

ACTION POINTS FROM THE CAP IRAQ 2009 - PILLAR I JULY WORKSHOP

1. Scenarios:

- Discuss most likely scenarios instead of predicting best/worst case scenarios.
- Take vulnerabilities as the baseline and build upon humanitarian indicators
- Look at scenarios broadly not from a geographical perspective
- Involve Iraqi government as early as possible
- Constraints regarding implementation of projects on the ground should be identified

See Annex I for suggested scenarios and assumptions

2. Vulnerability

- Look at UNICEF Impact project for the identification and ranking of indicators in order to determine vulnerability
- Use the UNICEF Impact project as a basis for determining vulnerability
- Look at Map of vulnerability set up by IAU
- Try not to use IDPs as a proxy for vulnerability but actually use vulnerability itself. This implies looking at areas that are not receiving the necessary assistance. Ensure grounds not top-down information.
- Ensure there is a SHARED understanding of vulnerability
- IAU and Iraq Knowledge Network to ensure coherence, reliability and accuracy of data and surveys used for the CAP
- Share with wider audience and with wider humanitarian community the surveys, data and documents used through a brief info e-mail

See Annex II for suggested definitions of vulnerability

3. Selection and Prioritization of Projects

- When determining project selection and prioritization criteria, ensure that selected projects are feasible and realistic.
- Ensure that agencies/NGOs have the necessary implementation capacity
- Standard of evidence needed for needs claimed by each proposed project
- A CAR-type system might be best
- Do not exclude agencies with mainly development programmes
- The dollar envelope should be realistic
- Identify what is the overall humanitarian funding situation in Iraq (beyond the CAP)
- Reflect upon whether last year's selection criteria were satisfactory
- SOTs can prioritise projects. This prioritization does not need to be reflected in the CAP.
- Despite CAP framework, projects are still donor driven.
- Distribute project selection and prioritization criteria asap to NGOs and others
- Use already existing SOT mechanism to set criteria (individual per sector not same criteria for all sectors) and to prioritise projects

See Annex III for suggested selection and prioritization criteria

4. Strategic Priorities

- the strategic priority should be specific enough to help in focusing the response
- Make sure strategic priorities for Iraq have these qualities:
 - 1 They state the results that must be achieved – feasible results, and not just humanitarian impact on people in need – enabling humanitarian operations among priorities
 - 2 They are specific enough to focus the response and differentiate between that relates to it and what doesn't
 - 3 They are clear and compelling enough to persuade organizations to change programming and donors to change funding – if necessary – in order to achieve the priorities
- The current strategic priorities focus too much on conflict and insecurity and less on vulnerabilities. Reconsider the focus.
- Identify precisely the target population for the CAP
- With regard to geographical reach go beyond governorates to include districts and other areas in the CAP
- Structured feed-back from donors on priorities essential (i.e. why are sectors or some NGOs underfunded etc.)

5. Monitoring and Evaluation

- Ask yourself whether the situation and needs have changed and whether our overall response needs to be adapted
- Monitor mainly two variables: (i) the situation and (ii) the outcome of our actions
- OCHA coordinates and suggests a structure for joint monitoring and the IAU is the inter-agency tool for it

6. Linkages between Pillar I and II

- main linkages with Pillar II are refugees and returnee issues and the interaction with the government on this issue.
- Two main sectors are critical in terms of linkages: health and education
- Ensure coherence and coordination in the process of creating Pillar I and II CHAPs
- Iraq drives and influences what happens outside of Iraq unless a host government adopts specific policies towards refugees
- Need to enhance information flow from inside Iraq to outside countries
- Look at issues of property rights, eviction
- Contingency planning – possibility of a mass inflow from neighbouring countries is unlikely; nevertheless, we need to look at this possibility. This also goes for IDP movement inside Iraq.

Suggested Draft Scenarios for the Iraq CAP 2009:

Most Likely Overall Assumption:

The overall humanitarian situation will continue to be mixed with vulnerability and needs particularly acute in specific pockets of the country, compounded by existing chronic deprivation, generalized violence, natural disasters and limitations of essential services.

Notable improvements in the security situation in parts of the country may continue to have positive repercussions for the provision of assistance due to improved access. However, ongoing security fluctuations and the fear of violence may restrict access to vulnerable communities and constraint the delivery of direct aid.

Initial small scale returns/relocations will continue at the current low level in recognition of a number of factors, including localized security improvements in parts of the country and diminishing coping mechanisms in the place of displacement. In the short term, no wide-scale facilitated return is envisaged in the absence of more substantive political and security stabilization.

Efforts towards enhancing humanitarian agencies' collective understanding of vulnerability through strengthened analysis and data collection will better ensure the targeted delivery of assistance based on need.

Suggested Assumptions:

- Progress continues on national reconciliations across sectarian and political divides (including national elections, disputed territories (Kirkuk) etc.)
- Efforts continue towards building the core institutions of the state, (including national human rights systems, promotion of an inclusive political, electoral and constitutional reform) to improve the delivery of essential services.
- The humanitarian community continues to expand its coverage and reach inside Iraq, including all 18 governorates, leading to direct deliveries and implementations from inside Iraq.
- Down-scaling of MNF-I presence (balanced against continued security assistance provided to UN) will not adversely affect security and access throughout Iraq.
- Humanitarian assistance will progressively become less linked to military escorts and security.

Notes to add to suggested scenarios / assumptions resulting from discussion:

- Absence of basic services versus limitations of basic services
- Possible tensions between communities to be included or taken into consideration
- What will come out of the decrease in MNF-I presence and decrease of the UN's reliance on their provided security?
- Humanitarian space
- Property rights issues, etc.
- Conditions for return

Proposed definitions of Vulnerability:

- 1- Deprivation which is stable but painful
- 2- Lack of access to coping mechanisms
- 3- Deprivation in an acute and worsening way that is threatening

Proposed Selection Criteria for discussion:

- 1- Projects are in line with the relevant sector objectives and the overall strategic priorities. All project activities contribute to the realisation of at least one of the strategic priorities;
- 2- All project activities must remedy, mitigate or avert direct and imminent physical harm or threats whether violence, disease or deprivation, to affected people within a short time span, OR build people's resilience or institutional capacity to averting or mitigating harm, OR enable other projects to do so
- 3- The proposing organization with planned partners must have a recognised capacity to implement the project, planned activities are realistic, relevant and impact can be monitored.

Proposed Prioritization Criteria for discussion:

- 1- Does the project remedy, mitigate or avert direct and imminent physical harm or threats (whether violence, disease or deprivation) to affected people within a short time span? (If yes, 2 points)
- 2- Is the project essential to enable other projects to remedy, mitigate or avert? (If yes, 2 points)
- 3- Does the project build vulnerable people's resilience to avert or mitigate harm? (If yes, 1 point)
- 4- Does the project build institutional capacity to remedy, mitigate or avert? (If yes, 1 point)
- 5- Is the project definitely feasible (assuming funding) by the proposing organization and planned partners, currently and in the most likely scenario? (If yes, 2 points)
- 6- Are the needs that the project plans to address confirmed by evidence that is solid by reason of first-hand assessment on the ground, or triangulation (multiple independent sources)? (If yes, 2 points)