

## JOINT PROGRAMME DOCUMENT

**Country:** Nepal

**Joint Programme Title:** Enhancing the quality of preparedness in Nepal: making preparedness pay-off.

Programme Duration: One year

Anticipated start date: January 2020

Anticipated end date: December 2021

Fund Management Option(s): pass-through

Administrative Agent: MPTF Office

Total estimated budget\*: **882,130.86 USD**

Out of which:

1. Funded Budget: **882,130.86 USD**

2. Unfunded budget:

\* Total estimated budget includes both programme costs and indirect support costs

**UN organizations**

Name of Representative: **Ms. Elke Wisch**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



Name of Organization: *United Nations Children's Fund*

Date & Seal: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Representative: **Ms. Pippa Bradford**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



Name of Organization: *World Food Programme*

Date & Seal: 30 March '20

Name of Representative: **Dr. Jos Vandelaer**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



Name of Organization: **World Health Organization**

Date & Seal: \_\_\_\_\_

2 April 2020

Name of Representative: **Ms. Wenny Kusuma**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



Name of Organization: **UNWOMEN**

Date & Seal: **31 March 2020**

## **Background:**

Nepal is at high risk from multiple natural hazards. Analysis of past disaster events (covering the period 1971-2018) shows the principle hazards include earthquakes, floods, landslides and fires. Nepal is generally categorized into three geographical zones – the Terai, Hill and Mountain areas. In April and May 2015 Nepal experienced two significant earthquakes of 7.8M and 7.3M which caused major loss of life and damage across central and western regions of the country. More frequently, the annual monsoon season leads to a spike in landslides particularly in Hill and Mountain areas and flooding, particularly in the flat plains of the Terai. Some years are worse than others. In 2017 approximately 1.7 million people across the Terai were affected by monsoon floods including 169 deaths and 460,000 people temporarily displaced from their homes. Economic losses were significant - US\$705 million. Areas of the Terai impacted by annual monsoon related hazards include some of the least developed areas of Nepal in Province 2 and 5 and the humanitarian impact is compounded by pre-existing vulnerabilities. It is well documented that natural disasters impact people and communities in different ways. In every humanitarian crisis, women and girls are affected differently than men and boys, and vulnerabilities are often exacerbated by other factors such as age, disability, sexual orientation and gender identity, caste, ethnicity or religion. Pre-existing societal structures, social norms, discriminatory practices and gender roles create or contribute to heightened risks for some members of the community - such as children, persons with disabilities, sexual and gender minorities, people living with HIV/AIDS, adolescent girls, single women, female headed households, pregnant and lactating mothers, senior citizens, Dalit women, women from religious and ethnic minorities and indigenous women.<sup>1</sup>

The Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA) takes the lead at present within the Government of Nepal (GoN) in coordinating disaster preparedness and response. Through MoHA, particularly the National Emergency Operations Centre (NEOC), international and national organizations coordinate response efforts. This is likely to shift with the formation of the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Authority, which in line with the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act (2017) will sit under MOHA and pull together a cross-government approach to emergency preparedness and response.

Given the high likelihood of natural disasters in Nepal, the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) currently puts together Emergency Response Preparedness Plans (ERPs) for both earthquake and monsoon-related humanitarian impact to support the Government in their response efforts if required. These are the disasters with the most severe humanitarian implications. The Cluster system, adopted by the Government of Nepal placed leadership of sectoral response with Government line ministries, with global cluster leads as co-leads. In Nepal, the co-leadership is mainly undertaken by the UN, with the exception of the Education Cluster which Save the Children co-leads along with UNICEF, and the Shelter Cluster, which is co-led by the International federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). This partnership approach provides a unique opportunity for the international humanitarian system to jointly-plan with and support Government's preparedness and response.

---

<sup>1</sup> Humanitarian Country Team, 2019, Nepal Contingency Plan for Monsoon Flooding, available here:

[http://un.org.np/sites/default/files/HCT%20Monsoon%20Season%20Emergency%20Response%20Preparedness%202019%20June\\_Final.pdf](http://un.org.np/sites/default/files/HCT%20Monsoon%20Season%20Emergency%20Response%20Preparedness%202019%20June_Final.pdf)

The monsoon ERP is revised every year using the lessons learned in the experience gained the previous year and incorporating new modalities, approaches and data available. The ERPs have focused on post-crisis response and now is the time to build on past experience to enable increased attention on key preparedness interventions, based on pre-crisis data. Many lessons have been learned from past responses and have been used to update and improve the ERPs, such as the Gender Equality profiles, conduct trainings for co-cluster leads and identify areas that require further capacity building, inter-agency collaboration and elaboration.

While being in support of the Government's response plans, until now Government and HCT ERPs have been separate, however the current indication from the Ministry of Home Affairs is, that as of 2020 they will be combined. It is vital, that cluster-co leads ensure a joined-up approach in support of the Government to enable this joint-planning process to be effective.

#### The need for a step-change in preparedness:

The HCT undertook a light-touch lessons – learned review following the 2019 monsoon season. The Government of Nepal did not request international assistance given the relatively small-scale flooding. However, cluster members including UN agencies did respond in support of local and provincial Governments, where requested. During the lessons-learned exercise, it was broadly felt that the response represented a step forward from previous responses, particularly in the context of considerable and far-reaching changes in both governance and disaster management structures due to the ongoing federalism processes. However, the exercise, echoing an earlier light touch review from the even smaller Bara and Parsa windstorm response (March/April 2019) gave clear indications about the need for a step-change in the international community's preparedness efforts. These findings are similarly reflected in the sparsity of preparedness activities articulated in the 2019 ERP:

- 1) While data preparedness has been scaled-up in recent years, including by the Index for Risk Management (INFORM) process and the World Food Programme (WFP's) 72-hour assessment. There were challenges for the clusters in interpreting pre-crisis data and extrapolating relevant preparedness interventions. Further, in key sectors, enhanced data preparedness with pre-crisis assessments could be of benefit to determine likely impact more effectively
- 2) Linked to the above, after the event, we have witnessed improvements in the Government-led Initial Rapid Assessment (IRA) process, but sector-specific analysis and complementary coordination of post-crisis data collection has been poorer. Cluster co-leads have a clear role in supplementing the IRA with ground-truthed analysis.
- 3) There needs to be an evidence-based discussion on the triggers for international intervention in support of the Government to avoid unintentionally undermining nascent Government response mechanisms.
- 4) Many felt that the coordination could be strengthened at sub-national level. The Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) instituted a coordination Focal Point Agency (FPA) system for humanitarian coordination this monsoon season, which was found to work well at provincial level (less-so at municipal level). Strengthening that system and supporting its use in preparedness as well as response could be of use.

## The case for preparedness:

Globally, the humanitarian system has traditionally been focused on reacting and responding to disasters with humanitarian appeals. Funding is channeled towards a particular response, which ultimately leads to inefficiencies, delays in assistance being provided, and more lives lost. The average delay between appeal and aid delivery at scale is 3-4 months<sup>2</sup> within a highly competitive and fragmented system. The ERP process was rolled-out as an attempt to shift this paradigm towards better preparedness. Evidence shows that one pound invested in the preparedness to respond... saves on average more than two pounds in humanitarian aid and can increase the speed of responses by two weeks<sup>3</sup>. For example, the WFP specific Return on Investment Analysis (ROI) for Nepal found that increasing the availability of trail maps, (undertaken as part of WFP's ongoing DFID programme) would, considering a 10-year time frame, result in actualized total savings of 3,7 million USD, and for each dollar invested there is a net savings of 21,86 USD.

The increasing accuracy of post-crisis scientific analysis, if used effectively and combined with an understanding of the underlying vulnerability and existing resilience capacities of a population, can make the pre-disaster planning process even more accurate. The RCO has a multi-year partnership with Durham University (supported by DFID) to model earthquake scenarios so that country-wide likely impact can be determined. This worked has formed the planning assumptions for the HCT's seismic ERP. In 2020, the Durham University-RCO partnership is likely to be scaled up to include multi-hazard risk (including flooding and landslide) to inform monsoon preparedness as well. This use of scientific data to inform preparedness is an example of best practice but as shown in both ERPs, more work is needed at cluster and sub-national levels to translate the data into needed preparedness interventions.

Global best practice<sup>4</sup> suggests that having credible plans in place before a disaster strikes, prevents inefficiency during emergencies. Ideally, these plans would include the relative capabilities within the system. Secondly, there would be agreement on what point additional international humanitarian support would be required – plus how this support would interact with the national crisis system. The third element, of pre-agreed finance is an ongoing discussion in Nepal and beyond the scope of this concept. The ultimate goal in Nepal is to develop national and local capacity to manage disasters and further strengthen community resilience. Effectively supporting countries to develop strong contingency plans and building national systems that can cope with and respond to crises, requires a coherent and well-coordinated approach from international humanitarian partners.

The UK has invested heavily in preparedness both in Nepal and globally. The UK supports a team within the RCO to lead on coordinating emergency preparedness and response in the absence of a presence of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). This included humanitarian advisory capacity, coordination, data analysis and a common service for accountability to affected populations. Further UK support to joined-up preparedness should complement this effort. At the global level, the Ready to Respond Programme<sup>5</sup> effectively

---

<sup>2</sup> Courtenay Cabot Venton, *Value for money of multi-year approaches to humanitarian funding*, June 2013, p 31.

<sup>3</sup> *UK humanitarian reform policy. (Price Waterhouse Cooper and Boston Consultancy Group, 2015 and 2017, Return on Investment Analysis (ROI) of the Ready to Respond Programme of UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and OCHA)*

<sup>4</sup> See 'Dull Disasters? How Planning Ahead Will Make A Difference.' D. J. Clarke and S. Dercon. Oxford University Press. 2016.

<sup>5</sup> *The "Strengthening Humanitarian Preparedness for Effective Response" implemented by WFP and UNICEF, started in December 2013. The Project supported preparedness activities carried out by the agencies' Headquarters, Regional Offices, seven target countries, four sub-regions and three additional high-risk countries. A second phase of the Programme started in April 2015 with two additional partners, UNHCR and UNOCHA, and a different selection of target countries and sub-regions. The overall theory of change of the programme was that by investing in preparedness through these 4 agencies they would be able to standardise and strengthen their joint efforts within a specific caseload of countries*

increased agency joined-up working on preparedness at headquarters and in pilot countries. Ultimately, it contributed to system-wide learning - that effective preparedness pays-off. Government capacity strengthening has been listed as a key success of this programme. The UN has a unique opportunity in Nepal to develop national and local disaster management capacity through its cluster-co lead role and bearing in mind the commitment to undertake truly joint preparedness planning in 2020. Injecting money for key preparedness actions within the UN to enhance coordination, information sharing and analysis within the international system could thus have the multiplier effect of enabling greater coordination across key line ministries and within the three tiers of the federal Government structure (municipal, provincial and federal). It would also ensure that the UN approach to disaster response is more sensitive to the new federal structures. An uncoordinated international humanitarian system has the potential to further complicate and reinforce the coordination challenges within Government.

#### The proposed approach:

Building on lessons learned from the global Ready to Respond Programme the following areas are recommended. These should be seen as an initial phase, focusing on key quick-win preparedness actions prior to the 2020 monsoon season, based on lessons from past responses and based on the following principles:

- a) An approach that supports and enhances Government capacity and considers sustainability.
- b) A one-UN approach that is scalable and specifically includes marginalized groups and refugees in its preparedness plans, in line with the broader Leave No One Behind development strategy.
- c) An approach that is based on the principle of protection sensitive programming, prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse, inclusion and gender responsive programming to the most vulnerable and support to the enabling environment for a more effective humanitarian response system in Nepal.
- d) Supportive of global normative frameworks, international humanitarian policy, bearing in mind the Sendai priority to enhance disaster preparedness for effective response and the commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit and in line with the Grand Bargain<sup>6</sup>.

#### *1) Joint analysis of key humanitarian concerns to underpin preparedness and response.*

Considerable work has been done to gather and interpret existing vulnerability and humanitarian impact data. This is coupled with the collection and analysis of primary data on humanitarian impact post- disaster. However, this has still not yet translated into a comprehensive ability within the clusters to clearly articulate the required preparedness interventions (drawing on the voices and interests of women and excluded groups), demonstrate humanitarian impact and immediately flag concerns to Government and donors. Further, undertaking this analysis in coordination with development partners would also make following-through on humanitarian-development nexus commitments more efficient in Nepal.

---

*selected based on risk. The programme focused on the following thematic areas: 1. Increasing Responsiveness and timely delivery of appropriate gender sensitive humanitarian relief in 12 countries; 2. Improving Capability for humanitarian emergencies to be mounted more efficiently (VFM and climate aware) within high risk countries; 3. Improving Capacity of national systems and the humanitarian community; and 4. Improving the Evidence Base that informs future preparedness actions including the value for money aspects. – Programme Completion Review.*

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.agendaforhumanity.org/>

## *2) Minimum preparedness actions:*

Based on the improved joint analysis, the UN can implement key preparedness actions to enable the UN to more effectively respond to a humanitarian emergency in support of the Government of Nepal. These preparedness interventions should focus on scaling-up the UN's response to a Level 2 emergency and above, which would necessitate international humanitarian actions. Activities can also build on ongoing interventions to allow development programmes to flex in respond to crises. Protection in Humanitarian Action will be central to our preparedness efforts and throughout the duration of humanitarian response and beyond. Therefore, a comprehensive protection strategy which can provide the HCT with the focus and framework necessary to support a comprehensive, system-wide and multisector effort to prevent or respond to the most serious protection risks facing affected populations as well as to prevent and stop recurrences of violations will be developed.

## *3) Inter-agency cash preparedness.*

The Government of Nepal delivers cash to affected populations via its social protection system and also provides cash to affected populations after an emergency through other modalities. The UN has also undertaken cash programming, WFP, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) have been the main cash delivery agencies, with the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) and others considering the use of cash in future. This use of cash has been sporadic, not well coordinated and lacking in a common framework for determining feasibility: market assessments and minimum expenditure basket, particularly for multi-purpose cash interventions. This lack of coordination is repeated within the broader Cash Coordination Group (CCG) in Nepal which was set-up post-earthquake by OCHA and is now co-chaired by the Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration (MOFAGA), the Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) and Danish Church Aid (DCA). Here nascent efforts are looking at supporting minimum standards and the beginnings of a common approach among the INGOs in particular. The CCG in coordination with MoFAGA is planning to develop a common cash-based transfer guideline for the government and humanitarian partners which will guide the cash-based emergency response. Additionally, work is beginning on adapting Government social safety net systems for emergency response – horizontal and vertical expansion are being considered with a number of donor partners including the EU, UK and World Bank. Cash delivered by humanitarian partners must be complementary and well- coordinated and reach all affected populations in the territory of Nepal.

## *4) Learning by doing - – monitoring, reporting and building on the lessons learned*

The UN is keen to adopt a flexible and adaptive approach to preparedness interventions. Harnessing global innovations at the country-level and learning from programmes implemented via this joint approach will allow for changes to be made within the lifespan of the project.

#### Project outline:

Outcome: UN preparedness efforts effectively enable a Government of Nepal led and managed humanitarian response system. UN in Nepal is ready to respond when the Government requests international humanitarian assistance.

Activities meeting the following requirements will be prioritized:

- a) Interventions that support and enhance Government capacity
- b) Programmes that consider sustainability of the intervention. A clear multi-year approach is preferred,
- c) A one-UN approach that is scalable and inclusive: must involve two or more agencies.

#### Programme management arrangements:

The Joint Programme will be implemented under the overall framework of Nepal Development Cooperation Framework MPTF. The Fund's operation, administration and implementation arrangements as detailed in the Fund's TOR.

The direct recipients of the Joint Programme's funds will be UNICEF, UNWomen, WFP and the World Health Organisation (WHO), in partnership with the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

The UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) will coordinate and oversee the overall approach, supported by a steering committee. The Joint Program Steering committee is the body in charge of the strategic guidance and the general supervision of the fund. The steering committee is chaired by UN Resident Coordinator.

The participating agencies for each output are highlighted below. In the first instance, the focus will be on lifesaving clusters: food security, health, nutrition, protection and water, sanitation and hygiene (WaSH), underpinned by logistics. Outputs to this programme will feed into the humanitarian coordination architecture via cluster preparedness planning and response.

A joint results framework for the programme and GANT chart will be developed by end January 2020. Appropriate regional and international agency-specific expertise will be drawn on to implement the programme in Nepal which builds on the global approach outlined above.

#### Narrative Reporting:

The Participating UN Organizations will provide annual narrative reports and the final narrative report to the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) by 31st March. The RCO will consolidate these reports and submit to the Administrative Agent. Light-touch narrative reporting will also be provided prior to tranche disbursement.

#### Financial Reporting:

Each Participating UN Organization will provide the Administrative Agent with the following financial statements and reports:

- (a) Annual financial report as of 31 December with respect to the funds disbursed to it from the Programme Account, to be provided no later than four (4) months (30 April) after the end of the calendar year; and
- (b) Certified final financial statements and final financial reports after the completion of the activities in the Joint Programme Document, including the final year of the activities in the Joint Programme Document, to be provided no later than five (5) months (31 May) after the end of the calendar year in which the financial closure of the activities in the Joint Programme Document occurs, or according to the time period specified in the financial regulations and rules of the Participating UN Organization, whichever is earlier.

The Administrative Agent will ensure the preparation of consolidated narrative progress and financial reports, based on the reports provided and will provide these consolidated reports to each donor that has contributed to the Programme, as well as the Steering Committee by 31st May.

The Joint Programme will be using a pass-through fund management modality. The UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office serves as the Administrative Agent (AA) of the Nepal Development Framework MPTF, as appointed by the Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs).

The Administrative Agent will:

- Establish a separate ledger account under its financial regulations and rules for the receipt and administration of the funds received from the donor(s) pursuant to the Administrative Arrangement. This Joint Programme Account will be administered by the Administrative Agent in accordance with the regulations, rules, directives and procedures applicable to it, including those relating to interest;
- Make disbursements to Participating UN Organizations from the Joint Programme Account based on instructions from the Advisory Committee, in line with the budget set forth in the relevant approved workplan of the Joint Programme.

The Participating UN Organizations will assume full programmatic and financial responsibility and accountability for the funds disbursed by the AA. Each UN organization is entitled to deduct 7% indirect costs of the total allocation received.

#### Programme Detail:

Output 1:

*Joint analysis of key humanitarian concerns to underpin preparedness and response.*

Suggested Activities:

1. Pre-crisis primary and secondary data collection for priority clusters and Focal Point Agencies (bearing in mind LNOB strategy and CFP methodology building on INFORM, JADE (WFP, OCHA, PDC joint-model) and a standardized rapid assessment approach (e.g. WFP 72-hour approach). Ensure inputs as applicable to Ministry of Home Affairs' Disaster Information Management System (DIMS) to ensure a homogenized government/UN understanding of multi-hazard risk. Dedicated stand-by capacity pre-agreed and budgeted to ensure local data collection and analytical capacity, particularly around integrating qualitative and quantitative analysis. Work towards adoption of GIS-based rapid assessment tools by MoHA. *UNICEF, WFP and WFP in partnership with OCHA and the RCO.*

2. Strengthen emergency needs assessment capacity for key clusters at Federal and Provincial level – including training and capacity building to seek to support sector specific analysis in complement to the IRA. *UNICEF, WFP in partnership with OCHA and the RCO.*
3. Dedicated stand-by information and analysis support to sectors and PFPAs beginning with Provinces 2 and 5 – pre and post crisis. *All agencies – no budget attached.*
4. Ensuring the inclusion of marginalized groups, refugees and persons at risk of being stateless in analysis of humanitarian concerns. *All agencies – no budget attached.*
5. Undertake analysis of the estimated costs of providing gender responsive services in emergencies. This builds on UN Women’s previous work on costings associated with programming to address violence against women. *UNWomen.*
6. Surge service needs analysis to enable realistic planning by the health and nutrition clusters *(WHO in collaboration with UNICEF, UNFPA & IOM; WFP & FAO)*
7. Development of decision support systems for operational planning and coordination based on enhanced capacity to integrate and analyze data from existing health information systems and that generated during emergency response. The decision support systems will use datasets, correlate them and generate information that the health cluster incident command system needs to deploy emergency surge resources appropriately *WHO*

## Output 2.

### *Minimum preparedness actions:*

- I. Building on enhanced earthquake risk mapping (RCO and Durham University) undertake key preparedness interventions deriving from the revised earthquake ERP. *No budget as yet as this depends on the outcome of assessments above.*
- II. Based on integrated need analysis, including community engagement/pre-crisis surveys and other tools, develop a cluster response capacity analysis to 1) better localize response modalities and identify Minimum Preparedness Actions analysis per-cluster to develop checklist to track. This includes linkages with monitoring and impact assessment indicators. *No budget. RCO lead with support from OCHA.*
- III. Pre-crisis risk assessment for multi-hazard health-related emergencies including public health emergencies: This would be focused on impacts of the risks in the health sector and on the public health emergency risks. Then follows the development of country contextualized tools, identification of personnel to be jointly trained and facilitation of the trained personnel to undertake the pre-crisis risk assessment. *WHO in collaboration with UNICEF, UNFPA, IOM.*
- IV. Identification and development of SoPs where needed. *UNICEF*
- V. Mapping of cluster partners to enable joined up approaches and multi-sector support to partners demonstrating ability to respond/added value in key locations. *All agencies. No budget attached.*
- VI. Establish linkages to the private sector in Nepal and regionally. Exploring the potential to build on local supply chains to complement work on humanitarian cash where appropriate. *WFP.*
- VII. Explore the development of common pipelines for humanitarian goods and supplies. *WFP.*
- VIII. Preparation of Provincial light-touch ERPs for monsoon and earthquake risk. Advocacy with women’s groups and excluded groups and select provincial and local governments on developing gender responsive ERP’s. *RCO leadership of the ERPs, no budget attached. UNWomen leadership on the integration of gender.*
- IX. Building on the RCO’s Leave No One Behind (LNOB) assessment, bringing in specialists to develop an HCT protection strategy. Protection tracker developed and monitored. Capacity building of relevant sub-national authorities and stakeholders on GBV in

emergencies. Train stakeholders and service providers at Sub-national level on Minimum Initial Service Package for SRH (MISP) in emergencies. *UNICEF in partnership with UNHCR and UNFPA.*

- X. Scale-up implementation of customs and methodologies/guidelines for importing humanitarian supplies. *No budget attached. RCO lead with support from OCHA and WFP.*
- XI. Roll-out of priority clusters at Provincial level with disaster information management and inter-clusters coordination mechanisms in place in coordination with Focal Point Agencies. Priority clusters will be determined based on the assessment of needs using pre-crisis data, agency presence and in discussion with MoHA and cluster lead ministries/agencies. *WFP and WHO in partnership with UNICEF and UNFPA.*
- XII. Development of a national stockpile strategy for humanitarian supplies in Nepal. *WFP.*
- XIII. Develop a one-UN approach to early warning in Nepal. *RCO lead, no budget attached.*

#### Output 3.

*Inter-agency cash preparedness – UNICEF and WFP with support from the RCO.*

- I. Development of a Nepal-specific version of the UN common cash analysis framework and a common platform for beneficiary registration and data management. Development of a framework for the joined-up use of multi-purpose cash in Nepal by the UN, building on the above analysis. This would include a Mapping of alternative/ supplementary cash delivery assistance mechanisms (other than the Govt's social security mechanism) given that approx. six million persons are without citizenship documentation and have not registered/ cannot register and potentially benefit from the GoN social security mechanism.
- II. Development of national emergency cash assistance guideline and cash for work operational guidelines for government and humanitarian partners in coordination with the Cash Coordination Group and complementary to ongoing efforts in that regard via that group
- III. Market systems development analysis undertaken. Market functionality and risk assessments.

#### Output 4.

*Learning by doing – monitoring, reporting and building on the lessons learned*

- I. Common service monitoring framework for programme tracking developed to ensure targeting in line with pre and post-crisis data on needs. To be rolled out in the event of a multi-cluster response. This will also enable the UN to begin to address concerns around targeted versus blanket distribution of relief.
- II. Beginning quarter 4 (calendar year) real time programme-specific review of lessons and learning from the programme implementation. This is a flexible and adaptive programme with potential for extension based on learning. Ensure monitoring of gender equality and social inclusion throughout the programme cycle. *UNWomen with support from UNRCO and in partnership with WFP, UNICEF and WHO.*
- III. Return on Investment Analysis undertaken to demonstrate value for money of preparedness interventions undertaken via the programme. *WFP*
- IV. Simulation / functional exercises of the WHO emergency medical team coordination cell (EMT-CC) linked with multi-sectoral simulation exercises on the monsoon / earthquake ERP. *WHO*

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized representatives of the respective participants have signed this proposal.

## ANNEX A

### **Implementation focal points are as follows:**

#### **World Food Programme:**

Mr. Naoki Maegawa

Head of Programme

Email: [naoki.maegawa@wfp.org](mailto:naoki.maegawa@wfp.org)

#### **UNICEF:**

Mr. Mohammad Harun Rashid

Emergency Chief

Email: [mhrashid@unicef.org](mailto:mhrashid@unicef.org)

#### **UN Women:**

Ms. Sama Shrestha

Program Specialist

Email: [sama.shrestha@unwomen.org](mailto:sama.shrestha@unwomen.org)

#### **World Health Organization**

Dr. Reuben Samuel

Team Leader - WHO Health Emergencies

Email: [samuelsr@who.int](mailto:samuelsr@who.int)

## Joint Programme Budget

### JOINT PROJECT BUDGET\*

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Total Resources for the transfer (US\$)</b> |             |
| <b>% of Indirect Costs</b>                     | <b>7.00</b> |
| <b>Total Indirect Costs</b>                    | <b>0.00</b> |
| <b>Total Direct Costs</b>                      | <b>0.00</b> |

| PROJECT BUDGET |  |                     | ESTIMATED UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES (US\$) |                   |                   |                   |
|----------------|--|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                | CATEGORY   | Total Amount (US\$) | WFP                                       | WHO               | UN Women          | UNICEF            |
| 1              | Staff and other personnel costs                          | 102,363.76          | 67,363.76                                 | 0.00              | 10,000.00         | 25,000.00         |
| 2              | Supplies, Commodities, Materials                         | 27,787.85           | 18,000.00                                 | 4,000.00          | 3,387.85          | 2,400.00          |
| 3              | Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation | 12,705.16           | 11,205.16                                 | 0.00              | 1,500.00          | 0.00              |
| 4              | Contractual Services                                     | 359,523.36          | 0.00                                      | 78,392.52         | 75,000.00         | 206,130.84        |
| 5              | Travel   | 21,055.72           | 4,055.72                                  | 10,000.00         | 1,000.00          | 6,000.00          |
| 6              | Transfers and Grants to Counterparts                     | 280,780.35          | 203,780.35                                | 0.00              | 0.00              | 77,000.00         |
| 7              | General Operating and Other Direct Costs                 | 20,205.16           | 11,205.16                                 | 4,000.00          | 5,000.00          | 0.00              |
|                | <b>Total Programme Costs</b>                             | <b>824,421.37</b>   | <b>315,610.16</b>                         | <b>96,392.52</b>  | <b>95,887.85</b>  | <b>316,530.84</b> |
| 8              | Indirect Support Costs**                                 | 57,709.49           | 22,092.71                                 | 6,747.48          | 6,712.15          | 22,157.16         |
|                | <b>TOTAL Pass-Through Amount Approved</b>                | <b>882,130.86</b>   | <b>337,702.87</b>                         | <b>103,140.00</b> | <b>102,600.00</b> | <b>338,688.00</b> |

