

Resilience Marker Assessment Card

1. ANALYSIS OF VULNERABILITY, HAZARDS, AND THREATS



Does the proposal include an adequate analysis of shocks, stresses and vulnerabilities?

☐

Yes

☐

Not sufficiently

Key Indicative elements for consideration:

- The analysis identifies relevant past and potential shocks and stresses (*e.g. risk of floods, droughts, storms, landslides, earthquakes, food price hikes, epidemics or technological disasters, climate change and environmental degradation and equally threat of an outbreak or intensification of conflict*) and their characteristics (*what areas might be affected, intensity and likelihood*).
- The analysis covers the vulnerability of different population groups to these shocks (*e.g. which population*

groups will be most affected by the identified hazards and threats and what capacities do they have to cope with them?).

- The analysis identifies what causes and drives these vulnerabilities.
- Coping mechanisms and livelihood patterns/strategies are identified.

2. THE PROJECT IS RISK INFORMED



Is the project risk informed? Does the project include adequate measures to ensure it does not aggravate risks or undermine capacities?

☐

Yes

☐

Not sufficiently

Key Indicative elements for consideration:

- The proposal identifies where the proposed activities may create or increase future vulnerability, hazard and threat characteristics and includes adequate measures to avoid or mitigate negative effects (*e.g. targeting criteria or location of services chosen in consultation with communities to prevent hostilities potentially leading to conflict and to safeguard access; fuel provided in camps to limit deforestation and reduce risks of landslides*).
- The proposal includes adequate measures for protecting project outputs from risks (*e.g. choosing sites for warehouses and distributions that are not at risk*

of floods, landslides or earthquakes; providing tents that are storm proof; continuity measure to prepare for escalation of risk or violence – so services can be maintained if access becomes limited).

- Projects are able to adapt or scale up their activities in the event of future hazards or threats (*e.g. hospitals with mobile teams able to react to disasters or incidents of violence; systems enabling scale-up of operations during emergencies*).

3. THE PROJECT STRENGTHENS LOCAL CAPACITIES TO COPE WITH SHOCKS AND STRESSES



Does the project include measures to build local capacities (beneficiaries + local institutions)?

☐ Yes

☐ Not sufficiently

🔑 Indicative elements for consideration:

- Capacities of beneficiaries and local institutions to absorb, respond and recover to these shocks and threats, including resource availability are analysed (*the role, capacity, activities and interests of local actors, local authorities, civil society is identified*).
- The proposal identifies if the proposed activities could undermine the capacities of individuals, communities, local governments and civil society to cope with future hazards and threats and includes adequate measure to avoid or mitigate negative effects (*e.g. the provision of services by international actors could undermine the capacity of local institutions; the sustained delivery of relief good could undermine livelihoods and create dependency among beneficiaries; providing relief could reduce incentives for local authorities to address root causes or prepare for disasters*).
- The project optimises opportunities to strengthen livelihoods and coping capacities against shocks and stresses (*e.g. cash for work is used for protective structures or productive assets; shelter programmes train and use local masons; interventions boosts local economies*).
- The project optimises opportunities to support local efforts across sectors to manage risks (*e.g. use cash for work for protective structures; strengthen social safety nets; contribute to sector contingency plans; support a multi-sectoral analysis of needs and response; strengthen the capacity of local institutions*).

4. A DELIBERATE STRATEGY TO REDUCE FUTURE HUMANITARIAN NEEDS



Does the project take opportunities to support long-term strategies to reduce humanitarian needs, underlying vulnerability and risks?

☐ Yes

☐ Not sufficiently

🔑 Indicative elements for consideration:

- The initial analysis is developed in consultation with other actors and stakeholders (*including humanitarian and development organisations, government, civil society and private sector – as appropriate*).
- The project demonstrates a good understanding of the multi-sectoral assistance required and of who delivers it and complements or supports other assistance plans where beneficial (*e.g. the proposal contains a mapping of humanitarian and development actors and their activities in relevant sectors; it uses existing mechanisms and systems avoiding duplication; funds are requested for international medical teams and supplies, while the need for strengthening local health systems is emphasized*).
- As much as the context permits, the project links and contributes to relevant government plans or strategies (*e.g. project activities use existing support channels; necessary information and updates are provided to relevant local actors*).