

Gap and policy analysis

Locally Led Anticipatory Action Toolkit

Purpose

The purpose of this tool is to identify factors which can enable, and gaps, weaknesses or barriers that can disable locally led anticipatory action (AA). This enables the identification of feasible options and the design of the locally led AA process to be applied. This information can also be used as a baseline when starting a locally led anticipatory action process, and to influence changes in policy and practice at different levels.

Guidance

The gap analysis is a series of questions for local and national actors that should be conducted before and alongside the participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment (PVCA) in order to inform it. Use the points below to guide questioning during key informant interviews and focus group discussions. It must be ensured that the gap analysis intentionally focuses on identifying information on hazardous events to be prioritised for anticipatory action and the status of related mechanisms.

The policy analysis can involve desk research of existing legal frameworks in place, and provides questions on what to look for, as well as ask those being interviewed or taking part in focus group discussions. The analysis needs to include details on any specific aspects applying an intersectional lens, and differences in gender disaggregated views and experiences.

Stakeholders involved should include:

- Disaster Management Authority
- Meteorology Department
- Agencies with technical expertise for the hazard prioritised for forecasting-based action planning
- Actors engaged in anticipatory action (i.e. other local actors, Red Cross Societies, UN Agencies, international NGOs, etc.)
- Cash Advisors (i.e. cash working groups)
- Local and national coordination platforms

Ensure that information captured is analysed and reported on so as to be accessible to decision makers, including a list of those interviewed (name, organisation, date, notes).

Local level

The analysis at the local level should have a focus on the status or function of the local administration system in connection with the communities being targeted by the work.

Factors to be analysed	Guiding interview questions
Early warning systems applying impact-based forecasting methods	
1. Early warning and surveillance systems for forecasting and anticipating humanitarian concerns – connected to the national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What is the status of systems for forecasting disasters and crises? – What are these warning and surveillance systems, are they operational, and do they cover all prioritised hazards? ● Do these systems provide forecasts for specific anticipated disasters, or do they only provide warnings (alerts)? ● Is information from the community level (impact-based) forecasting utilised at national level?
2. Community-Based early warning systems (EWS) – linked to forecasting systems and risk information services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are community based early warning systems able to access risk information available at the national level (meteorological services) and vice-versa? ● Do meteorological services provide access to their risk information? If yes, is the information useful (does it effectively inform local action planning)?
Participatory contingency planning	
3. Regularly updated local contingency plans, integrating community contingency plans (including preparedness, anticipatory actions, and response actions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does local contingency planning recognize the capacities indicated in community contingency plans (and do community contingency plans feed into the local/ district contingency plan, and is community contingency planning effectively supported)?
4. Inclusion of representatives of communities, local structures, and at-risk groups (including possible recipients of microgrants)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do you include all local structures ('whole of society' engagement) e.g. Community Disaster Management Committees, Village Savings and Loans Groups, communities, or at risk groups when contingency planning?
Funding mechanisms (including for microgrants)	

<p>5. Local resource allocation for community-based preparedness, anticipatory action, and response (including for capacity building and skills upgrading)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are resources provided, either in-kind, direct funds, technical support, capacity building or skills upgrading to support community preparedness, anticipatory action and response? • If yes, are the resources adequate and accessible by all community structures?
<p>6. Contingency funding / funds – accessible to community response structures and groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have funding to support community structures to respond to different kinds of disasters? • Is the funding accessible to all community response structures, e.g. Community development groups / committees, village savings and loans groups (VSLs)?
<p>Response coordination mechanisms (platforms)</p>	
<p>7. Local early warning – early action coordination mechanisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How timely is the coordination of early warning actions, i.e. does coordinated action take place to mitigate/reduce impact prior to disasters or only to take action to respond (are early / anticipatory actions being worked on and put in place for foreseeable disasters/crises)?
<p>8. Coordination mechanism for actioning advanced preparedness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there effective coordination mechanisms which enable institutional preparedness by agencies or actors prior to a forecast disaster/crises?
<p>9. Procedures for early risk communication, and engagement with community organisations, including emergent groups of volunteers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the status of coordinated development of advisories (risk communication) and planning, with all relevant stakeholders, for the effective communication of these advisories (risk communication)? • Are target groups (e.g. high risk groups) receiving available risk information timely (based on forecast events) and is this information understood? • In these procedures, how are community structures (VCPCs, ACPCs) or community volunteers (Red Cross) engaged?
<p>10. Transparent local monitoring and learning mechanisms with participation of communities (including with groups addressing the root causes of disasters)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the available participatory monitoring and learning mechanisms (for transparency and accountability)? • How effective is the mechanism for reviewing forecasts (advisories) local contingency planning, and the actions taken?

National Level

The analysis on this level has a focus on communication of information and coordinated decision-making with the local level for the following factors.

Factors to be analysed	Guiding interview questions
Early warning systems applying impact-based forecasting methods	
1. Trigger indicator identification and threshold setting (used for early action protocols- for taking anticipatory actions to mitigate impacts prior to a disaster/crises). (For example: the intensity [threshold level] of rainfall forecast over a specific period which provides a confident prediction of significant flooding and impact).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the early warning systems (that you are aware of), are trigger indicators being defined?
2. Early warning and surveillance systems for forecasting and anticipating humanitarian concerns, (With clear analysis of the specific impacts relating to defined scenarios based on forecasts for different intensity levels of hazard events).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the status of early warning and surveillance systems for forecasting and anticipating humanitarian concerns?
3. Forecasting systems and risk information services – connected to the local level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is sufficient risk information being received from, and provided to, the local level?
Participatory contingency planning	
4. Coordinating common approaches informed by local level and community contingency planning approaches (including for locally-led preparedness, anticipatory actions, and response actions) .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the status of collaborative contingency planning for defining common approaches (complementary planning and action by different actors), which enable locally led preparedness, anticipatory actions, and response actions?
5. Participatory mechanism, including consulting representatives of communities and at-risk groups (including possible recipients of microgrants) on operational planning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the participatory mechanisms to involve community representatives and at-risk groups involved in contingency/operational planning?

Funding mechanisms (including for microgrants)	
6. Available sources of flexible and appropriate financing for early action, including financing for community-level contingency planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there flexible funding sources for financing early action and community level contingency planning?
7. Policies supporting the utilisation of Community Microgrants (Group Cash Transfers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any available policies that support the utilisation of Group Cash Transfers (community microgrants)?
Response coordination mechanisms (platforms)	
8. Procedures and services for the activation of advanced preparedness and early actions in coordination with the local level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a country, do we have procedures and services for the activation of advanced preparedness and early actions in coordination with the local level (for example early action protocols)?
9. Procedures for early risk communication, including for the engagement of community organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a country, do we have procedures for early risk communication, including for the engagement (active participation in coordination mechanisms) of community structures / community organisations?
10. Transparent monitoring and learning mechanisms with participation of communities (including groups addressing the root causes of disasters)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the available participatory monitoring and learning mechanisms (for transparency and accountability)? • How effective is the mechanism for reviewing forecasts (advisories), local and national contingency planning, and the actions taken?

Policy Analysis

Consider the following questions as existing policies are explored:

1. Are there existing policies related to the four topics: Early warning systems applying impact-based forecasting methods; Participatory contingency planning; Funding mechanisms (including for microgrants); Response coordination mechanisms (platforms)?
2. Are there any policies related to anticipatory action?
3. Based on this interview or research, is there a need to review any of these policies, or for any policies to be developed?
4. Have you conducted or planned to conduct any analyses of these policies? Do you have documents to share?

Acknowledgement

This tool has been adapted from [The National Advocacy Toolkit](#) by GNDR. The [Locally Led Anticipatory Action Guide and Toolkit](#) was authored by Chris Ball, Director of [Bounce Back Resilience Ltd](#) and Humanitarian Advisor DRR and Climate Change for Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe. It was developed based on learning from the Local Leadership for Global Impact project implemented in partnership between [Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe](#), [CARD](#), [CEDES](#), [SAF/FJKM](#) and [GNDR](#); and supported by funds of the Federal Republic of Germany through the [Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development](#) (BMZ).