Introduction

# Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BHA | Bureau forHumanitarian Assistance |
| CLDRM+ | Community Led Disaster Risk Management + Protection |
| DRR | Disaster Risk Reduction |
| DRRM | Disaster Risk Reduction and Management |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| GPC | Global Protection Cluster |
| IASC | Inter Agency Standard Committee |
| KII | Key Informant Interview |
| PFA | Psychological First Aid |
| PrEPD | Preparing to Enhance Protection in Disasters |
| PSEA | Protection Against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse |
| SGBV | Sexual and Gender Based Violence |
| SOP | Standard Operating Procedures |
| UNDRR | United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction |

# Roadmap

This toolkit includes these sections:

**Introduction** presents an overview of the toolkit including tips about how to use the toolkit, the guiding principles underpinning the work, and a list of the tools.

**Part 1** hastools to support safe and dignified programming in disaster risk reduction and management. The tools are designed for local DRR and humanitarian actors. It includes training materials to increase knowledge and understanding of safe and dignified programming and different ways to do this. It also includes tools to guide people who develop disaster risk reduction and management plans at the community level.

**Part 2** has tools to supportshock-responsive local systems. The tools are designed for local DRR and humanitarian actors. It includes guidance on how to set up or adapt feedback mechanisms, referral pathways, and codes of conduct. It also has a simulation exercise to test their feedback mechanisms.

**Part 3** has tools, including training materials, to raise awareness on rights and entitlements with diverse community members. It also includes materials to support community Safeguarding Agents. The tools are designed for local DRR and humanitarian actors to use in communities.

**Part 4** has case studies from the project. It includes lessons learned on embedding safe and dignified programming approaches in preparedness and response work.

**Part 5** is a glossary of key terms used in the toolkit.

# Introduction to the toolkit

The most recent Annual Report by the Global Protection Cluster (GPC) reported that more than 150 million people were in need of protection assistance due to conflict, violence, epidemics and climate-related disasters. This is 40 million more than 2021 and the highest increase in one year.[[1]](#footnote-1)

In November 2019, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) actors called upon the GPC to ensure that protection is considered in disaster preparedness and risk reduction, recognizing that protection concerns are not sufficiently included in preparedness work.1 As protection needs continue to increase, many communities across the world are unprepared to manage the protection risks and impacts associated with natural disasters.

Community based DRR initiatives often include the core principles of participation, inclusion, accountability, and leadership by vulnerable groups. However, the needs and priorities of vulnerable groups are often misunderstood and poorly addressed. This means disaster risk reduction and humanitarian organizations do not always design and implement responses that ensure access, dignity and safety for the most marginalized people. Because of this vulnerable people may be disproportionately affected by the disaster but also by the resulting response.2 There may be protection risks in their communities that threaten their safety or they may face barriers to accessing assistance. And they may be unable to safely give feedback or complain when the response is ineffective or inappropriate.

Embedding safe and dignified programming into disaster preparedness and response is key to ensuring that DRR and humanitarian actors can give appropriate, accessible, safe, and sustainable support to people and communities.[[2]](#footnote-2) So too, is linking this work with the localization agenda and focusing on building and supporting national and local capacities whenever possible.

|  |
| --- |
| What is safe and dignified programming? Safe and dignified programming is about making sure programs respect the safety, meaningful access, and dignity of people and communities.  In this project, the team adapted CRS’ [Safe and Dignified Programming Framework](https://www.trocaire.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/PMWG-Protection-Mainstreaming-Framework-2017-1.pdf?type=policy) and focused on six areas: analysis, community engagement and participation, feedback and complaints mechanism, information sharing, mapping and referral, and staff conduct. |

# Background to the project

To address these needs, CRS launched its USAID/BHA-funded Preparing to Enhance Protection in Disasters (PrEPD) project in 2021. The 18-month project aimed to deliver a comprehensive toolkit, to support local DRR actors and humanitarian actors to embed safe and dignified programming in their work. To ensure the guidance was grounded in the needs and priorities of local stakeholders, the toolkit was developed and tested in three countries: the Philippines, Sierra Leone, and Uganda.

These countries were selected based on their high risk of frequent rapid onset disasters including storms, floods, earthquakes, and landslides. All have existing DRR systems and actors but needed to build capacities to fully embed safe and dignified programming.

An in-depth needs assessment was carried out before the project started to identify gaps in safe and dignified programming. The assessment found that in all three countries safe and dignified programming approaches were not consistently used ahead or during disasters and were often missing from national and local DRR contingency plans. There were also gaps in the knowledge of local humanitarian and DRR actors about safe and dignified programming. This meant the needs and priorities of vulnerable groups were often misunderstood and poorly addressed. Community awareness about rights and entitlements was also low. Community level shock responsive mechanisms, including feedback mechanisms and referral pathways, existed but were not widely used. The detailed findings of the needs assessment can be found in the case studies (PART 4).

The results of this detailed assessment helped to frame the project around a few core areas of work. These evolved over the course of the project to encompass:

1. The development of tools for safe and dignified programming with local DRR actors that are appropriate for and accessible to the target audience
2. The development of tools to support shock-responsive local systems, including feedback mechanisms and referral pathways
3. The development of tools to raise awareness on rights and entitlements with diverse community members
4. Case studies to capture the learning around successful safe and dignified programming approaches

# Who is this toolkit for?

This toolkit is for local DRR and humanitarian actors to help them embed safe and dignified programming approaches in their work.

# How to use the toolkit

The toolkit is designed to be flexible. The tools do not have to be used in a particular order. The choice and use of tools will depend on the context, the type and length of the project, and who is using the toolkit. It is important to choose the tools that are most relevant and useful in the context. The tools should be adapted to include suitable examples for the specific context. They should also be translated into the local language(s) wherever possible to maximize the engagement of marginalized groups.

# Guiding principles

All the tools in the toolkit are based on three guiding principles:

### ****Principle 1: Include diverse groups in the community****

Diverse groups should be involved with and lead in any preparedness or response activities. This means involving different groups from the community who are more vulnerable and traditionally marginalized. This may include women, children, older people, people with disabilities, speakers of marginalized languages, particular ethnic groups, indigenous people, informal settlers or people who are displaced. These groups are often left out of disaster preparedness work. Their needs and preferences may be overlooked or ignored. This means they can be even more badly affected in a disaster. It is important to include them to make sure everyone in a community is fully prepared for disasters.

### ****Principle 2: Leadership by the community****

Local communities should be at the forefront of planning for and managing responses. They know their contexts best, and they know what hazards and protection risks they face. Building on this in-depth knowledge is critical to ensuring disaster risk reduction work is appropriate, relevant, and sustainable.

### ****Principle 3: Accountability by all involved****

Accountability means using power responsibly and in a way that is clear and open for everyone to see, especially for the people who are affected by how that power is used. Effective disaster risk reduction approaches should be based on mutual accountability.

# Developing the tools through a participatory and inclusive way

The tools in the toolkit were developed in a participatory way. They were adapted and refined in response to feedback from country teams, partner organizations, and community groups. An example is the CLDRM+ which went through the following steps:

1. As part of the global PrEPD project, CRS forged a working group of project leads from the three implementing countries and three global technical advisors. The group met online regularly throughout 2022 to review the different tools, including the Community Led Disaster Risk Management + Protection Facilitation Guide (CLDRM+).
2. Because the project in the Philippines was implemented in coordination with another DRR focused project (SHAKE) the project team decided to test the tool during activities that were already planned. This included community-based Disaster Risk Reduction Management (DRRM) planning sessions in 10 targeted barangays (districts).
3. CRS introduced staff from partners including Caritas Pasig Inc. (CPI) and Diocese of Malolos Commission on Social Action (MDSAC) to the CLDRM+ in a weeklong face-to-face workshop. The training included presentations on DRR and safe and dignified programming and simulation exercises. The aim was to give partner staff the knowledge and confidence to co-facilitate the sessions.
4. CRS and partners tested the adapted CLDRM+ with 360 participants (including 247 women) over a two-month period. Participants included Barangay and City DRRM Committee members, community Safeguarding Agents (selected as part of the project) and DRRM Ambassadors. Representatives of diverse groups in the community were also invited. This included older people, people with disabilities, and single heads of household.
5. Project staff documented learning from the sessions in each of the 10 barangays. This included direct feedback from participants.
6. The CLDRM+ was updated based on the observations and feedback from the local partners organizations and communities’ representatives.

# List of tools

| **NUMBER OF TOOL** | **NAME OF TOOL** | **PURPOSE** | **COMPRISES** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 1 Tools for safe and dignified programming that are appropriate for and accessible to the target audience** | | | |
|  | **Introduction to the tools for safe and dignified programming** |  | Overview  Lessons learned |
| **1.1** | **Safe and Dignified Program Foundations Training** | To build foundational knowledge of local DRR and humanitarian actors on safe and dignified programming | Training facilitation guide, PowerPoint, and handouts |
| **1.2** | **Safe and dignified programming Training Package** | To increase the knowledge and capacity of local DRR and humanitarian actors on safe and dignified programming | Training facilitation guide, PowerPoint, and handouts |
| **1.3** | **Community-Led Disaster Risk Management + Protection Facilitation Guide (CLDRM+).** | To make sure diverse groups communities are involved with and lead the disaster risk management planning process | Facilitation guide |
| **PART 2 Tools for shock responsive systems** | | | |
|  | **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 | 3-step tool |
| **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 |
| **2.3** | **Developing a Referral Pathway for Essential Protection Services** | To help local DRR and humanitarian actors map protection services and develop referral pathways | 6 step tool | |
| **2.4** | **Code of Conduct Tools** | To help local DRR and humanitarian actors develop or adapt a code of conduct | Set of 4 tools |
| **2.5** | **Simulation Exercise facilitation pack** | To test the feedback mechanisms in place and develop an improvement plan | Simulation exercise facilitation guide, handouts, and score card |
| **PART 3 Tools to raise awareness on rights and entitlements with diverse community members** | | | |
|  | **Introduction to tools to raise awareness raising on rights and entitlements with communities** |  | Overview  Lessons learned |
| **3.1** | **Awareness session on rights and entitlements facilitation pack** | To increase the knowledge and capacity of local communities on their rights and entitlements | Training facilitation guide, PowerPoint, and handouts |
| **3.2** | **Safeguarding Agent Terms of Reference (TOR)** | To help local DRR and humanitarian actors identify and select community Safeguarding Agents | Tool outlining the role and responsibilities of community Safeguarding Agents |
| **3.3** | **Safeguarding Agent facilitation pack** | To increase the knowledge and capacity of community Safeguarding Agents | Training facilitation guide, PowerPoint, and handouts |
| **PART 4 Lessons learned and emerging best practice** | | | |
| **4.1** | **Needs assessment** | To share lessons learned about common gaps in safe and dignified programming in contexts vulnerable to natural disasters |  |
| **4.2** | **Sierra Leone** | To share lessons learned about embedding safe and dignified programming |  |
| **4.3** | **Sierra Leone** | To share lessons learned about mapping services and developing referral pathways |  |
| **4.4** | **Philippines** | To share lessons learned about how to embed safe and dignified programing in the CLDRM+ process |  |
| **4.5** | **Philippines** | To share lessons learned about developing local Codes of Conduct |  |
| **4.6** | **Uganda** | To share lessons learned about setting up and improving feedback mechanisms |  |
| **Part 5 Glossary** | | | |

1. [global\_protection\_cluster\_annual\_report\_2021.pdf (globalprotectioncluster.org)](https://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/sites/default/files/2022-03/global_protection_cluster_annual_report_2021.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. https://emergency.unhcr.org/entry/42554/accountability-to-affected-populations-aap [↑](#footnote-ref-2)