PART 2
Shock Responsive Systems

Summary

Part 2 has tools to support local shock-responsive systems. The tools are designed for local disaster risk reduction (DRR) and humanitarian actors. It includes guidance on how to develop or adapt feedback mechanisms, referral pathways and Codes of Conduct. It also has a simulation exercise to test response systems.

List of the tools

Introduction to tools to support shock-responsive protection and accountability systems		Overview Lessons learned	
2.1 Context analysis and consultation tool for feedback mechanisms	To help local DRR and humanitarian actors choose the best shock-resistant feedback mechanisms	Three-step tool	This tool gives an overview of whether feedback mechanisms exist in the community. It also helps clarify if they are reliable during a disaster, and what changes can be made to make sure all members of the communities can use them.
2.2 Feedback mechanisms standard operating procedures (SOPs)	To help local DRR and humanitarian actors set up shock-responsive feedback mechanisms	Tool that can be adapted	This tool helps record the protocols and processes related to the feedback mechanisms.
2.3 Developing a referral pathway for essential protection services	To help local DRR and humanitarian actors map protection services and develop referral pathways	Six-step tool	This tool focuses on understanding the protection landscape and getting in touch with the different protection actors. It requires DRR and local humanitarian actors to engage with protection actors at multiple levels, starting at the national level down to local service providers. It is important for DRR and local humanitarian actors to reflect on the support and informal service providers that exist at the community level, as there are often gaps in formal service provision at the local levels.
2.4 Code of Conduct Toolkit	To help local DRR and humanitarian actors develop or adapt a Code of Conduct	Set of four tools	This tool gives guidance on how to develop or revise a Code of Conduct. It also advises how to share the content of the Code of Conduct with local communities in an understandable and accessible way.

2.5 SIMEX facilitation guide	To test the feedback mechanisms in place and develop an improvement plan	Simulation exercise facilitation guide, handouts and score card	This tool guides a simulation exercise to practice receiving and managing a sensitive complaint. It involves testing the policies and procedures in place to receive the feedback and use referral pathways to orient survivors to local services. By the end of the session participants should have a clear understanding of any gaps and challenges in handling sensitive complaints. They should also have an action plan for improvements.

Lessons from using the tools

■ The tools in Part 2 on feedback mechanisms respond to the lack of general guidance for DRR actors on designing feedback mechanisms with community input. Local DRR and government actors often have various mechanisms at the national and local levels. However, communities are rarely consulted on their preferred feedback options. There is often no appropriate way to manage sensitive feedback. The tools should be used by DRR and local humanitarian actors to adapt and expand existing systems, address gaps and clearly map out a working and formalized feedback mechanism. A good approach is to build on what already exists in the community. Adapting existing mechanisms makes it easier for communities to adjust. This means they are more likely to be accepted, trusted and used by local communities.

"[Safe and Dignified Programming] has promoted empowerment in the villages where we are operating because all the community members have clear information and can now report any protection issues as they occur in their areas."

—PARTICIPATING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICER IN BUDUDA, UGANDA

■ The tool on mapping and referral pathways responds to a gap in linking DRR actors with protection service providers. In all three countries, some level of protection services existed but DRR actors were unaware of them. Coordination between different government levels was lacking and formalized referral pathways were absent. Learning from the project highlighted the importance of using tools that that engage multiple levels of protection actors and link them with DRR actors, helping to harmonize and connect service providers. This section of the toolkit also includes an exercise for DRR and local humanitarian actors to reflect on informal support and service providers that exist at the community level. This is particularly important because there are often gaps in formal service providers at the local levels.

■ The tools for strengthening Codes of Conduct should be used in line with local and national policies and legal frameworks. Many countries already have national level Codes and Standards; local DRR and humanitarian actors need to respond to these. However, there may be gaps in these Codes. For example, it is important to understand if there are any explicit references to the protection against sexual exploitation and abuse and whether staff members are trained on/aware of the Codes. A useful learning outcome from the project was to consider the different entry points for supporting the development and revision of Codes of Conduct. DRR actors at different levels (for example, at the village or district level) may find it helpful to check their existing Code of Conduct against international standards or to create their own simple Code of Conduct. When possible, it is helpful to work with local governments to review existing Codes of Conduct and support advocacy efforts with duty bearers if amendments are needed.

■ It is important to build trust with the community by making sure there are efficient systems in place. This means involving communities in the development and management of feedback mechanisms. Trust can be built by responding quickly to feedback and complaints received and making use of the referral pathways. It is also important to strengthen community structures that help maintain the systems. This includes community Safeguarding Agents.