <li>○ Reporting of Key Stakeholders,</li> <li>○ Disaster Simulation Exercises</li> </ul>	Level of engagement from ICT community (regulators, providers, users)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Raising awareness within the ICT community</li> <li>○ Closer engagement between the ICT providers and users</li> <li>○ Accurate need analysis to assist product development</li> </ul>
Appropriate understanding and implementation of the Tampere Convention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Signing/Ratifying the Tampere Convention</li> <li>○ Increased understanding of the Tampere Convention measured by the number of initiatives within Tampere framework</li> </ul>	Reports by relevant Government Ministries	Lack of government commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Closer engagement between public officials and the international community</li> <li>○ Continuous advocacy by international community and civil society</li> </ul>
Strengthening policy and regulatory frameworks	Adopting policies within a set timeframe	Follow up and evaluation reports by relevant state institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inability to comply with the timeframe</li> <li>○ Lack of political will</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advocacy by international community and civil society, particularly international NGOs</li> <li>○ Donor assistance for policy and regulatory capacity</li> </ul>

				building
Harmonization of Regulatory Frameworks	Standardized Disaster Management ICT Resources with multiple country application achieved within a set time period	Reports by national disaster management policy makers and national regulatory authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of regulatory commitment</li> <li>o Issues of national sovereignty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Stronger international commitments and frameworks</li> <li>o Awareness raising of the broader needs</li> </ul>
Development of National Disaster Plans	Completion of Plans within a set timeframe	Reports by National Disaster Management Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of capacity within ministry responsible</li> <li>o Limited public consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Comprehensive assessment of implementing ministries' capacity and steps to build capacity</li> <li>o Placing emphasis on public consultation</li> </ul>
Creating a Coordination Database	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Formal agreement to determine responsibilities</li> <li>o Collection of data from operators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Reports from meetings and minutes</li> <li>o Review the reports from operators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of commitment of stakeholders</li> <li>o Failure to submit data from operators</li> <li>o Lack of infrastructure</li> </ul>	Enabling regulatory environment
Capacity building	Number of available qualified and trained persons	Regular assessment reports by state agencies engaged in disaster management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Unavailability of the trained persons</li> <li>o Incompatibility of training with available response equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Funding assistance from donors and state</li> <li>o In-kind assistance from international community</li> </ul>
Encourage private sector to engage in the use of ICTs for disaster management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Allocation of frequency spectrum</li> <li>o License agreements</li> </ul>	Frequency spectrum audit by state agencies	Misuse of granted frequency spectrum	Enabling policy and regulatory framework
Adequate policy and regulatory framework for the use of ICTs in disaster management	Availability of adequate framework within acceptable time frame	Evaluation reports by state agencies and civil society	Lack of political goodwill and commitment	Continuous advocacy by international community
Ability to enhance capacity to meet the demands during disaster situations	Practical tests in simulations and actual disaster situations	Evaluation performance after practical test by state agencies	Weakness in performance of trained persons	Funding assistance from donors and state
Increased government commitment to the use of ICTs for disaster management	Government policy document on the use of ICTs for disaster management by a set target date	Allocation of budgetary resources	Budgetary limitations	Funding assistance from donors
<b>Outputs</b>				

All member states being Signatories to the Tampere Convention	Majority of Member States being Signatories	Reports by Government Ministries	Concerns about national sovereignty	Stronger international commitments and frameworks
Systematic coordination and appropriate links to international and regional early warning systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o establishment of comprehensive databases</li> <li>o availability of appropriate coordination mechanisms at international, national and community levels</li> </ul>	Oversight by effective national & international coordinating mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Limited resources</li> <li>o Costs of ICT material</li> <li>o Lack commitment at all levels</li> <li>o Lack of broad-based participation</li> <li>o Contradicting interests and priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Establishing points of contact</li> <li>o Strengthening political commitment</li> <li>o Strengthening capacity and human resources</li> <li>o Strengthening resource mobilisation</li> <li>o Establishing/strengthening partnerships</li> </ul>
Establishing National Disaster Strategic Plans and related institutional frameworks for disaster risk reduction with clear definition of roles and responsibilities at national and local levels	<p>Availability within set timeframes of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o disaster national communication plan</li> <li>o risk assessment</li> <li>o hazard mapping</li> <li>o disaster risk measures integrated into contingency plans</li> <li>o implementing the plans</li> </ul>	National Disaster Management Agency through regular reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Limited resources</li> <li>o Lack commitment and awareness</li> <li>o Conflicting interests and priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Establishing points of contact within Government agencies</li> <li>o Strong political leadership and commitment</li> <li>o Strengthening capacity and human resources</li> </ul>
Awareness and education regarding Tampere	The number of stakeholder consultations held	Reports by Government Ministries and civil society organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of financial resources</li> <li>o Lack of expertise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Increased assistance from Donor community</li> <li>o In-Kind contributions by International NGOs</li> </ul>
Harmonization of the use of ICT resources such as radio spectrum for disaster management	Establishing a collaborative Framework within an agreed timeframe	Reports by National Regulatory Authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Limited resources</li> <li>o Lack political commitment and awareness</li> <li>o Conflicting interests and priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Donor support</li> <li>o Strong political leadership</li> </ul>
Information dissemination to the local / community level	Setting up of an effective combination of high tech & traditional means to disseminate information to community level	Reports by Community Based Organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of information and data</li> <li>o Inadequate communication channels</li> </ul>	Strong advocacy by NGOs/CBOs

Information / databases on local demography risk areas	Making available relevant information within an agreed timeframe	Reports by all stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Availability of resources</li> <li>o Acceptance of sharing of information</li> </ul>	Increased support from donor and international community
Effective national laws and regulations	Passing of relevant laws within an agreed timeframe	Reports from Ministry(ies) of the progress of the various phases of the draft laws	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of effective enforcement</li> <li>o Conflict amongst agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Strong leadership</li> <li>o Good governance</li> <li>o Conducting workshops, meetings and forums to exchange views</li> </ul>
Build cooperative relationships between stakeholders	Availability of formal agreement(s) between regulators and stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Follow up of the agreement</li> <li>o Random checks and reports all stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Stakeholders not having the ability to carry out agreements</li> <li>o Difficulty of harmonizing between networks</li> </ul>	Coordination and advocacy
Reliable, affordable and secure access to ICT for disaster management	Establishing of an emergency call centre dedicated to disaster management	Quantum of free calls facilitated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Too expensive for the private sector</li> <li>o Lack of government support</li> </ul>	Forming public-Private-Partnerships
Enhanced stakeholder participation in the development and implementation of ICTs for disaster management	Establishment of multi-stakeholder Emergency Communications Committees (ECCs)	Reports of consultations under ECCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of expertise in multi-stakeholder consultations</li> <li>o Negative mindset of government officials</li> </ul>	Donor support for capacity building
Local and traditional knowledge incorporated in the ICT for disaster management policies	Quantum of traditional knowledge incorporated in the policies, regulations and strategies used for training	Dissemination and training manuals produced by state agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Inability and/or unavailability of expertise to adapt local and traditional knowledge in a fit-to-use format</li> <li>o Negative mindset of government officials</li> </ul>	Strong coordination and collaboration
Increased participation of marginalised strata of society (women, youth etc) in the use of ICTs for disaster management	Number of persons of identified categories being trained	Reports by training institutes and civil society organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of funding</li> <li>o Negative mindset of government officials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Increased engagement of international community</li> <li>o Engagement of representatives of marginalised strata of societies</li> </ul>
Work with operators to reduce cost	Cost analysis and available solutions	Feedback from stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Inability of the operators to reduce costs</li> </ul>	Forming Public-Private-Partnerships
<b>Inputs</b>				
Commitment of Governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Number of Signatories to Tampere Convention</li> </ul>	Reports by Governments and international community	Lack of commitment by government	Increased advocacy by international community

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Number of States collaborating for development of harmonized framework</li> </ul>			
Time, effort and Knowledge	Number of Days and Hours required to prepare consultations and collaborations	Reports by Governments and international community	Lack of funding	Building capacity to raise funding
Financial resources	Amount of funds committed by donors within set timeframes	Reports by Government agencies	Lack of donor commitment	Advocacy
Technical resources	Quantum of resources made available within agreed timeframes	Reports by Government agencies and civil society	Lack of commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Advocacy</li> <li>o Encouraging policy framework</li> </ul>
Education, training and public awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Number of training sessions</li> <li>o Number of participations</li> </ul>	Reports by training institutes and civil society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of funding</li> <li>o Lack of commitment of stakeholders</li> <li>o Unavailability of suitable persons to undergo training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Donor funding</li> <li>o Advocacy</li> <li>o Encouraging policy framework</li> </ul>
Commitment of and information from regional and International organizations	Number of Agreements Signed	Reports from regional and International organisations	Lack of coordination among relevant entities	Increased advocacy by international community
Effective partnerships and networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Provision of regular reports to coordination bodies</li> <li>o Establishment of database of partners</li> </ul>	Reports from international and local partnerships	Conflict of interests	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide standard policies</li> <li>2. Plan for the partnership</li> </ol>
Incentives for investors and service providers (i. e. reducing taxes, universal service provision fund).	Allocation of frequency spectrum at low costs by a set deadline	Frequency spectrum audit by relevant regulator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of interest by investors and service providers</li> <li>o Misuse of the privileges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Advocacy</li> <li>o Regulatory capacity building</li> </ul>

## Technology Providers and Operators

Design Summary	Performance Target – Tangible Result	Monitoring and Oversight	Risks	Contingencies
<b>Goal</b>				
Reduce losses of lives and poverty caused by disasters	Percentage reduction of lives lost by an agreed timeframe	Government statistics office on comparison of actual losses against expected losses with no mitigation measures	Difficulty in measuring the losses that didn't happen	Proper simulations
<b>Objectives</b>				
Increased and more Effective Use of ICTs for Disaster Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Improved connectivity from emergency management systems to citizens</li> <li>o Improved and faster communication of reports from the field to the emergency management services</li> <li>o Making infrastructure more resilient</li> <li>o More appropriate alternative reporting channels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Setting the terms of understanding and accountability in advance by facilitation groups</li> <li>o Trust protocol boards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of harmonisation for solutions causing conflicting and confusing messages being communicated to citizens.</li> <li>o Policy not being clear and logical enough for automatic logic systems to carry out actions in a short time without human intervention.</li> <li>o Technological vulnerability</li> </ul>	Improved consultations and closer interactions
Advanced planning and reduction of vulnerability of the population.	Deaths due to sudden disasters reduced by half over 5 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o UNISDR reports</li> <li>o interactions with relief agencies</li> </ul>	Lack of commitment from partners and civil society actors.	Advocacy by the international community
A pre-defined national plan covering all utilities & government departments and updating such plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Risk assessments conducted &amp; information shared</li> <li>o Integrated planning tool used by Government &amp; critical infrastructure providers</li> <li>o A GIS system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o To be identified within the Governments of each island</li> <li>o To be identified from among the Critical Infrastructure Providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of funding</li> <li>o Lack of planning</li> <li>o Lack of engagement</li> <li>o Lack of skills</li> <li>o Lack of commitment</li> <li>o Lack of clarity as to the purpose/scope of the GIS system</li> </ul>	Engagement between Governments of the region and within countries with the industry sector

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monitoring tools</li> <li>○ Modeling tools</li> <li>○ Call centers for reporting</li> </ul>			
Vulnerabilities known & understood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Risk assessments conducted &amp; information shared</li> <li>○ Off Island systems &amp; data</li> <li>○ Listing of all standards, construction, build, etc.</li> <li>○ Central document register repository available to all, e.g. flood data/maps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To be identified within the Governments of each island</li> <li>○ To be identified from among the Critical Infrastructure Providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of funding</li> <li>○ Lack of planning</li> <li>○ Lack of engagement</li> <li>○ Lack of skills</li> <li>○ Lack of commitment</li> </ul>	Engagement by Governments with the industry sector
Clear Command & Control structure – from 'Meta' perspective down into each organization	Pre-defined plan listing departments & organizations for restoration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To be identified within the Governments of each island</li> <li>○ To be identified from among the Critical Infrastructure Providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of funding</li> <li>○ Lack of planning</li> <li>○ Lack of engagement</li> <li>○ Lack of skills</li> <li>○ Lack of commitment</li> </ul>	Engagement by Governments with the industry sector
Resilient communications	Emergency communications capability for the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To be identified from among the Critical Infrastructure Providers</li> <li>○ Regular consultation with civil society and customers</li> <li>○ Monitoring of network performance and coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of funding</li> <li>○ Lack of planning</li> <li>○ Lack of engagement</li> <li>○ Lack of skills</li> <li>○ Lack of commitment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Engagement by Governments with the industry sector</li> <li>○ Educating/lobbying government for more support</li> <li>○ More effective networking with government &amp; society</li> <li>○ Backup &amp; robust/redundant) systems</li> </ul>
Emergency communication	Equipping National Emergency Rooms	To be identified from among the Critical Infrastructure Providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of political and civil support</li> <li>○ Lack of funding</li> <li>○ Lack of planning</li> <li>○ Lack of engagement</li> <li>○ Lack of skills/expertise</li> <li>○ Lack of commitment</li> </ul>	Engagement by Governments with the industry sector

<b>Outputs</b>				
Cell broadcast (or other widespread messaging system) for sending messages to the people by installing Broker hardware, CAP compliant platforms and technology enabled terminals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Percentage of population who have opted to participate in the programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monitor and test system performance</li> <li>○ Government statistics</li> <li>○ Trust protocol boards</li> <li>○ Accountability Systems</li> <li>○ Civil society actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Networks not granting access</li> <li>○ Misinformation/lack of public awareness</li> <li>○ Trust</li> <li>○ Falling into disuse</li> <li>○ Lack of capacity/knowledge to use</li> <li>○ Non-Harmonized Versions of CAP</li> </ul>	Education for public, operators & government
Encourage continuity Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Percentage of institutions who have opted to participate in the programme</li> <li>○ Percentage of population covered by continuity planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Government statistics</li> <li>○ Civil society actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Misinformation/lack of public awareness</li> <li>○ Falling into disuse</li> <li>○ Lack of capacity/knowledge to use</li> </ul>	Raising awareness of stakeholders
Reliable & dependable communications by engaging multiple technologies and multiple operators including private operators, within each technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of technologies used</li> <li>○ Number and percentage of operators agreed</li> <li>○ Percentage of population covered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Government and industry statistics and reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cost</li> <li>○ Lack of engagement by industry</li> <li>○ Perception of preference of one provider over others</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Better coordination between stakeholders</li> <li>○ Donor support</li> </ul>
Provide rapid deploy-GSM systems for voice and data	Availability of standby systems ready to deploy on a regional level	Regional and national DR/DP groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Costs of implementation</li> <li>○ Availability of volunteers</li> </ul>	Raising awareness of stakeholders
Deployment of mobile/portable satellite communication/tele-centres in affected regions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Time-to-deploy</li> <li>○ Establishment of guidelines</li> <li>○ Geographic deployment proportional to scale of event</li> </ul>	Post intervention field reports/statistics	Lack of funding	Donor support
Deployment of a network with remote collection points connected by satellite, terrestrial or radio terminals with centralized office for processing and advanced intervention based on relevant	Deployed validated network scaled to the geography and population	Monitored by government institutes and civil society organisations through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Period verification of collection equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of commitment</li> <li>○ Availability of trained personnel</li> <li>○ Regulatory/licensing clearance</li> <li>○ Availability of ongoing resources for maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Better coordination between stakeholders</li> <li>○ Donor support</li> <li>○ support of the international community</li> </ul>

data (drought, etc.)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ validation of system modelling by periodic test</li> <li>○ Evaluation against previous means of collecting data</li> <li>○ Periodic verification on accuracy</li> <li>○ Timeliness of input data</li> <li>○ simulation exercises</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of regional cooperation</li> </ul>	
Interconnection of all stakeholders during disaster alert dissemination	Availability of an effective interconnection on warning messages and response within an agreed timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monitored by regulatory agency</li> <li>○ Tests of recognition</li> <li>○ Response to warnings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of penetration of terminals to receive information</li> <li>○ Lack of volunteers</li> <li>○ commercial consideration</li> </ul>	Comprehensive coordination
Education of public on alert recognition and warning mechanism	Improved knowledge levels of communities on warning messages and responses measured by ability to use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tests of recognition</li> <li>○ Response to warnings by civil society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of penetration of terminals to receive information</li> <li>○ Lack of volunteers</li> </ul>	Closer state engagement
<b>Inputs</b>				
Provision of state funds	Amount of Government grants to build management systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Government institutions</li> <li>○ Industry associations</li> <li>○ Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	Incomplete Technology	Closer engagement between stakeholders
Provision of time by industry	Amount of contribution by service providers of relevant human resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Government institutions</li> <li>○ Industry associations</li> <li>○ Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	Inconsistent implementation	Closer engagement between stakeholders
Provision of knowledge through creation of Technical Universities/Training institutes and courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of institutions, Forums &amp; Virtual Forums created</li> <li>▪ Number of persons trained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Government institutions</li> <li>○ Industry associations</li> <li>○ Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of transparency</li> <li>○ Ineffective solutions</li> <li>○ Irrelevant knowledge</li> </ul>	Closer engagement between stakeholders
Facilitating regular contacts with other disaster communications stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of formal relationships established</li> <li>○ Instances of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Industry associations</li> <li>○ Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ineffective partnerships</li> <li>○ Non-utilisation/non-acceptance by stakeholders</li> </ul>	Encourage periodic interaction

	interactions			
Forming trust protocol by all stakeholders enabling the use of relevant technologies	Formation, functioning and effectiveness of Trust protocol board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Number of meetings of the trust protocol board</li> <li>o MoUs entered in to</li> </ul>	Some networks may not participate	Motivate the absent networks
Forming partnerships between industry at global level, local level and relevant state agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Number of disaster recovery operator partnerships formed</li> <li>o Signed agreements</li> <li>o Effectiveness of implementing the Tampere Convention</li> <li>o Volunteer bodies created</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Government institutions</li> <li>o Industry associations</li> <li>o Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	Slow implementation of Tampere Convention	Encourage consultation and coordination
Raising awareness of communities	Increased knowledge in community response at an agreed level within agreed time frameworks	Reports of progress in education on emergency warnings by training institutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of engagement by communities</li> <li>o Low knowledgeable community</li> </ul>	Encouraging policy framework

### Civil Society Organisations Log Frame

Design Summary	Performance Target – Tangible Result	Monitoring and Oversight	Risks	Contingencies
<b>Goal</b>				
Empowering communities with coping mechanisms, knowledge and capacity to cope with hazards and disasters.	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Making available channels of assistance</li> <li>○ Building capacity</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the scale of readiness of communities</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Survey to measure the quantum of capacity building</li> <li>○ Number of communities fully empowered</li> <li>○ Effectiveness of the campaign</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Relevant State institutions</li> <li>○ Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Luke-warm attitude to disaster management</li> <li>○ Non-collaboration of stakeholders and role-players</li> <li>○ Failure to identify certain risks</li> <li>○ Non-existence of policies, standards and guidelines to support the goals</li> <li>○ Bureaucracy as a barrier to implementation</li> <li>○ Inadequate Resources (personnel, time, money, etc)</li> <li>○ Lack of Commitment and cooperation</li> <li>○ Lack of Awareness</li> </ul>	Encouraging and empowering policy framework
Using ICT for effective disaster risk reduction at community level	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ provision of relevant ICT tools to communities</li> <li>○ building capacity at community level in the use of ICTs for disaster reduction</li> <li>○ number of community level partnerships created</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p>	<p>Monitored by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Survey of the scale of institutionalisation at the community level</li> <li>○ Performance reports of the use of ICT tools at community level</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Relevant State</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of political commitment</li> <li>○ Operating environment</li> <li>○ Lack of resources</li> <li>○ Inconsistent local norms and beliefs</li> </ul>	High level political leadership and commitment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o the scale of institutionalisation at the community level</li> <li>o scale of use of tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o institutions</li> <li>o Civil society organisations</li> </ul>		
<b>Objectives</b>				
Increased and more Effective Use of ICT for Disaster Management	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Level of information passed on to and engagement received from communities, CSOs, and local authorities</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Number of ICT models at work at community level</li> <li>o Frequency of updating stakeholders about the use of ICT tools</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Survey of the scale of institutionalisation at the community level</li> <li>o Performance reports of the use of ICT tools at community level</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Relevant State institutions</li> <li>o Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Difficulty in ensuring equal incentives for each stakeholder</li> <li>o Lack of engagement from stakeholders</li> <li>o Lack of awareness</li> </ul>	<p>Closer consultations and stronger communications</p>
Improve community access to relevant information to make informed decisions	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Provision of information to community level</li> <li>o Establishing links between information providers and the community</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o effectiveness of information flow</li> <li>o improvements in disaster readiness</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Assessment and performance reports</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Relevant State institutions</li> <li>o Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of commitment from community</li> <li>o Lack of capacity</li> <li>o Finance</li> <li>o Lack of ownership</li> <li>o Lack of leadership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Incentives/partnership approach/following designated authorities at the provincial and community level</li> <li>o Approach donors/partners/community fund raising</li> <li>o Build capacities</li> <li>o Leadership training</li> </ul>
Facilitate stakeholder dialogue	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Effective communications between stakeholders</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Number of partnerships formed</li> <li>o Establishing Sub-groups tasked with developing ICT for Disaster Management</li> <li>o Developing and publishing of</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored by</p> <p>Reports and surveys</p> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lack of commitment by stakeholders</li> <li>o Conflicting priorities and interests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Strong political leadership</li> <li>o Enabling policy and regulatory framework</li> </ul>

	advocacy proposals			
Upgrading ICT capabilities & compatibilities by civil society organisations	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Robust and flexible ICT frameworks</li> <li>o Compatibility of ICT platforms between CSOs</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Number of MOUs entered between major regional management agencies</li> <li>o Achieving convergences</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Reports and follow-up from partner organisations on progress</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Civil Society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Apathy of stakeholders</li> <li>o Absence of harmonisation of regulations</li> <li>o Conflicting priorities and interests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Continuing with developing the existing resources to prepare for convergence</li> <li>o Obtain a commitment from the group at large to allow the sub-group members to talk on their behalf</li> </ul>
Identification of risks (through community-based risk assessments) using ICTs	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Availability of community level risk assessments</li> <li>o Operational Early Warning System</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The number of assessments available</li> <li>o Frequency of updating</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Pre-assessment and post-assessment gap analysis</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o State institutions</li> <li>o Civil Society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Luke-warm attitude to disaster management,</li> <li>o Non-collaboration of stakeholders</li> </ul>	Encouraging and empowering policy framework
Develop preparedness strategies and contingency plans using ICTs	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Preparedness and Response Plans developed</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The number of plans developed</li> <li>o Frequency of updating</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Pre-assessment and post-assessment gap analysis</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o State institutions</li> <li>o Civil Society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Miss out on the identification of certain risks</li> <li>o Non-existence of policies, standards and guidelines to support the objective</li> <li>o Bureaucracy as a barrier to implementation</li> <li>o Inadequate Resources (personnel, time, money, etc)</li> </ul>	Closer engagement of international community for expertise

Develop Response and Recovery Plans using ICTs	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Availability of response and recovery plans</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The number of plans developed</li> <li>○ Frequency of updating</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pre-assessment and post-assessment gap analysis</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State institutions</li> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bureaucracy as a barrier to implementation</li> <li>○ Inadequate Resources (personnel, time, money, etc)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strong policy framework based on best practices</li> <li>○ Support by international community</li> </ul>
Building institutional capacities of CSOs using ICTs	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ systems, structures and resources developed to deal with disasters</li> <li>○ reducing human suffering,</li> <li>○ minimising injuries, deaths and damage to property</li> <li>○ reducing environmental degradation</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Persons trained</li> <li>○ Systems and procedures put in place</li> <li>○ Structures developed</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reports and surveys</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of Commitment</li> <li>○ Lack of cooperation between institutions</li> <li>○ Lack of resources</li> <li>○ Lack of skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Financial and in-kind contributions by international community</li> <li>○ encouraging policy frameworks</li> </ul>
<b>Outputs</b>				
Train the trainer Forums / Working groups	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Availability of trainers to train others</li> <li>○ Functioning working groups</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of training programmes delivered</li> <li>○ Number of working groups formed</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ reports</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> </ul>	Sustainability	Financial and in-kind contributions by international community

Technology feasibility studies and Community requirement analysis on ICT	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reports of feasibility studies</li> <li>○ Reports of ICT requirement analysis</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The number of reports</li> <li>○ Frequency of updating the reports</li> <li>○ Action taken on the requirement analysis</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evaluations</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> <li>○ Donor agencies</li> </ul>	Reliability of findings	Follow best practices
Bridging the gaps between service providers and community	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Closer working relationships between communities and service providers</li> <li>○ Ease of access by communities to the services</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The number of MoUs</li> <li>○ Points of contact established</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evaluations</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> <li>○ Service providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feasibility for long-term partnerships and products.</li> <li>○ Technology advancements</li> </ul>	Enabling policy framework
Annual meetings of stakeholders and electronic discussions	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Flow of information between the stakeholders</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of stakeholder representatives attending the discussions</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stakeholder participation</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> <li>○ Chair of Trust Protocol Board who moderates the discussion</li> </ul>	Churn of people due to constant changing of posts	Moderator to make periodic personal contacts
Implement strategies to have entities that are ready to get on board	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Improved readiness of CSOs</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of MoUs signed between stakeholders</li> <li>○ Appointment of person(s) to</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reports of the level of readiness</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Technical problems with compatibility</li> <li>○ political will to implement</li> </ul>	Make available a technical team to work on compatibility issues

	drive convergence between entities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designated persons appointed to monitor</li> </ul>		
Lobbying and advocacy	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher level of acceptance of programmes by civil society</li> <li>Closer engagement of and cooperation between all stakeholders</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of advocacy proposals submitted</li> <li>Number of consultations held with service providers and community leaders</li> <li>Delivery of reports to stakeholders</li> <li>Positive responses from policy makers</li> <li>Adopted policy papers and documents</li> <li>Finance and support received</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessments</li> <li>Evaluations</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil Society organisations</li> <li>Relevant state institutions</li> <li>Donor community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priority of stakeholders lobbied</li> <li>Political instability</li> <li>Legal implications</li> <li>Lack of members' time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delegate to a sub-group of committed members</li> <li>Approach donors/partners /community for fund raising</li> <li>A political approach</li> <li>Legal opinions</li> </ul>
<b>Inputs</b>				
Trainers at community level	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of trainers</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of trainers available</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessments</li> <li>Evaluations</li> <li>Statistical reports</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil Society organisations</li> <li>Relevant state institutions</li> </ul>	Lack of basic skills	Coordination between civil society organisations
Risk assessments	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of risk assessment reports</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports</li> <li>Evaluations</li> </ul>	Conflict between existing risk assessments	Awareness raising in best practices

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Implementing policies based on the assessments</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of assessments</li> <li>○ Frequency of updating</li> <li>○ Community participation</li> </ul>	<p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> <li>○ Service providers</li> </ul>		
Meetings and other forum	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Holding of meetings to disseminate information</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of meetings held</li> <li>○ Number of participants</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attendance reports</li> <li>○ Attendee evaluations of meetings</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> <li>○ Participants at the meetings</li> <li>○ Trust protocol boards</li> </ul>	Lack of engagement	Finding consensus
Team leaders and support staff	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Effective leadership</li> <li>○ Broader participation</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of teams formed</li> <li>○ Effectiveness of teams</li> <li>○ Establishment of procedures for teams to function</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reports</li> <li>○ Evaluations of performances</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> <li>○ Team members</li> </ul>	Apathy and non performance	Strong procedures
Integration of inputs from all stakeholders (Government, Private sectors, NGOs etc)	<p>Tangible results as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Closer cooperation between stakeholders</li> <li>○ Broader participation</li> </ul> <p>Measured through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Scale of integration</li> <li>○ Joint actions taken</li> <li>○ Inter-organisational teams formed</li> </ul>	<p>Monitored through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reports</li> <li>○ Evaluations of success</li> </ul> <p>Oversight by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Civil Society organisations</li> <li>○ Relevant state institutions</li> <li>○ Relevant team members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Luke-warm attitude to disaster management,</li> <li>○ Non-collaboration of stakeholders and role-players</li> <li>○ Bureaucracy as a barrier to implementation</li> <li>○ Inadequate Resources (personnel, time, money, etc)</li> <li>○ Lack of Commitments, cooperation,</li> <li>○ Lack of Awareness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Enabling policy framework</li> <li>○ wider awareness raising</li> </ul>

