

1 PD-ABK-513
93254

**Bureau for Africa
Disaster Response Coordination Staff
AFR/AA/DRC
STRATEGIC PLAN**

I. Introduction:

The Disaster Response Coordination Staff (AFR/AA/DRC) was officially established through the Africa Bureau reorganization June 1, 1994. This action was taken in response to a variety of evolving factors. First, there was a growing awareness within the Bureau that natural disasters and complex emergencies were becoming such a large part of the Agency's attention in Africa that it made sense to strengthen inter-Bureau collaboration, monitoring and reporting, and to collectively address the issues of impacts and linkages of humanitarian assistance and development programs.

Second, on an administrative level, the sheer proliferation of disaster activities affecting Africa engendered a growing need within the Bureau for a central point of contact to address and manage a range of transitional activities sporadically handled by the line offices of the Bureau, such as support to refugee resettlement; conflict resolution, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants, refugees and displaced persons; PVO/NGO liaison, and telecommunication support for disaster and development programs. Finally, greater focus on crisis prevention and mitigation activities offered the opportunity to pull together the regional portfolio of early warning and response projects under one roof for greater synergism and impact.

DRC was an outgrowth from these needs and its location within the Assistant Administrator's office is a reflection of the importance that the Bureau places on improving the integration of the Agency's humanitarian assistance with development objectives in Africa.

II. Mandate and Responsibilities

DRC's specific objectives and areas of activity contribute to its primary goal of *reducing the costs of humanitarian assistance*, while to a lesser extent they also support a secondary goal of *enhanced environmental preservation and improvement*. The range of responsibilities are divided into two primary functional areas: **support and operations**.

A. SUPPORT

The bulk of DRC's staff efforts are dedicated to supporting a range of strategy, policy and programmatic needs, both within the Africa Bureau, and outside, primarily with the Bureau of Humanitarian Response (BHR). The major responsibilities in this category include (1) Coordination and Facilitation and (2) Monitoring and Reporting.

As is the case with other Agency units, such as AFR Geographic Offices and AFR/DP, the "support" nature of this work does not lend itself to measurement, as practiced under the Agency's strategic objective system. Also, DRC's support work is integrated with that of other entities that ultimately measure the impact of programs to which DRC contributes. Thus, it's not possible nor worthwhile to attempt to separate out and measure any specific impact resulting from this support role. Nevertheless, given the important role that support functions play in achieving DRC's goals, we are describing them in this strategic plan.

The following activities are presented for background and context and also as a management tool for DRC to provide focus for its range of diverse responsibilities.

1. Coordination and Facilitation DRC maintains close working relationships with a wide variety of Agency and Department of State offices, as well as other USG, domestic, and international organizations. Much of its staff time is directed toward joint collaboration with these other entities in addressing and resolving issues and in facilitating the timely processing of actions related to following primary areas:

- Disaster Assistance
- Emergency Food Aid
- Conflict Resolution
- Demobilization and Reintegration (Ex-Combatants/ Displaced Persons/Refugees)
- PVO/NGO Liaison
- Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Assistance
- Relief/Development Linkage Issues
- Telecommunications Support

In the area of disaster assistance DRC interacts closely with BHR's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) in contributing to the technical review of the disaster assistance proposals, facilitating their clearance within the Africa Bureau, collaborating on joint country relief strategies, and integrating relief issues with development concerns.

The timely and targeted allocation of Title II emergency food aid is facilitated through DRC's coordination with BHR's Food for Peace Office (FFP). DRC staff work closely with Bureau and Mission offices to ascertain country food aid needs and integrate this information with data and analysis from the Famine Early Warning System (FEWS) Project. Recommendations on food allocations to needy countries are then jointly developed with FFP, followed by clearances and approvals which are facilitated throughout with Bureau management.

DRC maintains the central responsibility within the Bureau for monitoring and reporting on the Agency's conflict resolution,

demobilization and reintegration programs in Africa. In certain countries these are key transitional programs that include humanitarian as well as short-term development assistance. DRC is taking the lead in coordinating Agency support for the Africa Conflict Resolution Act which requires annual program funding and reporting on conflict resolution and demobilization activities in Africa.

DRC serves as the Bureau's central point of contact for issues concerning refugees, coordinating with State's Bureau for Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) on a wide range of refugee-related activities. For example, collaborating with OFDA and PRM, DRC is managing a \$2 million fund, to be administered by qualifying AFR Missions, which will provide development support for the reintegration of refugees into sustainable communities.

DRC maintains close links to the PVO/NGO community which supports and implements much of the Agency's humanitarian and development assistance. Staff served on the USAID/PVO Task Force charged with rewriting USAID's PVO policy and provides regular input to Interaction's Africa Liaison Project managed by AFR/DP. DRC also serves as an advisor to Interaction's continuing efforts to address relief and development linkage issues within the PVO community.

DRC represents the Bureau on an Interagency Working Group, convened in response to a PDD-25 tasker which seeks recommendations for improved USG and United Nations humanitarian assistance in the peacekeeping context.

Linkage of relief to development is an important issue that is receiving greater attention from the Agency as greater cost efficiency and impact is sought from declining resources. DRC serves as advisor to several entities which are addressing the linkages between relief and development, including numerous AFR units, OFDA's Division of Prevention, Mitigation and Preparedness, the Greater Horn of Africa Initiative, Interaction, etc. DRC represents the Bureau on the PRD-50 Task Force, which is charged with providing recommendations on improving USG and UN humanitarian assistance, including improving the linkages between early warning/crisis prevention, relief, rehabilitation, recovery and development.

Telecommunications is a new area of Bureau involvement but one which can improve efficiency and impact of both humanitarian assistance and development programs. In addition to utilizing telecommunications in its daily operations, DRC serves as the mentor for a AAAS Fellow who is, inter alia, assessing the status of current computer networking activities in Africa and developing an AFR management plan for telecommunications.

2. Monitoring and Reporting DRC serves as a central point within the Bureau for information collection and dissemination on disaster and disaster-related activities. In this capacity it maintains close links with Bureau Missions, OFDA, FFP, State/PRM and with United Nations Agencies, such as the Department of Humanitarian Affairs (UN/DHA) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to ensure that timely data, analysis and reports on potential disaster situations or emergency assistance programs are available and disseminated within the Agency and outside.

DRC was instrumental in establishing the Rwanda Information Center (RIC) during the Rwanda crisis, and in conjunction with OFDA and State/PRM, has prepared a "Blueprint" for future information centers, including a recommendation to institutionalize certain functions of the RIC and apply them to humanitarian assistance activities worldwide.

B. OPERATIONS

The second major area of DRC responsibility is **operations** -- the management and implementation of the Bureau's two crisis prevention and response projects: the Famine Early Warning Systems (FEWS III) and the Africa Emergency Locust/Grasshopper Assistance (AELGA) projects. Both of these activities with associated budgets, directly managed by DRC staff, are the foundation of the DRC Strategic Plan.

III. STRATEGIC PLAN

Successful implementation of the projects will be determined by first establishing baseline data for certain technical indicators and then measuring these indicators annually thereafter to document what progress has been achieved. The ultimate **Goal** of the program will be a:

Reduced Need for U.S. Humanitarian Assistance

Supporting this goal will be one primary **Strategic Objective**:

An improved use of USAID resources to prevent, mitigate, and respond to humanitarian crises in FEWS and AELGA-active countries.

The following **Indicators** will be measured annually to show progress in achievement of the strategic objective. They are:

- Reduction in ratio of requested food aid to aggregate food deficits during potential food emergencies.
- Reduction in the number of pest-related disaster declarations in Sub-Saharan Africa.

There are four **program outcomes** whose achievement will contribute to the higher-level strategic objective and goal. Each has a series of associated progress indicators that, from a technical standpoint, have been judged "measurable" and should indicate whether progress is being made or not in achieving planned outcomes over time.

Program Outcome 1 -- Improved use of early warning information by USAID management (Washington and Missions).

Indicators:

- Increasing use of AELGA information/recommendations by USAID decision makers in responding to potential or actual pest-related crises.
- Increasing use of FEWS early warning/vulnerability analyses by USAID staff in developing emergency food assistance requests and in taking other preventive actions.
- Increasing use of FEWS early warning/vulnerability analyses by host governments in developing emergency food aid requests to donors and in taking other preventive actions.
- Increasing use of FEWS early warning/vulnerability analyses by USAID/W in early programming and allocations of emergency food assistance.

Program Outcome 2 -- Improved host country government, regional, and international institutions' capacity to produce, obtain and use early warning information.

Indicators:

- Increased number of countries with technical and managerial capability to respond cost-effectively to potential food emergencies.
- Increased use by host government decision-makers of survey/forecasting information (produced by local, regional and international institutions) in addressing potential pest outbreaks.
- Increased number of host country, regional and international institutions systematically monitoring, reporting, and responding to potential pest outbreaks.

Program Outcome 3 -- Improved host country capacity to prevent and control pests.

Indicators:

- Reduction in the number of countries where major pest outbreaks occur.
- Increased number of outbreaks being contained.
- Earlier stages of grasshopper/locust plague development where intervention occurs.
- Increased number of countries with emergency pest control action plans and actively using them.
- Increased staff and budgets for crop protection units.
- Increased establishment of scheduled training programs for pest control or pesticide safety.

Program Outcome 4 -- Improved policies and strategies by affected countries, donors and international agencies, especially the FAO, for prevention and control of pests.

Indicators:

- Increased number of countries with written policies or strategies for locust prevention and emergency control.
- Increased donor consensus on approaches for locust early warning, outbreak control, and institutional support/strengthening.

The AELGA Project comprises a series of long-term activities which promote environmentally-sensitive approaches to pest management and control. Thus the project contributes to the second Goal: **Enhanced preservation and improvement of the environment** through one primary **Strategic Objective** which is: **Improved environmentally-safe approaches to prevent and mitigate agricultural pest crises adopted by host countries, regional institutions, and international organizations in AELGA-active countries.** Progress in achievement of this objective will be indicated by annual measurement of the following **Indicators:**

- Establishment and full operation of a multilateral locust plague preventive unit in key locust breeding areas.
- Adoption by host governments of international environmental guidelines for pest and pesticide management.

- Decreased use of long residual and broad spectrum organochlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides for emergency pest control.
- Increased identification and field use of biological pesticides to control locust and grasshoppers.

Successful implementation of the project's environmental activities will lead to achievement of a primary **Program Outcome of improved policies and strategies promoting environmentally-sound pest management**. The technical **Indicators** of progress are:

- Increased integration of Supplemental Environmental Assessments into host country pesticide use regulations.
- Increased quantity of pesticides safely eliminated, consolidated, or transferred from host country stores.
- Reduction in pesticide intoxicification cases associated with locust control.

o:\sadtpub\docs\strat95.drc

AFRICA BUREAU AFR/AA/DRC
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE FRAMEWORK

GOAL # 1

Reduced Need for U.S.
Humanitarian Assistance

OFFICE
STRATEGIC
OBJECTIVES

Improved use of USAID resources
to prevent, mitigate, and respond
to humanitarian crises in FEWS and
AELGA active countries

PROGRAM
OUTCOME

Improved use of Early Warning
Information by USAID
management (Washington and
Missions).

Improved host country government,
regional, and international institutions'
capacity to produce, obtain and use
early warning information.

Improved host country capacity
to prevent and control pests.

Improved policies and strategies by
affected countries, donors and
international agencies, especially the
FAO, for prevention and control
of pests.

**AFRICA BUREAU AFR/AA/DRC
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE FRAMEWORK**

GOAL # 2

**Enhanced preservation and
improvement of the environment**

**OFFICE
STRATEGIC
OBJECTIVES**

**Improved environmentally-safe
approaches to prevent and mitigate
agricultural pest crises adopted by host
countries, regional institutions, and
international organizations in AELGA-
active countries**

**PROGRAM
OUTCOME**

**Improved policies and strategies
promoting enviromentally-sound
pest management**

GOAL 1: REDUCED NEED FOR U.S. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

| Strategic Objective | Indicators | Baseline 1995 | Projected 1996 | Actual 1996 | Projected 1997 | Actual 1997 |
|--|---|---------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Strategic Objective 1: Improved use of USAID resources to prevent, mitigate, and respond to humanitarian crises in FEWS and AELGA-active countries. | Reduction in ratio of requested food aid to aggregate food deficits during potential food emergencies. | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| | Reduction in the number of pest-related disasters declarations in Sub-Saharan Africa | | | | | |
| Program Outcome | | | | | | |
| Program Outcome 1: Improved use of early warning information by USAID management (Washington and Mission). | Increasing use of AELGA information/recommendations by USAID decision makers in responding to potential or actual pest-related crises. | | | | | |
| | Increasing use of FEWS early warning/vulnerability analyses by USAID staff in developing emergency food assistance requests and in taking other preventive actions. | | | | | |
| | Increasing use of FEWS early warning/vulnerability analyses by host governments in developing emergency food aid requests to donors and in taking other preventive actions. | | | | | |
| | Increasing use of FEWS early warning/vulnerability analyses by USAID/W in early programming and allocations of emergency food assistance. | | | | | |
| Program Outcome 2: Improved host country government, regional, and international institutions' capacity to produce, obtain and use early warning information. | Increased number of countries with technical and managerial capability to respond cost-effectively to potential food emergencies. | | | | | |
| | Increased use by host government decision-makers of survey/forecasting information (produced by local, regional and international institutions) in addressing potential pest outbreaks. | | | | | |
| | Increased number of host country, regional and international institutions systematically monitoring, reporting, and responding to potential pest outbreaks. | | | | | |
| Program Outcome 3: Improved host country capacity to prevent and control pests. | Reduction in the number of countries where major pest outbreaks occur. | | | | | |
| | Increased number of outbreaks that were contained. | | | | | |
| | Earlier stages of grasshopper/locust plague development where intervention occurs. | | | | | |
| | Increased number of countries with emergency pest control action plans and actively using them. | | | | | |
| | Increased staff and budgets for crop protection units. | | | | | |
| | Increased establishment of scheduled training programs for pest control or pesticide safety. | | | | | |
| Program Outcome 4: Improved policies and strategies by affected countries, donors and international agencies, especially the FAO, for prevention and control pests. | Increased number of countries with written policies or strategies for locust prevention and emergency control. | | | | | |
| | Increased donor consensus on approaches for locust early warning, outbreak control, and institutional support/strengthening | | | | | |

GOAL 2: ENHANCED PRESERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

| Strategic Objective | Indicators | Baseline 1995 | Projected 1996 | Actual 1996 | Projected 1997 | Actual 1997 |
|--|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Strategic Objective 1: Improved environmentally-safe approaches to prevent and mitigate agricultural pest crises taken by host countries, regional institutions, and international organizations in AELGA-active countries | Establishment and full operation of a multilateral locust plague preventive unit in key locust breeding areas. | TBD | TDB | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| | Adoption by host governments of international environmental guidelines for pest and pesticide management. | | - | | | |
| | Decreased use of long residual and broad spectrum organochlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides for emergency pest control. | | | | | |
| | Increased identification and field use of biological pesticides to control locust and grasshoppers. | | | | | |
| Program Outcome | | | | | | |
| Program Outcome 1: Improved policies and strategies promoting environmentally-sound pest management. | Increased integration of Supplemental Environmental Assessments into host country pesticide use regulations. | | | | | |
| | Increased quantity of pesticides safely eliminated, consolidated, or transferred from host country stores. | | | | | |
| | Reduction in pesticide intoxicification cases associated with locust control. | | | | | |