Anticipatory Action Readiness Index

Reference Guide for Data Collection

Introduction to the Anticipatory Action Readiness Index

The Anticipatory Action Readiness Index is a tool to help National Societies assess and then prioritize specific areas to strengthen their AA capacities. It is also a tool to measure changes in National Society AA capacity over time. The index is organized around three categories of forecasting, financing and early action. Within those three categories, there are 22 criteria the NS can assess themselves against using a simple levelling system. A level score of between 1 – 3 will be given to each criteria and the **average of those combined scores** is the overall Readiness Score for the National Society.

The levelling system is shown in the table below.

Numeric Level Score	Level Description
1-1.9	**Basic Readiness Level** *NS does not have interpretable forecasting models to act on, have no AA plans or AA funding streams in place and have very limited ability to implement early actions.*
2-2.9	**Intermediate Readiness Level** *NS has access to and some ability to interpret forecasting models, has at least one or several AA plans or funding streams in place, and the ability to implement early action activities sub-nationally.*
3	**Advanced Readiness Level** *NS has access to and can interpret forecasting models for all relevant hazards, has all possible AA plans and funding streams in place, and the ability to implement early actions at scale.*

Each category also has an associated key performance indicator (KPI) that can be used for the NSs' internal performance management, if desired.

Key Performance Indicators:

1) Forecasting: Improve National Society capacity to interpret and/or develop forecasting and trigger models.
2) Financing: Expand National Society access to anticipation funding streams.
3) Early Action: Increase National Society breadth, speed and/or scale of early action programming.

The index is organized by the three categories above. An example of the index structure for the forecasting category is shown below.

KPI	Leveling Criteria		Leveling Ranking	
Forecasting: Improve National Society capacity to interpret and/or develop forecasting and trigger models.	1.1 Forecasting and trigger models	Level 1:	Do not exist	
		Level 2:	Exist, require strengthening	
		Level 3:	Strong	
	1.2 NS interpretability of forecasting and trigger models	Level 1:	Can not interpret models/models do not exist	
		Level 2:	Limited NS staff interpretation	
		Level 3:	All relevant NS staff can interpret	
	1.3 NS relationship with MET agency and/or other relevant forecasting bodies	Level 1:	No relationship	
		Level 2:	Exists, requires improvement	
		Level 3:	Strong relationship	

How to Use this Guide

Practitioners conducting the AA readiness assessment using the index should use this guide to familiarize themselves with the contents of the index prior to carrying out any assessments. During the assessment process, practitioners can use the interview questions provided, reference the leveling definitions (especially when a response is unclear or there is uncertainty around which level to apply), and ensure a standard approach to data collection is used.

NOTE: Examples and definitions given will not be exhaustive and this guide is an iterative document that is updated when new examples or justifications are given. If an example/response given by a National Society to justify their levelling is not included in the examples or definitions below, this does not mean the answer is not acceptable.

Data Collection Process

When: The index can be baselined with any National Society that plans to or is currently engaging in anticipatory action programming. Each NS should be reassessed at a frequency that is appropriate for the NS to understand whether progress has been made and in which areas. For example, it may not make sense to reassess the NS annually if no new activities were carried out or no additional funding was received for AA.

Who: Any representative that has been oriented to the index and this guide can lead the data collection process. This can be a M&E staff or program/technical staff, or both. Data collection will take place almost entirely through key informant or group interviews with key NS staff and partners. You should identify all relevant stakeholders in the NS that may have knowledge of or experience with the NS's disaster management or AA programming and ask them to participate in this assessment.

How: When possible, the data should be collected in-person with NS staff and partners. The number of interviews needed to collect all data will differ from NS to NS, but generally the process should take only a day or two. Index scores and justifications should be recorded in the provided index scoresheet by the representative leading the process.

Using the Index

The following section includes the index, example interview questions for each criteria, and examples/justifications that can help the practitioner and NS decide which level to rank each area. If you have questions about the index methodology or want to add rank justifications/examples, please email lisa.williams2@redcross.org

CATEGORY 1: FORECASTING

Key performance indicator: Improve National Society capacity to interpret and/or develop forecasting and trigger models.

<u>Leveling Criteria References</u>

Criteria	Level	Rank Justification/Examples
1.1 Usability of relevant forecasting products *Interview Question*: *Can you describe the NS ability to use forecasting products?*	1 – Do not exist or not usable	There are no forecasting products that are being produced nationally, regionally or globally from hydromet agencies that are currently able to be used in the anticipation context. This could be due to lack of reliability and skill of products, a need for products to be released at a more frequent interval to properly inform a trigger, and/or lack of government acceptance of existing products would like to use.
	2 – At least one useable forecast product available to NS, gaps remain for additional forecasts	Forecasting products exist, but reliability, accuracy and/or relevancy need to be improved for NS to confidently use to take action ahead of a hazard AND/OR additional forecasting products need to be in place for additional hazards that can be responded to in the anticipation window
	3 – Useable forecast products available that comprehensively cover all relevant hazards	All hazards that can be anticipated or that NS has ability/interest to respond to have appropriate forecasting products in place
1.2 NS understanding of hydro-meteorological concepts *Interview Question*: *Can you describe the NS ability to understand hydro-meteorological concepts such as the causes and characteristics of typhoons or floods?*	1 – NS staff have very limited understanding of concepts	NS staff that play a role in anticipation programming are not familiar with the basics of different hydro-meteorological phenomenon and the forecasting possibilities for each type of hazard that can be anticipated
	2 – NS staff have partial understanding of concepts	Either NS staff have some understanding of relevant hydro-met events and their associated forecasting possibilities but need more information, or some staff have this information but more need to be trained

	3 – All relevant NS staff have understanding of key concepts	All staff that need to be familiar with hydro-met concepts have the proper level of understanding
1.3 Creation of trigger models *Interview question: Can you describe the NS ability to create a trigger model based on available forecasts for relevant hazards?*	1 – Do not exist or require significant strengthening	
	2 - At least one strong model exists, further opportunities for additional models	
	3 - Strong models in place, comprehensively cover all relevant hazards	
1.4 NS interpretability of forecasting & trigger models *Interview question: Can you describe the NS ability to interpret and use available forecast and trigger models and which staff (if any) have this ability?*	1 – Can not interpret / models do not exist	Either NS does not have forecast and trigger models in place that inform anticipation interventions, or they exist but NS is reliant on external actors to interpret an anticipation activation for them
	2 – Partial NS staff interpretation	Some NS can interpret models but not all staff that need to be able to
	3 – All relevant NS staff can interpret	Self-explanatory
1.5 NS relationship with Hydro Met agency and/or other relevant forecasting bodies *Interview Question: How would you describe your NS relationship with the MET agency or other forecasting bodies?*	1 – No relationship	No established communication or engagement with MET/forecasting agencies
	2 – Exists, requires improvement	NS may have an indirect relationship with the MET agency through other international actors such as the IFRC, PNS or Red Cross Climate Centre (RCCC) but does not lead in these discussions
	3 – Strong relationship	MoU or agreement with the MET agency is signed and/or NS guides and leads in discussions with MET agency in order to obtain relevant forecasting products for anticipation

CATEGORY 2: FINANCING

Key performance indicator: Expand National Society access to anticipation funding streams.

<u>Leveling Criteria References</u>

Criteria	Level	Rank Justification/Examples
2.1 NS anticipation funding strategy *Interview Question: Does the NS have a funding strategy specifically for anticipation in place?*	1 – No AA funding strategy in place	
	2 – Funding strategy partially in place, needs improvement and/or documentation	
	3 – Comprehensive funding strategy for all relevant hazards and impact levels in place	
2.2 **Simplified** Early Action Protocols *Interview Question: Does your NS have any Simplified Early Action Protocols validated?*	1 – None in place	Self-explanatory; if simplified EAPs are **in progress** of development/validation but not approved, please note and score 1
	2 – Some in place, but additional opportunities	At least one simplified EAP is **approved** and in place
	3 – All possible simplified EAPs in place	Every hazard for which the NS would like to anticipate has simplified EAP in place
	0 - N/A	Does not apply - NS has no interest in pursuing EAPs
2.3 Early Action Protocols *Interview Question: Does your NS have any Early Action Protocols validated?*	1 – None in place	If EAPs are in progress of development/validation but **not approved**, please note and score 1
	2 – Some in place, additional opportunities	At least one EAP is **approved** and in place

	3 – All possible EAPs in place	Every hazard for which the NS would like to anticipate has an EAP in place
	0 - N/A	The NS has no interest in pursuing an EAP
2.4 Draft Emergency Plan of Action for DREF Imminent Crisis *Interview Question: Do you have any pre-disaster plans that are developed in anticipation of requesting DREF imminent crisis funds?*	1 – None in place	
	2 – Some in place, but additional opportunities	One or more hazards that are appropriate to utilize the DREF for Imminent Crisis has a finalized draft EPoA and trigger statement, but more opportunities exist
	3 – All possible draft EPoAs in place	All hazards that are appropriate for the DREF for Imminent Crisis mechanism have draft EPoAs and trigger statements in place
	0 – N/A	Does not apply if NS states they don't want to use the Imminent Crisis for DREF mechanism
2.5 National Level Funding for Anticipation *Interview Question: Have you or do you currently receive funding from national government or companies for AA?*	1 - None received	
	2 – Has received limited funding but additional opportunities exist	Has received some funding currently or in the past but there are known opportunities to pursue/receive additional funds
	3 - Fully established stream of national funding	All known or possible opportunities are established
	0 – N/A	The NS does not want to receive government or corporate funds; or no opportunities exist
2.6 Red Cross bilateral funding for anticipation *Interview Question: Have you or do you receive funding for AA from other Red Cross National Societies?*	1 – Not received	
	2 - Has received limited funding but additional opportunities exist	Example: The NS has received Quick Action Fund from AmCross
	3 - Fully established stream of bilateral funding	A grant or fund provided by a partner NS(s) dedicated to AA that is held by the NS

	0 – N/A	NS does not have interest in receiving bilateral funds or there are no NS bilateral funds available
2.7 Creation of NS-held replenishable fund for anticipation *Interview question: Does NS have a locally-held interest-gaining fund dedicated to AA or early response specifically and is replenished when depleted.*	1 - No fund	
	2 - Fund started, requires additional investment or procedures	Fund is established but funds are limited or SOPs/procedures on fund use/management is lacking
	3 - Fully functioning fund in place	Fund is established, able to be replenished and SOPs for fund use are in place
	0 – N/A	NS doesn't have interest in setting up this or isn't strategic priority
2.8 Other disaster risk financing mechanisms (risk insurance, UN funding pools etc.) *Interview Question: Does the NS currently or ever have disaster risk financing mechanisms, such as World Bank risk insurance?*	1 – Not received	
	2 – Has received but additional opportunities remain	Example: World Bank insurance schemes
	3 – Fully established stream of DRF financing for AA	
	0 – N/A	NS doesn't have interest in this mechanism

CATEGORY 3: EARLY ACTION

Key performance indicator: Increase National Society breadth, speed and/or scale of early action programming.

<u>Leveling Criteria References</u>

Criteria	Level	Rank Justification/Examples
3.1 NS NHQ and branch leadership support of AA *Interview Question*: *Can you describe your NHQ and branch leadership support of AA?*	1 - Not supportive	
	2 - Limited support	
	3 - Fully supportive	Has included AA as strategic goal/priority in strategic plans, has invested in or approved activities to build AA capacity
3.2 Comprehensive AA plan for all relevant hazards *Interview Question*: *Does the NS have an AA plan for all or some relevant hazards, either as part of their disaster management strategy or independently?*	1 – Does not exist	No comprehensive AA plan exists, either as part of or as complement to, the NS' wider disaster risk management strategy
	2 – Exists but needs strengthening and/or multiple AA plans need to be harmonized	An AA plan exists within the NS' disaster risk management strategy or multiple AA plans exist and need to be harmonized/integrated into a wider DRM strategy
	3 – Comprehensive plan fully aligned with NS DRM strategy in place	
3.3 Government partnerships on AA *Interview Question*: *Do you have any government partnerships to coordinate or implement AA?*	1 - No partnerships	
	2 - Limited partnerships	
	3 - All key partnerships in place	MoU, coordination mechanisms, or agreements in place with all relevant government partners. Examples: Bureau of Disaster Management Bureau of Statistics Bureau of Social Welfare

3.4 NS branch AA implementation capacity *Interview Question: Can your NS implement AA activities independently?*	1 - Branches can't implement AA without outside support	Branches need support from Partner NS, external agencies is needed
	2 - Branches have limited ability to implement AA independently	Some branches can implement some of an implementation plan without outside support
	3 - Branches can implement AA independently	All branches can implement AA independently
3.5 NS AA reach – Households *Interview Question: About how many people can your NS reach with AA interventions if activated/triggered?*	1 - NS can reach 2000 or less people (500 HHs) during a single AA intervention	
	2 - NS can reach 2001 – 10,000 people (500-2500 HHs) during a single AA intervention	
	3 - NS can reach more than 10,000 people (2,500+ HHs) during a single AA intervention	
3.6 NS AA reach - Geographic Coverage *Interview Question: What is an estimated percent of vulnerable geographies your NS can respond in with AA?*	1 - NS can respond in 30% or less of geographics vulnerable to AA hazards	
	2 - NS can respond in 31 – 65% of geographies vulnerable to AA hazards	
	3 - NS can respond in more than 65% of geographics vulnerable to AA hazards	

3.7 NS AA reach – Financial *Interview Question*: *About how much money can your NS program for AA per hazard?*	1 - NS can program $10,000 or per hazard (direct costs)	
	2 - NS can program between $10,001 - $500,000 per hazard	
	3 - NS can program more than $500,000 per hazard	
3.8 NS speed of AA programs *Interview Question*: *How much lead time does your NS need to implement AA?*	1 - NS can't implement AA for hazards with less than 2 months lead time	
	2 - NS can't implement AA for hazards with less than 2 weeks lead time	
	3 - NS can implement AA for hazards with any amount of lead time	
3.9 NS Frequency of AA implementation. *Interview Question*: *How many times has your NS activated AA programming in the past 5 years?*	1 - NS has not implemented AA programming in past 5 years	
	2 - NS has implemented AA programming 1 – 2 times in past 5 years	
	3 - NS has implemented AA 3 or more times in past 5 years	